Interplay of physical and cognitive performance using hierarchical continuous-time dynamic modelling and a dual-task training regime in AD patients

S. Schwarck[1,2*], M. C. Voelkle[3], A. Becke[1,2], N. Busse[1,2], W. Glanz[1,2], E. Düzel[1,2**], G. Ziegler[1,2]**

[1]Institute of Cognitive Neurology and Dementia research, Otto-von-Guericke-University Magdeburg, Germany

[2] German Center of Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Magdeburg, Germany

[3]Institute of Psychology, Humboldt University of Berlin, Berlin, Germany

*corresponding author:

E-mail: svenja.schwarck@med.ovgu.de

** shared senior authorship

Abstract

Various longitudinal studies report positive effects of physical exercise on cognitive performance in patients with Alzheimer's disease (AD). However, most of these studies fail to capture the dynamic nature of the change and interplay of physical fitness and cognition. To overcome this limitation, we employ a hierarchical continuous-time dynamic model to analyze data of a 24-week physical and cognitive dual-task training regime (3 sessions per week) in older adults with AD (N = 17). The model was specified with two fully connected state variables enabling bidirectional effects between physical and cognitive performance over measurement occasions. The results show that physical performance is dynamically linked to cognitive performance. In line with earlier findings, higher physical performance predicted improved memory recognition performance in terms of faster reaction times.

Keywords: Alzheimer's disease, cardiovascular training, cognition, intervention, continuous-time modelling, longitudinal analysis, dynamic modelling, ctsem, hierarchical

Introduction

A general goal of physical and/or cognitive training is to improve performance of the trained function: This rationale is promising for the context of promoting healthy ageing or even reducing cognitive decline in pathological conditions such as Alzheimer's disease (AD). A training is considered successful if a significant performance increase over time is established or if natural decline is delayed and more importantly if the training enables transfer to untrained tasks. In context of cognitive training Schmiedek et al. (2010) observed positive transfer effects for working memory, episodic memory, and perceptual speed in a 100-day memory training using a comprehensive session-to-session analysis in younger and older adults (1). Yet even in cognitively healthy participants, intra-individual cognitive performance is not inherently stable, but rather fluctuates from session-to-session or trial-to-trial (2–6). Intra-individual cognitive performance changes might be differentiated into two components: (A) trait changes defined by long-term (months to years) within-person modifications of the trait e.g. due to ageing or pathology that progress slowly but are relatively robust; and (B) short-term intra-individual (state) variability characterized by fast and reversible fluctuations in a person's true score (7,8). Consequently, in contrast to actual trait changes, short-term variability is associated with systematic time-associated fluctuations in the person's true state around the given trait value (9) and can cause quick and temporary changes within minutes or days (10). For many cognitive outcomes intra-individual variability was approximately 50% larger than the variability between persons (4).

Despite the decline of plasticity during healthy aging, numerous longitudinal cognitive training studies with old participants showed improved cognitive abilities (1,11,12). In contrast to healthy aging, neurodegenerative diseases such as AD are associated with greater impairment of cognitive performance (13). AD is a neurodegenerative disorder encompassing neuropathological changes including accumulation of amyloid plaques, neurofibrillary tangles and neuronal as well as synaptic loss resulting in macrostructural atrophy of the brain (13–15). AD is typically characterized by a progressive decline of cognitive functioning, starting with memory loss (13,16). Consequently, the vital question is whether and how cognitive decline can be counteracted in terms of prevention and interventions?

Several approaches towards effective treatments exist for patients with dementia (13) and interventions focussing on potential risk factors, such as physical inactivity, yielded promising effects in terms of prevention as well as delay of symptoms (17). Higher physical fitness across the lifespan mitigates age-related cognitive decline and reduces the risk of AD conversion (18–21). According to Hamer and Chida (2009) physical fitness reduces the AD-risk by 45% (22). In concordance, mice- and human studies suggest a neuroprotective effect of physical activity by reducing Aβ plaques, increasing hippocampal neurogenesis and improving memory performance (23–29). Several intervention-studies reported positive effects of physical exercise trainings on cognitive performance in patients with AD or MCI (20,30–34). In contrast, there are also longitudinal studies that yield no evidence for links of physical fitness and cognition in patients with dementia despite physical fitness improvements (35–39).

There are, however, several limitations of previous longitudinal training studies. Firstly, respective studies differ in numerous methodological (e.g., design, duration and type of exercise) and sample characteristics (e.g., sample size, neurological status, heterogeneity). Secondly, physical fitness as a single factor is not sufficient to explain all cognitive improvements or cognitive maintenance respectively (40). Physical fitness is not the only modifiable factor that can be manipulated in interventions. As such, the combination of multiple modifiable life-style factors such as cognitive training and physical exercise shows

promising effects in terms of maintaining cognitive performance in old age (41). Dual-task trainings, i.e. performing two tasks at the same time, offer a highly relevant, non-invasive and economic intervention to improve cognition (42). Compared to healthy age-matched controls, the dual-task performance in patients with AD is reduced and the impairment is an indicator of the severity of the disease (43–47). Nevertheless, longitudinal dual-task regimes seem to improve both cognitive and physical performance in patients with AD (48). Thus, there are reasons to expect that physical and cognitive performance are positively associated and might counteract the cognitive decline in patients with AD.

The majority of studies using repeated measurements report only undirected associations rather than analysing the dynamic change and interplay of physical and cognitive states (49,50). Temporal precedence is an important requirement for causality (51,52). Moreover, time itself is often treated as a discrete variable and accordingly the regression strength between time points is estimated without integrating information regarding the interval between them (52,53). The majority of longitudinal studies therefore struggles with unequal time interval lengths between and/or within participants, which might lead to biased parameter estimates and conclusions based thereon (52–54). In contrast, a hierarchical continuous-time dynamic modelling approach overcomes problems of conventional longitudinal modelling approaches, such as biased parameter estimates and unclear directionalities (49,50). Correspondingly, this approach enables the analysis of the dynamic change and coupling between states, even in the case of unequal time intervals (52,55,56). Taken together, to the best of our knowledge, dynamic longitudinal training studies using advantages of continuous and hierarchical modelling approaches that aim to examine the dynamics between physical and cognitive performance in a sample with AD are missing.

Here we study the dynamic changes of physical and cognitive performance and their interplay using an extensive longitudinal training study for AD patients comprised of 72 sessions over 24-weeks including a physical and cognitive dual-task regime. The positive exercise-induced effect of physical fitness on cognition was shown in a previous paper using a linear approach (57). In this study we focus on the dynamic interplay between physical and cognitive performance using state of the art hierarchical Bayesian continuous-time dynamical system modelling. We hypothesize that changes in physical performance predict subsequent changes of cognitive performance. In addition, we hypothesize that individual dynamics relate to dementia symptom severity as well as physical health.

Results

Demographic data

Table 1 provides the demographic data and associated neurological characteristics for the participants.

Demographic data	
Age (years)	67-80 (*M* = 73.41, *SD* = 3.43)
Sex	7:10 (ratio female to male)
Neurological characteristics	
ICD-10 diagnosis	Alzheimer's disease (F00.1)
MMSE pre	*M* = 23.35, *SD* = 3.50
MMSE post*	*M* = 22.75, *SD* = 4.06

Table 1: Demographic data and neurological characteristics of the sample (N = 17). MMSE pre, Mini Mental Status Examination score before the start of the intervention. MMSE post, Mini Mental Status Examination score after the end of the 24-week intervention (assessment within 12 days to 8 weeks after the intervention). * N = 16 due to one missing post assessment. *M*, mean. *SD*, standard deviation.

Analysis of cross-domain interplay using dynamic modelling

The range of valid measurement occasions of all 17 participants was between 59 – 70 sessions (*M* = 64.71, *SD* = 4.26) resulting in 1100 manifest observations per latent state (or domain) with 25 (~2.3%) missing values for physical performance. The time interval between successive measurement occasions ranged from 1 to 14 days (*M* = 2.54, *SD* = 1.04).

The longitudinal data was analysed using a 2-state dynamical model as illustrated in Figure 1 (for details see methods).



Fig. 1. Schematic illustration of the 2-state-model with the first three timepoints (t0, t1, t2) reflecting successive training sessions. The graphical model contains the observed variables (manifest indicators) power of the bicycle ergometer and HR (as ratio: Power/HR) and reaction time corrected for the proportion of error (RT) loading on the latent variables (ellipsoids) PP (physical performance) respectively COG (cognitive performance). The main effect of interest is the cross-effect of PP on

COG (further denoted as drift PP→COG). The model also contains latent error terms (**w**) and the continuous time intercept (triangle). The model shows regression paths (red lines) and variance and covariance (orange lines). Manifest intercepts are not shown.

We first performed comparisons of alternative models in light of the data (see methods for details). The Chi-Square difference test for model comparison revealed a significant difference between the full 2-CR model and the zero-model ($\chi^2(17) = 235.1$, $p < .001$). In addition, a significant difference was also observed between the 2-CR model and the PP→COG 1-CR model ($\chi^2(9) = 149.8$, $p < .001$) and COG→PP 1-CR model ($\chi^2(9) = 294.6$, $p < .001$). Correspondingly, the full 2-CR model containing both cross-effects that enable a bi-directional interplay between cognitive (COG) and physical (PP) performance domains fitted the data best. Estimated population parameters for both 1-CR model (with one cross-effect) and the 0-CR model (with auto-effects only) are shown in the Supplemental Material (Table S1). In what follows we further report details about the winning model and tests of our hypothesis about the interplay during training.

Table 2 shows the Bayesian posterior estimates of population mean parameters of the full 2-CR (cross-effect) continuous-time model.

	parameter	*symbol*	*Est.*	*SD*	*LL-BCI*	*UL-BCI*
DRIFT	$drift_{PP}$	A	-0.851	0.146	-1.146	-0.602
	$drift_{COG}$	A	-1.645	0.188	-2.026	-1.300
	$drift_{COG \rightarrow PP}$	A	0.313	0.087	0.154	0.485
	$drift_{PP \rightarrow COG}$	A	-1.335	0.201	-1.725	-0.954
$\mathbf{T0_{MEANS}}$	$T0m_{PP}$	η_1	-0.175	0.010	-0.194	-0.154
	$T0m_{COG}$	η_2	0.941	0.083	0.766	1.102
DIFFUSION	$diff_{PP}$	Q	0.045	0.011	0.027	0.070
	$diff_{COG}$	Q	0.797	0.038	0.722	0.874
	$diff_{PP \rightarrow COG}$	Q	-0.687	0.135	-0.884	-0.354
$\mathbf{MANIFEST_{VAR}}$	$mvar_{Power/HR}$	Θ	0.208	0.006	0.195	0.220
	$mvar_{RT}$	Θ	0.046	0.029	0.012	0.124
$\mathbf{MANIFEST_{MEANS}}$	$mm_{Power/HR}$	τ	-0.382	0.078	-0.531	-0.234
	mm_{RT}	τ	0.259	0.079	0.103	0.412

Table 2: Group level results showing estimated population means including Bayesian posterior intervals of the Full 2-CR (cross-effect) model. Sample size $n = 17$ with 1100 observed sessions in total; The model contains two latent variables (physical (PP) and cognitive (COG) performance) with one manifest indicator, each (Power/HR and RT corrected for PE) respectively, $n = 13$ free population mean parameters. Est. mean from mean of the chains; BCI, 95% Bayesian credible interval, LL, lower limit, UL, upper limit; Bayesian model estimation: number of chains = 4, number of iterations = 8000.

Changes in PP predict later changes in COG in the opposite direction as found by a more substantial negative cross-effect $drift_{PP \rightarrow COG}$ (-1.335, *SD* = 0.201, 95 BCI [-1.725, -0.954]). As such, when physical performance levels are above baseline (suggesting a higher physical performance) COG levels are likely to go downwards (indicating faster reaction times corrected for PE). In addition, the effect of physical on cognitive performance also varies

between participants which suggests that some subjects benefit more from the physical exercise training resulting in cognitive improvements than others (between-person variability in $drift_{PP \rightarrow COG}$: 2.44, *SD* = 0.29, 95% BCI[1.86, 3.02]). The high between-person differences in the effect of PP on COG comes along with its higher population mean ($T0_{MEANS}$, Table 2). This suggest that this effect seems more relevant in the sample but its importance also differs more between participants. In contrast, cognitive performance levels do partially predict later changes of physical performance in the same direction as indicated by a small and positive cross-effect ($drift_{COG \rightarrow PP}$). Accordingly, when subject's reaction time corrected for error increases (i.e. reduced cognitive performance) the physical performance levels did also slightly increase over following time. Furthermore, the temporal changes of PP last longer than the temporal dynamic of COG as shown by a higher auto-effect of PP ($drift_{PP}$).

The above drift parameters can be transformed into discrete parameters (time interval of one day) which facilitates the interpretation (for details see methods). Previous states of PP do impact COG negatively (-0.368, *SD* = 0.05, 95 BCI [-0.479, -0.266]). Figure 2 illustrates the captured dynamics by showing the expected pattern of both auto-effects and cross-effects over training days. The expected effect PP on COG peaks around one day suggesting rather short-term benefits from physical training. Changes in PP predict COG for up to around four days, after which the random-state fluctuations dominate. In contrast, the cross-lagged effect COG on PP was observed to be close to zero (0.086, *SD* = 0.024, 95 BCI [0.041, 0.136]) and accordingly there is practically no substantial effect in this direction. Furthermore, the small autoregressive (self-connection) effect of COG (0.145, *SD* = 0.039, 95 BCI [0.072, 0.226] suggested low stability of the construct over time. PP on one day had a small effect on PP on another day (0.363, *SD* = 0.05, 95 BCI [0.264, 0.472].



Fig 2. Auto and cross regression over time. Temporal autoregressive effects (upper panel) and cross-lagged effects (lower panel) over time (x-axis, time interval in days), median and 95% quantiles for a change of 1 at time zero. The expected autoregressive effect (or self-connection) of PP (drift PP) and COG (drift COG) peak around approximately one day and decrease with increasing time interval length. This suggests that the more time passes the less predictive is the performance for consecutive

performance levels. The expected cross-lagged effect (or interplay) of PP on COG (PP→COG) peaks around one day and seem to improve predictions of COG for up to around four days. This can be understood as rather short-term benefits from physical training on cognitive performance. The cross-lagged effect COG on PP (COG→PP) is very close to zero, suggesting that changes in cognitive performance do not improve predictions of physical performance.

The temporal dynamics of PP showed more inter-individual differences compared to COG. Some subjects showed relatively persistent physical performance levels over the entire training time, while the physical performance fluctuated more in other participants (between-person variability in $drift_{PP}$: 9.89, *SD* = 0.52, 95% BCI[8.89, 10.90]). The measurement error ($MANIFEST_{VAR}$) of the manifest indicator Power/HR (0.208) was found to be higher compared to RT (0.046) (Table 2). This suggests that measurement limitations and short-term situational influences (e.g. subjective stress or sunny days) are more present in the physical performance indicator. In contrast, cognitive performance showed higher session-to-session fluctuations within-person (0.188, *SD* = 0.014, 95 BCI [0.163, 0.217]) compared to physical performance (0.004, SD = 0.002, 95 BCI [0.001, 0.012]). The model prediction of COG and PP over training time are illustrated in Figure 3. In addition, the session-by-session data and corresponding model predictions over study time for five selected participants of the sample is included in Supplemental Material (Fig. S1).



Fig. 3. Individual estimates. Individual level analyses for all participants of the sample (*n* = 17) over time interval in days (x-axis). The solid lines presents the model prediction of the smoothed estimates of participant's individual latent states COG (upper panel) and PP (lower panel) within a 95% BCI. Each coloured solid line presents the individual model prediction for one subject each. The temporal dynamics of PP show more individual differences compared to COG.

Drift coefficients as a function of clinical baseline scores

We further aimed at validation of the obtained individual dynamics using available clinical scores. The baseline MMSE score and SF12 physical health score of each participant were included as time-independent predictor (covariates) of individual differences in the above model. Figure 4A illustrates the observed effect of the included covariate MMSE baseline score on drift parameters. Participants with higher MMSE baseline scores show lower persistence in the cross-effect COG on PP ($drift_{COG \rightarrow PP}$; -0.215, *SD* = 0.022, 95% BCI [-0.259, -0.172]). In addition, higher MMSE baseline scores were associated with lower persistence in cognitive performance ($drift_{COG}$; -0.538, *SD* = 0.174, 95% BCI [-0.887, -0.209]). In contrast, the effect of MMSE on the auto-effect PP and the cross-effect PP on COG is close to zero (-0.02, *SD* = 0.003, 95% BCI [-0.03, -0.01]. Figure 4B contains the covariate SF12 physical health baseline score. Participants with a lower health score show a stronger cross-effect of COG on PP ($drift_{COG \rightarrow PP}$; -0.231, *SD* = 0.035, 95% BCI [-0.303, -0.165]). Likewise, higher physical health scores seem to be associated with lower persistence in their physical performance ($drift_{PP}$; -0.036, *SD* = 0.008, 95% BCI [-0.052, -0.021]). The effect on the other auto-effect and cross-effect are close to zero.



Fig. 4. Estimated effect of subject-level covariate predictors on dynamical parameters. We show (A) MMSE and (B) SF12 physical health baseline score effects on drift parameters (auto-effects and cross-effects) within a 95% BCI. $drift_{PP}$, auto-effect PP (red solid line); $drift_{PP \rightarrow COG,}$ cross-effect PP on COG (green solid line); $drift_{COG \rightarrow PP,}$ cross-effect COG on PP (blue solid line); $drift_{COG,}$ auto-effect COG (purple solid line).

Changes of dynamics over the course of training

So far the above model assumed that the dynamics do not change over the course of the training e.g. the model did not allow for any increase or decrease of the interplay of domains over months. Therefore an extended model with the drift coefficient physical on cognitive performance (PP→COG) as a function of time was specified. As such, the model estimated if the strength of the cross effect PP on COG changed between the baseline (day 1-84) and the second half (day 85-168). To estimate this change from training day 84 (last baseline day) to 85 (first day of second half) an additional time dependent predictor and an extra latent step process were included (see methods). Results suggested that the cross-effect PP on COG (PP→COG) becomes positive in the second half of the training (2.08), i.e. the strength and associated effect of physical performance on cognitive performance was found to be reduced in the second half of training. This change was estimated as a function of PP→COG on baseline (-0.11, *SD* = 0.63, 95% BCI [-1.34, 1.14]) added PP→COG on the second half of the training (-1.50, *SD* = 0.08, 95% BCI [-1.66, -1.34]) multiplied by the extra latent step process (-1.45, SD = 0.38, 95% BCI [-2.21, -0.72]).

Discussion

AD is a devastating neurodegenerative disorder causing complex neuronal, physiological and behavioural changes (13). As such, a vital question in training and cognitive science is whether and how to counteract the cognitive decline in aging and AD by developing feasible and effective treatments. Recent longitudinal studies reported promising evidence of physical exercise training on cognitive performance in persons with dementia (20,30–33), while others observed no substantial change (35–39). However, most of these studies fail to capture the dynamic nature of the change and interplay of physical fitness and cognition (52). By taking advantage of a hierarchical continuous-time dynamic modelling approach (58) this study assessed the dynamic session-to-session changes and interplay of physical and cognitive performance over 72 measurement occasions (24-weeks) dual-task training in participants with AD. We specified a fully connected model enabling the analysis of the session-to-session connectivity (auto/self-effect) and coupling (cross-domain/interplay) of physical (PP) and cognitive (COG) performance.

Under the assumption of our model, physical performance is dynamically linked (coupled) to cognitive performance, i.e. when PP increases, COG levels tended to decrease (faster reaction time corrected for error). Thus, exercise-induced increased physical performance was positively associated with improved cognitive performance even in our sample with AD. This is in line with previous training studies reporting positive effects in terms of dementia prevention and delay of the progressive cognitive decline in AD or MCI (19,22,36,59). The observed coupling effect of PP on COG shows some between-person variability, i.e. some participants benefited from the physical exercise training resulting in improved cognitive performance to a greater extent than others. Going beyond the group level, however, there are also participants who fail to adapt on the training protocol (so called non-responders), i.e. showing unchanged or even worse physical performance (60,61). We aimed to design a personalized training protocol per participant including individual target HR (65-75% of maximum HR), start resistance and adaptive changes. However, since our study contains no

control group, we cannot rule out the possibility of non-responders benefiting more from a different type of exercise and/or intensity in our sample. Moreover, currently more accurate diagnostic tool to examine the training time course and personalize the training plan to create an optimal training load exist, such as heart rate variability monitoring (62). Nevertheless, the observed coupling effect of higher physical performance on improved cognitive performance supports the importance of regular physical exercise training to affect the cognitive decline a sample with AD.

In addition, an important question is how long this beneficial exercise-induced effect on cognition lasts (e.g. how many days). One main strength of the used dynamic modelling approach is the transformation of the above reported temporal connectivity and coupling effects into discrete (auto-lagged and cross-lagged) parameters allowing to examine the dynamics over time (58). Our results suggest that a positive change in physical performance can improve the prediction of increased cognitive performance for up to four days with the strongest influence after one day, after which unpredictable random fluctuations dominate. Accordingly, the training-induced benefit seems to be rather a short-term effect in our sample with AD. However, the effect cannot be directly attributed to training since the fluctuations could be due to unexplained or not modelled causes acting on both PP and COG and might appear without training as well. Nevertheless, the coupling effect appears at least under the condition of training, which is in line with recent studies (22,63). Importantly, the participants exercised three times per week (15 minutes each), resulting in 45 minutes training per week. Correspondingly, the pure weekly training time was below the recommendations of the World Health organization: 150 minutes of moderate or 75 minutes of vigorous intensity (or an equivalent combination) aerobic exercise (64). An increase of physical training time and/or sessions per week might have prolonged the strength of its effect on cognitive performance in our sample. In addition, the training intensity was suggested to be a driving factor in AD treatments. With regard to AD pathology, physical exercise was found to reduce the Aβ accumulation and preserve cognitive functions in the hippocampus in mice, which seem to mediate the exercise-induced memory benefits (65–67). However, a dose-dependent effect of exercise intensity was observed in this regard, i.e. the effect was found to be stronger for higher compared to low exercise intensities (67). Our training contained low up to moderate peak intensity. Thus, a higher intensity may have achieved a stronger and longer lasting effect on cognitive performance. However, the observed coupling effect suggests at least the performance of 45 minutes moderate physical exercise per week to yield short-term benefits on cognition, but ideally an increase up to the amount of training time according to the recommendations of the World Health Organization (2010).

The studied training was designed as a time-efficient dual-task regime, i.e. the participants had to maintain a given cadence on the ergometer while simultaneously memorizing pictures. In general, the dual-task performance is reduced in in patients with AD compared to MCI and healthy aged matched controls (43–47). Nevertheless, we still observed a positive interplay effect of PP on COG, while coupling the other way around was very minor. Here we are in line with Parvin (2020) reporting improvements in both cognitive and physical domain after a dual-task training in patients with AD (48). Importantly, the post-exercise memory recognition performance task was rather used as a cognitive performance measurement. We observed random session-to-session cognitive fluctuations within participants over time (deviations around the true cognitive state), while the measurement error was close to zero. Although intra-individual cognitive performance tends to fluctuate from session-to-session in

healthy older participants (2–6), the variability is higher in patients with AD or MCI (3,10,68–70). The higher amount of intra-individual variability is linked to AD pathology, such as impaired cerebral blood flow and increased hippocampal and entorhinal atrophy and functional decline (71,72). Correspondingly, within-person cognitive fluctuation cannot be considered exclusively as measurement error as it would be an oversimplification of the true cognitive state (73). The used dynamic modelling approach allows to separate such intra-individual deviations from a smooth overall change of cognitive performance into unpredictable but meaningful changes (fluctuations or short-term variability) in the cognitive process itself and measurement error, i.e. uncorrelated random noise in the indicator (58).

Thus despite the AD pathology in our sample, the observed short-term effect suggests that the cognitive system was still able to change and fluctuate. Physical exercise seem to elicit plasticity capacities that would otherwise have remained unused. Accordingly, our results support the importance of developing and optimizing regular aerobic exercise trainings to attenuate the cognitive decline, which can be easily integrated into the daily lives of persons with AD. However, the exercise-induced causal underlying molecular and cellular mechanism(s) leading to structural and functional brain changes and associated cognitive improvements is still discussed (74,75). Besides others, there seem to be strong evidence for exercise-induced neurotrophin-mediated neurogenesis counteracting the cognitive decline in healthy and pathological aging mice (75,76). Physical exercise increases neurotrophic factor levels, such as BDNF (brain-derived neurotrophic factor), neurogenesis in dentate gyrus of the hippocampus and cognitive function (77,78). Inhibited BDNF in the hippocampus by blocking tyrosine receptor kinase B also inhibited the action of BDNF and its associated beneficial effects on cognitive function (79,80).

We further aimed to validate the individual temporal dynamics (connectivity and coupling) of physical and cognitive performance with clinical baseline scores (covariates), namely MMSE (typical AD screening of cognitive impairment) and SF-12 questionnaire (physical health). We assessed the drift coefficients as a function of MMSE and SF-12, respectively. Validity of dynamical modelling parameters were supported by both clinical baseline scores. Higher SF-12 baseline scores (higher physical health) were associated with lower persistence in physical performance. These findings are in line with studies showing associations between SF-12 as well as its longer SF-36 version (81) and physical fitness associated outcomes (82–84). In addition, higher MMSE baseline score (less cognitive impairment) was associated with lower persistence in cognitive performance, i.e. the smaller the autoregressive (connectivity) effect, ceteris paribus. Thus, our results support some validity for our observed temporal dynamics since cognitive and physical performance were associated with their related clinical scores MMSE and SF-12 baseline score, respectively.

We observed a general increasing trend of physical performance and a decreasing trend of cognitive performance (faster reaction times corrected for error) over training time. This is in line with our previous study using a linear-mixed modelling approach (57). Beyond, we observed changes in the coupling effect of physical on cognitive performance over training time by specifying an additional model. The coupling effect of PP on COG was stronger in the first half of training (day 1- 84). This is in line with studies reporting positive effects after 12-weeks of physical exercise or dual-task training on cognitive performance in older healthy adults (85–88). However, in the second half of training (day 85 – 168) the strength of this coupling effect is reduced, i.e. the exercise-induced increase of physical performance positively affecting cognitive performance appeared to weaken over time. One explanation

might be that the changes may follow a non-linear time course, e.g. increase early or close to the end of the whole training regime. As such, further studies using time-varying analysis of those domains may clarify the temporal patterns of the coupling effect. However, since patients with AD show general reduced motivational capacities (89), the mitigated effect of physical on cognitive performance might also reflect a decrease in motivation over training time which could be compensated in future experimental studies. In addition, animal studies observed positive effects of environmental enrichment (combined physical, cognitive and social stimulation) on brain health, such as increased neurotrophic factor levels, neurogenesis, and improved cognitive performance (90–92). Although our dual-task training is a comparable equivalent for humans, the less variability in the task itself (exercising in a given rotation while memorizing pictures) may have led to reduced motivation and/or increased distraction (e.g., by social or environmental factors) from the middle of the training onwards.

Finally, we like to mention several limitations of the current study. Firstly, the exercise-induced underlying mechanisms yielding to cognitive improvements remain to be further understood. Although the model is mechanistic (or causal) it contains many assumptions that might be wrong and/or we may have not included all observable factors mediating the observed effects. Secondly, our approach assumed stationary dynamics over the course of the training. Thus, we cannot rule out non-stationary dynamics during the training time. Thirdly, our sample was small (N=17) and potentially biased regarding age and severity of AD. Fourthly, our study did not include a control group, e.g. healthy aged match controls and/or participants with different severities of symptoms. Since there is an absence of a physically inactive control group, future studies might look if cognitive volatility (i.e. also short reaching performance highs) is present without training and whether the coupling of physical on cognitive performance still exist without. With regard to the present literature showing positive due to regular exercise, (Colcombe & Kramer, 2003; Erickson et al., 2019; Schwarck et al., 2021), the latter one might not be the case. Future longitudinal randomized controlled studies are necessary to verify our results. Additionally, studies may examine the question how cognitive fluctuations can be used since they are random. Finally, a more comprehensive neuropsychological assessment should be taken into account to examine transfer effects.

Conclusion

The present extensive 24-week longitudinal training studies examines the temporal connectivity und coupling of physical and cognitive performance in a sample with AD using a hierarchical continuous-time dynamic modelling approach. Physical performance is dynamically linked to cognitive performance, i.e. higher physical improved cognitive performance in subsequent sessions. The beneficial effect is rather short-term, since a change in physical performance improved prediction of cognitive performance for up to four days after the training session. Furthermore, our observed dynamics were validated by clinical scores. Higher MMSE baseline score (less cognitive deficits) were associated with lower persistence in the temporal dynamics of cognitive performance. To summarize, we observed a short-term effect of exercise-induced increased physical performance positively affecting cognitive performance even in a sample with AD. Thus, physical exercise seem to be a promising treatment to counteract the cognitive decline in pathological aging.

Methods

Participants

The recruitment for the study took place in the period from September 2017 to September 2018 from the memory clinic of the German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Magdeburg. Older adults aged 60-80 years with diagnosed mild to moderate Alzheimer's disease (F00.1; MMSE: 18-26) were included. During enrolment 125 patients were assessed for eligibility. 92 patients were excluded because they did not meet the inclusion criteria (n = 10), declined to participate (n = 65) and due to other reasons (n = 17) such as too small apartments for an ergometer. In addition, 14 participants did not receive the allocated intervention due to deterioration of symptoms. One participant dropped out during the intervention due to physical health difficulties. Consequently, the final sample size was n = 17 participants (age: M = 73.33, SD = 3.43; Mini Mental Status Examination: M = 23.50, SD = 3.45; female = 8). All participants were free of pulmonary or cardiovascular disorders and symptoms of depression (Geriatric Depression Scale: M = 1.88, SD = 0.93). All participants and their relatives as representatives signed a written informed consent form for participation. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Otto-von-Guericke University, Magdeburg, Germany (approval number: 68/17). The study was registered as a clinical trial after the enrolment of participants started since this study was planned as a feasibility study (DRKS registration number: DRKS00019105). The authors confirm that all ongoing and related trials for this intervention are registered. The participants were not compensated monetarily for the costs of participation.

Design

The study contained a 24-week dual task regime on a bicycle ergometer with an integrated tablet. The dual task regime took place in the own households of the participants. The training support per week was provided by the relatives, a team member and a senior volunteer. It was attempted that each participant exercised at the same time to better control circadian rhythm. The participants exercised three times per week resulting in 72 physical and cognitive exercise training sessions. Each dual task training contained 15 minutes of physical exercise while simultaneously memorizing pictures. The heart rate (HR) was continuously measured every second using a Garmin chest belt. The subjective perceived exertion was assessed after each session using a 6-20 Borg Scale (93). Finally, a picture recognition test was carried out to measure visual short-term memory performance.

Moreover, the Min-Mental State Examination (MMSE) and the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS) and questionnaires were assessed before and immediately after the 24-week dual task regime. A more comprehensive post-assessment was conducted within 12 days to 8 weeks. In addition, the 12-Item Short Form Survey (SF-12) questionnaire assessing the impact on health on everyday activities (94) was used for further analysis. The questionnaire and screenings were part of the dementia care instruments used in the DelpHi-MV study ("Dementia: life- and person-centered help in Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania") of the German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE) Rostock/Greifswald (95).

Dual task regime

The dual task regime that was used in this study is a simultaneous physical and cognitive training, which is specifically developed for older adults with AD (for more details see 57). An individual training plan was designed for each participant. The required pedal frequency was individually set to 40 – 80 RPM. The exercise training was also dependent on an individual target HR of each participant which was set to 65-75% of the maximum HR using the Karvonen method (96) and was accordingly around 90 to 115 bpm. Each training session began with the individual start-resistance and proceeded by successively increasing it each 60s until the individual target HR was reached. Moreover, the overall training regime included an increase of the resistance from the individual assessed start resistance by approximately 5% every four weeks. These individual adaptations were carried out if the average target HR and the ratings of perceived exertion after each training session were in the determined range.

Simultaneously, each training session included the memorization of 30 pictures such as animals or landscapes, presented on an integrated tablet (Samsung Galaxy Tab A 2016 10.1 inch). The pictures were presented one after the other for 20 seconds each. During each 10-second inter-stimulus interval the screen background turned white. The same set of pictures was presented during each of the three training sessions within one week while the applied set was varied over weeks to minimize learning effects. The different sets of pictures were matched regarding the average difficulty memorability level determined by the open source LaMem score (97).

The picture recognition memory performance was assessed immediately after each dual task training. The test included 30 test screens containing the original picture visible during the training and a lure picture. The lure picture was new but matched the memorability score of the original picture. Accordingly, the participants had to decide one by one which of both test pictures was the original. The test was designed without a time limit for the response. The pictures on each test screen were arranged on top of each other, with the arrangement of the original and lure picture randomised. The picture recognition memory test was designed as a forced choice task. As with the pictures visible during the dual task, each training week contained the same lure pictures, while the 24 picture sets per week differed from each other. The lure picture sets were also matched for memorability using the LaMem score (97).

Statistical Analysis

The analysis focused on modelling the dynamic interplay between the two key domains: physical and cognitive performance. Each of the 72 training sessions per participant were included in the analysis insofar as they were completed (90% completed in sample). The training observations were z-standardized on the group level (grand mean centered and scaled across all sessions). First, the physical performance (PP) was defined as the ratio of power output (unit: Watt) and HR of each training session. Higher values reflect higher physical performance. Second, as outcome of cognitive performance (COG) we focused on reaction times corrected for the number of errors since this combination was previously reported as most efficient during detection of effects (98). The reaction time (RT, in seconds) within a valid range of ≤ 13 seconds was used and corrected for the proportion of error (PE) using the linear integrated speed-accuracy score (LISAS) (98):

$$\mathbf{LISAS}(\mathrm{j}) = \mathrm{RT}(\mathrm{j}) + \frac{\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{RT}}}{\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{PE}}} \times \mathrm{PE}(\mathrm{j}) \tag{1}$$

For each participant, the mean RT of the measurement occasion (j) was added to the ratio of the overall standard deviation of reaction time (SD_{RT}) and PE (SD_{PE}) multiplied by the corresponding PE observed at the measurement occasion (98). Lower linear integrated speed-accuracy scores reflect higher cognitive performance i.e. faster reaction time corrected for the proportion of error.

All statistical analyses were conducted in R version 4.0.2 using RStudio version 1.3.1056. The main approach followed in this paper to model session to session variability and interplay of physical and cognitive performances is hierarchical Bayesian continuous-time dynamic modelling. The approach was previously established and implemented in the R package ctsem (58) relying on the Stan software (99). All results were visualized using ctsem and the R package ggplot2 included in the package tidyverse (100). Model fit was compared using Chi-square tests. The alpha level for all frequentist statistical tests was defined as $p < .05$.

Firstly, hierarchical Bayesian continuous-time dynamic modelling was used to simultaneously analyse the longitudinal changes of physical and cognitive outcomes. In this framework the evolution of these two processes over training sessions is reflected in a 2-dimensional state variable $\boldsymbol{\eta}(t) = [PP(t), COG(t)]^T$ at time t. The model then describes the temporal dynamics of these states. The hierarchical continuous-time dynamic model of Driver and Voelkle (2018) consists of three main elements. Firstly, in its general form the subject-level latent dynamic model is a stochastic differential equation and can be written as follows:

$$\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\eta}(t) = \left(\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\eta}(t) + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\chi}(t)\right)\mathrm{d}t + \mathbf{G}\mathrm{d}\mathbf{W}(t) \tag{2}$$

with time-varying latent process $\boldsymbol{\eta}(t)$ and its temporal derivative $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\eta}(t)$ encoding the systems current state and its change over time, respectively. Eq. (2) is sometimes also called state equation. The DRIFT matrix **A** contains free parameters and defines the temporal dynamics of the process with so-called auto-effects on the main diagonal and cross-effects encoding interplay or interactions (across domains) on the off-diagonal elements. Moreover, Eq. (2) contains the continuous time intercept (CINT) **b** and the effect **M** of time dependent predictors $\boldsymbol{\chi}$ on $\boldsymbol{\eta}(t)$.

The continuous-time parameters of the DRIFT matrix (**A**) contain changes of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ over a small time interval in the differential equation. As such, the auto-effect parameters reflects the connectivity and the cross-effects the coupling. Moreover, the continuous-time parameter can be transformed into the discrete-time equivalent (**A***) reflecting the change of these connectivity and coupling over time. As such, the calculation of discrete-time parameters for any given time time interval length (Δt):

$$\mathbf{A}^*_{\Delta t_u} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathbf{A}(t_u - t_{u-1})} \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{A}^*_{\Delta t_u}$ includes the associated auto and cross regression effect for the effect of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ at the measurement occasion u-1 on $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ at measurement occasion u (58). Secondly, the model includes a linear measurement model for states $\boldsymbol{\eta}(t)$:

$$\mathbf{y}(t) = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\eta}(t) + \boldsymbol{\tau} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(t) \tag{4}$$

The vector of the manifest (i.e. observable) variables $\mathbf{y}(t)$ is defined by the factor loadings $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$, the manifest intercepts $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ and the residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ with covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$. Further details of the framework are included in the supplements.

The dynamic model was specified with two fully connected state variables enabling bi-directional coupling between PP and COG over 72 measurement occasions within 24 weeks. The measurement model relates manifest observables to latent state variables and in this study loadings were set such that manifest observable indicator Power/HR of each session were loading on PP and correspondingly reaction times (RT) on COG. All other parameters (except **b** and **M** which were set to zero) of the state equation and measurement model were left free to be estimated using the data. More specifically, the latent process means at t=0 (or initial states of the system), the manifest intercepts $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ and the auto-effects and cross-effects of the DRIFT-matrix **A** were allowed to vary free across participants resulting in a total of 49 parameters. Population and individual level parameters are estimated simultaneously using all data from all subjects. The hierarchical Bayesian model estimation was set to default priors and initial starting values. All models were estimated using 4 chains and 8.000 iterations (under Stan's optimizer for maximum a posteriori estimates (cf. see 58).

Overall, three models were hypothesized and compared using their model evidence. First, a full 2-CR model (cross-effects) containing both auto-effects and both cross-domain interplay parameters in the drift-matrix. The full 2-CR model results in 13 free population mean parameters and is a full model enabling bi-directional coupling of state variables. Secondly, a 1-CR (COG.PP) model with both auto-effects and the cross-effect from PP on COG (denoted as PP→COG) only, implementing the hypothesized effects of physical performance on cognition but not reversed. Thirdly, a 1-CR (PP.COG) model with both auto-effects and the cross-effect COG on PP (denoted as COG→PP) only. Both 1-CR model resulting in a total of 40 parameters each. Lastly, a zero-model (0-CR) was specified in which both cross-effects were fixed to zero (without domain interplays) and accordingly only the auto-effects were freely estimated. Then, the full 2-CR model was compared against both 1-CR (PP→COG and COG→PP) and 0-CR model with regard to their model fit using a Chi-Square difference test (58).

Furthermore, we aimed to validate the dynamic modelling coefficients that characterize the individual interplay of physical and cognitive domain by exploring their relationship with clinical scores. More specifically, we ran a second-level models with the MMSE baseline score and the SF12 physical sum baseline score as time-independent covariates. A higher score in both covariates is associated with higher cognitive status respectively higher physical health status. All other model specifications were the same as the above full 2-CR model.

Finally, we aimed to explore potential changes of dynamics over the course of training using a slightly extended full 2-CR model. The strength of the cross-effect in question physical on cognitive performance (PP→COG) was compared between the baseline (day 1-84) and

second half (day 85-168) of the training. Therefore we included a time dependent predictor χ (named 'secondhalf'), which is zero expect on day 84, when it is 1. Additional, an extra latent process (named 'step2ndhalf') was included, with all parameters and covariances fixed to zero, except the element on the time dependent predictor were set to 1. The later specification make this extra latent process a step function, i.e. shifts on day 84 to 1 and stay there. The cross-effect in question was defined as a function of PP→COG on baseline added by PP→COG on the second half of the training multiplied by the extra latent process. As such, a negative value reflects a stronger effect of physical on cognitive performance (i.e. when physical performance increases the reaction time decreases) in the second half of the training and vice versa. Both PP→COG baseline and second half were free parameters to estimate.

Author Contributions

GZ and SS contributed to the conceptualization and the data curation. SS, GZ, and MV performed the formal analysis. ED contributed to the funding acquisition, resources, and the supervision. The investigation was conducted by NB, WG, AB, and SS. ED, MV, GZ, AB, and SS contributed to the methodology and AB and NB to the project administration. The software and validation was conducted by AB. SS contributed to the visualization and the writing of the original draft preparation. SS, GZ, MV, WG, AB, NB, and ED contributed to the writing of the review and editing. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Funding

The project (ID: ZS/2016/05/78611) belongs to the Research Association Autonomy in old Age (AiA) funded by the European Union (ERDF-European Regional Development Fund) and the State of Saxony-Anhalt, Germany.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Supplemental Material

Methods – Statistical Analysis

Subject-level latent dynamic model

$$\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\eta}(t) = \left(\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\eta}(t) + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\chi}(t)\right)\mathrm{d}t + \mathbf{G}\mathrm{d}\mathbf{W}(t) \qquad (2)$$

Furthermore, $\mathbf{W}(t)$ denotes the so-called Wiener process, a random walk in continuous time with covariance matrix $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{T}}$. $\mathbf{Q}$ is also referred as the diffusion matrix. Further technical details and explanations can be found in (58).

Thirdly, the framework allows for some (or potentially all) parameters to differ across individuals. Here the parameters for each subject are drawn from a population distribution with unknown mean and variance and priors. Additionally, effects of time independent predictors (covariate effects) can be included (see Driver and Voelkle (2018) for further details).



Fig. S1. Individual level analyses for five randomly selected participants of the sample over time interval in days (x-axis). The solid lines presents the model prediction of the smoothed estimates of participant's individual latent states COG (upper panel) and PP (lower panel) within a 95% BCI. Each coloured solid line presents the individual model prediction for one subject (ID) each. The temporal dynamics of PP show more individual differences compared to COG.

Alternative model examine dynamic change and interplay of physical (PP) and cognitive (COG) performance

			model with cross-effect COG→PP only				*model with cross-effect PP→COG only*				*model with no cross-effects*			
	parameter	symbol	**Est.**	**SD**	**LL-BCI**	**UL-BCI**	**Est.**	**SD**	**LL-BCI**	**UL-BCI**	**Est.**	**SD**	**LL-BCI**	**UL-BCI**
DRIFT	$drift_{PP}$	A	-0.00	0.01	-0.01	-0.00	-0.50	0.17	-0.90	-0.24	-4.42	0.75	-5.92	-2.96
	$drift_{COG}$	A	-5.89	0.84	-7.53	-4.31	-3.43	1.81	7.52	-0.73	-1.74	0.36	-2.49	-1.09
	$drift_{COG \rightarrow PP}$	A	0.48	0.09	0.30	0.66								
	$drift_{PP \rightarrow COG}$	A					-0.52	0.29	-1.09	0.04				
$T0_{MEANS}$	$T0m_{PP}$	η_1	-0.15	0.11	-0.36	0.06	-0.31	0.02	-0.36	-0.25	-0.18	0.05	-0.28	-0.08
	$T0m_{COG}$	η_1	0.30	0.05	0.18	0.41	0.95	0.63	-0.18	2.15	1.11	0.30	0.47	1.67
DIFFUSION	$diff_{PP}$	Q	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.33	0.02	0.30	0.38	0.17	0.02	0.13	0.21
	$diff_{PP \rightarrow COG}$	Q	-0.69	0.12	-0.86	-0.41	0.03	0.05	-0.73	1.34	-0.08	0.06	-0.16	-0.01
	$diff_{COG}$	Q	1.07	0.15	0.80	1.39	1.00	0.16	0.73	1.34	0.82	0.06	0.70	0.96
MANIFEST VAR	$mvar_{Power/HR}$	Θ	0.20	0.01	0.18	0.21	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.11	0.24	0.01	0.22	0.25
	$mvar_{RT}$	Θ	0.24	0.03	0.18	0.32	0.10	0.07	0.02	0.30	0.07	0.04	0.02	0.18
MANIFEST MEANS	$mm_{Power/HR}$	τ	-0.38	0.14	-0.65	-0.11	-0.22	0.16	-0.55	0.09	-0.29	0.17	-0.62	0.06
	mm_{RT}	τ	0.82	0.22	0.38	1.24	0.32	0.37	-0.34	1.05	0.03	0.09	-0.14	0.03

Table S1: Group level results showing estimated population means including Bayesian posterior intervals of the alternative models that were compared with the full 2-CR (cross-effect) main model. Sample size *n* = 17. All alternative models contain two latent variables (physical (PP) and cognitive (COG) performance) with one manifest indicator, each (Power/HR and RT corrected for PE). The model with cross-effect COG→PP only contains both auto-effects and the cross-effect cognitive on physical performance only, *n* = X free population mean parameters. The model with cross-effect PP→COG contains both auto-effects and the cross-effect physical on cognitive performance only, *n* = X free population mean parameters. The model with no cross-effect contains both auto-effects only, *n* = X free population mean parameters. Est. mean from mean of the chains; BCI, 95% Bayesian credible interval, LL, lower limit, UL, upper limit; Bayesian model estimation: number of chains = 4, number of iterations = 8000.

References

1. Schmiedek. Hundred days of cognitive training enhance broad cognitive abilities in adulthood: findings from the COGITO study. Front Aging Neurosci [Internet]. 2010; Available from: http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnagi.2010.00027/abstract

2. Hertzog C, Dixon RA, Hultsch DF. Intraindividual change in text recall of the elderly. Brain Lang [Internet]. 1992 Apr;42(3):248–69. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0093934X9290100S

3. Hultsch DF, MacDonald SWS, Hunter MA, Levy-Bencheton J, Strauss E. Intraindividual variability in cognitive performance in older adults: Comparison of adults with mild dementia, adults with arthritis, and healthy adults. Neuropsychology [Internet]. 2000 Oct;14(4):588–98. Available from: http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/0894-4105.14.4.588

4. Salthouse TA, Nesselroade JR, Berish DE. Short-Term Variability in Cognitive Performance and the Calibration of Longitudinal Change. Journals Gerontol Ser B Psychol Sci Soc Sci [Internet]. 2006 May 1;61(3):P144–51. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/psychsocgerontology/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/geronb/61.3.P144

5. Salthouse TA, Berish DE. Correlates of Within-Person (Across-Occasion) Variability in Reaction Time. Neuropsychology [Internet]. 2005;19(1):77–87. Available from: http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/0894-4105.19.1.77

6. Shammi P, Bosman E, Stuss DT. Aging and Variability in Performance. Aging, Neuropsychol Cogn [Internet]. 1998 Mar 9;5(1):1–13. Available from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1076/anec.5.1.1.23

7. Li S-C, Huxhold O, Schmiedek F. Aging and Attenuated Processing Robustness. Gerontology [Internet]. 2004;50(1):28–34. Available from: https://www.karger.com/Article/FullText/74386

8. Nesselroade JR. The warp and the woof of the developmental fabric. In: R. M. Downs, L. S. Liben & DSP, editor. Visions ofaesthetics, the environment & development: The legacy of Joachim F Wohlwill. Nillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum; 1991. p. 213–40.

9. Geiser C, Keller BT, Lockhart G, Eid M, Cole DA, Koch T. Distinguishing state variability from trait change in longitudinal data: The role of measurement (non)invariance in latent state-trait analyses. Behav Res Methods [Internet]. 2015 Mar 21;47(1):172–203. Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.3758/s13428-014-0457-z

10. MacDonald SWS, Li S-C, Bäckman L. Neural underpinnings of within-person variability in cognitive functioning. Psychol Aging [Internet]. 2009;24(4):792–808. Available from: http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/a0017798

11. Brehmer Y, Li S-C, Müller V, von Oertzen T, Lindenberger U. Memory plasticity across the life span: Uncovering children's latent potential. Dev Psychol [Internet]. 2007;43(2):465–78. Available from: http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/0012-1649.43.2.465

12. Rebok GW, Carlson MC, Langbaum JBS. Training and Maintaining Memory Abilities in Healthy Older Adults: Traditional and Novel Approaches. Journals Gerontol Ser B

[Internet]. 2007 Jun 1;62(Special_Issue_1):53–61. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/psychsocgerontology/psychsocgerontology/article/2965152/Training

13. Breijyeh Z, Karaman R. Comprehensive Review on Alzheimer's Disease: Causes and Treatment. Molecules [Internet]. 2020 Dec 8;25(24):5789. Available from: https://www.mdpi.com/1420-3049/25/24/5789

14. Serrano-Pozo A, Frosch MP, Masliah E, Hyman BT. Neuropathological Alterations in Alzheimer Disease. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med [Internet]. 2011 Sep 1;1(1):a006189–a006189. Available from: http://perspectivesinmedicine.cshlp.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/cshperspect.a006189

15. Spires-Jones TL, Hyman BT. The Intersection of Amyloid Beta and Tau at Synapses in Alzheimer's Disease. Neuron [Internet]. 2014 May;82(4):756–71. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0896627314003900

16. De-Paula VJ, Radanovic M, Diniz BS, Forlenza O V. Alzheimer's Disease. In 2012. p. 329–52. Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-94-007-5416-4_14

17. Meng Q, Lin M-S, Tzeng I-S. Relationship Between Exercise and Alzheimer's Disease: A Narrative Literature Review. Front Neurosci [Internet]. 2020 Mar 26;14. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnins.2020.00131/full

18. Colcombe S, Kramer AF. Fitness Effects on the Cognitive Function of Older Adults. Psychol Sci [Internet]. 2003 Mar 25;14(2):125–30. Available from: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1111/1467-9280.t01-1-01430

19. Erickson KI, Hillman C, Stillman CM, Ballard RM, Bloodgood B, Conroy DE, et al. Physical Activity, Cognition, and Brain Outcomes: A Review of the 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines. Med Sci Sport Exerc [Internet]. 2019 Jun;51(6):1242–51. Available from: https://journals.lww.com/00005768-201906000-00019

20. Law C-K, Lam FM, Chung RC, Pang MY. Physical exercise attenuates cognitive decline and reduces behavioural problems in people with mild cognitive impairment and dementia: a systematic review. J Physiother [Internet]. 2020 Jan;66(1):9–18. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1836955319301341

21. Sofi F, Valecchi D, Bacci D, Abbate R, Gensini GF, Casini A, et al. Physical activity and risk of cognitive decline: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. J Intern Med [Internet]. 2011 Jan;269(1):107–17. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2796.2010.02281.x

22. Hamer M, Chida Y. Physical activity and risk of neurodegenerative disease: a systematic review of prospective evidence. Psychol Med [Internet]. 2009 Jan 23;39(1):3–11. Available from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0033291708003681/type/journal_article

23. Coelho FG de M, Vital TM, Stein AM, Arantes FJ, Rueda AV, Camarini R, et al. Acute Aerobic Exercise Increases Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor Levels in Elderly with Alzheimer's Disease. J Alzheimer's Dis [Internet]. 2014 Jan 24;39(2):401–8. Available from: https://www.medra.org/servlet/aliasResolver?alias=iospress&doi=10.3233/JAD-131073

24. Erickson KI, Voss MW, Prakash RS, Basak C, Szabo A, Chaddock L, et al. Exercise training increases size of hippocampus and improves memory. Proc Natl Acad Sci [Internet]. 2011 Feb 15;108(7):3017–22. Available from: http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1015950108

25. Pereira AC, Huddleston DE, Brickman AM, Sosunov AA, Hen R, McKhann GM, et al. An in vivo correlate of exercise-induced neurogenesis in the adult dentate gyrus. Proc Natl Acad Sci [Internet]. 2007 Mar 27;104(13):5638–43. Available from: http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0611721104

26. van Praag H, Kempermann G, Gage FH. Running increases cell proliferation and neurogenesis in the adult mouse dentate gyrus. Nat Neurosci [Internet]. 1999 Mar;2(3):266–70. Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/nn0399_266

27. van Praag H, Christie BR, Sejnowski TJ, Gage FH. Running enhances neurogenesis, learning, and long-term potentiation in mice. Proc Natl Acad Sci [Internet]. 1999 Nov 9;96(23):13427–31. Available from: http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.96.23.13427

28. Wolf SA, Kronenberg G, Lehmann K, Blankenship A, Overall R, Staufenbiel M, et al. Cognitive and Physical Activity Differently Modulate Disease Progression in the Amyloid Precursor Protein (APP)-23 Model of Alzheimer's Disease. Biol Psychiatry [Internet]. 2006 Dec;60(12):1314–23. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0006322306004665

29. Yuede CM, Zimmerman SD, Dong H, Kling MJ, Bero AW, Holtzman DM, et al. Effects of voluntary and forced exercise on plaque deposition, hippocampal volume, and behavior in the Tg2576 mouse model of Alzheimer's disease. Neurobiol Dis [Internet]. 2009 Sep;35(3):426–32. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0969996109001405

30. Geda YE, Roberts RO, Knopman DS, Christianson TJH, Pankratz VS, Ivnik RJ, et al. Physical Exercise, Aging, and Mild Cognitive Impairment. Arch Neurol [Internet]. 2010 Jan 1;67(1). Available from: http://archneur.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/archneurol.2009.297

31. Winchester J, Dick MB, Gillen D, Reed B, Miller B, Tinklenberg J, et al. Walking stabilizes cognitive functioning in Alzheimer's disease (AD) across one year. Arch Gerontol Geriatr [Internet]. 2013 Jan;56(1):96–103. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0167494312001409

32. Hernandez SSS, Coelho FGM, Gobbi S, Stella F. [Effects of physical activity on cognitive functions, balance and risk of falls in elderly patients with Alzheimer's dementia]. Rev Bras Fisioter [Internet]. 2010;14(1):68–74. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20414564

33. Groot C, Hooghiemstra AM, Raijmakers PGHM, van Berckel BNM, Scheltens P, Scherder EJA, et al. The effect of physical activity on cognitive function in patients with dementia: A meta-analysis of randomized control trials. Ageing Res Rev [Internet]. 2016 Jan;25:13–23. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1568163715300349

34. Heyn P, Abreu BC, Ottenbacher KJ. The effects of exercise training on elderly persons with cognitive impairment and dementia: A meta-analysis11No commercial party having a direct financial interest in the results of the research supporting this article has

or will confer a benefit upon th. Arch Phys Med Rehabil [Internet]. 2004 Oct;85(10):1694–704. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0003999304003971

35. Sink KM, Espeland MA, Castro CM, Church T, Cohen R, Dodson JA, et al. Effect of a 24-Month Physical Activity Intervention vs Health Education on Cognitive Outcomes in Sedentary Older Adults. JAMA [Internet]. 2015 Aug 25;314(8):781. Available from: http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jama.2015.9617

36. Young J, Angevaren M, Rusted J, Tabet N. Aerobic exercise to improve cognitive function in older people without known cognitive impairment. Cochrane Database Syst Rev [Internet]. 2015 Apr 22; Available from: https://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/14651858.CD005381.pub4

37. Snowden M, Steinman L, Mochan K, Grodstein F, Prohaska TR, Thurman DJ, et al. Effect of Exercise on Cognitive Performance in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: Review of Intervention Trials and Recommendations for Public Health Practice and Research. J Am Geriatr Soc [Internet]. 2011 Apr;59(4):704–16. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03323.x

38. Lamb SE, Sheehan B, Atherton N, Nichols V, Collins H, Mistry D, et al. Dementia And Physical Activity (DAPA) trial of moderate to high intensity exercise training for people with dementia: randomised controlled trial. BMJ [Internet]. 2018 May 16;k1675. Available from: https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.k1675

39. Sanders LMJ, Hortobágyi T, Karssemeijer EGA, Van der Zee EA, Scherder EJA, van Heuvelen MJG. Effects of low- and high-intensity physical exercise on physical and cognitive function in older persons with dementia: a randomized controlled trial. Alzheimers Res Ther [Internet]. 2020 Dec 19;12(1):28. Available from: https://alzres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13195-020-00597-3

40. Etnier JL, Nowell PM, Landers DM, Sibley BA. A meta-regression to examine the relationship between aerobic fitness and cognitive performance. Brain Res Rev [Internet]. 2006 Aug;52(1):119–30. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0165017306000038

41. Ngandu T, Lehtisalo J, Solomon A, Levälahti E, Ahtiluoto S, Antikainen R, et al. A 2 year multidomain intervention of diet, exercise, cognitive training, and vascular risk monitoring versus control to prevent cognitive decline in at-risk elderly people (FINGER): a randomised controlled trial. Lancet [Internet]. 2015 Jun;385(9984):2255–63. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673615604615

42. Jardim NYV, Bento-Torres NVO, Costa VO, Carvalho JPR, Pontes HTS, Tomás AM, et al. Dual-Task Exercise to Improve Cognition and Functional Capacity of Healthy Older Adults. Front Aging Neurosci [Internet]. 2021 Feb 16;13. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnagi.2021.589299/full

43. Baddeley A, Logie R, Bressi S, Sala S Della, Spinnler H. Dementia and Working Memory. Q J Exp Psychol Sect A [Internet]. 1986 Nov 1;38(4):603–18. Available from: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1080/14640748608401616

44. Baddeley AD, Bressi S, Della Sala S, Logie R SH. The decline of working memory in Alzheimer's disease. A longitudinal study. Brain [Internet]. 1991;114(6):2521–42. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/brain/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/brain/114.6.2521

45. Foley JA, Kaschel R, Logie RH, Della Sala S. Dual-Task Performance in Alzheimer's Disease, Mild Cognitive Impairment, and Normal Ageing. Arch Clin Neuropsychol [Internet]. 2011 Jun 1;26(4):340–8. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/acn/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/arclin/acr032

46. MacPherson SE, Sala S Della, Logie RH, Wilcock GK. Specific AD Impairment in Concurrent Performance of Two Memory Tasks. Cortex [Internet]. 2007 Jan;43(7):858–65. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0010945208706853

47. Sebastian MV, Menor J, Elosua MR. Attentional Dysfunction of the Central Executive in Ad: Evidence from Dual Task and Perseveration Errors. Cortex [Internet]. 2006 Jan;42(7):1015–20. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0010945208702077

48. Parvin E, Mohammadian F, Amani-Shalamzari S, Bayati M, Tazesh B. Dual-Task Training Affect Cognitive and Physical Performances and Brain Oscillation Ratio of Patients With Alzheimer's Disease: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Front Aging Neurosci [Internet]. 2020 Dec 22;12. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnagi.2020.605317/full

49. Hamaker EL, Asparouhov T, Brose A, Schmiedek F, Muthén B. At the Frontiers of Modeling Intensive Longitudinal Data: Dynamic Structural Equation Models for the Affective Measurements from the COGITO Study. Multivariate Behav Res [Internet]. 2018 Nov 2;53(6):820–41. Available from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00273171.2018.1446819

50. Hecht M, Voelkle MC. Continuous-time modeling in prevention research: An illustration. Int J Behav Dev [Internet]. 2021 Jan 19;45(1):19–27. Available from: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0165025419885026

51. Oppewal H. Concept of Causality and Conditions for Causality. In: Wiley International Encyclopedia of Marketing [Internet]. Chichester, UK, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2010. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781444316568.wiem02059

52. Voelkle MC, Gische C, Driver CC, Lindenberger U. The Role of Time in the Quest for Understanding Psychological Mechanisms. Multivariate Behav Res [Internet]. 2018 Nov 2;53(6):782–805. Available from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00273171.2018.1496813

53. Voelkle MC, Oud JHL. Continuous time modelling with individually varying time intervals for oscillating and non-oscillating processes. Br J Math Stat Psychol [Internet]. 2013 Feb;66(1):103–26. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.2044-8317.2012.02043.x

54. Voelkle MC, Oud JHL, Davidov E, Schmidt P. An SEM approach to continuous time modeling of panel data: Relating authoritarianism and anomia. Psychol Methods [Internet]. 2012;17(2):176–92. Available from: http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/a0027543

55. Friston KJ, Preller KH, Mathys C, Cagnan H, Heinzle J, Razi A, et al. Dynamic causal modelling revisited. Neuroimage [Internet]. 2019 Oct;199:730–44. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1053811917301568

56. Breakspear M. Dynamic models of large-scale brain activity. Nat Neurosci [Internet]. 2017 Mar 23;20(3):340–52. Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/nn.4497

57. Schwarck S, Busse N, Ziegler G, Glanz W, Becke A, Düzel E. Heart Rate Variability During Physical Exercise Is Associated With Improved Cognitive Performance in Alzheimer's Dementia Patients—A Longitudinal Feasibility Study. Front Sport Act Living [Internet]. 2021 Jul 15;3. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fspor.2021.684089/full

58. Driver CC, Voelkle MC. Hierarchical Bayesian continuous time dynamic modeling. Psychol Methods [Internet]. 2018 Dec;23(4):774–99. Available from: http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/met0000168

59. Ahlskog JE, Geda YE, Graff-Radford NR, Petersen RC. Physical Exercise as a Preventive or Disease-Modifying Treatment of Dementia and Brain Aging. Mayo Clin Proc [Internet]. 2011 Sep;86(9):876–84. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0025619611652191

60. Buford TW, Roberts MD, Church TS. Toward Exercise as Personalized Medicine. Sport Med [Internet]. 2013 Mar 5;43(3):157–65. Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s40279-013-0018-0

61. Bonafiglia JT, Rotundo MP, Whittall JP, Scribbans TD, Graham RB, Gurd BJ. Inter-Individual Variability in the Adaptive Responses to Endurance and Sprint Interval Training: A Randomized Crossover Study. Calbet JAL, editor. PLoS One [Internet]. 2016 Dec 9;11(12):e0167790. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0167790

62. Dong J-G. The role of heart rate variability in sports physiology. Exp Ther Med [Internet]. 2016 May;11(5):1531–6. Available from: https://www.spandidos-publications.com/10.3892/etm.2016.3104

63. Erickson KI, Hillman C, Stillman CM, Ballard RM, BLOODGOOD B, Conroy DE, et al. Physical Activity, Cognition, and Brain Outcomes: A Review of the 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines. Med Sci Sport Exerc [Internet]. 2019 Jun;51(6):1242–51. Available from: https://journals.lww.com/00005768-201906000-00019

64. World Health Organization. GLOBAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON PHYSICAL ACTIVITY FOR HEALTH. Geneva; 2010.

65. Zhang X, He Q, Huang T, Zhao N, Liang F, Xu B, et al. Treadmill Exercise Decreases Aβ Deposition and Counteracts Cognitive Decline in APP/PS1 Mice, Possibly via Hippocampal Microglia Modifications. Front Aging Neurosci [Internet]. 2019 Apr 5;11. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnagi.2019.00078/full

66. Di Loreto S, Falone S, D'Alessandro A, Santini S, Sebastiani P, Cacchio M, et al. Regular and moderate exercise initiated in middle age prevents age-related amyloidogenesis and preserves synaptic and neuroprotective signaling in mouse brain cortex. Exp Gerontol [Internet]. 2014 Sep;57:57–65. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0531556514001454

67. Moore KM, Girens RE, Larson SK, Jones MR, Restivo JL, Holtzman DM, et al. A spectrum of exercise training reduces soluble Aβ in a dose-dependent manner in a mouse model of Alzheimer's disease. Neurobiol Dis [Internet]. 2016 Jan;85:218–24. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0969996115300838

68. Dixon RA, Garrett DD, Lentz TL, MacDonald SWS, Strauss E, Hultsch DF. Neurocognitive markers of cognitive impairment: Exploring the roles of speed and inconsistency. Neuropsychology [Internet]. 2007 May;21(3):381–99. Available from: http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/0894-4105.21.3.381

69. Burton CL, Strauss E, Hultsch DF, Moll A, Hunter MA. Intraindividual Variability as a Marker of Neurological Dysfunction: A Comparison of Alzheimer's Disease and Parkinson's Disease. J Clin Exp Neuropsychol [Internet]. 2006 Jan 16;28(1):67–83. Available from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13803390490918318

70. Gamaldo AA, An Y, Allaire JC, Kitner-Triolo MH, Zonderman AB. Variability in performance: Identifying early signs of future cognitive impairment. Neuropsychology [Internet]. 2012 Jul;26(4):534–40. Available from: http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/a0028686

71. Bangen KJ, Weigand AJ, Thomas KR, Delano-Wood L, Clark LR, Eppig J, et al. Cognitive dispersion is a sensitive marker for early neurodegenerative changes and functional decline in nondemented older adults. Neuropsychology [Internet]. 2019 Jul;33(5):599–608. Available from: http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/neu0000532

72. Holmqvist SL, Thomas KR, Brenner EK, Edmonds EC, Calcetas A, Edwards L, et al. Longitudinal Intraindividual Cognitive Variability Is Associated With Reduction in Regional Cerebral Blood Flow Among Alzheimer's Disease Biomarker-Positive Older Adults. Front Aging Neurosci [Internet]. 2022 Jul 6;14. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnagi.2022.859873/full

73. Kievit RA, Brandmaier AM, Ziegler G, van Harmelen A-L, de Mooij SMM, Moutoussis M, et al. Developmental cognitive neuroscience using latent change score models: A tutorial and applications. Dev Cogn Neurosci [Internet]. 2018 Oct;33:99–117. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S187892931730021X

74. Stillman CM, Cohen J, Lehman ME, Erickson KI. Mediators of Physical Activity on Neurocognitive Function: A Review at Multiple Levels of Analysis. Front Hum Neurosci [Internet]. 2016 Dec 8;10. Available from: http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnhum.2016.00626/full

75. Erickson KI, Donofry SD, Sewell KR, Brown BM, Stillman CM. Cognitive Aging and the Promise of Physical Activity. Annu Rev Clin Psychol [Internet]. 2022 May 9;18(1):417–42. Available from: https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-072720-014213

76. Vivar C, Potter MC, van Praag H. All About Running: Synaptic Plasticity, Growth Factors and Adult Hippocampal Neurogenesis. In 2013. p. 189–210. Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/7854_2012_220

77. de Sousa Fernandes MS, Ordônio TF, Santos GCJ, Santos LER, Calazans CT, Gomes DA, et al. Effects of Physical Exercise on Neuroplasticity and Brain Function: A Systematic Review in Human and Animal Studies. Hess G, editor. Neural Plast [Internet]. 2020 Dec 14;2020:1–21. Available from: https://www.hindawi.com/journals/np/2020/8856621/

78. Kobilo T, Liu Q-R, Gandhi K, Mughal M, Shaham Y, van Praag H. Running is the neurogenic and neurotrophic stimulus in environmental enrichment. Learn Mem [Internet]. 2011 Sep 30;18(9):605–9. Available from:

http://learnmem.cshlp.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/lm.2283011

79. Vaynman S, Ying Z, Gomez-Pinilla F. Hippocampal BDNF mediates the efficacy of exercise on synaptic plasticity and cognition. Eur J Neurosci [Internet]. 2004 Nov;20(10):2580–90. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2004.03720.x

80. Liu Y-F, Chen H, Yu L, Kuo Y-M, Wu F-S, Chuang J-I, et al. Upregulation of hippocampal TrkB and synaptotagmin is involved in treadmill exercise-enhanced aversive memory in mice. Neurobiol Learn Mem [Internet]. 2008 Jul;90(1):81–9. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1074742708000324

81. Jenkinson C, Layte R, Jenkinson D, Lawrence K, Petersen S, Paice C, et al. A shorter form health survey: can the SF-12 replicate results from the SF-36 in longitudinal studies? J Public Health (Bangkok) [Internet]. 1997 Jun 1;19(2):179–86. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/jpubhealth/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/oxfordjournals.pubmed.a024606

82. Chen C-H, Chen Y-J, Tu H-P, Huang M-H, Jhong J-H, Lin K-L. Benefits of exercise training and the correlation between aerobic capacity and functional outcomes and quality of life in elderly patients with coronary artery disease. Kaohsiung J Med Sci [Internet]. 2014 Oct;30(10):521–30. Available from: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1016/j.kjms.2014.08.004

83. Amini M, Mirmoezzi M, Salmanpour M, Khorshidi D. Effect of 8-Week of Selected Aerobic Exercises on Improving the Quality of Life in Healthy Aged Sedentary Men. Int J Sport Stud Heal [Internet]. 2018 Jan 29;In Press(In Press). Available from: https://brief.land/intjssh/articles/67514.html

84. Abd El-Kader SM, Al-Jiffri OH. Aerobic exercise improves quality of life, psychological well-being and systemic inflammation in subjects with Alzheimer's disease. Afr Health Sci [Internet]. 2017 Mar 7;16(4):1045. Available from: https://www.ajol.info/index.php/ahs/article/view/152540

85. Nishiguchi S, Yamada M, Tanigawa T, Sekiyama K, Kawagoe T, Suzuki M, et al. A 12-Week Physical and Cognitive Exercise Program Can Improve Cognitive Function and Neural Efficiency in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A Randomized Controlled Trial. J Am Geriatr Soc [Internet]. 2015 Jul;63(7):1355–63. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jgs.13481

86. Roig-Coll F, Castells-Sánchez A, Lamonja-Vicente N, Torán-Monserrat P, Pera G, García-Molina A, et al. Effects of Aerobic Exercise, Cognitive and Combined Training on Cognition in Physically Inactive Healthy Late-Middle-Aged Adults: The Projecte Moviment Randomized Controlled Trial. Front Aging Neurosci [Internet]. 2020 Oct 29;12. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnagi.2020.590168/full

87. Rieker JA, Reales JM, Muiños M, Ballesteros S. The Effects of Combined Cognitive-Physical Interventions on Cognitive Functioning in Healthy Older Adults: A Systematic Review and Multilevel Meta-Analysis. Front Hum Neurosci [Internet]. 2022 Mar 24;16. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2022.838968/full

88. Gallardo-Gómez D, del Pozo-Cruz J, Noetel M, Álvarez-Barbosa F, Alfonso-Rosa RM, del Pozo Cruz B. Optimal dose and type of exercise to improve cognitive function in

older adults: A systematic review and bayesian model-based network meta-analysis of RCTs. Ageing Res Rev [Internet]. 2022 Apr;76:101591. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1568163722000332

89. Forstmeier S, Maercker A. Motivational processes in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease: results from the Motivational Reserve in Alzheimer's (MoReA) study. BMC Psychiatry [Internet]. 2015 Dec 17;15(1):293. Available from: http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-244X/15/293

90. Kempermann G, Kuhn HG, Gage FH. More hippocampal neurons in adult mice living in an enriched environment. Nature [Internet]. 1997 Apr;386(6624):493–5. Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/386493a0

91. Walsh RN, Budtz-Olsen OE, Penny JE, Cummins RA. The effects of environmental complexity on the histology of the rat hippocampus. J Comp Neurol [Internet]. 1969 Nov;137(3):361–5. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/cne.901370309

92. Wright RL, Conrad CD. Enriched environment prevents chronic stress-induced spatial learning and memory deficits. Behav Brain Res [Internet]. 2008 Feb;187(1):41–7. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0166432807004408

93. Borg GA. Psychophysical bases of perceived exertion. Med Sci Sports Exerc [Internet]. 1982;14(5):377–81. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7154893

94. Ware JE, Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: Construction of Scales and Preliminary Tests of Reliability and Validity. Med Care [Internet]. 1996 Mar;34(3):220–33. Available from: http://journals.lww.com/00005650-199603000-00003

95. Eichler T, Thyrian JR, Dreier A, Wucherer D, Köhler L, Fiß T, et al. Dementia care management: going new ways in ambulant dementia care within a GP-based randomized controlled intervention trial. Int Psychogeriatrics [Internet]. 2014 Feb 23;26(2):247–56. Available from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S1041610213001786/type/journal_article

96. Karvonen MJ, Kentala E, Mustala O. The effects of training on heart rate; a longitudinal study. Ann Med Exp Biol Fenn [Internet]. 1957;35(3):307–15. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/13470504

97. Khosla A, Raju AS, Torralba A, Oliva A. Understanding and Predicting Image Memorability at a Large Scale. In: 2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV) [Internet]. IEEE; 2015. p. 2390–8. Available from: http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7410632/

98. Vandierendonck A. A comparison of methods to combine speed and accuracy measures of performance: A rejoinder on the binning procedure. Behav Res Methods [Internet]. 2017 Apr 4;49(2):653–73. Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.3758/s13428-016-0721-5

99. Carpenter B, Gelman A, Hoffman MD, Lee D, Goodrich B, Betancourt M, et al. Stan□: A Probabilistic Programming Language. J Stat Softw [Internet]. 2017;76(1). Available from: http://www.jstatsoft.org/v76/i01/

100. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, et al. Welcome

to the Tidyverse. J Open Source Softw [Internet]. 2019 Nov 21;4(43):1686. Available from: https://joss.theoj.org/papers/10.21105/joss.01686