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- Neurobehavioral studies of Williams syndrome (WS) and Down syndrome (DS) have revealed distinct profiles of cognitive strengths and weaknesses. In a previous report, we described several gross brain morphologic distinctions on magnetic resonance images between these two disorders. While the observed cerebral hypoplasia was of equal degree in the two groups, cerebellar size was entirely normal in the subjects with WS but dramatically reduced in subjects with DS. In WS, paleocerebellar vermian lobules subtended a smaller area on midsagittal sections, but neocerebellar lobules were actually larger. These results suggested important distinctions between WS and DS in terms of the action and anatomic targets of factors that alter brain development in these syndromes. The present study extends the earlier findings by focusing in detail on the morphologic features of the cerebral hemispheres, particularly cerebral gray matter. The results suggest that some frontal and temporal limbic structures are relatively preserved in WS, while some basal ganglia and diencephalic structures are relatively preserved in DS.

(Arch Neurol. 1993;50:186-191)

Williams syndrome (WS) is a rare developmental disorder characterized by mental retardation. Several reports have appeared describing the nature of the neuropsychological deficits observed in subjects with WS, most noting their particularly poor visuospatial and visuomotor abilities and/or their relatively spared linguistic abilities. These studies have generally contrasted the performances of subjects with WS on standardized tests with those of IQ-matched controls who had mixed, or nonspecific, developmental disorders. In a series of recent neurobehavioral investigations, the unusual profile of higher cognitive functions in subjects with WS has been illuminated. These studies focused first on carefully selected children with WS who were clearly diagnosed as having WS by genetic or metabolic markers, and who were all in a similar state of development (10 years of age and above). The children with WS were contrasted with children with another well-defined genetically based disorder of mental retardation, Down syndrome (DS); the children with DS were matched to the subjects with WS in age, gender, background, and IQ. Moreover, the same subjects underwent a battery of tests across disciplines, including neurologic examinations, and involving standardized and experimental measures of linguistic, visuospatial, cognitive, and affective function. They also underwent magnetic resonance imaging and neurophysiologic probes. Highly distinct neuropsychological profiles for WS vs DS have emerged from these experimental paradigms. Perhaps the most striking differences between the groups occurred on probes of linguistic vs visuospatial abilities.

While measures of language that conflate general cognitive and linguistic abilities, such as the Vocabulary subtest from the Wechsler Intelligence Scaefor Children–Revised (which requires well-formed definitions), reveal equally severe deficits in both WS and DS, experimental probes of specifically linguistic processing yield striking differences between the two groups. The subjects with WS show a significant advantage on measures of lexical knowledge, word fluency, and other measures of semantic and syntactic competence. Moreover, the children with WS exhibit rich and unusual semantic organization.

In the visuospatial domain, although such global tests as the Developmental Test of Motor Integration and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children–Revised Block Design subtest suggest similar deficits in DS and WS, it is the subjects with DS who show an advantage on tests involving spatial integration. Experimental studies of visuospatial functions have revealed intriguing qualitative differences between the performances of subjects with WS and DS. By means of a paradigm employing hierarchical stimuli with information at both the global and local processing levels, subjects with WS showed to use local form information disproportionately, while subjects with DS showed an advantage for global forms. Again, this pattern emerged in the context of equally impaired overall performance in the two groups. Interestingly, previous neuropsychological studies with this task have suggested...
a larger role for the left hemisphere in the processing of local form information and right-hemisphere superiority for the processing of global forms.

Another interesting contrast occurs on tests of facial discrimination. Subjects with WS demonstrate a selective ability to discriminate unfamiliar faces, while subjects with DS are markedly impaired.\textsuperscript{10} Preservation of this function in subjects with WS is surprising in light of the severe impairment they show on other tasks requiring the integration of visuospatial information.

Finally, recently completed studies of the use of affect in language suggest further dramatic differences between the groups.\textsuperscript{14} The subjects with WS make abundant use of affective prosody and other affective linguistic devices in their narratives, perhaps even more than do normal subjects, whereas the subjects with DS employ few.

Our brain imaging studies of these subjects have attempted to identify anatomic distinctions between the groups that might shed some light on the neural bases of the complex behavioral differences. In our previous report,\textsuperscript{15} we described several gross brain morphologic distinctions on magnetic resonance images between these two disorders. While the cerebral hypoplasia observed was of equal degree in two IQ-matched groups, cerebellar size was entirely normal in the subjects with WS, while cerebellar hypoplasia was at least as severe in DS as was cerebral hypoplasia. In addition, measurements of vermal lobules in subjects with WS and controls suggested that while paracerebellar lobules tended to subextend a smaller area on midsagittal sections, necocerebellar lobules were actually larger. These results suggested important distinctions between WS and DS in terms of the action and anatomic targets of factors that alter brain development in these syndromes. The present study extends the earlier findings by focusing in detail on the morphologic features of the cerebral hemispheres, particularly cerebral gray matter, in larger groups of subjects with DS and WS and a group of age- and gender-matched controls.

SUBJECTS AND METHODS

Subjects

Nine subjects with WS (six female and three male) were studied. They ranged in age from 10 to 20 years (mean ±5.9, 14.7±3.4 years). The six subjects with DS (four female and two male) were also between 10 and 20 years of age (mean, 15.5±3.4 years). The full-scale IQ on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised was similar in the subjects with WS (mean, 51.6±8.47) and DS (mean, 52.5±8.26). IQ testing was not performed in one of the nine subjects with WS, who lived in another city and was unable to return for testing; however, her intellectual abilities were considered to be comparable with those of other subjects with WS whom we tested. The diagnosis of WS was made on the basis of clinical criteria described by Jones and Smith\textsuperscript{19} and confirmed in most cases by Jones and by neuroendocrine markers.\textsuperscript{20,21} The diagnosis of DS was made by a physician on the basis of distinct physical features and mental retardation and confirmed by karyotype analysis whenever possible. Subjects with WS and DS were enrolled in the same classes for the educable mentally retarded and drawn from similar socioeconomic backdrops. Six of the subjects with WS and three of the subjects with DS were also subjects in our earlier neuroanatomic report.\textsuperscript{19}

A group of 21 normal controls (13 female and eight male) was also examined. They ranged in age from 10 to 24 years (mean, 14.5±3.8 years). These subjects were screened for history of serious medical illness or developmental or intellectual disabilities.

Of the 21 controls, 18 were right-handed and three were left-handed. Six of the subjects with WS were right-handed and two were left-handed. All six of the subjects with DS were right-handed. An analysis comparing the incidence of left-handedness in the three groups yielded a χ² statistic with P > 3, suggesting that handedness was unlikely to affect group comparisons on the brain structural measures.

Imaging Protocol

Magnetic resonance imaging was performed with a 1.5-T superconducting magnet (Signa, General Electric Co., Milwaukee, Wis.) at the University of California, San Diego/American Medical International Magnetic Resonance Institute. Two spatially registered images were obtained simultaneously for each section, by means of an asymmetric, multiple-echo sequence (repetition time, 2000 milliseconds; echo times, 25 and 76 milliseconds; two excitations) to obtain images of the entire brain in the axial plane. Section thickness was 3.5 mm, with a 0.5 mm gap between successive sections. A 256×256 matrix and 24-cm field of view were used.

Image Analysis

Three subcortical structures and three cortical regions were examined. The volumes of caudate nuclei, lenticular nuclei, and the thalamic and hypothalamic (diencephalic) structures were computed, as were separate volumes of anterior, posterior, and temporal limbic cortex. Detailed descriptions of the image-analytic approach used in the present study are contained in several articles.\textsuperscript{22-25} Briefly, each pixel location within a section of the imaging brain was classified on the basis of its signal values in the two original images as most resembling cerebrospinal fluid, gray matter, white matter, or signal hypointensity (tissue abnormality). Consistently identifiable anatomic landmarks and structural boundaries were then designated by trained image analysts who were unaware of any subject characteristics. The processed image data were then transformed spatially so that all locations within the brain images could be identified relative to a common anatomic coordinate system (ie, stereotactically). Cortical regions were defined either entirely manually or, when boundaries could not be visually identified on a reliable basis, with the use of a combination of manual and stereotactic procedures.

To define anatomically consistent cortical regions, a method was adopted for making subdivisions of the cerebral surface to the centromedial structural midline and two consistently identifiable points: the most anterior midline point in the genu and the most posterior midline point in the splenium of the corpus callosum. By calculation of rotation angles with these landmarks, it was possible to perform a three-dimensional rotation of the images, thus correcting each individual's image data for rotation out of the optimal imaging plane. Cortical regions could then be constructed that resulted in highly consistent placement of regional boundaries relative to gross anatomic landmarks.

The orientation of the midsagittal plane was first determined by computing a regression line through a series of visually selected brain-stem midline points. The division of the cerebral was then based on two major planes (Fig 1): an axial plane, which is perpendicular in orientation to the midsagittal plane and passes through the two corpus callosum points, and a coronal plane, which is defined as perpendicular to the first plane and which passes through the midpoints between the two corpus callosum points. New coordinates for each voxel were then computed relative to these planes.

The voxels designated as within the caudate, lenticular, and diencephalic regions are highlighted in black in the representative, digitally processed images shown in Fig 2. It should be noted that although the operators circumscribe the entire putamen and globus pallidus, areas within the lenticular nucleus containing significant iron deposits, particularly in the globus pallidus, do not meet the signal criteria for gray matter and are thus not included in this region.

Volumes of the infratentorial and supratentorial cranial vaults were estimated, as in the previous study, by summing infratentorial or supratentorial voxels (including cerebrospinal fluid, by-
Fig 1.—Cerebral regions are defined as follows. Points A and B in the corpus callosum, shown above, are the most anterior midline point in the genu and the most posterior midline point in the splenium, respectively. An axial plane passing through these two points is defined, as shown, perpendicular to the midsagittal plane. A coronal plane is defined perpendicular to the axial plane and passing through the midpoint between points A and B. This coronal plane divides the cerebrum into an anterior and a posterior zone.

Fig 2.—Representative processed images illustrating definition of subcortical gray-matter regions. Pixels within caudate nuclei (top), lenticular nuclei (center), and diencephalic regions (bottom) are highlighted in black.

Fig 3.—Representative processed images illustrating definition of cortical regions. Pixels within temporal limbic (top), anterior (center), and posterior cortex (bottom) are highlighted in black.

in Fig 1, or to the posterior region (Fig 3, bottom). Additionally, each structure was measured separately for each hemisphere, for the purpose of examining asymmetries. To examine pattern differences between the groups, regional gray-matter volumes were expressed as proportions of the total cerebral gray-matter volume (sum of all regions).

The volume estimates in this study are provided as voxel sums. Each voxel represents 6.59 mm³ (which includes the 5-mm section and the 2.5-mm gap between sections); therefore, the volumes may be estimated in cubic millimeters by multiplying the voxel sums by 6.59.

Statistical Analysis

Group comparisons of the mean volumes and proportions were made by means of Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric analyses of variance and Mann-Whitney U tests for two-group comparisons.

RESULTS

Global analyses, summarized in Table 1, of the volumes of the supratentorial and infratentorial cranial vaults yielded results virtually identical to those reported previously with the smaller groups. Although the cerebellum was significantly larger in WS than in DS (and was, in fact, normal in size), the supratentorial (cerebral) volume was equally reduced in WS. Total cerebral gray matter, like the total volume of the supratentorial vault, showed a highly significant reduction in both retarded groups, but no difference was obtained between subjects with WS and subjects with DS.

Since the reduction in cerebral gray matter was approximately equal in the two groups, a pattern analysis was conducted in which each regional volume was expressed as a proportion of this total gray-matter volume. This regional analysis of cerebral gray matter is summarized in Table 2. When the anterior and posterior cortical regions
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Table 1.—Global Analyses of Volumes of the Supratentorial and Infratentorial Cranial Vaults*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Group Means</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C (N=21)</td>
<td>WS (N=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral</td>
<td>189 292</td>
<td>164 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebellar</td>
<td>26 023</td>
<td>25 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral gray</td>
<td>100 459</td>
<td>88 034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C indicates control; WS, Williams syndrome; DS, Down syndrome; and K-W, Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance. Volumes are expressed as voxel sums.
†p<.001.
‡p<.01.
§p<.05.

Table 2.—Regional Analysis of Cerebral Gray Matter Proportions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Group Means</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C (N=21)</td>
<td>WS (N=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anterior cortex</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posterior cortex</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal limbic cortex</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caudate nucleus</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenticular nucleus</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diencephalon</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C indicates control; WS, Williams syndrome; DS, Down syndrome; and K-W, Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance.
†p<.01.
‡p<.05.
§p<.10.
∥p<.001.

Fig 4.—The midcallosal plane through the model three-dimensional morphologic map for all subjects with Down syndrome (left), all control subjects (center), and all subjects with Williams syndrome (right). The decreased cerebral size in subjects with Down syndrome and Williams syndrome relative to controls is easily seen. The increased ventricular size, decreased frontal lobe volume, and normal thalamic volume in subjects with Down syndrome are also apparent.

were examined separately, a significant difference emerged between the two groups, with the subjects with DS being significantly more hypofrontal than either those with WS or control subjects. Although the subjects with WS were slightly more hypofrontal than controls were, this difference did not reach significance. The pattern observed within the limbic and brain-stem regions revealed a further dissociation between DS and WS. The subjects with DS had significantly greater relative volume reductions in the limbic region, while no difference was observed between subjects with WS and control subjects. In fact, not only was the limbic proportion normal in WS, but the absolute limbic volume was the only one of the regional volumes that did not show a significant reduction in subjects with WS relative to controls (P>.10).

In contrast, the diencephalic and lenticular proportions were both significantly increased in subjects with DS relative to both subjects with WS and controls. This is due to the fact that the subjects with WS showed reductions in these structures comparable with their overall cerebral reductions, while absolute diencephalic and lenticular volumes were completely normal in subjects with DS (P>.50). The results for the caudate nuclei revealed reductions of similar magnitude for both retard groups. No significant group differences were observed for the caudate proportions. The absolute caudate volumes were significantly reduced in subjects with WS relative to controls, and the difference between subjects with DS and controls approached significance.

Left-right ratios of all regions were examined, but only one, for the limbic region, showed a significant difference between the three groups (P<.05). This was due to an aberrant right-greater-than-left (0.85) ratio in the subjects with DS relative to the virtually symmetric values for controls and subjects with WS (0.97 and 0.96, respectively).

To provide a visual summary of the results, stereotactically standardized representations of the morphologic features observed in each group were computed from the fully processed images. This involved determining for each subject which tissue category (white matter, gray
matter, cerebrospinal fluid, or signal hyperintensity) was present at each location within the three-dimensional stereotactic space. Then, for each group separately, the modal tissue (among members of the group) was similarly determined for each location. A single standard plane (through the midportions of the genu and splenium of the corpus callosum) through these modal maps is shown in Fig 4 for each of the groups. The differences established by statistical comparisons of the volumes are visually discernible in these group-modal images.

**COMMENT**

To summarize, these comparisons of the sizes of structures within the cerebrum in DS and WS provide further support for important distinctions between the neurodevelopmental processes associated with these disorders. The cerebrum in WS is small; however, the frontal cortex appears to acquire an essentially normal volume relationship to the posterior cortex. In contrast, frontal cortex is disproportionately reduced in volume in DS. Limbic structures of the temporal lobe (including uncus, amygdala, hippocampus, and parahippocampal gyrus) appear to be spared in WS relative to other cerebral structures, while in DS such structures are dramatically reduced in volume. The opposite pattern is observed in several subcortical structures, specifically in regions including thalamus, putamen, and globus pallidus. The volumes of these structures are entirely normal in DS despite dramatic overall brain size reductions.

These cerebral distinctions, together with differences within cerebellar structures reported earlier, suggest that relatively intact linguistic, affective, and face processing functions in WS may rely on relatively normal development of some limbic, frontal cortical, and cerebellar structures. Leiner et al\(^{27}\) recently proposed that a cerebellofrontocortical system has evolved in humans to support the processing demands of fluent speech, pointing out that large increases in the sizes of these structures occur in humans relative to apes. Thus, the relative sparing of frontal and cerebellar structures in subjects with WS may contribute to their relative linguistic competence.

As reviewed above, subjects with WS, in marked contrast to subjects with DS, are sociable and affectively sensitive, and they use affective linguistic devices at least as frequently as controls do, perhaps excessively. The present finding of relative sparing of structures in the limbic system in WS is interesting in light of these observations. Perhaps a neurodevelopmental course favoring certain limbic structures over other cortical and subcortical structures results in relative prominence of affective strategies in communication. The normal symmetry observed in temporal limbic regions is further evidence of normal maturation and specialization in this system.

The results in DS are consistent with earlier reports of the gross brain morphologic characteristics of these subjects. Cerebral hypofrontality, cerebellar hypoplasia, and even relatively normal appearance of brain-stem structures have been noted in autopsy studies.\(^{28,29}\) This is the first report, to our knowledge, of normal volumes of thalamus and lenticular nuclei in subjects with DS who are definitely microcephalic. The pattern of poor development of cerebellar, limbic, and neocortical (particularly frontal) systems may underlie the impoverishment of language and social-affective function in these subjects. The relatively preserved brain-stem and posterior cortical structures may provide the basis for superior global form and spatial integrative functions in subjects with DS relative to subjects with WS.

Functional distinctions between ventrally and dorsally lying cortical systems have been described, particularly within the visual system.\(^{30,31}\) Form, color, and face processing functions have been associated with a ventral cortical system with predominant input from the parvocellular pathway, while spatial integrative and motion processing functions have been associated with dorsal structures in the temporoparietal function (related to the magnocellular pathway).\(^{32,33}\) In some ways, the spared and impaired visuospatial functions in WS appear to respect these distinctions. Face processing is spared, while spatial integrative functions are markedly affected. Perhaps cortical systems subserving the slower, but higher-resolution, processes associated with the parvocellular pathway are selectively spared in WS, while in DS the two pathways are both affected. Selective effects on the magnocellular system have been hypothesized to account for dyslexia, another developmental disorder.\(^{34}\) Future studies with the rapidly improving brain-imaging technologies will permit examination of more specific cortical structures within these two cortical subsystems.
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