INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF
HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

INSIGHTS-JHR
INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

Identifying Environmental and Genetic Risk Factors Associated with Early-Onset Dementia: A Case-Control Study

Case-Control Study

Abdullah[1], Maham Zaidi[2], Sara Mumtaz[3]*

Authors Affiliation
[1]Advance Physiotherapy Centre, Quetta Pakistan.
https://orcid.org/0009-0003-8628-5253
[2]Senior Physiotherapist, Indus Hospital Bedian, Pakistan.
https://orcid.org/0009-0009-8546-6769
[3]Chester University, UK.
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9396-1809

Corresponding Author*
Abdullah
abdullahpt01@gmail.com
Advance Physiotherapy Centre, Quetta Pakistan

Conflict of Interest:
None

Grant Support & Financial Support:
None

***Date Submitted**: 08-03-2024.*
***Date Published**: 31-03-2024.*
Volume 2 Issue 1, 2024

Abstract

Background: Early-onset dementia (EOD) poses significant challenges due to its complex etiology involving both environmental and genetic factors. Identifying how these factors contribute to EOD can enhance understanding and aid in developing targeted interventions.

Objective: To assess the impact of environmental exposures on individuals with a genetic predisposition to EOD over a period of two months, comparing the effects against a control group with no such exposures.

Methods: This case-control study involved 92 participants divided into two groups (InterventionGroup1 and ControlGroup2) with 46 individuals each, comprising 28 males and 18 females in InterventionGroup1 and 32 males and 14 females in ControlGroup2. Baseline and post-intervention assessments were conducted to measure Body Mass Index (BMI), the prevalence of EOD, and Quality of Life (QoL). Genetic screening for known dementia markers was performed pre-study to ensure comparable genetic risk across groups. The intervention consisted of specific environmental exposures, including dietary changes and exposure to non-toxic chemicals hypothesized to affect cognitive function.

Results: After two months, ControlGroup2 exhibited a significant reduction in BMI (from 26.0 ± 2.8 to 25.5 ± 2.7, p=0.04) and an improvement in QoL scores (from 75 ± 12 to 78 ± 11, p=0.02). In contrast, InterventionGroup1 showed a slight increase in BMI (from 27.5 ± 3.2 to 28.0 ± 3.3) and a rise in EOD prevalence from 4.35% to 6.52%. No significant changes were observed in the QoL for InterventionGroup1.

Conclusion: The findings suggest that environmental interventions may not uniformly benefit individuals with a genetic predisposition to early-onset dementia and that less invasive approaches might be more effective. The study highlights the need for personalized interventions based on genetic and environmental risk assessments.

Keywords: Body Mass Index, Case-Control Study, Dementia, Environmental Exposures, Genetic Predisposition, Intervention, Quality of Life, Risk Factors, Early-Onset Dementia.

INTRODUCTION

The burgeoning body of research into early-onset dementia (EOD) has highlighted the critical interplay between environmental and genetic determinants in the pathogenesis of this complex condition (1). Historically, dementia research predominantly focused on older populations, with early-onset cases, characterized by symptom onset before the age of 65, receiving comparatively less attention (2). However, the growing incidence of EOD in younger demographics necessitates a more rigorous investigation into its unique causative factors, aiming to develop tailored prevention and management strategies (3).

A notable strength of current research lies in its increasingly sophisticated methodologies for isolating and analyzing genetic factors (4). Advances in genomic technologies have enabled researchers to identify specific genetic variants that predispose individuals to EOD, thereby illuminating potential pathways for targeted therapeutic interventions (5). For instance, the identification of risk alleles in genes such as PSEN1 and APP provides a direct link to familial Alzheimer's disease, suggesting that genetic screening could become a pivotal component of EOD diagnostics (6). Additionally, environmental studies have expanded our understanding of how lifestyle factors, such as exposure to toxins and dietary habits, intersect with genetic predispositions to influence disease onset (7). This holistic approach

INSIGHTS-JHR
INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

underscores the multifactorial nature of EOD, supporting the development of comprehensive care models that address both genetic and environmental elements (8).

However, these strengths are counterbalanced by significant limitations inherent to EOD research (9). One of the primary challenges is the heterogeneity of EOD cases, which can complicate the extrapolation of findings across diverse patient populations (10). This variability often results in studies that, while rigorous in their own contexts, may not universally apply, thus necessitating cautious interpretation of research data (11). Furthermore, the ethical considerations surrounding genetic testing for dementia, particularly regarding the disclosure of predisposition to an incurable disease, pose ongoing debates within the medical community (12). These ethical dilemmas highlight the need for clear guidelines and support systems for individuals undergoing genetic screening, ensuring that they are adequately prepared for potential outcomes (13).

Moreover, while the integration of genetic and environmental research holds promise, it also introduces complexity into the study designs (14). The interaction between multiple risk factors can obscure causal pathways, making it challenging to distinguish between correlation and causation (15). This is particularly problematic in identifying actionable interventions, as the presence of confounding variables can diminish the apparent efficacy of potential treatments (16). Thus, while current research strategies are robust, they must continually evolve to address these complexities through more refined experimental designs and larger, more diverse study populations (17).

Investigation into the etiology of early-onset dementia is a dynamic field that adeptly integrates genetic and environmental research to unravel the complexities of this debilitating disease. While it boasts significant strengths, such as advanced genomic analysis and an inclusive approach to risk factors, it also faces substantial challenges, including case heterogeneity and ethical issues in genetic testing. Addressing these limitations through ongoing refinement of research methodologies and ethical frameworks will be crucial in advancing our understanding and management of early-onset dementia. This balanced perspective not only enhances the scientific rigor of the research but also ensures that it remains grounded in the realities of patient care, ultimately aiming to improve quality of life and outcomes for individuals affected by EOD.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

In this study, researchers conducted a controlled experiment over a duration of two months to explore the environmental and genetic risk factors associated with early-onset dementia. The subjects were divided into two distinct groups, each with a specific role in the investigation. InterventionGroup1 comprised 46 participants, including 28 males and 18 females, who were exposed to a series of environmental conditions believed to influence the development of dementia. ControlGroup2, serving as the comparison group, included 46 individuals as well, with a distribution of 32 males and 14 females. The participants in ControlGroup2 were not subjected to the same environmental conditions as those in InterventionGroup1, providing a baseline against which the effects of the environmental exposures could be assessed.

Participants in both groups were selected based on a stringent inclusion criterion that required them to be between 45 and 65 years of age with no prior diagnosis of any type of dementia. Furthermore, all participants underwent genetic screening to identify known genetic markers associated with increased risk of early-onset dementia. This pre-screening helped in understanding the baseline genetic risk within each group, ensuring the comparability of InterventionGroup1 and ControlGroup2 with respect to genetic predispositions.

The environmental exposures for InterventionGroup1 were carefully controlled and included factors such as exposure to specific chemicals known to affect cognitive functions, variations in diet specifically tailored to influence neurological health, and modifications in lifestyle factors such as physical activity levels and sleep patterns. The duration of exposure to these conditions was consistently maintained at two months, with regular monitoring and assessment to ensure compliance and to monitor any immediate effects.

The primary outcomes measured were changes in cognitive function, assessed through a series of standardized cognitive tests administered at the beginning and end of the study period. Secondary outcomes included the analysis of blood samples for biochemical markers of neural inflammation and neurodegeneration, providing a link between environmental exposures and physiological changes in the brain. Genetic analyses were also conducted post-exposure to determine if the environmental factors had any interaction effects with the participants' genetic markers that could predispose them to early-onset dementia.

This structured approach allowed researchers to meticulously document the impact of controlled environmental variables on a genetically predisposed group and compare these findings against a control group under normal conditions. The findings aimed to enhance the understanding of how lifestyle and environmental factors could interact with genetic profiles to influence the risk and onset of early-onset dementia, potentially guiding future preventive strategies or therapeutic interventions.

RESULTS

The study revealed notable differences in outcomes between the two groups over two months. In ControlGroup2, BMI significantly decreased ($p=0.04$), and Quality of Life scores improved ($p=0.02$). Conversely, InterventionGroup1 experienced a slight increase in

INSIGHTS-JHR
INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

BMI and a marginal rise in Early-Onset Dementia prevalence from 4.35% to 6.52%, with no significant changes in Quality of Life. These results suggest that the control conditions may be more conducive to maintaining or enhancing health metrics compared to the intervention environment.

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of participants

Characteristic	InterventionGroup1	ControlGroup2
Age (years, mean ± SD)	55 ± 7	53 ± 6
Gender (M/F)	28M / 18F	32M / 14F
Body Mass Index (BMI, mean ± SD)	27.5 ± 3.2	26.0 ± 2.8
Prevalence of Early-Onset Dementia (%)	2 (4.35%)	0 (0%)
Quality of Life Score (mean ± SD)	70 ± 15 (scale 0-100)	75 ± 12 (scale 0-100)

In the study, InterventionGroup1, with 28 males and 18 females, has an average age of 55 years and a BMI of 27.5, while ControlGroup2 consists of 32 males and 14 females with an average age of 53 years and a BMI of 26.0. Notably, InterventionGroup1 has a 4.35% prevalence of early-onset dementia.

Table 2: Characteristics (BMI, prevalence of Early-Onset Dementia, and Quality of Life)

Characteristic	Group	Baseline	2 Months	Test Name	p-value
Body Mass Index (BMI, mean ± SD)	InterventionGroup1	27.5 ± 3.2	28.0 ± 3.3	Paired t-test	0.25
	ControlGroup2	26.0 ± 2.8	25.5 ± 2.7	Paired t-test	0.04
Prevalence of Early-Onset Dementia (%)	InterventionGroup1	2 (4.35%)	3 (6.52%)	Chi-square	0.63
	ControlGroup2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	Chi-square	1.00
Quality of Life Score (mean ± SD)	InterventionGroup1	70 ± 15	68 ± 16	Paired t-test	0.33
	ControlGroup2	75 ± 12	78 ± 11	Paired t-test	0.02

The table presents a comparative analysis of three key characteristics—Body Mass Index (BMI), prevalence of Early-Onset Dementia, and Quality of Life—across two groups over a two-month period. In InterventionGroup1, the BMI slightly increased from 27.5 ± 3.2 to 28.0 ± 3.3, while ControlGroup2 saw a decrease from 26.0 ± 2.8 to 25.5 ± 2.7, with the change being statistically significant (p=0.04). Early-Onset Dementia prevalence marginally rose in InterventionGroup1 from 4.35% to 6.52%, yet remained 0% in ControlGroup2 throughout the study. Quality of Life scores slightly decreased in InterventionGroup1 from 70 ± 15 to 68 ± 16 and improved in ControlGroup2 from 75 ± 12 to 78 ± 11, with this increase being statistically significant (p=0.02). These metrics highlight differential impacts of the study conditions on the two groups.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study elucidate the nuanced dynamics between environmental exposures and genetic predispositions in the context of early-onset dementia. InterventionGroup1, subjected to specific environmental conditions, did not show the anticipated beneficial outcomes. Instead, this group witnessed a slight increase in BMI and a non-significant increase in the prevalence of early-onset dementia, which contrasts with the stability observed in ControlGroup2. This control group not only maintained a 0% prevalence of dementia but also experienced a significant improvement in quality of life and a reduction in BMI, suggesting that less interference might sometimes be more beneficial in managing health outcomes related to dementia (18).

One of the strengths of the current research is the robust methodological framework which allowed for the controlled manipulation of environmental variables while closely monitoring genetic factors. This dual focus is critical, as it acknowledges the complexity of dementia's etiology, involving an interplay of multiple risk factors. However, a limitation inherent to the study's design is the short duration of two months, which may not be sufficient to capture the long-term impacts of the interventions or to observe significant changes in dementia prevalence, which is generally a slowly progressing condition. Additionally, the small sample size could limit the generalizability of the findings, and larger studies are necessary to validate these results (19).

INSIGHTS-JHR
INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

The divergent outcomes between the two groups offer a platform for discussing the impact of environmental modifications in populations with a genetic predisposition to dementia. While the intervention was hypothesized to potentially mitigate risk factors through controlled exposures, the actual benefits were observed in the group without these targeted interventions. This counterintuitive result suggests that interventions might need to be highly personalized, taking into account individual genetic backgrounds, to be effective (20).

CONCLUSION

The study's findings underscore the complexity of addressing early-onset dementia through environmental interventions. The evidence suggests that while targeted environmental changes are theoretically promising, their practical application requires careful consideration of individual genetic susceptibilities. Further research is needed to explore the long-term effects of such interventions and to develop guidelines for personalized approaches that can more effectively leverage environmental modifications for dementia prevention. The pursuit of such knowledge remains critical as the population ages and the prevalence of dementia increases, highlighting the need for effective strategies to mitigate its impact on society.

REFERENCES

1. Ceppi L. CARING FOR OLDER ADULTS: BIO-PSYCHO-SOCIAL ASSESSMENT AND WELL-BEING IN NURSING HOMES. 2024.

2. Rogers KA. Characterising the pre-diagnostic phase of behavioural-variant frontotemporal dementia: A mixed-methods study: The University of Melbourne; 2018.

3. Jalil J, Volle D, Zhu T, Sassounian M. Depression, Anxiety, and Other Mood Disorders. Geriatric Medicine: A Person Centered Evidence Based Approach: Springer; 2024. p. 1111-53.

4. D'Argenio V, Sarnataro DJJoPM. New insights into the molecular bases of familial Alzheimer's disease. 2020;10(2):26.

5. Seto M, Weiner RL, Dumitrescu L, Hohman TJJMn. Protective genes and pathways in Alzheimer's disease: moving towards precision interventions. 2021;16(1):29.

6. Quan M, Cao S, Wang Q, Wang S, Jia JJP. Genetic Phenotypes of Alzheimer's Disease: Mechanisms and Potential Therapy. 2023;3(4):333-49.

7. Kwok MK, Lin SL, Schooling CMJE. Re-thinking Alzheimer's disease therapeutic targets using gene-based tests. 2018;37:461-70.

8. Giau VV, Bagyinszky E, Yang YS, Youn YC, An SSA, Kim SYJSr. Genetic analyses of early-onset Alzheimer's disease using next generation sequencing. 2019;9(1):8368.

9. Irving R, Clarke AJ. Ethical and Social Issues in Clinical Genetics. Emery and Rimoin's Principles and Practice of Medical Genetics and Genomics: Elsevier; 2019. p. 327-54.

10. Clarke AJ, Wallgren-Pettersson CJJoCG. Ethics in genetic counselling. 2019;10(1):3-33.

11. Erdmann A, Rehmann-Sutter C, Bozzaro CJBme. Patients' and professionals' views related to ethical issues in precision medicine: a mixed research synthesis. 2021;22(1):116.

12. Wöhlke S, Perry JJST, Health. Responsibility in dealing with genetic risk information. 2021;19(1):21-42.

13. Kater-Kuipers A, Bunnik E, De Beaufort I, Galjaard RJBp, childbirth. Limits to the scope of non-invasive prenatal testing (NIPT): an analysis of the international ethical framework for prenatal screening and an interview study with Dutch professionals. 2018;18:1-14.

14. Li A, Bergan RCJC. Clinical trial design: Past, present, and future in the context of big data and precision medicine. 2020;126(22):4838-46.

15. Burger HU, Gerlinger C, Harbron C, Koch A, Posch M, Rochon J, et al. The use of external controls: To what extent can it currently be recommended? 2021;20(6):1002-16.

16. Schneeweiss S, Patorno EJEr. Conducting real-world evidence studies on the clinical outcomes of diabetes treatments. 2021;42(5):658-90.

17. El-Madafri I, Peña M, Olmedo-Torre NJF. The Wildfire Dataset: Enhancing Deep Learning-Based Forest Fire Detection with a Diverse Evolving Open-Source Dataset Focused on Data Representativeness and a Novel Multi-Task Learning Approach. 2023;14(9):1697.

18. Jin L, Chen C. The effects of the nursing intervention on the quality of life in patients with senile dementia: A descriptive review. 2021.

19. Wang Y, Haaksma ML, Ramakers IH, Verhey FR, van de Flier WM, Scheltens P, et al. Cognitive and functional progression of dementia in two longitudinal studies. 2019;34(11):1623-32.

20. Luo J, Thomassen JQ, Bellenguez C, Grenier-Boley B, De Rojas I, Castillo A, et al. Genetic associations between modifiable risk factors and Alzheimer disease. 2023;6(5):e2313734-e.

