Supplementary Materials for the manuscript:

Neurofilament light chain and α -synuclein RT-QuIC as differential diagnostic biomarkers in parkinsonisms and related syndromes

Corinne Quadalti, Giovanna Calandra-Buonaura, Simone Baiardi, Andrea Mastrangelo, Marcello Rossi, Corrado Zenesini, Giulia Giannini, Niccolò Candelise, Luisa Sambati, Barbara Polischi, Giuseppe Plazzi, Sabina Capellari, Pietro Cortelli, Piero Parchi.

Supplementary Methods

Sample collection

EDTA plasma samples were collected, aliquoted, and stored at -80° C according to standard procedures. CSF samples were obtained by lumbar puncture (LP) following a standard procedure, centrifuged in case of blood contamination (<2% of cases), divided into aliquots, and stored in polypropylene tubes at -80° C until analysis.

A/T/N classification

We classified all cases with available CSF according to the A/T/N scheme, [1] as follow: amyloid positive (A+), if A β 42/40 ratio <0.68; tau positive (T+), if p-tau >58 pg/ml; neurodegeneration positive (N+), if t-tau >450 pg/ml.

Statistical analysis and patient group comparisons.

We used IBM SPSS Statistics version 24 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA) and GraphPad Prism 8 (GraphPad Software, La Jolla, CA, USA) software. Depending on their distribution, data were presented as mean ± standard deviation (SD) or median and interquartile range (IQR).

In both linear regression models and Cox regression analyses amyloid ratio and orthostatic hypotension were analysed as categorical parameters (presence or absence). Positive amyloid status was defined by a ratio <0.65, whereas the presence of orthostatic hypotension was defined by a drop in systolic blood pressure of \geq 10 mmHg with assumption of an upright posture.[2]

In this study PD and PDD groups have been considered two different cohorts, except when evaluating the association with disease severity of cNfL and pNfL. We kept the two groups separate when assessing the diagnostic value of NfL because the presence or absence of cognitive decline makes a difference in the early diagnostic evaluation of these patients in the clinical setting. Moreover, PDD is by definition an evolutionary stage of PD with cognitive decline occurring at least one year after the onset of parkinsonism. In contrast, given that PDD represents an evolutionary stage of PD related to the spread of LB pathology and/or the association with AD pathology or other co-pathologies, we considered PD and PDD as a single entity when evaluating NfL association with disease severity.

Supplementary References

- [1] Jack, CR Jr., et al. An unbiased descriptive classification scheme for Alzheimer disease biomarkers. *Neurology*, 87(5), 539-47, (2016).
- [2] Freeman, R., et al. Consensus statement on the definition of orthostatic hypotension, neurally mediated syncope and the postural tachycardia syndrome. *Clin. Auton. Res.* 21(2), 69-72, (2011).

Supplementary Table 1. Comparison of NfL levels and clinical/demographic features between MSA with predominant cerebellar ataxia (MSA-C) and MSA with predominant parkinsonism (MSA-P).

	MSA-C	MSA-P	p value
$\mathbf{n}^{\scriptscriptstyle 1}$	44	34	
Age, yrs	60.5±7.2	61.9±9.1	0.449
Female, n (%)	20 (45.5)	22 (64.7)	0.091
Time between onset to sample collection, mo.	43.0 (32,0-61.3)	50.5 (28.0-68.3)	0.539
CSF NfL (pg/ml)	3151 (2153-4487)	3119 (1932-4281)	0.567
Plasma NfL (pg/ml)	29.1 (22.3-38.6)	35.8 (26.8-47.6)	0.084
Orthostatic hypotension (%)	21 (47.7)	26 (68.4)	0.059
Αβ42/40 <0.65 (%)	5 (11.9)	2 (6.9)	0.693

Age is expressed as mean±SD, while the other continuous variable as median (interquartile range). CSF NfL was analysed in 38 MSA-C and 29 MSA-P, while plasma NfL in 30 MSA-C and 23 MSA P. ¹Two patients were excluded from the analysis because of the equal severity of parkinsonian and cerebellar features.

Supplementary Table 2. Comparison of NfL levels and clinical/demographic features between MSA presenting with isolated autonomic failure and MSA with other symptoms/signs at onset.

Clinical presentation	isolate autonomic	other	p value
	failure	symptoms/signs	
n	18	62	
Age, yrs	61.6±6.9	61.0±8.4	0.784
Female, n (%)	9 (50,0)	34 (54.8)	0.792
Time between onset to sample collection,	45.5 (34.5-68.0)	43.0 (25.8-67.5)	0.619
mo.			
CSF NfL (pg/ml)	3249 (2408-4604)	3009 (1995-4266)	0.618
Plasma NfL (pg/ml)	27.6 (23.9-24.5)	35.1 (24.5-41.5)	0.251

MSA-C/MSA-P (%)	61.1/38.9	55.0/45.0	0.788
Αβ42/40 <0.65 (%)	13.3	9.4	0.645

Age is expressed as mean±SD, while the other continuous variable as median (interquartile range). CSF NfL was analyzed in 15 MSA-isolate AF and 53 MSA-other symptoms/signs at onset, while plasma NfL in 12 MSA-isolate AF and 43 MSA-other symptoms/signs at onset.

Supplementary Table 3. Comparison of NfL levels and clinical/demographic features in MSA between early (<3 years from onset) and late disease stages.

	MSA early	MSA late	n voluo
	(≤3 yrs)	(>3 yrs)	p value
n	30	50	
Age, yrs	59.3±7.8	62.3±8.0	0.108
Female, n (%)	13 (43.3)	30 (60.0)	0.149
Time between onset to sample collection, mo.	25.0 (20.3-32.3)	59.0 (45.3-72.8)	<0.0001
CSF NfL (pg/ml)	3098 (2018-4520)	3075 (2118-4249)	0.768
Plasma NfL (pg/ml)	31.1 (21.3-37.9)	34.6 (25.2-42.3)	0.393
Orthostatic hypotension (%)	22 (73.3)	38 (79.2)	0.552
Αβ42/40 <0.65 (%)	2 (7.7)	5 (11.9)	0.699

Age is expressed as mean±SD, while the other continuous variable as median (interquartile range). CSF NfL was analysed in 26 MSA early and 42 MSA late, while plasma NfL in 17 MSA early and 38 MSA late.

Supplementary Table 4. Summary of the results of the cNfL and α -syn RT-QuIC combined analysis between diagnostic groups.

PD vs MSA		PD Di	iagnosis	PD vs PSF	PD vs PSP/CBS		agnosis	PD vs APDs		PD Diagnosis	
		Y	N				N			Y	N
cNfL + α-	+	115	3	cNfL + α-	+	113	0	cNfL + α-	+	114	5
syn-s	-	1	65	syn-s	-	3	52	syn-s	-	2	115
	TOT	116	68		TOT	116	52		TOT	116	120
	ROC AUC [95% CI]		974 3–0,999]	ROC AV [95% C			987 3-1.000]	ROC AU [95% C			971 -0.992]

List of abbreviations: PD Parkinson's disease; MSA multiple system atrophy; PSP/CBS progressive supranuclear palsy/corticobasal syndrome; APDs atypical parkinsonisms (i.e. MSA + PSP/CBS).

cNfL: CSF Neurofilament light chain; α-syn-s α-synuclein seeding activity.

Y patients with positive PD diagnosis; N patients with non-PD diagnosis (i.e. MSA, PSP/CBS, APDs).

"+" positive α -syn-s OR cNfL value below the selected cut-off for the combination; "-" negative α -syn-s AND cNfL value above the selected cut-off for the combination (see Table 3 of the manuscript for cut-offs values).

ROC AUC [95% CI] indicates the area under the ROC curve of the combined tests, with 95% confidence intervals.

Supplementary Table 5. Details regarding patients with discrepant results in PD vs APDs discrimination using both cNfL and α -syn RT-QuIC assays.

diagnostic tests MRI: mild vascular changes.
MRI: mild vascular
vascular
vascular
changes.
DatScan:
reduced
BG
uptake.
MRI:
moderate
vascular
changes.
MRI:
cerebellar
atrophy
_

						incontinence, orthostatic	
						hypotension. RBD.	
						Tracheostomy because of	
						respiratory arrest during	
						sleep.	
MSA	MSA-C	66	74	2712	Positive	Onset with cerebellar sign,	DatScan:
	probable					then orthostatic	reduced
						hypotension,	BG
						parkinsonism and	uptake;
						pyramidal signs. RBD.	MIBG:
						Stridor. Urinary	abnormal
						incontinence.	adrenergic
							innervation
MSA	MSA-C	67	59	4608	Positive	Isolated autonomic failure	MRI:
	probable					(orthostatic hypotension,	cerebellar
						urinary incontinence) at	atrophy;
						onset, then parkinsonism,	DatScan:
						cerebellar and pyramidal	reduced
						signs. RBD. Stridor.	BG
							uptake;
							MIBG:
							normal
							adrenergic
							innervation
PSP/CBS	PSP-RS/P	59	67	596	Negative	Axial-predominant,	MRI:
	probable					akinetic-rigid	vascular
						parkinsonism, early falls.	changes,
						Then vertical gaze palsy,	fronto-
						gait freezing, pyramidal	temporal
						signs, myoclonic jerks,	atrophy;
						and dysphagia.	DatScan:
							reduced
							BG uptake
PSP/CBS	PSP-RS/P	70	75	600	Negative	Axial-predominant,	MRI: mild
	probable					akinetic-rigid	vascular
						parkinsonism poorly	changes;
						responsive to levodopa,	DatScan:

			falls (<1 years), gait	reduced
			freezing, vertical gaze	BG uptake
			palsy, hypophonia,	
			dysarthria, dysphagia,	
			ideomotor apraxia,	
			cervical dystonia.	

Discrepant results are highlighted in bold. Age is expressed in years, while the time between onset to lumbar puncture in months. List of abbreviations: LP, lumbar puncture; BG, basal ganglia; RBD, REM-sleep behavior disorder; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; MIBG, metaiodobenzylguanidine.

Supplementary Table 6. Sensitivity and specificity of the NfL and α -syn RT-QuIC assay comparisons between PDD alone, and PD/PDD, versus atypical parkinsonisms.

Diagnostic	Biomarker	NfL cut-off	+/- 1	Sens. (%)	Spec. (%)
Group		(pg/ml)		[95% CI]	[95% CI]
PD/PDD	cNfl	1417	145/7 vs 1/67	95.4 [90.8-97.8]	98.5 [92.1-99.9]
vs MSA	pNfL	17.43	71/13 vs 2/53	96.4 [87.7-99.4]	84.5 [75.3-90.7]
	α-syn-s	NA	142/10 vs 3/65	93.4 [88.2-96.8]	95.6 [87.6-99.1]
PD/PDD	cNfl	1057	135/17 vs 10/42	80.8 [68.1-89.2]	88.8 [82.8-92.9]
vs PSP/CBS	pNfL	17.56	72/12 vs 6/35	85.4 [71.6-93.1]	85.7 [76.7-91.6]
	α-syn-s	NA	142/10 vs 0/52	93.4 [88.2-96.8]	100 [93.2-100.0]
PD/PDD	cNfL	1124	138/14 vs 13/107	90.8 [85.1-94.4]	89.2 [82.3-93.6]
vs APDs	pNfL	17.56	72/12 vs 9/87	85.7 [76.7-91.6]	90.6 [83.1-95.0]
	α-syn-s	NA	142/10 vs 3/117	93.4 [88.2-96.8]	97.5 [92.9-99.5]
PDD vs	cNfl	1417	34/2 vs 1/67	94.4 [81.9-99.0]	98.5 [92.1-99.9]
MSA	pNfL	17.58	16/6 vs 3/52	94.6 [85.2-98.5]	72.7 [51.9-86.9]
	α-syn-s	NA	36/0 vs 3/65	100 [90.3-100.0]	95.6 [87.6-99.1]
PDD vs PSP/CBS	cNfl	1297	33/3 vs 16/36	69.2 [55.7-80.1]	91.7 [78.2-97.1]

	pNfL	17.56	16/6 vs 6/35	85.4 [71.6-93.1]	72.7 [51.9-86.9]
	α-syn-s	NA	36/0 vs 0/52	100 [90.3-100.0]	100 [93.2-100.0]
PDD vs	cNfL	1364	34/2 vs 20/100	94.4 [81.9-99.0]	83.3 [75.7-88.9]
APDs	pNfL	17.56	16/6 vs 9/87	90.6 [83.1-95.0]	72.7 [51.9-86.9]
	α-syn-s	NA	36/0 vs 3/117	100 [90.3-100.0]	97.5 [92.9-99.5]

List of abbreviations: PD, Parkinson's disease; MSA, multiple system atrophy; PSP/CBS, progressive supranuclear palsy/corticobasal syndrome; APDs, atypical parkinsonisms (MSA + PSP/CBS); Sens., sensitivity; Spec., specificity.

Supplementary Table 7. Associations between NfL values and clinical parameters (univariate model).

Diagnostic	NfL	Coefficient	Time onset	MMSE	Hoehn &	UPDRS-III	Orthostatic	Amyloid
group	source		to LP		Yahr		hypotension	${ m ratio}^1$
PD/PDD	CSF	В	0.002	-0.037	0.243	0.014	0.217	0.365
		95% CI	0.001-0.003	-0.059-0.015	0.130-0.356	0.006-0.022	0.021-0.413	0.141-0.590
		SE	0.001	0.011	0.057	0.004	0.099	0.114
		Beta	0.219	-0.281	0.378	0.353	0.192;	0.254
		P value	0.007	0.001	<0.0001	0.001	0.030	0.002
	Plasma	В	0.001	-0.400	0.200	0.009	0.362	0.418
		95% CI	-0.001-0.003	-0.064	0.082-0.319	0.001-0.017	0.113-0.610	0.155-0.681
		SE	0.001	0.016	0.059	0.004	0.124	0.132
		Beta	0.087	0.012	0.389	0.309	0.326	0.333
		P value	0.433	-0.356	0.001	0.022	0.005	0.002
				0.001				
MSA	CSF	В	-0.002	0.001	0.13	-0.011	0.202	0.062
		95% CI	-0.006-0.002	-0.060-0.062	-0.029-0.054	-0.030-0.008	-0.062-0.466	-0.314-0.438
		SE	0.002	0.030	0.021	0.009	0.132	0.188
		Beta	-0.117	0.004	0.082	-0.327	0.186	0.040
		P value	0.347	0.976	0.551	0.234	0.131	0.744
	Plasma	В	0.002	-0.061	0.016	0.01	0.337	-0.169
		95% CI	-0.002-0.005	-0.144-0.022	-0.027-0.058	-0.017-0.019	0.014-0.660	-0.616-0.277
		SE	0.002	0.041	0.021	0.008	0.161	0.221
		Beta	0.111	-0.229	0.111	0.049	0.282	-0.119

 $^{^{1}}$ "+" for α -syn seeds indicates a positive seeding reaction in the RT-QuIC analysis, while it means "below the cut-off" for the NfL assay. Conversely, "-" for α -syn seeds indicates a negative seeding reaction in the RT-QuIC analysis, and a "above the cut-off" value of NfL.

		P value	0.430	0.144	0.461	0.885	0.041	0.448
PSP/CBS	CSF	В	0.001	0.001	0.202	0.005	-0.126	0.502
		95% CI	-0.004-0.006	-0.035-0.037	-0.091-0.494	-0.008-0.018	-1.258-1.007	-0.001-1.006
		SE	0.003	0.018	0.143	0.006	0.552	0.251
		Beta	0.060	0.008	0.245	0.198	-0.044	0.273
		P value	0.672	0.958	0.170	0.463	0.822	0.051
	Plasma	В	-0.003	-0.035	0.176	0.013		0.229
		95% CI	-0.008-0.002	-0.062	-0.040-0.392	-0.007-0.033		-0.385-0.844
		SE	0.002	0.008	0.105	0.009		0.302
		Beta	-0.218	0.013	0.325	0.439	-	0.131
		P value	0.176	-0.407	0.105	0.177		0.453
				0.013				
DLB	CSF	В	< 0.001	-0.006	0.025	-0.001	0.185	0.106
		95% CI	-0.001-0.002	-0.034-0.022	-0.213-0.262	-0.029-0.027	-0.261-0.632	-0.160-0.373
		SE	0.001	0.014	0.117	0.013	0.219	0.133
		Beta	0.015	-0.052	0.035	-0.014	0.148	0.101
		P value	0.907	0.693	0.835	0.952	0.404	0.428
	Plasma	В	0.001	0.004	0.005	-0.020	0.168	0.220
		95% CI	-0.002-0.005	-0.048-0.055	-0354-0.363	-0.065-0.024	-0.578-0.915	-0.273-0.714
		SE	0.002	0.025	0.171	0.020	0.352	0.242
		Beta	0.124	0.028	0.006	-0.291	0.119	0.161
		P value	0.493	0.881	0.978	0.335	0.640	0.370

List of abbreviations: PD Parkinson's disease; PDD PD dementia; DLB dementia with Lewy bodies; MSA multiple system atrophy; PSP/CBS progressive supranuclear palsy/corticobasal syndrome; LP lumbar puncture; MMSE Mini-mental state examination; UPDRS Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale.

Supplementary Table 8. Associations between NfL values and clinical parameters (adjusted for age).

Diagnostic	NfL	Coefficient	Time onset	MMSE	Hoehn &	UPDRS-III	Orthostatic	Amyloid
Group	source		to LP		Yahr		hypotension	ratio ¹
PD/PDD	CSF	В	0.001	-0.017	0.143	0.022	0.004	0.166
		95% CI	-0.001-0.002	-0.036-0.003	0.036-0.249	0.014-0.029	-0.175-0.182	-0.034-0.366
		SE	0.001	0.010	0.054	0.004	0.090	0.101
		Beta	0.061	-0.125	0.222	0.215	0.003	0.116
		P value	0.369	0.101	0.009	0.019	0.968	0.102
	Plasma	В	-0.001	-0.020	0.090	0.003	0.140	0.188
		95% CI	-0.002-0.001	-0.042-0.001	-0.019-0.199	-0.003-0.010	-0.079-0.359	-0.050-0.427
		SE	0.001	0.011	0.055	0.003	0.110	0.120

 $^{^{1}}$ Amyloid ratio evaluated as A β 42/40 <0.65 (presence or absence).

		Beta	-0.086	-0.183	0.174	0.116	0.126	0.150
		P value	0.363	0.062	0.105	0.303	0.207	0.119
MSA	CSF	В	-0.002	0.012	0.015	-0.016	0.203	0.069
		95% CI	-0.006-0.002	-0.053-0.078	-0.027-0.057	-0.038-0.006	-0.063-0.469	-0.335-0.474
		SE	0.002	0.008	0.021	0.010	0.133	0.202
		Beta	-0.117	0.056	0.099	-0.484	0.187	0.045
		P value	0.349	0.706	0.478	0.130	0.132	0.733
	Plasma	В	0.002	-0.091	0.013	-0.001	0.336	-0.213
		95% CI	-0.002-0.005	-0.182-0.000	-0.030-0.056	-0.023-0.022	0.010-0.662	-0.700-0.274
		SE	0.002	0.045	0.021	0.010	0.162	0.241
		Beta	0.114	-0.342	0.093	-0.033	0.281	-0.150
		P value	0.421	0.050	0.546	0.939	0.043	0.382
PSP/CBS	CSF	В	0.001	0.007	0.188	0.002	-0.257	0.442
		95% CI	-0.004-0.006	-0.030-0.044	-0.113-0.488	-0.013-0.016	-1.315-0.801	-0.065-0.950
		SE	0.003	0.018	0.147	0.007	0.515	0.253
		Beta	0.062	0.057	0.228	0.074	-0.090	0.240
		P value	0.657	0.703	0.212	0.802	0.622	0.086
	Plasma	В	-0.004	-0.024	0.181	0.008		-0.072
		95% CI	-0.008-0.001	-0.051-0.002	-0.014-0.376	-0.010-0.027		-0.603-0.459
		SE	0.002	0.013	0.094	0.008	-	0.261
		Beta	-0.234	-0.284	0.334	0.290		-0.041
		P value	0.097	0.066	0.067	0.328		0.783
DLB	CSF	В	< 0.001	0.002	-0.043	-0.001	0.233	0.042
		95% CI	-0.002-0.001	-0.026-0.030	-0.298-0.211	-0.029-0.027	-0.213-0.679	-0.228-0.312
		SE	0.001	0.014	0.125	0.013	0.219	0.135
		Beta	-0.033	0.020	-0.061	-0.019	0.186	0.040
		P value	0.797	0.880	0.731	0.938	0.295	0.755
	Plasma	В	< 0.001	0.021	-0.108	-0.018	0.231	0.108
		95% CI	-0.003-0.004	-0.026-0.069	-0.429-0.213	-0.063-0.027	-0.450-0.912	-0.358-0.574
		SE	0.002	0.023	0.153	0.020	0.319	0.228
		Beta	0.049	0.159	-0.145	-0.254	0.163	0.079
		P value	0.770	0.364	0.488	0.400	0.480	0.639
						domantia with		

List of abbreviations: PD Parkinson's disease; PDD PD dementia; DLB dementia with Lewy bodies; MSA multiple system atrophy; PSP/CBS progressive supranuclear palsy/corticobasal syndrome; LP lumbar puncture; MMSE Mini-mental state examination; UPDRS Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale.

 $^{^{1}}$ Amyloid ratio evaluated as A β 42/40 <0.65 (presence or absence).

GUIDANCE CHECHLIST: STARD

Section & Topic	No	Item	Reported on
Section & Topic	NU	item -	page #
TITLE OR			
ABSTRACT			
	1	Identification as a study of diagnostic accuracy using at least one	1
		measure of accuracy	
		(such as sensitivity, specificity, predictive values, or AUC)	
ABSTRACT			
	2	Structured summary of study design, methods, results, and conclusions	2
		(for specific guidance, see STARD for Abstracts)	
INTRODUCTION			
	3	Scientific and clinical background, including the intended use and	3
		clinical role of the index test	
	4	Study objectives and hypotheses	3
METHODS			
Study design	5	Whether data collection was planned before the index test and	4
		reference standard	
		were performed (prospective study) or after (retrospective study)	
Participants	6	Eligibility criteria	4
	7	On what basis potentially eligible participants were identified	4-5
		(such as symptoms, results from previous tests, inclusion in registry)	
	8	Where and when potentially eligible participants were identified	4
		(setting, location and dates)	
	9	Whether participants formed a consecutive, random or convenience	4
		series	
Test methods	10 a	Index test, in sufficient detail to allow replication	5-6
	10b	Reference standard, in sufficient detail to allow replication	5
	11	Rationale for choosing the reference standard (if alternatives exist)	3-5
	12a	Definition of and rationale for test positivity cut-offs or result	5-6
		categories	
		of the index test, distinguishing pre-specified from exploratory	

	12b	Definition of and rationale for test positivity cut-offs or result categories	5-6
		of the reference standard, distinguishing pre-specified from exploratory	
	13 a	Whether clinical information and reference standard results were available	6
		to the performers/readers of the index test	
	13b	Whether clinical information and index test results were available	NA
		to the assessors of the reference standard	
Analysis	14	Methods for estimating or comparing measures of diagnostic accuracy	6
	15	How indeterminate index test or reference standard results were	5,6
		handled	
	16	How missing data on the index test and reference standard were	NA
		handled	
	17	Any analyses of variability in diagnostic accuracy, distinguishing pre-	NA
		specified from exploratory	
	18	Intended sample size and how it was determined	NA
RESULTS			
Participants	19	Flow of participants, using a diagram	NA
	20	Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics of participants	7
	21 a	Distribution of severity of disease in those with the target condition	7 (Table 1)
	21b	Distribution of alternative diagnoses in those without the target	NA
		condition	
	22	Time interval and any clinical interventions between index test and	7 (Table 1)
		reference standard	
Test results	23	Cross tabulation of the index test results (or their distribution)	10 (Table 3)
		by the results of the reference standard	
	24	Estimates of diagnostic accuracy and their precision (such as 95%	10
		confidence intervals)	
	25	Any adverse events from performing the index test or the reference	NA
		standard	
DISCUSSION			
	26	Study limitations, including sources of potential bias, statistical	15
		uncertainty, and generalisability	

	27	Implications for practice, including the intended use and clinical role of	15
		the index test	
OTHER			
INFORMATION			
		Registration number and name of registry	NA
	29	Where the full study protocol can be accessed	NA
		Sources of funding and other support; role of funders	16