

1 **Cognition-oriented treatments and physical exercise on cognitive
2 function in Huntington's disease: Protocol for systematic review**

3 Katharine Huynh^{a,b}, Leila Nategh^b, Sharna Jamadar^{a,c}, Nellie Georgiou-
4 Karistianis^a, Amit Lampit^b

5 ^a*School of Psychological Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences,
6 Turner Institute for Brain and Mental Health, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria,
7 Australia*

8 ^b*Academic Unit for Psychiatry of Old Age, Department of Psychiatry, The University of
9 Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia*

10 ^c*Monash Biomedical Imaging, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia*

11 Corresponding author: Katharine Huynh

12 Address: School of Psychological Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health
13 Sciences, Turner Institute for Brain and Mental Health, Monash University, 18
14 Innovation Walk, Clayton, VIC, 3800, Australia
15 E-mail: katharine.huynh@monash.edu

16 **Abstract**

17 **Introduction:** Cognitive impairments are prevalent in Huntington's disease (HD),
18 occurring many years prior to clinical diagnosis and are the most impactful on quality of
19 life of patients. Cognitive interventions and exercise have been found to be efficacious
20 in improving cognitive function in several clinical populations (e.g., older adults with
21 mild cognitive impairment and dementia). However, the utility of cognitive
22 interventions has not been systematically reviewed in HD. This systematic review aims
23 to examine the efficacy of cognitive and physical interventions on cognitive function in
24 HD.

25 **Methods:** Electronic databases (MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO, CENTRAL) were
26 searched through till 10 May 2021 for interventional studies investigating the effect of
27 cognition-oriented treatments and physical exercise on cognitive function in individuals
28 with HD, compared to any control or no control. The primary outcome is change on
29 objective measures of cognition. Additional outcomes include change in psychosocial,
30 functional and neuroimaging measures. Variations of effects based on population and
31 study factors will be considered. Risk of bias will be assessed using the Cochrane RoB
32 2 tool and ROBINS-I tool. Where appropriate, outcomes will be pooled using random-
33 effects meta-analyses, heterogeneity will be examined using tau² and I² statistics, and
34 moderators will be examined using meta-regression models.

35 **Discussion:** This review will systematically evaluate the efficacy of cognitive and
36 physical interventions on improving cognitive function in HD. The eligibility criteria
37 and planned analyses will allow for a comprehensive assessment of certainty in the
38 evidence that will inform future trials and clinical practice.

39 **Registration:** This protocol was registered on PROSPERO (CRD42021259152).

40 **Keywords:** systematic review; Huntington disease; cognition; cognitive intervention;

41 physical exercise

42 **Introduction**

43 *Rationale*

44 Huntington's disease (HD) is a genetically inherited neurodegenerative disease that
45 causes progressive motor, psychiatric and cognitive decline [1,2]. Although diagnosis is
46 based on motor symptoms, cognitive impairment is prevalent. In the pre-manifest phase
47 of HD (prior to onset of diagnosable motor symptoms), mild cognitive impairment is
48 reported in 40% of individuals [3], and this proportion increases to over 80% at the
49 onset of manifest disease (where motor symptoms are sufficient for clinical diagnosis)
50 [4]. Additionally, 5% of individuals are classified as having dementia at the stage of
51 diagnosis [4]. Although cognitive symptoms are reported to have the greatest impact on
52 quality of life beyond motor and psychiatric symptoms, there are no current
53 pharmacological treatments available to improve or maintain cognition in HD [1,5].

54 Non-pharmacological interventions, specifically physical exercise and
55 cognition-oriented treatments, have increasingly shown evidence of efficacy in
56 improving cognition in other populations. These populations include healthy older
57 adults [6-8], adults with mild cognitive impairment [6-9] and people with dementia
58 [7,10,11]. Furthermore, some evidence suggests that physical exercise and cognitive
59 interventions may affect cognition through different pathways, and multi-domain
60 interventions such as physical exercise combined with cognitive training may offer
61 greater benefits than single-domain interventions [12].

62 Existing reviews of the effects of non-pharmacological interventions such as
63 physical exercise [13], physical therapy [14] and art-based rehabilitation [15,16] on
64 cognitive function in HD have been largely inconclusive. This is partly attributed to
65 reviews including only randomized controlled trials, leading to only a few studies being
66 eligible for synthesis [13,15]. Further, the effect of cognitive interventions has been

67 largely unexplored in HD. To our knowledge, only one systematic review of cognitive
68 interventions in HD exists [17]. However, that review focused specifically on cognitive
69 rehabilitation, was conducted almost ten years ago, and included only one study in HD.
70 Finally, the effect of multi-domain interventions has not been assessed independently
71 from single domain interventions [14]. A comprehensive review of the effect of
72 cognitive, physical, and multi-domain interventions on cognitive function in HD,
73 including randomized and non-randomized studies, is therefore warranted.

74 ***Objectives***

75 The primary aim of the review is to evaluate whether cognition-oriented treatments and
76 physical exercise are associated with improved cognitive outcomes in individuals with
77 HD, compared to any control or no control. The secondary aims are to evaluate the
78 effects on psychosocial, functional and neuroimaging outcomes, and explore how these
79 associations vary across different factors, such as participant and intervention
80 characteristics.

81 **Materials and methods**

82 This protocol adheres to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and
83 Meta-analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) [18] and PRISMA 2020 guidelines [19]. The
84 PRISMA-P 2015 checklist is provided as Supplementary file 1. The protocol was
85 registered on PROSPERO on 15 July 2021 (registration number CRD42021259152).
86 Important protocol amendments will be documented in the PROSPERO registry, and
87 divergences from the protocol will be described in the final published review paper.

88 ***Eligibility criteria***

89 Studies fulfilling the following criteria are eligible.

90 *Study design*

91 Interventional studies including randomised controlled trials, quasi-experimental
92 studies, pre-post studies with single group and interventional cohort studies will be
93 considered. Case-control studies, cross-sectional studies and case studies will be
94 excluded.

95 *Participants*

96 Studies including participants aged 18 or above, with clinically diagnosed manifest or
97 pre-manifest HD are eligible. Studies that include other subgroups of participants are
98 also eligible, but the review will only consider the subgroup with HD. Studies with
99 participants aged below 18 will be excluded.

100 *Interventions*

101 Studies assessing physical exercise or cognition-oriented treatment, either alone,
102 combined with each other, or with other non-pharmacological interventions, will be
103 considered. The intervention must include a minimum of 3 hours of physical exercise or
104 cognition-oriented treatment, either independently or combined with each other.

105 Additionally, for interventions combining physical or cognitive interventions with other
106 non-pharmacological interventions, the physical exercise and cognitive intervention
107 components must constitute at least 50% of the total intervention. Physical exercise is
108 defined as a structured activity that can improve endurance, strength, balance, or any
109 combination of these aspects. This includes walking, cycling, resistance training,
110 balance training, and mind-body exercises. Cognition-oriented treatments are defined as
111 enhancing, restorative or compensatory interventions that aim to improve cognitive
112 performance or reduce specific impairments. This includes cognitive stimulation,
113 cognitive training, and cognitive rehabilitation [7]. Social prescribing interventions that

114 do not provide an intervention will be excluded.

115 *Comparators*

116 Studies with any type of control group, including standard care, waitlist, no contact, or
117 active control groups are eligible. Studies without control groups are also eligible.
118 Control groups comprised of people without HD will be excluded.

119 *Outcomes*

120 Studies are eligible if they report change in objective measures of cognition (global or
121 domain-specific) from baseline to post-intervention. Additional outcomes of interest
122 include change in measures of psychosocial well-being (e.g., mood and quality of life),
123 daily function (e.g., functional independence), and neuroimaging outcomes (e.g., brain
124 volumes).

125 *Other characteristics*

126 No limits will be placed on year of publication, language, or country of publication.

127 *Information sources*

128 Electronic databases (MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO, CENTRAL) were searched for
129 eligible studies through 10 May 2021. Additional sources of grey literature included
130 clinical trial registries via the WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform
131 (searched on 4 June 2021), theses databases (ProQuest and EThOS; searched on 4 June
132 2021) and key conferences or meetings (Huntington Study Group, Huntington's Disease
133 Society of America, European Huntington's Disease Network; searched on 6 June
134 2021). Reference lists of included articles and previous reviews will also be searched
135 for additional articles. In instances where otherwise eligible studies are missing required

136 outcome data, contact with authors will be attempted.

137 ***Search strategy***

138 The search strategy for MEDLINE is presented in Table 1. The search strategies for all
 139 databases, registries and websites are presented in Supplementary file 2. Search results
 140 were collated, and records were uploaded to an EndNote library. Duplicates were
 141 removed using EndNote and manual searching. Remaining records were uploaded to
 142 Covidence for screening.

143 Table 1. Search strategy for MEDLINE.

1	huntington\$.mp. or Huntington disease/
2	rehabilitation.mp. or exp Rehabilitation/
3	training.mp.
4	(cognitive adj1 (intervention or therapy or treatment or remediation or stimulation)).mp.
5	neurorehabilitation.mp.
6	neurofeedback.mp. or neurofeedback/
7	(exergam\$ or game\$ or gaming or Wii or virtual reality).mp. or Video Games/
8	exercise\$.mp. or exp Exercise/
9	(physical adj2 (intervention or therapy or treatment)).mp.
10	(motor adj2 (intervention or therapy or treatment)).mp.
11	physiotherapy.mp. or exp Physical Therapy Modalities/
12	(mind-body or mind body).mp.
13	tai chi.mp. or tai ji/
14	yoga/ or yoga.mp.
15	danc\$.mp. or Dancing/
16	multi?domain.mp.
17	multi?disciplinary.mp.
18	or/2-17
19	1 and 18

144 ***Selection process***

145 Screening based on title and abstracts, and full-text screening against eligibility criteria
146 will be conducted independently by two reviewers. Disagreements at each stage will be
147 resolved by consensus or a third reviewer.

148 ***Data collection process***

149 Data will be extracted to an Excel spreadsheet in duplicate by two reviewers.
150 Disagreements will be resolved by consensus or resolved by a third reviewer. If data is
151 missing or unclear, authors will be contacted to obtain data.

152 ***Data items***

153 ***Outcomes***

154 The primary outcome is change in an objective measure of cognition (either global or
155 domain-specific). Secondary outcomes include change in measures of psychosocial
156 well-being (e.g., mood, depression, anxiety, quality of life), daily function (e.g.,
157 functional independence), and neuroimaging outcomes (e.g., total brain volume, caudate
158 and putamen volumes, network connectivity).

159 Outcomes will be extracted for both experimental and control groups (if
160 applicable). If multiple measures of an outcome are reported (e.g., multiple measures of
161 working memory capacity), all eligible data will be extracted. If data is reported for
162 multiple time points, we will extract data from pre-intervention to first post-intervention
163 timepoints. If results from multiple analyses are available, data from intention-to-treat
164 analyses will be preferred.

165 *Other variables*

166 The following information will also be extracted:

- 167 • Study information: Author, year of publication, study setting, study design
- 168 • Population: Mean age, percent male, mean CAG repeat length, mean disease
- 169 burden score, disease stage (percent premanifest), disease duration (if
- 170 applicable), mean United Huntington's Disease Rating Scale total motor score
- 171 • Intervention: Type of intervention, intervention content, delivery format,
- 172 supervision, session frequency (sessions/week), session length (minutes), total
- 173 number of sessions, number of weeks, total duration of intervention (hours)
- 174 • Comparator (if applicable): Type of control, control activity
- 175 • Other information: Funding sources, conflicts of interest

176 If information is missing or unclear following attempts to contact authors, the
177 study will be left out of relevant analyses (e.g., examining effects of specific study
178 population or intervention characteristics).

179 ***Study risk of bias assessment***

180 Risk of bias will be assessed separately for each relevant outcome in each study using
181 the Cochrane RoB 2 tool for randomised controlled trials [20] and ROBINS-I tool for
182 non-randomised studies [21].

183 The RoB 2 tool considers:

- 184 (1) Bias arising from the randomisation process
- 185 (2) Bias due to deviations from intended interventions
- 186 (3) Bias due to missing outcome data
- 187 (4) Bias in measurement of the outcome

188 (5) Bias in selection of the reported result

189 (6) Overall bias

190 The ROBINS-I tool considers:

191 (1) Bias due to confounding

192 (2) Bias in selection of participants into the study

193 (3) Bias in classification of interventions

194 (4) Bias due to deviations from intended interventions

195 (5) Bias due to missing data

196 (6) Bias in measurement of outcomes

197 (7) Bias in selection of the reported result

198 (8) Overall bias

199 Risk of bias assessments will be conducted independently by two reviewers.

200 Disagreements between the reviewers will be resolved by discussion, with involvement

201 of a third review author where necessary. Study authors will be contacted if reports do

202 not provide sufficient details to determine risk of bias.

203 Risk of bias information will be used when considering heterogeneity (if

204 applicable) between study results, and in determining confidence in the body of

205 evidence for each outcome.

206 ***Effect measures***

207 For each outcome, continuous data will be extracted as means and standard deviation.

208 Dichotomous (events) data will be extracted as number of individuals who did and did

209 not experience event in each group. If data is not in the desired format, data in other

210 formats (e.g., effect sizes and confidence intervals) will be extracted and converted prior

211 to synthesis of results.

212 ***Synthesis methods***

213 Studies will be grouped based on study design (randomised controlled trials separated
214 from non-randomised studies), type of intervention and outcome. Studies with the same
215 design, intervention and outcome will be synthesised together.

216 For continuous data, effects will be reported as standardised mean difference
217 with 95% CI due to expected variability in the measures used across studies. For
218 dichotomous data, effects will be reported as odds ratios or risk ratios.

219 Characteristics of all included studies will be presented in a summary table.

220 Findings from syntheses will be reported in text, structured based on priority of
221 outcomes (cognitive outcomes followed by additional outcomes), followed by type of
222 intervention, and then study design (randomised controlled trials followed by non-
223 randomised studies). Study results from each synthesis will be presented in summary
224 tables, and forest plots will be included where meta-analysis is conducted.

225 Where at least 3 studies are available in a group (with the same design, type of
226 intervention and outcome), results will be pooled using a multivariate random-effects
227 meta-analysis to account for non-independence of effect sizes within studies [22,23].

228 Analyses will be conducted using the packages metafor, metaSEM, robumeta and
229 clubSandwich for R.

230 Heterogeneity will be assessed using both the τ^2 and the I^2 statistics. If there is
231 significant heterogeneity, we will use meta-regressions to explore heterogeneity in
232 effect estimates according to risk of bias, study population and intervention
233 characteristics [24].

234 Sensitivity analyses will be performed by removing studies at higher risk of bias
235 and recalculating the pooled estimate, and additionally by comparing results from
236 multilevel and robust variance estimation models.

237 If meta-analysis is not possible, findings will be synthesised narratively and
238 similarly structured based on study design, type of intervention and outcome. Synthesis
239 will similarly consider heterogeneity and causes of heterogeneity, including risk of bias,
240 population and intervention characteristics.

241 ***Reporting bias assessment***

242 Evidence of small-study effect will be assessed by inspecting funnel plots of effect size
243 versus standard error for each outcome [25]. Where there are at least 10 studies, we will
244 use formal statistical methods to tests for small-study effects. If summary estimates are
245 in the form of standardized mean differences, we will use Egger's test [26]. If summary
246 estimates are in the form of odds ratio, we will use the tests proposed by Peters, Sutton
247 [27] and Rücker, Schwarzer [28] when there is low between-study heterogeneity ($\tau^2 <$
248 0.1) and substantial between-study heterogeneity ($\tau^2 > 0.1$), respectively. Where there
249 are less than 10 studies, we will remove outliers and recalculate pooled effect sizes after
250 their removal.

251 ***Certainty assessment***

252 Confidence in the body of evidence for each outcome will consider the risk of bias,
253 heterogeneity, indirectness, imprecision, and evidence of small-study effects (including
254 publication and reporting biases).

255 ***Discussion***

256 Cognitive impairments are prevalent in individuals with HD and greatly impact quality

257 of life, but no effective pharmacological treatments are currently available [4,5]. This
258 review will systematically evaluate the efficacy of cognition-oriented treatments and
259 physical exercise on cognitive function in HD, as there is accumulating evidence of
260 efficacy in other clinical populations. The eligibility criteria allow for the inclusion of
261 randomized and non-randomized studies, and studies that include any control or no
262 control, given the rarity of the disease and the small number of anticipated studies. The
263 planned analyses will also examine the influence of risk of bias, study population, and
264 intervention characteristics, to provide a comprehensive assessment of certainty in the
265 evidence, and to inform future trials and clinical practice.

266 **Funding details**

267 No funding was acquired for this manuscript. Jamadar is supported by an Australian
268 National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Fellowship (APP1174164).

269 **Declaration of interest statement**

270 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

271 **Data availability statement**

272 Data sharing is not applicable to this manuscript as no new data were created or
273 analyzed.

274 **Contributions**

275 KH led the design of the review and the drafting of the manuscript, LN edited the draft
276 manuscript, SJ edited the draft manuscript, NGK contributed to the design of the review
277 and edited the draft manuscript, AL contributed to the design of the review and edited
278 the draft manuscript.

279 **References**

- 280 1. McColgan P, Tabrizi SJ. Huntington's disease: a clinical review. *Eur J Neurol.*
281 2018;25(1):24-34.
- 282 2. Ross CA, Aylward EH, Wild EJ, et al. Huntington disease: natural history,
283 biomarkers and prospects for therapeutics. *Nat Rev Neurol.* 2014;10(4):204-216.
- 284 3. Duff K, Paulsen J, Mills J, et al. Mild cognitive impairment in prediagnosed
285 Huntington disease. *Neurology.* 2010;75(6):500.
- 286 4. Julayanont P, McFarland NR, Heilman KM. Mild cognitive impairment and
287 dementia in motor manifest Huntington's disease: Classification and prevalence.
288 *J Neurol Sci.* 2020;408:116523.
- 289 5. Simpson JA, Lovecky D, Kogan J, et al. Survey of the Huntington's disease
290 patient and caregiver community reveals most impactful symptoms and
291 treatment needs. *Journal of Huntington's Disease.* 2016;15(4):395-403.
- 292 6. Whitty E, Mansour H, Aguirre E, et al. Efficacy of lifestyle and psychosocial
293 interventions in reducing cognitive decline in older people: Systematic review.
294 *Ageing Res Rev.* 2020;62(1872-9649 (Electronic)):101113.
- 295 7. Gavelin HM, Lampit A, Hallock H, et al. Cognition-oriented treatments for
296 older adults: a systematic overview of systematic reviews. *Neuropsychol Rev.*
297 2020;30(2):167-193.
- 298 8. Northey JM, Cherbuin N, Pumpa KL, et al. Exercise interventions for cognitive
299 function in adults older than 50: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Br J*
300 *Sports Med.* 2018;52(3):154.
- 301 9. Song D, Yu DSF, Li PWC, et al. The effectiveness of physical exercise on
302 cognitive and psychological outcomes in individuals with mild cognitive
303 impairment: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Nurs Stud.*
304 2018;79:155-164.
- 305 10. McDermott O, Charlesworth G, Hogervorst E, et al. Psychosocial interventions
306 for people with dementia: a synthesis of systematic reviews. *Aging Ment Health.*
307 2019;23(4):393-403.
- 308 11. Law C-K, Lam FMH, Chung RCK, et al. Physical exercise attenuates cognitive
309 decline and reduces behavioural problems in people with mild cognitive
310 impairment and dementia: a systematic review. *J Physiother.* 2020;66(1):9-18.

- 311 12. Gavelin HM, Dong C, Minkov R, et al. Combined physical and cognitive
312 training for older adults with and without cognitive impairment: A systematic
313 review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Ageing Res
314 Rev. 2021;66:101232.
- 315 13. Dauwan MA-O, Begemann MJH, Slot MIE, et al. Physical exercise improves
316 quality of life, depressive symptoms, and cognition across chronic brain
317 disorders: a transdiagnostic systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized
318 controlled trials. J Neurol. 2019;268(4):1222-1246.
- 319 14. Fritz NE, Rao AK, Kegelmeyer D, et al. Physical therapy and exercise
320 interventions in Huntington's Disease: a mixed methods systematic review. J
321 Huntingtons Dis. 2017;6:217-235.
- 322 15. Yu M, Bega D. A review of the clinical evidence for complementary and
323 alternative medicine in Huntington's disease. Tremor Other Hyperkinet Mov (N
324 Y). 2019;9:10.7916/tohm.v0.678.
- 325 16. Schwartz AE, van Walsem MR, Brean A, et al. Therapeutic use of music, dance,
326 and rhythmic auditory cueing for patients with Huntington's disease: A
327 systematic review. J Huntingtons Dis. 2019;8(4):393-420.
- 328 17. Langenbahn DM, Ashman T, Cantor J, et al. An evidence-based review of
329 cognitive rehabilitation in medical conditions affecting cognitive function. Arch
330 Phys Med Rehabil. 2013;94(2):271-286.
- 331 18. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic
332 review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Syst Rev.
333 2015;4(1):1.
- 334 19. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an
335 updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372:n71.
- 336 20. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of
337 bias in randomised trials. BMJ. 2019;366:l4898.
- 338 21. Sterne JAC, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk
339 of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. BMJ. 2016;355:i4919.
- 340 22. Cheung MWL. A guide to conducting a meta-analysis with non-independent
341 effect sizes. Neuropsychol Rev. 2019;29(4):387-396.
- 342 23. Hedges LV, Tipton E, Johnson MC. Robust variance estimation in meta-
343 regression with dependent effect size estimates. Res Synth Methods.
344 2010;1(1):39-65.

- 345 24. Hedges LV, Pigott TD. The power of statistical tests in meta-analysis. *Psychol*
346 *Methods*. 2001;6(3):203-217.
- 347 25. Sterne JAC, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JPA, et al. Recommendations for examining
348 and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised
349 controlled trials. *BMJ*. 2011;343:d4002.
- 350 26. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, et al. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a
351 simple, graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997;315(7109):629.
- 352 27. Peters JL, Sutton AJ, Jones DR, et al. Comparison of two methods to detect
353 publication bias in meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2006;295(6):676-680.
- 354 28. Rücker G, Schwarzer G, Carpenter J. Arcsine test for publication bias in meta-
355 analyses with binary outcomes. *Stat Med*. 2008;27(5):746-763.