



Heriot-Watt University
Research Gateway

A commentary on Liang et al.'s paper with regard to emerging views of memory assessment in Alzheimer's disease

Citation for published version:

Parra Rodriguez, M 2017, 'A commentary on Liang et al.'s paper with regard to emerging views of memory assessment in Alzheimer's disease', *Cortex*, vol. 88, pp. 198-200.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.06.006>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1016/j.cortex.2016.06.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.06.006)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Heriot-Watt Research Portal](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Cortex

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via Heriot-Watt Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

Heriot-Watt University has made every reasonable effort to ensure that the content in Heriot-Watt Research Portal complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact open.access@hw.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Accepted Manuscript

A commentary on Liang et al.'s paper with regard to emerging views of memory assessment in Alzheimer's disease

Mario Alfredo Parra, MD, PhD



PII: S0010-9452(16)30159-9

DOI: [10.1016/j.cortex.2016.06.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.06.006)

Reference: CORTEX 1767

To appear in: *Cortex*

Received Date: 4 April 2016

Revised Date: 2 June 2016

Accepted Date: 7 June 2016

Please cite this article as: Parra MA, A commentary on Liang et al.'s paper with regard to emerging views of memory assessment in Alzheimer's disease, *CORTEX* (2016), doi: 10.1016/j.cortex.2016.06.006.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

**A commentary on Liang et al.'s paper with regard to emerging views of
memory assessment in Alzheimer's disease**

Mario Alfredo Parra ¹⁻⁵

1. School of Life Sciences, Psychology, Heriot-Watt University, UK.
2. Human Cognitive Neuroscience, University of Edinburgh, UK.
3. Alzheimer Scotland Dementia Research Centre and Centre for Cognitive Ageing and Cognitive Epidemiology, University of Edinburgh, UK.
4. UDP-INECO Foundation Core on Neuroscience (UIFCoN), Diego Portales University, Psychology, Chile.
5. Universidad Autónoma del Caribe, Barranquilla, Colombia.

✉ Mario A Parra Rodriguez, MD, PhD

School of Life Sciences

Psychology Department

Heriot-Watt University

Edinburgh, EH14 4AS

Tel. +44 (0) 131 451 8365

Email: M.Parra_Rodriguez@hw.ac.uk

Liang, Pertzov, Nicholas, Henley, Crutch et al. (2016) reported on a study carried out to investigate whether Alzheimer's disease in its familial variant (FAD) affects visual short-term memory (VSTM) for integrated representations comprising visuospatial information i.e., object and location. This is the second study investigating VSTM binding abilities in symptomatic and pre-symptomatic cases of FAD. An earlier study investigated VSTM for integrated representations comprising surface features such as shapes and colours (Parra, Abrahams, Logie, Mendez, Lopera et al., 2010a). The memory function investigated by Liang et al. (2016) is known as "relational binding" whereas that one investigated by Parra et al. (2010a) is known as "conjunctive binding". Visuospatial relational binding deficits in long-term memory (LTM), also known as associative learning impairments, have been previously reported in cases of sporadic AD (SAD) in the clinical (Swainson, Hodges, Galton, Semple, Michael et al., 2001) and prodromal stages (Fowler, Saling, Conway, Semple, & Louis, 2002). Parra, Abrahams, Logie, and Della Sala (2010b) have reported VSTM conjunctive binding deficits in SAD. Taken together, the results from these studies suggest that AD affects memory binding abilities regardless of the variant of the disease, the memory system where bound representations are held, or the nature of such representations (i.e., shapes, colours, locations).

The evidence drawn from rare cases of FAD is expected to support research into AD broadly. I will therefore focus my commentary on memory assessment in AD as a disorder affecting people at different ages. Particularly, I will focus on four areas on which Liang et al.'s study motivates debate: (1) format and structure of memory, (2) the effect of age on memory representations, (3) memory at the boundaries between normal and abnormal ageing, and (4) a new memory paradigm for the early detection of AD.

Format and structure of memory. Liang et al. (2016) used a novel memory test known as the Delayed Reproduction Task (DRT). The DRT measures precision of recall and provides an index of the quality of memory representation (Pertzov, Heider, Liang, & Husain, 2015). Quality is assessed by measuring how accurately the precise location of items scattered on visual arrays can be recalled. The most informative measure drawn from this task, with regard to ageing and AD assessment, is that indexing the ability to keep the two pieces of information together in memory as a unified representation (i.e., item-location). Loss of this ability would lead to what the authors called “swap errors”. This ability is seemingly linked to the capacity to retain in memory object tokens (item-location; Treisman, 2006), a function akin to those derived from slot models of memory (Suchow, Fougine, Brady, & Alvarez, 2014). Hence, impairments found during the DRT may be accounted for either by limited resources (i.e., spatial precision) or limited slots (item-location tokens). Contrary to shape and colour, which can be integrated into a unified representation with own identity detached from context, object and location cannot. This is because each piece of information retains its own identity in the new association (Mayes, Montaldi, & Migo, 2007) and hence remains available throughout the task. To be able to unveil binding specific impairments, a task devised to investigate this function should demonstrate that impairments in conjunctive or relational functions cannot be accounted for by impairments in processing the constituent parts. Unfortunately, this has not been the case for relational memory tasks involving object-location associations when used to assess healthy older adults (Chalfonte & Johnson, 1996). The precision component of the DRT may be linked to the ability to form and hold configural (spatial) representations, whereas the slot component may be linked to the ability to accurately allocate items to the vertices of such

configurations (temporary episodic tokens, Treisman & Zhang, 2006). I will further develop this view in the next section by considering previous findings from ageing studies.

The effect of age on memory representations. Memory for visual arrays involves memory for items and their arrangement (i.e., ensemble; Brady, Konkle, & Alvarez, 2011). Older people seem to be able to take advantage of configural clues when they are available during the task. This seems to be the case when the number of to-be-remembered locations is small (Olson, Zhang, Mitchell, Johnson, Bloise et al., 2004). When the number of locations increases, healthy older adults struggle to retain such configurations (Cowan, Naveh-Benjamin, Kilb, & Saults, 2006). Previous data from the DRT seems to support this view (Pertzov, Heider, Liang, & Husain, 2015). The DRT requests examinees to remember the location of three items. Although precision deficits indicate that older adults are less able to retain the exact locations of remembered items, thus confirming age-related visuospatial impairments, they could benefit from configural cues to make discrete decisions regarding items allocation to the configuration vertices (object-token). Previous studies suggest that this will be unlikely if visual arrays become more crowded (Cowan et al., 2006; Olson et al., 2004). A reason why older adults struggle to associate information in memory is because relational functions require the integrity of the hippocampus (Cer & O'Reilly, 2006). The hippocampus shrinks with age regardless of risk for AD (Yang, Goh, Chen, & Qiu, 2013). Liang et al. confirmed that successful performance on the DRT heavily relies on the integrity of the hippocampus.

Memory at the boundaries between normal and abnormal ageing. Binding shapes and colours in VSTM declines in asymptomatic cases of FAD (Parra et al., 2010a). This function remains preserved across the life span (Parra, Abrahams, Logie, & Della Sala, 2009; Rhodes,

Parra, & Logie, 2015), and does not rely on the hippocampus (Parra, Della Sala, Logie, & Morcom, 2014; Parra, Fabi, Luzzi, Cubelli, Hernandez et al., 2015). Liang et al. (2016) showed that relational functions carried out during VSTM also decline in pre-symptomatic cases of FAD. However, this function declines in healthy ageing and heavily relies on the integrity of the hippocampus. This would pose challenges if this task was used to assess cases at risk of SAD. Such a limitation of associative memory tasks has long been underestimated and continues to be neglected by current guidelines and consensus papers (Dubois, Feldman, Jacova, Cummings, DeKosky et al., 2010). I will address this issue next.

A new memory paradigm for the early detection of AD. AD seems to progress in two stages, a sub-hippocampal and a hippocampal stage (Didic, Barbeau, Felician, Tramon, Guedj et al., 2011). The sub-hippocampal stage is driven by the impact of AD on structures such as entorhinal and perirhinal cortex. This is prior to the MCI stage and is characterised by impairments in context-free memory functions such as those assessed by recognition tasks (Parra et al., 2010; Wolk, Mancuso, Kliot, Arnold, & Dickerson, 2013). The onset of the hippocampal stage corresponds clinically to the MCI stage. This is when impairments in context-rich memory functions (i.e., associative memory deficits) become apparent. Recent studies carried out in cases of FAD support this view (Romero Vanegas, Valencia Marin, Aguirre Acevedo, Buschke, & Lopera, 2010). Brain regions subserving context-free memory functions remain unaffected across the lifespan (Insausti, Juottonen, Soininen, Insausti, Partanen et al., 1998) and degenerate in AD much earlier than the hippocampus (Juottonen, Laakso, Insausti, Lehtovirta, Pitkanen et al., 1998; Khan, Liu, Provenzano, Berman, Profaci et al., 2014).

Final remarks. Memories are built and kept via context-free and context-rich functions. Though complementary, they have different lifespan trajectories. To date, tasks aimed at disentangling normal and abnormal ageing trajectories have been biased towards context-rich functions. This longstanding view no longer suits current diagnostic pathways which now focus on the preclinical stages of AD (Rentz, Parra, Amariglio, Stern, Sperling et al., 2013). It has been recently suggested that good preclinical tests for AD should “not show effects of healthy aging” (Logie, Parra, & Della Sala, 2015). VSTM conjunctive binding deficits have been recently suggested among the earliest cognitive changes indicative of the clinical state of AD (Dubois, Hampel, Feldman, Scheltens, Aisen et al., 2016). Future work will be needed to explore how these novel paradigms can be inserted in new clinical algorithms for the early detection of AD.

Acknowledgements

MAP research program is support by the Alzheimer’s Society [AS-R42303 and AS-SF-14-008]. The support from the Alzheimer’s Scotland Dementia Research Centre and the Centre for Cognitive Ageing and Cognitive Epidemiology part of the cross council Lifelong Health and Wellbeing Initiative (MR/K026992/1) both from the University of Edinburgh is also acknowledged.

References

Brady, T. F., Konkle, T., & Alvarez, G. A. (2011). A review of visual memory capacity: Beyond individual items and toward structured representations. *Journal of Vision, 11*, 4.

Cer, D. M., & O'Reilly, R. C. (2006). Neural Mechanisms of Binding in the Hippocampus and Neocortex: Insights from Computational Models. In H.D.Zimmer, A.Mecklinger, and U.Lindenberger (Eds.) *Handbook of binding and memory, perspective from cognitive neuroscience* (pp. 193-220). New York: Oxford University Press.

Chalfonte, B. L. & Johnson, M. K. (1996). Feature memory and binding in young and older adults. *Memory and Cognition, 24*, 403-416.

Cowan, N., Naveh-Benjamin, M., Kilb, A., & Saults, J. S. (2006). Life-span development of visual working memory: when is feature binding difficult? *Developmental Psychology, 42*, 1089-1102.

Didic, M., Barbeau, E. J., Felician, O., Tramon, E., Guedj, E., Poncet, M., et al. (2011). Which memory system is impaired first in Alzheimer's disease? *Journal of Alzheimers Disease, 27*, 11-22.

Dubois, B., Feldman, H. H., Jacova, C., Cummings, J. L., DeKosky, S. T., Barberger-Gateau, P., et al., (2010). Revising the definition of Alzheimer's disease: a new lexicon. *Lancet Neurology, 9*, 1118-1127.

Dubois, B., Hampel, H., Feldman, H. H., Scheltens, P., Aisen, P., Andrieu, S., et al. (2016). Preclinical Alzheimer's disease: Definition, natural history, and diagnostic criteria. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, *12*, 292-323.

Fowler, K. S., Saling, M. M., Conway, E. L., Semple, J. M., & Louis, W. J. (2002). Paired associate performance in the early detection of DAT. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, *8*, 58-71.

Insausti, R., Juottonen, K., Soininen, H., Insausti, A. M., Partanen, K., Vainio, P., et al. (1998). MR volumetric analysis of the human entorhinal, perirhinal, and temporopolar cortices. *AJNR American Journal of Neuroradiology*, *19*, 659-671.

Juottonen, K., Laakso, M. P., Insausti, R., Lehtovirta, M., Pitkanen, A., Partanen, K., et al. (1998). Volumes of the entorhinal and perirhinal cortices in Alzheimer's disease. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *19*, 15-22.

Khan, U. A., Liu, L., Provenzano, F. A., Berman, D. E., Profaci, C. P., Sloan, R., et al. (2014). Molecular drivers and cortical spread of lateral entorhinal cortex dysfunction in preclinical Alzheimer's disease. *Nature Neuroscience*, *17*, 304-311.

Liang, Y., Pertzov, Y., Nicholas, J. M., Henley, S. M. D., Crutch, S., Woodward, F., et al. (2016). Visual short-term memory binding deficit in familial Alzheimer's disease. *Cortex*, (in press).

Logie, R. H., Parra, M. A., & Della Sala, S. (2015). From Cognitive Science to Dementia Assessment. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *2*, 81-91.

Mayes, A., Montaldi, D., & Migo, E. (2007). Associative memory and the medial temporal lobes. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*, 126-135.

Olson, I. R., Zhang, J. X., Mitchell, K. J., Johnson, M. K., Bloise, S. M., & Higgins, J. A. (2004). Preserved spatial memory over brief intervals in older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *19*, 310-317.

Parra, M. A., Abrahams, S., Logie, R., & Della Sala, S. (2009). Age and binding within-dimension features in visual short term memory. *Neuroscience Letters*, *449*, 1-5.

Parra, M. A., Abrahams, S., Logie, R. H., Mendez, L. G., Lopera, F., & Della Sala, S. (2010a). Visual short-term memory binding deficits in familial Alzheimer's disease. *Brain*, *133*, 2702-2713.

Parra, M. A., Abrahams, S., Logie, R. H., & Della Sala, S. (2010b). Visual short-term memory binding in Alzheimer's disease and depression. *Journal of Neurology*, *257*, 1160-1169.

Parra, M. A., Della Sala, S., Logie, R. H., & Morcom, A. M. (2014). Neural correlates of shape-color binding in visual working memory. *Neuropsychologia*, *52*, 27-36.

Parra, M. A., Fabi, K., Luzzi, S., Cubelli, R., Hernandez, V. M., & Della Sala, S. (2015). Relational and conjunctive binding functions dissociate in short-term memory. *Neurocase*, *21*, 56-66.

Pertzov, Y., Heider, M., Liang, Y., & Husain, M. (2015). Effects of healthy ageing on precision and binding of object location in visual short term memory. *Psychology and Aging, 30*, 26-35.

Rentz, D., Parra, M. A., Amariglio, R., Stern, Y., Sperling, R., & Ferris, S. (2013). Promising developments in neuropsychological approaches for the detection of preclinical Alzheimer's disease: a selective review. *Alzheimer's Research & Therapy, 5*, 58.

Rhodes, S., Parra, M. A., & Logie, R. H. (2015). Ageing and feature binding in visual working memory: The role of presentation time. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 69*, 654-68.

Romero Vanegas, S. J., Valencia Marin, C. M., Aguirre Acevedo, D. C., Buschke, H., & Lopera, F. (2010). Verbal episodic memory at the preclinical and early phases of familiar early - onset Alzheimer disease caused by E280A mutation at PS1. *Acta Neurologica Colombiana, 26*, 177-194.

Suchow, J. W., Fournie, D., Brady, T. F., & Alvarez, G. A. (2014). Terms of the debate on the format and structure of visual memory. *Attention, Perception & Psychophysics, 76*, 2071-2079.

Swainson, R., Hodges, J. R., Galton, C. J., Semple, J., Michael, A., Dunn, B. D., Iddon, J. L., et al., (2001). Early detection and differential diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and depression with neuropsychological tasks. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders, 12*, 265-280.

Treisman, A. (2006). Objects tooken, binding, and visual memory. In H.D.Zimmer, A.Mecklinger, and U.Lindenberger (Eds.) *Handbook of binding and memory, perspective from cognitive neuroscience* (pp. 315-338). New York: Oxford University Press.

Treisman, A. & Zhang, W. (2006). Location and binding in visual working memory. *Memory and Cognition*, *34*, 1704-1719.

Wolk, D. A., Mancuso, L., Kliot, D., Arnold, S. E., & Dickerson, B. C. (2013). Familiarity-based memory as an early cognitive marker of preclinical and prodromal AD. *Neuropsychologia*, *51*, 1094-1102.

Yang, X., Goh, A., Chen, S. H. A., & Qiu, A. (2013). Evolution of hippocampal shapes across the human lifespan. *Human Brain Mapping*, *34*, 3075-3085.