medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Social health and change in cognitive capability among older adults: findings from four European longitudinal studies.

Jane Maddock[1], Federico Gallo[2,3], Frank J Wolters[4,5], Jean Stafford[1], Anna Marseglia[6], Serhiy Dekhtyar[2], Marta Lenart-Bugla[7], Eline Verspoor[8], Marieke Perry[8], Suraj Samtani[9], Myrra Vernooij-Dassen[10], Karin Wolf-Ostermann[11,12], Rene Melis[8], Henry Brodaty[9], Mohammad Arfan Ikram[4], Anna-Karin Welmer [2,13,14], Daniel Davis[1], George B Ploubidis[15], Marcus Richards[1], Praveetha Patalay[1,15]

[1] MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL, Faculty of Population Health, University College London.

[2] Aging Research Center, Department of Neurobiology, Care Sciences and Society, Karolinska Institutet, and Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden.

[3] Centre for Cognition and Decision Making, Institute for Cognitive Neuroscience, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russian Federation.

[4] Department of Epidemiology, Erasmus MC Rotterdam, Netherlands.

[5] Department of Radiology & Nuclear Medicine, Erasmus MC Rotterdam, Netherlands.

[6] Division of Clinical Geriatrics, Center for Alzheimer Research, Department of Neurobiology, Care Sciences and Society, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden.

[7] Department of Psychiatry, Wroclaw Medical University, Wroclaw, Poland

[8] Department of Geriatric Medicine, Radboud Institute for Health Sciences, Radboud University Medical Center Nijmegen, The Netherlands

[9] Centre for Healthy Brain Ageing, Discipline of Psychiatry and Mental Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney

[10] Scientific Center for Quality of Healthcare (IQ healthcare). Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

[11] Institute for Public Health and Nursing Research, University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany.

[12] Leibniz ScienceCampus Digital Public Health, Bremen, Germany.

[13] Division of Physiotherapy, Department of Neurobiology, Care Sciences and Society, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden.

[14] Women´s Health and Allied Health Professionals Theme, Medical Unit Medical Psychology, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden

[15] Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education, University College London, London, UK.

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/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

***Corresponding author**:

Jane Maddock

MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL,

1-19 Torrington Place,

London, WC1E 7HB

Tel: +44 (0)20 7670 5700

Email: jane.maddock@ucl.ac.uk

Keywords: social support; social network; cognition; longitudinal; cohort

ABSTRACT

We examined associations between structural and functional aspects of social health, and subsequent trajectories of cognitive capability (memory, executive functioning, and processing speed).

Using data from 16,858 participants (mean age 65.8 years; 56% female) from the National Survey for Health and Development (NSHD), the English Longitudinal Study of Aging (ELSA), the Swedish National Study on Aging and Care in Kungsholmen (SNAC-K), and the Rotterdam Study, we applied multilevel models to examine social health in relation to cognitive capability and the rate of cognitive decline.

Those who were married/cohabiting scored 0.07SD (95%CI:0.00,0.14; heterogeneity I^2=79%) higher on executive functioning compared to those who lived alone. Associations with memory and processing speed were also heterogeneous (I^2>75%); for example, being married was associated with better memory in ELSA (0.05SD 95%CI:0.02,0.08) and SNAC-K (0.13SD 95%CI:0.06,0.20) but not in NSHD nor Rotterdam. Those with larger network sizes (≥6 people) scored higher on executive functioning and processing speed tests, whereas those with frequent social contacts performed better on executive functioning tasks only. Higher participation in social activities and greater perceived positive/less negative social support were associated with higher scores on all cognitive domains. Associations between social health and the rate of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

cognitive decline varied by social health marker, cognitive domain and study; generally, better social health was associated with a slowing of decline (<0.02 SD/year).

Various measures of social health are related to cognitive capability in different ways. These findings may guide future studies to determine if promoting social health at old age may deter cognitive decline.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 capability, the capacity to undertake the mental tasks of daily living, is an important aspect of healthy ageing [1–3]. Numerous factors across the life course can affect cognitive capability and its decline [4–7]. Social health, a concept covering a range of individual and environmental social markers such as social participation and appraisal of social environment, are among these life course factors [8].

Researchers have theorised that markers of social health can influence cognition through a combination of physiological, psychological, or behavioural pathways. For example, participating in social activities involves cognitive and mental stimulation [9]. Positive aspects of social support may act as a buffer against stress, which itself can impair cognition [10,11]. Further, health-related behaviours can be influenced by the normative behaviours of a social network, a phenomenon known as the social control theory [10].

There is empirical evidence that markers of social health contribute to cognitive capability, the rate of cognitive decline and risk of dementia [12–17]. A systematic review highlighting the complexities of associations between social health and cognition [12] reported that social activity, larger social networks, and greater social support were associated with greater global cognitive capability, with mixed findings for domain-specific cognitive abilities and less evidence for associations with cognitive decline. Further systematic reviews and meta-analyses focusing on cognitive decline found that poor social relationships (for example, small social network size, low social engagement, and loneliness) were associated with faster rates of decline, but there was heterogeneity between the studies and evidence for publication bias [14,17].

It is difficult to ascertain the exact nature of the association between social health and cognitive capability for several reasons. First, the term social health refers to a multitude of markers that have been variously defined, operationalised, assessed, and analysed. Second, cognitive capability has often been examined as a composite measure in relation to markers of social health, and differential effects between specific cognitive domains (e.g. memory, processing speed) observed in some previous studies are worth exploring [12,18] Third, heterogeneity in findings may be attributed to different statistical approaches implemented by previous studies as well as cultural and geographical diversity between studies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

The current study sought to overcome some of these challenges by using a clear framework to operationalise markers of social health and applying co-ordinated analyses across four large European longitudinal studies. We examine both specific cognitive domains (memory, executive function, and processing speed) and global or composite cognitive function where possible. Our overall aim was to examine whether social health markers measured at baseline are associated with differences in cognitive capability and in the rate of cognitive decline over an 11-to-18-year period among older adults.

METHODS

Participants

Participants from this study came from four European population-based longitudinal studies located in the UK, Sweden and the Netherlands: The National Survey of Health and Development (NSHD) [21] and The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) [22] in the UK, The Swedish National Study on Aging and Care-Kungsholmen (SNAC-K) [23] in Sweden and The Rotterdam Study [24] in the Netherlands. Detailed information about these studies including ethical approval and data accessibility is provided in Supplementary File 1. Briefly, NSHD is a British birth cohort where participants of the same age have been followed up 24 times since birth in 1946. Cognitive capability was measured in 1999, 2006-2010, and 2014-2015 when participants were aged 53, 60-64, and 68-69 years. ELSA is a study of adults aged 50 years and over living in private households in England. The original sample was contacted in 2002-2003 and participants are followed up every 2 years. Cognitive capability was measured in waves 1 to 9. SNAC-K is a study of people aged 60 years and older living at home or in nursing homes in Kungsholmen (central Stockholm). Baseline assessment took place between 2001 and 2004. Those aged between 60 and 72 years were followed every six years, and those aged 78 years and older every three years, up until a maximum follow-up period of 12 years. The Rotterdam Study is a study of adults aged 45 years or older that began in 1990-1993. Participants are followed up every four years. For each of these studies, our analytical sample consisted of participants with information on at least one social relationship variable at baseline, and cognitive capability from at least two time points in one domain. Participants with dementia at baseline and those with missing covariate data (<9%) were excluded (see Supplementary file 1). Table 1 outlines the analytical sample size for each study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

Measures

We briefly describe variables used in analyses in the following sections. We harmonised variables across studies as much as possible. Full details of the questions and coding used within each study are in Supplementary File 1. Note that some studies did not include every outcome and exposure of interest (Table 1).

Social health: structural and functional markers

We distinguish between structural and functional social health markers based primarily on work from Vernooij-Dassen and colleagues [8], complemented by the social networks model by Berkman, and social health domains identified by Huber [19,20]. Structural characteristics represent the structure of the social network itself in determining opportunities by which the social network can influence health (e.g., marital status, social network size, and contact frequency). Functional characteristics denote the function of the social network structure (e.g., social engagement and social support). Structural social health markers at baseline included: marital or cohabitation status (married or cohabiting vs. unmarried and alone); social network size (1-2 people, 3-6 people or ≥6 people vs. none); contact frequency (more than once a year, about once to twice a month, weekly or more than twice a month, at least two to three times per week vs. never or almost never). Interactional social relationship variables included: participation in social activities (moderate or high vs. low); perceived positive support (coded as a standardised score and categorised as -1SD to 0SD, 0 to 1SD and >1SD vs. <-1SD); and perceived negative support (coded as a standardised score and categorized as -1SD to 0SD, 0 to 1SD and >1SD vs. <-1SD). We categorised the standardised scores for support as positive support in the Rotterdam Study and SNAC-K had a skewed distribution (Table 1).

Cognitive capabilities

We included three tests of cognitive capability that were similarly measured across studies. Memory was assessed in all cohorts using an immediate word list recall. Executive function was assessed in ELSA, SNAC-K and the Rotterdam Study using a test of semantic verbal fluency. Processing speed was assessed in NSHD and ELSA using a letter cancellation task and in SNAC-K using a digit cancellation task. We standardised each test across time-points and within studies on a common standard deviation (SD)-based scale. This enhances comparability of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

estimates between studies while allowing examination of changes over time within studies. Total follow-up time in each study ranged between 11 to 18 years (Supplementary table 1 provides detailed follow-up time for each cognitive outcome within each study). Study-specific global or composite cognitive scores were constructed for sensitivity analyses (full details in supplementary table 1).

Confounders

Confounders measured at baseline were: sex (female vs. male); social class (non-manual vs. manual occupation); education (secondary or higher vs. lower); impairment in Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL; at least one vs. none); and vascular-related health conditions excluding hypertension, e.g., diabetes, stroke, heart disease. We consider mental health to be a potential mediator and therefore have not included it in our main models, however we adjust for standardised mental health scores in sensitivity analyses. For details of mental health measurement in each study, see Supplementary File 1.

Analyses

Within each study, change in each cognitive domain and each individual social health marker were modelled using linear mixed-effects models with random intercepts and slopes and time centered on baseline date and coded as years. This method accounts for within-person correlation between repeated cognitive scores over time. We used two main approaches when applying these linear mixed-effects models. First, we included the social health marker and time in the model and interpreted the coefficient for social health as the association with levels of cognitive capability on average over time, hereinafter referred to as ‘average cognitive capability’. Second, we included an interaction term between the social health marker and time and interpreted the coefficient as association with rate of cognitive decline.

We applied three levels of adjustment to the specified linear mixed-effects models. After estimating associations adjusted for sex and age at baseline, we adjusted first for socio-demographic information (social class and education) and second for health-related information at baseline (IADL and vascular-related health conditions). We decided to use three levels of adjustment as the identity of key confounding variables remains uncertain. We also wanted to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

explicitly demonstrate the effect of health-related information above socio-demographic information on the observed associations.

It is plausible that associations between social health and cognitive capability might vary by sex [25,26], therefore each model was repeated stratifying by sex.

Within-study analyses were conducted using Stata. Overall and stratified results from each study were pooled using random effects meta-analysis with restricted maximum likelihood (*meta* command in Stata 17). Tests of sex-differences were performed using the subgroup option in the *meta* command in Stata 17. We report heterogeneity using the I^2 statistic, where 0% indicates estimates were similar across studies and values closer to 100% represent greater heterogeneity. Figures 1 and 3 were created using R.

Sensitivity analyses

In sensitivity analyses we examined if associations were robust to additional adjustment for depressive symptoms. We also repeated analyses with a global or composite measure of cognitive function.

RESULTS

Our analyses included 16,858 participants (mean age 65.8 years; 56% female) with a follow-up times ranging from 11 to 18 years across four studies (Table 1). Most participants came from a non-manual social class, particularly in SNAC-K (85%). The proportion of participants who were married or cohabiting was somewhat higher in the two UK studies (NSHD and ELSA) than in SNAC-K and Rotterdam Study, which included on average older participants. Most people had extensive social networks (>40% had more than six people in their network) and reported having high positive support (median ranged from 6 to 10 across studies where scales ranged from 0-9 and 0-10). A large proportion of SNAC-K participants (87%) had high levels of social participation. Markers of social health were weakly correlated within studies (ρ<0.03, supplementary file 2). Cognitive domains were moderately correlated within studies (r>0.3) except for memory and processing speed in NSHD, ELSA and SNAC-K (r<0.3, supplementary

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

file 2). We observed decline in all cognitive domains across all studies ranging from -0.02 to -0.06 SD per year (Table 1).

[Table 1 about here]

Results for the linear mixed-effects models are discussed in the following sections. We organise results by structural or functional social health makers. Within each subsection we report results first for average cognitive capability and then rate of cognitive decline. We primarily state the pooled estimate and then highlight study-specific results as appropriate. We focus on the fully adjusted models as we did not observe large differences in results between different adjustment models (Figure 1, Supplementary file 2). We did not observe many sex-differences in the results (Supplementary file 2) therefore only discuss any observed sex differences in the below sections.

Structural social health variables and cognitive capability

Figure 1 shows the study-specific and pooled estimates for structural social health variables and average cognitive capability for each level of adjustment (see supplementary file 2 for this information in table format). Figure 2 presents study specific, fully adjusted models of structural social health variables and rate of decline in each cognitive domain (see supplementary file 2 for this information in a forest plot).

Marital or cohabitation status

The fully adjusted random effects meta-analysis showed that those who were married or cohabiting scored 0.07 SD (95% CI: 0.00 to 0.14) higher on executive function on average. Confidence intervals of pooled estimates from the other cognitive domains crossed the null (Figure 1, supplementary file 2), but with substantial heterogeneity for all three cognitive domains ($I^2 \geq 74\%$ in fully adjusted models, Figure 1). Estimates from SNAC-K showed clear associations between being married or cohabiting and scoring higher on all three cognitive domains on average. Similarly, participants who were married or cohabiting at baseline in ELSA scored higher on memory and executive function but not processing speed (Figure 1). This pattern was not observed in the Rotterdam Study or NSHD.

In the sex-stratified analyses, we observed stronger associations between being married or cohabiting with higher scores across all cognitive domains on average among males than among females (Supplementary file 2). For example, compared with unmarried males, married or

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

cohabiting males scored 0.12 SD (95% CI: 0.04 to 0.20) higher on tests of executive function on average. The estimate for females was 0.05 SD (95% CI: -0.02 to 0.11). However, the formal tests for subgroup difference among the pooled estimates were not statistically significant ($p \geq 0.05$).

Those who were married or cohabiting at baseline had a slower rate of decline in all three cognitive domains, although the effect size across all cognitive domains was small (e.g., 0.01SD/year 95%CI: 0.00 to 0.01). These estimates were fairly consistent for executive function and processing speed (I^2<30%), but heterogenous for memory (I^2=76%). (Figure 2, Supplementary file 2).

Social network size

Overall, having a larger network size (≥6 people vs. none) was associated with higher average scores on executive function and processing speed across all studies with available data (0.17 SD [95%CI: 0.00 to 0.34], I^2=27%; and 0.12 SD [95% CI: 0.01 to 0.23], I^2=0%) respectively, Figure 1 and Supplementary file 2).

Having a larger network size was associated with a slower rate of decline in memory and processing speed, but effect estimates were again small (e.g., 0.01 SD/year [95% CI: 0.00 to 0.03], I^2<0.18% for ≥6 people vs. none) (Figure 2).

Social contact frequency

Frequent social contact (all categories vs never or almost never) was associated with higher scores on executive function on average (e.g., 0.32 SD [95%CI: 0.16 to 0.49], I^2=0%, Figure 1, Supplementary file 2) but not with memory or processing speed (0.04 SD [95% CI: -0.21 to 0.28], I^2=51%; 0.12 SD [95%CI:-0.08 to 0.31], I^2=0%>).

We did not observe associations between contact frequency and the rate of decline in any of the cognitive domains (Figure 2; Supplementary file 2).

Functional social health variables and change in cognitive capability

Figure 3 shows the pooled estimates for function social health variables and average cognitive capability for each level of adjustment (see Supplementary file 2 for this information in table format). Figure 4 presents study specific, fully adjusted models of functional social health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

variables and decline in each cognitive domain (see Supplementary file 2 for this information in a forest plot).

Social participation

Participation in social activities was consistently associated with higher average cognitive capability across all three cognitive domains. For example, participating in four or more activities was associated with 0.32 SD (95%CI: 0.28 to 0.35, I^2=0%) higher memory scores on average over time. Those who reported participating in more activities at baseline had a slightly slower rate of decline in memory and executive function (0.01 SD/year [95% CI: 0.01 to 0.02] for both), but not processing speed.

Positive social support

Compared with participants who reported having low levels of positive social support (i.e., <-1 SD), those in the middle of the distribution (between -1SD to 1SD) had higher average cognitive capability (figure 2, supplementary file 2). Contrary to these results, individuals reporting high levels of positive support (>1SD vs. <-1SD) did not score higher on any cognitive domain, due in particular to lower cognitive scores in participants reporting high levels of positive support in SNAC-K. We did not observe associations between positive social support and decline in any cognitive domain.

Negative social support

Only the UK studies (ELSA and NSHD) had information about perceived negative aspects of social support. Compared to participants who reported having higher negative social support (i.e., <-1 SD), those in the middle of the distribution (between –1 SD to 1 SD) scored higher on memory and executive function on average over time (e.g., 0.16 SD [95% CI: 0.12 to 0.19], I^2=0.02%; 0.14 [95%CI: 0.09 to 0.19], I^2=ELSA only). Those reporting low levels of negative social support (>1SD) did not have higher average cognitive capability. We did not observe associations between negative social support and decline in any cognitive domain.

Sensitivity analyses:

Overall, additional adjustment for depressive symptoms slightly attenuated estimates but did not change general interpretation (Supplementary file 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

Estimates for the global or composite measures of cognitive capability were of a similar magnitude as the domain-specific estimates (Supplementary file 2). Being married or cohabiting was associated with 0.07 SD (95% CI: 0.01 to 0.15, I^2=81%) higher average composite or global score and slower rate of decline (0.01 SD/year [95% CI: 0.00, 0.02], I^2=84%) decline per year), with the average association being stronger for males (0.15 SD [95%CI: 0.06 to 0.25]) than for females (0.03 SD [95%CI:-0.05 to 0.11]; *p*-value for subgroup difference=0.05). Having a larger network size (≥6 people vs. none) was associated with a 0.15 SD (95%CI: 0.05 0.24, I^2=0%) higher average composite or global score and a slower rate of decline (0.02 SD/year [95%CI: 0.01 to 0.03], I^2=0.2%). We observed no associations between frequency of contact and the composite or global score of cognitive capability. More frequent participation in social activities was associated with 0.37 SD (0.32 to 0.41, I^2=0.01%) higher average composite score and a slower rate of decline (0.01 SD /year [95%CI: 0.01 to 0.02], I^2=0.09%). Compared with participants who reported having low levels of *positive* social support or high levels of *negative* support, those in the middle of the distribution (between -1SD to 1SD) had a higher average composite or global score (e.g. 0.09 [95%CI: 0.05 to 1.12, I^2=0.2%] for positive support and 0.14 [95%CI: 0.09 to 0.18, I^2=0.01%] for negative support), but we did not observe associations with high positive support and low negative support, nor with rate of decline for either of the support measures.

DISCUSSION

We combined estimates from participants aged 50 years and older from four longitudinal European studies and, overall, found that markers of good social health were associated with higher average cognitive capability and slower rate of cognitive decline. However, associations varied across cohorts, exposure type and cognitive domains, and generally were larger for average cognitive capability than for the rate of decline.

Our findings are support conclusions from a previous systematic review suggesting distinct relationships between markers of social health and cognitive domains [12]. Findings for structural markers of social health (marital or cohabitation status, social network size, contact frequency) were mixed — all were associated with executive function, and network size was also associated with processing speed. We did not observe associations between structural markers of social health and memory. We did find associations between functional aspects of social health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

(social participation, positive and negative social support) across all cognitive domains (except for negative social support and processing speed). This result likely reflects distinct mechanisms underlying the associations between social health and cognitive capability. Active engagement and quality of interpersonal relationships are key components in our definition of functional aspects of social health. While engagement may be beneficial for cognitive capability through cognitive stimulation [27], positive interpersonal relationships may act as a buffer against stressful life events [10,11]. This implies that functional aspects of social health may affect different aspects of cognitive capability through several pathways.

Although we observed associations between marital or cohabitation status, network size and social participation with the rate of decline in cognitive capability, estimates were close to zero. Results from a previous systematic review and meta-analysis indicated that markers of poor structural and functional social health predicted 1.11 (95% CI: 1.08 to 1.14) and 1.12 (95% CI: 1.05 to 1.20) higher odds of cognitive decline respectively [28]. It should be noted that this meta-analysis used a binary measure representing the risk of developing cognitive impairment while we used continuous scores of cognitive capabilities measured across multiple time points. It is possible that, although the follow-up time in our study ranged from 11 to 18 years, it may take longer for many participants to experience the effect of social health on cognitive decline. Alternatively, certain social health markers may convey a protective effect on the baseline level of cognitive capability, namely by affecting its peak levels during the life course, but less on the rate of its decline. Researchers from the United States observed a similar association between education and initial levels of global cognition but not with the rate of cognitive change among older participants [29].

Two specific results require further discussion. First, a sex difference in the strength of the relationship between marital and cohabitation status and average cognitive capability has also been observed in some [30,31] but not all studies [32]. We can only speculate on the potential explanations for this sex difference. For example, a positive experience of partnership could provide emotional support and adoption of health-related behaviours for men, whereas females may have additional support systems to compensate for these attributes if they do not have a partner. Second, for both positive and negative aspects of social support, we observed non-linear relationships. Compared to those in the lower end of the distribution (<-1SD), those in the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

middle scored higher on cognitive tests but this effect attenuated for the higher part of the distribution (>1 SD). There are several potential explanations for this. There may be a threshold for the beneficial effects of social support on cognitive capability Alternativity, this could reflect reverse causality; participants with lower cognitive capability at baseline may already receive higher social support at baseline.

A major strength of our study was the inclusion of four European studies which resulted in a large sample size and the ability to examine replication of findings across datasets. We applied a single framework and coordinated analyses to multiple datasets, selected outcomes that were similarly measured across studies, and harmonised variables as far as possible. This approach has the advantage of reducing conceptual and analytical heterogeneity. Associations that are consistently observed across all studies support the existence of a true effect (or lack thereof). This approach also highlights the importance of not relying on single datasets. Where findings diverge between studies, further exploration of study-specific or context-specific consideration is needed, and caution is required when interpreting the overall pooled effect. However, there are limitations to our study. Assuming that attrition predominantly affected people with poor social health and poor cognition, this could have led to an underestimation of the relationships of interest. Despite our efforts to harmonise measures, some of the heterogeneity in findings between studies observed could be due to differences in the wording of social health questions, and differences in the distribution of social relationship variables. A consequence of harmonisation is that we sometimes restrict the comparison to information available across studies [33]. This reduces our ability to explore more nuanced markers of social health, for example the mode of social contact frequency. Importantly, while we examine social health markers at baseline and cognitive capability over a long follow-up, a bi-directional association between social health and cognitive capability cannot be ruled out and further studies examining the direction of this relationship are warranted. Finally, it is also important to note that since the majority of participants were western European, we cannot generalise the results to people of other cultures or ethnicities.

In conclusion, we provide evidence that markers of good social health have a positive association with cognitive capability in later life. However, we found differential associations between specific markers of social health and cognitive domains, and smaller estimates for longitudinal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

effects caution that findings may in part be attributable to reverse causation. Social contact is recognised as a key component in dementia prevention, intervention, and care [34]. Understanding the mechanisms through which markers of social health can affect cognitive capability is a key next step to identify effective policy-level interventions that target social health. As such, our findings may guide future studies to determine if promoting social health at old age may dealy cognitive decline.

Acknowledgements and declarations

This project is part of the 'Social Health And Reserve in the Dementia patient journey (SHARED) SHARED Consortium, an EU Joint Programme-Neurodegenerative Disease Research (JPND). The project is supported by Alzheimer's Society (Ref:469) in the UK, by ZonMw/JPND (733051082) in the Netherlands, by NCBiR (National Center for Research and Development in Poland, project number (JPND/06/2020) in Poland, by the NHMRC (National Health and Medical Research Council (APP1169489) in Australia.

FG received additional support from the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics.

NSHD is funded and supported by the UK Medical Research Council (MC_UU_00019/2). The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing was developed by a team of researchers based at University College London, NatCen Social Research, the Institute for Fiscal Studies, the University of Manchester and the University of East Anglia. The data were collected by NatCen Social Research. The funding is currently provided by the National Institute on Aging (Ref: R01AG017644) and by a consortium of UK government departments: Department for Health and Social Care; Department for Transport; Department for Work and Pensions, which is coordinated by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR, Ref: 198-1074). Funding has also been provided by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). SNAC-K (http://www.snac.org) is financially supported by the Swedish Ministry of Health and Social

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

Affairs; participating County Councils and Municipalities; the Swedish Research Council; and Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life and Welfare. This project was funded by the Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life, and Welfare (FORTE grant no.: 2018-01888 to AK Welmer).

References

1. Richards M, Deary IJ. A life course approach to cognitive capability. In: Kuh D, Cooper R, Hardy R, Richards M, Ben-Shlomo Y (eds.). *A Life Course Approach to Healthy Ageing*. Oxford, 2014, 32–46.

2. Davis D, Cooper R, Terrera GM *et al*. Verbal memory and search speed in early midlife are associated with mortality over 25 years' follow-up, independently of health status and early life factors: a British birth cohort study. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2016; 45: 1216–25.

3. Batty GD, Deary IJ, Zaninotto P. Association of cognitive function with cause-specific mortality in middle and older age: Follow-up of participants in the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2016;183:183–90.

4. Salthouse TA. Correlates of cognitive change. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 2014; 143: 1026–48.

5. Ritchie SJ, Tucker-Drob EM, Cox SR *et al.* Predictors of ageing-related decline across multiple cognitive functions. *Intelligence* 2016;59:115–26.

6. Plassman BL, Williams JW, Burke JR *et al.* Systematic review: Factors associated with risk for and possible prevention of cognitive decline in later life. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2010;153:182–93

7. Lenart M, Luc M, Pawlowski M *et al*. Protective and risk factors of cognitive decline and dementia with a special emphasis on social health: A systematic mapping review. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* 2020;16:e041898.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

8. Vernooij-Dassen M, Verspoor E, Samtani S *et al.* Conceptual Advancement: Social Health as a facilitator in the use of cognitive reserve. *MedRxiv*. https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.07.22276079.

9. Stern Y. Cognitive reserve in ageing and Alzheimer's disease. *The Lancet Neurology* 2012;11:1006–12

10. Cohen S. Social relationships and health. *American Psychologist* 2004;59:676–84.

11. Cohen. Stress, Social Support, and the Buffering Hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin* 1985;98:310–57.

12. Kelly ME, Duff H, Kelly S *et al.* The impact of social activities, social networks, social support and social relationships on the cognitive functioning of healthy older adults: A systematic review. *Systematic Reviews* 2017;6, 259.

13. Kuiper JS, Zuidersma M, Oude Voshaar RC *et al.* Social relationships and risk of dementia: A systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal cohort studies. *Ageing Research Reviews* 2015;22:39–57.

14. Kuiper JS, Zuidersma M, Zuidema SU *et al.* Social relationships and cognitive decline: a systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal cohort studies. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2016;45:1169–206.

15. Brown CL, Gibbons LE, Kennison RF *et al.* Social activity and cognitive functioning over time: A coordinated analysis of four longitudinal studies. *Journal of Aging Research* 2012; 287438.

16. Bielak AAM. How can we not "lose it" if we still don't understand how to "use it"? unanswered questions about the influence of activity participation on cognitive performance in older age - A mini-review. *Gerontology* 2010;56:507–19.

17. Piolatto M, Bianchi F, Rota M *et al.* The effect of social relationships on cognitive decline in older adults: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal cohort studies. *BMC Public Health* 2022;22:1–14.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

18. Gow AJ, Corley J, Starr JM *et al.* Which Social Network or Support Factors are Associated with Cognitive Abilities in Old Age? *Gerontology* 2013;59:454–63.

19. Berkman LF, Glass T, Brissette I *et al.* From social integration to health: Durkheim in the new millennium. 2000; 51: 843-57.

20. Huber M, André Knottnerus J, Green L *et al.* How should we define health? *BMJ (Online)* 2011;343:1–3.

21. Wadsworth M, Kuh D, Richards M *et al.* Cohort profile: The 1946 National Birth Cohort (MRC National Survey of Health and Development). *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2006;35:49–54.

22. Steptoe A, Breeze E, Banks J *et al.* Cohort profile: The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2013;42:1640–88.

23. Lagergren M, Fratiglioni L, Hallberg IR *et al.* A longitudinal study integrating population, care and social services data. The Swedish National study on Aging and Care (SNAC). *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research* 2004;16:158–68.

24. Ikram MA, Brusselle G, Ghanbari M *et al. Objectives,* Design and Main Findings until 2020 from the Rotterdam Study. *European Journal of Epidemiology* 2020; 35: 483-517.

25. Pillemer S, Ayers E, Holtzer R. Gender-stratified analyses reveal longitudinal associations between social support and cognitive decline in older men. *Ageing and Mental Health* 2018;23:1326–32.

26. Lee H, Ang S. Productive Activities and Risk of Cognitive Impairment and Depression: Does the Association Vary by Gender? *Sociological Perspectives.* 2019;63:608–29.

27. Hultsch DF, Hertzog C, Small BJ *et al.* Use it or lose it: engaged lifestyle as a buffer of cognitive decline in aging? *Psychology and Aging* 1999;14:245–63.

28. Piolatto M, Bianchi F, Rota M *et al.* The effect of social relationships on cognitive decline in older adults: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal cohort studies. *BMC Public Health* 2022;22:1–14.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 .

29. Wilson RS, Yu L, Lamar M *et al*. Education and cognitive reserve in old age. *Neurology* 2019;92:E1041–50.

30. Håkansson K, Rovio S, Helkala EL *et al.* Association between mid-life marital status and cognitive function in later life: population based cohort study. *BMJ* 2009;339:99.

31. Feng L, Ng X-T, Yap P *et al.* Marital Status and Cognitive Impairment among Community-Dwelling Chinese Older Adults: The Role of Gender and Social Engagement. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders Extra* 2014;4:375-384.

32. Liu H, Zhang Y, Burgard SA *et al.* Marital Status and Cognitive Impairment in the United States: Evidence from the National Health and Aging Trends Study. *Annals of Epidemiology* 2019;38:28-34.e2.

33. Bann D, Wright L, Goisis A *et al.* Investigating change across time in prevalence or association using observational data: guidance on utility, methodology, and interpretation. *OSF Preprints.* https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/tf7vg

34. Livingston G, Huntley J, Sommerlad A *et al.* Dementia prevention, intervention, and care: 2020 report of the Lancet Commission. *The Lancet* 2020;396:413–46.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics across studies

	NSHD	ELSA	SNAC-K	Rotterdam
N	2,109	8,460	1,892	4,397
Total follow-up time, years	16	18	12	11
Age at baseline, years (SD)	53.4 (0.17)	64.3 (9.8)	71.4 (9.6)	72.2 (7.3)
Demographics				
Female, %(n)	53 (1,116)	55 (4,625)	62 (1,182)	56 (2,466)
Occupational social class, %(n)				
Manual	33 (699)	44 (3,732)	27 (1,193)	27 (1,330)
Non-manual	67 (1,410)	56 (4,728)	73 (3,204)	68 (3,444)
Education, %(n)				
Lower	39 (820)	47 (4,018)	11 (484)	11 (573)
Secondary	50 (1,053)	28 (2,390)	43 (1,909)	44 (2,243)
Higher	11 (236)	24 (2,052)	45 (2,004)	45 (2,275)
IADL, %(n)				
None	N/A	93 (7,841)	64 (2,813)	64 (3,3x27)
At least one		7 (619)	36 (1,584)	36 (1,811)
Vascular-related health conditions, %(n)				
None	96 (2,029)	87 (7,334)	67 (2,954)	67 (3,170)
At least one	4 (80)	13 (1,126)	33 (1,443)	33 (1,553)
Structural social relationship variables				
Marital/cohabitation status, %(n)				
Unmarried and alone	9 (189)	24 (2,011)	32 (1,416)	32 (1,621)
Married or cohabiting	91 (1,920)	76 (6,449)	68 (2,980)	68 (3,444)
Missing	0	0	0.1 (1)	2 (103)
Network size, %(n)				
None	4 (78)	2 (145)	N/A	N/A
1-2 people	13 (269)	12 (975)		
3-6	30 (626)	39 (3,330)		
≥6	54 (1,136)	40 (3,443)		
Missing	0	7 (567)		
Contact frequency, %(n)				
Never or almost never	0.9 (18)	1 (49)	N/A	N/A
More than once a year	8 (161)	15 (1,271)		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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.

About once to twice a month	12 (261)	55 (4,618)		
Weekly or more than twice a month	48 (1,013)	20 (1,722)		
At least two to three times per week	29 (620)	4 (311)		
Missing	2 (36)	6 (489)		
Interactional social relationship variables				
Participation in social activities, %(n)				
Low (≤1 activity)	N/A	21 (1,751)	N/A	N/A
moderate (2-3 activities)		33.3 (2,816)		
high (≥4 or more activities)		46 (3,893)		
Missing		0		
Positive support*				
Range	0-9	0-9	0-10	0-10
Median (IQR range)	6.0 (5.0 – 8.0)	7.0 (5.8 – 8.0)	10 (9 – 10)	10 (9 – 10)
Missing, %(n)	3 (70)	6 (516)	0.1 (5)	2.1 (111)
Negative support*				
Range	0-9	0-9	N/A	N/A
Median (IQR range)	8.0 (6.0 – 8.0)	7.3 (6.3-8.0)		
Missing, %(n)	3 (70)	6 (479)		
Cognitive capability				
Memory*				
Range	0-15	0-10	0-16	0-15
At baseline, mean (SD)	6.0 (2.0)	5.6 (1.7)	7.3 (2.3)	7.3 (2.2)
***Rate of decline, β (95% CI)*	-0.025 (-0.028, -0.022)	-0.03 (-0.04, 0.03)	-0.049 (-0.054, -0.045)	-0.034 (-0.037, -0.031)
Executive function*				
Range	N/A	0-50	2-50	2-47
At baseline, mean (SD)		19.9 (6.2)	22.0 (6.3)	22.0 (5.9)
***Rate of decline, β (95% CI)*		-0.01 (-0.02, -0.01)	-0.046 (-0.050, -0.042)	-0.039 (-0.042, -0.036)
Processing speed*				
Range	0-780	0-780	2-34	1-55
At baseline, mean (SD)	283.9 (73.9)	309.7 (94.3)	18.0 (4.1)	28.8 (7.4)
***Rate of decline, β (95% CI)*	-0.020 (-0.023, -0.017)	-0.03 (-0.04, -0.03)	-0.045 (-0.049, -0.041)	-0.063 (-0.065, -0.060)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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.

Full details on how each variable was coded are in Supplementary file 1.
*Raw scores presented for descriptive purposes; standardised scores used in analyses. For negative support, higher scores indicate less feelings of negative support.
**Based on standardised outcomes from mixed-effects multilevel models e.g., -0.03 indicates a 0.03 SD lower cognitive score per year

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 Associations between baseline structural social relationship variables and standardised cognitive capability on average over time. Size of the estimate markers represent study weight. See supplementary file 2 for this information in table format. Model 1: sex, age at baseline. Model 2: sex, age at baseline, social class, education. Model 3: sex, age at baseline, social class, education, IADL, and vascular-related health conditions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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.

a) Marital/cohabitation status



b) Social Network size



c) Contact frequency



Figure 2. Association between a) marital and cohabitation status b) social network size c) social contact frequency and decline in cognitive function in each study. Estimates are adjusted for sex, age at baseline, social class, education, IADLs, vascular-related health conditions. Overall result reflects the meta-analysed value for decline. Where there is more than one exposure category, the overall value reflects the result from the final category.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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 Associations between baseline functional social relationship variables and standardised cognitive capability on average over time. Size of the estimate markers represent study weight. See supplementary file 2 for this information in table format. Model 1: sex, age at baseline. Model 2: sex, age at baseline, social class, education. Model 3: sex, age at baseline, social class, education, IADL, and vascular-related health conditions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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.

a) Social participation



b) Positive social support



c) Negative social support



Figure 4. Association between a) social participation b) positive social support c) negative social support and decline in cognitive function in each study. Estimates are adjusted for sex, age at baseline, social class, education, IADLs, vascular-related health conditions. Overall result reflects the meta-analysed value for decline. Where there is more than one exposure category, the overall value reflects the result from the final category.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.29.22279324; this version posted August 30, 2022. 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.