

Dissociating effects of aging and genetic risk of sporadic Alzheimer's disease on path integration

Lise Colmant^{1,2,3*}, Anne Bierbrauer^{4,5}, Youssef Bellaali², Lukas Kunz⁶, Jasper Van Dongen⁷, Kristel Slegers⁷, Nikolai Axmacher⁵, Philippe Lefèvre^{1,3}, Bernard Hanseeuw^{1,2,8,9}

¹Institute of Neuroscience, UCLouvain, Brussels, Belgium ; ²Cliniques Universitaires Saint-Luc, Brussels, Belgium; ³Institute of Information and Communication Technologies, Electronics and Applied Mathematics, UCLouvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium; ⁴Institute for Systems Neuroscience, Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany; ⁵Department of Neuropsychology, Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, Faculty of Psychology, Ruhr University Bochum, Germany; ⁶Department of Epileptology, University of Bonn Medical Center, Bonn, Germany; ⁷VIB-Department of Molecular Genetics, University of Antwerp, Belgium; ⁸Gordon Center for Medical Imaging, Department of Radiology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA; ⁹WELBIO department, WEL Research Institute, avenue Pasteur, 6, 1300 Wavre, Belgium

*Corresponding author at: Institute of Neuroscience, UCLouvain, Avenue Mounier 53/B1.53.05, 1200 Brussels, Belgium
Email: lise.colmant@uclouvain.be

Highlights

- Aging and risk of Alzheimer's disease have dissociable effects on path integration
- Genetic risk of Alzheimer's disease specifically impacts pure path integration
- Aging specifically impacts landmark-supported path integration
- Navigation behavior of older participants is biased by the initial view of the goal

Abstract

Path integration is a spatial navigation ability that requires the integration of information derived from self-motion cues and stable landmarks, when available, to return to a previous location. Path integration declines with age and Alzheimer's disease (AD). Here, we sought to separate

the effects of age and AD risk on path integration, with and without a landmark. Overall, 279 people participated, aged between 18 and 80 years old. Advanced age impaired the appropriate use of a landmark. Older participants furthermore remembered the location of the goal relative to their starting location, and reproduced this initial view without considering that they had moved in the environment. This lack of adaptative behavior was not associated with AD risk. In contrast, participants at genetic risk of AD (*APOE* ϵ 4 carriers) exhibited a pure path integration deficit, corresponding to difficulty in performing path integration in the absence of a landmark. Our results show that advanced age impacts landmark-supported path integration, and that this age effect is dissociable from the effects of AD risk impacting pure path integration.

Keywords: path integration, aging, Alzheimer's disease, *APOE*, entorhinal cortex

1. Introduction

Spatial navigation in humans is a complex cognitive ability that allows individuals to orientate in space. Navigation is vulnerable to the aging process (Lester et al., 2017; Moffat, 2009), and disorientation is also an early symptom of Alzheimer's disease (AD) (Coughlan et al., 2018; Igarashi, 2022). Distinguishing impairment in spatial navigation due to aging from that related to early AD could help with detecting early AD pathology.

Navigation is guided by information derived from self-motion cues and from stable landmarks (Wolbers and Hegarty, 2010). Various navigation strategies combine these two types of information to facilitate successful navigation. Path integration is a type of navigation that corresponds to the ability of keeping track of and returning to a previously visited location. It requires the integration of self-motion over time by using external landmarks, when available. In path integration, the current position is estimated continuously according to an initial location (Fukawa et al., 2020; McNaughton et al., 2006).

Path integration is assumed to rely on the entorhinal cortex, particularly the postero-medial entorhinal cortex (pmEC), which contains grid cells. Grid cells have the property of firing

according to a hexagonal pattern (Hafting et al., 2005). Grid cells are believed to contribute to path integration, estimating a particular location according to an initial location (Banino et al., 2018; Bush et al., 2015; Gil et al., 2018); however, errors accumulate over time (Hardcastle et al., 2015). Error accumulation can be corrected for with visual information from stable landmarks, objects, and boundaries (Hardcastle et al., 2015). This information is processed through the antero-lateral entorhinal cortex (alEC), and is projected to the hippocampus (Knierim et al., 2014). The hippocampus receives path integration information from the pmEC and visual information about objects from the alEC. These two sources of information are integrated in the hippocampus to improve self-localization estimates (Fukawa et al., 2020).

The entorhinal cortex and hippocampus are vulnerable to both normal aging and early AD pathology (Igarashi, 2022; Kunz et al., 2015; Segen et al., 2022). There is evidence that the alEC dysfunctions with healthy aging (Reagh et al., 2018) and in preclinical AD (Knierim et al., 2014). However, knowledge remains limited about how the presence of a landmark affects path integration across different age ranges (West et al., 2023), and to what extent the impairment of path integration is identical in normal aging versus preclinical AD. In AD, tauopathy, which is related to cognitive impairment (Hanseeuw et al., 2019), starts to accumulate in the transentorhinal cortex, which consists of the alEC and perirhinal cortex (Braak and Braak, 1991; Sanchez et al., 2021). Subsequently, tauopathy encompasses the entire EC (Braak stage II), and spreads to the medial temporal lobe, including the hippocampus (Braak stage III) (Braak and Braak, 1991). The spread of tauopathy in the entire EC, including the pmEC, could impair grid-cell functioning and lead to pure path integration deficit in early stages of AD (Bierbrauer et al., 2020; Fu et al., 2017; Igarashi, 2022; Jun et al., 2020; Kunz et al., 2015; Ridler et al., 2020; Ying et al., 2022)

The main objective of this study was to distinguish path integration deficits relating to advanced age (up to 80 years old) from those related to an increased genetic risk of developing sporadic AD. Because the alEC is commonly affected by tau pathology due to aging, we hypothesized that older individuals would have greater difficulty in processing visual information from a proximal landmark. By contrast, since the pmEC is mainly affected by tau

pathology due to preclinical AD stages, we hypothesized that pure path integration, without an external landmark, would be impaired in older carriers of the apolipoprotein E ϵ 4 allele (the main genetic risk factor for sporadic AD), as this process is considered to rely more strongly on grid cells localized in the pmEC. The second objective of this study was to investigate mechanisms used by older participants to navigate. Because we hypothesized that older adults would have difficulty in using an external landmark to navigate, we investigated whether older participants would have a bias toward an egocentric strategy.

2. Methods

2.1 Participants

We recruited 282 clinically normal volunteers with an age range of 18 to 80 years old in Belgium through local advertisements. These volunteers were asked to perform a visual path integration task, the “Apple Game” (Akan et al., 2023; Bierbrauer et al., 2020). The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the institutional review board. All participants gave their written informed consent. All participants reported normal or corrected-to-normal vision, and no recent illness or change in medical treatment during the last three months.

We classified participants into four age groups: ≤ 50 years, 51–60 years, 61–70 years, and 71–80 years. The youngest group was considered to have no AD neuropathology, because AD is extremely rare before 50 years of age (“2022 Alzheimer’s disease facts and figures,” 2022). To ensure that participants older than 50 years old had no cognitive impairment, we evaluated their Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) (Folstein et al., 1975). We excluded participants with an MMSE below 25/30 ($n = 3$). Furthermore, the genetic risk of developing AD was estimated by genotyping the Apolipoprotein E gene (*APOE*).

2.2 *APOE* genotyping

Participants were not genetically preselected. All participants were analyzed for *APOE* polymorphisms rs429358 (which is a [C/T] substitution on chromosome 19q13.32 of the sequence

GCTGGGCGCGGACATGGAGGACGTG[C/T]GCGGCCGCCTGGTGCAGTACCGCGG, and

rs7412 (which is a [C/T] substitution of the sequence
CCGCGATGCCGATGACCTGCAGAAG[C/T]GCCTGGCAGTGTACCAGGCCGGGGC.

Based on the two single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), one of the three alleles was assigned $\epsilon 2$, $\epsilon 3$, or $\epsilon 4$ (see Supplement for detailed methods on *APOE* genotyping). The *APOE* $\epsilon 4$ allele represents a major risk factor of AD, whereas the $\epsilon 2$ allele confers a protective effect (Corder et al., 1993; Farrer, 1997; Roses, M.D, 1996). We classified participants into two groups: “ $\epsilon 4$ carriers—risk group” ($\epsilon 3\epsilon 4$ and $\epsilon 4\epsilon 4$) and “ $\epsilon 4$ non-carrier—control group” ($\epsilon 2\epsilon 2$, $\epsilon 2\epsilon 3$ and $\epsilon 3\epsilon 3$); $\epsilon 4$ carriers had a higher risk of developing AD compared to $\epsilon 4$ non-carriers. We excluded participants with the genotypes $\epsilon 2\epsilon 4$, because their risk of developing AD was intermediate as they have one protective allele and one at risk allele.

2.3 Characteristics of the genetic subgroups

We recruited 282 participants, of which 279 had an MMSE higher or equal to 25/30. The 3 participants with a MMSE below 25/30 have been excluded from the analyses. Therefore, 279 participants were included in the study. The prevalence of $\epsilon 4$ carriers (risk group) was 26.16% ($\epsilon 3\epsilon 4$: 24.37%; $\epsilon 4\epsilon 4$: 1.79%). The prevalence of $\epsilon 4$ non-carriers (control group) was 70.97% ($\epsilon 2\epsilon 3$: 11.83%; $\epsilon 3\epsilon 3$: 58.78%, $\epsilon 2\epsilon 2$: 0.36%). The prevalence of excluded participants ($n = 8$) was 2.87% ($\epsilon 2\epsilon 4$: 2.87%). The MMSE, video game experience, education, and age did not differ between $\epsilon 4$ carriers and non-carriers using two-sample *t*-tests. The video game experience corresponded to the number of hours during which participants played video games per week. Education corresponded to the number of years of study. A Chi-Square test confirmed that gender repartition was not different between *APOE* groups. Risk ($n = 73$) and control ($n = 198$) groups did not differ in terms of age or any demographic characteristics (Table 1). Across age and *APOE* groups, we did not observe differences in terms of gender repartition using Chi-Square tests, or education, MMSE, or video game experience, using one-way ANOVA.

	ε4 non-carriers	ε4 carriers	p-values
N (%)	198 (73%)	73 (27%)	
APOE genotype (n)	ε3ε3 (164), ε2ε3 (33), ε2ε2 (1)	ε3ε4 (68), ε4ε4 (5)	
Gender = male/female	70/128	28/45	0.75 ^a
Education (years): mean (SD)	16.03 (2.38)	16.60 (2.33)	0.07 ^b
MMSE*: mean (SD)	28.53 (1.19)	28.33 (1.29)	0.32 ^b
Hours video game per week: mean (SD)	1.03 (2.70)	1.21 (3.00)	0.65 ^b
Age: mean (SD)	57.29 (16.30)	58.61 (15.20)	0.53 ^b
<= 50 years: n	51	16	0.78 ^a
51-60 years: n	41	16	
61-70 years: n	65	28	
71-80 years: n	41	13	

Table 1 : Demographic data of included participants. P-values refer to: (a) χ^2 -test, and (b) two-sample t-test. SD: standard deviation. *For participants older than 50 years old.


2.4 Experimental task

Participants performed a visual path integration task, the Apple Game (Bierbrauer et al., 2020). The task was implemented via Unreal Engine (Epic Games, version 4.11). The game was displayed on a 15-inch full HD screen. During the game, players moved in a virtual environment using a joystick (Trust GXT 555 Predator). The joystick allowed them to move forward, turn left, or turn right. Moving backward was not possible, such that movement direction was identical to heading direction. The position of participants was sampled at 5 Hz.


A. Trial procedure



B. Bird's eye view



C. Subtasks



148

149 *Figure 1: Experimental paradigm. A. Trial procedure: participants pick up an empty basket (start phase), find an*
 150 *apple under a tree (outgoing phase), and return the basket to its original location with the apple in it (incoming*
 151 *phase). They then received feedback as stars according to the distance between the correct basket location and*
 152 *the return location. B. Bird's eye view of the virtual environment. Baskets and trees were randomly positioned in an*
 153 *8 x 8 grid (3200 vm x 3200 vm). The landmark was located at x = 1600 vm and y = 800 vm in the landmark-*
 154 *supported path integration condition. C. The task contained two subtasks depending on the presence or absence*
 155 *of supportive spatial cues. The pure path integration (PPI) subtask contained no external cues, whereas the*
 156 *landmark-supported path integration (LPI) subtask contained a landmark (lighthouse).*

157 The game environment was an endless grassy field with a blue sky rendered at infinity. Players
 158 arrived in the field at a start location. First, they looked for an empty basket and collected it
 159 (start phase, Fig. 1A). Then, a tree appeared in the environment, with or without an apple at
 160 the bottom. In both cases, participants were asked to walk toward the tree. When they reached
 161 the tree, it disappeared, and a new tree appear if there was no apple at the bottom of the tree.
 162 Participants walked from tree to tree with the basket (outgoing phase, Fig 1A) until reaching
 163 the tree with the apple. Once players collected the apple in the basket, they had to return, as
 164 directly as possible, to the remembered original location where the basket was collected from
 165 (incoming phase, Fig. 1A) and return it (drop it back). Then, the participants received feedback
 166 on performance via zero to three stars. The number of stars depended on the Euclidean
 167 distance between the response location and the correct goal location (<1600 vm (virtual meter)
 168 for three stars, <3200 vm for two stars, <6400 vm for one star, Fig.1B). Virtual meters are the
 169 metric used to quantify distances in the virtual environment as given by Unreal Engine
 170 (Bierbrauer et al., 2020).

All phases were self-paced, except the incoming phase, which had a time limit of 30 sec. The mean time to return the basket to the original location was 16.27 sec. If participants did not return the basket within the time limit, their final position was used as the return (or drop) location. This happened in 3.3 % of all trials.

The locations of baskets and trees were randomly distributed on an invisible grid of 8 x 8 squares (bin edge length 800 vm, Fig. 1B). The grid was surrounded by an invisible circular area with a radius of $1.5 \times \text{grid half diagonal}$ (6788 vm). Participants could not move outside this circular area, and their speed decreased linearly to zero when their distance from the center of the arena exceeded 5656 vm. In this speed reduction zone, participants could navigate at full speed when heading toward the center of the arena. This action was implemented to ensure that participants did not navigate too far away from the relevant part of the infinite environment.

The task was implemented as two environmental subtasks, which were defined by the absence or presence of supportive spatial cues (Fig. 1C). In the "pure path integration" subtask (PPI), the environment did not contain any landmarks. In the "landmark-supported path integration" subtask (LPI), a landmark, represented by a lighthouse, which looked the same from every angle, was present in the virtual environment.

The paradigm was subdivided into five blocks. The first block was a training block, and was not analyzed. Each block had six trials, with three trials for each subtask (PPI and LPI). For each subtask, there was one trial with one, two, and three trees. For trials with one tree, the apple was at the bottom of the first tree. For trials with two or three trees, the apple was at the bottom of the second or third tree. Thus, there were one or two distractor trees, respectively. A distractor tree was a tree that leads the participant to a particular location to increase the difficulty of path integration. In each block, trials were grouped by subtask in a pseudo-random order. The number of trees was also pseudo-randomized. Participants could take breaks between blocks. Participants started the first trial for each block at the center of the virtual environment. In all other trials, their start location corresponded to the final location of the previous trial. Between each trial, a black screen was displayed for 5 sec.

After the first analyses, we noticed that trials with three trees were very difficult for older participants. To increase the number of trials with one and two trees, without increasing the time for doing the task, we decided to remove trials with three trees from the task. So, some participants ($n = 64$) conducted a paradigm of five blocks with eight trials. The first block remained a training block. Each block had four trials in both subtasks (PPI and LPI), with two trials with one tree and two trials with two trees in a pseudo-random order.

A subsample of participants ($n = 37$) also performed a previous version of the Apple Game (Bierbrauer et al., 2020). This previous version was developed for younger participants (mean age: 38 years old), and included trials with one to five trees, in three subtasks (PPI, LPI, and boundary-based path integration). We decided to simplify the task by limiting the number of trees, and focusing on the PPI and LPI subtasks, to best test our hypotheses. For the subsample of participants having performed this previous version of the task, we only analyzed trials in the LPI and PPI subtasks, with one, two, or three trees (as was performed by the other participants). This set up corresponded to three trials with one tree (corresponding to the tree with apple), three trials with two trees, and four trials with three trees in PPI and LPI. The fact that not all participants conducted the same version of the paradigm was considered in our models by using a random effect. It was never significant indicating that the version of the task did not influence the performance of participants.

2.5 Data analysis

We extracted behavioral data from logfiles using MATLAB (2020a, The MathWorks Inc.). Statistical analyses were conducted with R (4.0.3) (R Core Team) using the lmerTest (3.1.3) (Bates et al., 2014) and emmeans (1.5.4) packages (Russell, Lenth, 2019).

Performances analysis We analyzed spatial navigation performances using linear mixed models. The participant and version of the paradigm were allocated as random factors in all models. All distance variables were divided by 1000 to be expressed as vkm (virtual kilometer). Gender, video game experience, and education were covariates in all models. We only reported the effects of the *APOE* and age groups here. We compared age groups differences, and *APOE* effects in each age group, using estimated marginal means (emmeans function) or

estimated marginal means of linear trends (emtrends function) (Russell, Lenth, 2019). We used the Kenward-Roger method to calculate the degrees of freedom. The level of significance was set to $\alpha = 0.05$. We corrected all p -values for multiple comparisons using Bonferroni-Holm methods.

Performance was quantified based on the drop error (Fig. 2A); in other words, the Euclidean distance between the correct original location of the basket and the final return (drop) location. Based on our hypothesis, we modeled the drop error with predictors for age groups, *APOE* status, and their interaction. As the effect of variables could vary according to subtask (PPI vs. LPI) and difficulty (number of trees), we constructed separate models for each subtask and difficulty level. Therefore, the subtask and difficulty level were not covariates in the models. The following linear mixed model was used to estimate the drop error:

$$\text{Equation 1 : error} = \beta_0 + \beta_{0i} + \beta_{0j} + \beta_1 \text{AgeGroup} + \beta_2 \text{APOE} + \beta_3 \text{Gender} + \beta_4 \text{Video Game} + \beta_5 \text{Education} + \beta_{12} \text{AgeGroup} * \text{APOE}$$

In the model, β_{0i} is a random intercept per participant and β_{0j} is a random intercept per version. We analyzed whether drop errors differed between age groups and $\epsilon 4$ carriers and non-carriers in each age group using estimated marginal means, with covariates being set to the average (emmeans function) (Russell, Lenth, 2019).

We also analyzed the two components of the drop error (distance and rotation errors) using analogous linear mixed models (Equation 1). The distance error is the absolute value of the difference between the incoming distance (distance from the stop after the apple to the correct basket location) and the response distance (Fig. 2B). The response distance is the distance between the stop location after the apple and the drop location. The rotation error is the angle between the drop location, the stop after the apple, and the correct basket location (Fig. 2C). This angle could be any values between 0 and 180°. We used the stop location after the apple, not the exact apple location, as the reference point for the apple to compute metrics (response distance, angle error, incoming distance, and outgoing distance). In 7.1% of trials,

the response distance was 0. In these trials, we used the angle between the gaze direction and the correct basket location (Fig. 2C) to determine the rotation error.

A. Task parameters




Figure 2: A. Task parameters. Participants started navigation at the start location, searched for an empty basket and collected it. The start-basket distance is the distance between the start location and the basket location. Participants then navigated from tree to tree until finding a tree with an apple (outgoing distance). Finally, they aimed to navigate back to the remembered original basket location. The drop error is the Euclidean distance between the correct basket location (basket in dark color) and the drop location (basket in bright color). The incoming distance is the distance between the apple tree (stop after apple) and the correct basket location. The response distance is the distance between the stop after apple and the drop location. **B. Distance error.** The distance error is the absolute value of the difference between the incoming distance and the response distance. **C. Rotation error.** The rotation error is the angle between the basket, apple (stop after the apple tree), and drop location. If the drop location is localized at the stop after apple (i.e., the response distance is 0), the rotation error is defined as the angle between the gaze direction when the player dropped the basket and the correct basket location. **D. Angles relative to the landmark.** When players were at the start location, they saw the basket at a certain location relative to the landmark (initial view angle). Then, they collected the apple and had to drop the basket with the apple using an angle relative to the landmark called correct angle to drop the basket. The angle relative to the landmark from the apple to the basket drop location is the apple-landmark-drop location angle.

Next, we investigated the behavior of the participants. We hypothesized that the behavior of advanced age participants could be affected by the initial view of the basket if they used an incorrect egocentric strategy. We focused on the response distance and studied parameters affected it. Ideally, the response distance should be equal to the incoming distance (Fig. 2A). We analyzed whether the response distance would be also affected by the start-

basket distance. The start-basket distance is the distance between the start location of the participant in the trial and the basket (Fig. 2A), and corresponds to the distance at which participants initially saw the basket. This initial view distance of the basket should not affect the response distance, but might disturb participants if they memorize the basket location relative to their initial starting location during a given trial. For each subtask and difficulty level, we computed a linear mixed model of the response distance according to the incoming distance (correct distance to travel), start-basket distance (initial view distance), age group, and *APOE* status. Because we were interested in the effects of aging, we added interactions between the incoming distance and age group, and between the start-basket distance and age group. We fitted the following model:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Equation 2: Response distance} = & \beta_0 + \beta_{0i} + \beta_{0j} + \beta_1 \text{Incoming distance} + \\ & \beta_2 \text{Start basket distance} + \beta_3 \text{AgeGroup} + \beta_4 \text{Gender} + \beta_5 \text{APOE} + \beta_6 \text{Video Game} + \\ & \beta_7 \text{Education} + \beta_{13} \text{Incoming distance} * \text{AgeGroup} + \beta_{23} \text{Distance start basket} * \text{AgeGroup} \end{aligned}$$

When participants performed the task perfectly, β_1 would be equal to one and all other regressors would be equal to zero, such that the response distance would be equal to the incoming distance. We first tested whether the response distance differed across age groups. We then compared the β estimates of the incoming distance and the start-basket distance according to age group.

Then, to examine whether distance parameters were influenced by *APOE* status in addition to age, we fitted a second model by adding the triple interactions among *APOE* status, age group, and incoming distance and among *APOE* status, age group, and start-basket distance. We tested whether β estimates differed according to *APOE* status in each age group.

Landmark effect. We compared trials with and without a landmark. We estimated drop errors according to age group, subtask (PPI vs. LPI), their interaction, and *APOE* status. The following linear mixed model was fitted for each difficulty level:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Equation 3: drop error} = & \beta_0 + \beta_{0i} + \beta_{0j} + \beta_1 \text{AgeGroup} + \beta_2 \text{APOE} + \beta_3 \text{Gender} + \\ & \beta_4 \text{Video Game} + \beta_5 \text{Education} + \beta_6 \text{Subtask} + \beta_{16} \text{AgeGroup} * \text{Subtask} \end{aligned}$$

The p -values of regressors were computed with Satterthwaite's method as implemented in lmer function (Bates et al., 2014).

Angle relative to the landmark. We investigated whether the initial view of the basket relative to the landmark affected the drop location. During the task, participants first had to search for the empty basket. They initially viewed the basket at a certain location relative to the landmark. For example, players initially saw the basket to the right in front of the landmark (Fig. 2D). This initial view of the basket location relative to the landmark is represented by the initial view angle (start-landmark-basket angle). Then, participants walked toward the apple tree and had to return (drop back) the basket with the apple at the remembered original location. In the example (Fig. 2D), when participants were at the apple location, they had to return the basket to the left of the landmark (correct angle to drop the basket). We assessed how the apple-landmark-drop location angle was affected by the correct angle, and the initial view angle for each age group. If participants were affected by the initial view of the basket, they would drop the basket to the right in front of the landmark as illustrated (Fig. 2D). Both angles (apple-landmark-drop location angle and correct angle to drop the basket) were computed with the stop after the apple as reference point. As parameters could change with age, we added the interaction between age group and angle regressors. We fitted the following model for each difficulty level:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Equation 4 : angle apple landmark basket} = & \beta_0 + \beta_{0i} + \beta_{0j} + \beta_1 \text{Correct angle} + \\ & \beta_2 \text{Initial view angle} + \beta_3 \text{Gender} + \beta_4 \text{APOE} + \beta_5 \text{Video Game} + \beta_6 \text{Education} + \\ & \beta_7 \text{AgeGroup} + \beta_{17} \text{Correct angle} * \text{AgeGroup} + \beta_{27} \text{Initial view angle} * \text{AgeGroup} \end{aligned}$$

Then, we assessed whether *APOE* status modified the effect of the correct angle and the initial view angle by adding the triple interactions among correct angle, age group, and *APOE*, and among initial view angle, age group, and *APOE*.

Distractor trees. We evaluated the effect of distractor trees. We compared the drop error of trials with one and two distractor trees. We used Equation 1, and added an interaction between the number of trees and age group.

2.6. Summary of hypotheses

Our hypotheses are summarized in Table 2. First, we hypothesized that in older participants at risk of AD ($\epsilon 4$ carriers), tau pathology will spread to the entire EC, including the pmEC. This should lead to a deficit in pure path integration, due to the implication of grid cells localized in the pmEC. We therefore hypothesized that older $\epsilon 4$ carriers will make higher drop errors than non-carriers of the same age group in PPI (Hyp. 1.1). It is currently not clear how exactly grid cells support path integration. Some studies on rodents overt that grid cells support distance estimation for path integration (Evans et al., 2016; Stemmler et al., 2015). Other studies suggest that grid cells are more generally implied in path integration, including distance and direction estimation (McNaughton et al., 2006). Therefore, we decomposed the drop errors into distance and rotation errors. We hypothesized that the higher drop error among older $\epsilon 4$ carriers would be related to both higher distance errors and higher rotation errors. In contrast, in LPI, the landmark would help both $\epsilon 4$ carriers and non-carriers. Therefore, in the LPI subtask, we did not expect performance differences between $\epsilon 4$ carriers and non-carriers in any age group (Hyp. 1.2).

The second aim of our study was to investigate the effect of advanced age on landmark-supported path integration. We hypothesized that, with age, the aIEC will dysfunction, which will affect the landmark processing. Therefore, the drop error should increase with age in LPI (Hyp. 2.1) and the positive effect of the landmark should decrease with age (Hyp. 2.2).

Finally, we investigated the cognitive mechanisms behind age-related path integration deficits. We hypothesized that older participants use an incorrect egocentric strategy (Hyp. 3), resulting in an influence of the initial view of the goal on the response of the participants (Hyp. 3.1 and Hyp. 3.2.), while this initial view is not relevant for solving the task. We hypothesized that this bias toward the initial view of the goal increases with age, but not with AD risk (Hyp 3.3).

Effect of the risk of AD (older $\epsilon 4$ carriers) on path integration

Hypothesis 1: With AD risk, tau accumulates in the entire EC, including the pmEC, leading to grid-cell dysfunction and to a pure path integration deficit

	Hypotheses	Equations
Hyp. 1.1	Higher drop errors, distance errors, and rotation errors, in pure path integration (PPI) in older $\epsilon 4$ carriers	Eq.1 in PPI: errors according to age and <i>APOE</i> $\epsilon 4$ status
Hyp. 1.2	No deficit in landmark-supported path integration (LPI) in $\epsilon 4$ carriers vs. non-carriers in any age group	Eq.1 in LPI: errors according to age and <i>APOE</i> $\epsilon 4$ status

Effect of advanced age on path integration

Hypothesis 2: Dysfunction of the alEC, leading to difficulty in using the landmark with age

	Hypotheses	Equations
Hyp. 2.1	Decrease of the positive effect of the landmark with age	Eq.3: Drop errors according to age and subtask (PPI versus LPI)
Hyp. 2.2	Deficit in LPI performances with age, not with $\epsilon 4$ status	Eq.1 in LPI: errors according to age and <i>APOE</i> $\epsilon 4$ status

Hypothesis 3: Bias toward an egocentric strategy with age

	Hypotheses	Equations
Hyp. 3.1	Response distance influenced by the initial view distance with age	Eq. 2 in PPI and LPI: Response distance according to the correct distance, and initial view distance for each age group
Hyp. 3.2	Drop location relative to the landmark influenced by the initial view angle of the goal relative to the landmark with age (Fig. 2D)	Eq. 4: Apple-landmark-drop location angle according to the correct angle and the initial view angle for each age group

Hyp. 3.3	The bias toward an egocentric strategy is not different in $\epsilon 4$ carriers versus non-carriers	No triple interaction between <i>APOE</i> group, age groups and regressors of Eq.2 and Eq. 4
-----------------	--	--

Table 2: Summary of hypotheses on the *APOE* and aging effect on path integration

3. Results

3.1 Path integration performance without the distractor tree

We first investigated the effects of age and *APOE* status on path integration performance in trials with no distractor tree. In these trials, participants collected the apple at the first tree, then turned around, and returned to the remembered basket location.

3.1.1 Pure path integration (PPI) – No landmark

In the PPI condition without a distractor tree, drop errors (Fig. 3A; Fig.S1A) and rotation errors (Fig. 3B; Fig. S1B) increased in the 71–80 age group compared to the ≤ 50 age group. In contrast, distance errors started to increase at the age of 51 years, and increased between each consecutive age group (Fig. 3C; Fig. S1C). Thus, distance errors appeared to be more sensitive to aging. Furthermore, $\epsilon 4$ carriers in the 71–80 age group made higher drop errors than non-carriers of the same age ($t_{197} = 2.12$, $p = 0.035$), which confirmed our hypothesis 1.1. This deficit was not apparent in rotation errors ($t_{203} = 1.51$, $p = 0.133$) or distance errors ($t_{195} = 1.39$, $p = 0.164$), showing that the drop error, which combines rotation and distance errors, is most sensitive to AD risk-related deficits.

PPI: no distractor tree




Figure 3: Linear mixed models (Equation 1): beta estimates and their confidence intervals according to age and APOE groups in pure path integration with no distractor tree (apple at the first tree). **A.** Drop errors were higher in the 71–80 age group compared to groups younger than 61 years old. In the 71–80 age group, ε4 carriers had higher drop errors compared to ε4 non-carriers. **B.** Rotation errors were higher in the 71–80 age group compared to the <=50 age group. **C.** Distance errors increased between each age group. P-values are corrected for multiple comparisons with Bonferroni-Holm method. *0.01 < p < 0.05; ** 0.001 < p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001

Response distance. Response distance decreased between each age group (Table 3) meaning that from 50 years onwards, participants travelled shorter distances, an observation consistent with the increased distance error observed with age.

Contrast	Degrees of freedom	t-ratio	p-value
<=50 – 51-60	212	2.96	0.007
<=50 – 61-70	157	5.14	<0.001
<=50 – 71-80	98	6.91	<0.001
51-60 – 61-70	257	2.12	0.035
51-60 – 71-80	231	4.59	<0.001
61-70 – 71-80	231	3.18	0.005

Table 3: Comparison of the response distance between age groups, from Equation 2, in pure path integration with no distractor tree, using estimated marginal means. P-values are corrected for multiple comparisons with Bonferroni-Holm method.

We investigated whether the response distance depended on the correct distance and/or the initial view distance according to the age group, in relation to hypothesis 3.1. Response distances depended well on the correct distance for participants younger than 71 years old whereas the initial view distance influenced participants older than 50 years old (Fig. 4). For participants in the ≤ 50 age group, the β estimate of the correct distance tended toward 1 (0.74), showing that the response distance was close to the correct distance. The effect of the correct distance on the response distance significantly decreased across age groups (Fig. 4; β incoming distance = 0.74, 0.42, 0.27, and 0.04 for ≤ 50 , 51–60, 61–70, and 71–80 age groups, respectively). This β estimate value was not significantly different from zero in the 71–80 age group. The ability to estimate distances decreased with age, and was largely impaired in the 71–80 age group. In contrast, the β estimate of the start-basket distance was not significantly different from zero in the ≤ 50 age group ($\beta = 0.07$), contrasting with those over 50 years old ($\beta = 0.12$, 0.19, and 0.26 for 51–60, 61–70, and 71–80 age groups respectively, Fig. 4). The effect of the start-basket distance was higher in the 71–80 age group compared to the ≤ 50 age group (Fig. 4). In the 71–80 age group, the response distance depended on the initial view distance of the basket only, but not on the correct distance (i.e., they moved a greater distance if the basket was initially far away from them, independent of the distance between the basket and the apple tree). As suggested by hypothesis 3.1, we found that older participants tried to reproduce the distance of the initial view of the basket without considering their path from the basket to the apple tree.

PPI: no distractor tree




Figure 4: Linear mixed models (Equation 2): Response distance according to the incoming distance (correct distance) and the start-basket distance (initial view distance of the basket) for each age group in PPI with no distractor tree. The effect of the incoming distance on the response distance decreased with age. The correct distance significantly affected the response distance for participants younger than 71 years old. The effect of the start-basket distance on the response distance was higher for the 71–80 age group compared to the ≤50 age group. Confidence intervals are plotted. *P*-values are corrected for multiple comparisons with Bonferroni-Holm method. * $0.01 < p < 0.05$; ** $0.001 < p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

To determine whether this effect of the initial view was related to *APOE* status (Hyp.

3.3), we next studied how *APOE* status affected the use of the correct distance or the initial view distance in each age group. The response distance depended less on the correct distance for $\epsilon 4$ carriers in the 61–70 age group as compared to non-carriers of the same age ($t_{1123} = -2.42$, $p = 0.015$). Thus, $\epsilon 4$ carriers in the 61–70 age group were less able to integrate distances, as were all participants in the 71–80 age group, which was not part of our hypotheses. This result highlights a subtle pure path integration deficit among participants in the 61–70 age group at risk of AD. There was no *APOE* effect on the initial view distance for any age group, as proposed in hypothesis 3.3.

3.1.2 Landmark-based path integration – LPI

The presence of the landmark was associated with lower drop errors (Equation 3, $t_{2303} = -7.23$, $p < 0.001$). The interaction between age groups and subtasks was significant, such that the positive effect of the landmark was smaller for each age group above 50 years old compared to the ≤50 age group ($t_{2303} = 3.39$, $p < 0.001$ for 51–60; $t_{2303} = 2.70$, $p = 0.007$ for 61–70; $t_{2303} = 3.73$, $p < 0.001$ for 71–80), confirming hypothesis 2.1. Above 50 years old, participants had more difficulty in using the landmark to improve path integration.

Drop errors (Fig. 5A, Fig. S1D) and distance errors (Fig. 5C, Fig. S1F) were higher in all age groups above 50 years old compared to the ≤ 50 age group, and further increased in the 71–80 age group. Rotation errors were also higher in all age groups above 50 years old (Fig. 5B, Fig. S1E). As stated in hypothesis 2.2, drop errors and rotation errors increased above 50 years old in LPI, and increased only above 70 years old in PPI. Thus, landmark-processing deficit appears earlier than the pure path integration deficit.




Figure 5: Linear mixed models (Equation 1): beta estimates and their confidence intervals according to the age and APOE groups in landmark-supported path integration with no distractor tree. **A.** Drop errors increased above 50 years old, and still increased in the 71–80 age group. **B.** Rotation errors increased above 50 years old. **C.** Distance errors increased above 50 years old, and still increased in the 71–80 age group. In the 61–70 age group, $\epsilon 4$ carriers made greater distance errors compared to $\epsilon 4$ non-carriers. P-values are corrected for multiple comparisons by Bonferroni-Holm method. * $0.01 < p < 0.05$; ** $0.001 < p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

APOE did not affect the drop and rotation errors in any age group (Fig. 5AB), as supposed by hypothesis 1.2. Interestingly, distance errors were greater for $\epsilon 4$ carriers compared to $\epsilon 4$ non-carriers in the 61–70 age group ($t_{220} = 2.98$, $p = 0.003$, Fig. 5C), which was unexpected according to our hypotheses. Participants at risk of AD in the 61–70 age group had greater distance errors in LPI, just as they had difficulty in estimating the correct distance in PPI. Distance errors did not differ between carriers and non-carriers among participants in the 71–80 age group, possibly because older individuals had difficulty estimating distances in both APOE groups.

Response distance. The response distance was shorter for participants in the 61–70 ($t_{133} = -2.97, p = 0.018$) and 71–80 age groups ($t_{54} = -3.29, p = 0.011$) compared to participants in the ≤ 50 age group (Equation 2). As in the PPI subtask, the effect of the correct distance on response distance decreased with age (Table 4; β correct distance = 0.74, 0.38, 0.29, and 0.17 for ≤ 50 , 51–60, 61–70, and 71–80 age groups, respectively). In line with hypothesis 3.1, we found that the effect of the start-basket distance tended to increase with age (β start-basket distance = 0.09, 0.10, 0.16, and 0.25 for ≤ 50 , 51–60, 61–70, and 71–80 age groups, respectively), but there were no significant differences across age groups.

Contrast	Degrees of freedom	t-ratio	p-value
$\leq 50 - 51-60$	1277	4.25	<0.001
$\leq 50 - 61-70$	1279	5.98	<0.001
$\leq 50 - 71-80$	1276	7.12	<0.001
$51-60 - 61-70$	1259	1.26	0.207
$51-60 - 71-80$	1250	2.68	0.022
$61-70 - 71-80$	1248	1.71	0.175

Table 4: Comparison of the effect of the correct distance on response distance across age groups, from Equation 2, in landmark-supported path integration with no distractor tree, using estimated marginal means of linear trends. P-values are corrected for multiple comparisons with Bonferroni-Holm method.

We next added a triple interaction among *APOE*, age groups, and distance regressors to test whether the influence of the initial view distance was not affected by *APOE* status (Hyp. 3.3). As in the PPI subtask, the effect of the correct distance was smaller for $\epsilon 4$ carriers compared to non-carriers in the 61–70 age group ($t_{1240} = -3.02, p = 0.003$). Thus, participants with a higher risk of AD between 61 and 70 years old had more difficulty in estimating distances with and without a landmark. The effect of the start-basket distance was not correlated with *APOE* genotype.

Angle relative to the landmark. We furthermore investigated whether participants were affected by the initial view angle of the basket relative to the landmark with advanced age (Hyp. 3.2). The β estimate of the correct angle significantly decreased between each age group

(Fig.6, β correct angle = 0.61, 0.37, 0.20, and 0.07 for ≤ 50 , 51–60, 61–70, and 71–80 age groups, respectively). Participants older than 50 years old were influenced by the initial view angle, whereas participants in the ≤ 50 age group were not (Fig. 6, β initial view angle = -0.02, 0.22, 0.22, and 0.29 for ≤ 50 , 51–60, 61–70, and 71–80 age groups, respectively). For participants older than 50 years old, the angle depended more significantly on the initial view angle compared to participants in the ≤ 50 age group (Fig.6). Thus, older participants were biased by the initial view of the basket, and were less likely to take the correct angle into account, providing empirical evidence in support of hypothesis 3.2. For example, if older participants saw the basket initially to the right of the landmark, they would return the basket to the right of the landmark (Fig. 2D) even if they had to pass to the other side of the landmark to reach the apple tree.




Figure 6: Linear mixed models (Equation 4): angle apple-landmark-basket according to the correct angle and initial view angle for each age group in LPI with no distractor tree (apple at the first tree). The effect of the correct angle decreased with increasing age groups. The initial view angle affected participants older than 50 years old more. Confidence intervals are plotted. P-values are corrected for multiple comparisons with Bonferroni-Holm method. * $0.01 < p < 0.05$; ** $0.001 < p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

We investigated whether the influence of the angle regressors differed between *APOE* groups. Our hypothesis 3.3 proposed that the influence of the initial view was not related to *APOE* group. The $\epsilon 4$ carriers were less affected by the initial view angle compared to non-carriers in the 71–80 age group ($t_{1230} = -2.20$, $p = 0.028$). *APOE* did not affect the correct angle. Hence, participants at risk of AD, in the 71–80 age group, were less affected by the initial basket location relative to the landmark, which is a more correct behavior in principle. However,

it could indicate that participants did not remember the initial location of the basket, as they did not drop the basket at a location depending more on the correct angle.

3.2 Path integration with distractor trees

The drop error was smaller with one distractor tree compared to two distractor trees only for participants younger than 50 years old in both subtasks (without landmark: $t_{1861} = -2.01$, $p = 0.044$; with landmark: $t_{1864} = -3.43$, $p < 0.001$). Above 50 years old, performance did not decline with the number of distractors, suggesting that the task with one distractor tree was already very difficult for these participants. Therefore, we restricted our analyses to trials with one distractor tree.

3.2.1 Pure path integration – PPI

We provided detailed results on trials with one distractor tree in the PPI subtask in section S3. The drop error and its two components were higher above 50 years old compared to the ≤ 50 age group. The *APOE* group did not affect drop errors (fig. S2A), rotation errors (fig. S2B), and distance errors (fig. S2C) in any age group. In contrast, in PPI with no distractor tree, $\epsilon 4$ carriers in the 71–80 age group had higher drop errors compared to non-carriers (see above). We did not observe any *APOE* effects when adding a distractor tree probably because the task was too difficult for all older participants.

3.2.2 Landmark-supported path integration – LPI

Detailed results on trials with one distractor tree in the LPI subtask are provided in section S4. As in the condition with no distractor tree, the positive effect of the landmark decreased with age. Drop errors (Fig. S3A), rotation errors (Fig. S3B), and distance errors (Fig. S3C) were significantly higher above 50 years old compared to the ≤ 50 age group. As in the condition without distractor tree, *APOE* did not affect drop errors in any age group; and distance errors were greater for $\epsilon 4$ carriers in the 61–70 age group compared to non-carriers ($t_{214} = 2.27$, $p = 0.024$). Interestingly, with a distractor tree, distance errors were also higher for $\epsilon 4$ carriers in the 51–60 age group ($t_{232} = 2.03$, $p = 0.043$) as well as rotation errors (Fig. S3B, $t_{232} = 2.27$, $p = 0.024$). Thus, adding a distractor tree allowed disclosing a deficit in distance and rotation

errors in landmark-supported path integration among participants in the 51–60 age group, but decreased our ability to disclose differences in the participants older than 70 years old. Putatively, this is because the task was too difficult for all participants above a certain age, regardless of their risk status.

4. Discussion

This study provides evidence that aging is associated with a decline in landmark-supported path integration, whereas the risk of developing AD (older ϵ 4 carriers) is related to impairment in pure path integration. While both pure path integration and landmark-supported path integration deteriorated with age, in line with previous studies (Adamo et al., 2012; Allen et al., 2004; Harris and Wolbers, 2012; Lester et al., 2017; Mahmood et al., 2009; Segen et al., 2022; Stangl et al., 2018), we showed that the positive effect of the landmark decreased with age. Furthermore, higher drop errors in landmark-supported path integration appeared at a younger age (from 50 years old) compared to pure path integration (from 70 years old). We specifically showed that advanced age participants used an un-adaptative strategy, which could explain why they did not benefit as much from the landmark. Older participants were affected by the initial view of their goal (relative to their own start location and/or the external landmark), and reproduced this view without considering that they had moved during the trial. This effect of the initial view of the goal was not related to the participants' risk of developing AD. In contrast, we showed that participants in the 71–80 age group at risk of AD had a pure path integration deficit, supporting a previous study (Bierbrauer et al., 2020). We also showed that both aging and risk of AD are related to difficulty in estimating distances, and that participants at risk of AD in the 61–70 age group had more difficulty in estimating distances compared to non-at-risk participants.

The main observations were made based on a very simple task (returning after reaching a single tree). Using distractor trees allowed path integration deficits to be detected among younger participants at risk of AD (in the 51-60 age group), but made the task too difficult for advanced age participants.

This study showed that landmark-supported path integration deteriorates with age, supporting previous studies, which showed that older adults have difficulty with landmark coding (Bécu et al., 2023, 2020; Hill, 2023). We hypothesized that the difficulty in using the landmark with advanced age was attributed to the initial view of the goal (a basket in our task). Older participants tended to return the basket at the same location relative to the landmark and to themselves, as in the initial view of the scene. For example, if participants initially saw the basket far from them at the right of the landmark, they would remember the basket being far from them to the right of the landmark, and would return without taking the fact that they had moved in the environment into account, and that their viewpoint had changed. Thus, older participants lost the ability to update their position, and attempted to reproduce a remembered static image. This effect of the initial view shows that older participants remembered the initial view; thus, path integration deficits likely occurred in the absence of visual memory deficits. Of note, older $\epsilon 4$ carriers were less affected by the initial basket location relative to the landmark compared to $\epsilon 4$ non-carriers. Although this seems to be a beneficial behavior, it might indicate that older $\epsilon 4$ carriers had incipient impairment in visual memory, as they did not return the basket to a location depending more on the correct location either.

The current study was able to demonstrate the effect of the initial view of the goal because the task involved two important characteristics. First, the start locations differed from the goal locations. Standard path integration tasks tend to be triangle completion tasks (Allen et al., 2004; Harris and Wolbers, 2012; Mahmood et al., 2009); in contrast, here, participants had to reach the goal before starting path integration. During the start phase, participants saw the goal at a specific location relative to themselves and/or to the landmark. This initial view of the goal was not supposed to affect the behavior to return to the goal location at the end of the trial. Thus, participants were supposed to integrate the travelled path, starting at the goal location and not before, from the start location. Our results showed that the initial view of the goal biased the behavior of older participants, indicating that they performed path integration incorrectly.

The second important characteristic of our task was the proximal cue. This cue allowed participants to move around the landmark, and change their view of it. Previous path integration studies mostly used distal cues, in which participant could not change their view relative to the cue (Harris and Wolbers, 2012). Our results support other studies showing that older adults have more difficulty with spatial memory tasks when the view point changes (Montefinese et al., 2015; Wiener et al., 2012).

The current study also highlighted that age mainly impaired distance estimation in the two subtasks. The response distance was shorter above 50 years old in pure path integration and above 60 years old in landmark-supported path integration, compared to the ≤ 50 age group. This result fits with previous studies, which demonstrated an underestimation of distances with age during path integration (Allen et al., 2004; Mahmood et al., 2009). The correct distance affected the response distance less with increasing age. In older adults, the response distance depended more on the distance at which participants initially saw the goal. This effect of the initial view distance was present in both subtasks, with and without the landmark, confirming the robustness of this result.

Our study demonstrated that $\epsilon 4$ carriers, in the 71–80 age group, had a pure path integration deficit compared to non-at-risk individuals of the same age. As aging and *APOE* $\epsilon 4$ allele are two main risk factors of AD, $\epsilon 4$ carriers in the 71–80 age group are more likely to have preclinical AD. Our finding supports studies showing the impairment of spatial navigation in preclinical and prodromal AD (Coughlan et al., 2018; Howett et al., 2019). The lower performance in path integration might be caused by tau pathology in the EC, particularly the pmEC, which contains grid cells. Previous studies showed that path integration performance is correlated with the volume or thickness of the EC (Bierbrauer et al., 2020; Mokrisova et al., 2016). Lower entorhinal grid-cell activity could explain path integration deficits in both normal aging (Stangl et al., 2018) and AD, as previously shown in mice (Fu et al., 2017; Igarashi, 2022; Jun et al., 2020; Ridler et al., 2020; Ying et al., 2022).

Moreover, we showed that $\epsilon 4$ carriers, in the 61–70 age group, had subtle path integration deficits. These participants at risk of AD had more difficulty in estimating distances compared to non-carriers of the same age. Their response distance depended less on the correct distance, in both subtasks (PPI and LPI), and they made higher distance errors with the landmark. This deficit could be related to tau pathology in the EC. Human studies point to a role of the pmEC in distance estimation (Chen et al., 2015; Evans et al., 2016). Previous studies with mice also showed that the medial entorhinal cortex, the mice homolog of human pmEC, contains neurons that encode the distance traveled in the dark, corresponding to grid cells (Campbell et al., 2021).

Age-related difficulty in using landmark information efficiently could be related to hippocampal dysfunction (Colombo et al., 2017) and/or an increasing deficiency of aIEC with advanced age (Reagh et al., 2018). The aIEC processes information about local landmarks (Chen et al., 2019; Knierim et al., 2014), and there is evidence of age-related dysfunction in the aIEC (Reagh et al., 2018). Interestingly, the aIEC is included in the transentorhinal cortex. Tau pathology starts accumulating with age in the aIEC, which is called primary age-related tauopathy (Crary et al., 2014). Whether this condition is an early stage of AD is subject to debate (Duyckaerts et al., 2015). Tau pathology is observed in the aIEC in many older individuals, whereas the entire EC is only affected in older adults with amyloid (Sanchez et al., 2021). Thus, landmark-based navigation might be affected with age independently of pure path integration. Tau imaging and longitudinal path integration data are needed to explore these subjects, and establish a temporal sequence of path integration deficits.

In addition to the aIEC and pmEC, hippocampal dysfunction also occurs in older individuals (Lester et al., 2017). Because the hippocampus integrates information from several brain regions, including the aIEC and pmEC, it might dysfunction with any EC sub-regions. Several studies have shown that older adults use extra-hippocampal strategies to solve spatial navigation tasks (Colombo et al., 2017; Moffat, 2009; Zhong and Moffat, 2018). We hypothesize that the un-adaptative strategy used by older participants to solve our task (i.e.,

to reproduce the initial view of the basket location) is related to changes to hippocampal and/or
alEC function.

This study has several limitations. First, we used genotype as a proxy for the risk of
preclinical AD, but we did not measure AD pathology. Future work should evaluate the impact
of AD neuropathology on path integration using PET imaging, cerebrospinal fluid, or blood
markers of amyloid and tau. Longitudinal studies could also be used to assess the predictive
power of path integration measures on subsequent cognitive decline, and the sequence of
navigational deficits in normal and pathological aging. Another limitation of this work is that we
focused on recruiting older individuals, and did not have the statistical power to investigate
aging effects before 50 years old. Therefore, we grouped all our participants younger than 50
years old into a single group, which is an arbitrary age limit. Although some middle-age effects
could be present before 50 years of age, Yu et al. found no differences in path integration
between young and middle-aged participants (Yu et al., 2021). Deeper analyses of the initial
view effects in middle-aged participants could help elucidate when and how path integration
starts declining. Finally, as older adults displayed subtle deficits in using information about
distance and self-motion from optic flow (Lich and Bremmer, 2014), using a purely visual flow
task could interfere with performance. However, the function of other senses (proprioception,
vestibular functions) also decreases with age. A visual path integration task allows body-based
cues to be eliminated. Furthermore, previous studies confirmed that navigation performance
in the real world is correlated with performances in virtual environments for healthy older
individuals, and for patients with neurodegenerative disease (Adamo et al., 2012; Cushman et
al., 2008; Stangl et al., 2018).

5. Conclusion

This study showed that a simple path integration task (returning to an original location after
reaching a single tree) is suitable for testing older participants, including detecting aging
effects, and differences between older *APOE* $\epsilon 4$ carriers and non-carriers. Importantly, this
study demonstrated that advanced age impairs the appropriate use of a landmark. Older adults

kept in mind the initial view of their goal, and reproduced this initial view, without considering their movement during the trial. This un-adaptative behavior was not related to ϵ_4 status. This study also confirmed that adults at risk of AD have a pure path integration deficit. This path integration task is promising to disclose AD pathology among clinically normal older individuals, and allows to dissociate effects of age and *APOE*.

Acknowledgements

We thank all participants and the Stichting Alzheimer Onderzoek for their help in our study.

Funding Information The Belgian Fund for Scientific Research (FNRS) provided grants for the personnel conducting this research (L.C.: No. ASP40001844). LK was supported by the Ministry of Culture and Science of North Rhine-Westphalia.

NA acknowledges support by ERC CoG 864164.

BJH acknowledges support from the FNRS (grant n° CCL40010417) and from the FRFS-WELBIO (grant n° 40010035).

References

2022 Alzheimer's disease facts and figures, 2022. . *Alzheimer's & Dementia* 18, 700–789.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.12638>

Adamo, D.E., Briceño, E.M., Sindone, J.A., Alexander, N.B., Moffat, S.D., 2012. Age

differences in virtual environment and real world path integration. *Front. Ag. Neurosci.*

4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2012.00026>

Akan, O., Bierbrauer, A., Kunz, L., Gajewski, P.D., Getzmann, S., Hengstler, J.G., Wascher,

E., Axmacher, N., Wolf, O.T., 2023. Chronic stress is associated with specific path

integration deficits. *Behavioural Brain Research* 442, 114305.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2023.114305>

686 Allen, G.L., Kirasic, K.C., Rashotte, M.A., Haun, D.B.M., 2004. Aging and path integration
687 skill: Kinesthetic and vestibular contributions to wayfinding. *Perception &*
688 *Psychophysics* 66, 170–179. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03194870>

689 Banino, A., Barry, C., Uria, B., Blundell, C., Lillicrap, T., Mirowski, P., Pritzel, A., Chadwick,
690 M.J., Degris, T., Modayil, J., Wayne, G., Soyer, H., Viola, F., Zhang, B., Goroshin, R.,
691 Rabinowitz, N., Pascanu, R., Beattie, C., Petersen, S., Sadik, A., Gaffney, S., King,
692 H., Kavukcuoglu, K., Hassabis, D., Hadsell, R., Kumaran, D., 2018. Vector-based
693 navigation using grid-like representations in artificial agents. *Nature* 557, 429–433.
694 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0102-6>

695 Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., 2014. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models
696 using lme4.

697 Bécu, M., Sheynikhovich, D., Ramanoël, S., Tatur, G., Ozier-Lafontaine, A., Authié, C.N.,
698 Sahel, J.-A., Arleo, A., 2023. Landmark-based spatial navigation across the human
699 lifespan. *eLife* 12, e81318. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.81318>

700 Bécu, M., Sheynikhovich, D., Tatur, G., Agathos, C.P., Bologna, L.L., Sahel, J.-A., Arleo, A.,
701 2020. Age-related preference for geometric spatial cues during real-world navigation.
702 *Nat Hum Behav* 4, 88–99. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0718-z>

703 Bierbrauer, A., Kunz, L., Gomes, C.A., Luhmann, M., Deuker, L., Getzmann, S., Wascher, E.,
704 Gajewski, P.D., Hengstler, J.G., Fernandez-Alvarez, M., Atienza, M., Cammisuli,
705 D.M., Bonatti, F., Pruneti, C., Percesepe, A., Bellaali, Y., Hanseeuw, B., Strange,
706 B.A., Cantero, J.L., Axmacher, N., 2020. Unmasking selective path integration deficits
707 in Alzheimer’s disease risk carriers. *Sci. Adv.* 6, eaba1394.
708 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aba1394>

709 Braak, H., Braak, E., 1991. Neuropathological staging of Alzheimer-related changes. *Acta*
710 *Neuropathol* 82, 239–259. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00308809>

711 Bush, D., Barry, C., Manson, D., Burgess, N., 2015. Using Grid Cells for Navigation. *Neuron*
712 87, 507–520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.07.006>

713 Campbell, M.G., Attinger, A., Ocko, S.A., Ganguli, S., Giocomo, L.M., 2021. Distance-tuned
 714 neurons drive specialized path integration calculations in medial entorhinal cortex.
 715 Cell Reports 36, 109669. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2021.109669>
 716 Chen, X., He, Q., Kelly, J.W., Fiete, I.R., McNamara, T.P., 2015. Bias in Human Path
 717 Integration Is Predicted by Properties of Grid Cells. Current Biology 25, 1771–1776.
 718 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2015.05.031>
 719 Chen, X., Vieweg, P., Wolbers, T., 2019. Computing distance information from landmarks
 720 and self-motion cues - Differential contributions of anterior-lateral vs. posterior-medial
 721 entorhinal cortex in humans. NeuroImage 202, 116074.
 722 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116074>
 723 Colombo, D., Serino, S., Tuena, C., Pedroli, E., Dakanalis, A., Cipresso, P., Riva, G., 2017.
 724 Egocentric and allocentric spatial reference frames in aging: A systematic review.
 725 Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews 80, 605–621.
 726 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.07.012>
 727 Corder, E.H., Saunders, A.M., Strittmatter, W.J., Schmechel, D.E., Gaskell, P.C., Small,
 728 G.W., Roses, A.D., Haines, J.L., Pericak-Vance, M.A., 1993. Gene Dose of
 729 Apolipoprotein E Type 4 Allele and the Risk of Alzheimer's Disease in Late Onset
 730 Families. Science 261, 921–923. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.8346443>
 731 Coughlan, G., Laczó, J., Hort, J., Minihane, A.-M., Hornberger, M., 2018. Spatial navigation
 732 deficits — overlooked cognitive marker for preclinical Alzheimer disease? Nat Rev
 733 Neurol 14, 496–506. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41582-018-0031-x>
 734 Crary, J.F., Trojanowski, J.Q., Schneider, J.A., Abisambra, J.F., Abner, E.L., Alafuzoff, I.,
 735 Arnold, S.E., Attems, J., Beach, T.G., Bigio, E.H., Cairns, N.J., Dickson, D.W.,
 736 Gearing, M., Grinberg, L.T., Hof, P.R., Hyman, B.T., Jellinger, K., Jicha, G.A.,
 737 Kovacs, G.G., Knopman, D.S., Kofler, J., Kukull, W.A., Mackenzie, I.R., Masliah, E.,
 738 McKee, A., Montine, T.J., Murray, M.E., Neltner, J.H., Santa-Maria, I., Seeley, W.W.,
 739 Serrano-Pozo, A., Shelanski, M.L., Stein, T., Takao, M., Thal, D.R., Toledo, J.B.,
 740 Troncoso, J.C., Vonsattel, J.P., White, C.L., Wisniewski, T., Woltjer, R.L., Yamada,

741 M., Nelson, P.T., 2014. Primary age-related tauopathy (PART): a common pathology
 742 associated with human aging. *Acta Neuropathol* 128, 755–766.
 743 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00401-014-1349-0>

744 Cushman, L.A., Stein, K., Duffy, C.J., 2008. Detecting navigational deficits in cognitive aging
 745 and Alzheimer disease using virtual reality. *Neurology* 71, 888–895.
 746 <https://doi.org/10.1212/01.wnl.0000326262.67613.fe>

747 Duyckaerts, C., Braak, H., Brion, J.-P., Buée, L., Del Tredici, K., Goedert, M., Halliday, G.,
 748 Neumann, M., Spillantini, M.G., Tolnay, M., Uchihara, T., 2015. PART is part of
 749 Alzheimer disease. *Acta Neuropathol* 129, 749–756. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00401-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00401-015-1390-7)
 750 [015-1390-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00401-015-1390-7)

751 Evans, T., Bicanski, A., Bush, D., Burgess, N., 2016. How environment and self-motion
 752 combine in neural representations of space: Environment and self-motion in neural
 753 representations of space. *J Physiol* 594, 6535–6546.
 754 <https://doi.org/10.1113/JP270666>

755 Farrer, L.A., 1997. Effects of Age, Sex, and Ethnicity on the Association Between
 756 Apolipoprotein E Genotype and Alzheimer Disease: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA* 278,
 757 1349. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1997.03550160069041>

758 Folstein, M.F., Folstein, S.E., McHugh, P.R., 1975. “Mini-mental state.” *Journal of Psychiatric*
 759 *Research* 12, 189–198. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3956\(75\)90026-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3956(75)90026-6)

760 Fu, H., Rodriguez, G.A., Herman, M., Emrani, S., Nahmani, E., Barrett, G., Figueroa, H.Y.,
 761 Goldberg, E., Hussaini, S.A., Duff, K.E., 2017. Tau Pathology Induces Excitatory
 762 Neuron Loss, Grid Cell Dysfunction, and Spatial Memory Deficits Reminiscent of
 763 Early Alzheimer’s Disease. *Neuron* 93, 533-541.e5.
 764 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2016.12.023>

765 Fukawa, A., Aizawa, T., Yamakawa, H., Eguchi Yairi, I., 2020. Identifying Core Regions for
 766 Path Integration on Medial Entorhinal Cortex of Hippocampal Formation. *Brain*
 767 *Sciences* 10, 28. <https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci10010028>

768 Gil, M., Ancau, M., Schlesiger, M.I., Neitz, A., Allen, K., De Marco, R.J., Monyer, H., 2018.
 769 Impaired path integration in mice with disrupted grid cell firing. *Nat Neurosci* 21, 81–
 770 91. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-017-0039-3>
 771 Hafting, T., Fyhn, M., Molden, S., Moser, M.-B., Moser, E.I., 2005. Microstructure of a spatial
 772 map in the entorhinal cortex. *Nature* 436, 801–806.
 773 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03721>
 774 Hanseeuw, B.J., Betensky, R.A., Jacobs, H.I.L., Schultz, A.P., Sepulcre, J., Becker, J.A.,
 775 Cosio, D.M.O., Farrell, M., Quiroz, Y.T., Mormino, E.C., Buckley, R.F., Papp, K.V.,
 776 Amariglio, R.A., Dewachter, I., Ivanoiu, A., Huijbers, W., Hedden, T., Marshall, G.A.,
 777 Chhatwal, J.P., Rentz, D.M., Sperling, R.A., Johnson, K., 2019. Association of
 778 Amyloid and Tau With Cognition in Preclinical Alzheimer Disease: A Longitudinal
 779 Study. *JAMA Neurol* 76, 915. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaneurol.2019.1424>
 780 Hardcastle, K., Ganguli, S., Giocomo, L.M., 2015. Environmental Boundaries as an Error
 781 Correction Mechanism for Grid Cells. *Neuron* 86, 827–839.
 782 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.03.039>
 783 Harris, M.A., Wolbers, T., 2012. Ageing effects on path integration and landmark navigation.
 784 *Hippocampus* 22, 1770–1780. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.22011>
 785 Hill, P.F., 2023. When landmarks are not enough. *eLife* 12, e87771.
 786 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.87771>
 787 Howett, D., Castegnaro, A., Krzywicka, K., Hagman, J., Marchment, D., Henson, R., Rio, M.,
 788 King, J.A., Burgess, N., Chan, D., 2019. Differentiation of mild cognitive impairment
 789 using an entorhinal cortex-based test of virtual reality navigation. *Brain* 142, 1751–
 790 1766. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awz116>
 791 Igarashi, K.M., 2022. Entorhinal cortex dysfunction in Alzheimer's disease. *Trends in*
 792 *Neurosciences* S0166223622002375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2022.11.006>
 793 Jun, H., Bramian, A., Soma, S., Saito, T., Saido, T.C., Igarashi, K.M., 2020. Disrupted Place
 794 Cell Remapping and Impaired Grid Cells in a Knockin Model of Alzheimer's Disease.
 795 *Neuron* 107, 1095–1112.e6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2020.06.023>

796 Knierim, J.J., Neunuebel, J.P., Deshmukh, S.S., 2014. Functional correlates of the lateral
 797 and medial entorhinal cortex: objects, path integration and local–global reference
 798 frames. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 369, 20130369. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0369>
 799 Kunz, L., Schröder, T.N., Lee, H., Montag, C., Lachmann, B., Sariyska, R., Reuter, M.,
 800 Stirnberg, R., Stöcker, T., Messing-Floeter, P.C., Fell, J., Doeller, C.F., Axmacher, N.,
 801 2015. Reduced grid-cell–like representations in adults at genetic risk for Alzheimer’s
 802 disease. *Science* 350, 430–433. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac8128>
 803 Lester, A.W., Moffat, S.D., Wiener, J.M., Barnes, C.A., Wolbers, T., 2017. The Aging
 804 Navigational System. *Neuron* 95, 1019–1035.
 805 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.06.037>
 806 Lich, M., Bremmer, F., 2014. Self-motion perception in the elderly. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 8.
 807 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00681>
 808 Mahmood, O., Adamo, D., Briceno, E., Moffat, S.D., 2009. Age differences in visual path
 809 integration. *Behavioural Brain Research* 205, 88–95.
 810 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2009.08.001>
 811 McNaughton, B.L., Battaglia, F.P., Jensen, O., Moser, E.I., Moser, M.-B., 2006. Path
 812 integration and the neural basis of the “cognitive map.” *Nat Rev Neurosci* 7, 663–678.
 813 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1932>
 814 Moffat, S.D., 2009. Aging and Spatial Navigation: What Do We Know and Where Do We Go?
 815 *Neuropsychol Rev* 19, 478–489. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-009-9120-3>
 816 Mokrisova, I., Laczo, J., Andel, R., Gazova, I., Vyhnalek, M., Nedelska, Z., Levčík, D.,
 817 Cerman, J., Vlcek, K., Hort, J., 2016. Real-space path integration is impaired in
 818 Alzheimer’s disease and mild cognitive impairment. *Behavioural Brain Research* 307,
 819 150–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2016.03.052>
 820 Montefinese, M., Sulpizio, V., Galati, G., Committeri, G., 2015. Age-related effects on spatial
 821 memory across viewpoint changes relative to different reference frames.
 822 *Psychological Research* 79, 687–697. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-014-0598-9>

823 Reagh, Z.M., Noche, J.A., Tustison, N.J., Delisle, D., Murray, E.A., Yassa, M.A., 2018.
824 Functional Imbalance of Anterolateral Entorhinal Cortex and Hippocampal
825 Dentate/CA3 Underlies Age-Related Object Pattern Separation Deficits. *Neuron* 97,
826 1187-1198.e4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2018.01.039>

827 Ridler, T., Witton, J., Phillips, K.G., Randall, A.D., Brown, J.T., 2020. Impaired speed
828 encoding and grid cell periodicity in a mouse model of tauopathy. *eLife* 9, e59045.
829 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.59045>

830 Roses, M.D., A.D., 1996. APOLIPOPROTEIN E ALLELES AS RISK FACTORS IN
831 ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE. *Annu. Rev. Med.* 47, 387–400.
832 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.med.47.1.387>

833 Russell, Lenth, 2019. emmeans: estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. R
834 package version 1.4. 3.01.

835 Sanchez, J.S., Becker, J.A., Jacobs, H.I.L., Hanseeuw, B.J., Jiang, S., Schultz, A.P.,
836 Properzi, M.J., Katz, S.R., Beiser, A., Satizabal, C.L., O'Donnell, A., DeCarli, C.,
837 Killiany, R., El Fakhri, G., Normandin, M.D., Gómez-Isla, T., Quiroz, Y.T., Rentz,
838 D.M., Sperling, R.A., Seshadri, S., Augustinack, J., Price, J.C., Johnson, K.A., 2021.
839 The cortical origin and initial spread of medial temporal tauopathy in Alzheimer's
840 disease assessed with positron emission tomography. *Sci. Transl. Med.* 13,
841 eabc0655. <https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.abc0655>

842 Segen, V., Ying, J., Morgan, E., Brandon, M., Wolbers, T., 2022. Path integration in normal
843 aging and Alzheimer's disease. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 26, 142–158.
844 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2021.11.001>

845 Stangl, M., Achtzehn, J., Huber, K., Dietrich, C., Tempelmann, C., Wolbers, T., 2018.
846 Compromised Grid-Cell-like Representations in Old Age as a Key Mechanism to
847 Explain Age-Related Navigational Deficits. *Current Biology* 28, 1108-1115.e6.
848 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2018.02.038>

849 Stemmler, M., Mathis, A., Herz, A.V.M., 2015. Connecting multiple spatial scales to decode
850 the population activity of grid cells. *Sci. Adv.* 1, e1500816.
851 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1500816>

852 West, G.L., Patai, Z.E., Coutrot, A., Hornberger, M., Bohbot, V.D., Spiers, H.J., 2023.
853 Landmark-dependent Navigation Strategy Declines across the Human Life-Span:
854 Evidence from Over 37,000 Participants. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 35, 452–
855 467. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01956

856 Wiener, J.M., Kmecova, H., de Condappa, O., 2012. Route repetition and route retracing:
857 effects of cognitive aging. *Front. Ag. Neurosci.* 4.
858 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2012.00007>

859 Wolbers, T., Hegarty, M., 2010. What determines our navigational abilities? *Trends in*
860 *Cognitive Sciences* 14, 138–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.01.001>

861 Ying, J., Keinath, A.T., Lavoie, R., Vigneault, E., El Mestikawy, S., Brandon, M.P., 2022.
862 Disruption of the grid cell network in a mouse model of early Alzheimer’s disease. *Nat*
863 *Commun* 13, 886. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-28551-x>

864 Yu, S., Boone, A.P., He, C., Davis, R.C., Hegarty, M., Chrastil, E.R., Jacobs, E.G., 2021.
865 Age-Related Changes in Spatial Navigation Are Evident by Midlife and Differ by Sex
866 13.

867 Zhong, J.Y., Moffat, S.D., 2018. Extrahippocampal Contributions to Age-Related Changes in
868 Spatial Navigation Ability. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 12, 272.
869 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00272>

870