1   Running Head: Task selection in linguistic profiles for AD speech

2

4

5   **Importance of task selection for connected speech analysis in patients with Alzheimer's**
6   **disease from an ethnically diverse sample**

7

8   Arpita **Bose**[a*], Manaswita **Dutta**[b]; Niladri S. **Dash**[c], Ranita **Nandi**[d], Aparna **Dutt**[d],

9   Samrah **Ahmed**[a, e]

10   [a]School of Psychology and Clinical Language Sciences, University of Reading, Reading, UK

11   [b]Department of Communication Disorders and Sciences, Rush University Medical Center,
12   Chicago, USA
13   [c]Linguistic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India
14   [d] Neuropsychology and Clinical Psychology Unit, Duttanagar Mental Health Centre, Kolkata,
15   India

16   [e]Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Oxford, UK

17
18   **Word count: 2150**

19

22
23
24
25
26   *** Corresponding author:**
27   Arpita Bose, PhD.
28   School of Psychology and Clinical Language Sciences,
29   University of Reading, Reading, UK.
30   Email: a.bose@reading.ac.uk

31
32

1   **Abstract**

2   Features of linguistic impairment in Alzheimer's disease (AD) are primarily derived from

3   English-speaking patients. Little is known regarding such deficits in linguistically diverse

4   speakers with AD. We aimed to detail linguistic profiles (speech rate, dysfluencies, syntactic,

5   lexical, morphological, semantics) from two connected speech tasks – Frog Story and picture

6   description – in Bengali-speaking AD patients. The Frog Story detected group differences on

7   all six linguistic levels, compared to only three with picture description. Critically, Frog Story

8   captured the language-specific differences between the groups. Careful consideration should

9   be given to the choice of connected speech tasks for dementia diagnosis in linguistically

10   diverse populations.

11

1   **Introduction**

2   Alzheimer's disease (AD) is characterised by hallmark changes in memory and

3   language [1]. Recent research in the linguistic profile of connected speech in non-English

4   speaking communities indicates that the profile of impairment is not comparative across

5   languages, and certainly not comparative to impairments deemed characteristic of language

6   breakdown in English [2, 3]. Manifestation of the linguistic impairments depend on the

7   structure of the language system [4], and this principle has implications for symptoms of

8   language breakdown in AD.

9   Recently, we reported that Bengali-speaking AD patients produced fewer pronouns in

10   novel story telling [3], in direct contrast with the overuse of pronouns by English-speaking

11   AD patients [5, 6]. Similarly, Kavé & Levy (2003) reported that Hebrew-speaking AD

12   patients produced a similar proportion of inflected words compared to controls in Cookie

13   Theft picture description [7], a difference that is typically found in English-speaking AD

14   patients [5, 8]. Thus, profiling of linguistic features is implicitly linked to the specific

15   language structure [8-10]. To elicit these language specific features, the type of connected

16   speech task used is critical. Research with English speakers has consistently shown that the

17   type of task used (e.g., picture description, story narrative, semi-structured interview) impacts

18   the breadth of linguistic features captured [9-11], with implications for the accuracy of

19   diagnosis.

20   To date, research comparing linguistic profiles across commonly used connected

21   speech tasks in AD patients of South-Asian languages, such as, Hindi, Urdu, Bengali, Punjab,

22   Tamil, Marathi, has not been published. Petti et al. (2020)'s systematic review of automatic

23   AD detection from speech and language noted the dearth of research in non-European

24   languages in AD and highlighted an urgency to investigate these languages in future studies

25   [10, 12].

1   The aim of the current study is to detail the linguistic profile from two connected speech tasks

2   – story narrative and picture description – from Bengali speakers with AD. Bengali is a

3   highly inflected pro-drop East Indo-Aryan language [13]. It is currently the seventh most

4   spoken language in the world with over 265 million speakers; and is the national language of

5   Bangladesh, official language of three states in India (West Bengal, Tripura and Assam)

6   along with substantial Bengali diaspora in Western and Middle Eastern countries. This

7   research therefore fills a significant gap in the literature for profiling linguistic impairments

8   in ethnically diverse AD populations.

9   **Methods**

10   *Participants and background assessments*: Participants were six right-handed Bengali

11   speakers with a clinical diagnosis of probable AD dementia based on the NINCDS/ADRAA

12   criteria [14], and eight age-, gender-, education-, and language-matched healthy control

13   participants (HC) (Table 1). They were recruited from the Duttanagar Mental Health Centre,

14   Kolkata, eastern India. All participants were native speakers of Bengali and were Bengali-

15   English sequential bilinguals. They were living in a predominantly Bengali speaking context

16   (i.e., using Bengali at home and at work). At the time of the study, they were living with their

17   families in the urban metropolis of Kolkata. They were professionally engaged prior to the

18   onset of AD in education, business, agriculture, accounting, or engineering sectors. Exclusion

19   criteria for both groups included a known history of alcohol or drug abuse, or other

20   neurological or psychiatric illness, and less than ten years of education. Participants

21   underwent a battery of tests to profile general cognitive functioning and activities of daily

22   living (Table 1). All HC performed within the normal range on the test battery. Except for

23   AD07 with moderate dementia (i.e., Clinical Dementia Rating, CDR global score of 2), all

24   other AD participants had mild dementia (i.e., CDR global score of 1). This study was carried

25   out with ethical clearance from the University of Reading (2017-035-AB).

Table 1. Demographic characteristics and neuropsychological data on the various background measures for each individual with Alzheimer's Disease (AD) as well as Mean and SD of AD and Healthy Controls (HC) groups. This table is adapted from Bose et al. 2021 [3].

| | Individual AD Cases | | | | | | Group Means | | | | | | Results of Statistical Tests | | |
| | AD01 | AD03 | AD04 | AD06 | AD07 | AD09 | Alzheimer's Disease (AD) | | Healthy Control (HC) | | | | | | |
							Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Min	Max	z value	p value	effect size
Demographic information															
Age at the time of study (years)	67	76	78	51	71	56	66.5	10.89	71.7	4.2	67	78	-0.65	0.52	-0.17
Education (years)	15	14	10	15	17	17	14.7	2.58	16.1	1.2	15	18	-1.09	0.28	-0.29
Duration of symptoms (months)	36	36	24	12	30	48	31.0	12.25							
Age at the onset of symptoms (years)	64	73	76	50	68.5	52	63.9	10.82							
Sex	F	M	M	M	F	F									
Handedness	R	R	R	R	R	R									
General cognitive functioning															
Bengali Mini-Mental State Examination, BMSE (/30)	22	20	20	22	14	16	19.0	3.29	30.0	0	30	30	-3.44	**0.00**	-0.92
ACE-III, Bengali adapted (/100)	49	40	45	73	27	31	44.2	16.38	92.7	2.3	89	96	-3.10	**0.00**	-0.83
Attention (/18)	11	10	11	13	7	8	10.0	2.19	17.7	0.7	16	18	-3.23	**0.00**	-0.86
Memory (/26)	10	9	12	16	3	4	9.0	4.90	25.3	0.7	24	26	-3.15	**0.00**	-0.84
Fluency (/14)	4	1	0	9	1	1	2.7	3.39	8.0	1.0	7	10	-2.29	**0.02**	-0.61
Language (/26)	16	12	15	24	9	15	15.2	5.04	25.9	0.3	25	26	-3.31	**0.00**	-0.89
Visuoconstructional (/16)	9	8	7	11	7	3	7.5	2.66	15.8	0.4	15	16	-3.23	**0.00**	-0.86
Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR)	1	1	1	1	2	1	1.2	0.41	0.0	0	0	0	-3.53	**0.00**	-0.94
Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Scale in Elderly (IADL-EDR) (% impairment)	20	50	CNT[1]	11	81	36	39.6	27.56	0.0	0	0	0	-3.34	**0.00**	-0.93

BMSE [15]; ACE-III [16]; CDR [17] (CDR score of 0= no dementia, 0.5=questionable dementia, 1.0=mild dementia, 2.0=moderate dementia, 3=severe dementia); IADL-EDR [18] (a score >16 is in the impaired range with higher value representing higher level of impairment), [1]Could not be tested.

1   *Experimental Tasks:* Two connected speech tasks were elicited in Bengali: 1) Story

2   telling using the wordless picture book "Frog, Where Are you?" [19]; 2) Picnic Scene Picture

3   Description from the Western Aphasia Battery-Revised [20]. For both tasks, participants

4   were encouraged to speak in sentences. Other than occasional prompts and generic

5   encouragement, tester interruptions were kept to a minimum. For the Frog story, participants

6   were given a brief background about the story and were told that the main characters of the

7   story are a boy, his dog, and a frog. Before describing the story based on the pictures,

8   participants looked through the book once. For the Picnic scene, participants were given

9   Bengali equivalent of the instruction "Tell me everything you are see going on in this

10   picture". Sessions were recorded using the digital audio recorder Olympus voice recorder

11   WS-833 for subsequent verbatim orthographic transcription. The Frog Story data have been

12   previously published in Bose et al. (2021) to develop language-specific linguistic profile for

13   Bengali speakers [3].

14   *Quantitative analysis of narrative speech and variables:* To capture the

15   multidimensional nature of connected speech, measures for this study were in keeping with

16   the recommendations from recent reviews for linguistic levels that are essential for

17   characterizing AD speech [21, 22]. They aimed at quantifying six different linguistic levels of

18   production: 1. speech rate; 2. structural and syntactic measures; 3. lexical measures; 4.

19   morphological and inflectional measures; 5. semantic measures; and 6. measure of

20   spontaneity and fluency disruptions [3, 5, 6, 21-24]. The Quantitative Production Analysis

21   (QPA; [25]) and the Correct Information Unit (CIU; [26]) analyses were implemented to

22   calculate a set of count and proportional measures for each sample. The QPA scheme was

23   augmented to capture specific linguistic features of Bengali (e.g., verbal and nominal

24   morphology, proportion of postposition). Supplementary Table provides the full definition of

25   all the variables along with the individual level data. To keep the comparisons between the

1 tasks succinct, we focused on the proportional measures. To ensure reliability, transcriptions

2 and coding were reviewed and agreed upon by multiple authors (AB, MD, NSD). Details on

3 transcription, along with definition and description for the full range of variables can be

4 found in Bose et al. (2021) [3].

5   *Statistical analysis:* The novelty of these data in a language that has not been

6 investigated before necessitates the capture of both group and individual level performance.

7 We approached the analyses in two ways: group and case-series analyses. We report the

8 comparative pattern of performance across the two tasks between groups. For the group

9 comparisons, non-parametric versions of independent samples t-test (Mann-Whitney U test)

10 were used for the selected variables. Given that finding might be informative for under-

11 researched clinical population and potential for future larger scale studies [27, 28], we report

12 findings with exact p-values and effect sizes for readers to appreciate the strength of these

13 effects. It has been suggested that over-correction of alpha level risks the chance of

14 increasing type II errors (i.e., rejecting significant findings) especially for under-represented

15 clinical populations [27, 29]. In addition, we implemented Crawford and colleague's single-

16 subject statistical method of comparing a single case to a small control group (at least five) to

17 identify differences between each AD participant and controls (e.g., [30, 31]). To facilitate

18 understanding of individual variation and to capture the heterogeneity of the AD population,

19 we mention the number of participants within the AD group who showed significant

20 difference from the control based on Crawford et al.'s single-subject analysis methods (see

21 Table 2).

22
23 **Results**
24
25   Between group comparisons of the profile of linguistic impairments across the two

26 tasks revealed that for the Frog Story AD patients showed significant differences from the

27 controls in all six linguistic levels: speech rate, syntactic, lexical, morphological and

1   inflectional, semantic, and spontaneity and fluency measures. In contrast, the picture

2   description task could capture differences only in three levels: syntactic, semantic, and

3   spontaneity and fluency measures (see Table 2). With the picture description task, of the

4   linguistic levels that showed differences, fewer variables were different between the two

5   groups. For example, for the Frog story, three variables within the syntactic measures were

6   significantly different (i.e., mean length of sentences, proportion of well-formed sentences,

7   embedding index) vs. only one variable in the picture description (i.e., proportion of well-

8   formed sentences). Furthermore, for significant findings, the effect sizes were stronger for the

9   Frog Story than picture description. Individual level analyses revealed that, in contrast to

10 picture description, Frog Story resulted in a higher number of AD patients showing

11 significant differences from the control group (see Table 2).

12   Compared to controls, AD patients' Frog Story narrative was characterized by a

13 slower rate of speech with increased dysfluencies that was marked by increased reformulation

14 attempts. Their sentences had smaller mean length, were less well-formed and grammatically

15 simpler with lower embedding index. The lexical distribution of the production indicated

16 increased proportion of open-class words with a corresponding decrease in closed-class

17 words, decreased proportion of pronouns, and decreased number of reduplications. AD

18 patients produced a similar proportion of inflected lexical items compared to controls. Nouns

19 and verbs which were inflected were inflected correctly without obvious errors. However,

20 they defaulted to simpler types and forms of inflections as noted by a decrease in case

21 markers and increase in definiteness markers for nouns. Semantically their production had a

22 lower number of CIUs which resulted in lower idea density and efficiency. Unlike Frog

23 Story, picture description was unable to capture the language-specific differences between the

24 groups, showing no difference in pronoun usage, number of reduplications, or in the quality

25 of noun inflections.

Table 2. Summary of the key findings across the six linguistic levels of speech and language production for both connected speech tasks (Frog Story and Picnic Picture Description), and information on the proportion of AD individuals who showed similar results to the group differences. Grey shading indicates significant group difference.

Variables	Frog Story AD Mean	AD SD	HC Mean	HC SD	p value	Effect size	Direction of effect for AD	# (%) of AD patients showing sign difference	Picnic Picture Description (WAB-R) AD Mean	AD SD	HC Mean	HC SD	p value	Effect size	Direction of effect for AD	# (%) of AD patients showing sign difference
Speech rate																
Total number of words	322.00	133.43	466.00	211.98	0.16	-0.38			103.00	42.21	91.43	41.54	0.73	-0.10		
Words per minute	60.07	29.52	135.92	31.89	**0.00**	**-0.79**	decreased	5 (83%)	77.26	24.94	76.93	4.61	0.73	-0.12		
Structural and syntactic measures																
Proportion of words in sentences	0.86	0.05	0.80	0.15	0.05	-0.52			0.99	0.02	0.94	0.07	0.14	-0.44		
Mean sentence length	4.26	0.64	7.68	0.82	**0.00**	**-0.83**	shorter	6 (100%)	4.76	0.70	5.11	0.68	0.63	-0.16		
Proportion of well-formed sentences	0.79	0.13	0.95	0.06	**0.01**	**-0.68**	lesser	2 (33%)	0.58	0.18	0.90	0.17	**0.01**	**-0.68**	lesser	4 (67%)
Embedding index	0.03	0.05	0.60	0.22	**0.00**	**-0.83**	lower	6 (100%)	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.95	-0.04		
Lexical measures																
Proportion of open class words	0.81	0.03	0.76	0.04	**0.03**	**-0.57**	increased		0.83	0.06	0.82	0.03	0.73	-0.10		
Proportion of closed class words	0.19	0.03	0.24	0.04	**0.03**	**-0.57**	decreased		0.17	0.06	0.18	0.03	0.63	-0.14		
Proportion of noun , N (N/all NW)	0.33	0.04	0.33	0.03	0.48	-0.19			0.34	0.06	0.37	0.05	0.63	-0.14		
Proportion of pronoun, P (P/all NW)	0.05	0.03	0.10	0.03	**0.02**	**-0.61**	decreased	3 (50%)	0.10	0.09	0.08	0.04	0.95	-0.02		
Proportion of pronoun to noun (P/P+N)	0.14	0.08	0.24	0.06	**0.03**	**-0.57**	decreased	4 (67%)	0.22	0.16	0.17	0.08	0.73	-0.10		
Proportion of verb, V (V/all NW)	0.27	0.02	0.24	0.04	0.15	-0.38			0.23	0.04	0.21	0.04	0.73	-0.12		
Proportion of postposition, PP (PP/NW)	0.09	0.03	0.08	0.02	0.19	-0.35			0.06	0.05	0.09	0.02	0.37	-0.26		
Number of reduplication	0.50	0.55	3.00	2.78	**0.05**	**-0.53**	decreased	3 (50%)	1.17	0.90	1.43	1.40	0.95	-0.02		
Morphological and inflectional measures																
Nouns inflections																
Noun inflection index	0.98	0.03	1.00	0.00	0.09	-0.45			1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00		
Proportion of inflected nouns	60.95	14.39	58.05	10.72	0.80	-0.07			26.81	8.59	26.94	9.86	0.95	-0.02		
Proportion of noun with 1 inflection	0.82	0.06	0.85	0.09	0.56	-0.16			0.84	0.18	0.92	0.15	0.30	-0.33		
Proportion of noun with 2 or more inflections	0.17	0.06	0.18	0.07	0.70	-0.10			0.16	0.18	0.08	0.15	0.30	-0.33		
Proportion of definiteness markers in %	60.38	19.95	27.09	12.07	**0.01**	**-0.66**	increased	5 (83%)	27.78	27.22	19.10	13.85	0.95	-0.02		
Proportion of case markers in %	39.16	17.18	72.44	12.56	**0.01**	**-0.72**	decreased	5 (83%)	72.22	27.22	83.26	14.16	0.30	-0.33		
Verb inflections																
Verb inflection index	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00			1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00		
Verb complexity score	1.99	0.01	1.99	0.04	0.92	-0.03			3.32	0.13	3.26	0.55	0.84	-0.06		
Semantic measures																
Number of CIU	135.67	29.65	161.63	5.71	**0.01**	**-0.70**	fewer	4 (67%)	65.83	21.98	74.86	26.96	0.63	-0.16		
CIU% (Idea density)	62.48	12.44	90.87	5.54	**0.00**	**-0.83**	decreased	6 (100%)	67.43	13.58	84.85	8.55	**0.02**	**-0.67**	decreased	3 (50%)
CIUs per minute (Idea efficiency)	41.23	12.34	98.24	15.93	**0.00**	**-0.83**	decreased	6 (100%)	49.86	48.77	65.17	6.51	**0.01**	**-0.67**	decreased	3 (50%)
Measures of spontaneity and fluency disruptions																
Repetition	2.83	2.56	0.75	1.04	0.11	-0.43			2.33	2.39	0.00	0.00	**0.02**	**-0.67**	greater	3 (50%)
Revisions	8.50	4.59	2.25	2.55	**0.01**	**-0.72**	greater		1.83	1.64	0.14	0.38	0.23	0.34		
Reformulations	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.35	0.39	-0.23			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.94	0.02		
Total count of disruptions of fluency (repetition, revision, reformulations)	11.33	5.96	3.13	2.90	**0.01**	**-0.71**	greater	3 (50%)	4.17	4.03	0.14	0.38	**0.02**	**-0.65**	greater	5 (83%)

NW: Narrative Words; CIU: Correct Information Unit

Discussion

The key finding of this study is that complex narrative tasks that entail the integration of characters and events within a temporal framework, such as, the Frog Story task, capture *more* differences between Bengali-speaking AD patients and controls than single picture description. Compared to a picture description task, learned or novel story retelling tasks enable speakers to generate a rich and extended language output. For the reasons of simplicity and resource constraints, picture description tasks have been most commonly used in the field of connected speech analysis research and clinical practise [32]. However, this study shows that picture description is limiting in terms of richness, length and quality of the speech produced.

In the Frog Story, all six linguistic levels — speech rate, dysfluencies, syntactic, lexical, morphological and semantics — showed significant differences between AD patients and controls, whilst only three linguistic levels showed group differences using the picture description task. Moreover, even the linguistic levels that showed differences in both tasks, such as syntactic measures, Frog Story resulted in broader data capture with three variables revealing significant differences (mean sentence length, proportion of well-formed sentences, embedding index) versus only one variable with picture description (i.e., proportion of well-formed sentences). These findings can be attributed to the fact that picture description often encourages listing of items in the picture, as speakers do not need to generate complex and long sentences to describe the image (see Table 2; [33, 34]). Overall, the Frog Story was more sensitive in detecting differences at several different linguistic levels whereas picture description was most useful in evaluating semantic impairments.

Furthermore, amongst these observed differences Frog Story captured several language-specific features of Bengali, which were not evident in picture description. For example, in Frog Story, the AD patients produced a lower proportion of pronouns in Bengali,

1   which is in direct contrast with the overuse of pronouns by English-speaking AD patients

2   consistently reported in the literature (e.g., [5, 6]. Differential performance on the pronoun

3   usage is driven by the pro-drop nature of Bengali, as it allows dropping of the subject nouns

4   [3]. However, a lower proportion of pronouns was not observed in the picture description in

5   Bengali. Similarly, the AD patients were defaulting to simpler noun inflections despite being

6   able to produce equivalent proportion of noun inflections, which was only evident in Frog

7   Story.

8   Recruiting a large sample of clinical group remains a perennial difficulty for

9   researchers. This study had six participants with AD. A larger sample of AD participants

10   would be desirable, although such number is not unusual in clinical studies particularly where

11   participants belong to an underrepresented group. The methodology was selected to mitigate

12   challenges of generalisation. As such, statistical analysis captured findings at both the group

13   and individual levels, offering a comprehensive, detailed and nuanced approach to the

14   profiling of linguistic impairments in a language which has not yet been linguistically studied

15   in depth in neurological impairments. Future research must consider recruitment strategies for

16   these underserved populations for development of larger sample sizes with varying severity

17   and impairment profiles.

18   These findings highlight the need for researchers and clinicians to pull together

19   resources to identify, characterize, and analyse the linguistic features of connected speech

20   among individuals with dementia from different language users. Currently, our understanding

21   of linguistic breakdowns in dementia in diverse languages is limited, as the vast majority of

22   studies have been conducted in English-speaking participants [22, 23]. Furthermore, studies

23   undertaking linguistic research in under-explored languages should employ a range of tasks

24   and variables to consistently and reliably capture variables that differentiates patients and

25   controls. Moreover, these tasks and variables must be sensitive in capturing language-specific

11

1   differences. Clinical assessments limited to single picture descriptions would delay

2   identification of early signs of dementia, which in turn would lead to delayed diagnosis,

3   access to pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions leading to poorer outcomes

4   for patients.

5   **Acknowledgments**

13
14   **Conflict of Interest/Disclosure Statement**
15   The authors have no conflict of interest to report.

16   **References**

17   [1]   Snowdon DA, Kemper SJ, Mortimer JA, Greiner LH, Wekstein DR, Markesbery WR
18   (1996) Linguistic ability in early life and cognitive function and Alzheimer's disease
19   in late life: Findings from the Nun Study. *Jama* **275**, 528-532.

20   [2]   Auclair-Ouellet N (2015) Inflectional morphology in primary progressive aphasia and
21   Alzheimer's disease: A systematic review. *Journal of Neurolinguistics* **34**, 41-64.

22   [3]   Bose A, Dash NS, Ahmed S, Dutta M, Dutt A, Nandi R, Cheng Y, D. Mello TM
23   (2021) Connected Speech Characteristics of Bengali Speakers with Alzheimer's
24   Disease: Evidence for Language-Specific Diagnostic Markers. *Frontiers in Aging*
25   *Neuroscience* **13**, 707628-707628.

26   [4]   Paradis M (1988) Recent developments in the study of agrammatism: Their import for
27   the assessment of bilingual aphasia. *Journal of Neurolinguistics* **3**, 127-160.

28   [5]   Ahmed S, Haigh A-MF, De Jager CA, Garrard P (2013) Connected speech as a
29   marker of disease progression in autopsy-proven Alzheimer's disease. *Brain (London,*
30   *England: 1878)* **136**, 3727-3737.

31   [6]   Fraser KC, Meltzer JA, Rudzicz F (2016) Linguistic features identify Alzheimer's
32   disease in narrative speech. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease* **49**, 407-422.

33   [7]   Kavé G, Levy Y. (2003) Morphology in picture descriptions provided by persons
34   with Alzheimer's disease. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* **46**,
35   341–352.

36   [8]   Sajjadi SA, Patterson K, Tomek M, Nestor PJ (2012) Abnormalities of connected

speech in semantic dementia vs Alzheimer's disease. *Aphasiology* **26**, 847-866.

[9]   Clarke N, Barrick TR, Garrard P (2021) A comparison of connected speech tasks for detecting early Alzheimer's Disease and Mild Cognitive Impairment using natural language processing and machine learning. *Front. Comput. Sci. 3: 634360. doi: 10.3389/fcomp.*

[10]   Petti U, Baker S, Korhonen A (2020) A systematic literature review of automatic Alzheimer's disease detection from speech and language. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA* **27**, 1784-1797.

[11]   Lavoie M, Black SE, Tang-Wai DF, Graham NL, Stewart S, Leonard C, Rochon E (2021) Description of connected speech across different elicitation tasks in the logopenic variant of primary progressive aphasia. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders* **56**, 1074-1085.

[12]   Mueller KD, Hermann B, Mecollari J, Turkstra LS (2018) Connected speech and language in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease: A review of picture description tasks. *Journal of clinical and experimental neuropsychology* **40**, 917-939.

[13]   Thompson, H. (2010). *Bengali: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Taylor and Francis.

[14].   McKhann GM, Knopman DS, Chertkow H, Hyman BT, Jack Jr CR, Kawas CH, Klunk WE, Koroshetz WJ, Manly JJ, Mayeux R (2011) The diagnosis of dementia due to Alzheimer's disease: Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* **7**, 263-269.

[15]   Das SK, Banerjee TK, Mukherjee CS, Bose P, Biswas A, Hazra A, Dutt A, Das S, Chaudhuri A, Raut D (2006) An urban community-based study of cognitive function among non-demented elderly population in India. *Neurology Asia* **11**, 37-48.

[16]   Hsieh S, Schubert S, Hoon C, Mioshi E, Hodges JR (2013) Validation of the Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination III in Frontotemporal Dementia and Alzheimer's Disease. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders* **36**, 242-250.

[17]   Morris JC (1993) The Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR): Current version and scoring rules. *Neurology* **43**, 2412-2414.

[18]   Mathuranath P, George A, Cherian PJ, Mathew R, Sarma PS (2005) Instrumental activities of daily living scale for dementia screening in elderly people. *International Psychogeriatrics* **17**, 461-474.

[19]   Mayer M (1969) Frog, where are you? New York, NY: Penguin Books.

[20] Kertesz A (2007) Western Aphasia Battery—Revised.

[21] Slegers A, Filiou R-P, Montembeault M, Brambati SM (2018) Connected speech features from picture description in Alzheimer's disease: A systematic review. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease* **65**, 519-542.

[22] Filiou R-P, Bier N, Slegers A, Houzé B, Belchior P, Brambati SM (2020) Connected speech assessment in the early detection of Alzheimer's disease and mild cognitive impairment: a scoping review. *Aphasiology* **34**, 723-755.

[23] Boschi V, Catricala E, Consonni M, Chesi C, Moro A, Cappa SF (2017) Connected speech in neurodegenerative language disorders: a review. *Frontiers in psychology* **8**, 269.

[24] Wilson SM, Henry ML, Besbris M, Ogar JM, Dronkers NF, Jarrold W, Miller BL, Gorno-Tempini ML (2010) Connected speech production in three variants of primary progressive aphasia. *Brain* **133**, 2069-2088.

[25] Berndt RS (2000) *Quantitative production analysis a training manual for the analysis of aphasic sentence production*, Psychology Press.

[26] Nicholas M, Obler LK, Albert ML, Helm-Estabrooks N (1985) Empty speech in Alzheimer's disease and fluent aphasia. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* **28**, 405-410.

[27] Feise RJ (2002) Do multiple outcome measures require p-value adjustment? *BMC medical research methodology* **2**, 1-4.

[28] Perneger TV (1998) What's wrong with Bonferroni adjustments. *Bmj* **316**, 1236-1238.

[29] Streiner DL, Norman GR (2011) Correction for multiple testing: is there a resolution? *Chest* **140**, 16-18.

[30] Crawford JR, Garthwaite PH (2002) Investigation of the single case in neuropsychology: Confidence limits on the abnormality of test scores and test score differences. *Neuropsychologia* **40**, 1196-1208.

[31] Crawford JR, Garthwaite PH, Porter S (2010) Point and interval estimates of effect sizes for the case-controls design in neuropsychology: rationale, methods, implementations, and proposed reporting standards. *Cognitive Neuropsychology* **27**, 245-260.

[32] de la Fuente Garcia S, Ritchie CW, Luz S (2020) Artificial intelligence, speech, and language processing approaches to monitoring Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease* **78**, 1547-1574.

[33] Stark BC (2019) A comparison of three discourse elicitation methods in aphasia and

1   age-matched adults: Implications for language assessment and outcome. *American*
2   *Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* **28**, 1067-1083.
3   [34]   Wright HH, Capilouto GJ (2009) Manipulating task instructions to change narrative
4   discourse performance. *Aphasiology* **23**, 1295-1308.

1   Supplementary Table.
2   Definition of the connected speech variables across six linguistic levels and individual
3   raw scores for both connected speech tasks (Frog Story and Picnic Picture Description)
4   for each AD participant, and mean group data from Alzheimer's Disease (AD) and
5   Healthy Controls (HC) across these variables along with the results of statistical
6   analysis. Shaded cells represent significant difference ($p<.05$) in single-subject
7   statistics, where individual AD's score was significantly different than the HC group
8   mean. The check marked (✓) variables are used for group comparison in this study.
9