

1 **Two Separate, Large Cohorts Reveal Potential Modifiers of Age-Associated Variation in Visual**
2 **Reaction Time Performance**

3
4 J.S. Talboom^{1,2}, M.D. De Both^{1,2}, M.A. Naymik^{1,2}, A.M. Schmidt^{1,2}, C.R. Lewis^{1,2}, W.M. Jepsen^{1,2},
5 A.K. Håberg³, T. Rundek⁴, B.E. Levin⁴, S. Hoscheidt^{2,5}, Y. Bolla^{2,5}, R.D. Brinton^{2,5}, N.J. Schork^{1,6}, M.
6 Hay^{2,5}, C.A. Barnes^{2,5}, E. Glisky^{2,5}, L. Ryan^{2,5}, and M.J. Huentelman^{1,2}

7
8 ¹The Translational Genomics Research Institute (TGen), Phoenix, Arizona 85004 USA

9 ²Arizona Alzheimer's Consortium, Phoenix, Arizona 85004 USA

10 ³Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim 7491 Norway

11 ⁴University of Miami Miller School of Medicine and Evelyn F. McKnight Brain Institute,
12 Miami, FL 33136 USA

13 ⁵University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721 USA

14 ⁶City of Hope National Medical Center, Duarte, CA 91010 USA

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

15

Abstract

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

To identify individual differences and potential factors influencing age-related cognitive decline and disease, we created MindCrowd. MindCrowd is a cross-sectional web-based assessment of simple visual (sv) reaction time (RT, index of processing speed) and paired-associate learning (PAL, index of verbal episodic memory). svRT and PAL results were combined with 22 survey questions. Analysis of MindCrowd's svRT data revealed education and reported stroke as potential modifiers of changes in processing speed and memory from younger to older ages ($n_{total} = 75,666$, $n_{women} = 47,700$, $n_{men} = 27,966$; ages 18-85 years old, mean $(M)_{Age} = 46.54$, standard deviation $(SD)_{Age} = 18.40$). To complement this work, we evaluated complex recognition reaction time (cvrRT) in the UK Biobank cohort ($n_{total} = 158,249$, $n_{women} = 89,333$, $n_{men} = 68,916$; ages 40-70 years old, $M_{Age} = 55.81$, $SD_{Age} = 7.72$). Similarities between the UK Biobank and MindCrowd were assessed using a subset of the MindCrowd cohort. Labeled UKBb MindCrowd ($n_{total} = 39,795$, $n_{women} = 29,640$, $n_{men} = 10,155$; ages 40-70 years old, $M_{Age} = 56.59$, $SD_{Age} = 8.16$), this subset was carefully selected to mirror the UK Biobank. An identical linear model (LM) was used to assess both cohorts. The LM revealed similarities between MindCrowd and the UK Biobank across most results, despite obvious cohort differences (e.g., US vs. the UK). Notable divergent findings from the UK Biobank included (1) a first-degree family history of Alzheimer's disease (FHAD) was associated with longer RTs in only. (2) Compared to being a man with more education, being a woman was associated with longer cvrRT length differences observed from younger to older ages. Divergent results from UKBb MindCrowd include more education and reported smoking. More education was associated with shorter and smoking longer cvrRTs differences observed from younger to older ages. Collected with our prior work, MindCrowd is beginning to reveal the intricate network connecting processing speed, memory, and cognition to healthy and pathological brain aging.

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

37 Reaction time (RT), an index of processing speed or efficiency in the central nervous system
38 (CNS)¹, is an essential factor in higher cognitive function^{2,3} and is profoundly affected by age⁴. In fact,
39 of the studied demographics, age is the main factor known to influence RT⁴. Processing speed is an
40 important limiting factor for most aspects of cognition during aging, most notably memory^{5,6}. In studies
41 where processing speed was used as a covariate, the age-related variance in various episodic memory
42 measures was reduced or even eliminated^{7,8}. Moreover, studies comparing varied factors and tests of
43 age-related episodic memory deficit implicate age-related decline in processing speed as the main
44 mediator⁹⁻¹¹. These findings collectively suggest that RT is a useful index of age-related cognitive
45 decline, healthy brain aging, and neurodevelopment.

46 RT can be operationally defined as “simple,” which typically involves a non-choice reaction to a
47 visual stimulus (svRT). RT can also be operationally defined as “complex,” which involves a reaction to
48 one or more visual stimuli after recognition (cvtRT) of correct stimuli and inhibiting incorrect stimuli¹².
49 svRT demonstrates variability between individuals, which is akin to paired-associate learning (PAL) and
50 is influenced by genetic and environmental factors¹³. In addition, svRT effects are well noted across the
51 field of neurology; for example, AD and stroke patients show slower svRT and higher inter-individual
52 variability^{14,15}. However, due to the limitations of traditional research methods, the body of work
53 concerning RT examined only limited ranges of demographic, health, medical, and lifestyle factors in
54 small cohorts. For example, prior work’s demographics consisted of college-aged students, well-
55 educated older adults¹⁶⁻¹⁸, or athletes¹⁹⁻²¹.

56 Further, with notable exceptions²²⁻²⁴, many studies had few participants (e.g., $n < 1000$) and were
57 therefore powered to detect only variables with large effect size and to lead to spurious non-replicable
58 findings²⁵. Consequently, many RT studies had minimal ability to reveal low frequency factors or those
59 with subtle effect sizes and conduct more sophisticated analyses (e.g., ANOVA vs. Growth Modeling) to

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

60 find interactions and moderators. Collectively, this suggests that if RT performance can inform models
61 of disease or normative and atypical aging, we need a deeper understanding of the normal variation of
62 RT and the genetic and environmental factors associated with RT performance.

63 This study aimed to characterize RT across a broad range of demographic, health, medical, and
64 lifestyle variables commonly associated with cognitive performance and AD risk. To do this, we utilized
65 both the MindCrowd and UK Biobank cohorts^{26,27}, comprising over 233 thousand combined
66 participants, to model RT as a function of 11 or more demographic, health, medical, and lifestyle
67 factors. These factors have been previously associated with aging and cognition²⁸⁻³³. Based on our prior
68 work and earlier RT research³⁴, we hypothesized that RT, via its structure of factor association and
69 modifications, would reveal meaningful connections to healthy brain aging.

70 **Materials and Methods**

71 **Study Participants**

72 *MindCrowd: Overview*

73 In January 2013, we launched our internet-based study at www.mindcrowd.org. Website visitors
74 18 years or older were asked to consent to our study before any data collection via an electronic consent
75 form. As of 3-26-2020, we have had 356,674 non-duplicate or distinct visitors to the website. Of these
76 distinct visitors, over 194,542 (54%) consented to take part. The final data set had 75,666 (54% of
77 consented individuals) participants who completed a simple visual reaction time (svRT) and paired-
78 associate learning (PAL) tasks and answered 22 demographic, lifestyle, and health questions. Approval
79 for this study was obtained from the Western Institutional Review Board (WIRB study number
80 1129241).

81 *MindCrowd: simple visual reaction time (svRT)*

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

82 After consenting to the study and answering five demographic questions (i.e., age, biological sex,
83 years of education, primary language, and country where they reside), participants were asked to
84 complete a web-based svRT task. We chose svRT because it is a simple central and peripheral nervous
85 system-dependent task influenced by intelligence and brain injury³⁵. Participants were presented with a
86 pink sphere that appeared at random intervals (between 1-10 seconds) on the screen, and they were
87 instructed to respond as quickly as possible after the sphere appeared by pressing the enter/return key on
88 their keyboard. Once the participant responded, the sphere disappeared until the next trial. Each
89 participant received a total of five trials. The sphere stayed on the screen until the participant responded.
90 The dependent variable, response time in milliseconds (msec), was recorded from the sphere's
91 appearance on the screen to the participant's key press or screen touch.

92 ***MindCrowd: paired-associate learning (PAL)***

93 Next, participants were presented with the PAL task. For this cognitive task, during the learning
94 phase, participants were shown 12 word-pairs, one word-pair at a time (2s/word-pair). During the recall
95 phase, participants were given the first word of each pair and were asked to use their keyboard to type in
96 (i.e., recall) the missing word. This learning-recall procedure was repeated for two more trials. Before
97 beginning the task, each participant received one practice trial consisting of three word-pairs not
98 contained in the 12 used during the test. Word-pairs were presented in different random orders during
99 each learning and each recall phase. The same word pairs and order of presentation were used for all
100 participants. The dependent variable/criterion was the total number of correct word pairs entered across
101 the three trials (i.e., $12 \times 3 = 36$, a perfect score).

102 ***MindCrowd: demographic, medical, health, and lifestyle questions***

103 Upon completing the PAL task, participants were asked to fill out an additional 17 demographic
104 and health/disease risk factor questions. These questions included: marital status, handedness, race,

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

105 ethnicity, number of daily prescription medications, a first-degree family history of dementia, and yes/no
106 responses to the following: seizures, dizzy spells, loss of consciousness (more than 10 minutes), high
107 blood pressure, smoking status, diabetes mellitus, heart disease, cancer, reported stroke, alcohol/drug
108 abuse, brain disease, and memory problems). Next, participants were shown their results and provided
109 different comparisons to other test takers based on the average scores across all participants' sex, age,
110 and education demographics. On this same page of the site, participants were given the option to be
111 recontacted for future research (see Supplementary Table 2 for the list of MindCrowd questions asked).

112 *UK Biobank: study design and aims*

113 The UK Biobank (research ethics committee approval [11/NW/0382]) is a long-term study and
114 research resource in the United Kingdom (UK), which investigates genetic and environmental exposure
115 to the development of the disease. The UK Biobank's stated goal is to "build a major resource that can
116 support a diverse range of research intended to improve the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of
117 illness and the promotion of health throughout society." The UK Biobank began in 2006. The study is
118 currently following about 500,000 participants in the UK, enrolled at ages 40 to 69. Initial enrollment
119 took place from 2006 to 2010. All participants are monitored for at least 30 years after recruitment and
120 initial assessment (i.e., termed "instance 0" by the Biobank). Potential participants were invited to visit
121 an assessment center, where they completed a questionnaire. Participants were next interviewed about
122 lifestyle, medical history, and nutritional habits. Lastly, vital measurements, such as weight, height, and
123 blood pressure, were measured. The UK Biobank aims to electronically record all health-related changes
124 and events across the entire 30-year study. Notably, this task is aided by the UK's integrated health
125 system and corresponding electronic health record-keeping, an approach that is not possible in the
126 United States.

127 *UK Biobank: data procurement*

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

128 All UK Biobank data were derived from Application #43036, entitled “Exploring and
129 Accommodating Heterogeneity in Large-Scale Genetic Analyses” as a “Collaborator Project,”

130 *UK Biobank: Complex visual recognition reaction time (cvrRT) and educational attainment.*

131 Each participant’s cvrRT was based on 12 rounds of the card-game ‘Snap.’ Participants were
132 shown two cards at a time with a picture on them. Participants pressed a button on a table in front of
133 them as quickly as possible if the images cards/matched. For each of the 12 rounds, the following data
134 were collected: the pictures shown on the cards (Index of card A, Index of card B), the number of times
135 the participant clicked the ‘snap’ button, and the latency to first click of the ‘snap’ button. This last
136 record of “latency to click the button” was used as the UK Biobank’s criterion for regression analyses.

137 For Educational Attainment, the following conversions from UK Biobank (UKBb) answer codes
138 (see <http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/coding.cgi?id=100305>) to MindCrowd (MC) values were
139 made: a) “UKBb -7 None of the above” to “MC No high school diploma,” b) “UKBb 2 A levels/AS
140 levels or equivalent” to “MC High school diploma,” c) “UKBb 3 O levels/GCSEs or equivalent” to “MC
141 High school diploma,” d) “UKBb 4 CSEs or equivalent” to “MC High school diploma,” e) “UKBb 5
142 NVQ or HND or HNC or equivalent” to “MC Some college,” f) “UKBb 6 Other professional
143 qualifications (e.g., nursing and teaching)” to” MC Some college,” g) “UKBb 1 College or University
144 degree” to “MC College degree.” All UKBb participants selecting “-3 Prefer not to answer” were
145 removed from the final dataset before model selection and analysis. While we did our best to ensure a
146 similar education measure across UKBb MindCrowd and the UK Biobank, we realize that there are
147 fundamental differences between US and UK schools that we cannot control or eliminate. Table 6 lists
148 the UK Biobank data fields used.

149 **Data Quality Control**

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

150 For the MindCrowd analysis, a final data set, including all qualifying participants up to 3-17-
151 2020, was generated. See Supplementary Figure 9 for a flowchart detailing the following filtering steps.
152 This dataset removed participants: a) with duplicate email addresses (only first entry kept), b) who did
153 not complete all three rounds of the PAL test, c) whose primary language was not English, d) who was
154 not between 18-85 years old, e) whose RT trials were above or below 1.5 x the interquartile range (IQR)
155 and f) whose median svRT was above or below 1.5 x the IQR range of all participants of the same age
156 (Supplementary Figure 10 details RT and IQR exclusion). Participants from either study were removed
157 if they were missing any data (listwise deletion). Lastly, for the UKBb MindCrowd and UK Biobank
158 analysis, participants were removed if their responses to a demographic, medical, health, and lifestyle
159 question did not match the other study. For example, participants in the UK Biobank who responded to
160 the “Race” question with “Prefer Not to Answer” were removed. “Prefer Not to Answer” was not a
161 choice MindCrowd participants were given on the “Race” question. Removing these participants was
162 done to align UKBb MindCrowd and UK Biobank cohorts as much as possible.

163 **Statistical Methods**

164 Statistical analyses were conducted using R^{36,37}. For all analyses, multivariate linear regression
165 was performed using the general linear model (LM) to model Median svRT or Median cvrRT (i.e.,
166 criterion or dependent variable) as a function of either 24 (MindCrowd) or 11 predictors (UK Biobank
167 analysis). For the MindCrowd analysis, svRT was modeled as a function of PAL Performance and Age
168 raised to the power of three (i.e., to fit and estimate nonlinear associations). Most figures were created
169 using “ggplot2” bundled together as a part of the R package, “tidyverse³⁸”. Continuous by continuous
170 interactions (i.e., simple slopes) were estimated using the R packages “interactions³⁹,” “sandwich⁴⁰,”
171 “jtools⁴¹”. Categorical by categorical interactions were estimated using the R package, “emmeans”⁴².
172 Adjustments for multiple comparisons were evaluated using Tukey’s method via the “emmeans”

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

173 package. Missing data were assessed via the “*finalfit*,”⁴³ “*visdat*,”⁴⁴ and “*naniar*”⁴⁵ R packages (see
174 Supplementary Table 1 for a complete list of resources).

175 *Model evaluation and controls*

176 All measurements were taken from distinct samples. Model fit and violations of parametric
177 assumptions were evaluated separately in each model. Here we evaluated different residual plots,
178 assessing normality, homoscedasticity, outliers, residual autocorrelation, and multicollinearity. The
179 MindCrowd LM included all 22 demographic questions, health, medical, and lifestyle questions. These
180 questions were: Age, Biological Sex, Race, Ethnicity, Educational Attainment, Marital Status,
181 Handedness, Number of Daily Medications, Seizures, Reported Dizziness, Loss of Consciousness,
182 Reported Hypertension, Smoking Status, Heart Disease, Reported Stroke, Alcohol/Drug Abuse,
183 Diabetes Mellitus, Cancer, a First-Degree Family History of Alzheimer’s disease, history of brain
184 disease, whether the test was taken on a mobile device, and the version of the MindCrowd site used. Not
185 surprisingly, the device used to take the RT test in MindCrowd was associated with RT performance.
186 For the UK Biobank analyses, these 11 variables included: Age, Biological Sex, Diabetes mellitus,
187 Handedness, Reported Stroke, Reported Hypertension, Smoking Status, Reported Dizziness,
188 Educational Attainment, and a First-Degree Family History of Alzheimer’s Disease. Examination of
189 each model’s variance inflation factors (VIF) revealed no unexpected factors with a VIF > 5 (i.e.,
190 considered “highly” colinear by convention, see Supplementary Table 3).

191 *Inclusion of polynomials and automated model selection*

192 The MindCrowd analyses included Age and PAL Performance as first through third-degree non-
193 orthogonal polynomials (i.e., cubic regression). This choice was based on empirical evaluations, using
194 Bayesian information criterion (BIC) weights (a.k.a Schwarz weights)⁴⁶. We generated, ran, and
195 recorded BICs across seven models (i.e., base and first – sixth-degree-[nonorthogonal]polynomial). BIC

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

196 weights were calculated from raw BIC values using the “*qPCR*”⁴⁷ (v1.4-1) R for each model. The third-
197 degree polynomial model reported the largest BIC weight, and it was 1.46E+270 times more likely to
198 occur than the base (no polynomial) model ($\text{BIC}_{\text{HighW}} 9.99\text{E-}01 / \text{BIC}_{\text{LowW}} 6.82\text{E-}271 = 1.46\text{E+}270$)⁴⁶. It is
199 worth noting that a prior study examining both complex and simple RT also included age as a third-
200 degree polynomial. Other similarities included: a relatively large $n = 7,000$, both sexes, an 18-94 years-
201 old age-range, and several RT findings⁴⁶.

202 For the MindCrowd, UKBb MindCrowd, and UK Biobank cohorts, we used the R package
203 “*glmulti*” (v1.0.8)⁴⁸ to define our GLM models. “*glmulti*” uses full information criterion model
204 selection versus shrinkage regression methods (e.g., LASSO or LAR)⁴⁸. We used “*glmulti*” to avoid the
205 pitfalls of stepwise selection methods or unintentional biased introduced via manual or *p*-value-based
206 model selection. We had “*glmulti*” define the “best” (i.e., lowest *BIC*) MindCrowd and UK Biobank
207 models separately using its “*genetic*” algorithm method with “*marginality*” set to True. We chose *BIC*
208 as opposed to other information criterion methods because *BIC* punishes for model complexity. Two
209 rounds of model selection were run to find pairwise interactions due to package limitations (i.e., millions
210 of potential models). For round 1, the optimal model contained only the main effects when all 22 factors
211 were included. In round 2, the only factors selected in the optimal main effects model were then
212 included to select an optimal model, including two-way interactions.

213 ***Code availability***

214 The code supporting each analysis, figure, table, or other material is publicly available. The
215 directory containing these files is included in this study’s data repository (see Data availability for more
216 information).

217 **Results**

218 **MindCrowd**

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

219 As of March 13th, 2020, after filtering (see Data Quality Control in Materials and Methods),
220 MindCrowd, had recruited 75,666 qualified participants (see Table 1 for Sociodemographic
221 Characteristics and Supplementary Figure 1A for a histogram of age). We modeled svRT as a function
222 of Age³ and PAL Performance³ (i.e., curvilinear associations) as well as 20 other factors (see
223 Supplementary Figure 2 for diagnostic regression plots, and Table 2 for all coefficient *ns*). The omnibus
224 model was significant ($F_{omnibus}[58, 73406] = 858.20$, $p_{omnibus} < 2.2e-16$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.40$).

225 ***Curvilinear associations: Age and paired-associate learning (PAL) total correct***

226 Our model revealed that all three Age polynomials were significantly associated with svRT.
227 Age¹ (i.e., linear association, first-degree polynomial, aka slope), Age² (i.e., quadratic association,
228 second-degree polynomial), and Age³ (i.e., cubic association, third-degree polynomial). On average
229 from younger to older Age, a one-year difference ($X=1$). (1) Age¹ (shift in Y; $p_{Age2} = 3.23E-17$) was
230 associated with 7 msec longer svRT. (2) Age² (shift in Age¹; $p_{Age1} = 3.06E-18$) was associated with 0.15
231 msec of additional svRT length (i.e., $7 + .15$ msec/year, Figure 1A). (3) Age³ (shift in Age²; $p_{Age3} =$
232 $1.46E-34$) was associated with a negligible $1.20E-04$ msec shift in additional svRT length (i.e., $7 + (0.15$
233 $+ 1.20E-4)$ msec/year, Figure 1A). In contrast to Age's association with longer svRT, each word pair
234 correct for PAL Performance. (1) PAL¹ ($p_{PAL1} = 3.77E-34$) was associated 9 msec shorter svRT. (2)
235 PAL² ($p_{PAL2} = 2.35E-14$) was associated with 0.32 msec of additional svRT shortening (i.e., $9 + 0.32$
236 msec/year, Figure 1B). (3) PAL³ ($p_{PAL3} = 7.28E-09$) was associated with a slight $7.14E-04$ msec shift in
237 additional svRT shortening (i.e., $9 + (0.32 + 7.14E-04)$ msec/year Figure 1B).

238 ***Biological sex, educational attainment, and handedness***

239 Biological Sex was a significant predictor of svRT ($p_{Sex} = 1.26E-163$). Being a man was
240 associated with an average of 34 msec (9.63%) faster svRT response than being a woman (Figure 1D).
241 Educational Attainment was also a significant factor associated with svRT. Compared to “No High

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

242 School Diploma,” participants who had “Some College” ($p_{College} = 8.74E-05$), or a “College Degree”
243 ($p_{CDegree} = 2.95E-17$, Figure 2A) were faster. Attending college and attaining a college degree was
244 associated with a respective near 15 (4.14%) and 32 (8.92%) msec shorter svRT compared to not
245 graduating from high school. Handedness was also associated with svRT. Left-handed participants had a
246 near 4 msec (1.09%) faster svRT ($p_{Left} = 0.03$, Figure 2B). This association was present in individuals 20
247 to 40 years old ($p_{40Left} < 0.01$, Figure 2C) but not in individuals 40 to 60 years old ($p_{60Left} = 0.07$, Figure
248 2D).

249 *Health, medical, and lifestyle factors*

250 For health and medical factors associated with svRT, we found that Smoking Status ($p_{Smoking} =$
251 $1.26E-03$, Figure 3A) and Reported Dizziness ($p_{Dizzy} = 0.04$, Figure 3B) were both significant predictors
252 of svRT. Smoking Status was associated with 7 msec (1.99%) slower svRT, and Reported Dizziness was
253 associated with nearly 5 msec (1.37%) slower svRT. When compared to participants reporting "no daily
254 medications," taking "Two" ($p_{Meds2} = 2.00E-03$), "Three" ($p_{Meds3} < 0.01$), and "Four" ($p_{Meds4} = 3.51E-16$)
255 Daily Medications were associated with an approximately 5 (1.64%), 6 (1.76%), and 18 (5.01%) msec
256 longer svRTs, respectively (Figure 3C). Further, Diabetes Mellitus ($p_{Diabetes} < 3.36E-05$, Figure 3D), and
257 Stroke ($p_{Stroke} = 3.59E-04$, Figure 3E) were related to 11 (3.16%) and 20 (5.73%) msec longer svRTs
258 respectively when compared to participants not reporting either condition. Of note, in this model, both a
259 first-degree family history of Alzheimer’s disease (FHAD; $p_{FHAD} = 0.78$) and Hypertension ($p_{Hyper} =$
260 0.52) were not significant predictors of svRT performance (Supplementary Figure 3A-B).

261 *Two-way interactions*

262 For interactions, we found Age significantly interacted with PAL Performance. Age x PAL
263 Performance ($p_{Age*PAL} = 9.93E-62$). Analysis of simple slopes suggests that each word-pair correct was
264 associated with shorter svRT from younger to older ages. That is, at 20 ($p_{Age20*PAL} < 0.00$), 40

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

265 ($p_{Age40*PAL} < 0.00$), 60 ($p_{Age60*PAL} < 0.00$), and 80 ($p_{Age80*PAL} < 0.00$, Figure 1C) years old. There was a
266 significant Biological Sex x Age interaction ($p_{Age*Sex} = 4.61E-08$), indicating that the associated slowing
267 of svRT at younger and older ages in men, compared to women, was 0.36 msec (0.08%) less per one
268 year difference in age (Figure 1C). These data suggest that men's svRT lengthened at a slower rate when
269 compared to women. Of interest, in both women and men, we found significant Age x Educational
270 Attainment interactions. Compared to Age x "No High School Diploma", participants reporting having
271 "Some College" ($p_{Age*College} = 4.20E-04$) or a College Degree" ($p_{Age*CDegree} = 2.07E-12$) was associated
272 with slower RTs from young to an older age. These results suggest that attending college or getting a
273 college degree was associated with a 0.65 (0.15%) and 1.31 (0.30%) msec faster svRT performance per
274 year of life, respectively (Figure 2A). The MindCrowd model revealed a significant Age x Reported
275 Stroke interaction ($p_{Age*Stroke} = 2.72E-06$). Participants who Reported Stroke were about 2 msec (0.37%)
276 slower on svRT per year of life than those without Reported Stroke (Figure 3E). Lastly, we found a
277 significant Age x Smoking Status interaction ($p_{Age*Smoke} = 5.67E-07$). This interaction suggests that
278 Smoking Status lengthens svRT by adding 0.57 msec (0.11%) per year difference in age (Figure 3A).
279 See Table 3 for a complete list of the significant predictors, covariates, and interactions from the
280 MindCrowd analysis.

281 ***Mobile Device***

282 Participants who were identified as using a mobile device to take MindCrowd (i.e., using a
283 touchscreen, $n = 7,603$, age $M = 54.06$ $SD = 14.54$ years) had slower svRTs and were older ($\beta_{Age\sim Mobile} =$
284 14.13 , $p_{Age\sim Mobile} < 2e-16$) than those who did not use a mobile device ($n = 76,775$, age $M = 45.54$ $SD =$
285 18.43 years, see Supplementary Figure 8).

286

287 **UKBb MindCrowd and UK Biobank**

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

288 Of the total 75,666 MindCrowd participants, 39,759 between the ages of 40 and 70 were selected
289 to mirror the UK Biobank. This subset is called UKBb MindCrowd from here on to differentiate it from
290 MindCrowd. After filtering (see Data Quality Control), the UK Biobank cohort had 158,249
291 participants, derived from a data-request we received on 9-19-2019 (See Table 1 for Sociodemographic
292 Characteristics and Supplementary Figure 1B-C for age histograms). We model both the UKBb
293 MindCrowd's svRT (see Supplementary Figure 4 for regression diagnostic plots) as well UK Biobank's
294 cvrRT (see Supplementary Figure 5 for regression diagnostic plots) as a function of 11 shared survey
295 questions (see Table 4 for the *ns* used to estimate each coefficient). The omnibus UKBb MindCrowd
296 ($F_{mcomni}[20, 38871] = 1039$, $p_{mcomni} < 2.2e-16$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.08$) and UK Biobank ($F_{ukbbomni}[20,$
297 $157903] = 1038$, $p_{ukbbomni} < 2.2e-16$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.13$) LMs were both significant. Table 5 lists the
298 effects for each cohort side by side.

299 *Age and biological sex*

300 The UKBb MindCrowd cohort revealed Age as a significant predictor of svRT ($p_{Age} =$
301 $2.00E-16$). The parallel analysis (see Statistical Methods) of Age in the UK Biobank cohort was also
302 significant ($p_{Age} = 2.00E-16$) for complex, visual, recognition reaction time (cvrRT). For the association
303 of Age and RT, UKBb MindCrowd and the UK Biobank showed longer RTs or worse RT performance
304 from younger to older ages, with nearly 6 and 3 msec slower RT per year difference of age, respectively
305 (Figure 4A-B). For UKBb MindCrowd, Biological Sex was a significant predictor of RT ($\beta_{Sex}=-40.00$,
306 $p_{Sex}=8.03E-71$), which was also the case in the UK Biobank ($\beta_{Sex}=-18.28$, $p_{Sex}=2.00E-16$). Being a man
307 in both cohorts was associated with shorter RTs compared to being a woman (Figure 4C-D). Here the
308 effect of Biological Sex on RT between UKBb MindCrowd was 40 msec (20.46%), and the UK Biobank
309 was 18 msec (5.16%).

310 *Education and handedness*

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

311 Akin to the association found in the MindCrowd analysis, the UKBb MindCrowd and UK
312 Biobank comparison found that Educational Attainment was a significant RT predictor. Indeed, for
313 UKBb MindCrowd a “High School Diploma” ($\beta_{HSDiploma} = -9.68$, $p_{HSDiploma} = 2.70E-01$, 1.87%, “Some
314 College” ($\beta_{College} = -26.08$, $p_{College} = 1.61E-03$, 5.06%) and a “College Degree” ($\beta_{CDegree} = -49.07$, $p_{CDegree}$
315 $= 1.91E-09$, 9.51%), and in the UK Biobank a “High School Diploma” ($\beta_{HSDiploma} = -9.68$, $p_{HSDiploma} =$
316 $1.23E-33$, 1.74%), “Some College” ($\beta_{College} = -10.26$, $p_{College} = 1.30E-40$, 1.85%), or a “College Degree”
317 ($\beta_{CDegree} = -11.71$, $p_{CDegree} = 1.46E-41$, 2.11%) were all significantly different from “No High School
318 Diploma” (Figure 5A-B). Here, both UKBb MindCrowd and UK Biobank large cohorts reported shorter
319 RT was associated with more education. Lastly, unlike the MindCrowd analyses, both the UKBb
320 MindCrowd ($p_{Handedness} = .40$) and the UK Biobank ($p_{Handedness} = 0.36$) cohorts between the ages of 40-70
321 did not find Handedness to be a significant predictor of RT performance (Supplementary Figure 6).

322 ***Health, medical, and lifestyle factors***

323 In terms of health factors associated with RT, in the UKBb MindCrowd cohort, Diabetes
324 ($\beta_{Diabetes}=11.48$, $p_{Diabetes}=3.31E-03$, 5.87%), Stroke ($\beta_{Stroke}=18.47$, $p_{Stroke}=4.00E-02$, 9.45%),
325 ($\beta_{Hypertension}=7.99$, $p_{Hypertension}=3.16E-03$, 3.58%), and Dizziness ($\beta_{Dizzy}=12.13$, $p_{Dizzy}=2.52E-03$, 6.19%)
326 were all significantly associated with longer svRTs. These associations were recapitulated by the UK
327 Biobank. To that end, Diabetes Mellitus ($\beta_{Diabetes} = 5.48$, $p_{Diabetes} = 4.80E-07$, 1.55%, Figure 5C-D),
328 Reported Stroke ($\beta_{Stroke} = 10.61$, $p_{Stroke} = 6.15E-07$, 2.99%, Figure 6A-B), Reported Hypertension
329 ($\beta_{Hypertension} = 1.14$, $p_{Hypertension} = 0.02$, 0.31%, Figure 6C-D), and Reported Dizziness ($\beta_{Dizzy} = 3.21$, $p_{Dizzy} =$
330 $3.71E-14$, 0.91%, Figure 7A-B) were all significantly related to longer cvrRTs; however, the association
331 between Reported Hypertension and cvrRT was small (Figure 6D). Further, in agreement with the
332 MindCrowd analysis, Smoking Status was significantly related to svRT ($\beta_{Smoke}=10.18$, $p_{Smoke}=0.01$,
333 5.21%) in the UKBb MindCrowd cohort; however, FHAD ($\beta_{FHAD}=-0.07$, $p_{FHAD}=0.97$) was not. This

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

334 pattern of associations were reversed in the UK Biobank; that is, Smoking Status was not a significant
335 predictor of cvrRT ($\beta_{Smoke}=0.47$, $p_{Smoke}=0.22$, Figure 7C-D), but FHAD was ($\beta_{FHAD}=2.36$, $p_{FHAD}=3.35E-$
336 05, 0.69%, Figure 8A-B).

337 **Two-way interactions**

338 The “*glmulti*”⁴⁸ R package defined two interactions in the UKBb MindCrowd and UK Biobank
339 analysis. In UKBb MindCrowd we found a significant Age x Biological Sex interaction ($p_{Age*Sex} =$
340 2.00E-02, 0.33%). We found a comparable significant Age x Biological Sex interaction for cvrRT (
341 $p_{Age*Sex} = 4.18E-28$, 0.16%) in the UK Biobank. Across both MindCrowd and the UK Biobank, these
342 interactions indicated that RT was lengthened in men from younger to older ages compared to women,
343 was over 0.5 msec shorter per one year difference in age (Figure 4C-D). In addition, the UK Biobank
344 analysis revealed a significant Biological Sex x Educational Attainment interaction not found in UKBb
345 MindCrowd. Here, men with a “High School Diploma” ($p_{Sex*HSDiploma} = 3.30E-12$, 3.35%), “Some
346 College” ($p_{sex*College} = 8.71E-12$, 3.14%) or a “College Degree” ($p_{sex*CDegree} = 1.68E-13$, 3.18%) were
347 significantly associated with faster cvrRT performance when compared to women having “No High
348 School Diploma” (Figure 8C). Follow-up analyses of the simple effects via estimated marginal means
349 (EMM, see Statistical Methods) revealed that men who did not graduate high school ($EMM = 558.91$
350 msec), compared to men with more education ($EMMs = 542.99$, 542.98, and 540.41 msec), had
351 markedly faster cvrRTs, more in line with the women’s cvrRT performance ($EMMs = 566.80$, 562.11,
352 561.40, and 561.09 ms). The associated difference in cvrRT for men with “No High School Diploma”
353 compared to men with a “High School Diploma” ($\beta_{Men}=15.92$, $p_{Men} = 2.00E-16$, 1.75%) was more
354 substantial than between women with “No High School Diploma” compared to women with a “High
355 School Diploma” ($\beta_{Women}=4.68$, $p_{Women} = 3.12E-04$, 1.69%, see Supplementary Figure 7 for a graph of
356 the EMM).

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

357 **Discussion**

358 **Slowing of Reaction Time (RT) from Younger to Older Ages: Factors and Modifiers**

359 Our study's results illuminate a portion of the intricate relationship between age and RT
360 performance by identifying demographic, health, medical, and lifestyle factors associated with either
361 attenuation or exacerbation of RT lengthening from younger to older ages (see figure 9 for an illustrative
362 summary of the results). A large body of work on RT, leading back to Sir Francis Gaulton in 1890⁴⁹, has
363 consistently demonstrated an age-associated shift in RT⁵⁰. It is not surprising that MindCrowd, UKBb
364 MindCrowd, and UK Biobank models revealed slowing of simple visual (svRT, MindCrowd) and
365 complex visual recognition RT (cvtRT, UK Biobank) from younger to older ages. Likewise, the
366 MindCrowd model found that the relationship between svRT and age was modestly curvilinear (Figure
367 1A). While this curvilinear relation between RT and age has been noted previously⁵¹, both cohorts' large
368 sample size combined with our application of an algorithm-based model definition⁴⁸ revealed a notable
369 addition to this picture. Specifically, in the MindCrowd analysis, we observed an interaction between
370 age and education (Figure 2A) and smoking (Figure 3A). Here, less education and smoking were related
371 to the additional slowing of simple visual RT (svRT) on top of the svRT slowing associated with
372 transitioning from younger to older ages. Lastly, the age by reported stroke interaction modeled in
373 MindCrowd was associated with longer RTs (Figure 3E). This study's large sample size and broad age
374 and surveyed data range places it as one of the most substantial cross-sectional RT evaluations across
375 the aging spectrum. Our findings suggest that smoking and stroke (i.e., cardiovascular health) and
376 amount of education (i.e., cognitive demand or reserve) are factors, modifiable across aging, that
377 influence age-associated RT slowing.

378 **A First-Degree Family History of Alzheimer's Disease (FHAD), Cognition, and RT: Intertwined** 379 **systems**

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

380 In the UK Biobank cohort²⁷, we found an association between having an FHAD and slower (2.43
381 msec) cvrRT (Figure 8B). This effect of FHAD on RT or more so underlying process speed is in line
382 with our episodic verbal memory task (i.e., paired-associate learning [PAL]) finding³⁴, where we found
383 FHAD was linked to lower PAL performance. Furthermore, a prior functional magnetic resonance
384 imaging (fMRI) study examining medial-temporal lobe activation using a cvrRT task found a ~100 msec
385 RT lengthening in 68 (mean age of 54) FHAD participants⁵². These data suggest that genetic and
386 environmental factors relating to AD risk are present in individuals with an FHAD. Indeed, the first-
387 degree relatives of identified FHAD participants consisted of familial early-onset AD or late-onset AD,
388 which also has a high heritability of 79%, suggesting that they are a higher risk category for developing
389 AD. Thus, such shared AD and FHAD factors may relate to sensorimotor function and processing speed
390 (i.e., RT) analogous to alterations in cognition and memory (i.e., PAL).

391 We found a correlation between svRT and PAL performance (Figure 1B). This finding was in
392 line with many prior studies, the dependence of episodic memory on processing speed, a dependence
393 that grows with age and incident of age-related disease (e.g., AD)^{5-8,53}. The association of svRT with
394 PAL may highlight distributed systems and networks that underlie RT performance. For example, svRT
395 performance could depend on the functioning of many cognitive areas that PAL requires and vice versa.
396 Another possibility is that properly functioning memory, and cognitive networks correspond to better
397 RT performance. Evidence for this is suggested by the fact that higher intelligence is related to faster
398 RT⁵⁴⁻⁵⁶. However, diverse factors (e.g., exercise, time of day, meal proximity, and individual assessing
399 RT) affect RT performance^{53,56,57}. Thus, making an accurate estimation of RT's effect on intelligence
400 and vice versa challenging. Together with our prior results, these findings suggest that RT performance
401 could be used as a metric to assess potential AD risk. However, further research, including longitudinal

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

402 studies, replication, and corroboration of RT's link to age-related cognitive decline and disease, are
403 necessary to support this notion.

404 The difference in the effects of FHAD between UK Biobank and MindCrowd (for both
405 MindCrowd and UKBb MindCrowd analyses, Supplementary Figure 3A and Figure 8A) could be due to
406 the vast difference in the fraction of FHAD participants in the UK Biobank (FHAD = 13% of total)
407 compared to UKBb MindCrowd (FHAD = 35% of total). While noting that we target those with FHAD
408 for recruitment into MindCrowd, this substantial disparity could also be due to the accuracy of the UK
409 Biobank's FHAD. The UK Biobank was calculated from three separate questions (i.e., mother, father,
410 and siblings AD diagnosis). Adding to this, the United Kingdom uses a massive, detailed, nation-wide
411 electronic health record system facilitating respondent health and medical survey accuracy. Compare
412 this to our single question in MindCrowd, asking participants of all ages to remember if a relative was
413 diagnosed with AD. Another possibility is the RT paradigm used; that is, MindCrowd's test of svRT
414 compared to the UK Biobank's use of cvrRT. The fact that complex reaction time, requiring recognition
415 and the choice to "respond or not respond," rather than just stimulus-response, may underly this
416 difference. UKBb MindCrowd svRT performance was consistently faster across age than UK Biobank
417 cvrRT performance; an observation noted in a prior study also measured both simple and complex RT⁵⁸.
418 These findings are consistent with the idea that complex RT requires more processing time^{12,59}, and prior
419 work found the age-associated slowing of RT was higher for choice RT than simple RT⁶⁰. Lastly, the
420 differences in FHAD associations across MindCrowd and the UK Biobank are perhaps due to the UK
421 Biobank had over 2X the number of participants compared to MindCrowd (i.e., 158K vs. 76K). The
422 larger sample is expected to produce better model definitions and increased statistical power. Increased
423 statistical power may also have enhanced accuracy, validity, and reproducibility.

424 **Biological Sex and Educational Attainment**

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

425 Numerous RT studies have found sex differences in RT performance, which does not appear to
426 be reduced by practice^{16,20,58}. Consistent with others^{58,60}, men exhibited shorter RTs in each model
427 across cohorts (Figures 1D and 4C-D). In addition, the analysis of the UKBb MindCrowd and UK
428 Biobank implicated biological sex affecting RT slowing from younger to older ages. The age interaction
429 with biological sex suggests that being a woman from younger to older ages is associated with longer
430 RT compared to being a man. These results largely replicate a previous sizable study (i.e., 7,000
431 participants) evaluating RT⁵⁸. Similar to our own, this study found that 1) men consistently
432 outperformed women on all RT measures across age, 2) differences in RT performance from younger to
433 older ages were nonlinear, 3) including a third-degree polynomial for age provided the best model fit,
434 and 3) compared to men, women displayed longer RTs consistently from younger to older ages⁵⁸.
435 Collected with our prior study of PAL performance³⁴, these associations replicate prior work and
436 suggest that biological sex affects RT and age-associated shift in RT.

437 Educational attainment was associated with svRT in both MindCrowd cohorts and cvrRT in the
438 UK Biobank. Overall, having more education (i.e., reporting higher milestones) was related to shorter
439 svRT and cvrRT (Figures 2A and 5A-B). However, it is unclear if individuals with higher processing
440 speed naturally seek more education and what other factors confound this relationship. Further work
441 utilizing both cohorts is necessary to shed light on the effects and modifiers of FHAD and cross-cohort
442 discrepancies. The model of the UK Biobank revealed an interaction between biological sex and
443 education on RT performance. The breakdown revealed that men had similar RT performance if they
444 attained a high school diploma and above. However, men who did not graduate high school showed
445 markedly slower RTs, which brought them in line with women's RT performance. However, the
446 associated lengthening of RT for less-educated men was vastly more than that found in less-educated

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

447 women (reported “No High School Diploma” made up 3.83% of women and 3.11% of men; see
448 Supplementary Figure 7).

449 **Handedness**

450 In MindCrowd, handedness, specifically being left-handed, was associated with shorter svRTs.
451 Prior studies have reported similar associations, where left-handedness was correlated with shorter
452 svRT^{19,59,61}. Hemispheric asymmetries in spatial processing are thought to underly faster svRT for the
453 left hand^{60,62}. Handedness was not associated with svRT in UKBb MindCrowd or cvrRT in the UK
454 Biobank. One explanation for the divergent findings is that MindCrowd includes younger participants
455 (i.e., 18–40-year-olds). Indeed, in MindCrowd, the association appears to diminish from younger to
456 older ages. Specifically, in Figure 2B, the separation of the regression lines between left- and right-
457 handed participants shrinks and eventually crosses around the 4th decade of life. Figure 2C shows that
458 the left- and right-handed regression lines separate in 20 to 40-years-olds, while Figure 2D shows that
459 these regression lines are not separate in 40 to 60-year-olds. While purely speculative, differences in
460 social conventions may have played a role. For example, some older participants were forced to be right-
461 handed, whereas younger participants were not. In doing so, upping the amount of unexplained variance
462 in older, but not younger, participants across MindCrowd and the UK Biobank.

463 **Health, Medical, and Lifestyle Factors**

464 The MindCrowd analysis incorporated all 13 available health, medical, and lifestyle-related
465 factors, of which six were present and incorporated into the shared UKBb MindCrowd/UK Biobank
466 model (Tables 2 and 4). Before the launch of MindCrowd, these factors were carefully selected based
467 upon their known relation to 1) age-associated alterations, 2) RT performance, and 3) PAL Performance.
468 Of the 13 health, medical, and lifestyle factors evaluated in the MindCrowd analysis, we found
469 associations between svRT and the number of daily medications, reported dizziness, smoking status,

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

470 reported stroke, and diabetes mellitus. Each health and medical factor were associated with longer
471 svRTs (Figure 3). We should note that the number of daily medications is a serving as a proxy for
472 overall health. That is, the worse one's health, the worse one's performance, the increased number of
473 medications treating the underlying health conditions. The UKBb MindCrowd (svRT) and the UK
474 Biobank (cvtRT) analyses found *similar* associations between reported dizziness, reported stroke,
475 diabetes mellitus, indicating hypertension. Although each association differed in magnitude between the
476 two older cohorts, each was related to slower RT. The UKBb MindCrowd to the UK Biobank found a
477 different association for FHAD (UKBb MindCrowd = no association; UK Biobank = 2.43 msec slower),
478 smoking status (UKBb MindCrowd = 10 msec slower; UK Biobank = no association). Interestingly,
479 despite some differences, only a few coefficient signs differed between the UKBb MindCrowd and UK
480 Biobank; indeed, most estimations were well within an order of magnitude between the two cohorts
481 (e.g., age, educational attainment, and age by biological sex interaction, Table 5).

482 Many factors are likely to account for the different associations between smoking and FHAD
483 between UKBb MindCrowd and the UK Biobank (Figures 7C-D and 8A-B). Some of these include
484 differences in demographics, genetic heterogeneity, and age²⁶. However, candidates include the fractions
485 of participants reporting each factor (e.g., for diabetes mellitus: MindCrowd = 1%, UKBb MindCrowd =
486 7%, and UK Biobank = 3%). Another factor is that the UK Biobank's participant number is twice the
487 size of MindCrowd and four times the size of UKBb MindCrowd. Despite our study's size, the
488 observational and cross-sectional method means that we cannot rule out effects due to confounding
489 variables.

490 Consequently, while numbers may be close, we do not assume that the UKBb MindCrowd is
491 similar and can be compared to the UK Biobank. Furthermore, we observed that UKBb MindCrowd
492 consistently reported larger estimates and standard errors than the UK Biobank. For example, the

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

493 MindCrowd cohort's estimation of the sex-difference was consistently slower (~40 msec), even in the
494 UKBb MindCrowd cohort, when looking at the UK Biobank (~19 msec). This difference demonstrates
495 why the study of neuropsychological traits and disease requires large sizes to provide accurate
496 estimations driving better predictive validity.

497 **Opportunities and Limitations of Our Research**

498 *Opportunities: Unique impact*

499 We strongly advocate for large-scale efforts like ours, the UK Biobank⁶³, and others²². Indeed,
500 studies of this kind have characteristics that provide the unique impact necessary to move the fields of
501 aging and age-related diseases forward. These include: 1) statistical control, as our MindCrowd analysis
502 incorporated all 24 available factors, 11 of which were used in the UKBb MindCrowd and UK Biobank
503 model. 2) The inclusion of each predictor controlled for its association on RT, which potentially
504 removed variability (noise), thus enhancing statistical power. 3) The two models used for each of the
505 analyses were selected with little human input by automated application of specific statistical criteria
506 (see Inclusion of polynomials and automatic model selection in Statistical Methods). This likely
507 decreases bias, the probability of overfitting, and multicollinearity. 4) For the present study, MindCrowd
508 had over 76K and the UK Biobank over 158K participants. Large sample sizes in each cohort were
509 expected to help reduce variance, enhance estimation, select better models, and in turn, enhance
510 statistical power. Expanded statistical power may then enhance accuracy, validity, and reproducibility.

511 Lastly, a recent genome-wide association study examining associations between RT and single
512 nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP) in the UK Biobank and CHARGE and COGENT consortia noted
513 weak correlations between the reported cognitive-associated SNPs among US and UK cohorts⁶⁴. Here,
514 MindCrowd presents a future opportunity to resolve these weak associations and get a better picture of
515 potential cohort effects. Taken together, these characteristics increase the likelihood of making accurate

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

516 inferences regarding associations while boosting predictive validity. These are both necessary and vital
517 attributes when searching for genetic associations and the structure underlying healthy brain aging.

518 *Limitations: Internet self-report and others*

519 There are potential concerns that arise from web-based studies⁶⁵. Indeed, limitations of this study
520 include the cross-sectional design and the partial discrepancy in MindCrowd's svRT test compared to
521 the UK Biobank's cvrRT test and info collected between the UK Biobank and MindCrowd (e.g., the
522 omission of "prefer not to answer" choices for race and education questions). Acknowledging these
523 drawbacks, we believe that the advantage of meaningfully higher participant numbers and enriched
524 cohort diversity facilitated via online research remediates some disadvantages. For example, the range of
525 error reported in recent internet-based studies of self-reported quantitative traits like height and weight
526 was between 0.3% and 20%⁶⁶⁻⁶⁹. Previously, we ran simulations on the association between FHAD and
527 PAL by randomly shuffling the FHAD responses (e.g., Yes to No, and No to Yes), introducing
528 increasing sequential amounts of "error." We found that even with a subtle effect such as FHAD on PAL
529 performance, due to our cohort size, 24% error would still have only made us commit a Type1 error
530 50% of the time³⁴. In line with this notion, another publication demonstrated that online RT studies
531 produce reproducible results⁷⁰.

532 Further, we developed an extensive and automated data filtering pipeline (see Data Quality
533 Control and Supplementary Figures 9-10) to address these concerns and enhance validity and accuracy.
534 For example, we controlled for svRT delays generated using the touchscreen or mobile device by adding
535 this information as a variable to the regression model (see Supplementary Figure 8). These data (i.e., real
536 or filtered) were excluded before analysis (i.e., listwise deletion). Exclusion resulted in dropping 0.3 %
537 and 6.1% of MindCrowd and UK Biobank participants, respectively. One of the 25 critical factors had
538 over 5% missing data (see Supplementary Figure 11 and Supplementary Tables 4 and 5). Reported

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

539 Dizziness in the UK Biobank had 64.36% missing data. Hence, interpretation of this factor's association
540 with cvrRT should only be considered for "hypothesis-generation"⁷¹. Evaluation of selection bias
541 between retained and excluded participants revealed an overall lower probability of exclusion in
542 MindCrowd and higher likelihood in the UK Biobank (see Supplementary Tables 6 and 7). Notable
543 groups with a higher probability of exclusion included those in the highest age ranges and those
544 reporting hypertension and dizziness. These higher probability groups were found in both study's
545 cohorts.

546 Lastly, it is essential to note that our internet-based svRT task was not designed to mirror
547 conventional face-to-face RT testing paradigms directly. Indeed, we find higher RTs and steeper slopes
548 across aging than studies assessing svRT via the gold standard, laboratory-based assessments (e.g.,^{60,72}).
549 However, these paradigm differences are not likely to alter our svRT test's validity or reliability. One
550 reason being our test is only interpreted within MindCrowd to identify associated factors and reveal
551 individual differences. Despite test paradigm differences, we believe that large cross-sectional studies
552 like MindCrowd, utilizing internet-based testing and remote biosample collection, are vital to moving
553 the field of aging and age-related disease forward (see Opportunities: Unique impact above and⁶³).

554 **Conclusion**

555 Understanding the modifiable and non-modifiable variables associated with RT and related
556 cognitive function will begin to deconstruct the underlying architecture of elements accounting for the
557 vast heterogeneity seen in individual trajectories of age-associated cognitive decline. Only then will it be
558 possible to develop a healthy brain aging model that is both valid and reliable⁷³. Such a model holds
559 immense potential to attenuate age- and disease-related cognitive deficits, thus enhancing cognitive
560 healthspan. Any extension of cognitive healthspan, better aligning it to the human lifespan, would be
561 invaluable and increasingly vital when aggregated across the aging population. Mitigating age- or

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

562 disease-related cognitive decline, allowing maintenance of independence by even only a few years,
563 would have many benefits. For example, the U.S. could save billions of dollars in health care costs and
564 lost productivity of caregivers while improving the quality of life for the aging population⁶³. In this
565 study, we revealed several potential factors related to aging and processing speed. Of those, smoking
566 and education, as potentially modifiable factors throughout life, were associated with slower and faster
567 RTs, respectively, from younger to older ages. With MindCrowd recruitment ever-increasing, our goal is
568 to continue supplying and refining the knowledge necessary to optimize cognitive performance
569 throughout life.

570

References

- 571 1. Boisgontier, M.P., Wittenberg, G.F., Fujiyama, H., Levin, O. & Swinnen, S.P. Complexity of
572 central processing in simple and choice multilimb reaction-time tasks. *PLoS One* **9**, e90457
573 (2014).
- 574 2. Deary, I.J. & Der, G. Reaction time, age, and cognitive ability: Longitudinal findings from age
575 16 to 63 years in representative population samples. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and cognition* **12**,
576 187-215 (2005).
- 577 3. Deary, I.J., Allerhand, M. & Der, G. Smarter in middle age, faster in old age: a cross-lagged
578 panel analysis of reaction time and cognitive ability over 13 years in the West of Scotland
579 Twenty-07 Study. *Psychol Aging* **24**, 40-7 (2009).
- 580 4. Welford, A.T. Reaction time, speed of performance, and age. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* **515**, 1-17
581 (1988).
- 582 5. Verhaeghen, P. & Salthouse, T.A. Meta-analyses of age-cognition relations in adulthood:
583 estimates of linear and nonlinear age effects and structural models. *Psychol Bull* **122**, 231-49
584 (1997).
- 585 6. Salthouse, T.A. & Babcock, R.L. Decomposing adult age differences in working memory.
586 *Developmental psychology* **27**, 763 (1991).
- 587 7. Salthouse, T.A. Aging and measures of processing speed. *Biol Psychol* **54**, 35-54 (2000).
- 588 8. Sliwinski, M. & Buschke, H. Processing speed and memory in aging and dementia. *J Gerontol B*
589 *Psychol Sci Soc Sci* **52**, P308-18 (1997).
- 590 9. Bryan, J. & Luszcz, M.A. Speed of information processing as a mediator between age and free-
591 recall performance. *Psychology and aging* **11**, 3 (1996).
- 592 10. Baudouin, A., Clarys, D., Vanneste, S. & Isingrini, M. Executive functioning and processing
593 speed in age-related differences in memory: contribution of a coding task. *Brain Cogn* **71**, 240-5
594 (2009).
- 595 11. Lindenberger, U., Mayr, U. & Kliegl, R. Speed and intelligence in old age. *Psychol Aging* **8**,
596 207-20 (1993).
- 597 12. Balakrishnan, G. *et al.* A comparative study on visual choice reaction time for different colors in
598 females. *Neurol Res Int* **2014**, 301473 (2014).

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

- 599 13. Fan, J., Wu, Y., Fossella, J.A. & Posner, M.I. Assessing the heritability of attentional networks.
600 *BMC Neurosci* **2**, 14 (2001).
- 601 14. Evarts, E.V., Teravainen, H. & Calne, D.B. Reaction time in Parkinson's disease. *Brain* **104**,
602 167-86 (1981).
- 603 15. Pearce, S.C., Stolwyk, R.J., New, P.W. & Anderson, C. Sleep disturbance and deficits of
604 sustained attention following stroke. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol* **38**, 1-11 (2016).
- 605 16. Spierer, D.K., Petersen, R.A., Duffy, K., Corcoran, B.M. & Rawls-Martin, T. Gender influence
606 on response time to sensory stimuli. *J Strength Cond Res* **24**, 957-63 (2010).
- 607 17. Blough, P.M. & Slavin, L.K. Reaction time assessments of gender differences in visual-spatial
608 performance. *Percept Psychophys* **41**, 276-81 (1987).
- 609 18. Lupinacci, N.S., Rikli, R.E., Jones, C.J. & Ross, D. Age and physical activity effects on reaction
610 time and digit symbol substitution performance in cognitively active adults. *Res Q Exerc Sport*
611 **64**, 144-50 (1993).
- 612 19. Dane, S. & Erzurumluoglu, A. Sex and handedness differences in eye-hand visual reaction times
613 in handball players. *Int J Neurosci* **113**, 923-9 (2003).
- 614 20. Tonnessen, E., Haugen, T. & Shalfawi, S.A. Reaction time aspects of elite sprinters in athletic
615 world championships. *J Strength Cond Res* **27**, 885-92 (2013).
- 616 21. Kaur, P., Paul, M. & Sandhu, J.S. Auditory and visual reaction time in athletes, healthy controls,
617 and patients of type 1 diabetes mellitus: A comparative study. *International Journal of Diabetes*
618 *in Developing Countries* **26**(2006).
- 619 22. Vincent, A.S., Roebuck-Spencer, T., Gilliland, K. & Schlegel, R. Automated
620 Neuropsychological Assessment Metrics (v4) Traumatic Brain Injury Battery: military normative
621 data. *Mil Med* **177**, 256-69 (2012).
- 622 23. Vincent, A.S. *et al.* Reference data from the automated Neuropsychological Assessment Metrics
623 for use in traumatic brain injury in an active duty military sample. *Mil Med* **173**, 836-52 (2008).
- 624 24. Krieg, E.F., Jr. *et al.* Neurobehavioral test performance in the third National Health and Nutrition
625 Examination Survey. *Neurotoxicol Teratol* **23**, 569-89 (2001).
- 626 25. Button, K.S. *et al.* Power failure: why small sample size undermines the reliability of
627 neuroscience. *Nat Rev Neurosci* **14**, 365-76 (2013).
- 628 26. Sudlow, C. *et al.* UK biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range
629 of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLoS Med* **12**, e1001779 (2015).
- 630 27. Sudlow, C. *et al.* UK biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range
631 of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLoS medicine* **12**(2015).
- 632 28. Rawle, M.J., Cooper, R., Kuh, D. & Richards, M. Associations between polypharmacy and
633 cognitive and physical capability: a British birth cohort study. *Journal of the American*
634 *Geriatrics Society* **66**, 916-923 (2018).
- 635 29. Grimby, A. & Rosenhall, U. Health-related quality of life and dizziness in old age. *Gerontology*
636 **41**, 286-98 (1995).
- 637 30. Sabia, S., Marmot, M., Dufouil, C. & Singh-Manoux, A. Smoking history and cognitive function
638 in middle age from the Whitehall II study. *Arch Intern Med* **168**, 1165-73 (2008).
- 639 31. Biessels, G.J., Deary, I.J. & Ryan, C.M. Cognition and diabetes: a lifespan perspective. *Lancet*
640 *Neurol* **7**, 184-90 (2008).
- 641 32. Kilander, L., Nyman, H., Boberg, M., Hansson, L. & Lithell, H. Hypertension is related to
642 cognitive impairment: a 20-year follow-up of 999 men. *Hypertension* **31**, 780-786 (1998).

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

- 643 33. Patel, M.D., Coshall, C., Rudd, A.G. & Wolfe, C.D. Cognitive impairment after stroke: clinical
644 determinants and its associations with long-term stroke outcomes. *J Am Geriatr Soc* **50**, 700-6
645 (2002).
- 646 34. Talboom, J.S. *et al.* Family history of Alzheimer's disease alters cognition and is modified by
647 medical and genetic factors. *Elife* **8**(2019).
- 648 35. Bashore, T.R. & Ridderinkhof, K.R. Older age, traumatic brain injury, and cognitive slowing:
649 some convergent and divergent findings. *Psychol Bull* **128**, 151-98 (2002).
- 650 36. Team, R.C. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. (Vienna, Austria, 2013).
- 651 37. Racine, J.S. RStudio: a platform-independent IDE for R and Sweave. (JSTOR, 2012).
- 652 38. Wickham, H. *et al.* Welcome to the Tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software* **4**, 1686 (2019).
- 653 39. JA, L. Interactions: Comprehensive, User-Friendly Toolkit for Probing Interactions. R package
654 version 1.1.0. (2019).
- 655 40. Zeileis, A., Lumley, T., Berger, S., Graham, N. & Zeileis, M.A. Package 'sandwich'. (2020).
- 656 41. Long, J.A. & Long, M.J.A. Package 'jtools'. (2017).
- 657 42. Lenth, R., Singmann, H. & Love, J. Emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka least-squares
658 means. *R package version 1*(2018).
- 659 43. Harrison, E., Drake, T. & Ots, R. finalfit: Quickly Create Elegant Regression Results Tables and
660 Plots when Modelling. *R package version 0.9. 0*, URL [https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=finalfit)
661 *finalfit* (2019).
- 662 44. Tierney, N. visdat: Visualising whole data frames. *Journal of Open Source Software* **2**, 355
663 (2017).
- 664 45. Tierney, N., Cook, D., McBain, M. & Fay, C. naniar: data structures, summaries, and
665 visualisations for missing data. R package version 0.5. 0. (2020).
- 666 46. Wagenmakers, E.-J. & Farrell, S. AIC model selection using Akaike weights. *Psychonomic*
667 *bulletin & review* **11**, 192-196 (2004).
- 668 47. Ritz, C. & Spiess, A.-N. qpcR: an R package for sigmoidal model selection in quantitative real-
669 time polymerase chain reaction analysis. *Bioinformatics* **24**, 1549-1551 (2008).
- 670 48. Calcagno, V. & de Mazancourt, C. glmulti: an R package for easy automated model selection
671 with (generalized) linear models. *Journal of statistical software* **34**, 1-29 (2010).
- 672 49. Galton, F. Exhibition of instruments (1) for testing perception of differences of tint, and (2) for
673 determining reaction-time. *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and*
674 *Ireland* **19**, 27-29 (1890).
- 675 50. Bleecker, M.L., Bolla-Wilson, K., Agnew, J. & Meyers, D.A. Simple visual reaction time: sex
676 and age differences. *Developmental Neuropsychology* **3**, 165-172 (1987).
- 677 51. Kosinski, R.J. A literature review on reaction time. *Clemson University* **10**, 337-344 (2008).
- 678 52. Johnson, S.C. *et al.* The influence of Alzheimer disease family history and apolipoprotein E
679 epsilon4 on mesial temporal lobe activation. *J Neurosci* **26**, 6069-76 (2006).
- 680 53. Moradi, A. & Esmaeilzadeh, S. Simple reaction time and obesity in children: whether there is a
681 relationship? *Environ Health Prev Med* **22**, 2 (2017).
- 682 54. Nettelbeck, T. Factors affecting reaction time: Mental retardation, brain damage, and other
683 psychopathologies. *Reaction times*, 355-401 (1980).
- 684 55. Lee, J.J. & Chabris, C.F. General cognitive ability and the psychological refractory period:
685 individual differences in the mind's bottleneck. *Psychol Sci* **24**, 1226-33 (2013).
- 686 56. Taimela, S. Factors Affecting Reaction-Time Testing and the Interpretation of Results.
687 *Perceptual and Motor Skills* **73**, 1195-1202 (1991).

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

- 688 57. Jain, A., Bansal, R., Kumar, A. & Singh, K.D. A comparative study of visual and auditory
689 reaction times on the basis of gender and physical activity levels of medical first year students.
690 *Int J Appl Basic Med Res* **5**, 124-7 (2015).
- 691 58. Der, G. & Deary, I.J. Age and sex differences in reaction time in adulthood: results from the
692 United Kingdom Health and Lifestyle Survey. *Psychol Aging* **21**, 62-73 (2006).
- 693 59. Barthelemy, S. & Boulinguez, P. Manual reaction time asymmetries in human subjects: the role
694 of movement planning and attention. *Neurosci Lett* **315**, 41-4 (2001).
- 695 60. Woods, D.L., Wyma, J.M., Yund, E.W., Herron, T.J. & Reed, B. Factors influencing the latency
696 of simple reaction time. *Front Hum Neurosci* **9**, 131 (2015).
- 697 61. Barthelemy, S. & Boulinguez, P. Orienting visuospatial attention generates manual reaction time
698 asymmetries in target detection and pointing. *Behav Brain Res* **133**, 109-16 (2002).
- 699 62. Gonzalez, C.L., Ganel, T. & Goodale, M.A. Hemispheric specialization for the visual control of
700 action is independent of handedness. *J Neurophysiol* **95**, 3496-501 (2006).
- 701 63. Huentelman, M.J., Talboom, J.S., Lewis, C.R., Chen, Z. & Barnes, C.A. Reinventing
702 Neuroaging Research in the Digital Age. *Trends Neurosci* **43**, 17-23 (2020).
- 703 64. Davies, G. *et al.* Study of 300,486 individuals identifies 148 independent genetic loci influencing
704 general cognitive function. *Nat Commun* **9**, 2098 (2018).
- 705 65. Kraut, R. *et al.* Psychological research online: report of Board of Scientific Affairs' Advisory
706 Group on the Conduct of Research on the Internet. *Am Psychol* **59**, 105-17 (2004).
- 707 66. Elgar, F.J. & Stewart, J.M. Validity of self-report screening for overweight and obesity.
708 Evidence from the Canadian Community Health Survey. *Can J Public Health* **99**, 423-7 (2008).
- 709 67. Shields, M., Connor Gorber, S. & Tremblay, M.S. Estimates of obesity based on self-report
710 versus direct measures. *Health Rep* **19**, 61-76 (2008).
- 711 68. Ikeda, N. Validity of Self-Reports of Height and Weight among the General Adult Population in
712 Japan: Findings from National Household Surveys, 1986. *PLoS One* **11**, e0148297 (2016).
- 713 69. Yoon, K., Jang, S.N., Chun, H. & Cho, S.I. Self-reported anthropometric information cannot
714 vouch for the accurate assessment of obesity prevalence in populations of middle-aged and older
715 Korean individuals. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* **59**, 584-92 (2014).
- 716 70. Reimers, S. & Stewart, N. Adobe Flash as a medium for online experimentation: A test of
717 reaction time measurement capabilities. *Behavior research methods* **39**, 365-370 (2007).
- 718 71. Madley-Dowd, P., Hughes, R., Tilling, K. & Heron, J. The proportion of missing data should not
719 be used to guide decisions on multiple imputation. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **110**, 63-73
720 (2019).
- 721 72. Woods, D.L., Wyma, J.M., Yund, E.W., Herron, T.J. & Reed, B. Age-related slowing of
722 response selection and production in a visual choice reaction time task. *Front Hum Neurosci* **9**,
723 193 (2015).
- 724 73. Ryan, L. *et al.* Precision Aging: Applying Precision Medicine to the Field of Cognitive Aging.
725 *Front Aging Neurosci* **11**, 128 (2019).
- 726

727 **Data Availability**

728 All programs, software, and other materials described herein are publicly or commercially
729 available. R code used for all analyses and figure generation was included as "Source Data" R

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

730 Markdown notebook. The R code includes each model selected and the full list of parameters used. The
731 data that support each analysis, figure, and table is freely available at Dryad (<https://datadryad.org>).

732 **Acknowledgments**

733 A substantial porting of this research was conducted using the generous data and resources
734 provided by the UK Biobank (<https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/published-papers>). We acknowledge the
735 Mueller Family Charitable Trust and Mike Mueller their significant donations. The State of Arizona
736 DHS also supported this work in support of the Arizona Alzheimer's Consortium (PI; Eric Reiman), the
737 Flinn Foundation (PI; Matt Huentelman), The McKnight Brain Research Foundation, NIH-NIA grant
738 R01-AG049465 (PI; Carol Barnes), and NIH-NIA grants UH2 AG064706, U19 AG023122, U24
739 AG051129, and U24 AG051129-04S1 (PI; Nicholas J. Schork). We also recognize the support of many
740 anonymous donors and institutional support of TGen, the City of Hope, and the University of Arizona.

741 **Competing Interest**

742 The authors have no known competing or conflicting interests to declare.

743 **Materials and Correspondence**

744 Matt Huentelman, Ph.D., TGen, 445 N Fifth Street, Phoenix, AZ 85004, 602-343-8730 (office),
745 mhuentelman@tgen.org.

746 **Author Contributions**

747 J.S.T wrote and edited much of the manuscript, analyzed much of these data, and supervised
748 several project management areas. J.S.T also contributed to data analysis, interpretation, and synthesis.
749 M.D.DB oversaw much of the information technology needed for this study, analyzed a portion of these
750 data, and supplied critical project support. M.A.N analyzed a part of these data, generated some figures,
751 and provided critical statistical support. A.M.S. helped write and edit the manuscript as well as conduct
752 critical portions of the statistical analyses. C.R.L. aided in writing and editing the manuscript, data

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME

753 analysis, and general project oversight. W.M.J. aided in writing and editing the manuscript, data
754 analysis, and general project oversight. A.K.H wrote and helped write portions of the manuscript and
755 serve as a primary editor. Further, A.K.H. gave critical early data analysis and project support as well as
756 data interpretation and synthesis. T.R. edited the manuscript and provided critical clinical insight and
757 project management support. B.E.L. edited the manuscript and gave vital clinical insight. S.H. edited the
758 manuscript and supported data analysis. Y.B. edited the manuscript and provided critical clinical insight
759 and project management support. R.D.B. was instrumental in planning, designing, and executing this
760 research. N.J.S. collaborated to provide access to the UK Biobank and helped with data analysis as well
761 as project insight generation. M.H. supplied critical early data analysis and project support, as well as
762 data interpretation and synthesis. C.A.B. helped write and edit the manuscript. In addition, C.A.B. aided
763 several aspects of study design and helped with overall project planning and data interpretation and
764 synthesis. E.G., aided in writing and editing the manuscript and study design and data interpretation and
765 synthesis. L.R. aided in writing and editing the manuscript and study planning, design, and data
766 interpretation and synthesis. M.J.H. was the principal investigator of this project. M.J.H oversaw most
767 study planning, design, data collection and analysis, and data interpretation and synthesis. MJH played a
768 substantial role in writing and editing the manuscript.

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME




Figure 1. Age, paired associates learning (PAL) performance, and Biological Sex were associated with simple visual reaction time (svRT) in the MindCrowd analysis (ages 18-85). (A) Linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI, error bars \pm SEM) of the median svRT by Age³ (curvilinear model). There was a curvilinear relationship between svRT and Age¹ ($\beta_{Age1} = 7.07$, $p_{Age1} = 3.06E-18$), Age² ($\beta_{Age2} = -0.15$, $p_{Age2} = 3.23E-17$), and Age³ ($\beta_{Age3} = 1.47E-03$, $p_{Age3} < 1.46E-34$, $n = 75,666$). (B) Linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI, error bars \pm SEM) of the median svRT by Age³ (curvilinear model). There was a curvilinear relationship between svRT and paired-associate learning (PAL) performance PAL Performance¹ ($\beta_{PAL1} = -8.89$, $p_{PAL1} = 3.77E-34$), PAL Performance² ($\beta_{PAL2} = 0.32$, $p_{PAL2} = 2.35E-14$), and PAL Performance³ ($\beta_{PAL3} = -4.13E-03$, $p_{PAL3} = 7.28E-09$, $n = 75,666$). (C) Simple slope analysis of the Linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI, error bars \pm SEM) of the median svRT by PAL Performance ($\beta_{Age*PAL} = -0.07$, $p_{Age*PAL} = 1.26E-59$). At 20 ($\beta_{Age20*PAL} = -5.48$, $p_{Age20*PAL} < 0.00$, $n = 1985$), 40 ($\beta_{Age40*PAL} = -6.41$, $p_{Age40*PAL} < 0.00$, $n = 739$), 60 ($\beta_{Age60*PAL} = -7.75$, $p_{Age60*PAL} < 0.00$, $n = 1789$), and 80 ($\beta_{Age80*PAL} = -9.08$, $p_{Age80*PAL} < 0.00$, $n = 344$) years of age. (D) Linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI, error bars \pm SEM) of the median svRT by Age³ (curvilinear model) with lines split by Biological Sex. Women demonstrated longer svRT compared to men from younger to older ages ($\beta_{Sex} = -34.26$, $p_{Sex} = 1.26E-163$, $n_{Women} = 47,700$, $n_{Men} = 27,966$).

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME




Figure 2. Educational attainment and handedness altered simple visual reaction time (svRT) performance. MindCrowd analysis (ages 18-85). (A) Linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of the median svRT by Age³ (curvilinear model) with lines split by Educational Attainment. Participants who had “Some College” ($\beta_{\text{College}} = -14.73$, $p_{\text{College}} = 8.74\text{E-}05$, $n = 22,950$), or a “College Degree” ($\beta_{\text{CDegree}} = -31.78$, $p_{\text{CDegree}} = 2.95\text{E-}17$, $n = 44,140$) were faster than those with “No High School Diploma” ($n = 1,881$). (B-D) Linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of the median svRT by Age³ (curvilinear model) with lines split by Handedness. (B) From 18-85 years old, left-handed participants showed slightly faster svRTs ($\beta_{\text{Left}} = -3.87$, $p_{\text{Left}} < 0.03$), (C) an association found in 20-40 years olds ($\beta_{40\text{Left}} = -3.16$, $p_{40\text{Left}} < 0.01$, Left-Handed $n = 8,449$), (D) but not 40-60 years olds ($\beta_{60\text{Left}} = -2.69$, $p_{60\text{Left}} = 0.07$, Right-Handed $n = 66,903$).

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME




Figure 3. *A-B* Simple visual reaction times (svRT) were slower for those who smoked or Reported Dizziness. MindCrowd analysis (ages 18-85). (A) Linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of the median svRT by Age³ (curvilinear model) with lines split by Smoking Status. Participants identifying as a smoker showed slower svRT ($\beta_{Smoking} = 7.07$, $p_{Smoking} = 1.26E-03$, Smoker $n = 5,793$, Non-Smoker $n = 69,873$). (B) Linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of the median svRT by Age³ (curvilinear model) with lines split by Reported Dizziness. Participants reporting Reported Dizziness showed slower svRT performance ($\beta_{Dizzy} = 4.87$, $p_{Dizzy} = 0.04$, Reported Dizziness Reported $n = 4,749$, No Reported Dizziness Reported $n = 70,917$). *C-E* Health factors such as daily medications taken, diabetes, and Reported Stroke all slowed simple visual reaction time (svRT). MindCrowd analysis (ages 18-85). (C) Linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of the median svRT by Age³ (curvilinear model) with lines split by Daily Medications Taken. Compared to participants reporting “no daily medications” ($n = 33,672$), taking “Two” ($\beta_{Meds2} = 5.84$, $p_{Meds2} = 2.00E-03$, $n = 9,651$), “Three” ($\beta_{Meds3} = 6.24$, $p_{Meds3} < 0.01$, $n = 6,656$), and “Four” ($\beta_{Meds4} = 17.82$, $p_{Meds4} = 3.51E-16$, $n = 10,769$) slowed svRT. (D) Linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of the median svRT by Age³ (curvilinear model) with lines split by diabetes mellitus. Participants reporting having diabetes had slower svRT performance ($\beta_{Diabetes} = 11.23$, $p_{Diabetes} < 3.36E-05$, Diabetes Reported $n = 3,887$, No Diabetes Reported $n = 71,779$). (E) Linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of the median svRT by Age³ (curvilinear model) with lines split by Reported Stroke. Reporting having had a Reported Stroke impaired (slowed) svRT performance ($\beta_{Stroke} = 20.38$, $p_{Stroke} = 3.59E-04$, Reported Stroke Reported $n = 765$, No Reported Stroke Reported $n = 74,901$).

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME




Figure 4. A-B Age was linearly associated with visual reaction time (RT). UK Biobank analysis (ages 40-70). (A) UKBb MindCrowd linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI, error bars \pm SEM) of median simple visual RT (svRT) across Age. (B) UK Biobank linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI, error bars \pm SEM) of median complex, visual, recognition RT (cvrRT) across Age. UKBb MindCrowd svRT ($\beta_{Age} = 5.75$, $p_{Age} = 2.00E-16$, $n = 39,795$) and UK Biobank cvrRT ($\beta_{Age} = 3.40$, $p_{Age} = 2.00E-16$, $n = 158,245$) showed similar slowing from younger to older ages, but overall higher RT. The average 50 msec difference between UKBb MindCrowd svRT ($M = 478.66$ msec) and UK Biobank ($M = 528.74$ msec) is likely due to the choice component (i.e., do cards match or not > press button) of the UK Biobank's cvrRT task compared to UKBb MindCrowd's stimulus-response (i.e., the pink sphere appears > press button) svRT. C-D Visual reaction time (RT) was faster in men. UK Biobank analysis (ages 40-70). (C) UKBb MindCrowd linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI, error bars \pm SEM) of median simple visual RT (svRT) across Age with lines split by Biological Sex. (D) UK Biobank linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI, error bars \pm SEM) of median complex, visual, recognition RT (cvrRT) across Age with lines split by Biological Sex. Both UKBb MindCrowd svRT ($\beta_{Sex} = -40.00$, $p_{Sex} = 8.03E-71$, 20.46%, Women [$M = 489.75$ msec, $n = 29,640$], Men [$M = 446.28$ msec, $n = 10,155$]) and UK Biobank cvrRT ($\beta_{Sex} = -18.28$, $p_{Sex} = 2.00E-16$, 5.16%, Women [$M = 534.98$ msec, $n = 89,331$], Men [$M = 520.66$ msec, $n = 68,914$]) found men consistently outperforming women from 40-70 years of age.

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME




Figure 5. A-B More education was related to faster visual reaction time (RT). UK Biobank analysis (ages 40-70). (A) UKBb MindCrowd linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median simple visual RT (svRT) across Age with lines split by Educational Attainment. Participants who had a “High School Diploma” ($\beta_{HSDiploma} = -9.68$, $p_{HSDiploma} = 2.70E-01$, 1.87%, $n = 3,176$), “Some College” ($\beta_{College} = -26.08$, $p_{College} = 1.61E-03$, 5.06%, $n = 11,139$), or a “College Degree” ($\beta_{CDegree} = -49.07$, $p_{CDegree} = 1.91E-09$, 9.51%, $n = 24,875$) were faster than those with “No High School Diploma” ($n = 605$). (B) UK Biobank linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median complex, visual, recognition RT (cvrRT) across Age with lines split by Educational Attainment. Like the UKBb MindCrowd cohort, participants who had a “High School Diploma” ($\beta_{HSDiploma} = -9.68$, $p_{HSDiploma} = 1.23E-33$, 1.74%, $n = 46,247$), “Some College” ($\beta_{College} = -10.26$, $p_{College} = 1.30E-40$, 1.85%, $n = 77,270$), or a “College Degree” ($\beta_{CDegree} = -11.71$, $p_{CDegree} = 1.46E-41$, 2.11%, $n = 23,750$) were faster than those with “No High School Diploma” ($n = 10,978$). **C-D Diabetes mellitus slowed visual reaction time (RT). UK Biobank analysis (ages 40-70).** (C) UKBb MindCrowd linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median simple visual RT (svRT) across Age with lines split by diabetes mellitus. (D) UK Biobank linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median complex, visual, recognition RT (cvrRT) across Age with lines split by diabetes mellitus. Participant visual RT performance for UKBb MindCrowd svRT ($\beta_{Diabetes} = 11.48$, $p_{Diabetes} = 3.31E-03$, Diabetes Reported $n = 2,807$, No Diabetes Reported $n = 36,988$) and UK Biobank cvrRT ($\beta_{Diabetes} = 5.48$, $p_{Diabetes} = 4.80E-07$, Diabetes Reported $n = 4,969$, No Diabetes Reported $n = 153,276$), was slowed with Diabetes Mellitus.

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME




Figure 6. A-B Visual reaction time (RT) was impaired if a Reported Stroke was reported. UK Biobank analysis (ages 40-70). (A) UKBb MindCrowd linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median simple visual RT (svRT) across Age with lines split by Reported Stroke. (B) UK Biobank linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median complex, visual, recognition RT (cvrRT) across Age with lines split by Reported Stroke. In both the UKBb MindCrowd svRT ($\beta_{Stroke} = 18.47$, $p_{Stroke} = 4.00E-02$, Reported Stroke Reported $n = 2,807$, No Reported Stroke Reported $n = 39,318$) and UK Biobank cvrRT ($\beta_{Stroke} = 10.61$, $p_{Stroke} = 6.15E-07$, Reported Stroke Reported $n = 1,237$, No Reported Stroke Reported $n = 157,008$) analysis, experiencing a Reported Stroke was associated with slower visual RT. C-D Reported Hypertension slowed both types of visual reaction time (RT). UK Biobank analysis (ages 40-70). (C) UKBb MindCrowd linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median simple visual RT (svRT) across Age with lines split by Reported Hypertension. (D) UK Biobank linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median complex, visual, recognition RT (cvrRT) across Age with lines split by Reported Hypertension. Unlike the MindCrowd analysis, hypertension was related to slower svRT in UKBb MindCrowd ($\beta_{Hypertension} = 7.99$, $p_{Hypertension} = 3.16E-03$, Hypertension Reported $n = 9,676$, No Hypertension Reported $n = 30,119$) and cvrRT in the UK Biobank ($\beta_{Hypertension} = 1.14$, $p_{Hypertension} = 0.02$, Hypertension Reported $n = 32,593$, No Hypertension Reported $n = 125,652$).

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME




Figure 7. A-B Reported Dizziness impaired visual reaction time (RT). UK Biobank analysis (ages 40-70). (A) UKBb MindCrowd linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median simple visual RT (svRT) across Age with lines split by Reported Dizziness. (B) UK Biobank linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median complex, visual, recognition RT (cvrRT) across Age with lines split by Reported Dizziness. UKBb MindCrowd svRT ($\beta_{Dizzy} = 12.13$, $p_{Dizzy} = 2.52E-03$, Reported Dizziness Reported $n = 2,543$, No Reported Dizziness Reported $n = 37,252$) and UK Biobank cvrRT ($\beta_{Dizzy} = 3.21$, $p_{Dizzy} = 3.71E-14$, Reported Dizziness Reported $n = 42,210$, No Reported Dizziness Reported $n = 116,035$) were slowed if participants reported Reported Dizziness. **C-D** Smoking Status is related to impaired MindCrowd simple visual reaction time (svRT), not UK Biobank complex, visual recognition reaction time (cvrRT). UK Biobank analysis (ages 40-70). (C) UKBb MindCrowd linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median svRT across Age with lines split by Smoking Status. Compared to non-smokers, smokers demonstrated slower svRT ($\beta_{Smoke} = 10.18$, $p_{Smoke} = 0.01$, Smoker $n = 2,783$, Non-Smoker $n = 37,012$). (D) UK Biobank linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median cvrRT across Age with lines split by Smoking Status. An association between Smoking Status and cvrRT was not found in the UK Biobank ($\beta_{Smoke} = 0.47$, $p_{Smoke} = 0.22$, Smoker $n = 91,312$, Non-Smoker $n = 66,923$).

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME




Figure 8. A-B A first-degree family history of Alzheimer's disease (FHAD) was related to slower UK Biobank complex, visual recognition reaction time (cvrRT), UKBb MindCrowd simple visual reaction time (svRT). UK Biobank analysis (ages 40-70). (A) UKBb MindCrowd linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median svRT across Age with lines split by reported FHAD. An association between FHAD and svRT was not found in the UKBb MindCrowd cohort ($\beta_{FHAD} = -0.07$, $p_{FHAD} = 0.97$, FHAD Reported $n = 13,748$, No FHAD Reported $n = 26,047$). (B) UK Biobank linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of median cvrRT across Age with lines split by reported FHAD. Compared to those reporting No FHAD, FHAD was related to worse cvrRT performance in the UK Biobank ($\beta_{FHAD} = 2.36$, $p_{FHAD} = 3.35E-05$, FHAD Reported $n = 19,741$, No FHAD Reported $n = 138,504$). C In the UK Biobank, biological sex modified the association of educational attainment and complex, visual, recognition reaction time (cvrRT) (ages 40-70). Linear model fits (line fill \pm 95% CI) of the median cvrRT by Age with lines split by Educational Attainment and Biological Sex. Compared to women having "No High School Diploma" ($n = 6,056$), men with a "High School Diploma" ($\beta_{Sex*HSDiploma} = -11.24$, $p_{Sex*HSDiploma} = 3.30E-12$, $n = 18,505$), "Some College" ($\beta_{Sex*College} = -10.54$, $p_{Sex*College} = 8.71E-12$, $n = 34,230$) or a "College Degree" ($\beta_{Sex*CDegree} = -12.8$, $p_{Sex*CDegree} = 1.68E-13$, $n = 11,257$) were all significantly associated with faster cvrRT. See Supplementary Figure 7, displaying simple effects parsed using estimated marginal means (EMM).

MODIFIERS OF AGE-ASSOCIATED VARIATION IN REACTION TIME




Figure 9. An illustrative summary of the results. Data are shown across the MindCrowd (MC), UKBb MindCrowd, and the UK Biobank (UKBb). The color (i.e., red = low negative and blue = high positive) indicates the size of the β (beta coefficient) estimate. "N.S.," indicates if the estimated β value was not statistically significant ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Table 2
MindCrowd Cohort Sample Sizes (n) for Each Factor

Factor	<i>n</i>
Biological Sex	Women = 47,700 Men = 27,966
Educational Attainment	No High School Diploma = 1,881 High School Diploma = 6,695 Some College = 22,950 College Degree = 44,140
Handedness	Left-Handed = 8,449 Right-Handed = 66,903
Daily Medications Taken	None = 33,672 One = 14,409 Two = 9,651 Three = 6,656 Four = 10,769
Reported Dizziness	Dizziness Reported = 4,749 No Dizziness Reported = 70,917
Smoking Status	Smoker = 5,793 Non-Smoker = 69,873
Diabetes Mellitus	Diabetes Reported = 3,887 No Diabetes Reported = 71,779
Reported Stroke	Stroke Reported = 765 No Stroke Reported = 74,901

Table 2. Summary of sample size numbers (*n*) of each multiple regression coefficients from MindCrowd.

Table 3
MindCrowd Summary of Results

Factor	Value	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept		355.88	11.99	29.68	1.89E-192
Age ¹	Per Year Change in Slope	7.07	0.81	8.71	3.06E-18
Age ²	Per Year Change in How Much the Slope Is Altered	-0.15	0.02	-8.44	3.23E-17
Age ³	Per Year Change in How Much the Slope Is Altered	1.20E-04	0	12.27	1.46E-34
PAL Performance ¹	PAL Word Pairs Correctly Remembered	-8.89	0.73	-12.19	3.77E-34
PAL Performance ²	Per Word Pair Change in Slope	0.32	0.04	7.63	2.35E-14
PAL Performance ³	Per Year Change in How Much the Slope Is Altered	7.14E-04	0	-5.78	7.28E-09
Biological Sex	Men	-34.26	1.25	-27.33	1.26E-163
Educational Attainment	Some College	-14.73	3.75	-3.92	8.74E-05
Educational Attainment	College Degree	-31.78	3.76	-8.45	2.95E-17
Handedness	Left	-3.87	1.76	-2.2	0.03
Daily Medications Taken	Two	5.84	1.89	3.09	2.00E-03
Daily Medications Taken	Three	6.24	2.26	2.76	0.01
Daily Medications Taken	Four	17.82	2.18	8.16	3.51E-16
Reported Dizziness	TRUE	4.87	2.35	2.07	0.04
Smoking Status	TRUE	7.07	2.19	3.23	1.26E-03
Diabetes Mellitus	TRUE	11.23	2.71	4.15	3.36E-05
Reported Stroke	TRUE	20.38	5.71	3.57	3.59E-04
Age x PAL Performance	Trajectory of age-related change in svRT performance is altered buy PAL Performance	-7.56E-04	4.41E-05	-1.72E+01	8.34E-66
Age x Smoking Status	Smoking Status alters the trajectory of age-related changes to svRT	0.58	0.12	4.67	2.95E-06
Age x Reported Stroke	Reported Stroke adds to age-related decrements in svRT	1.87	0.42	4.46	8.17E-06
Age x Biological Sex	Men have a shifted trajectory of age-related svRT changes	-0.37	0.07	-5.59	2.23E-08
Age x Educational Attainment	Having Some College vs. No High School Diploma alters the trajectory of age-related alterations to svRT	-0.76	0.18	-4.09	4.28E-05
Age x Educational Attainment	A College Degree vs. No High School Diploma alters the trajectory of age-related modifications to svRT performance	-1.53	0.19	-8.14	4.08E-16

Table 3. Summary of the main findings from MindCrowd, listing main associations and interactions. β = unstandardized regression coefficient, *SE* = standard error, *t* = value of *t*-statistic, *p* = *p*-value.

Table 4

UKBb MindCrowd and UK Biobank Cohort Sample Sizes (n)

Characteristic	UKBb MindCrowd <i>ns</i>	UK Biobank <i>ns</i>
Biological Sex	Women = 29,640 Men = 10,155	Women = 89,331 Men n = 68,914
Diabetes Mellitus	Diabetes Reported = 2,807 No Diabetes Reported = 36,988	Diabetes Reported = 4,969 No Diabetes Reported = 153,276
Handedness	Left-Handed = 4,520 Right-Handed = 35,034	Left-Handed = 15,287 Right-Handed = 142,958
Reported Stroke	Reported Stroke Reported = 2,807 No Reported Stroke Reported = 39,318	Reported Stroke Reported = 1,237 No Reported Stroke Reported = 157,008
Reported Hypertension	Hypertension Rep. = 9,676 No Hypertension Rep. = 30,119	Hypertension Rep. = 32,593 No Hypertension Rep. = 125,652
Smoking Status	Smoker = 2,783 Non-Smoker = 37,012	Smoker = 91,312 Non-Smoker = 66,923
Reported Dizziness	Reported Dizziness Reported = 2,543 No Reported Dizziness Reported = 37,252	Reported Dizziness Reported = 42,210 No Reported Dizziness Reported = 116,035
Educational Attainment	No High School Diploma = 605 High School Diploma = 3,176 Some College = 11,139 College Degree = 24,875	No High School Diploma = 10,978 High School Diploma = 46,247 Some College = 77,270 College Degree = 23,750
FHAD	FHAD Reported = 13,748 No FHAD Reported = 26,047	FHAD Reported = 19,741 No FHAD Reported = 138,504
Educational Attainment x Biological Sex	Women No High School Diploma = 426 High School Diploma = 2,496 Some College = 8,740 College Degree = 17,978 Men No High School Diploma = 179 High School Diploma = 680 Some College = 2,399 College Degree = 12,493	Women No High School Diploma = 6,056 High School Diploma = 27,742 Some College = 43,040 College Degree = 23,750 Men No High School Diploma = 4,922 High School Diploma = 18,505 Some College = 34,230 College Degree = 11,257

Table 4. Summary of sample size numbers (*ns*) of each multiple regression coefficient from the UKBb MindCrowd and UK Biobank.

Table 5
UKBb MindCrowd and the UK Biobank Summary of Results

Variable	Value	UKBb MindCrowd				The UK Biobank				Outcome
		β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	
Intercept		189.77	10.65	18.35	6.46E-75	335.93	1.69	209.93	2.00E-16	Agree
Age	Per Year	5.75	0.12	46.57	2.00E-16	3.40	0.03	132.87	2.00E-16	Agree
Biological Sex	Men	-40.00	2.24	-17.83	8.03E-71	-18.28	0.38	-47.70	2.00E-16	Agree
Diabetes Mellitus	TRUE	11.48	3.91	2.94	3.31E-03	5.48	1.09	5.03	4.80E-07	Agree
Handedness	Left	-2.58	3.05	-0.85	4.00E-01	0.58	0.63	0.92	0.36	N.S. in both - but MindCrowd subtle effect
Reported Stroke	TRUE	18.47	9.02	2.05	4.00E-02	10.61	2.13	4.99	6.15E-07	Agree
Reported Hypertension	TRUE	6.99	2.37	2.95	3.16E-03	1.09	0.48	2.27	2.00E-02	Agree
Smoking Status	TRUE	10.18	3.87	2.63	0.01	0.40	0.38	1.05	0.29	MindCrowd Finding: Both Primary and UKBb
Reported Dizziness	TRUE	12.10	4.00	3.02	2.52E-03	3.21	0.42	7.57	3.71E-14	Agree
Educational Attainment	High School Diploma	-9.68	8.77	-1.10	2.70E-01	-9.68	0.80	-12.09	1.23E-33	Agree
Educational Attainment	Some College	-26.08	8.27	-3.15	1.61E-03	-10.26	0.77	-13.35	1.30E-40	Agree
Educational Attainment	College Degree	-49.07	8.17	-6.01	1.91E-09	-11.71	0.87	-13.51	1.46E-41	Agree
First-Degree Family History of Alzheimer's Disease	TRUE	-0.07	2.06	-0.04	0.97	2.43	0.57	4.26	2.04E-05	UK Biobank Finding
Age x Biological Sex	Men's vs. Women's per year change in Age slope	-0.62	0.26	-2.38	2.00E-02	-0.55	0.05	-10.99	4.18E-28	Agree
Biological Sex by Educational Attainment	Men with High School Diploma vs. Women with No High School Diploma	21.63	19.62	1.10	0.27	-11.24	1.61	-6.96	3.30E-12	UK Biobank Finding
Biological Sex by Educational Attainment	Men with Some College vs. Women with No High School Diploma	16.25	18.28	0.89	0.37	-10.54	1.54	-6.83	8.71E-12	UK Biobank Finding
Biological Sex by Educational Attainment	Men with a College Degree vs. Women with No High School Diploma	14.79	17.94	0.82	0.41	-12.8	1.74	-7.37	1.68E-13	UK Biobank Finding

Table 5. Summary of the main findings from the UKBb MindCrowd and the UK Biobank cohorts. Here factor names, factor definitions, β = unstandardized regression coefficients as well as estimate *SE* = standard error, *t* = value of *t*-statistic, and *p* = *p*-value across both cohorts is shown. The last column displays model outcomes in terms of the agreement between the cohorts.

Table 6

UK Biobank Factor Generation

Index #	Field Description	Field ID	Count (n)	Type	Description	Column Label	Used to Generate
6	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=31	31	502,524	Categorical (single)	Sex	Sex	Biological Sex
7	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=34	34	502,524	Integer	Year of birth	Birth Year	Age
264	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=404	404	202,464	Integer	Duration to the first press of snap-button in each round	Snap-Button Time to First Press (Instance 0)	Median cvrRT (8 out of 12 Rounds)
395	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=1707	1707	501,626	Categorical (single)	Handedness (chirality/laterality)	Handedness	Handedness
422	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=2443	2443	501,593	Categorical (single)	Diabetes diagnosed by doctor	Diabetes mellitus	Diabetes mellitus
426	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=2453	2453	501,593	Categorical (single)	Cancer diagnosed by doctor	Cancer	Cancer
482	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=2966	2966	134,645	Integer	Age high blood pressure diagnosed	Age Hypertension Diagnosed	Hypertension Diag. via MD
616	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=4056	4056	7,579	Integer	Age Reported Stroke diagnosed	Age Reported Stroke Diagnosed	Reported Stroke Diag. via MD
2104	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=20107	20107	487,790	Categorical (single)	Illnesses of father	(Multiple Columns)	FHAD
2144	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=20110	20110	492,928	Categorical (single)	Illnesses of mother	(Multiple Columns)	FHAD
2188	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=20111	20111	433,922	Categorical (single)	Illnesses of siblings	(Multiple Columns)	FHAD
2325	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=20116	20116	501,633	Categorical (single)	Smoking status	Smoking status	Smoking Status
2356	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=21022	21022	502,524	Integer	Age at recruitment	Age at Recruitment	Age (verify)
120	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=401	401	495,702	Categorical (single)	Index for card A in round	Needed to Know if Snap-Button Should Have Been Pressed	Median cvrRT
168	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=402	402	495,702	Categorical (single)	Index for card B in round	Needed to Know if Snap-Button Should Have Been Pressed	Median cvrRT
1635	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=6138	6138	497,883	Categorical (multiple)	Qualifications	Education	Educational Attainment
2357	http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=21053	21053	174,774	Categorical (single)	Degree bothered by dizziness in the last three months	Dizziness	Dizziness

Table 6. List of derived factors from the UK Biobank. UK Biobank’s “Index Number,” “Field Description,” “Field ID” and sample size (*ns*) for data field used to generate factors evaluated via multiple linear regression. “Data fields” were chosen to match to the questions posed in MindCrowd. If multiple instances (e.g., 0-4, timepoints) were available for data, only the first (instance 0) was used. For cvrRT and FHAD, multiple columns were compiled to generate the factor. For the UKBb MindCrowd and UK Biobank analyses,

participants were removed if any of their responses to a demographic, medical, health, and lifestyle question did not match the other cohort.

Table 1

Sociodemographic Characteristics of Each Cohort

<i>Cohort</i>	<i>Descriptive or Factor Level</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
1. MindCrowd 18-85yr: Age	<i>M</i> = 46.54 <i>SD</i> = 18.40	75,666	100
UKBb MindCrowd 40-70yr: Age	<i>M</i> = 56.59 <i>SD</i> = 8.16	39,795	100
UK Biobank 40-70yr: Age	<i>M</i> = 55.81 <i>SD</i> = 7.72	158,249	100
2. MindCrowd 18-85yr: Biological Sex	Women	47,700	63.08
	Men	27,966	36.91
UKBb MindCrowd 40-70yr: Biological Sex	Women	29,640	74.51
	Men	10,155	25.49
UK Biobank 40-70yr: Biological Sex	Women	89,333	56.45
	Men	68,916	43.55
3. MindCrowd 18-85yr: Race	Native American	445	0.6
	Asian	3,491	4.74
	Black/African American	1,555	2.11
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	270	0.37
	Mixed	490	0.66
	White	67,433	91.52
UKBb MindCrowd 40-70yr: Race	Asian	743	1.90
	Black/African American	732	1.87
	Mixed	182	0.47
	White	37,235	95.03
UK Biobank 40-70yr: Race	Asian	1,612	1.02
	Black/African American	979	0.62
	Mixed	847	0.54
	White	154,809	97.83
4. MindCrowd 18-85yr: FHAD	TRUE	17,382	23.59
	FALSE	56,302	76.41
UKBB MindCrowd 40-70yr: FHAD	TRUE	13,554	34.59
	FALSE	25,627	65.41
UK Biobank 40-70yr: FHAD	TRUE	19,741	12.48
	FALSE	138,506	87.52
5. MindCrowd 18-85yr: Handedness	Left	8,276	11.23
	Right	65,408	88.77
UKBb MindCrowd 40-70yr: Handedness	Left	4,474	11.42
	Right	34,707	88.58
UK Biobank 40-70yr: Handedness	Left	15,287	9.66
	Right	142,960	90.34
6. MindCrowd 18-85yr: Educational Attainment	No High School Diploma	1,792	2.43
	High School Diploma	6,470	8.78
	Some College	22,335	30.31
	College Degree	43,087	58.48
UKBb MindCrowd 40-70yr: Educational Attainment	No High School Diploma	577	1.47
	High School Diploma	3,108	7.93
	Some College	10,955	27.96
	College Degree	24,541	62.63
UK Biobank 40-70yr: Educational Attainment	No High School Diploma	10,979	6.94
	High School Diploma	46,247	29.23
	Some College	77,271	48.83
	College Degree	23,750	15.01

Table 1. Sociodemographic Characteristics Across Each of the Three Cohorts. Study *ns* and related percentages of commonly reported sociodemographic factors from each of the three cohorts (i.e., MindCrowd and UKBb MindCrowd and the UK Biobank).