Semantic Memory in Healthy Apolipoprotein ε4 Carriers: A Systematic Review

Riccardo Sacripante [1*], Tabitha James[2,3], Michael Hornberger[3], Joshua Blake[1], Louis Renoult[2]

[1] Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychological Therapies, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK

[2] School of Psychology, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

[3] Department of Medicine, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

*Corresponding author: Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychological Therapies, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK

Email address: uke22vdu@uea.ac.uk

Abstract

The Apolipoprotein epsilon 4 (*APOE* ε4) genetic variant is notoriously linked to enhanced risk of developing Alzheimer's Disease (AD). Several studies have examined how this allele could influence cognitive functioning in healthy adults, and whether ε4 carriers show a subtle cognitive decline that would indicate preclinical AD pathology. Research has predominantly focused on episodic memory, where ε4 carriers are usually impaired, while semantic memory functioning has received less attention. To evaluate current evidence on the influence of *APOE* ε4 on semantic memory, we systematically reviewed the research literature assessing semantic memory in non-clinical adult populations according to the PRISMA guidelines. We reviewed 17 studies that revealed high heterogeneity in how semantic memory is conceptualised and assessed. When tested via standard neuropsychological tests (i.e., verbal fluency, naming, language comprehension, and general knowledge), ε4 carriers did not significantly differ from non-carriers. Instead, ε4 carriers showed lower performance than non-carriers when assessed via more complex semantic memory tasks (i.e., longer verbal fluency tasks, autobiographical memory tasks, measures of semantic clustering). The impact of *APOE* ε4 on semantic memory thus appears to be restricted to these more complex tasks, which could constitute a better match to episodic memory tasks for which *APOE* effects are typically observed. Future research investigating autobiographical memory retrieval in ε4 carriers could provide a more sensitive and ecologically valid assessment of semantic memory and would disentangle between personal and general forms of semantic memory.

Keywords: Apolipoprotein, *APOE*, autobiographical memory, semantic memory, aging, Alzheimer's Disease

1. Introduction

Alzheimer's Disease (AD) is the most common form of neurodegenerative disease and dementia in the world, and it has become one of the most expensive and burdening conditions of this century (Scheltens et al., 2021). Early and accurate detection of AD is important for the screening, diagnosis and subsequent management and care of people affected by this neurodegenerative condition (Porsteinsson et al., 2021). However, detecting early deficits in preclinical AD is problematic and clinically difficult, given the vast heterogeneity of normal ageing and AD expression (Emrani et al., 2020). Early cognitive deficits often involve spatial navigation and declarative memory (Coughlan et al., 2018) and once a person receives a diagnosis, cognitive impairments are often fairly pronounced. Late-onset AD can therefore elude clinical detection for years and even decades, and this inevitably has a life-changing impact on the quality of life of people receiving such diagnosis and their families and carers (Rasmussen & Langerman, 2019). With the recent approval and imminent rollout of the first disease-modifying pharmacological treatments for AD (e.g., Donanembad, or Lecanemab; Mintun et al., 2021, see also Laurell et al., 2024), early detection of subtle cognitive markers of AD has become even more important.

Advances in neuroimaging measures like Positron Emission Tomography (PET), fluorodeoxyglucose PET (FDG-PET), or functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI) (for a review see Ewers et al., 2011) in conjunction with AD biomarkers (e.g., beta-amyloid and tau proteins) have dramatically improved the precision of the AD diagnostic criteria (see McKhann et al., 2011 for AD). Indeed, changes in brain biochemistry involving biomarkers are now thought to occur approximately 20 years before the onset of classic AD symptoms (Alzheimer’s Association, 2019). In this regard, a promising ground of research derives from cognitive and genetic markers in preclinical AD which, along with brain biomarkers and

sensitive cognitive assessment, could predict the development of the disease and inform future pharmacological and cognitive interventions (for a review see Jackson et al., 2024).

1.1 Apolipoprotein Epsilon 4 (*APOE* ε4)

APOE, or apolipoprotein E, is a protein that transports cholesterol and other fatty substances within brain cells and supplies the central nervous system with essential lipids. *APOE* corresponds to different versions of a DNA sequence on chromosome 19, known as an allele, with three major variants or isoforms (ε2, ε3, and ε4), for which every individual inherits one from each parent. Variants in allele genotypes can be homozygous (ε2ε2, ε3ε3, ε4ε4) or heterozygous (ε2ε3, ε2ε4, ε3ε4) and each isoform of the *APOE* protein corresponds to distinct structural properties which impact brain function.

It has been demonstrated that people carrying the ε4 variant of the *APOE* gene are at increased risk of developing sporadic late-onset Alzheimer's Disease (Corder et al., 1993; Farrer et al., 1997) with an earlier age of onset (Fortea et al., 2024), while those carrying the ε2 allele are at a decreased risk (Reiman et al., 2020, for a review see Suri et al., 2013). Notably, ε4 homozygotes carriers (ε4ε4) present with greater risk compared to ε4 heterozygotes carriers (ε3ε4 or ε2ε4), meaning that genetic risk to AD could be dose-dependent (Blacker et al., 1997; Davidson et al., 2006). Despite the presence of the *APOE* ε4 genotype being restricted to only 20 to 25% of the general population in different global regions, the allele is highly present in cases of late-onset AD (i.e., almost half of all cases, see Caselli & Reiman, 2012). A recent study examining clinical, pathological, and biomarker changes in homozygotic *APOE* ε4 carriers (Fortea et al., 2024) concluded that this allele mutation represents a direct cause of late-onset AD and not just a risk factor, as almost all these participants presented with AD brain pathology already from middle age (see also Xu et al., 2024), although having high amyloid burden does not necessarily translate to AD (for a meta-analysis see Jansen et al., 2015).

A plethora of research studies focused their attention on how this allele could influence cognition and cognitive decline in non-demented healthy adults (see O'Donoghue et al., 2018; Small et al., 2004; Wisdom et al., 2011). Meta-analyses on the effect of *APOE* on cognition (Small et al., 2004; Wisdom et al., 2011) observed that *APOE* ε4 carriers predominantly show reduced performance in episodic memory, executive functioning, and, more marginally, perceptual speed, as compared to non-carriers. This has, however, produced findings that are difficult to interpret across studies because of variable methodology regarding the age groups involved, the cognitive measures employed, sample sizes, and study designs.

The precise role of *APOE* ε4 genotype on cognitive functioning therefore remains uncertain. A recent systematic review on the effect of *APOE* ε4 on cognition in the healthy population (O'Donoghue et al., 2018) suggested that cognitive deficits shown by *APOE* ε4 carriers can be partly explained by early AD pathology ('Prodromal hypothesis'; Foster et al., 2013; Smith et al., 1998), yet they also hypothesised that subtle cognitive deficits related to the *APOE* ε4 genotype could be observed already in mid-adulthood when using sensitive cognitive measures ('Phenotype hypothesis'; Fouquet et al., 2014; Greenwood et al., 2005; Parasuraman et al., 2002). Therefore, the evidence supporting the role of *APOE* genotype on cognitive abilities in the healthy population and the translational potential of this line of research remains still limited.

1.2 Episodic and Semantic Memory

Autobiographical memory includes knowledge of specific lived events (episodic memory) and knowledge about general facts or one's personal life circumstances (semantic memory) (for a review, see Fan et al., 2024). While episodic memory entails re-experiencing and recollecting past events that are traceable in time and space (e.g., one's 18th birthday party),

semantic memory relates to knowledge acquired through accumulated experiences but detached from its context of acquisition (e.g., Renoult et al., 2019).

When considering research on episodic and semantic memory in *APOE* ε4 carriers, existing research has predominantly been focused on episodic memory (see O'Donoghue et al., 2018; Small et al., 2004; Wisdom et al., 2011). This may be because episodic memory deficits are regarded as the early cognitive hallmark of Alzheimer's Disease, where patients are commonly known to be impaired in the recollection of recent episodic events (McKhann et al., 2011). In a systematic review examining the role of the *APOE* ε4 genotype on episodic memory in AD patients, El Haj et al. (2016) indeed observed that most studies reported a significant relationship between *APOE* ε4 and episodic memory decline. The most recent meta-analysis available in the field (Wisdom et al., 2011) indicated that healthy ε4 carriers perform significantly worse on episodic memory and executive functioning tasks, in line with a previous meta-analysis (Small et al., 2004).

The distinction between episodic and semantic memory has also been questioned by studies that documented how these two forms of memory could be interdependent and overlapping in their neural correlates (see Greenberg & Verfaellie, 2010; Irish & Grilli, 2024; Tanguay et al., 2024). This distinction has also been revisited through evidence involving clinical populations (Buckley et al., 2014; Duval et al., 2012; Irish et al., 2010; Strikwerda-Brown et al., 2019). Semantic memory has been dissociated into personal and general semantics (Renoult et al., 2012, 2019, 2020; see also Strikwerda-Brown et al., 2019), with the former referring to knowledge of one's personal past and the latter to culturally shared knowledge (e.g., events happening in the local community or around the world). Personal semantics has been further fractioned into sub-categories involving autobiographical facts, memory for repeated events, and self-knowledge (Melega et al., 2024; Renoult et al., 2012, 2016; Tanguay et al., 2018).

Despite these recent new insights, the role of semantic memory in healthy people at increased genetic risk of developing AD is yet to be clarified. Semantic memory was initially thought to be relatively spared at the earliest stages of the disease, as seen in famous case studies (see Gabrieli et al., 1988; O'Kane et al., 2004; Warrington & McCarthy, 1988) and less sensitive to aging (Nyberg et al., 2003), therefore consolidating the assumption that semantic memory may not be a sensitive marker for late-onset AD. A line of evidence has however challenged this view (Duff et al., 2020; Hoffman & Morcom, 2018; Verma & Howard, 2011), with cross-sectional studies involving people with Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI) and AD which documented semantic memory impairments when using verbal fluency, naming and other similar tasks (Chasles et al., 2020; Joubert et al., 2010, 2021; Koenig et al., 2007; Storandt, 2008; Taler et al., 2016, 2020). Interestingly, in a study assessing autobiographical narratives in people with MCI and relative controls, Buckley and colleagues (2014) reported that personal semantic memory performance was related to beta-amyloid burden after adjusting for age and *APOE* ε4 genotype. In healthy APOE ε4 carriers, longitudinal studies including measures of semantic memory have however reported mixed results (Wilson et al., 2002; Nilsson et al., 2006), therefore the impact of the *APOE* ε4 genotype on semantic memory is still unclear.

1.3 Aims of the present review

To our knowledge, no previous systematic review has selectively investigated the impact of *APOE* ε4 on semantic memory in healthy adults. This was the aim of the present study, where we reviewed the available literature to scrutinize studies that reported and compared performance on semantic memory tasks in non-clinical adult populations with and without *APOE* ε4.

2. Methods

The initial search was carried out on 1st March 2024 according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines followed by an update search on 1st September 2024, and another one carried out on 1st March 2025. The search protocol and inclusion/exclusion criteria were pre-registered on the Prospero database (ID: CRD42024499684). For this systematic review, we adopted a narrative synthesis approach, as outlined by Popay et al. (2006).

2.1 Search strategy

The search strategy included the electronic databases: Academic Search Complete, AMED (The Allied and Complementary Medicine Database), CINAHL Complete (Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature), APA PsycArticles, APA PsycInfo, and MEDLINE Complete. The following search terms were used: "*APOE*" OR "*apolipoprotein*" AND "*memory*")[1].

As in previous reviews in the field (O'Donoghue et al., 2018), we only considered papers published from 1993, the year when *APOE* ε4 was first identified as a risk factor for AD (Corder et al., 1993). We also carried out a manual search by looking at reference lists of the articles included, systematic reviews, or meta-analyses relevant to the review topic.

2.2 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The inclusion criteria were selected using the Population, Intervention, Outcomes and Study (PICOS) framework (Methley et al., 2014; Pollock & Berge, 2018):

[1] We chose a broad search term ("memory") to maximise sensitivity, as initial searches revealed that relevant studies did not always use the expression "semantic memory".

1) Population: healthy adults over the age of 18 without a diagnosis of neurodegenerative disease (including mild cognitive impairment), acquired brain injuries, psychiatric conditions, or reports of subjective memory complaints or decline;
2) Comparison: studies needed to report *APOE* genotype (i.e., ε2, ε3, ε4, or ε4 carriers vs non-carriers), and include a group comparison of *APOE* ε4 carriers versus non-carriers on semantic memory performance;
3) Outcome: Semantic memory performance assessed through standardized neuropsychological, cognitive, or experimental memory tasks;
4) Study: Empirical studies published in the English language.

In this process, we also referred to the following exclusion criteria:

1) Studies only including a paediatric population (under the age of 18);
2) Non-human animal studies;
3) Studies that did not report semantic memory performance at baseline (e.g., longitudinal study) and/or that did not mention semantic memory;
4) Reviews (including systematic reviews), meta-analyses, book chapters, and case reports;
5) Studies published in other languages than English;

2.3 Screening and Selection

Relevant articles were screened by title, abstract, and full-text after the removal of duplicates by the first reviewer (R.S.). A second reviewer (T.J.) screened 10% of the articles for the title and abstract and 20% of the articles for full-text. The second reviewer was randomly assigned a selection of articles to screen and was blind to the ratings of the first reviewer (R.S.). For both stages, the two reviewers discussed and resolved diverging views around inclusion or exclusion of papers.

2.4 Quality Rating

Quality assessment and critical appraisal of included articles was conducted using the Appraisal tool for Cross-Sectional Studies (AXIS – Downes et al., 2016). The AXIS tool includes 20 items with “Yes”, “No”, or “Not known” responses concerning the quality of reporting and of the study design, as well as potential sources of bias. The rating of risk of bias (“High”, “Medium” or “Low”) was based on reviewers’ judgment. To aid the quality rating process, a numerical rating was also computed: “Yes” answers received a point, and a “No” or “Not known” answer was scored as zero (excluding items 13 and 19, for which scores were reversed to “Yes/Not known ” = 0, “No” = 1).

As in the screening and selection process, the two reviewers completed this step and were blind to each other ratings . The second reviewer assessed the quality and risk of bias of approximately 50% of the included papers. Once the quality rating was completed, they discussed and resolved diverging views regarding the quality rating of the articles. The two raters agreed on almost all the items (154/160, 96.25%) and were able to resolve any disagreements.

3. Results

3.1 Study selection

Figure 1 shows the review process via the PRISMA 2020 flowchart diagram. The initial search from all the databases produced 7,881 articles. A total of 4,683 duplicates were removed, and a preliminary screening of 3,198 papers by title and abstract was completed. Forty-eight studies underwent full-text screening.

We excluded 36 research articles during full-text screening (See Figure 1). This left 12 articles, all conventionally identified via databases. Two additional papers were identified via citation-searching of relevant papers, while three other papers were included in a previous systematic review on the effects of the APOE genotype on cognition (O'Donoghue et al., 2018). Seventeen papers were selected, with a total number of 8,491 participants tested.



Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart outlining the article identification, screening and selection process.

3.2 Quality Assessment and Risk of Bias

Seven studies were rated has having "Medium" risk of bias, one paper was rated as "Medium to High" risk, and the remaining nine articles were considered to have a "Low" risk. Of the 17 articles, 10 did not justify the sample size, nor mentioned power analysis (Item 3).

3.3 Study Details

Detailed characteristics of each of the included studies are reported in *Table 1*. Apart from a single longitudinal study (Nilsson et al., 2006), all were cross-sectional studies including group comparisons between *APOE* ε4 carriers and non-carriers at a single time point. One paper (Seidenberg et al., 2009) also grouped the participants by family history for AD and *APOE* genotype to determine risk, while five papers stratified the participants by *APOE* genotype groups (i.e., *APOE* ε2/2, ε2/3, ε3/3, ε4/4, ε2/4, ε3/4; Helkala et al., 1995; Nilsson et al., 2006; Salo et al., 2001; Staehelin et al., 1999; Wikgren et al., 2012). The remaining 11 papers divided their participants between *APOE* ε4 carriers (+) and non-carriers (-).

The study sample sizes varied extensively, from samples of a few dozen participants (e.g., Grilli et al., 2018, 2021; Rosen et al., 2005; Salo et al., 2001) to large cohorts of hundreds or even thousands respondents (e.g., Ford et al., 2020; Helkala et al., 1995; Laukka et al., 2013; Nilsson et al., 2006; Payton et al., 2006).

Likewise, the age groups of the samples included in the studies varied too. All but one study included healthy older adults in their samples (Eich et al., 2019). Out of those 16 studies that included healthy older adults, three papers stratified the age of their participants by Young-Old, or Old-Old adults (e.g., < 75 years, and > 75 years respectively; Duchek et al., 2006; Nilsson et al., 2006; Stahaelin et al., 1999).

Eight studies also included middle-aged adults (Eich et al., 2019; Grilli et al., 2018, 2021; Knoff et al., 2024; Nilsson et al., 2006; Payton et al., 2006; Rosen et al., 2005; Wikgren et al., 2012) and two studies also provided data from younger adults (Duchek et al., 2006; Eich et al., 2019).

----------INSERT TABLE 1 HERE----------

The main source of heterogeneity among the selected studies derived from the type of test or task used to measure semantic memory. As outlined in *Table 2*, 11 studies adopted verbal fluency tasks (i.e., category fluency; Duchek et al., 2006; Ford et al., 2020; Grilli et al., 2018, 2021; Helkala et al., 1995; Knoff et al., 2024; Nilsson et al., 2006; Rosen et al., 2005; Salo et al., 2001; Tse et al., 2010; Wikgren et al., 2012), five used naming tests (e.g., Boston Naming Test; Duchek et al., 2006; Eich et al., 2019; Grilli et al., 2018, 2021; Knoff et al., 2024), and 15 used tests of language comprehension or general knowledge tests (e.g., verbal comprehension tests; Duchek et al., 2006; Eich et al., 2019; Grilli et al., 2018, 2021; Knoff et al., 2024; Laukka et al., 2013; Nilsson et al., 2006; Payton et al., 2006; Rosen et al., 2005; Salo et al., 2001; Sapkota et al., 2016; Seidenberg et al., 2009; Stahaelin et al., 1999; Tse et al., 2010; Wikgren et al., 2012). Two studies assessed semantic memory by looking at autobiographical memory retrieval (Grilli et al., 2018, 2021).

Given this heterogeneity in the methodology and tasks employed that may tap into different aspects of semantic memory as well as other cognitive abilities, we herein separately report the findings by the type of task used to measure semantic memory.

----------INSERT TABLE 2 HERE----------

3.3.1 Verbal Fluency

Verbal fluency tasks involve naming as many components of a particular semantic category (e.g., animals, fruits, vegetables), or as many words starting with a specific letter (e.g., F,A,S) in a specific time frame (usually one minute). While the former task is named Category or Semantic Fluency, the latter is commonly referred to as Letter or Phonemic Fluency. In these

tasks, participants are warned against repeating the same word more than once, or generating proper nouns, like names of people or places (e.g., cities, countries, regions). Tests of verbal fluency primarily assess the ability of accessing and retrieving words and their associations from an internal lexicon (Salthouse, 1991), as well as self-monitoring, and mental flexibility which are commonly referred to as Executive Functions (de Frias et al., 2005; Lezak et al., 2008).

Eleven studies included in this review considered verbal fluency tests as assessing semantic memory. Eight studies did not find any significant group differences using these tests (Grilli et al., 2018, 2021; Helkala et al., 1995; Knoff et al., 2024; Nilsson et al., 2006; Salo et al., 2001; Tse et al., 2010; Wikgren et al., 2013). Two studies observed that *APOE* ε4 carriers performed significantly worse than non-carriers (Ford et al., 2020; Rosen et al., 2005). Finally, one study (Duchek et al., 2006) reported a reverse effect, with significantly higher performance among Young-Old *APOE* ε4 carriers (65 to 78 years of age) than non-carriers of the same age on a Category fluency task (p = .013). Such reversed effects of *APOE* on cognition are not unusual, although they are usually observed in early adulthood (see Section 4).

Along with the traditional one-minute Category and Letter fluency tests, Rosen et al. (2005) also administered an extensive Category Fluency task, where participants were asked to generate names from the animal category for 10 minutes and were also encouraged to generate names from subcategories (e.g., flowers). Despite not finding any significant group differences in the one-minute Category and Letter fluency tests, the authors reported that, in the 10 minutes version of the task, *APOE* ε4 carriers generated fewer animal names (p = .02), and fewer clusters of semantically related words (p = .03), as compared to non-carriers. These participants also showed longer retrieval times when shifting from one semantic cluster to another, as compared to non-carriers (p = .03).

More recently, Ford et al. (2020) assessed the ability of participants to generate groups of semantically similar items using the Categorization task (CAT; Stern & White, 2003), and to group words of similar meaning, as measured by the Semantic Clustering index (where a cluster corresponded to two or more words). The CAT task uses visual cues such as photographs and verbal information. While there were no significant differences in the Categorization task, the authors observed a lower Semantic Clustering performance in *APOE* ε4 carriers, compared to non-carriers (p = .015).

Considering the results of the verbal fluency tests together, it appears that *APOE* ε4 carriers' performance on these tasks generally does not differ from the performance of non-carriers. This pattern of results does not seem to be influenced by the age groups of the participants involved, by the sample size included in the studies, or the rated risk of bias. However, those studies that employed a more complex variation of the verbal fluency tests reported a lower performance among *APOE* ε4 carriers (Ford et al., 2020; Rosen et al., 2005).

3.3.2 Naming

Naming tests are designed to assess confrontational picture-naming and word retrieval and, more generally, expressive language. For instance, the commonly used Boston Naming Test (Kaplan et al., 1983) requires respondents to name a series of pictures of common line-drawn objects and animals. If an object is not named spontaneously, participants are allowed to receive semantic cues (e.g., "something that contains water" for a glass). Although naming abilities are usually considered part of the language domain, the ability to recognise and name common objects largely draws upon the use of semantic knowledge and the lexicon.

In this review, five studies (Duchek et al., 2006; Eich et al., 2019; Grilli et al., 2018, 2021; Knoff et al., 2024) included naming tests as a proxy measure of semantic memory, such as the Boston Naming Test (Kaplan et al., 1983), and the Picture Naming Test (Woodcock et al., 1989). As all five studies failed to detect any significant group difference (Duchek et al., 2006; Eich et al., 2019; Grilli et al., 2018, 2021; Knoff et al., 2024), these findings thus suggest that the presence of *APOE* ε4 genotype does not generally seem to impact semantic memory when assessed through common language naming tasks. Crucially, some of these studies also reported the presence of ceiling effects in both carriers and non-carriers on the Boston Naming task (Duchek et al., 2006; Grilli et al., 2021; Knoff et al., 2024), as could be expected in samples of healthy older adults.

3.3.3 Language Comprehension/General Knowledge Tests

Tests of language comprehension are also informative for semantic memory functioning. For instance, subtests of the Verbal Comprehension Index of the Weschler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS-IV; Weschler, 2008) are designed and standardised to assess understanding of language (e.g., Vocabulary), use of verbal reasoning (e.g., Similarities) and of verbal knowledge (e.g., Information), which all rely on semantic knowledge.

Fourteen studies included in this review employed a language comprehension task as a measure of semantic memory performance (Duchek et al., 2006; Eich et al., 2019; Grilli et al., 2018, 2021; Knoff et al., 2024; Laukka et al., 2013; Nilsson et al., 2006; Payton et al., 2006; Rosen et al., 2005; Salo et al., 2001; Sapkota et al., 2016; Stahaelin et al., 1999; Tse et al., 2010; Wikgren et al., 2012). These tasks included the subtests of the Verbal Comprehension index of the WAIS-IV, the SRB Vocabulary Test (Dureman, 1960) and its revised version (Dureman & Salde, 1971), other Vocabulary tasks (see Ekstrom et al., 1976: Raven 1965), Synonyms and Antonyms (Salthouse 1993a, 1993b).

Thirteen of these studies failed to detect a significant group difference in language comprehension tasks (Duchek et al., 2006; Eich et al., 2019; Grilli et al., 2018, 2021; Knoff et al., 2024; Laukka et al., 2013; Nilsson et al., 2006; Payton et al., 2006; Rosen et al., 2005; Salo et al., 2001; Sapkota et al., 2016; Tse et al., 2010; Wikgren et al., 2013). Only Stahaelin et al. (1999) reported a significant effect of *APOE* ε4, whereby carriers performed significantly worse than non-carriers (p = .041) on the Vocabulary test of the WAIS-Revised. Apart from this single study, the findings reported in the other studies predominantly suggest that, when semantic memory is measured through standard tests of language comprehension, *APOE* ε4 carriers and non-carriers do not seem to differ on these tasks. Nonetheless, in those studies including the Verbal Comprehension Index of the WAIS-IV (Grilli et al., 2018, 2021; Knoff et al., 2024), mean composite scores suggested that participants tendentially fell in the high average range (110 to 119) or even in the superior range (120 to 129) of the general population, which indicates that these participants were highly educated for their age. This, therefore, may indicate a sampling bias and a non-accurate representation of the general population.

Tests of General Knowledge have also been frequently used as a measure of semantic memory (Bäckmann & Nilsson, 1996; Nyberg et al., 2003). These may include factual questions ("What is the capital of Paraguay?" or "What is the fastest animal in the world?") or recognition questions, such as identifying the names or pictures of famous people (e.g., historical figures, politicians, actors, singers). In our systematic review, we included three papers using these types of tasks to assess semantic memory. Two studies (Duchek et al., 2006; Laukka et al., 2013) employed a General Knowledge Test (Dahl et al., 2009; Einstein et al., 1995), while Seidenberg et al., (2009) instead used a fame-judgement task, where carriers and non-carriers participants with and without an additional risk factor of a family history of AD were shown a series of names and were asked to rate them as "famous" or as "unfamiliar". Reportedly, none of these studies observed any significant group differences between *APOE*

ε4 carriers and non-carriers on task accuracy, or on reaction times. There were, however, indications of possible ceiling effects in Seidenberg et al., (2009), where participants' performance in all groups exceeded 90% mean accuracy on the fame discrimination task, regardless of their genetic risk for developing AD (*APOE* genotype and family history).

3.3.4 Autobiographical Memory

Semantic memory can also be measured via interview-based protocols that were developed to measure the retrieval of autobiographical memories. These include the Autobiographical Memory Interview (Kopelman et al., 1989) or the widely used Autobiographical Interview (Levine et al., 2002) and its more recent updated version (see Melega et al., 2024). These tasks are designed to assess and measure episodic and semantic memory retrieval, as they are both considered integrative parts of autobiographical memory.

In our systematic review, only two of the selected studies assessed the effect of *APOE* ε4 allele on semantic memory by considering autobiographical memory (Grilli et al., 2018, 2021). In their first study, Grilli et al. (2018) administered an adapted version of the Autobiographical Interview (Levine et al., 2002) to a group of *APOE* ε4 carriers and non-carriers. In this task, healthy older participants were asked to recall events from six different time periods, and detailed memory for each life event was scored as internal (i.e., episodic) or external (including semantic details). While carriers produced autobiographical memories that were generally reduced in internal details as compared to non-carriers, Grilli et al. (2018) did not observe any significant group difference in external details.

In a more recent study, Grilli et al. (2021) used an adapted version of the Autobiographical fluency tasks (Addis & Tippet, 2004; see also Dritschel et al., 1992) to assess episodic and personal semantic details. In this adapted task, participants were asked to generate exemplars of episodic (i.e., specific events) or personal semantic (e.g., names of personally

relevant people) memories across three distinct life periods (childhood, early adulthood, recent life). Reportedly, *APOE* ε4 carriers generated fewer exemplars on this task than non-carriers, showing an overall lower fluency on personal semantic memory (p = .02), as well as on episodic memory (p = .02). Interestingly, *APOE* ε4 carriers did not show reduced performance in general semantic fluency tests, as measured by standard neuropsychological tests of category fluency (animals, fruits/vegetables, and letters commencing with "F", "A", "S"). Based on these findings, the authors suggested that, along with reduced episodic memory, autobiographical memory deficits in *APOE* ε4 carriers could also extend to personal semantics, but not to general semantics.

Despite their very limited number, studies on autobiographical memory retrieval suggest that the presence of the *APOE* ε4 allele may not impact semantic memory when recollecting life events (Grilli et al., 2018), or at least not all aspects of semantic memory, as it was observed in one study that *APOE* ε4 negatively impacted the generation of personal semantic memory, when it was assessed via the demands of an autobiographical fluency task (Grilli et al., 2021).

4. Discussion

As evidence has suggested that semantic memory could be impaired in MCI and AD (Chasles et al., 2020; Joubert et al., 2010, 2020; Taler et al., 2016, 2020), we aimed to systematically review the available literature that explored the role of *APOE* ε4 genotype on this memory domain in healthy adults at increased genetic risk of developing AD. Research in the field has abundantly reported episodic memory deficits associated with the *APOE* ε4 genotype (O'Donoghue et al., 2018; Small et al., 2004; Wisdom et al., 2011), while semantic memory has been more rarely investigated.

Overall, we found broad similarities in performance on semantic memory tasks between *APOE* ε4 and non-carriers, with some exceptions. The picture that, however, emerged from our systematic review is depicted by highly heterogeneous views on how semantic memory has been conceptualised and assessed over the past thirty years of research.

For instance, Nilsson et al. (2006) highlighted a theoretical ambiguity in how to classify verbal fluency tests. These authors critically stated that when relevant longitudinal studies in the field were commenced, verbal fluency tests were reliably regarded as tests of semantic memory (Backmann & Nilsson 1996; Nilsson et al., 1997), as they assessed the generation of words from an internal lexicon (Kausler, 1982, 1991), while they later started to be considered as part of a wider executive functioning assessment (de Frias et al., 2005; Salthouse et al., 2003). Similarly, even though naming tasks are often used as a measure of semantic memory, they are also employed as a measure of language production abilities. Even tasks assessing language or word comprehension that are considered more direct measures of semantic memory (Laukka et al., 2013; Nilsson et al., 2006), together with tasks assessing general knowledge of semantic facts (i.e., general semantics), still rely on other cognitive domains such as language and executive functioning. For consistency, we here briefly summarise the results

of the effect of *APOE* ε4 genotype for each type of cognitive task used to assess semantic memory functioning.

When assessed with standard verbal fluency tasks, the studies here reviewed consistently reported similar semantic memory performance between *APOE* ε4 carriers and non-carriers, apart from one study from Duchek et al. (2006), where Young-Old *APOE* ε4 carriers outperformed non-carriers on an Animal Fluency task. To date, paradoxical findings are not unusual in this research field (see Carrion-Baralt et al., 2009), as past studies also documented unaffected or even improved cognitive performance in *APOE* ε4 young adult carriers as compared to non-carriers of similar age (Acevedo et al., 2010; Bloss et al., 2010; Mondadori et al., 2007), therefore suggesting that *APOE* ε4 could have a beneficial effect on cognition in early life but a detrimental effect on cognition in later life (Han & Bondi, 2008). Nonetheless, there is still quite limited longitudinal evidence to support this hypothesis (see Ihle et al., 2012), and a more recent meta-analysis failed to observe any significant differences between young carriers and non-carriers on several cognition domains (see Weissberger et al., 2018).

A significant genotype effect was detected in studies that employed a more complex version of verbal fluency tasks, where semantic memory was assessed over longer periods (i.e., 10 minutes, see Rosen et al., 2005). It could be argued that these complex fluency tasks are associated with heavier demands on executive functions (Eich et al., 2010; Rosen et al., 2005) that are known to be affected in ε4 carriers (O'Donoghue et al., 2018; Small et al., 2004; Wisdom et al., 2011), as observed in early studies investigating semantic memory in AD where patients showed difficulties on semantic tasks requiring self-initiation (e.g., category fluency, see Henry et al., 2004; Nebes, 1989). Moreover, studies assessing the ability of grouping words with similar meaning in verbal fluency tasks (i.e., semantic clustering) also observed that the *APOE* ε4 genotype was associated with reduced performance (Ford et al., 2020; Rosen et al.,

2005), in line with studies that documented a decline in the usage of semantic clustering from MCI to a final diagnosis of AD (Malek-Ahmadi et al., 2011; McLaughlin et al., 2014).

When semantic memory was tested with naming tasks, there were no significant group differences between *APOE* ε4 carriers and non-carriers. Nevertheless, three studies also reported the presence of ceiling effects in the commonly used Boston Naming Task (Duchek et al., 2006; Grilli et al., 2021; Knoff et al., 2024), which could be expected in tasks that were initially designed for clinical populations. This therefore raises the question as to whether these tasks would be appropriate and sensitive enough to assess semantic memory in the healthy adult population, although performance on naming abilities was generally found to decline in late adulthood (see Verhaegen & Poncelet, 2012).

Taken together, when semantic memory is assessed via naming tasks, the evidence in support of *APOE* ε4 genotype effects remains limited and confined to one single study (Staehelin et al., 1999), that reported significantly lower performance in two groups of healthy older *APOE* ε4 carriers (Young-Old, Old-Old) as compared to non-carriers of the same age, while the rest of the papers reviewed did not report significant group differences.

Only two studies assessed semantic memory retrieval with autobiographical memory tasks. The study from Grilli et al. (2018) was the first and, so far, the only one adopting the autobiographical memory interview to compare *APOE* ε4 cognitively healthy middle-aged and older carriers and non-carriers. Nonetheless, in the autobiographical interview, external details include general semantics, personal semantics, but also metacognitive statements, comments and repetitions, and details about off-topic events, and are thus not a pure measure of semantic processing, though semantic details often represent an important portion of the interview transcripts, especially in older adults (Renoult et al., 2020). Further studies should clarify whether ε4 carriers and non-carriers differ in semantic details specifically.

The emerging finding of a specific impact on personal semantics, highlighted by Grilli et al. (2021), suggests that personal and general semantic fluency may entail different task demands, whereby personal semantics involve the retrieval of personally known names or spatiotemporal context (i.e., lifetime periods) which also share some episodic qualities (see Renoult et al., 2012) and is supported by the medial temporal lobe (Conway, 2005; Greenberg et al., 2009; Sheldon & Moscovitch, 2012). Similar findings were also reported by Buckley et al. (2014), where personal semantic memory performance was related to neocortical beta-amyloid burden after adjusting for age and *APOE* status. Neuroimaging studies also documented changes in brain anatomy and connectivity in medial temporal lobe regions in healthy *APOE* ε4 carriers (Donix et al., 2010; Gallagher & Koh, 2011; Machulda et al., 2011; Mishra et al., 2018; for reviews see also Habib et al., 2017; Kucikova et al., 2021). Despite the restricted number of studies looking at this, the results of Grilli et al. (2021) suggest that the *APOE* ε4 genotype may not only affect episodic memory, but may be associated with broader autobiographical memory alterations.

Considering the overall results of this systematic review, most of the reviewed studies (70%) did not report significant group differences in semantic memory between *APOE* ε4 carriers and non-carriers. These findings are consistent with a previous systematic review on the effects of the *APOE* genotype on cognition that also considered semantic memory (O'Donoghue et al., 2018), although this review only included four studies evaluating semantic memory. In our review, four of the five studies that obtained significant group differences reported lower semantic memory performance in *APOE* ε4 carriers (Ford et al., 2020; Grilli et al., 2021; Rosen et al., 2005; Staehelin et al., 1999) and one reported an opposite effect in young participants (Duchek et al., 2006). As such, the evidence reviewed here predominantly suggests that *APOE* ε4 genotype is unlikely to influence semantic memory retrieval, at least when this is measured and assessed via standard neuropsychological tasks (i.e., verbal fluency,

naming, and language comprehension tasks). Some group differences emerged when semantic memory was assessed via modified and more complex versions of verbal fluency tasks, or when measuring semantic clustering (Rosen et al., 20005; Ford et al., 2020), or when using autobiographical memory tasks allowing to differentiate personal and general semantics (Grilli et al., 2021).

This pattern of results indicates that the effect of *APOE* ε4 genotype on semantic memory could be revealed with a more precise assessment of semantic memory functioning. As observed in studies involving people with amnesia that used more complex semantic tasks (see Duff et al., 2020 for a review), semantic memory deficits could be similar to those of episodic memory as both memory domains rely on medial temporal regions. These tasks could include word associate tests (i.e., identifying synonyms and common collocates), word senses tasks (i.e., name all the senses that a related to a word), and word feature tasks (i.e., name all of the features of a word) (Klooster & Duff, 2015), or extensive naming tasks (Hilverman & Duff, 2021), fairy tales or Bible stories (Rosenbaum et al., 2009; Verfaellie et al., 2014) or even generating hypothetical meaning for novel word compounds (e.g., cactus carpet, see Keane et al., 2020). Moreover, longitudinal evidence also suggested that semantic memory performance may decline over time in ε4 carriers, when assessed through a composite score combining verbal fluency with naming, reading and vocabulary abilities (see Wilson et al., 2002).

Considering future research, there is a clear need for more studies adopting measures of autobiographical memory. Such tasks and interview protocols could arguably represent a more ecologically valid assessment of episodic and semantic memory function, which are notionally linked to brain areas that are vulnerable to the early stages of AD pathology (i.e., medial temporal lobes, see Martinelli et al., 2013), as already stated for more complex general semantic tasks (Duff et al., 2020). Therefore, a more precise assessment of semantic memory

is needed to better understand whether this cognitive domain is affected by *APOE* ε4 genotype, and studies focusing on autobiographical memory tasks could help cast light on this matter.

4.1 Other sources of heterogeneity and limitations

The age of the participants included in the selected papers could have also been a source of heterogeneity and bias in our findings, as most *APOE* ε4 effects on cognition are observed in older adults. Out of the 17 papers here reviewed, 16 included healthy older adults (94%), while 8 studies also included middle-aged adults (47%) and two even included younger adults (11.8%). Crucially, all the significant findings relating *APOE* ε4 to semantic memory were observed in studies involving cohorts of older adults. However, as almost all studies included older adults and only few considered participants in early adulthood, the mediating influence of age on *APOE* ε4 effects on semantic memory is still unclear.

The studies included in this review differed in terms of *APOE* genotype types used to allocate participants into groups, with thirteen studies considering overall group differences between *APOE* ε4 carriers and non-carriers (Duchek et al., 2006 Eich et al., 2019; Ford et al., 2020; ; Grilli et al., 2018, 2021; Knoff et al., 2024; Laukka et al., 2013; Payton et al., 2006; Rosen et al., 2005; Sapkota et al., 2016; Seidenberg et al., 2009; Tse et al., 2010), while five stratified respondents for each genotype group (Helkala et al., 1995; Nilsson et al., 2006; Staehelin et al., 1999; Salo et al., 2001; Wikgren et al., 2012). By looking at the date of publication of these latter studies, it appears that they were mainly published in the early years of *APOE* genotype research (later 90s/early 2000s) when the ε4 genotype was still being investigated as a potential genetic risk factor for AD. Instead, later research in the field then started to compare samples with homozygote and heterozygote ε4 carriers to groups of participants who were simply considered non-carriers, likely because the evidence around the effect *APOE* ε4 on cognition has become more consolidated. Nonetheless, recruiting an

adequate number of *APOE* ε4 homozygote carriers can also be quite challenging, as these participants are quite rare in the general population (see Caselli & Reiman, 2013), so recruitment would therefore require very large samples of participants, usually from already genotyped cohorts.

4.2 Conclusions

Considering recent research advances that have revisited the role of semantic memory in AD, we systematically reviewed studies comparing healthy adult *APOE* ε4 carriers and non-carriers on semantic memory tasks. Our findings indicate a pervasive heterogeneity and a lack of consensus on the conceptualisation and therefore the assessment of semantic memory. When tested via classic neuropsychological tests that mainly assess general semantic memory, the performance *APOE* ε4 carriers did not generally differ from non-carriers. When semantic memory was assessed via modified versions of verbal fluency tasks or considering semantic clustering, carriers were found to be impaired. Similarly, in one study considering retrieval fluency of autobiographical memories, carriers showed a deficit in the generation of personal semantic information, compared to non-carriers (Grilli et al., 2021).

We conclude that the impact of *APOE* ε4 on semantic memory may be restricted to more demanding tasks, which could constitute a better match to episodic memory tasks for which effects are typically observed (Small et al., 2004; Wisdom et al., 2011), though a mediating role of executive functions should also be considered (O'Donoghue et al., 2018; Wisdom et al., 2011). Future studies on autobiographical memory retrieval in *APOE* ε4 carriers could provide a more precise and ecologically valid assessment of semantic memory, especially when disentangling between personal and general forms of semantic memory.

Funding

This work was completed as part of RS thesis portfolio for the Doctorate of Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD) at the University of East Anglia. LR was supported by Grant MR/S011463/1 from the Medical Research Council (MRC).

Authors' contributions

This work was ideated by RS, JB and LR. Literature search and evaluation was completed by the first rater (RS) with the help of a second rater (TJ). The first draft was written by RS and all authors critically read and revised the work, and eventually approved the final manuscript.

Declarations

None.

Conflict of interest

The authors of this research project declare no potential conflict of interest related to the research and the publication of this manuscript.

Data availability

No data are available for this study other than the ones reported in this manuscript.

References

Acevedo, S. F., Piper, B. J., Craytor, M. J., Benice, T. S., Raber, J., 2010. Apolipoprotein E4 and sex affect neurobehavioral performance in primary school children. Pediatr Res 67(3), 293-299. https://doi.org/10.1203/PDR.0b013e3181cb8e68

Addis, R.D., Tippett, L., 2004. Memory of myself: Autobiographical memory and identity in Alzheimer's disease. Memory 12 (1), 56-74. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210244000423

Alzheimer's Association., 2019. 2019 Alzheimer's disease facts and figures. Alzheimers Dement 15(3), 321–387. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2019.01.010

Bäckman, L., Nilsson, L. G., 1996. Semantic memory functioning across the adult life span. Eur Psychol *1*(1), 27-33. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.1.1.27

Bastin, C., Feyers, D., Jedidi, H., Bahri, M. A., Degueldre, C., Lemaire, C., ... & Salmon, E., 2013. Episodic autobiographical memory in amnestic mild cognitive impairment: What are the neural correlates?. Hum Brain Mapp 34(8), 1811-1825. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22032

Blacker, D., Haines, J. L., Rodes, L., Terwedow, H., Go, R. C. P., Harrell, L. E., ... & Tanzi, R., 1997. APOE-4 and age at onset of Alzheimer's disease: the NIMH genetics initiative. Neurology 48(1), 139-147. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.48.1.139

Bloss, C. S., Delis, D. C., Salmon, D. P., & Bondi, M. W., 2010. APOE genotype is associated with left-handedness and visuospatial skills in children. Neurobiol Aging 31(5), 787-795. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2008.05.021

Buckley, R. F., Saling, M. M., Irish, M., Ames, D., Rowe, C. C., Villemagne, V. L., ... Ellis, K. A., 2014. Autobiographical narratives relate to Alzheimer's disease biomarkers in

older adults. Int Psychogeriatr 26(10), 1737-1746. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1041610214001136

Carrión-Baralt, J. R., Meléndez-Cabrero, J., Rodriguez-Ubinas, H., Schmeidler, J., Beeri, M. S., Angelo, G., ... Silverman, J. M., 2009. Impact of APOE ε4 on the cognitive performance of a sample of non-demented Puerto Rican nonagenarians. J Alzheimers Dis 18(3), 533-540. https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-2009-1160

Caselli, R. J., Reiman, E. M., 2012. Characterizing the preclinical stages of Alzheimer's disease and the prospect of presymptomatic intervention. J Alzheimers Dis 33(s1), S405-S416. https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-2012-129026

Chasles, M. J., Tremblay, A., Escudier, F., Lajeunesse, A., Benoit, S., Langlois, R., ... Rouleau, I., 2020. An examination of semantic impairment in amnestic MCI and AD: What can we learn from verbal fluency?. Arch Clin Neuropsych 35(1), 22-30. https://doi.org/10.1093/arclin/acz018

Conway, M. A., 2005. Memory and the self. J Memory and Language 53(4), 594-628. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2005.08.005

Corder, E. H., Saunders, A. M., Strittmatter, W. J., Schmechel, D. E., Gaskell, P. C., Small, G., ... Pericak-Vance, M. A., 1993. Gene dose of apolipoprotein E type 4 allele and the risk of Alzheimer's disease in late onset families. Science 261(5123), 921-923. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.8346443

Coughlan, G., Laczó, J., Hort, J., Minihane, A. M., Hornberger, M., 2018. Spatial navigation deficits—overlooked cognitive marker for preclinical Alzheimer disease?. Nat Rev Neurol 14(8), 496-506. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41582-018-0031-x

Davidson, Y., Gibbons, L., Pritchard, A., Hardicre, J., Wren, J., Stopford, C., ... Mann, D. M., 2006. Apolipoprotein E ε4 allele frequency and age at onset of Alzheimer's disease. Dement Geriatr Cogn, 23(1), 60-66. https://doi.org/10.1159/000097038

Donix, M., Burggren, A. C., Suthana, N. A., Siddarth, P., Ekstrom, A. D., Krupa, A. K., ... & Bookheimer, S. Y., 2010. Longitudinal changes in medial temporal cortical thickness in normal subjects with the APOE-4 polymorphism. Neuroimage 53(1), 37-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.06.009

Dritschel, B. H., Williams, J. M. G., Baddeley, A. D., Nimmo-Smith, I., 1992. Autobiographical fluency: A method for the study of personal memory. Mem Cognition 20, 133-140. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03197162

Duchek, J. M., Balota, D. A., Cortese, M., 2006. Prospective memory and apolipoprotein E in healthy aging and early stage Alzheimer's disease. Neuropsychology, 20(6), 633 –644. https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.20.6.633

Duff, M. C., Covington, N. V., Hilverman, C., Cohen, N. J., 2020. Semantic memory and the hippocampus: Revisiting, reaffirming, and extending the reach of their critical relationship. Front Hum Neurosci 13, 471. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2019.00471

Dureman, I., 1960,. *SRB:1*. Psykologiförlaget.

Dureman, I., Kebbon, L., Österberg, E., 1971. *A manual to the DS-battery*. Psykologiförlaget.

Duval, C., Desgranges, B., de La Sayette, V., Belliard, S., Eustache, F., Piolino, P. , 2012. What happens to personal identity when semantic knowledge degrades? A study of the self and autobiographical memory in semantic dementia. *Neuropsychologia 50*(2), 254-265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2011.11.019

de Frias, C. M., Annerbrink, K., Westberg, L., Eriksson, E., Adolfsson, R., Nilsson, L.-G., 2005. Catechol O-Methyltransferase Val158 Met polymorphism is associated with cognitive performance in nondemented adults. J Cognitive Neuroscience 17, 1018–1025. https://doi.org/10.1162/0898929054475136

Downes, M. J., Brennan, M. L., Williams, H. C., Dean, R. S., 2016. Development of a critical appraisal tool to assess the quality of cross-sectional studies (AXIS). BMJ Open 6(12), e011458. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011458

Duchek, J. M., Balota, D. A., Cortese, M., 2006. Prospective memory and apolipoprotein E in healthy aging and early stage Alzheimer's disease. Neuropsychology 20(6), 633 –644. https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.20.6.633

Duval, C., Desgranges, B., de La Sayette, V., Belliard, S., Eustache, F., Piolino, P., 2012. What happens to personal identity when semantic knowledge degrades? A study of the self and autobiographical memory in semantic dementia. Neuropsychologia 50(2), 254-265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2011.11.019

El Haj, M., Antoine, P., Amouyel, P., Lambert, J. C., Pasquier, F., Kapogiannis, D., 2016. Apolipoprotein E (APOE) ε4 and episodic memory decline in Alzheimer’s disease: A review. Ageing Res Rev 27, 15-22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arr.2016.02.002

Eich, T. S., Tsapanou, A., Stern, Y., 2019. When time's arrow doesn't bend: APOE-ε4 influences episodic memory before old age. Neuropsychologia 133, 107180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2019.107180

Ekstrom, R.B., French, J.E.W., Harman, H.H., Dermen, D., 1976. *Manual for the Kit of Factor-Referenced Cognitive Tests*. Educational Testing Service.

Emrani, S., Arain, H. A., DeMarshall, C., Nuriel, T., 2020. APOE4 is associated with cognitive and pathological heterogeneity in patients with Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review. Alzheimers Res Ther 12(1), 141. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13195-020-00712-4

Ewers, M., Sperling, R. A., Klunk, W. E., Weiner, M. W., Hampel, H., 2011. Neuroimaging markers for the prediction and early diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease dementia. Trends Neurosci 34(8), 430-442. https://doi:10.1016/j.tins.2011.05.005

Fan, C., Simpson, S., Sokolowski, H. M., Levine, B., 2024. Autobiographical memory, in: Kahana, M.K., Wagner, K.D. (Eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Human Memory, Two Volume Pack: Foundations and Applications. Oxford Academic, Oxford, pp. 1140–1170. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190917982.013.39

Farrer, L. A., Cupples, L. A., Haines, J. L., Hyman, B., Kukull, W. A., Mayeux, R., ... Van Duijn, C. M., 1997. Effects of age, sex, and ethnicity on the association between apolipoprotein E genotype and Alzheimer disease: a meta-analysis. JAMA 278(16), 1349-1356. https://doi:10.1001/jama.1997.03550160069041

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., Lang, A. G., 2009. Statistical power analyses using G* Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. Behav Res Methods 41(4), 1149-1160. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149

Ford, J., Zheng, B., Hurtado, B., de Jager, C. A., Udeh-Momoh, C., Middleton, L., Price, G., 2020. Strategy or symptom: Semantic clustering and risk of Alzheimer's disease-related impairment. J Clin Exp Neuropsyc 42(8), 849-856. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803395.2020.1819964

Fortea, J., Pegueroles, J., Alcolea, D., Belbin, O., Dols-Icardo, O., Vaqué-Alcázar, L., ... Montal, V., 2024. APOE4 homozygozity represents a distinct genetic form of Alzheimer's disease. Nat Med 30, 1284–1291 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-024-02931-w

Foster, J. K., Albrecht, M. A., Savage, G., Lautenschlager, N. T., Ellis, K. A., Maruff, P., ... AIBL Research Group, 2013. Lack of reliable evidence for a distinctive ε4− related cognitive phenotype that is independent from clinical diagnostic status: findings from the Australian Imaging, Biomarkers and Lifestyle Study. Brain 136(7), 2201-2216. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awt127

Fouquet, M., Besson, F. L., Gonneaud, J., La Joie, R., Chételat, G., 2014. Imaging brain effects of APOE4 in cognitively normal individuals across the lifespan. Neuropsychol Rev 24, 290-299. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-014-9263-8

Gabrieli, J. D., Cohen, N. J., Corkin, S., 1988. The impaired learning of semantic knowledge following bilateral medial temporal-lobe resection. Brain Cognition 7(2), 157-177. https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-2626(88)90027-9

Gallagher, M., & Koh, M. T., 2011. Episodic memory on the path to Alzheimer's disease. Curr Opin Neurobiol 21(6), 929-934. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2011.10.021

Gamboz, N., De Vito, S., Brandimonte, M. A., Pappalardo, S., Galeone, F., Iavarone, A., Della Sala, S., 2010. Episodic future thinking in amnesic mild cognitive impairment. Neuropsychologia 48(7), 2091-2097. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2010.03.030

Greenberg, D. L., Keane, M. M., Ryan, L., Verfaellie, M., 2009. Impaired category fluency in medial temporal lobe amnesia: The role of episodic memory. J Neurosci 29(35), 10900-10908. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1202-09.2009

Greenberg, D. L., Verfaellie, M., 2010. Interdependence of episodic and semantic memory: Evidence from neuropsychology. J Int Neuropsych Soc 16(5), 748-753. https://doi:10.1017/S1355617710000676

Greenwood, P. M., Sunderland, T., Putnam, K., Levy, J., Parasuraman, R., 2005. Scaling of visuospatial attention undergoes differential longitudinal change as a function of APOE genotype prior to old age: results from the NIMH BIOCARD study. Neuropsychology 19(6), 830 –840. https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.19.6.830

Grilli, M. D., Verfaellie, M., 2014. Personal semantic memory: insights from neuropsychological research on amnesia. Neuropsychologia 61, 56-64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2014.06.012

Grilli, M. D., Wank, A. A., Bercel, J. J., Ryan, L., 2018. Evidence for reduced autobiographical memory episodic specificity in cognitively normal middle-aged and older individuals at increased risk for Alzheimer's disease dementia. J Int Neuropsych Soc 24(10), 1073-1083. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617718000577

Grilli, M. D., Wank, A. A., Huentelman, M. J., Ryan, L., 2021. Autobiographical memory fluency reductions in cognitively unimpaired middle-aged and older adults at increased risk for Alzheimer's disease dementia. J Int Neuropsych Soc 27(9), 905-915. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617720001319

Habib, M., Mak, E., Gabel, S., Su, L., Williams, G., Waldman, A., ... & O'Brien, J. T., 2017. Functional neuroimaging findings in healthy middle-aged adults at risk of Alzheimer's disease. Ageing Res Rev 36, 88-104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arr.2017.03.004

Han, S. D., Bondi, M. W., 2008. Revision of the apolipoprotein E compensatory mechanism recruitment hypothesis. Alzheimers Dement 4(4), 251-254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2008.02.006

Helkala, E. L., Koivisto, K., Hänninen, T., Vanhanen, M., Kervinen, K., Kuusisto, J., ... Riekkinen Sr, P., 1995. The association of apolipoprotein E polymorphism with memory: a

population based study. Neurosci Lett 191(3), 141-144. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3940(95)11575-H

Henry, J. D., Crawford, J. R., Phillips, L. H., 2004. Verbal fluency performance in dementia of the Alzheimer's type: a meta-analysis. Neuropsychologia 42(9), 1212-1222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2004.02.001

Hilverman, C., Duff, M. C., 2021. Evidence of impaired naming in patients with hippocampal amnesia. Hippocampus 31(6), 612-626. https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.23325

Hoffman, P., Morcom, A. M., 2018. Age-related changes in the neural networks supporting semantic cognition: A meta-analysis of 47 functional neuroimaging studies. Neurosci Biobehav R 84, 134-150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.11.010

Ihle, A., Bunce, D., Kliegel, M., 2012. APOE ε4 and cognitive function in early life: a meta-analysis. Neuropsychology 26(3), 267-277. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026769

Irish, M., Lawlor, B. A., O'Mara, S. M., Coen, R. F., 2010. Exploring the recollective experience during autobiographical memory retrieval in amnestic mild cognitive impairment. J Int Neuropsych Soc 16(3), 546-555. https://doi:10.1017/S1355617710000172

Irish, M., Lawlor, B. A., O'Mara, S. M., Coen, R. F., 2011. Impaired capacity for autonoetic reliving during autobiographical event recall in mild Alzheimer's disease. Cortex 47(2), 236-249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2010.01.002

Irish, M., Addis, D. R., Hodges, J. R., Piguet, O., 2012. Considering the role of semantic memory in episodic future thinking: evidence from semantic dementia. Brain 135(7), 2178-2191. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/aws119

Irish, M., Grilli, M. D., 2024. Interactions between episodic and semantic memory, in: Wixted, J.T. (Ed.), Learning and Memory: A Comprehensive Reference, Elseiver, pp 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-443-15754-7.00009-2

Jackson, R. J., Hyman, B. T., Serrano-Pozo, A., 2024. Multifaceted roles of APOE in Alzheimer disease. Nat Rev Neurol 20(8), 457-474. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41582-024-00988-2

Joubert, S., Brambati, S. M., Ansado, J., Barbeau, E. J., Felician, O., Didic, M., ... Kergoat, M. J., 2010. The cognitive and neural expression of semantic memory impairment in mild cognitive impairment and early Alzheimer's disease. Neuropsychologia 48(4), 978-988. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.11.019

Joubert, S., Gardy, L., Didic, M., Rouleau, I., Barbeau, E. J., 2021. A meta-analysis of semantic memory in mild cognitive impairment. Neuropsych Rev 31, 221-232. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-020-09453-5

Kaplan, E., Goodglass, H., & Weintraub, S., 1983. Boston Naming Test (BNT). APA PsycTests. https://doi.org/10.1037/t27208-000

Kausler, D. H., 1982. Experimental psychology and human aging. Wiley, New York.

Kausler, D. H., 1991. Experimental psychology, cognition, and human aging. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Keane, M. M., Bousquet, K., Wank, A., Verfaellie, M., 2020. Relational processing in the semantic domain is impaired in medial temporal lobe amnesia. J Neuropsych 14(3), 416-430. https://doi.org/10.1111/jnp.12196

Klooster, N. B., Duff, M. C., 2015. Remote semantic memory is impoverished in hippocampal amnesia. Neuropsychologia 79, 42-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.10.017

Knoff, A. A., Bowles, B., Andrews-Hanna, J. R., Grilli, M. D. 2024. Direct access to specific autobiographical memories is lower in healthy middle-aged to older adult Apolipoprotein E ε4 carriers compared to non-carriers. J Neuropsychol. https://doi.org/10.1111/jnp.12380

Koenig, P., Smith, E. E., Moore, P., Glosser, G., Grossman, M., 2007. Categorization of novel animals by patients with Alzheimer's disease and corticobasal degeneration. Neuropsychology 21(2), 193 –206. https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.21.2.193

Kopelman, M. D., Wilson, B. A., Baddeley, A. D., 1989. The autobiographical memory interview: a new assessment of autobiographical and personal semantic memory in amnesic patients. J Clin Exp Neuropsyc 11(5), 724-744. https://doi.org/10.1080/01688638908400928

Kucikova, L., Goerdten, J., Dounavi, M. E., Mak, E., Su, L., Waldman, A. D., ... & Ritchie, C. W., 2021. Resting-state brain connectivity in healthy young and middle-aged adults at risk of progressive Alzheimer’s disease. Neurosci Biobehav R 129, 142-153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2021.07.024

Laukka, E. J., Lövdén, M., Herlitz, A., Karlsson, S., Ferencz, B., Pantzar, A., ... & Bäckman, L., 2013. Genetic effects on old-age cognitive functioning: a population-based study. Psychol Aging 28(1), 262 –274. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030829

Laurell, A. A., Venkataraman, A. V., Schmidt, T., Montagnese, M., Mueller, C., Stewart, R., ... & Underwood, B. R., 2024. Estimating demand for potential disease-modifying therapies for Alzheimer's disease in the UK. Brit J Psychiat 224(6), 198-204. https://doi:10.1192/bjp.2023.166

Levine, B., Svoboda, E., Hay, J. F., Winocur, G., Moscovitch, M., 2002. Aging and autobiographical memory: dissociating episodic from semantic retrieval. Psychol Aging 17(4), 677 –689. https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.17.4.677

Lezak, M. D., Howieson, D.B., Bigler, E.D., Tranel, D., 2012. Neuropsychological Assessment, fifth ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Liberati, A., Altman, D. G., Tetzlaff, J., Mulrow, C., Gøtzsche, P. C., Ioannidis, J. P., ... & Moher, D., 2009. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. Ann Intern Med 151(4), W-65.

Liu, C. C., Kanekiyo, T., Xu, H., Bu, G., 2013. Apolipoprotein E and Alzheimer disease: risk, mechanisms and therapy. Nat Rev Neurol 9(2), 106-118. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2012.263

Machulda, M. M., Jones, D. T., Vemuri, P., McDade, E., Avula, R., Przybelski, S., ... & Jack, C. R., 2011. Effect of APOE ε4 status on intrinsic network connectivity in cognitively normal elderly subjects. Arch Neurol 68(9), 1131-1136. https://doi.org/10.1001/archneurol.2011.108

Malek-Ahmadi, M., Raj, A., Small, B. J., 2011. Semantic clustering as a neuropsychological predictor for amnestic-MCI. Aging Neuropsychol C 18(3), 280-292. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2010.540642

Martinelli, P., Sperduti, M., Piolino, P., 2013. Neural substrates of the self-memory system: New insights from a meta-analysis. Hum Brain Mapp 34(7), 1515-1529. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22008

McKhann, G. M., Knopman, D. S., Chertkow, H., Hyman, B. T., Jack Jr, C. R., Kawas, C. H., ... Phelps, C. H., 2011. The diagnosis of dementia due to Alzheimer's disease: Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimers Dement 7(3), 263-269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2011.03.005

McLaughlin, P. M., Wright, M. J., LaRocca, M., Nguyen, P. T., Teng, E., Apostolova, L. G., ... Woo, E., 2014. The "Alzheimer's type" profile of semantic clustering in amnestic mild cognitive impairment. J Int Neuropsych Soc 20(4), 402-412. https://doi.org/10.1017/S135561771400006X

Melega, G., Lancelotte, F., Johnen, A. K., Hornberger, M., Levine, B., Renoult, L., 2024. Evoking episodic and semantic details with instructional manipulation during autobiographical recall. Psychol Aging 39(4), 378-390. https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000821

Methley, A. M., Campbell, S., Chew-Graham, C., McNally, R., Cheraghi-Sohi, S., 2014. PICO, PICOS and SPIDER: a comparison study of specificity and sensitivity in three search tools for qualitative systematic reviews. BMC Health Serv Res 14(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-014-0579-0

Mintun, M. A., Lo, A. C., Duggan Evans, C., Wessels, A. M., Ardayfio, P. A., Andersen, S. W., ... Skovronsky, D. M., 2021. Donanemab in early Alzheimer's disease. New Engl J Med 384(18), 1691-1704. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2100708

Mishra, S., Blazey, T. M., Holtzman, D. M., Cruchaga, C., Su, Y., Morris, J. C., ... & Gordon, B. A., 2018. Longitudinal brain imaging in preclinical Alzheimer disease: impact of APOE ε4 genotype. Brain 141(6), 1828-1839. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awy103

Mondadori, C. R., de Quervain, D. J. F., Buchmann, A., Mustovic, H., Wollmer, M. A., Schmidt, C. F., ... Henke, K., 2007. Better memory and neural efficiency in young

apolipoprotein E ε4 carriers. Cereb Cortex 17(8), 1934-1947. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhl103

Murphy, K. J., Troyer, A. K., Levine, B., Moscovitch, M., 2008. Episodic, but not semantic, autobiographical memory is reduced in amnestic mild cognitive impairment. Neuropsychologia 46(13), 3116-3123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2008.07.004

Nebes, R. D., 1989. Semantic memory in Alzheimer's disease. Psychol Bull 106(3), 377–394. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.106.3.377

Nilsson, L. G., BÄCkman, L., Erngrund, K., Nyberg, L., Adolfsson, R., Bucht, G., ... Winblad, B., 1997. The Betula prospective cohort study: Memory, health, and aging. Aging Neuropsychol C 4(1), 1-32. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825589708256633

Nilsson, L. G., Adolfsson, R., Bäckman, L., Cruts, M., Nyberg, L., Small, B. J., Van Broeckoven, C., 2006. The influence of APOE status on episodic and semantic memory: data from a population-based study. Neuropsychology 20(6), 645-657. https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.20.6.645

Nyberg, L., Sandblom, J., Jones, S., Neely, A. S., Petersson, K. M., Ingvar, M., Bäckman, L., 2003. Neural correlates of training-related memory improvement in adulthood and aging. P Natl A Sci 100(23), 13728-13733. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1735487100

O'Donoghue, M. C., Murphy, S. E., Zamboni, G., Nobre, A. C., Mackay, C. E., 2018. APOE genotype and cognition in healthy individuals at risk of Alzheimer's disease: A review. Cortex 104, 103-123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2018.03.025

O'Kane, G., Kensinger, E. A., Corkin, S., 2004. Evidence for semantic learning in profound amnesia: an investigation with patient HM. Hippocampus 14(4), 417-425.

Parasuraman, R., Greenwood, P. M., Sunderland, T., 2002. The apolipoprotein E gene, attention, and brain function. Neuropsychology 16(2), 254-274. https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.16.2.254

Payton, A., Van Den Boogerd, E., Davidson, Y., Gibbons, L., Ollier, W., Rabbitt, P., ... Pendleton, N., 2006. Influence and interactions of cathepsin D, HLA-DRB1 and APOE on cognitive abilities in an older non-demented population. Genes Brain and Behav 5(S1), 23-31. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1601-183X.2006.00191.x

Pollock, A., Berge, E., 2018. How to do a systematic review. Int J Stroke 13(2), 138-156. https://doi.org/10.1177/1747493017743796

Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Arai, L., Rodgers, M., Britten, N., Roen, K., Duffy, S., 2006. Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. ESRC Methods Programme. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=ed8b23836338f6fdea0cc55e161b0fc5805f9e27

Porsteinsson, A. P., Isaacson, R. S., Knox, S., Sabbagh, M. N., Rubino, I., 2021. Diagnosis of early Alzheimer's disease: clinical practice in 2021. J Prev Alzheimers Dis 8, 371-386. https://doi.org/10.14283/jpad.2021.23

Rasmussen, J., Langerman, H., 2019. Alzheimer's disease–why we need early diagnosis. Degener Neurol Neuromuscul Dis 9, 123–130. https://doi.org/10.2147/DNND.S228939

Raven, J.C., 1965. The Mill Hill Vocabulary Scale. H.K. Lewis, London.

Reiman, E. M., Arboleda-Velasquez, J. F., Quiroz, Y. T., Huentelman, M. J., Beach, T. G., Caselli, R. J., ... Jun, G. R., 2020. Exceptionally low likelihood of Alzheimer's dementia in

APOE2 homozygotes from a 5,000-person neuropathological study. Nat Commun 11(1), 667. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-14279-8

Renoult, L., Davidson, P. S., Palombo, D. J., Moscovitch, M., Levine, B., 2012. Personal semantics: at the crossroads of semantic and episodic memory. Trends Cogn Sci 16(11), 550-558. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2012.09.003

Renoult, L., Tanguay, A., Beaudry, M., Tavakoli, P., Rabipour, S., Campbell, K., ... Davidson, P. S., 2016. Personal semantics: Is it distinct from episodic and semantic memory? An electrophysiological study of memory for autobiographical facts and repeated events in honor of Shlomo Bentin. Neuropsychologia 83, 242-256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.08.013

Renoult, L., Irish, M., Moscovitch, M., Rugg, M. D., 2019. From knowing to remembering: the semantic–episodic distinction. Trends Cogn Sci 23(12), 1041-1057. https://10.1016/j.tics.2019.09.008

Renoult, L., Armson, M. J., Diamond, N. B., Fan, C. L., Jeyakumar, N., Levesque, L., ... Levine, B., 2020. Classification of general and personal semantic details in the Autobiographical Interview. Neuropsychologia 144, 107501. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2020.107501

Rosen, V. M., Sunderland, T., Levy, J., Harwell, A., McGee, L., Hammond, C., ... Lefkowitz, C., 2005. Apolipoprotein E and category fluency: evidence for reduced semantic access in healthy normal controls at risk for developing Alzheimer's disease. Neuropsychologia 43(4), 647-658. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2004.06.022

Rosenbaum, R. S., Gilboa, A., Levine, B., Winocur, G., Moscovitch, M., 2009. Amnesia as an impairment of detail generation and binding: evidence from personal, fictional,

and semantic narratives in KC. Neuropsychologia 47(11), 2181-2187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2008.11.028

Salo, A., Ylikoski, R., Verkkoniemi, A., Polvikoski, T., Juva, K., Rastas, S., ... Sulkava, R., 2001. Does apolipoprotein E influence learning and memory in the nondemented oldest old?. Int Psychogeriatr 13(4), 451-459. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1041610201007864

Salthouse, T. A., 1991. Theoretical perspectives on cognitive aging. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey.

Salthouse, T. A., 1993. Speed and knowledge as determinants of adult age differences in verbal tasks. J Gerontol 48(1), 29-36. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronj/48.1.P29

Salthouse, T. A., 1993. Speed mediation of adult age differences in cognition. Dev Psychol 29(4), 722 –738. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.29.4.722

Salthouse, T. A., Atkinson, T. M., Berish, D. E., 2003. Executive functioning as a potential mediator of age-related cognitive decline in normal adults. J Exp Psychol Gen 132(4), 566-594. https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.132.4.566

Scheltens, P., De Strooper, B., Kivipelto, M., Holstege, H., Chételat, G., Teunissen, C. E., ... van der Flier, W. M., 2021. Alzheimer's disease. Lancet 397(10284), 1577-1590. https://10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32205-4

Sheldon, S., Moscovitch, M., 2012. The nature and time-course of medial temporal lobe contributions to semantic retrieval: An fMRI study on verbal fluency. Hippocampus 22(6), 1451-1466. https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.20985

Small, B. J., Rosnick, C. B., Fratiglioni, L., Bäckman, L., 2004. Apolipoprotein E and cognitive performance: a meta-analysis. Psychol Aging 19(4), 592-600. https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.19.4.592

Smith, G. E., Bohac, D. L., Waring, S. C., Kokmen, E., Tangalos, E. G., Ivnik, R. J., Petersen, R. C., 1998. Apolipoprotein E genotype influences cognitive ‘phenotype’in patients with Alzheimer's disease but not in healthy control subjects. Neurology 50(2), 355-362. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.50.2.35

Staehelin, H. B., Perrig-Chiello, P., Mitrache, C., Miserez, A. R., Perrig, W. J., 1999. Apolipoprotein E genotypes and cognitive functions in healthy elderly persons. Acta Neurol Scand 100(1), 53-60. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0404.1999.tb00723.x

Stern, R. A., White, T., 2003. NAB, neuropsychological assessment battery: Administration, scoring, and interpretation manual. Psychological Assessment Resources.

Storandt, M., 2008. Cognitive deficits in the early stages of Alzheimer's disease. Curr Dir Psychol Sci 17(3), 198-202. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2008.00574.x

Strikwerda-Brown, C., Mothakunnel, A., Hodges, J. R., Piguet, O., Irish, M., 2019. External details revisited–A new taxonomy for coding ‘non-episodic’ content during autobiographical memory retrieval. J Neuropsychol 13(3), 371-397. https://doi.org/10.1111/jnp.12160

Suri, S., Heise, V., Trachtenberg, A. J., Mackay, C. E., 2013. The forgotten APOE allele: a review of the evidence and suggested mechanisms for the protective effect of APOE ε2. Neurosci Biobehav R 37(10), 2878-2886. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.10.010

Taler, V., Voronchikhina, A., Gorfine, G., & Lukasik, M., 2016. Knowledge of semantic features in mild cognitive impairment. J Neurolinguist 38, 56-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2015.11.002

Taler, V., Monetta, L., Sheppard, C., & Ohman, A., 2020. Semantic function in mild cognitive impairment. Front Psychol 10, 3041. https://doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03041

Tanguay, A. N., Benton, L., Romio, L., Sievers, C., Davidson, P. S., Renoult, L., 2018. The ERP correlates of self-knowledge: Are assessments of one's past, present, and future traits closer to semantic or episodic memory?. Neuropsychologia 110, 65-83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2017.10.024

Tanguay, A., Thériault, K., Clough, S., Taler, V., Renoult, L., Davidson, P., 2024. The Properties of Personal Semantics. PsyArXiv. https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/3d8m7

Tramoni, E., Felician, O., Koric, L., Balzamo, M., Joubert, S., Ceccaldi, M., 2012. Alteration of autobiographical memory in amnestic mild cognitive impairment. Cortex 48(10), 1310-1319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2011.09.002

Tse, C. S., Balota, D. A., Moynan, S. C., Duchek, J. M., Jacoby, L. L., 2010. The utility of placing recollection in opposition to familiarity in early discrimination of healthy aging and very mild dementia of the Alzheimer's type. Neuropsychology 24(1), 49 – 67. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014887

Verfaellie, M., Bousquet, K., Keane, M. M., 2014. Medial temporal and neocortical contributions to remote memory for semantic narratives: evidence from amnesia. Neuropsychologia 61, 105-112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2014.06.018

Verhaegen, C., Poncelet, M., 2013. Changes in naming and semantic abilities with aging from 50 to 90 years. J Int Neuropsych Soc 19(2), 119-126. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617712001178

Verma, M., Howard, R. J., 2012. Semantic memory and language dysfunction in early Alzheimer's disease: a review. Int J Geriatr Psych 27(12), 1209-1217. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.3766

Warrington, E. K., McCarthy, R. A., 1988. The fractionation of retrograde amnesia. Brain Cognition 7(2), 184-200. https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-2626(88)90029-2

Wechsler, D., 2008. WAIS-IV Manual. Psychological Corporation.

Weissberger, G. H., Nation, D. A., Nguyen, C. P., Bondi, M. W., Han, S. D., 2018. Meta-analysis of cognitive ability differences by apolipoprotein e genotype in young humans. Neurosci Biobehav R 94, 49-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.08.009

Wikgren, M., Karlsson, T., Nilbrink, T., Nordfjäll, K., Hultdin, J., Sleegers, K., ... Norrback, K. F., 2012. APOE ε4 is associated with longer telomeres, and longer telomeres among ε4 carriers predicts worse episodic memory. Neurobiol Aging 33(2), 335-344. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2010.03.004

Wilson, R. S., Bienias, J. L., Berry-Kravis, E., Evans, D. A., Bennett, D. A., 2002. The apolipoprotein E ε2 allele and decline in episodic memory. J Neurol Neurosur Ps 73(6), 672-677. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.73.6.672

Wisdom, N. M., Callahan, J. L., & Hawkins, K. A., 2011. The effects of apolipoprotein E on non-impaired cognitive functioning: a meta-analysis. Neurobiol Aging 32(1), 63-74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2009.02.003

Woodcock, R.W., Johnson, M.B., Mather, N., 1989. Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational-Revised. DLM Teaching Resources, Allen, Texas.

Xu, Q., Liang, Z., Huang, Y., 2024. APOE4 homozygosity is a new genetic form of Alzheimer's disease. Nat Med 30, 1241–1242 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-024-02923-w

Table 1. Tabulated results of the papers included in the systematic review.

Author, Year	Study type	Sample size	Age groups	*APOE* groups	Semantic memory Task	Key finding/*APOE* ε4 effect
Duchek et al., (2006)	Cross-sectional	n = 76	Healthy Younger adults (18-24 years), Young-old adults (65-78 years), Old-old adults (80-93 years)	*APOE* ε4 (+) *APOE* ε4 (-)	Information (WAIS-IV) General Knowledge test (Einstein et al, 1995) Word fluency test S-P (Thurstone & Thurstone, 1949) Boston Naming Test (Kaplan et al., 1983) Animal Naming Test (Goodglass & Kaplan, 1983)	No significant group differences, apart from Animal Naming Test in Young-old: *APOE* ε4 (+) > ε4 (-) (p = .013)
Eich et al., (2019)	Cross-sectional	n = 146	Healthy Young and middle-aged adults (20-60 years)	*APOE* ε4 (+) *APOE* ε4 (-)	Vocabulary tasks: Synonyms and Antonyms (Salthouse, 1993a,b) Picture Naming (Woodcock et al., 1989)	No significant group differences
Ford et al., (2020)	Cross-sectional	n = 699	Healthy older adults (60 -85 years)	*APOE* ε4 (+) *APOE* ε4 (-)	Categorization task (Stern & White, 2003), including Semantic Clustering index	No significant group differences in semantic categorization, bur lower semantic clustering in *APOE* ε4 (+) (p = .015)
Grilli et al., (2018)	Cross-sectional	n = 40	Healthy middle-aged and older adults (52-80 years)	*APOE* ε4 (+) *APOE* ε4 (-)	Verbal Comprehension Index (WAIS-IV) Boston Naming Test (Kaplan et al., 1983) Category Fluency Test Adapted version of the Autobiographical Memory Interview (Levine et al., 2002)	No significant group differences on Boston Naming test, Category Fluency test and Verbal Comprehension Index. No significant group differences between carriers and non-carriers in the recollection of external (semantic) memory details.
Grilli et al., (2021)	Cross-sectional	n = 45	Healthy middle-aged and older adults (53 – 84 years)	*APOE* ε4 (+) *APOE* ε4 (-)	Verbal Comprehension index (WAIS-IV) Boston Naming Test (Kaplan et al., 1983) Category and Letter Fluency tests (COWAT, Benton, 1969)	No significant group differences on Verbal Comprehension Index, Boston Naming Test, Letter and Category Fluency *APOE* ε4 (+) generated significantly fewer exemplars on autobiographical fluency (p = .02), with overall lower personal semantic (p = .02) and episodic memory fluency (p = .02) compared to *APOE* E4 (-)

					Adapted version of the autobiographical fluency task (Addis & Tippett, 2004) assessing episodic memory and personal semantics	
Helkala et al., (1995)	Cross-sectional	n = 916	Healthy older adults (> 65)	*APOE* ε2/2, ε2/3 *APOE* ε3/3 *APOE* ε4/4, ε2/4, ε3/4	Category and Letter Fluency tests	No significant group differences on Category and Letter fluency tests
Knoff et al., (2024)	Cross-sectional	n = 84	Healthy middle-aged and older adults (60 – 80 years)	*APOE* ε4 (+) *APOE* ε4 (-)	Verbal Comprehension index (WAIS-IV) Boston Naming Test (Kaplan et al., 1983) Category Fluency test	No significant group differences on Boston Naming Task, Category Fluency and Verbal Comprehension Index.
Laukka et al., (2013)	Cross-sectional	n = 2694	Healthy older adults (60 - 90+ years)	*APOE* ε4 (+) *APOE* ε4 (-)	SRB Vocabulary test (Dureman, 1960) General Knowledge task (Dahl et al., 2009)	No significant group differences
Nilsson et al., (2006)	Longitudinal (Betula study)	n = 1733	Middle-aged adults (35-50 years), Young-old adults (55-65 years), Old-old adults (70-85 years)	*APOE* ε3/3 *APOE* ε3/4 *APOE* ε4/4	SRB vocabulary test (Dureman, 1960) Category and Letter fluency tests	No significant group differences at Wave 1 and Wave 2
Payton et al., (2006)	Cross-sectional	n = 766	Middle-aged and older adults (50 – 85 years)	*APOE* ε4 (+) *APOE* ε4 (-)	Raven Mill Hill vocabulary scale parts A and B (Raven, 1965)	No significant group differences
Rosen et al., (2005)	Cross-sectional	n = 40	Healthy middle-aged and older adults (50–79 years)	*APOE* ε4 (+) *APOE* ε4 (-)	Extensive category fluency task (10 minutes) Category fluency task (1-minute) Letter fluency task (1-minute) Vocabulary Test (WAIS-IV)	No significant group difference in WAIS vocabulary test. No significant group difference on brief letter Fluency task, nor in the brief category fluency task. Significant group differences on extensive Category Fluency test, where *APOE* ε4 (+) generated fewer animal names (p = .02), and fewer clusters of semantically related words (p = .03) and showed longer between-cluster retrieval times (p = .03)

Salo et al., (2001)	Cross-sectional	n = 46	Healthy older adults (> 85)	*APOE* ε2/2,2/3 *APOE* ε3/3 *APOE* ε4/4, ε2/4, ε3/4	Category and Letter Fluency tests, Similarities Test WAIS-R	No significant group difference between any *APOE* groups
Sapkota et al., (2016)	Cross-sectional	n = 282	Healthy older adults (> 60 years)	*APOE* ε4 (+) *APOE* ε4 (-)	Vocabulary task (Ekstrom et al.,1976)	No significant group differences
Seidenberg et al., (2009)	Cross-sectional	n = 69	Healthy older adults (65-85 years)	Control: No AD family history, *APOE* E4 (-) Group 1: AD Family history, *APOE* ε4 (-) Group 2: AD family history, *APOE* ε4 (+)	Fame judgement task (see Douville et al., 2005).	No significant group differences
Stahaelin et al., (1999)	Cross-sectional	n = 332	Healthy older adults (> 65): Young-old (< 75 years) Old -old (> 75 years)	*APOE* ε2/2, ε2/3, ε2/4 *APOE* ε3/3 *APOE* ε4/4, ε3/4	Vocabulary Test (WAIS-R)	The *APOE* ε3 group performed significantly better than the *APOE* ε4 group (p =.041). There was a trend for the *APOE* ε2 group to perform better than the *APOE* ε4 group (p = .062)
Tse et al., (2010)	Cross-sectional	n = 96	Healthy Older adults (> 60 years)	*APOE* ε4 (+) *APOE* ε4 (-)	Category Fluency Word fluency test S-P (Thurstone & Thurstone, 1949) Information and Similarities (WAIS-IV)	No significant group differences in mean hit rates. No significant group differences in Category and Word fluency tasks, Information and Similarities.
Wikgren et al., (2012)	Cross-sectional	n = 427	Healthy middle-aged and older adults (41-85 years)	*APOE* ε3/3 *APOE* ε3/4 *APOE* ε4/4	Revised version of the SRB vocabulary test (Dureman & Salde, 1971) Word fluency test	No significant group differences

Table 2. Findings of the selected papers tabulated by task used to measure Semantic Memory

Author, year	Verbal Fluency (n = 11)	Naming (n = 5)	Language Comprehension/ General Knowledge Tests (n = 15)	Autobiographical Memory (n = 2)	*APOE* Effect
Duchek et al. (2006)	YES**	YES	YES	NO	YES**
Eich et al. (2019)	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Ford et al. (2020)	YES*	NO	NO	NO	YES*
Grilli et al. (2018)	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
Grilli et al. (2021)	YES	YES	YES	YES*	YES*
Helkala et al. (1995)	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Knoff et al., (2024)	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
Laukka et al. (2013)	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Nilsson et al. (2006)	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Payton et al. (2006)	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Rosen et al. (2005)	YES*	NO	YES	NO	YES*
Salo et al. (2001)	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Sapkota et al. (2016)	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Stahaelin et al., (1999)	NO	NO	YES*	NO	YES*
Seidenberg et al. (2009)	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Tse et al. (2010)	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Wikgren et al. (2012)	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Ratio	**3/11 (27.3%)**	**0/5 (0%)**	**1/15 (6%)**	**1/2 (50%)**	**5/17 (29.4%)**

**APOE* ε4(+) < *APOE* ε4(-), ** *APOE* ε4(+) > *APOE* ε4(-)