medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Computerized Cognitive Training in People with Depression: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials

Eliane Gefen, MSc[1,2]; Nathalie H. Launder[1]; Christopher G. Davey, MD, PhD[1]; Mor Nahum[2]; Yafit Gilboa, PhD[2]; Carsten Finke, MD, PhD[3,4]; Hanna Malmberg Gavelin, PhD[5]; Nicola T. Lautenschlager[1]; Amit Lampit, PhD[1]

[1] Department of Psychiatry, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia

[2] School of Occupational Therapy, Faculty of Medicine, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel

[3] Department of Neurology, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany

[4] Berlin School of Mind and Brain, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany

[5] Department of Psychology, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

Corresponding author:

Amit Lampit, PhD, Academic Unit for Psychiatry of Old Age, University of Melbourne, Parkville VIC 3053 Australia (amit.lampit@unimelb.edu.au)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Importance: Cognitive impairment is a common feature of both symptomatic and remitted states of depression that is associated with poorer psychosocial outcomes and treatment non-response. As such, finding treatments to maintain or enhance cognition in people with depression is imperative.

Objective: To investigate the efficacy and moderators of computerized cognitive training (CCT) for cognitive and functional outcomes in people with depression.

Data Sources: MEDLINE, EMBASE and PsycINFO databases were screened from inception through to 08 September 2022, with no language or publication type restrictions.

Study Selection: Two independent reviewers conducted duplicate study screening and assessed against the following inclusion criteria: (1) adults (mean age 18 years or older) with depression, (2) CCT with minimum three hours practice, (3) active or passive control group, (4) cognitive and/or functional outcomes measured at baseline and post-intervention, (5) randomized controlled trials. Of 4245 identified studies, 34 met selection criteria.

Data Extraction and Synthesis: The methods used followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. Data extraction and risk of bias assessment using the revised Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool (RoB2) was conducted independently by two reviewers. Analyses were conducted using robust variance estimation.

Outcomes: The primary outcome was change from baseline to post-intervention in overall cognition. Secondary outcomes were depressive symptoms, psychiatric symptoms, psychosocial functioning, daily functioning, subjective cognition, global cognition and domain-specific cognitive function.

Results: Thirty-four studies encompassing 39 comparisons and 2041 unique participants met inclusion criteria. The pooled effect size of CCT was small for both overall cognition (g=0.28; 95% CI 0.17 to 0.38; P<.001; τ^2=0.078; I^2=47%; 95% prediction interval -0.31 to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

0.86) and depressive symptoms (g=0.23; 95% CI 0.08 to 0.39; P=.004; τ^2=0.066; I^2=45%; 95% prediction interval -0.32 to 0.78). Benefits of CCT were also found for psychosocial functioning, subjective cognition, fluid reasoning, long-term memory and retrieval, low working memory, shifting, inhibition and processing speed. Greater CCT dose and multidomain programs were associated with greater cognitive response to CCT. There was no evidence for difference across clinical subtypes or between delivery modalities.

Conclusions and Relevance: This systematic review and meta-analysis indicates that CCT is an efficacious intervention for overall cognition, depressive symptoms, psychosocial functioning, subjective cognition, and many domain-specific cognitive functions for people with depression.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Cognitive impairment is a central feature of depression,[1] presented frequently in both symptomatic and remitted states, associated with poorer psychosocial functioning[2] and treatment non-response[3-5] and is only partially responsive to antidepressants.[6] Comorbid depression and cognitive impairment are common in people with chronic diseases and may interfere with the management of medical disorders and treatment adherence, leading to worse functional and medical outcomes.[7] Moreover, as one of the most robust dementia risk factors, depression increases the risk of dementia in later life by approximately 80%[8] and given its prevalence may independently account for around 8% of dementia cases worldwide.[9] Thus, interventions that effectively target cognition alongside other symptoms in people with depression may have a key role in supporting everyday function,[10] as well as in delaying or preventing cognitive decline and dementia.[8,11]

Computerized cognitive training (CCT) is a safe and scalable cognitive training approach that focuses on repeated and controlled practice on cognitively demanding tasks. CCT is appealing as it can be adapted to individual needs, provides ongoing feedback, is relatively inexpensive and can be delivered flexibly. CCT is arguably the most common intervention in cognitive impairment trials delivered as a standalone or in combination with other approaches such as physical exercise[12] and cognitive remediation,[13] with robust evidence for efficacy in ageing,[14,15] neurodegenerative[12,16] and psychiatric disorders.[13,17] However, efficacy for specific outcomes varies across populations, and associated with intervention design factors such as content, dose and delivery. Indirect evidence from meta-analyses in older adults[14] and schizophrenia[13,18] suggests that CCT may be efficacious only when combined with behavioral or cognitive remediation techniques.

Several recent meta-analyses investigated the efficacy of cognitive remediation in people with depression, reporting improvements in depressive symptoms and mixed results for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

objective and subjective cognitive outcomes.[19-23] However, all of these combined CCT with other cognitive remediation techniques that did not include CCT, only one[19] was limited to randomized controlled trials (RCTs), and no meta-analysis accounted for non-independence of effect sizes within studies, potentially over-estimating effect estimates in under-estimating heterogeneity.[24] Moreover, nearly all the studies included in previous meta-analyses excluded older adults and people with comorbidities, thereby limiting the applicability of results to clinical practice.

Therefore we aimed to robustly estimate the efficacy and heterogeneity of CCT as a standalone or component intervention on cognitive, mood and psychosocial outcomes across populations with depression, and to investigate factors associated with response – key evidence gap to guide clinical implementation.[10]

Methods

This review adheres to the 2020 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA 2020) guidelines[25] and largely follows methods established in our previous reviews of CCT.[14,15,26,27] The protocol has been prospectively registered with PROSPERO (CRD42020204209) and published previously.[28]

Eligibility Criteria

We included RCTs studying the effects of CCT compared to control conditions on one or more cognitive, depressive symptoms, psychosocial or functional outcome(s) in adults with depression at baseline (at any clinical stage). Depression was established according to standard diagnostic criteria, diagnostic interviews, expert clinical diagnosis or a mean score greater than a validated cut-off on an established clinical measure (**eTable 1** in the Supplement). There was no restriction on study population apart from studies targeting primarily people with dementia or major psychiatric comorbidities; when the study population included a mixed sample (e.g., as indicated by baseline demographics or when

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

≥50% of the sample received antipsychotic medication), the study was only included if data of eligible participants could be obtained separately. CCT was defined as a total of minimum of 3 hours of intended practice on standardized computerized tasks or video games with clear cognitive rationale.[14,15,27] Eligible controls included passive (wait-list, no-contact) and active (e.g., sham CCT, recreational activities) comparison groups. Studies combining CCT with other non-pharmacological interventions (e.g., psychotherapy, physical exercise) or with pharmacological interventions were eligible as long as both arms received the same adjacent interventions (i.e., the difference between the arms is the CCT and not the adjacent intervention). All eligible comparisons in multi-arm studies were included using multivariate models.

Information Sources and Study Selection

MEDLINE, EMBASE and PsycINFO were searched through the OVID interface for eligible articles from inception through to 8 September 2022. No restrictions on language or type of publication were applied. The electronic search was complemented by hand-searching the references of included studies and previous reviews of CCT[14-16,27] and cognitive remediation[19-21] as well as clinical trial registries. The full search strategy is shown in **eTable 2** in the Supplement. Three independent reviewers (NHL, EG and MN) conducted duplicate screening of titles and abstracts as well as full text screening of potentially eligible articles. Disagreements at each stage were resolved by consensus or by involvement of a senior reviewer (AL), who also contacted the corresponding authors of primary studies for additional information. The final list of included studies was reviewed and approved by AL.

Data Extraction and Coding

Data were extracted and coded in duplicate by two reviewers (NHL, RM or EG), supervised by a neuropsychologist (HMG). Outcome data were extracted as mean and standard deviation (SD) for each group at each time point, or when not available, as measures of mean

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

difference and SD or confidence intervals (CI). Missing or incomplete data were requested from the corresponding authors of the studies. Coding of cognitive outcomes was conducted according to the Cattell-Horn-Carroll-Miyake (CHC-M) framework, tailored specifically for meta-analyses of CCT.[29] Following this framework, each cognitive outcome was classified into a broad cognitive domain (e.g., executive function) as well as a more specific narrow cognitive domain (e.g., inhibition). Cognitive screening instruments, such as the Mini-Mental State Examination, were classified as global cognition.[14,15] The classification of individual outcome measures into domains is presented in **eTable 3** in the Supplement. Non-cognitive outcomes included depressive symptoms, psychiatric symptoms, psychosocial functioning, daily functioning, and subjective cognition. The classification of baseline depressive symptoms severity for subgroup analysis is presented in **eTable 4** in the Supplement.

Risk of Bias Within Studies

Three independent reviewers (NHL, EG and RM) assessed the risk of bias of eligible comparisons within studies using the revised Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool (RoB2).[30] Disagreements were resolved by consensus or by consultation with a senior reviewer (AL). In contrast to the original RoB2 macros, studies with “some concerns” or “high” risk of bias in domains 3 (bias due to missing outcome data) or 4 (bias in measurement of the outcome) were considered as having some concerns or high risk of bias, respectively.[27]

Data Synthesis

Analyses were conducted using the packages robumeta,[31] clubSandwich[32] and metafor[33]in R, version 4.2.2. Between-group differences in change from baseline to post-intervention were converted to standardized mean differences and calculated as Hedges’ *g* with 95% CI for each eligible outcome measure. Multivariate analyses were performed using robust variance estimation (RVE) based on a correlational model with rho=0.8 to account for the non-independence of multiple effect sizes within studies.[34] The primary outcome was change

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

from baseline to post-intervention in overall cognition, assessed through one or more non-trained measures of objective cognition using standardized neuropsychological tests. Secondary outcomes included depressive symptoms, psychiatric symptoms, psychosocial functioning, daily functioning, subjective cognition, global cognition, and domain-specific cognitive function.

Heterogeneity across studies was quantified using τ^2 and expressed as a proportion of overall observed variance using the I^2 statistic.[35,36] Prediction intervals were calculated to assess the dispersion of true effects across settings.[37] Univariable RVE meta-regressions of a priori potential moderators (design characteristics, population characteristics and overall risk of bias) were performed for overall cognition and depressive symptoms using robumeta and contrasts formally tested using Hotelling–Zhang test (F-statistic) with clubSandwich.[38] Small-study effect for primary outcomes was assessed by visually inspecting funnel plots of effect size vs standard error[39] and formally tested using the Egger's test as a meta-regression in RVE.[40] The Duval and Tweedie trim and fill[41] was also used to assess the magnitude of small-study bias. Two-sided $\alpha<.05$ indicated statistical significance.

Results

Study Selection

After removal of duplicates, we screened 4927 articles for eligibility, of which 657 articles were assessed in full-text screening. A total of 34 studies were found eligible for inclusion (**Figure 1**). A list of studies excluded at the full text screening stage is provided in **eTable 5** in the Supplement. Additionally, the authors of ten eligible studies were contacted for additional data, of which five[42-45] provided data.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1: Flowchart of study selection

Characteristics of Included Studies

The 34 included studies reported data from 39 eligible comparisons, encompassing 2041 unique participants, with mean age ranging between 19.21 and 74.51 years. Most of the studies included people with a diagnosis of MDD or a current major depressive episode (*k*=13 RCTs; *n*=813). Four studies[46-49] specifically focused on people with partially and/or fully remitted depression (*n*=207). Seven studies included people with multiple sclerosis[50-56] (n=360). Three studies included people with Parkinson's disease (n=153) [57,58] and two studies included people with MCI/SCD (*n*=65). Five studies (*n*=188) targeted older adults with the mean age of participants over 65 years of age.[42,57-60] Mean baseline depression severity was classified as mild depression (*k*=18; *n*=1049) or moderate to severe depression (*k*=16; *n*=992) according to the standard severity cut-offs for the clinical measures used. Studies including participants with fully remitted depression that had mean baseline depression severities below cut-offs[46,47] were included in the mild depression subgroup. The most common type of CCT

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

was multidomain training (*k*=22*; n*=1083), followed by working memory training (*k*=7*; n*=443), attention training (*k=2; n*=367), memory training (*k*=2*; n*=75) and speed of processing training (*k*=1*; n*=73). Two studies had two CCT arms (*n*=110).[48,61] Eighteen studies used an active control group (*n*=970), 13 studies had a passive control group (*n*=598), one study had two active control groups (*n*=279)[44] and two studies had both active and passive control groups (*n*=194).[62] Overall risk of bias was assessed as low in 15 studies, with some concerns in seven studies, and high risk of bias in 11 studies. Finally, one study[62] had one comparison assessed as low and the other as high (**eTable 6** in the Supplement).

Primary Outcome: Overall Cognition

Thirty-one studies reported objective cognitive outcomes at baseline and post-intervention timepoints. The pooled effect size across these 31 studies, with a total of 304 cognitive outcomes, was small and statistically significant with moderate heterogeneity (*g*=0.28; 95% CI 0.17 to 0.38; *P*<.001; τ^2=0.078; I^2=47%; prediction interval -0.31 to 0.86, **Figure 2**). Funnel plot asymmetry was detected, indicating possible small-study effect (β=-0.105; one-tailed *P*=.03; **eFigure 1** in the Supplement). A trim and fill analysis imputed two studies; the adjusted effect size suggested negligible small-study bias (*g*=0.24; 95% CI 0.14 to 0.34; **eFigure 2** in the Supplement). Sensitivity analyses comparing a hierarchical (*g*=0.22; 95% CI 0.10 to 0.34; *P*=.001; W^2=0.018; τ^2=0.061) to the correlational model as well as correlation assumptions revealed the model assumptions of the main analysis to be robust (**eTable 7** in the Supplement). An additional sensitivity analysis excluding studies of remitted depression populations (*k*=2; *n*=78)[47,48] was also consistent with the overall result (*g*=0.28; 95% CI 0.18 to 0.39; *P*<.001; τ^2=0.074; I^2=46%). The pooled effect size was similar across active- and passive-controlled comparisons and larger in studies with low risk of bias, but the difference was not statistically significant (**Table 2**). However, trial registration was associated with smaller effect sizes compared to non-registered trials.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2: Meta-analysis of overall cognitive outcomes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Secondary Outcome: Depressive Symptoms

Twenty-eight studies reported depressive symptoms outcomes at baseline and post-intervention timepoints. The pooled effect size across these 28 studies and 41 effect sizes was small and statistically significant with moderate heterogeneity (g=0.23; 95% CI 0.08 to 0.38; P=.004; τ^2=0.066; I^2=45%; prediction interval -0.32 to 0.78). Funnel plot asymmetry was detected, indicating possible small-study effect (β= -0.231; P=.08; **eFigure 4** in the Supplement). A trim and fill analysis imputed three studies, with the adjusted effect size suggesting minor small-study bias (g=0.17; 95% CI 0.01 to 0.32; **eFigure 4** in the Supplement). Sensitivity analyses comparing a hierarchal (g=0.24; 95% CI 0.08 to 0.39; P=.004; W^2=0.0; τ^2=0.057) to the correlational model as well as correlation assumptions revealed the model assumptions of the main analysis to be robust (**eTable 7** in the Supplement). An additional sensitivity analysis excluding studies of remitted depression populations (k=2; n=78) further supported this (g=0.23; 95% CI 0.07 to 0.39; P=.008; τ^2=0.073; I^2=48%). An additional sensitivity analysis excluding studies of remitted depression populations (k=3, n=150)[46,47,49] further supported this (g=0.23; 95% CI 0.07 to 0.39; P=.008; τ^2=0.073; I^2=48%). The pooled effect size was similar across studies with high and low risk of bias, as well as across active- and passive-controlled comparisons (**Table 2**).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3: Meta-analysis of depressive symptoms

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Moderator analyses

Results of meta-regressions for the key outcomes of overall cognition and depressive symptoms are provided in **Table 2**. Greater dose (i.e., more training hours) was associated with larger cognitive effect sizes, in patterns suggestive of dose-responsiveness. Of particular importance, training regimes of less than 12 hours was the most common design (13 of the 31 studies reporting cognitive outcomes) and was associated with negligible cognitive benefits. No association was found between population parameters (diagnosis, baseline depression level and age) and CCT benefits.

Secondary Outcomes: Non-cognitive Endpoints

Analyses of non-cognitive outcomes are provided in eFigures 3 to 11. Small and statistically significant effect sizes were noted for measures of psychosocial functioning (k=14; g=0.20; 95% CI 0.03 to 0.37; P=.03; τ^2=0.022; I^2=21%) and subjective cognition (k=11; g=0.21; 95% CI 0.02 to 0.40; P=.03; τ^2=0.019; I^2=20%). Negligible effects sizes were found for psychiatric symptoms (k=13; g=0.15; 95% CI -0.01 to 0.32; P=.07; τ^2=0.027; I^2=27%), daily function (k=5; g=0.11; 95% CI -0.19 to 0.51; P=.25; τ^2=0.01; I^2=27%),

Secondary Outcomes: Specific Cognitive Domains

Results of meta-analyses of individual cognitive domains for which sufficient data were available (i.e., k>3) are provided in **Figure 4**. Small-to-moderate effect sizes were found for all the broad CHC-M domains apart from visual processing, which was estimated from 5 studies and was therefore imprecise. Small-to-moderate effect sizes were found for the narrow domains of abstract reasoning, learning, retrieval, low working memory, shifting, inhibition and processing speed. The pooled effect size for global cognition screening tools was small and not statistically significant (k=6; g=0.21; 95% CI -0.12 to 0.55; P=.16; τ^2=0.041; I^2=35%). Forest and funnel plots for analyses of global cognition and individual cognitive domains are provided in **eFigures 12-45** in the Supplement.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4: Meta-analyses individual cognitive domains

Discussion

To The best of our knowledge, this is the first systematic review with meta-analysis to examine the efficacy of CCT across populations with clinical depression, thereby extending the implications of results into other clinical populations with high prevalence of depressive symptoms, most notably older adults or those with neurodegenerative disorders. It overcomes the limitations of previous meta-analyses in the field by including only RCTs, strictly limiting interventions to CCT rather than other cognitive remediation strategies, and using multivariate methods that substantially improve our ability to detect and investigate heterogeneity. By using more sensitive methods and better controlling for study quality confounders, we were able to increase our certainty in the robustness of the results and examine potential effect moderators with high relevance to clinical practice.

We report robust findings that overall cognitive performance, depressive symptoms and nearly all specific cognitive domains appear to be responsive to CCT. The key findings were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

not confounded by risk of bias, type of control and population, and the impact of small-study bias on effect estimates was inconsequential. Particularly encouraging is the relatively large effect size for fluid (abstract) reasoning, which is key for everyday reasoning ability and suggested as a predictor of depressive symptoms in later life.[63] Yet the effect size estimates for cognitive and depression endpoints are noticeably smaller and more heterogenous than those reported in previous meta-analyses in depression.[19-23] This may be due to limiting the analyses to RCTs, using more robust statistical and the inclusion of more recent and rigorous trials, as evident by a tendency of non-registered and typically older studies to report larger effect sizes compared to preregistered trials. The effect estimates provided here are in line with those of previous meta-analyses of CCT in other clinical populations that used comparable synthesis methods.[14-16,27] In addition, CCT was associated with small improvements in measures of subjective cognition and psychosocial functioning, but there was insufficient indication that these changes also relate to everyday functioning, social participation and self-care.

Taken together, the findings confirm the role of CCT in management of cognitive disorders in people with depression, but suggest that additional interventions may be needed in order to enhance its efficacy and functional impact. Cognitive remediation techniques have a very likely impact on people's ability to carry objective cognitive improvement into everyday life,[10] perhaps even independently from cognitive practice.[13] Combination with physical exercise may augment cognitive effects, especially when provided simultaneously rather than in separate sessions, at least in older adults.[12] The evidence regarding potential additive effects between CCT and neuromodulation, behavior change techniques,[64] psychotherapy and antidepressants such as vortioxetine[65] is more equivocal at this stage. Even less is known about how to combine interventions effectively given the numerous components and combination approaches (including order and dose) suggested in the literature. It is also not

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

unlikely that some combinations will result in antagonistic effects, for instance by reducing adherence or effort.

Heterogeneity was substantial across studies, with about one-third of the prediction intervals falling around or below zero. CCT dose (i.e., total training hours) appears to play an important role here; nearly half of the studies provided a dose of less than 12 hours, which was associated with negligible overall cognitive and depression effect sizes. Sessions longer than 60 minutes all but eliminated the effect of symptoms, but paradoxically were associated with larger cognitive benefits. Consistent with previous synthesis work on CCT in older adults,[14] we found that training regimens of >3 sessions per week are less efficacious than less frequent training, and that multidomain training is more efficacious for overall cognition than single-domain programs. Conversely to older adults, however, the mode of supervision was not associated with effect sizes, meaning that CCT by itself could be delivered successfully in in-person as well as home (self-administered or remotely supervised) settings.

While this work addresses some critical limitations of previous meta-analyses in the field and provides a rigorous platform for further designing and investigating the effectiveness of CCT across populations with depression, some limitations are noteworthy. First, since most studies focused on short-term cognitive and functional outcomes, the durability of the observed benefits as well as strategies to maintain them remain unclear. Second, although we were able to detect heterogeneity and investigate its potential sources to guide future intervention design, there are still not enough studies in the field to compare intervention components head-to-head (e.g., using network meta-analysis), meaning that the results of the subgroup analyses may be confounded by common design factors. Third, most studies did not report functional outcomes, leaving the pooled analyses of psychiatric symptoms, psychosocial functioning, daily functioning and subjective cognition underpowered and to be interpreted with caution. Similarly, only four studies[46-48] specifically focused on people with partially

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

and/or fully remitted depression, leaving subgroup analysis for this population also underpowered. Future studies should make efforts to include functional and patient-centered outcomes alongside clinical measures to investigate the true contribution of CCT to improve social and community participation across depression states.

Conclusion

CCT could be efficacious for improving overall cognition, specific cognitive domains and mood with potential carry-over effects on indicators of psychosocial functioning in people with clinical depression, including older adults and those with other neurological disorders. Training dose, frequency and content appear to be stronger indicators of outcomes than the type of population or delivery mode. To progress the field, future studies may consider increasing their overall dose, compare CCT approaches and combinations with other common or potential interventions and investigate the long-term implications of CCT effects, with a particular focus on individual factors, goals and trajectories.

REFERENCES

1. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, 5th edition. *Arlington: American Psychiatric Publishing*. 2013;
2. Rock PL, Roiser JP, Riedel WJ, Blackwell AD. Cognitive impairment in depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychol Med*. Jul 2014;44(10):2029-40. doi:10.1017/S0033291713002535
3. Gorlyn M, Keilp JG, Grunebaum MF, et al. Neuropsychological characteristics as predictors of SSRI treatment response in depressed subjects. *J Neural Transm (Vienna).* Aug 2008;115(8):1213-9. doi:10.1007/s00702-008-0084-x
4. Dunkin JJ, Leuchter AF, Cook IA, Kasl-Godley JE, Abrams M, Rosenberg-Thompson S. Executive dysfunction predicts nonresponse to fluoxetine in major depression. *J Affect Disord*. Oct 2000;60(1):13-23. doi:10.1016/s0165-0327(99)00157-3
5. Story TJ, Potter GG, Attix DK, Welsh-Bohmer KA, Steffens DC. Neurocognitive correlates of response to treatment in late-life depression. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry*. Sep 2008;16(9):752-9. doi:10.1097/JGP.0b013e31817e739a
6. Prado CE, Watt S, Crowe SF. A meta-analysis of the effects of antidepressants on cognitive functioning in depressed and non-depressed samples. *Neuropsychol Rev*. Mar 2018;28(1):32-72. doi:10.1007/s11065-018-9369-5
7. Gold SM, Kohler-Forsberg O, Moss-Morris R, et al. Comorbid depression in medical diseases. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. Aug 20 2020;6(1):69. doi:10.1038/s41572-020-0200-2
8. Yu JT, Xu W, Tan CC, et al. Evidence-based prevention of Alzheimer's disease: systematic review and meta-analysis of 243 observational prospective studies and 153 randomised controlled trials. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. Nov 2020;91(11):1201-1209. doi:10.1136/jnnp-2019-321913

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

9. Norton S, Matthews FE, Barnes DE, Yaffe K, Brayne C. Potential for primary prevention of Alzheimer's disease: an analysis of population-based data. *Lancet Neurol*. Aug 2014;13(8):788-94. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(14)70136-X
10. Douglas KM, Milanovic M, Porter RJ, Bowie CR. Clinical and methodological considerations for psychological treatment of cognitive impairment in major depressive disorder. *BJPsych Open*. Jun 29 2020;6(4):e67. doi:10.1192/bjo.2020.53
11. Livingston G, Huntley J, Sommerlad A, et al. Dementia prevention, intervention, and care: 2020 report of the Lancet Commission. *Lancet*. Aug 8 2020;396(10248):413-446. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30367-6
12. Gavelin HM, Dong C, Minkov R, et al. Combined physical and cognitive training for older adults with and without cognitive impairment: A systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Ageing Res Rev*. Mar 2021;66:101232. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2020.101232
13. Vita A, Barlati S, Ceraso A, et al. Effectiveness, Core Elements, and Moderators of Response of Cognitive Remediation for Schizophrenia: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials. *JAMA Psychiatry*. Aug 1 2021;78(8):848-858. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2021.0620
14. Lampit A, Hallock H, Valenzuela M. Computerized cognitive training in cognitively healthy older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis of effect modifiers. *PLoS Med*. Nov 2014;11(11):e1001756. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001756
15. Hill NT, Mowszowski L, Naismith SL, Chadwick VL, Valenzuela M, Lampit A. Computerized Cognitive Training in Older Adults With Mild Cognitive Impairment or Dementia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Am J Psychiatry*. Apr 1 2017;174(4):329-340. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2016.16030360
16. Lampit A, Heine J, Finke C, et al. Computerized Cognitive Training in Multiple Sclerosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. Sep 2019;33(9):695-706. doi:10.1177/1545968319860490
17. Cella M, Price T, Corboy H, Onwumere J, Shergill S, Preti A. Cognitive remediation for inpatients with psychosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychol Med*. May 2020;50(7):1062-1076. doi:10.1017/S0033291720000872
18. Lejeune JA, Northrop A, Kurtz MM. A Meta-analysis of Cognitive Remediation for Schizophrenia: Efficacy and the Role of Participant and Treatment Factors. *Schizophr Bull*. Jul 8 2021;47(4):997-1006. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbab022
19. Therond A, Pezzoli P, Abbas M, Howard A, Bowie CR, Guimond S. The Efficacy of Cognitive Remediation in Depression: A Systematic Literature Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Affect Disord*. Apr 1 2021;284:238-246. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2021.02.009
20. Legemaat AM, Semkovska M, Brouwer M, et al. Effectiveness of cognitive remediation in depression: a meta-analysis. *Psychol Med*. Apr 14 2021;52(16):1-16. doi:10.1017/S0033291721001100
21. Goldberg Z, Kuslak B, Kurtz MM. A meta-analytic investigation of cognitive remediation for mood disorders: Efficacy and the role of study quality, sample and treatment factors. *J Affect Disord*. Jun 1 2023;330:74-82. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2023.02.137
22. Woolf C, Lampit A, Shahnawaz Z, et al. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Cognitive Training in Adults with Major Depressive Disorder. *Neuropsychol Rev*. Jun 2022;32(2):419-437. doi:10.1007/s11065-021-09487-3
23. Sociali A, Borgi M, Pettorruso M, et al. What role for cognitive remediation in the treatment of depressive symptoms? A superiority and noninferiority meta-analysis for clinicians. *Depress Anxiety*. Jul 2022;39(7):586-606. doi:10.1002/da.23263
24. Cheung MW. A Guide to Conducting a Meta-Analysis with Non-Independent Effect Sizes. *Neuropsychol Rev*. Dec 2019;29(4):387-396. doi:10.1007/s11065-019-09415-6
25. Page MJ, Moher D, Bossuyt PM, et al. PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. Mar 29 2021;372:n160. doi:10.1136/bmj.n160
26. Webb SL, Loh V, Lampit A, Bateman JE, Birney DP. Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Computerized Cognitive Training on Executive Functions: a Cross-Disciplinary Taxonomy for Classifying Outcome Cognitive Factors. *Neuropsychol Rev*. Jun 2018;28(2):232-250. doi:10.1007/s11065-018-9374-8
27. Gavelin HM, Domellof ME, Leung I, et al. Computerized cognitive training in Parkinson's disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ageing Res Rev*. Sep 2022;80:101671. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2022.101671
28. Lampit A, Launder NH, Minkov R, et al. Computerized cognitive training in people with depression: a protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Syst Rev*. Jan 6 2022;11(1):6. doi:10.1186/s13643-021-01872-6
29. Webb SL, Loh V, Lampit A, Bateman JE, Birney DP. Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Computerized Cognitive Training on Executive Functions: a Cross-Disciplinary Taxonomy for Classifying Outcome Cognitive Factors. *Neuropsychology Review*. Jun 2018;28(2):232-250. doi:10.1007/s11065-018-9374-8
30. Sterne JA, Savovic J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. Aug 28 2019;366:l4898. doi:10.1136/bmj.l4898

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

31. Fisher Z, Tipton E, Zhipeng H. robumeta: Robust variance meta□regression. 2023;
32. Pustejovsky J. clubSandwich: Cluster-robust (sandwich) variance estimators with small-sample corrections. 2023;
33. Viechtbauer W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2010;36(3):1-48.
34. Hedges LV, Tipton E, Johnson MC. Robust variance estimation in meta-regression with dependent effect size estimates. *Res Synth Methods*. Jan 2010;1(1):39-65. doi:10.1002/jrsm.5
35. Borenstein M, Higgins JP, Hedges LV, Rothstein HR. Basics of meta-analysis: I(2) is not an absolute measure of heterogeneity. *Res Synth Methods.* Mar 2017;8(1):5-18. doi:10.1002/jrsm.1230
36. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med*. Jun 15 2002;21(11):1539-58. doi:10.1002/sim.1186
37. Riley RD, Higgins JP, Deeks JJ. Interpretation of random effects meta-analyses. *BMJ*. Feb 10 2011;342:d549. doi:10.1136/bmj.d549
38. Tipton E, Pustejovsky JE. Small-Sample Adjustments for Tests of Moderators and Model Fit Using Robust Variance Estimation in Meta-Regression. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*. 2015;40(6):604-634. doi:10.3102/1076998615606099
39. Sterne JA, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JP, et al. Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. *BMJ*. Jul 22 2011;343:d4002. doi:10.1136/bmj.d4002
40. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. Research Support, U.S. Gov't, Non-P.H.S. *BMJ*. Sep 13 1997;315(7109):629-34. doi:10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629
41. Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: A simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics*. Jun 2000;56(2):455-63. doi:10.1111/j.0006-341x.2000.00455.x
42. Morimoto SS, Altizer RA, Gunning FM, et al. Targeting Cognitive Control Deficits With Neuroplasticity-Based Computerized Cognitive Remediation in Patients With Geriatric Major Depression: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Controlled Trial. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry*. Sep 2020;28(9):971-980. doi:10.1016/j.jagp.2020.05.023
43. Semkovska M, Lambe S, Lonargain DO, McLoughlin DM. Neurocognitive Remediation Therapy for Depression: A Feasibility Study and Randomized Controlled Pilot Protocol Testing. *J Nerv Ment Dis.* Aug 2015;203(8):609-16. doi:10.1097/NMD.0000000000000337
44. Arean PA, Hallgren KA, Jordan JT, et al. The Use and Effectiveness of Mobile Apps for Depression: Results From a Fully Remote Clinical Trial. *J Med Internet Res*. Dec 20 2016;18(12):e330. doi:10.2196/jmir.6482
45. Bowie CR, Gupta M, Holshausen K, Jokic R, Best M, Milev R. Cognitive remediation for treatment-resistant depression: effects on cognition and functioning and the role of online homework. *J Nerv Ment Dis*. Aug 2013;201(8):680-5. doi:10.1097/NMD.0b013e31829c5030
46. Hoorelbeke K, Koster EHW. Internet-delivered cognitive control training as a preventive intervention for remitted depressed patients: Evidence from a double-blind randomized controlled trial study. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. Feb 2017;85(2):135-146. doi:10.1037/ccp0000128
47. Semkovska M, Ahern E. Online neurocognitive remediation therapy to improve cognition in community-living individuals with a history of depression: A pilot study. *Internet Interv*. Sep 2017;9:7-14. doi:10.1016/j.invent.2017.04.003
48. Listunova L, Kienzle J, Bartolovic M, et al. Cognitive remediation therapy for partially remitted unipolar depression: A single-blind randomized controlled trial. *J Affect Disord*. Nov 1 2020;276:316-326. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2020.07.008
49. Vervaeke J, Hoorelbeke K, Baeken C, Koster EHW. Online Cognitive Control Training for Remitted Depressed Individuals: A Replication and Extension Study. *Cognit Ther Res*. 2021/10/01 2021;45(5):944-958. doi:10.1007/s10608-021-10238-0
50. Solari A, Motta A, Mendozzi L, et al. Computer-aided retraining of memory and attention in people with multiple sclerosis: a randomized, double-blind controlled trial. *J Neurol Sci*. Jul 15 2004;222(1-2):99-104. doi:10.1016/j.jns.2004.04.027
51. Messinis L, Nasios G, Kosmidis MH, et al. Efficacy of a Computer-Assisted Cognitive Rehabilitation Intervention in Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis Patients: A Multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial. *Behav Neurol*. 2017;2017:5919841. doi:10.1155/2017/5919841
52. Amato MP, Goretti B, Viterbo RG, et al. Computer-assisted rehabilitation of attention in patients with multiple sclerosis: results of a randomized, double-blind trial. *Mult Scler*. Jan 2014;20(1):91-8. doi:10.1177/1352458513501571
53. Grasso MG, Broccoli M, Casillo P, et al. Evaluation of the Impact of Cognitive Training on Quality of Life in Patients with Multiple Sclerosis. *Eur Neurol*. 2017;78(1-2):111-117. doi:10.1159/000478726

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

54. Mattioli F, Stampatori C, Zanotti D, Parrinello G, Capra R. Efficacy and specificity of intensive cognitive rehabilitation of attention and executive functions in multiple sclerosis. *J Neurol Sci*. Jan 15 2010;288(1-2):101-5. doi:10.1016/j.jns.2009.09.024
55. Messinis L, Kosmidis MH, Nasios G, et al. Do secondary progressive multiple sclerosis patients benefit from computer-based cognitive neurorehabilitation? A randomized sham controlled trial. *Multiple sclerosis and related disorders*. 2020;39:101932.
56. Vilou I, Bakirtzis C, Artemiadis A, et al. Computerized cognitive rehabilitation for treatment of cognitive impairment in multiple sclerosis: an explorative study. *Journal of integrative neuroscience*. 2020;19(2):341-347.
57. Edwards JD, Hauser RA, O'Connor ML, Valdes EG, Zesiewicz TA, Uc EY. Randomized trial of cognitive speed of processing training in Parkinson disease. *Neurology*. Oct 8 2013;81(15):1284-90. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182a823ba
58. Maggio MG, De Cola MC, Latella D, et al. What About the Role of Virtual Reality in Parkinson Disease's Cognitive Rehabilitation? Preliminary Findings From a Randomized Clinical Trial. *J Geriatr Psychiatry Neurol*. Nov 2018;31(6):312-318. doi:10.1177/0891988718807973
59. Finn M, McDonald S. Repetition-lag training to improve recollection memory in older people with amnestic mild cognitive impairment. A randomized controlled trial. *Neuropsychol Dev Cogn B Aging Neuropsychol Cogn*. 2015;22(2):244-58. doi:10.1080/13825585.2014.915918
60. Kang JM, Kim N, Lee SY, et al. Effect of Cognitive Training in Fully Immersive Virtual Reality on Visuospatial Function and Frontal-Occipital Functional Connectivity in Predementia: Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of medical Internet research*. 2021;23(5):e24526.
61. Oh SJ, Seo S, Lee JH, Song MJ, Shin MS. Effects of smartphone-based memory training for older adults with subjective memory complaints: a randomized controlled trial. *Aging Ment Health*. Apr 2018;22(4):526-534. doi:10.1080/13607863.2016.1274373
62. Choi J, Wang Y, Feng T, Prudic J. Cognitive training to improve memory in individuals undergoing electroconvulsive therapy: Negative findings. *J Psychiatr Res*. Sep 2017;92:8-14. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychires.2017.03.016
63. Aichele S, Ghisletta P, Corley J, et al. Fluid Intelligence Predicts Change in Depressive Symptoms in Later Life: The Lothian Birth Cohort 1936. *Psychol Sci*. Dec 2018;29(12):1984-1995. doi:10.1177/0956797618804501
64. Peeters G, Black IL, Gomersall SR, et al. Behaviour Change Techniques in Computerized Cognitive Training for Cognitively Healthy Older Adults: A Systematic Review. *Neuropsychol Rev*. Mar 2023;33(1):238-254. doi:10.1007/s11065-022-09537-4
65. Zhang X, Cai Y, Hu X, Lu CY, Nie X, Shi L. Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Vortioxetine for the Treatment of Major Depressive Disorder in Adults. *Front Psychiatry*. 2022;13:922648. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2022.922648
66. De Luca R, Latella D, Maggio MG, et al. Computer assisted cognitive rehabilitation improves visuospatial and executive functions in Parkinson's disease: Preliminary results. *NeuroRehabilitation*. 2019;45(2):285-290. doi:10.3233/NRE-192789
67. Dos Santos M, Hardy□Léger I, Rigal O, et al. Cognitive rehabilitation program to improve cognition of cancer patients treated with chemotherapy: A 3□arm randomized trial. *Cancer*. 2020;126(24):5328-5336.
68. Ferrari GR, Vanderhasselt M-A, Rinck M, et al. A cognitive control training as add-on treatment to usual care for depressed inpatients. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*. 2021:1-15.
69. Hagen BI, Lau B, Joormann J, Smastuen MC, Landro NI, Stubberud J. Goal management training as a cognitive remediation intervention in depression: A randomized controlled trial. *J Affect Disord*. Oct 1 2020;275:268-277. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2020.07.015
70. Iacoviello BM, Wu G, Alvarez E, et al. Cognitive-emotional training as an intervention for major depressive disorder. *Depress Anxiety*. Aug 2014;31(8):699-706. doi:10.1002/da.22266
71. Iacoviello BM, Murrough JW, Hoch MM, et al. A randomized, controlled pilot trial of the Emotional Faces Memory Task: a digital therapeutic for depression. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2018;1doi:10.1038/s41746-018-0025-5
72. Klojčnik M, Bakracevic K. The effectiveness of computerized cognitive remediation therapy (CCRT) for deficits in attention and executive functions in depression: A pilot study. *Applied Neuropsychology: Adult*. 2021:1-9.
73. Mahncke HW, DeGutis J, Levin H, et al. A randomized clinical trial of plasticity-based cognitive training in mild traumatic brain injury. *Brain*. Aug 17 2021;144(7):1994-2008. doi:10.1093/brain/awab202
74. Roberts H, Mostazir M, Moberly NJ, Watkins ER, Adlam A-L. Working memory updating training reduces state repetitive negative thinking: Proof-of-concept for a novel cognitive control training. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*. 2021;142:103871.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

75. Trapp W, Engel S, Hajak G, Lautenbacher S, Gallhofer B. Cognitive remediation for depressed inpatients: Results of a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. Jan 2016;50(1):46-55. doi:10.1177/0004867415622271

76. Trebo E, Holzner B, Pircher M, Prunnlechner R, Gunther V. [The effects of a computer assisted cognitive training on neuropsychological parameters, mood and dysfunctional cognitions in depressive patients]. *Neuropsychiatr*. 2007;21(3):207-15. Der Einfluss eines computergestutzten kognitiven Trainings auf neuropsychologische und kognitionspsychologische Funktionen depressiver Patienten.

77. Vance DE, Fazeli PL, Azuero A, Wadley VG, Raper JL, Ball KK. Can Individualized-Targeted Computerized Cognitive Training Benefit Adults with HIV-Associated Neurocognitive Disorder? The Training on Purpose Study (TOPS). *AIDS Behav*. Dec 2021;25(12):3898-3908. doi:10.1007/s10461-021-03230-y

78. Wanmaker S, Geraerts E, Franken IH. A working memory training to decrease rumination in depressed and anxious individuals: a double-blind randomized controlled trial. *J Affect Disord*. Apr 1 2015;175:310-9. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2014.12.027

Table 1: Study characteristics

Study	*n*[a]	% fem	Mean age[b]	Depression severity	Clinical population[c]	Interventions	CCT type	Delivery	Dose	Risk of bias
Amato 2014[52]	88 (CCT: 55; Control: 33)	78	40.96	Mild	Multiple sclerosis	CCT: Attention Processing Training (ST) Control: Non-specific computerized activities (n-ST)	Attention	Home	Dose: 24 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 2 Weeks: 12	Some concerns
Arean 2016[44]	76[d] (CCT: 51; Control: 25); 179[e] (CCT: 100; Control: 79)	76	34.15	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: Project: EVO (EVO) Control: Problem-solving therapy app (iPST)	Attention	Home	Dose: 12 h Session: 30 min Frequency: 6 Weeks: 4	High
Arean 2016[44]	71[d] (CCT: 51; Control: 20); 200[e] (CCT: 100; Control: 100)	80	34.25	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: Project: EVO (EVO) Control: Health tips app (HT)	Attention	Home	Dose: 12 h Session: 30 min Frequency: 6 Weeks: 4	High
Bowie 2013[45]	21 (CCT: 11; Control: 10)	70	45.81	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: Scientific Brain Training Pro (CR) Control: Wait-list (WL)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 9 h Session: 54 min Frequency: 1 Weeks: 10	Low
Choi 2017[62]	33 (CCT: 18; Control: 15)	51	43.42	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: In-house program (Mem-ECT) Control: Computer and pencil-and-paper puzzles (AC)	Memory	Supervised	Dose: 7.88 h Session: 67.5 min Frequency: 2 Weeks: 3	High
Choi 2017[62]	36 (CCT: 18; Control: 18)	59	40.47	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: In-house program (Mem-ECT) Control: Treatment as usual (TAU)	Memory	Supervised	Dose: 7.88 h Session: 67.5 min Frequency: 2 Weeks: 3	Low
De Luca 2019[66]	60 (CCT: 30; Control: 30)	48	62.55	Mild	Parkinson's disease	CCT: ERICA (EG) Control: Pencil-and-paper cognitive training with therapist (CG)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 24 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 3 Weeks: 8	Some concerns

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

Dos Santos 2020[67]	92 (CCT: 48; Control: 44)	96	51.30	Moderate-severe	Cancer-related cognitive impairment	CCT: Computer-assisted cognitive rehabilitation with a neuropsychologist (RehaCom) Control: Pencil-and-paper cognitive exercises at home	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 7.88 h Session: 52.5 min Frequency: 0.75 Weeks: 12	High
Dos Santos 2020[67]	99 (CCT: 48; Control: 51)	96	51.20	Moderate-severe	Cancer-related cognitive impairment	CCT: Computer-assisted cognitive rehabilitation with a neuropsychologist (RehaCom) Control: Phone follow-up	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 7.88 h Session: 52.5 min Frequency: 0.75 Weeks: 12	High
Edwards 2013[57]	73 (CCT: 32; Control: 41)	38	68.85	Mild	Parkinson's disease	CCT: InSight (SOPT) Control: Wait-list (CG)	Speed of processing	Home	Dose: 20 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 2 Weeks: 12	High
Ferrari 2021[68]	115 (CCT: 56; Control: 59)	63	51.31	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: In-house program (adaptive PASAT) Control: Sham PASAT	Working memory	Supervised	Dose: 4.17 h Session: 25 min Frequency: 5 Weeks: 2	Low
Finn 2015[59]	24 (CCT: 12; Control: 12)	29	73.96	Mild	MCI	CCT: In-house program (repetition lag training) Control: No-contact	Memory	Supervised	Dose: 9 h Session: 90 min Frequency: 2 Weeks: 4	Some concerns
Grasso 2017[53]	34 (CCT: 17; Control: 17)	65	59.11	Moderate-severe	Multiple sclerosis	CCT: Attention Processing Training (CMD) Control: Non-specific computerized activities (MD)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 36 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 3 Weeks: 12	Low
Hagen 2020[69]	63 (CCT: 28; Control: 35)	78	42.00	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: BrainHQ Control: Goal management training (GMT)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 9 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 2 Weeks: 4.5	High
Hoorelbeke 2017[46]	61 (CCT: 29; Control: 32)	66	46.97	Mild	Remitted MDD	CCT: In-house program (adaptive PASAT) Control: Sham PASAT	Working memory	Home	Dose: 3.33 h Session: 20 min Frequency: 5 Weeks: 2	High

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Iacoviello 2014[70]	21 (CCT: 11; Control: 10)	52	37.84	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: In-house program (Emotional Faces Memory Task training) Control: Sham CCT (CT)	Working memory	Supervised	Dose: 5 h Session: 37.5 min Frequency: 2 Weeks: 4	Low
Iacoviello 2018[71]	48 (CCT: 26; Control: 22)	69	35.04	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: In-house program (Emotional Faces Memory Task training) Control: Sham CCT (CT)	Working memory	Supervised	Dose: 8.25 h Session: 27.5 min Frequency: 3 Weeks: 6	High
Kang 2021[60]	41 (CCT: 23; Control: 18)	71	74.51	Mild	Older adults with subjective cognitive decline or MCI	CCT: In-house program (VR cognitive training) Control: Treatment as usual (TAU)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 3.33 h Session: 25 min Frequency: 2 Weeks: 4	Some concerns
Klojcnik 2021[72]	20 (CCT: 10; Control: 10)	55	45.30	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: CogniPlus (CCRT) Control: Treatment as usual (TAU)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 9 h Session: 45 min Frequency: 1.2 Weeks: 10	Some concerns
Listunova 2020[48]	39 (CCT: 20; Control: 19)	72	45.41	Mild	Partially remitted MDD	CCT: CogniPlus individualized training (IT) Control: No-contact (CG)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 13.5 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 3 Weeks: 5	Low
Listunova 2020[48]	37 (CCT: 18; Control: 19)	73	45.10	Mild	Partially remitted MDD	CCT: CogniPlus generalized training (GT) Control: No-contact (CG)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 13.5 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 3 Weeks: 5	Low
Maggio 2018[58]	20 (CCT: 10; Control: 10)	50	69.40	Mild	Parkinson's disease	CCT: BTS Nirvana Control: Pencil-and-paper cognitive training with therapist	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 24 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 3 Weeks: 8	Low
Mahnke 2021[73]	83 (CCT:41; Control: 42)	19	33.8	Mild	mTBI	CCT: BrainHQ Control: Computer games	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 60 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 5 Weeks: 12	Low
Mattioli 2010[54]	20 (CCT: 10; Control: 10)	100	45.16	Mild	Multiple sclerosis	CCT: RehaCom (SG) Control: No-contact (CG)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 36 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 3	High

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

									Weeks: 12	
Messinis 2017[51]	58 (CCT: 32; Control: 26)	69	45.64	Mild	Multiple sclerosis	CCT: RehaCom Control: No-contact (CG)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 20 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 2 Weeks: 10	Low
Messinis 2020[55]	36 (CCT: 19; Control: 17)	67	45.91	Mild	Multiple sclerosis	CCT: RehaCom Control: Sham cognitive intervention (non-specific computer-based activities)	Multidomain	Home	Dose: 18 h Session: 45 min Frequency: 3 Weeks: 8	Low
Morimoto 2020[42]	30 (CCT: 18; Control: 12)	64	73.70	Moderate-severe	Older adults with MDD	CCT: BrainHQ and in-house program (nCCR) Control: Watching documentaries and answering questions about them (AC)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 30 h Session: 150 min Frequency: 3 Weeks: 4	High
Oh 2018[61]	34 (CCT: 18; Control: 16)	53	59.59	Mild	Subjective memory complaints	CCT: SMART Control: Wait-list (WL)	Multidomain	Home	Dose: 11.67 h Session: 17.5 min Frequency: 5 Weeks: 8	Some concerns
Oh 2018[61]	35 (CCT: 19; Control: 16)	54	59.32	Mild	Subjective memory complaints	CCT: Fit Brains Control: Wait-list (WL)	Multidomain	Home	Dose: 11.67 h Session: 17.5 min Frequency: 5 Weeks: 8	Some concerns
Roberts 2021[74]	55 (CCT: 26; Control: 29)	NR	19.21	Mild	Young adults	CCT: In-house program (adaptive working memory updating training) Control: Non-adaptive working memory updating training	Working memory	Home	Dose: 10 h Session: 30 min Frequency: 5 Weeks: 4	High
Semkovska 2015[43]	15 (CCT: 8; Control: 7)	46	43.40	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: RehaCom (NCRT) Control: Computer games	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 20 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 3 Weeks: 6.67	High
Semkovska 2017[47]	21 (CCT: 11; Control: 10)	82	46.40	Mild	Remitted MDD	CCT: RehaCom (NCRT) Control: Computer games	Multidomain	Home	Dose: 20 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 4 Weeks: 5	Low

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Solari 2004[50]	77 (CCT: 40; Control: 37)	64	43.80	Moderate-severe	Multiple sclerosis	CCT: RehaCom (SG) Control: RehaCom visuo-constructional and visuo-motor coordination retraining (CG)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 12 h Session: 45 min Frequency: 2 Weeks: 8	Low
Trapp 2016[75]	41 (CCT: 21; Control: 20)	67	35.57	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: X-Cog (EG) Control: Treatment as usual (CG)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 12 h Session: 60 min Frequency: 3 Weeks: 4	Low
Trebo 2007[76]	34 (CCT: 24; Control: 10)	71	51.72	Moderate-severe	MDD	CCT: COGPACK Control: No-contact (CG)	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 12.5 h Session: 37.5 min Frequency: 2 Weeks: 10	High
Vance 2021[77]	109 (CCT: 64; Control: 45)	30.27	53.56	Mild	HIV	CCT: BrainHQ Control: Passive	Multidomain	Supervised	Dose: 20 h Session: 99.6 min Frequency: 1 Weeks: 12	High
Vervake 2021[49]	68 (CCT: 34; Control:34)	64.7	46.2	Mild	Remitted MDD	CCT: aPASAT Control: speed-of-response training task	Working Memory	Home	Dose: 2.5 h Session: 15 min Frequency: ? Weeks: 2	Low
Vilou 2020[56]	47 (CCT: 23; Control: 24)	85	35.70	Mild	Multiple sclerosis	CCT: BrainHQ Control: Treatment as usual (TAU)	Multidomain	Home	Dose: 8 h Session: 40 min Frequency: 2 Weeks: 6	Low
Wanmaker 2015[78]	75 (CCT: 36; Control: 39)	49	47.03	Mild	MDD	CCT: In-house program (EG) Control: Non-adaptive working memory training (PG)	Working memory	Home	Dose: 10 h Session: 25 min Frequency: 6 Weeks: 4	Some concerns

Abbreviations: CCT = computerized cognitive training. MDD = major depressive disorder. MCI = mild cognitive impairment. NR = not reported.
[a] Sample size used in analysis
[b] Weighted mean age for CCT and control groups
[c] Clinical populations specified in original studies
[d] Mean sample size for cognitive outcomes
[e] Sample size for depressive symptoms outcome

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2: Results of meta-regressions

	Overall cognition				Depressive symptoms			
Moderator	**No. of studies (effect sizes)**	**Summary effect and test of moderators**			**No. of studies (effect sizes)**	**Summary effect and test of moderators**		
		Hedges' *g* (95% CI)	***t* (df)**	***P* value**		**Hedges' *g* (95% CI)**	***t* (df)**	***P* value**
Risk of bias[a]				***F*(2, 15.6) = 1.75, *P* = .21**				***F*(2, 12.6) = 0.67, *P* = .53**
Low	13 (132)	0.37 (0.19, 0.56)	4.57 (10.9)	<.001	10 (15)	0.23 (-0.05, 0.51)	1.92 (8.1)	.09
Some concerns	7 (75)	0.28 (0.02, 0.54)	2.70 (5.6)	.04	6 (9)	0.08 (-0.27, 0.44)	0.63 (4.7)	.56
High	12 (97)	0.18 (0.03, 0.32)	2.66 (9.8)	.02	13 (17)	0.29 (0.04, 0.55)	2.55 (10.3)	.03
Control type[a]				***F*(1, 24.8) = 0.003, *P* = .96**				***F*(1, 15) = 0.08, *P* = .79**
Active	18 (121)	0.28 (0.13, 0.43)	4.0 (15)	.001	19 (27)	0.22 (0.03, 0.41)	2.5 (16.0)	.02
Passive	14 (183)	0.27 (0.12, 0.43)	3.9 (12)	.002	10 (14)	0.26 (-0.03, 0.56)	2.0 (7.9)	.10
CCT dose, h				***F*(2, 15) = 4.77, *P* = .02**				***F*(2, 11.1) = 0.32, *P* = .73**
<12	13 (118)	0.14 (-0.02, 0.31)	1.88 (11.1)	.09	14 (23)	0.18 (-0.05, 0.41)	1.67 (12.3)	.12
≥12 – <24	11 (132)	0.31 (0.14, 0.48)	4.07 (9.2)	.003	8 (12)	0.31 (0.03, 0.59)	2.69 (6.0)	.04
≥24	7 (54)	0.46 (0.29, 0.63)	6.89 (5.4)	.001	6 (6)	0.26 (-0.29, 0.82)	1.27 (4.5)	.27
Session length				***F*(1, 25.9) = 2.04, *P* = .16**				***F*(1, 22.8) = 3.14, *P* = .09**
Up to 60 min	14 (126)	0.20 (0.01, 0.38)	2.35 (12.1)	.04	14 (23)	0.34 (0.14, 0.54)	3.7 (11.6)	.003
≥60 min	17 (178)	0.34 (0.23, 0.45)	6.37 (14.7)	<.001	14(18)	0.10 (-0.12, 0.32)	1.0 (11.3)	.34
Delivery				***F*(1, 15) = 0.55, *P* = .47**				***F*(1, 16.3) = 0.46, *P* = .51**
Supervised	22 (234)	0.25 (0.14, 0.36)	4.7 (19.3)	<.001	19 (26)	0.27 (0.06, 0.48)	2.7 (16.2)	.01
Home-based	9 (70)	0.34 (0.09, 0.59)	3.1 (7.6)	.02	9 (15)	0.17 (-0.08, 0.43)	1.6 (7.4)	.16
Frequency, d/wk				***F*(2, 13.2) = 0.38, *P* = .69**				***F*(2, 15.8) = 2.07, *P* = .16**
1-2	15 (119)	0.28 (0.14, 0.41)	4.4 (13.0)	<.001	10 (14)	0.18 (-0.12, 0.48)	1.4 (8.0)	.21
3	10 (128)	0.34 (0.07, 0.61)	2.9 (8.5)	.02	9 (12)	0.49 (0.10, 0.89)	2.9 (7.3)	.02
>3	6 (57)	0.19 (-0.09, 0.48)	1. 8 (4.7)	.13	9 (15)	0.10 (-0.09, 0.29)	1.3 (7.4)	.25
CCT type				***F*(1, 14.8) = 2.84, *P* = .07**				***F*(1, 22.6) = 0.47, *P* = .50**
Multidomain	22 (269)	0.33 (0.21, 0.45)	5.9 (19.3)	<.001	16 (21)	0.28 (0.06, 0.50)	2.7 (13.0)	.02
Single-domain	9 (35)	0.15 (-0.07, 0.37)	1.5 (7.6)	.16	12 (20)	0.18 (-0.06, 0.41)	1.7 (10.0)	.12
BL Depression				***F*(1, 25.1) = 1.6, *P* = .22**				***F*(1, 22.2) = 1.26, *P* = .28**
Mild	17 (179)	0.33 (0.17, 0.50)	4.61 (15.0)	<.001	15 (22)	0.16 (-0.05, 0.37)	1.66 (12.8)	.12
Mod-severe	14 (125)	0.21 (0.07, 0.34)	3.31 (11.9)	.006	13 (19)	0.32 (0.09, 0.56)	3.01 (10.4)	.01
Population				***F*(3, 4.34) = 3.19, *P* = 0.14**				***F*(3, 2.8) = 3.86, *P* = .16**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21254003; this version posted July 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

MDD	14 (152)	0.21 (0.06, 0.36)	3.01 (12.1)	.01	15 (24)	0.27 (0.05. 0.48)	2.70 (12.2)	.02
Mild	1 (7)	0.11 (-0.34, 0.56)			1 (1)	0.06 (-0.39, 0.50)		
Mod-severe	11 (89)	0.24 (0.04, 0.44)	2.71 (9.6)	.02	11 (16)	0.30 (0.01, 0.60)	2.34 (8.7)	.04
Remitted	2 (56)	0.18 (-2.76, 3.12)	0.78 (1.0)	.58	3 (7)	0.24 (-0.82, 1.31)	1.07 (1.8)	.41
MS	7 (54)	0.49 (0.23, 0.75)	4.69 (5.6)	.004	3 (3)	0.79 (-0.67, 2.25)	2.49 (1.9)	.14
PD	3 (19)	0.38 (-0.21, 0.97)	3.10 (1.8)	.10	3 (3)	-0.12 (-0.36, 0.11)	-2.50 (1.8)	.14
SCD/MCI	3 (48)	0.09 (-0.16, 0.33)	1.56 (2.0)	.27	3 (6)	0.19 (-1.03, 1.40)	0.67 (2.0)	.57
Mean age, y			***F*(2, 10.8) = 0.17, *P* = .84**				***F*(2, 10.0) = 0.19, *P* = .83**	
18 – ≤45	12 (71)	0.25 (0.05, 0.45)	2.80 (10.4)	.02	9 (14)	0.17 (-0.14, 0.49)	1.30 (7.1)	.23
>45 – <65	14 (198)	0.28 (0.12, 0.43)	3.91 (12.0)	.002	14 (20)	0.28 (0.07, 0.49)	2.86 (11.9)	.01
≥65	5 (35)	0.34 (0.04, 0.63)	3.27 (3.7)	.03	5 (7)	0.22 (-0.42, 0.85)	0.97 (3.7)	.39
Trial registration			***F*(1, 16.6) = 6.36, *P* = .02**				***F*(1, 24.2) = 0.01, *P* = .92**	
Registered	9 (75)	0.14 (0.02, 0.26)	2.6 (7.8)	.031	12 (21)	0.23 (0.02, 0.43)	2.5 (11)	.03
No registration	22 (229)	0.35 (0.21, 0.49)	5.3 (19.2)	<.001	16 (20)	0.24 (-0.02, 0.50)	2.0 (14)	.07

[a] Number of studies is greater than total number of studies as some studies with multiple eligible comparisons had comparisons in different subgroups

Abbreviations: BL = baseline. PD = Parkinson's disease. SCD = subjective cognitive decline.