Mak E, Su L, Williams GB, Watson R, Firbank M, Blamire A, O'Brien J.
Differential Atrophy of Hippocampal Subfields: A Comparative Study of
Dementia with Lewy Bodies and Alzheimer Disease.
American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry 2016, 24(2), 136-143.

Copyright:

© 2016. This manuscript version is made available under the [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license](#)

DOI link to article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jagp.2015.06.006>

Date deposited:

12/04/2016

This work is licensed under a
[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence](#)

**Differential atrophy of hippocampal subfields: a comparative study of
dementia with Lewy bodies and Alzheimer's disease**

Elijah Mak (BA)¹, Su Li (PhD)¹, Guy Williams (PhD)², Rosie Watson (PhD)^{3,4,5}, Michael Firbank (PhD)⁴, Andrew Blamire (PhD)⁶, John O'Brien (DM)¹

¹ Department of Psychiatry, School of Clinical Medicine, Addenbrooke's University of Cambridge, UK., ² Wolfson Brain Imaging Centre, University of Cambridge, UK., ³ Department of Aged Care, The Royal Melbourne Hospital, Australia, ⁴ Institute of Neuroscience, Newcastle University, ⁵ The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and the Department of Medicine, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia., ⁶ Institute of Cellular Medicine & Newcastle Magnetic Resonance Centre, UK.

Elijah Mak – fk24@medschl.cam.ac.uk

Li Su – ls514@cam.ac.uk

Guy B. Williams – gbw1000@wbic.cam.ac.uk

Rosie Watson – rosie.watson@ncl.ac.uk

Michael Firbank – michael.firbank@newcastle.ac.uk

Andrew M. Blamire – andrew.blamire@ncl.ac.uk

John O'Brien – john.obrien@medschl.cam.ac.uk

Corresponding author:

Professor John O'Brien

Foundation Professor of Old Age Psychiatry

Department of Psychiatry

University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine

Box 189, Level E4 Cambridge Biomedical Campus

Cambridge

CB2 0SP

UK

John O'Brien has acted as a consultant for GE Healthcare, Lilly, TauRx and Cytos.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Sir Jules Thorn Charitable Trust, the NIHR Biomedical Research Unit in Dementia and the Biomedical Research Centre awarded to Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Cambridge, and the NIHR Biomedical Research Unit in Dementia and the Biomedical Research Centre awarded to Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and the Newcastle University. Elijah Mak was in receipt of a Gates Cambridge PhD studentship and an Alzheimer's Research UK Cambridge Network Award.

ABSTRACT

Background and objectives: Dementia with Lewy bodies (DLB) is characterized by relative preservation of the medial temporal lobe compared to Alzheimer's disease (AD). However, the differential involvement of the hippocampal subfields in both diseases has not been clearly established. We aim to investigate hippocampal subfield differences in vivo in a clinical cohort of DLB and AD subjects.

Methods: 104 participants (35 DLBs, 36 ADs, and 35 healthy comparison subjects (HC)) underwent clinical assessment and 3 Tesla T1-weighted imaging. A Bayesian model implemented in Freesurfer was used to automatically segment the hippocampus and its subfields. We also examined associations between hippocampal subfields and tests of memory function.

Results: Both the AD and DLB groups demonstrated significant atrophy of the total hippocampus relative to HC but the DLB group was characterized by preservation of the CA1, fimbria and fissure. In contrast, all the hippocampal subfields except the fissure were significantly atrophied in AD compared to both DLB and HC groups. Among DLB subjects, CA1 was correlated with the Recent Memory score of the CAMCOG and Delayed Recall subscores of the HVLT.

Conclusions: DLB is characterized by milder hippocampal atrophy that was accompanied by preservation of the CA1. The CA1 was also associated with memory function in DLB. Our findings highlight the promising role of hippocampal subfield volumetry, particularly that of the CA1, as a biomarker for the distinction between AD and DLB.

Keywords: Lewy bodies, Alzheimer's disease, neuroimaging, MRI, hippocampus.

1. INTRODUCTION

Dementia with Lewy bodies (DLB) is the second leading cause of degenerative dementia in older people after Alzheimer's disease (AD), accounting for up to 15% of cases at autopsy ¹. DLB shares common clinical, neuropsychological and pathological features with other dementia subtypes such as AD and Parkinson's disease (PD) with dementia, making differentiation between these disorders challenging. Despite the development of consensus diagnostic criteria, the sensitivity for differential diagnosis of DLB in clinical practice remains low, with many DLB subjects misdiagnosed. In light of this uncertainty, and with important implications for subsequent patient management, there is need for reliable imaging markers to help distinguish DLB from other subtypes of dementia, most especially AD.

Structural neuroimaging studies have found reduced global atrophy in DLB compared to AD ². The relative preservation of the hippocampus in DLB compared to AD is recognized as one of the most consistent structural MRI findings ^{2,3}, and has been incorporated as a supportive feature in the revised criteria for the diagnosis of DLB ¹.

However, most previous studies have compared total hippocampal volumes using a region of interest approach. Considering the functional specialization of the histologically distinct subfields of the hippocampus, local analyses of the hippocampus are increasingly recognized as a viable method to characterize the involvement of cytoarchitectonic regions in the pathology of

neurodegenerative diseases, most commonly in AD, mild cognitive impairment (MCI) ⁴, and PD ⁵.

Using a manual tracing technique on 4T MRI images, Mueller and colleagues ⁶ have demonstrated atrophy of the *cornu ammonis* (CA)1 and the subiculum in AD. Interestingly, a similar pattern of hippocampal changes in healthy comparisons (HC) has also been associated with development of amnesic MCI ⁴. There is also histopathological evidence that the CA1 region is preferentially vulnerable to the neuropathology of AD ⁷.

There have been few direct comparisons of the hippocampal subfields in DLB and AD. Two previous studies have reported a milder degree of atrophy in the subiculum and CA1 regions of the hippocampus in DLB compared to AD ^{8,9}, although another study did not find any significant difference in hippocampal volumes ¹⁰. As such, the clinical utility of hippocampal subfield volumetry to aid in the differential diagnosis of DLB from AD remains unclear.

The discrepancy of findings in the literature could be attributed to the variability of methods that are currently employed to examine the hippocampal subfields. To date, manual tracing is widely acknowledged as the gold standard of hippocampal subfield delineation. However, it is labor intensive, and its reproducibility might be limited by inter/intra-rater variability. There is also the possibility of asymmetric bias in manual segmentations due to laterality of visual perception ¹¹. To overcome these limitations, we used a validated and automated technique ¹² to compare the volumetric differences

of the hippocampal subfields in DLB and AD and investigate their associations with memory performance.

2. METHODS

2.1. Subjects, assessment and diagnosis

Seventy-one individuals over the age of 60 (36 subjects with probable AD ¹³ and 35 with probable DLB ¹ were recruited from a community dwelling population of patients referred to local Old Age Psychiatry, Geriatric Medicine or Neurology Services. Thirty-five similarly aged healthy comparison subjects were recruited from relatives and friends of subjects with dementia or volunteered via advertisements in local community newsletters. The research was approved by the local ethics committee. All subjects or, where appropriate, their nearest relative, provided written informed consent.

Subjects underwent clinical and neuropsychological evaluation. Neuropsychological assessments of global cognitive measures included the Cambridge Cognitive Examination (CAMCOG) ¹⁴, which incorporates the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) ¹⁵ in addition to a number of subscales assessing domains including orientation, language, memory, attention, praxis, calculation, abstract thinking and perception. Verbal and visuospatial memory was assessed with the Hopkins Verbal Learning Test (HVLT) ¹⁶ and the Brief Visuospatial Memory Test (BVMt) respectively ¹⁷. Motor parkinsonism was evaluated with the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale Part III (UPDRS) (2003). For subjects with dementia, neuropsychiatric features were examined with the Neuropsychiatric Inventory

(NPI) ¹⁹, and cognitive fluctuations were assessed with the cognitive fluctuation scale ²⁰, a test to obtain information about the historical pattern of cognitive fluctuation over time in a patient.

2.2. MRI acquisition

Subjects underwent T1 weighted MR scanning on the same 3T MRI system using an 8 channel head coil (Intera Achieva scanner, Philips Medical Systems, Eindhoven, Netherlands). The sequence was a standard T1 weighted volumetric sequence covering the whole brain (3D MPRAGE, sagittal acquisition, 1 mm isotropic resolution and matrix size of 240 (anterior-posterior) x 240 (superior-inferior) x 180 (right-left); repetition time (TR) = 9.6ms; echo time (TE) = 4.6ms; flip angle = 8°; SENSE factor = 2).

2.3. Image analysis

Cortical reconstruction and volumetric segmentation of MRI scans were processed on the same workstation using the Freesurfer 5.3 image analysis suite (<http://surfer.nmr.mgh.harvard.edu/>). The technical details are described previously ^{21,22}. In summary, the initial processing of T1 MRI images includes the following steps: removal of non-brain tissue ²³, automated Talairach transformation, segmentation of the subcortical white matter and deep grey matter volumetric structures ²⁴, intensity normalization ²⁵, tessellation of the grey matter/white matter boundary, automated topology correction ²⁶, and surface deformation to optimally place the grey matter/white matter and grey matter/cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) boundaries ²¹. All surface models in our study were visually inspected for accuracy and manual corrections while

blinded to diagnostic information. However, 2 subjects (2 AD) with extensive pial/white matter surface errors failed the hippocampal segmentations and were excluded from the analyses. The dataset for all subsequent analyses comprised of 35 HC, 34 AD, and 35 DLB.

Total hippocampal volumes were obtained from the automated pipeline for volumetric segmentation of subcortical structures implemented in Freesurfer. Subsequently, the hippocampal subfields were segmented by using a Bayesian inference approach, and a probabilistic atlas of the hippocampal formations based on manual delineations of subfields from several training subjects. The left and right hippocampi were segmented into 7 subfields: CA1, CA2–3, CA4–DG, subiculum, presubiculum, fimbria, and hippocampal fissure (Figure 1). The detailed procedures for subfield delineations have been described elsewhere ¹².

2.4. Statistical analyses

Statistical analyses were performed with the STATA13 (<http://www.stata.com/>) software. The distribution of continuous variables was tested for normality using the Skewness-Kurtosis test and visual inspection of histograms. Demographic differences across the three diagnostic groups were assessed with ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis while clinical and cognitive scores were compared between DLB and AD using T-Tests or Mann-Whitney depending on the normality of distributions. The χ^2 test was used to examine gender distributions between groups. Comparisons of hippocampal subfield volumes between groups were examined with ANCOVA, controlling for age,

gender, education, and intracranial volumes (ICV), followed by post-hoc pairwise Bonferroni tests. Subsequently, we also performed Bonferroni correction for the number of subfields, with an adjusted significance threshold of $p = 0.007$. Within each group, we further investigated associations of hippocampal subfields which were differentially affected with memory functions scores using partial correlations to account for the effects of age, gender, education, and ICV.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Subject characteristics

The demographic and clinical data for patients and healthy comparison subjects are summarized in Table 1. Subject groups were well matched for age [$F(2,101) = 0.74$; $p = 0.479$], gender [$\chi^2(2)=4.27$; $p = 0.118$], and years of education [$\chi^2(2)=5.62$; $p = 0.060$]. As expected, the DLB group had significantly higher UPDRS scores than the AD group ($Z = -6.817$, $p < 0.001$). DLB subjects also scored significantly higher on the Cognitive Fluctuations Scale ($Z = -3.915$, $p < 0.001$), although there were no significant differences between dementia groups in scores of NPI [$Z = -0.738$, $p = 0.461$], MMSE [$t(67) = -0.5921$, $p = 0.556$], CAMCOG [$t(67) = -0.692$, $p = 0.491$], and HVLT-Total Recall [$t(66) = -0.086$, $p = 0.932$]. Compared to the DLB group, the AD group performed significantly poorer on the HVLT-Delayed Recall [$Z = -3.20$, $p = 0.001$] and HVLT-Retention [$Z = -3.27$, $p = 0.001$].

3.2. Hippocampal subfields

The volumetric comparisons of the hippocampal subfields between groups are shown in Figure 2 and Table 2. Overall, ANCOVA analyses revealed a main effect of diagnosis on total hippocampal volumes. The AD group showed the most atrophy of the hippocampus, with the DLB group being intermediate between AD and HC ($AD < DLB < HC$). The relative extent of hippocampal subfield atrophy in DLB and AD compared to the healthy comparison group is shown in Table 3. After controlling for age, gender, education, and ICV, we found significant atrophy affecting all the hippocampal subfields, with the exception of the fissure, in AD compared to both HC and DLB groups. In contrast, the CA1, fimbria and the fissure were preserved in DLB relative to HC.

3.3 Correlations with memory functions

Hippocampal subfield analyses revealed that the CA1 volumes in DLB were also significantly correlated with the Recent Memory scores of the CAMCOG ($r = 0.40$; $p = 0.029$) and Delayed Recall scores from the HVLT ($r = 0.37$; $p = 0.043$). The AD group did not show any significant associations of total hippocampus and the CA1 with any cognitive test.

4. DISCUSSION

The main findings of the study were (a) DLB was associated with significantly milder hippocampal atrophy than AD; (b) AD showed a global pattern of hippocampal atrophy affecting all the subfields with the exception of the fissure (c) the CA1 region was relatively preserved in DLB compared to HC and AD; (d) the CA1 region is associated with memory functions in DLB.

Neuropathological studies have shown that the hippocampus is one of the earliest sites of pathology in the disease course of AD, which progresses in a systematic fashion: neurofibrillary tangle originates in entorhinal areas before spreading to the CA1 and subiculum, and subsequently to the CA2 and CA3 areas before affecting the neocortex ²⁷. Despite growing evidence suggesting that the neurodegenerative pathology is not uniformly distributed throughout the hippocampus, the majority of volumetric studies in DLB and AD have considered the hippocampus as a unitary structure. Therefore, to appreciate the complex anatomical structure of the hippocampus, we used an automated technique to compare local volumetric differences in the hippocampus in DLB subjects with those of AD and age-matched HC.

In accordance with previous estimates of hippocampal atrophy ranging from 23% ^{8,9} – 28% ²⁸, we demonstrated that AD subjects had 29.5% smaller hippocampal volumes relative to HC. At the subregional level, we found that AD group had significant atrophy in all hippocampal subfields compared to both DLB and HC, with the exception of the fissure. Our finding is corroborated by previous imaging studies ²⁹, including post-mortem evidence indicating greater CA1, CA2, CA3, and subiculum atrophy in AD relative to HC ^{30,31}. Taken together, the global pattern of hippocampal atrophy observed in our AD group is congruent with a previous finding that subfield measurements may not confer additional sensitivity over total hippocampus volumes in the detection of AD ³².

The relative preservation of the hippocampus in DLB compared to AD is in agreement with the literature ² and fits with the different neuropsychological profiles of each group, where memory deficits are more prominent in AD. Previous studies have also suggested that DLB is associated with lesser pathology affecting the perforant pathways ³³.

To date, only a few studies have compared atrophy patterns of the hippocampal subfields between DLB and AD with considerable heterogeneity in methodologies and findings. The CA1, fimbria, and fissure were the most preserved regions in our DLB subjects. Interestingly, the present results are in partial agreement with previous work from our group ⁸. In that study, we used a manual drawing approach and reported a lower degree of atrophy affecting the CA1 and subiculum regions in DLB compared to AD. It is noteworthy that our findings, despite different methodologies (automatic segmentation v manual tracing), are also consistent with histopathological evidence in DLB, indicating that neuronal loss and Lewy neurites are largely confined to the presubiculum and the CA2-3, with sparing of the CA1 and subiculum regions ³¹. However, two previous studies, employing the hippocampal radial distance technique, have reported increased atrophy, rather than preservation, of the CA1 in DLB relative to HC ^{9,10}. Methodological differences in the anatomical delineations of the subfields might account for the conflicting findings. The CA1 as well as other hippocampal structures are parallel to each other and are organized along the anterior-medial to posterior-lateral axis of the hippocampus. The hippocampal radiance distance technique, which measures in perpendicular directions to this axis, might be limited in its

capacity to reveal differential volume changes in CA1 and other subfields, and in fact, over-estimate the volume reduction of CA1 due to atrophy of other parallel structures.

The hippocampus is a complex structure, with interconnected subfields having different projections. The CA1 has extensive reciprocal projections with the enthorinal cortex ³⁴ and emerging evidence from high-resolution 4T imaging ³⁵ and lesion ³⁶ studies have pointed toward a critical involvement of CA1 neurons in episodic memory functions. The preservation of the CA1 region in DLB subjects also parallels with significantly better memory function compared to AD in our study. Furthermore, consistent with our previous work ⁸, the CA1 volumes in our DLB group were also significantly associated with memory functions. We are not aware of other studies that have examined correlations of hippocampal subfields with cognitive measures in DLB.

Although a previous study using the same Freesurfer technique has reported a correlation between hippocampal volumes and delayed recall scores in AD ³⁷, we did not find any significant association in the AD group with memory function, most likely due to a floor effect of memory performance. In future, the domain-specific contribution of hippocampal subfields will be better understood as this automated technique receives more recognition.

The major strengths of the study include the comprehensive neuropsychological assessment and a well-characterized group of probable DLB and AD subjects. Furthermore, in light of significant disparities in age ¹⁰,

gender and education ⁹ across comparison groups in previous studies, we extend the literature by investigating a cohort that was matched for age, gender, and educational level. We also used a publicly available technique that is capable of segmenting the hippocampal subfields in a reproducible and automatic fashion. Thus, we are able to address limitations associated with manual delineations of the hippocampus (see Introduction) and the practical challenges of processing large datasets. Lastly, this technique has also been validated against manual volume estimations ¹². Nevertheless, the operational definition of the medial boundaries of CA1 varies between segmentation protocols, resulting in a smaller volume of CA1 for the Freesurfer technique compared to other studies ^{8,38}. Also, whilst this method reports a combined volume of CA2 + CA3, others have reported CA2 separately, and combined CA3 with CA4 and DG. In addition, Van Leemput et al originally assessed hippocampal subfields with ultra-high resolution MPRAGE (slice thickness = 0.8mm) and enhanced signal-to-noise ratio ¹². Consistent with other studies, we used a standard 3T MPRAGE acquisition sequence (slice thickness = 1mm isotropic). However, this automated technique has been used to segment hippocampal subfields from 1.5T scans with a much lower resolution and a longer acquisition time of 35 minutes ⁵. Finally, although this technique has been widely applied in neurodegenerative diseases, the probabilistic atlas from Van Leemput et al was built upon healthy subjects, although this is an inherent limitation in many imaging studies where a common template is necessary for the investigation of group differences. Hence, some caution must be exercised in comparing findings between studies.

Additional potential limitations of this study include the lack of neuropathological verification of AD and DLB, as subject groups were based on clinical diagnosis, though this is an inherent limitation of all ante-mortem imaging studies. Furthermore, we have previously demonstrated good agreement between clinical and pathological diagnosis using the consensus clinical diagnostic method adopted here ³⁹.

5. CONCLUSION

To date, very few studies have compared atrophy patterns of the hippocampal subfields in DLB and AD. The main findings of (a) CA1 preservation and (b) milder global hippocampal atrophy in a clinically diagnosed DLB subjects are largely consistent with the topography of neuronal loss described in histopathological studies as well as with previous imaging studies. The distinct involvement of the CA1 in DLB and AD suggests that hippocampal subfield volumetry could be a promising biomarker to aid in the differential diagnosis of DLB.

REFERENCES

1. McKeith IG, Dickson DW, Lowe J, et al. Diagnosis and management of dementia with Lewy bodies: third report of the DLB Consortium. *Neurology* 2005;65(12):1863-1872.
2. Mak E, Su L, Williams G, O'Brien J. Neuroimaging characteristics of dementia with Lewy bodies. *Alzheimers. Res. Ther.* 2014;6(2):18.
3. Watson R, O'Brien JT, Barber R, Blamire AM. Patterns of gray matter atrophy in dementia with Lewy bodies: a voxel-based morphometry study. *Int Psychogeriatr* 2012;24(4):532-540.
4. Apostolova LG, Mosconi L, Thompson PM, et al. Subregional hippocampal atrophy predicts Alzheimer's dementia in the cognitively normal. *Neurobiol. Aging* 2010;31(7):1077-88.
5. Pereira JB, Junqué C, Bartrés-Faz D, Ramírez-Ruiz B, Martí M-J, Tolosa E. Regional vulnerability of hippocampal subfields and memory deficits in Parkinson's disease. *Hippocampus* 2013;23(8):720-8.
6. Mueller SG, Weiner MW. Selective effect of age, Apo e4, and Alzheimer's disease on hippocampal subfields. *Hippocampus* 2009;19(6):558-64.
7. Bobinski M, de Leon MJ, Tarnawski M, et al. Neuronal and volume loss in CA1 of the hippocampal formation uniquely predicts duration and severity of Alzheimer disease. *Brain Res.* 1998;805(1-2):267-269.
8. Firbank MJ, Blamire AM, Teodorczuk A, Teper E, Burton EJ. High Resolution Imaging of the Medial Temporal Lobe in Alzheimer ' s Disease and Dementia with Lewy Bodies. 2010;21:1129-1140.
9. Sabattoli F, Boccardi M, Galluzzi S, Treves a, Thompson PM, Frisoni GB. Hippocampal shape differences in dementia with Lewy bodies. *Neuroimage* 2008;41(3):699-705.
10. Chow N, Aarsland D, Honarpisheh H, et al. Comparing hippocampal atrophy in Alzheimer's dementia and dementia with lewy bodies. *Dement. Geriatr. Cogn. Disord.* 2012;34(1):44-50.
11. Maltbie E, Bhatt K, Paniagua B, et al. Asymmetric bias in user guided segmentations of brain structures. *Neuroimage* 2012;59(2):1315-23.
12. Van Leemput K, Bakkour A, Benner T, et al. Automated segmentation of hippocampal subfields from ultra-high resolution in vivo MRI. *Hippocampus* 2009;19(6):549-57.
13. McKhann G, Drachman D, Folstein M, Katzman R, Price D, Stadlan EM. Clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: Report of the NINCDS-

- ADRDA Work Group* under the auspices of Department of Health and Human Services Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease. *Neurology* 1984;34(7):939.
14. Huppert FA, Brayne C, Gill C, Paykel ES, Beardsall L. CAMCOG--a concise neuropsychological test to assist dementia diagnosis: socio-demographic determinants in an elderly population sample. *Br J Clin Psychol* 1995;34 (Pt 4):529-541.
 15. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. "Mini-mental state". A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res* 1975;12(3):189-198.
 16. Brandt J. The hopkins verbal learning test: Development of a new memory test with six equivalent forms. *Clin. Neuropsychol.* 1991;5(2):125-142.
 17. Benedict RHB, Schretlen D, Groninger L, Dobraski M, Shpritz B. Revision of the Brief Visuospatial Memory Test: Studies of normal performance, reliability, and validity. *Psychol. Assess.* 1996;8(2):145-153.
 18. The Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS): status and recommendations. *Mov Disord* 2003;18(7):738-750.
 19. Cummings JL, Mega M, Gray K, Rosenberg-Thompson S, Carusi DA, Gornbein J. The Neuropsychiatric Inventory: comprehensive assessment of psychopathology in dementia. *Neurology* 1994;44(12):2308-2314.
 20. Walker MP, Ayre GA, Cummings JL, et al. The Clinician Assessment of Fluctuation and the One Day Fluctuation Assessment Scale. Two methods to assess fluctuating confusion in dementia. *Br J Psychiatry* 2000;177:252-256.
 21. Fischl B, Dale AM. Measuring the thickness of the human cerebral cortex from magnetic resonance images. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2000;97(20):11050-11055.
 22. Fischl B, Sereno MI, Dale AM. Cortical surface-based analysis. II: Inflation, flattening, and a surface-based coordinate system. *Neuroimage* 1999;9(2):195-207.
 23. Ségonne F, Dale AM, Busa E, et al. A hybrid approach to the skull stripping problem in MRI. *Neuroimage* 2004;22(3):1060-75.
 24. Fischl B, Salat DH, van der Kouwe AJW, et al. Sequence-independent segmentation of magnetic resonance images. *Neuroimage* 2004;23 Suppl 1:S69-84.

25. Sled JG, Zijdenbos AP, Evans AC. A nonparametric method for automatic correction of intensity nonuniformity in MRI data. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging* 1998;17(1):87-97.
26. Ségonne F, Pacheco J, Fischl B. Geometrically accurate topology-correction of cortical surfaces using nonseparating loops. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging* 2007;26(4):518-29.
27. Schönheit B, Zarski R, Ohm TG. Spatial and temporal relationships between plaques and tangles in Alzheimer-pathology. *Neurobiol. Aging* 2004;25(6):697-711.
28. Callen DJ, Black SE, Gao F, Caldwell CB, Szalai JP. Beyond the hippocampus: MRI volumetry confirms widespread limbic atrophy in AD. *Neurology* 2001;57(9):1669-74.
29. Apostolova LG, Dinov ID, Dutton R a, et al. 3D comparison of hippocampal atrophy in amnesic mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. *Brain* 2006;129(Pt 11):2867-73.
30. Bobinski M, Wegiel J, Wisniewski HM, et al. Atrophy of hippocampal formation subdivisions correlates with stage and duration of Alzheimer disease. *Dementia* 1995;6(4):205-10.
31. Harding AJ, Lakay B, Halliday GM. Selective hippocampal neuron loss in dementia with Lewy bodies. *Ann. Neurol.* 2002;51(1):125-8.
32. Mueller SG, Schuff N, Yaffe K, Madison C, Miller B, Weiner MW. Hippocampal atrophy patterns in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* 2010;31(9):1339-47.
33. Lippa CF, Pulaski-Salo D, Dickson DW, Smith TW. Alzheimer's disease, Lewy body disease and aging: a comparative study of the perforant pathway. *J. Neurol. Sci.* 1997;147(2):161-166.
34. Duvernoy H. *The Human Hippocampus. Functional Anatomy, Vascularization and Serial Sections with MRI*. Berlin: Springer; 1998.
35. Mueller SG, Chao LL, Berman B, Weiner MW. Evidence for functional specialization of hippocampal subfields detected by MR subfield volumetry on high resolution images at 4 T. *Neuroimage* 2011;56(3):851-7.
36. Rempel-clower NL, Zola SM, Squire LR, Amaral DG. Three Cases of Enduring Memory Impairment after Bilateral Damage Limited to the Hippocampal Formation. 1996;16(16):5233-5255.
37. Lim HK, Hong SC, Jung WS, et al. Automated Segmentation of Hippocampal Subfields in Drug-Naïve Patients with Alzheimer Disease. 2013.

38. Mueller SG, Stables L, Du a T, et al. Measurement of hippocampal subfields and age-related changes with high resolution MRI at 4T. *Neurobiol. Aging* 2007;28(5):719-26.
39. McKeith IG, Ballard CG, Perry RH, et al. Prospective validation of consensus criteria for the diagnosis of dementia with Lewy bodies. *Neurology* 2000;54(5):1050-1058.

TABLES AND FIGURES

	HC	DLB	AD	p value
<i>n</i>	35	35	34	
Gender (m:f)	20:15	27:8	19:15	$\chi^2=4.27$, 0.118 [§]
Age (yrs)	76.7 $\pm$ 5.2	78.4 $\pm$ 6.9	78.1 $\pm$ 5.8	$F_{2,101}=0.74$, $p=0.479^a$
Education (yrs)	11.7 $\pm$ 2.6	10.8 $\pm$ 2.6	11.1 $\pm$ 3.5	$p=0.060^k$
UPDRS	2.0 $\pm$ 1.9	26.0 $\pm$ 10.7	5.6 $\pm$ 4.4	$p<0.001^w$
NPI		21.5 $\pm$ 17.1	17.0 $\pm$ 12.2	$p=0.461^w$
CogFluct		6.1 $\pm$ 3.8	2.3 $\pm$ 3.7	$p<0.001^w$
MMSE	29.1 $\pm$ 1.0	20.3 $\pm$ 5.3	19.6 $\pm$ 4.5	$p=0.556^\dagger$
CAMCOG	97.3 $\pm$ 3.8	67.7 $\pm$ 15.2	65.4 $\pm$ 12.2	$p=0.491^\dagger$
HVLT-Total Recall	25.9 $\pm$ 4.6	10.8 $\pm$ 4.8	10.7 $\pm$ 5.0	$p=0.932^\dagger$
HVLT-Delay Recall	8.5 $\pm$ 2.9	1.7 $\pm$ 2.3	0.3 $\pm$ 0.8	$p=0.001^w$
HVLT-Retention	80.6 $\pm$ 22.7	30.2 $\pm$ 38.0	4.1 $\pm$ 12.2	$p=0.001^w$
BVMT-Total	18.8 $\pm$ 6.5	6.9 $\pm$ 6.7	4.0 $\pm$ 2.5	$p=0.119^w$

Table 1. Demographics, clinical and neuropsychological measures.

Values expressed as Mean $\pm$ 1SD. [§] χ^2 – Chi-Square (df = 2) ; ^a ANOVA; ^k Kruskal-Wallis test (df = 2). ^w Mann-Whitney test – AD and DLB; [†] Student's t-test (df = 67) – AD and DLB. Abbreviations: DLB = dementia with Lewy bodies; AD = Alzheimer's disease; HC = Healthy comparison subjects; UPDRS = Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale, Part III; NPI = Neuropsychiatry Inventory; CogFluct = Cognitive Fluctuation Scale; MMSE = Mini-Mental State examination; CAMCOG = Cambridge Cognitive Examination; HVLT = Hopkins Verbal Learning Test; BVMT = Brief Visuospatial Memory Test.

Hippocampal subfields (mm ³)	HC (N=35)		DLB (N=35)		AD (N=34)		Group comparisons (df=2)
	mean	sd	mean	sd	mean	sd	
Total	5456	702	4894	775	3848	716	p<0.001 ^{a,b,c,d *}
Presubiculum	823	92	688	136	562	101	p<0.001 ^{a,b,c,d *}
CA1	650	58	608	94	528	116	p<0.001 ^{a, b *} p=0.002 ^{c *} p=0.082 ^d
CA2-3	1828	200	1574	293	1312	257	p<0.001 ^{a,b,c,d *}
Fimbria	113	30	100	42	74	35	p<0.001 ^{a,b *} p=0.005 ^{c *} p=0.615 ^d
Subiculum	1163	109	999	166	815	140	p<0.001 ^{a,b,c,d *}
CA4-DG	1040	106	895	158	743	144	p<0.001 ^{a,b,c,d *}
Fissure	128	37	125	42	132	46	p=0.867 ^a

Table 2. Volumetric comparisons of hippocampal subfields in AD (n=34), DLB (n=35), and HC (n=35), in mean (SD). ^a ANCOVA [df=2] controlling for age, gender, education, and intracranial volumes with post-hoc Bonferroni pairwise tests: ^b AD < HC; ^c AD < DLB; ^d DLB < HC. After Bonferroni correction for the number of subfields, the significance threshold is set at p = 0.007. Abbreviations: HC = Healthy comparison subjects ; AD = Alzheimer's disease; DLB = Dementia with Lewy bodies; CA = cornu Ammonis; DG = Dentate gyrus.

Relative extent of atrophy compared to HC	AD	DLB
Total Hippocampus	-29.5%	-10.3%
Presubiculum	-31.7%	-16.3%
CA1	-18.6%	-6.3%
CA2-3	-28.3%	-13.9%
Fimbria	-34.5%	-11.6%
Subiculum	-29.9%	-14.1%
CA4-DG	-28.5%	-13.9%
Fissure	2.6%	-2.6%

Table 3. Relative extent of total and regional hippocampal atrophy in AD and DLB compared to healthy comparison subjects.

Figure 1. Segmented hippocampal subfields from each representative subject in all three diagnostic groups.

Figure 2. Volumetric comparisons of hippocampal subfields in AD (n=34), DLB (n=35), and HC (n=35), in mean (SD). The bars in the figure represent standard error bars. Abbreviations: HC = Healthy comparison subjects; AD = Alzheimer's disease; DLB = Dementia with Lewy bodies; CA = cornu ammonis; DG = Dentate gyrus.