The associations between cognitive reserve proxies, multimodal MRI brain measures and cognition, motor function and mood in healthy adults

Isaac Saywell[1], Sabrina Sghirripa[2,3], Angela Walls[3,5], Andrew Dwyer[3,4,5], Brittany Child[1], John Salamon[3], Lyndsey Collins-Praino[6], Mark Jenkinson,[2,3] Irina Baetu[1]

[1]*School of Psychology, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia 5005*

[2]*School of Computer and Mathematical Sciences, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia 5005*

[3]*South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Adelaide, Australia, 5000*

[4]*South Australia Medical Imaging, Adelaide, Australia, 5000*

[5]*Clinical and Research Imaging Centre, South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Adelaide, Australia 5000*

[6]*School of Biomedicine, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia 5005*

[†]Emails for corresponding authors: isaac.saywell@adelaide.edu.au; irina.baetu@adelaide.edu.au

Isaac Saywell will handle correspondence at all stages of refereeing, publication, and post-publication. Irina Baetu is the senior author.

Postal address for corresponding author: Level 2, Hughes building, room 245. North Terrace campus. The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia 5005

Abstract

Introduction: In healthy ageing, cognitive reserve (CR) is thought to enhance cognitive processes that moderate the relationship between neuroanatomical characteristics and task performance. Although, the interplay between CR and brain measures is unclear. To date, no study has investigated the relationships between a diverse set of brain measures, CR, and functional outcomes. Using a multimodal magnetic resonance imaging approach we explored the relative importance of CR proxies, compared to key brain characteristics, for cognition, motor function, and mood in healthy adults.

Methods: 74 subjects completed two CR assessments, a cognitive battery, motor function tests, and mood questionnaires. Structural, diffusion, and functional brain measures were investigated. Multiple linear regression was used to explore the associations between CR, brain measures and functional outcomes.

Results: Of all MRI brain measures, greater brain volume and cortical thickness were the most important predictors of higher CR. CR explained a significant portion of variance in both cognitive and motor function, whereas brain volume and cortical thickness were significant predictors for only motor function. While structural characteristics were not a significant predictor of cognition, CR moderated the relationship between brain structure and cognition. Neither CR nor brain measures were significant predictors of mood.

Conclusions: CR was significantly associated with overall cognitive and motor function differences, beyond brain measures. However, specific outcome test performance variance is more nuanced, often more strongly associated with brain measures depending on the task. These findings highlight the importance of considering both CR and multiple brain measures to accurately evaluate functional outcomes.

Keywords

cognitive reserve; structural MRI; diffusion MRI; functional MRI; cognition; motor function; mood

1 Introduction

Ageing is an incredibly heterogenous process. In older populations, functional abilities vary considerably compared to younger adults (Ferrucci & Kuchel, 2021), and individual differences in outcomes have been well-documented in longitudinal studies (Akhtar-Danesh & Landeen, 2007; Wilson et al., 2002). These individual differences in performance have also been observed in neurological diseases, such as dementia and Parkinson's disease (PD; Nelson et al., 2021a; Saywell et al., 2024), where a type of reserve is thought to sustain task performance, despite the accumulation of brain pathology (Katzman et al., 1988). Two main models of reserve have been proposed. Brain reserve (BR) functions passively, suggesting that neurobiological capital helps resist brain damage until a fixed threshold is reached (Stern, 2002). More recently, reserve has been suggested to function actively in response to pathology, a phenomenon termed cognitive reserve (CR). According to this model, CR grants more efficient usage of cognitive and functional brain processes, thereby increasing neural capacity, which is linked to better task performance and enhanced ability to cope with pathology (Stern, 2009).

Directly measuring the mechanisms underlying CR's potential neuroprotective effect is challenging due to its theoretical nature. Instead, CR is usually quantified through lifetime experiences, such as education, occupation, leisure time activities, social engagement, and intelligence (Stern, 2002), which are thought to support CR by giving rise to cognitive strategies that help actively withstand neural damage (Jones et al., 2011; Valenzuela & Sachdev, 2006b, 2006a). These factors serve as indirect measures (or proxies), with this approach justified by previous demonstrations of their longitudinal protective effects against decline. The most commonly reported CR proxy, years of education, has been shown to moderate the association between pathology and cognition in healthy individuals (Querbes et al., 2009; Rentz et al., 2010). In other words, the accumulation of pathology that typically

impairs cognition has less impact on individuals with higher CR, compared to those with lower CR, who rely more on the preservation of neuroanatomical structures. This suggests that, in addition to preserving function in individuals with neurological disorders (Contador et al., 2023; Nelson et al., 2021b; Nunes & Silva Nunes, 2021; Saywell et al., 2024), CR can even be neuroprotective for non-diagnosed levels of minor, age-related pathology. Despite this, conclusions derived from studies relying on socio-behavioural proxies are limited by the fact that a CR proxy may have a relationship with functional outcomes due to factors other than the neuroprotection that CR is hypothesised to grant (Jones et al., 2011). Therefore, in order to maximise reliability, more recent studies estimate CR's influence by using multiple proxies in combination, a comprehensive battery (Opdebeeck et al., 2016a), or by calculating a residual measure generated from expected performance (e.g., based on age) and actual performance (Reed et al., 2010).

Despite promising findings, there is still no consensus on a preferred CR assessment approach. Variability in CR measures and study methodology limit interpretations of the construct's effects across studies. Ideally, studies should demonstrate that a CR proxy moderates the relationship between brain status and outcome, or show that the proxy is associated with a specific outcome while adjusting for pathology or brain characteristics (Stern et al., 2023). However, studies often simply analyse a correlation between proxies and an outcome without considering brain status, making it difficult to determine whether CR's influence reflects better cognitive processes or arises from factors unrelated to protective mechanisms. Neuroanatomical characteristics are infrequently integrated into CR analyses, even though these factors have established importance for estimating CR's residual effect and functional outcomes (Stern et al., 2023). Additionally, while some CR studies do incorporate neuroimaging, there is little consensus on what brain indices should be used, often resulting in the selection of the most easily accessible or analysable measure, with limited justification

for these decisions. Therefore, structural magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) measures, usually volumetric, are most frequently used, given that they, like cognitive performance, are typically negatively associated with age and the accompanying pathology (Murman, 2015).

Of note, healthy individuals with higher CR have been shown to have increased grey matter (GM) volume in the supplementary motor area, middle frontal gyrus, angular gyrus, rectus gyrus, middle cingulum and the cerebellum, accompanied by decreased resting-state functional connectivity (FC) in the sensorimotor, salience, and executive-control networks, but increased FC in the default mode network (DMN), indicating that CR may differentially affect brain networks (Conti et al., 2021). Moreover, cortical thickness, a key measure of brain morphology, correlates with CR and exhibits a positive relationship with cognitive processes moderated by CR (Stern et al., 2018). Other healthy control studies have shown that CR proxies are positively associated with fractional anisotropy (FA) in the right posterior inferior longitudinal fasciculus (Haut et al., 2007), but negatively with mean diffusivity (MD) in the thalamus, putamen, hippocampus and caudate (Piras et al., 2011). Further, in Alzheimer's disease (AD) subjects, after controlling for cognitive performance, higher CR has been linked to increased GM volume in the supramarginal gyrus, posterior cingulate cortex, and frontal opercular cortex, but decreased GM in areas typically affected by AD pathology, such as the entorhinal cortex and hippocampus (Persson et al., 2017; Serra et al., 2011; Solé-Padullés et al., 2009). Functionally, brain network activation has been found to increase for AD patients with greater CR both at rest and during a memory task, controlling for cognitive performance (Bozzali et al., 2015; Solé-Padullés et al., 2009). This indicates that CR and GM change may interact and help to engage additional neural circuits as a compensatory mechanism. CR's neuroprotective effect also seems to generalise to other forms of pathology that can emerge in healthy ageing, like white matter hyperintensities (WMH), with greater WMH volume often observed in high compared to low CR individuals

that possess similar cognitive abilities (Brickman et al., 2011). However, higher CR has also been associated with decreased WMHs in healthy subjects without adjusting for cognitive function (Chen et al., 2022). Thus, individuals with more developed CR may delay the deterioration of brain structures and networks associated with pathology, and when neuroanatomical decline eventually occurs, they may cope better with these brain changes to maintain sufficient task performance.

Some of these neuroanatomical features have also been linked to individual differences in functional performance, regardless of CR status. Co-occurrence of age-related cognitive decline and neuroanatomical deterioration, in the form of atrophy, lesions, and increased white matter (WM) diffusivity, have been widely reported (Salthouse, 2011; Zimmerman et al., 2006). GM tissue volume has also been positively associated with better neuropsychological test performance (MacLullich et al., 2002; Zimmerman et al., 2006), suggesting that differences in cognition might be explained by neuroanatomical variation. Age-related alterations in motor function are also linked to the functional status of neural circuits, as well as cortical atrophy and WM tracts (Seidler et al., 2010). Additionally, activation in structures like the amygdala, prefrontal cortex (PFC), insular cortex, and anterior cingulate seem to be involved in emotional states that dictate mood (Davidson & Irwin, 1999). Neuroanatomical decline with age seems to have little influence on mood, although older adults appear to have more control over emotional processing, possibly related to increased PFC recruitment and decreased amygdala activation (Kensinger & Leclerc, 2009).

Despite established relationships between functional outcomes and both CR and neuroanatomical characteristics, the interactions among these factors remain poorly understood. One prior study explored the neuroanatomical correlates of a composite CR measure (Conti et al., 2021), however, the shared and unique contributions of brain measures

and CR on functional outcomes was not investigated. While this approach identified possible associations between CR and neuroanatomical features, it was unable to determine the relative importance of CR's neuroprotective effect for behavioural outcomes compared to brain characteristics. Given the overlap between the associations that CR and *in vivo* neuroanatomical measures have with functional performance, it is important to establish whether these factors contribute to shared or exclusive variance. Further, CR's moderating effect on the relationship between pathology and outcome performance has been shown to vary depending on the proxy variable used, as well as the neuroanatomical measure and cognitive domain assessed (Jin et al., 2023). For example, neural activity, which is hypothesised to compensate for decreased cognitive performance with age, has been shown to correlate with structural brain measures, but not CR proxies (Elshiekh et al., 2020). Thus, the relationship between CR and neuroanatomical factors is complex. Investigating CR and neuroimaging derived brain indices simultaneously would help elucidate whether discrepancies in outcomes can better be attributed to neuroanatomical variation or CR. No previous study has used a multimodal MRI approach to explore if CR proxies contribute beyond measures of important brain regions and networks to individual differences in cognition, motor function and mood. Therefore, in the present study, we aimed to identify neuroanatomical features, measured by MRI modalities, that could explain differences in CR among healthy adults, and whether the predictive utility of CR and brain measures varies across three functional outcomes: cognition, motor function, and mood.

2 Methods

2.1 Subjects and data collection

Seventy-four healthy adults (30 males and 44 females) aged between 20 and 80 years (average age = 55.9 ± 14.4 years) were recruited between October 2020 and May 2023 from

an ongoing cross-sectional study examining behavioural outcomes in healthy ageing among 901 individuals. The selected subset of study participants were those from the larger sample who underwent both an MRI scan and behavioural testing within six months of the scan. All subjects completed an online questionnaire prior to cognitive, motor function, and mood assessments. English-speaking individuals aged 18 or older, without diagnosed neurological impairment and no prior history of brain injury were eligible. Other exclusion criteria included an uncorrected visual or hearing impairment, a diagnosed learning disability, past or present drug/alcohol abuse, smoking more than five cigarettes per day, and being ineligible to undergo an MRI scan (i.e., claustrophobic, pregnant, or possessing a metal implant). Ethics approval was obtained from the University of Adelaide Human Research Ethics Committee (approval numbers H-2021-120 and H-2020-017), research was carried out according to the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research, and all participants provided signed informed consent.

2.2 Behavioural outcome measurements

2.2.1 Cognition

A comprehensive battery of neuropsychological assessments was administered on an iPad. Working memory was tested visually and verbally through a dot matrix task (Law et al., 1995) and the digit span task (total score; Woods et al., 2011), respectively. Visual processing speed was measured via inspection time (Vickers et al., 1972) and a two-choice reaction time task (Ratcliff & Smith, 2004). The two-choice reaction time task requires subjects to hold their dominant index finger on a blue circle before reacting to one of two squares by touching the one that lights up white. From this, decision time, the period between one square lighting up white and the participant lifting their finger, was derived as another measure of visual processing speed. Response time, a measure of motor speed, was also determined using the

two-choice reaction time task by calculating the duration between a subject lifting their finger off the blue circle and placing it on the square that changed colour to white. Raven's progressive matrices were used to estimate visuo-spatial reasoning ability (Raven & Raven, 2003). Stop signal reaction time (SSRT) was calculated using a stop signal task (SST) paradigm, consisting of 'Go' and 'Stop' tasks, to measure response inhibition (Dagenbach & Carr, 1994). Time difference between incongruent and congruent trials on the Simon Task was used to assess executive functioning and selective attention (Lu & Proctor, 1995). Additionally, a researcher administered the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA; Nasreddine et al., 2005) as an evaluation of global cognitive ability. Higher scores on all cognitive tests indicated better performance. To accommodate for this, scores on speed-based assessments such as the choice-reaction time task (decision time), inspection time, the Simon task, and the SST were inverted by subtracting each subject's score from the maximum score in the sample.

2.2.2 Motor function

Motor function was assessed across five different abilities: speed of hand movement, tremor, balance, gait and response time. A tapping test on an iPad was used to evaluate hand dexterity by capturing how fast a subject could move their index finger to repeatedly tap two static dots (3.5cm diameter) 13cm apart within 30 seconds. Average number of taps within the last 25 seconds of each 30-second interval (right and left hands) was computed as the final score. Tremor and balance were measured in silence using a Nintendo® Wii remote and balance board, respectively, and custom recording software was used to process and store data. For tremor, participants were required to sit still and hold the controller limply, with their palm facing upward, for 60 seconds in each hand. Average theta power (3-7Hz) from both hands was used to estimate hand movement using the controller accelerometer, an accurate measurement of resting tremor (Daneault et al., 2013; Koçer & Oktay, 2016). For balance,

subjects were asked to stand as stationary as possible on the board for 30 seconds with their feet together and then apart, while staring at a red dot positioned two metres away and 1.75 metres high. Average path length, total distance travelled by the centre of pressure, across feet together and apart trials was used to generate a balance score, with a greater path length corresponding to worse balance. The Wii balance board has been validated against laboratory-grade force platforms (Clark et al., 2010), an approach which we also verified with our own paradigm (see Supplementary Material Fig 1). Balance data was not obtained for one subject due to a technical failure. Gait was evaluated using a portable BTS® sensor (BTS SpA, Milano, Italy) and BTS® G-Studio software for data recording. Average stride length relative to height was used to quantify gait during an eight metre up-and-back walk using the validated G-Studio "Walk" protocol (Bugané et al., 2012). Like cognition, higher scores on all motor function tests indicated better performance. Thus, assessments where higher raw scores are associated with worse motor function, like balance (path length), tremor (theta power), and the choice-reaction time task (response time) were inverted by subtracting each subject's score from the maximum score in the sample.

2.2.3 Mood

Two mood questionnaires were administered to assess depression, anxiety and stress. The Depression Anxiety Stress Scale (DASS-21; Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995) is a validated tool for measuring mood in different populations (Brown et al., 1997; Henry & Crawford, 2005), with greater scores indicating a higher negative mood state (Antony et al., 1998). The Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale short form (CESD-10) was also used to assess depression, where higher scores suggest a worse depressive state (Andresen et al., 1994). Total scores derived from each questionnaire were used in analyses.

2.3 MRI acquisition

All neuroimaging images were collected using a Siemens Magnetom Skyra 3.0 T MRI scanner and 64-channel head/neck coil across a 45 minute brain scan protocol consisting of sequences: (1) 3D T1-weighted magnetisation-prepared rapid gradient echo sequence (5 minutes and 30 seconds scan time, 192 contiguous 1mm sagittal slices, voxel size = 1 x 1 x 1mm, echo time [TE] = 2.96ms, repetition time [TR] = 2300ms, inversion time = 900ms, flip angle = 9°, and field of view [FOV] = 256 x 256 x 192mm); (2) 3D T2-weighted fluid-attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR) sequence (5 minutes and 52 seconds scan time, 192 contiguous 1.05mm sagittal slices, voxel size = 1 x 1 x 1.05mm, TE = 397ms, TR = 5000ms, inversion time = 1800ms, and FOV = 256 x 256 x 202mm); (3) Diffusion-weighted multiband echo-planar imaging sequence (6 minutes and 32 seconds scan time, 72 contiguous 2mm axial slices, voxel size = 2.02 x 2.02 x 2mm, TE = 94ms, TR = 3600ms, flip angle = 78°, FOV = 210 x 210 x 144mm, with diffusion gradients applied along 104 noncollinear directions using three b-values: 0 [B0 image], 1000s/mm2 and 2000s/mm2); (4) Resting-state functional MRI (fMRI) echo-planar imaging sequence using blood oxygen level dependent (BOLD) contrast with 490 volumes (6 minutes and 10 seconds scan time, 64 contiguous 2.4mm axial slices, voxel size = 2.4 x 2.4 x 2.4mm, TE = 39ms, TR = 736ms, flip angle = 52°, FOV = 210 x 210 x 154mm). Subjects were instructed to keep their eyes open for the resting state fMRI sequence. The T2-weighted FLAIR sequence could not be successfully completed for five subjects.

2.4 MRI pre-processing

Neuroimaging data for each scan type was pre-processed using FMRIB Software Library (FSL) tools (www.fmrib.ox.ac.uk). T1-weighted structural and T2-weighted FLAIR images

were all brain extracted using FreeSurfer's (https://surfer.nmr.mgh.harvard.edu) SynthStrip (Hoopes et al., 2022).

2.4.1 Structural analysis

Partial volume tissue segmentation of T1-weighted images was performed using FAST (Zhang et al., 2001) to generate GM and WM images. Further segmentation, specifically of bilateral subcortical structures (striatum, globus pallidus, hippocampus and thalamus), was conducted using FIRST (Patenaude et al., 2011). Left and right volumes for each subcortical structure were summed together. A deep learning neuroimaging pipeline, FastSurfer (Henschel et al., 2020), was used to create masks of the cerebellum and ventricular cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) in subject T1-weighted images, from which the volume of these structures was calculated. Ventricular CSF volume was chosen over peripheral CSF volume, or a combination of both, for its superior reliability in delineating between brain tissue and CSF. Cortical thickness of the lateral orbitofrontal cortex, medial orbitofrontal cortex, and superior frontal gyrus in both hemispheres was also calculated using FastSurfer to create an average PFC thickness measure. Using FSL's BIANCA (Griffanti et al., 2016), white matter hyperintensities (WMH) were automatically delineated on T2-weighted FLAIR images using the k-nearest neighbour algorithm to determine the probability of a voxel being a WMH. A training set was created from manual WMH classifications in 15% of the study sample to generate a set of feature vectors for WMH and non-WMH classes. Total WMH was calculated from voxels exceeding a probability of 0.9 of being a WMH within a WM exclusive mask. All volumetric indices generated were normalised by dividing the volumes by the estimated total intracranial volume, as calculated using FastSurfer.

2.4.2 Diffusion-weighted MRI analysis

Diffusion-weighted images were first corrected for susceptibility-induced distortions using the topup tool from FSL (Andersson et al., 2003), which processes pairs of images acquired with opposing phase encoding directions, but without diffusion-weighting (b=0), and then applies the derived correction to all images, including those with diffusion-weighting (b>0). Following this, all images were brain extracted before being corrected for eddy current distortions and movement, aligning them to the reference *b*=0 image, using FSL's eddy tool (Andersson & Sotiropoulos, 2016). The FSL DTIFIT tool was used to generate FA and MD maps, which were then registered to T1-weighted structural space using FLIRT (Jenkinson & Smith, 2001). The diffusion tensor imaging maps (FA and MD) in T1-weighted structural space were used in conjunction with subcortical masks produced by FIRST and the cerebellum mask produced by FastSurfer to calculate microstructure diffusivity metrics (FA and MD) within these regions. Left and right hemisphere FA and MD values for each structure were averaged to calculate bilateral diffusivity metrics.

2.4.3 Resting-state functional MRI analysis

Resting-state fMRI data was pre-processed and decomposed into different spatial and temporal components using FSL's MELODIC (Beckmann & Smith, 2004) tool to perform single-subject independent component analysis (ICA). Prior to this step, the corresponding fieldmap magnitude image was brain extracted and used, alongside the fieldmap phase image, to generate a fieldmap image in radians per second for correction of magnetic field inhomogeneities in the functional image. Functional image pre-processing steps performed within MELODIC included: motion correct via MCFLIRT (Jenkinson et al., 2002), interleaved slice timing correction, spatial smoothing with 3mm FWHM, and high pass temporal filtering at 100 seconds to remove very slow drifts. Lowpass filtering was not

performed since, unlike at extremely low frequencies, there can be useful neural signal at higher frequencies (Poldrack et al., 2011). For a subset of 15% of subjects, independent components (ICs) output by MELODIC were manually classified as ‘Signal’ or ‘Noise’ and used to create a training file for automatic classification of ICs using FSL’s pyFIX (Salimi-Khorshidi et al., 2014) at a threshold of 20. Lower pyFIX threshold values allow more ICs to be classified as signal (even if they are noise), while higher values, like the one chosen in the current study, are stricter. Subsequently, functional images were denoised via this classification and registered to the Montreal Neurological Institute’s brain template using FSL’s applywarp. Group-level spatial maps were created by temporally concatenating filtered functional data for all subjects through group ICA in MELODIC. The short scan duration restricted group ICA dimensionality to 20. Visual inspection of all the 20 spatial maps produced revealed that there were 10 resting-state networks (RSN) and 10 noise components (see Supplementary Material Fig 2). Dual regression was performed on these group-level RSNs to estimate subject-specific spatial maps for each RSN by regressing the group-average spatial map into each subject’s 4D space-time dataset (Nickerson et al., 2017). In addition, group-level spatial maps for RSNs were thresholded using an alternative hypothesis test based on fitting a Gaussian/gamma mixture model to the distribution of voxel intensities within a spatial map (Beckmann et al., 2005) and controlling the local false-discovery rate at $p < 0.5$ (equal balance between false positives and false negatives). A binary mask for each RSN was created and used to thresholded subject-specific RSN spatial maps. The mean intensity of positive intensity voxels in an RSN that survived thresholding was used to index FC within that RSN.

2.5 Neuroanatomical factor measurement selection

The multimodal MRI approach enabled generation of countless MRI brain measures; however, given sample size limitations and to improve interpretability, the choice of neuroanatomical features had to be highly selective. Only structures and functional networks that have an established relationship with CR in the literature, and thus appear 'CR relevant', were included. The association evidence summarised in Supplementary Material Table 1 shows examples from the literature for each structure and network. Only significant relationships were included; the literature review was used to reduce the initial list of reliably automated measures down to a key subset that was suitable for analysis. The final list of neuroanatomical features derived from each MRI sequence were grouped into three different measure types and are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

List of magnetic resonance imaging brain measures included in analyses.

Structural	Diffusion	Functional
Total GM Volume	Striatum FA	Medial Visual Network FC
Total WM Volume	Globus Pallidus FA	Lateral Visual Network FC
Total Ventricular CSF Volume	Hippocampus FA	Default Mode Network FC
Striatum Volume	Thalamus FA	Salience Network FC
Globus Pallidus Volume	Cerebellum FA	Central Executive Network FC
Hippocampus Volume	Striatum MD	Sensorimotor Network FC
Thalamus Volume	Globus Pallidus MD	Left Frontoparietal Network FC
Cerebellum Volume	Hippocampus MD	Auditory Network FC
Mean PFC Cortical Thickness	Thalamus MD	Right Frontoparietal Network FC
WMH Volume	Cerebellum MD	Cerebellar Network FC

CSF = cerebrospinal fluid. FA = fractional anisotropy. FC = functional connectivity. MD = mean diffusivity. GM = grey matter. PFC = prefrontal cortex. WM = white matter. WMH = white matter hyperintensity.

2.6 Cognitive reserve measurement

Currently, there is no gold standard measurement tool to measure CR that is consistently used across studies. CR is said to function dynamically (Malek-Ahmadi et al., 2017), and as such, should be assessed with a combination of proxies that actively contribute to CR throughout the different stages of the lifespan. For this reason, we used two CR proxies. All subjects were administered the Cognitive Reserve Index questionnaire (CRIq; Nucci et al., 2012), a widely used, comprehensive socio-behavioural CR measure. As CR is also frequently evaluated using intelligence measures that capture the contributions of a broad number of lifetime experiences (Boyle et al., 2021; Nogueira et al., 2022), a vocabulary Spot-the-Word test was also used (Baddeley et al., 1993).

2.7 Principal component analyses

Principal component analysis (PCA) was used to generate composite scores for all primary variables of interest by decomposing the data into orthogonal components. Before PCA, missing data was imputed using the median value and all data was scaled using the StandardScaler from the scikit-learn library (v1.3.2; Python software, v3.12.3; Pedregosa et al., 2011). Prior to analysis, the effects of age and sex were regressed out of each variable, generating residual values for MRI brain measures and behavioural assessments. These residuals were included in each PCA. This approach allowed us to account for confounders without compromising the statistical power of regression models by adding two additional predictors. Multiple linear regression models were planned to include CR as a predictor, meaning a maximum of six additional variables could be incorporated into models without violating minimum assumptions of 10 subjects per predictor (Harrell, 2001). Thus, given our sample size of 74, we only included the six principal components (PC) that accounted for the most variance in the MRI brain measure PCA. Dimensionality of neuroanatomical features

was reduced to capture contributions of all chosen brain measures without including too many variables in analyses. Hierarchical clustering of MRI brain measures was used to validate the PCA output.

For residual data from behavioural variables, a separate PCA was performed to generate a composite score for each variable type. That being, four summary measures were produced for CR, cognition, motor function, and mood by using the PC that explained the most variance. The specific variables included in each PCA can be viewed in Supplementary Material Table 2. To improve reliability, these PCAs were performed using the larger study dataset (N = 901) that included a combination of participants who did, and did not, complete an MRI. From these PCAs, scores for participants who did complete the MRI session were extracted and used as behavioural composite scores. To ensure these scores were reliable we also conducted behavioural PCAs using only the 74 subjects who completed both the MRI and behavioural testing. Composite scores derived from each dataset for the same behavioural measures correlated highly (>0.9) with those derived from the larger sample.

2.8 Statistical analyses

After performing PCA, statistical analyses were conducted with R Statistical Software (v4.3.2; R Core Team, 2022). Correlations between variables were calculated for raw data and residual data. MRI brain measure PCs were included in multiple linear regression analyses to explore explained variance in CR score. These MRI brain measures were also included in combination with CR score as predictors, in separate models, of each functional outcome. The relaimpo package was used to calculate relative importance of predictors in each model (v2.2-7; Groemping, 2005). As a supplementary analysis, the effect of age was explored by performing the same regressions, using the same MRI brain measure PCs and behavioural composite scores, on younger and older groups split by median age. Analysis of

variance (ANOVA) was used to assess whether removing either all brain measure PCs simultaneously, or CR, significantly affected explained variance in regression models of overall outcome tests. ANOVAs were also performed for individual outcome tests.

3 Results

3.1 Principal component analyses

The six PCs from the PCA of MRI brain measures explained 66.1% of the total variance (see loadings in Table 2). PC1 explained over a quarter of the model variance (29.4%) and predominantly represented FC of RSNs. PC2 (17.4%) represented MD in specific brain regions. Striatal, thalamic, and cerebellar FA loaded positively onto PC3 (14.7%), while MD in the thalamus and volume of the striatum had strong negative loadings, potentially suggesting healthier microstructure. Most structural MRI brain measures were represented in PC4 (13%). Volume of brain negatively loaded onto this PC, in contrast to a positive loading of ventricular CSF, indicating that higher PC4 scores represent greater structural atrophy. Striatum and globus pallidus MD also had reasonably strong loadings on PC4, however, given that most variables that loaded onto this PC were structural, PC4 was considered to be largely structural in nature. Inspection of PC5 (10.4%) and PC6 (8%) did not identify a clear neuroanatomical basis. PC5 appeared to be heavily influenced by basal ganglia structures, the hippocampus, and WMHs. Alternatively, PC6 was even more mixed, with strong loadings from different cerebellar and thalamic indices, as well as hippocampal volume, globus pallidus FA, and FC in the right frontoparietal network. The patterns observed in this PCA were largely consistent with hierarchical clustering of MRI brain measures (see Supplementary Material Fig 3). Most clusters were anatomically sensible, with the exception of globus pallidus FA and ventricular CSF volume clustering together.

For the composite scores produced from behavioural PCAs, greater scores were associated with higher CR, better cognitive and motor function performance, and more adverse (i.e., higher scores indicated worse outcomes) mood symptoms (see Supplementary Material Table 2). The composite score produced from CR variables explained 55% of variance and each variable loaded equally. The overall cognition composite score captured 25% of variance and loadings of each cognitive test were relatively even. Hand dexterity assessments (tapping test and response time) were most strongly associated with the overall motor function score, which explained 29% of variance in individual motor scores. For overall mood, both measures contributed equally to the composite score, which explained 92% of variance.

Table 2

Loadings from principal component analysis of magnetic resonance imaging brain measures (brain measures with absolute loading magnitudes greater than 0.20 are shown in bold).

Brain measures	**PC1**	**PC2**	**PC3**	**PC4**	**PC5**	**PC6**
Structural						
Total GM Volume	-0.0037	-0.1305	0.0864	**-0.2830**	0.1288	-0.0925
Total WM Volume	-0.0030	-0.0389	0.1646	**-0.3344**	-0.1341	0.1608
Ventricular CSF Volume	-0.0730	0.0952	-0.0289	**0.2955**	0.0226	0.1420
Hippocampus Volume	0.0908	-0.1646	-0.2280	-0.1667	-0.2358	**-0.3166**
Striatum Volume	-0.1095	-0.0815	**-0.4479**	-0.1650	-0.1729	-0.0468
Globus Pallidus Volume	0.0182	0.0155	-0.1134	**-0.2170**	**-0.4207**	0.1285
Thalamus Volume	0.0165	-0.0545	0.0457	**-0.3407**	-0.1202	-0.0105
Cerebellum Volume	0.0451	-0.1427	-0.0339	**-0.2982**	-0.0099	**0.3529**
Mean PFC Thickness	0.0729	-0.0400	-0.0981	**-0.2127**	-0.0041	-0.0175
WMH Volume	0.0481	0.0121	-0.1349	-0.1184	**0.4806**	0.1370
Diffusion-weighted						
Hippocampus FA	0.0347	-0.1067	0.1357	-0.1880	**0.2005**	-0.1335
Striatum FA	0.0815	0.0580	**0.4993**	0.0750	**-0.2544**	0.0451
Globus Pallidus FA	-0.0532	0.0673	-0.0422	0.1903	-0.0372	**0.3795**
Thalamus FA	0.0322	0.1888	**0.4126**	-0.1610	0.0578	**-0.2660**
Cerebellum FA	-0.0445	-0.1065	**0.2466**	-0.1256	-0.1202	**0.2943**
Hippocampus MD	0.0952	**0.4436**	-0.0639	0.0232	**-0.2452**	-0.0772
Striatum MD	0.0133	**0.3620**	-0.1002	**-0.2617**	**0.3875**	0.0352
Globus Pallidus MD	0.1089	**0.4063**	0.1788	**-0.2422**	0.0131	0.0780
Thalamus MD	0.0578	**0.4044**	**-0.2147**	-0.0419	-0.0044	**0.2341**
Cerebellum MD	0.0914	**0.3769**	-0.1561	-0.0191	-0.1697	-0.1039
Functional						
Medial Visual Network FC	**0.3004**	0.0422	0.0255	0.1952	0.0088	0.0015
Lateral Visual Network FC	**0.3232**	-0.0240	-0.0779	0.1494	0.0595	-0.1271
Default Mode Network FC	**0.3007**	-0.0724	0.1204	0.1836	0.0587	0.0946
Salience Network FC	**0.3232**	-0.1107	-0.0452	-0.0446	-0.0317	-0.0908
Central Executive Network FC	**0.3460**	-0.0070	-0.0488	-0.0078	-0.0791	-0.0005
Sensorimotor Network FC	**0.2526**	-0.0832	-0.1123	-0.0167	0.0913	-0.0417
Left Frontoparietal Network FC	**0.3467**	-0.0672	-0.0691	-0.0099	-0.1255	0.0638
Auditory Network FC	**0.2985**	-0.0740	-0.0310	-0.0885	**0.2171**	0.1801
Right Frontoparietal Network FC	**0.3208**	-0.0830	0.0387	-0.0057	-0.0788	**0.2796**
Cerebellar Network FC	0.1796	0.0695	0.0748	-0.0358	0.0422	**-0.3646**
Explained variance	0.194	0.115	0.097	0.086	0.069	0.053
Potential Component Interpretation						
PC1	Resting-state intra-network FC					
PC2	Subcortical microstructure					
PC3	Striatal volume and region-specific FA					
PC4	Structural volume and cortical thickness					
PC5	Mixed loadings (largely basal ganglia structures)					
PC6	Mixed loadings (largely cerebellar metrics)					

GM = grey matter. WM = white matter. CSF = cerebrospinal fluid. PFC = Prefrontal Cortex. WMH = white matter hyperintensity. FA = fractional anisotropy. MD = mean diffusivity. FC = functional connectivity.

3.2 Demographics and summary statistics

Descriptive statistics for demographics and behavioural measures are provided in Table 3, and in Supplementary Material Table 3 for each MRI brain measure included in the PCA. These summary statistics are for raw values, not residual data. Expectedly, total CRIq and Spot-the-word scores correlated with age (CRIq = 0.69, $p < .001$; Spot-the-word = 0.41, $p < .001$), given lifetime experiences and crystallised intelligence increase with age (Baddeley et al., 1993). Thus, regressing out the effect of age was important to justify that CR proxy effects were beyond age-related differences. Age was significantly correlated with better mood and CR, but worse cognitive and motor function (see Supplementary Material Table 4). For residuals (after age and sex were regressed out), MoCA scores were highly correlated with CR, cognition and motor function. Education was significantly associated with the CR composite score when age and sex were controlled for, but not prior to regressing out age and sex (see Supplementary Material Table 5). The PC representing RSN FC (PC1) was negatively correlated with motor function, and the structural volume PC (PC4) was also negatively correlated to CR and motor function. These results indicate that greater RSN FC and larger structural brain volume was associated with better motor function test performance. CR was significantly correlated with superior cognition, more effective motor function, and better mood outcomes.

Table 3

Demographic and behavioural characteristics prior to calculation of residuals and principal component analyses.

Variables	**Mean ± SD**
Demographics	
Sample Size	74
Age	55.92 ± 14.44
Sex (M / F count)	30 / 44
Education years	16.09 ± 3.22
CR	
Spot-the-Word total score	26.35 ± 2.10
CRIq total score	118.94 ± 16.9
CRI-Education total score	116.14 ± 13.52
CRI-Working Activity total score	108.53 ± 17.09
CRI-Leisure Time total score	121.67 ± 24.69
Cognition	
Decision time (from CRT)	385.85 ± 46.94
Digit Span total score	17.07 ± 3.08
Dot Matrix score	31.95 ± 14.51
Inspection time	65.15 ± 44.66
MoCA	28.22 ± 1.67
Raven's Progressive Matrices total score	15.19 ± 2.66
Simon Task time*	30.46 ± 41.66
SSRT	256.73 ± 56.95
Motor Function	
Balance (mean path length)**	58.23 ± 16.08
Gait (stride length relative to height)	78.30 ± 9.79
Response time (from CRT)	180.89 ± 67.63
Tapping test score	89.05 ± 14.64
Tremor (mean theta power raw)	2.68 ± 0.87
Mood	
DASS-21 total score	10.46 ± 8.08
CESD-10 total score	7.05 ± 4.69

*Difference in reaction time between incongruent and congruent trials. **Mean path length for feet together and feet apart trials.

3.3 Variance in cognitive reserve levels

The model regressing CR scores on the MRI brain measure PCs was not statistically significant (see Table 4). Approximately 10.1% of variance in CR was explained by all six MRI brain measure PCs, and this was mostly attributed to the only significant predictor in the model, PC4 (see Fig 1). Greater PC4 scores, which primarily represent smaller brain region volume and reduced PFC cortical thickness, were negatively associated with CR levels, although this effect was small.

3.4 Variance in functional outcomes

Models using a combination of CR and MRI brain measure PCs as predictors of overall cognition and motor function were both significant (see Table 4). Brain measures and CR explained 23% of variance in overall cognition. CR was the sole significant predictor of overall cognition and explained the most variance of all predictors (6% of overall cognition score variance). Each MRI brain measure PC made independent contributions to differences in overall cognition that were lower than CR, non-significant, and not concentrated on any one PC (see Fig 1). Thus, compared to brain measures, CR explained substantial differences in cognition, with a higher CR associated with better performance. However, 17% of variance could still be attributed to these brain measure components when considered as a whole, indicating that several neuroanatomical factors may make relevant, independent contributions to cognition.

Using the same predictors, 23% of variance in overall motor function was explained by the model. One subject was omitted from the model as they performed poorly on, and potentially did not fully understand, the two-choice reaction time task and consequently had an unreasonable overall motor function score (more than three standard deviations below the

mean)[i]. CR was a significant predictor of overall motor function, with subjects possessing higher CR levels demonstrating greater performance on motor function tests, beyond brain measures. Notably, PC4 was the most important predictor (9% of overall motor function score variance) for overall motor function, making a greater contribution to the model than CR and signifying that greater brain volume and PFC cortical thickness was associated with better motor function.

For self-reported mood, CR and PC6 explained the most variance (5% and 3% of variance in mood scores, respectively). However, neither of these predictors, nor the total set used in the model, which only explained 9% of variance overall, were significant.

[i]Subjects with outlier scores on outcome tests included in behavioural PCAs were not excluded, as the composite scores generated from these analyses were produced in a robust manner from the larger study dataset. If overall composite scores or individual outcome test scores were deemed outliers they were removed prior to regression analyses.

Table 4

Results of multiple linear regressions predicting cognitive reserve and functional outcome composite scores (uncorrected *p*-values ≤ .05 are shown in bold).

	CR				Overall Cognition				Overall Motor Function (*n*=73)				Overall Mood			
	β	SE	*p*	R^2	β	SE	*p*	R^2	β	SE	*p*	R^2	β	SE	*p*	R^2
CR																
CR composite score					0.380	0.174	**.033**	0.061	0.347	0.155	**.028**	0.069	-0.356	0.197	.075	0.052
MRI brain measure PCs																
PC1	0.036	0.043	.404	0.009	-0.114	0.062	.071	0.035	-0.117	0.060	.056	0.035	0.023	0.070	.748	0.001
PC2	-0.011	0.057	.841	0.001	0.134	0.081	.101	0.031	0.004	0.071	.956	0.001	-0.041	0.091	.658	0.002
PC3	0.074	0.061	.232	0.020	0.096	0.088	.283	0.019	-0.052	0.076	.498	0.004	-0.015	0.100	.881	0.001
PC4	-0.141	0.065	**.034**	0.063	-0.121	0.096	.210	0.030	-0.205	0.082	**.016**	0.092	0.031	0.109	.776	0.005
PC5	0.008	0.073	.909	0.000	-0.136	0.104	.193	0.020	-0.120	0.090	.186	0.024	0.052	0.117	.657	0.003
PC6	-0.064	0.083	.443	0.008	0.217	0.119	.072	0.035	-0.086	0.103	.406	0.008	0.175	0.134	.198	0.027
Total Model R^2	0.101 (*p* = .292)				0.231 (*p* = **.012**)				0.234 (*p* = **.012**)				0.091 (*p* = .481)			

β = beta coefficient. CR = cognitive reserve. MRI = magnetic resonance imaging. *p* = *p*-value. PCs = principal components. R^2 = proportion of variance explained by predictor. SE = standard error.

3.5 Functional outcome variance explained by cognitive reserve compared to neuroanatomy

To test the relative importance of predictors, ANOVAs were performed comparing regression models of each outcome test (i.e., the single behavioural composite measure as well as the individual test scores) with both CR and MRI brain measure PCs as predictors vs models where either CR or all MRI brain measure PCs were removed. If so, one could conclude that the removed predictor(s) explained a significant amount of unique variance in the functional outcome. Some subjects with scores three standard deviations or greater away from the mean were removed from these analyses (outcome variables with a sample size of 73; see Table 5).

The variance explained by CR was higher compared to all MRI brain measure PCs combined for Raven's Matrices score and MoCA score, both the DASS-21 and CESD-10, and response time (see Supplementary Material Tables 6, 7 and 8). In these models, CR's greater explained variance in outcome performance was especially noteworthy given that it, as a single predictor, outperformed all six neuroanatomical measures. Removing CR from models that included all predictors resulted in a significant reduction in the total explained variance for Raven's Matrices score, MoCA score, overall cognition, DASS-21 score, response time, and overall motor function.



Fig 1. Pie charts showing the breakdown of the total explained variance by all predictors in the regression models for cognitive reserve and each functional outcome.

MRI brain measures explained a higher proportion of variance than CR in all motor function assessments and all cognitive measures, with the exception of Raven's Matrices and the MoCA. For most of these outcome tests where MRI brain measures explained more variance, CR explained little to no variance. This was particularly evident for SSRT, where nearly all the variance was attributed to neuroanatomy (see Table 5), with PC5 accounting for the majority (see Supplementary Material Table 6). As with CR, removing MRI brain measures from the overall cognition model that included all predictors resulted in a significant reduction in the variance explained. This suggests that while CR accounts for some significant differences in performance variance above and beyond what brain measures explain, considering specific neuroanatomical features is equally important when evaluating functional outcomes. The small number of significant differences seen when dropping MRI brain measure PCs from the full models, despite neuroanatomical characteristics generally explaining more variance than CR, might possibly be a result of simultaneously removing six predictors, reducing the statistical power of the ANOVA given the difference in degrees of freedom.

Table 5

Analysis of variance results comparing variance explained by regression models when either only cognitive reserve or all magnetic resonance imaging brain measures are dropped from the full model (uncorrected p-values ≤ .05 are shown in bold).

Outcome	Full model R^2	CR model R^2	MRI model R^2	Full model vs MRI measures removed *p*	Full model vs CR removed *p*
Cognition					
Raven's Progressive Matrices	0.304	0.179	0.157	.082	**< .001**
Inspection Time (*n*=73)	0.171	0.053	0.125	.179	.062
Decision Time (*n*=73)	0.136	0.003	0.125	.142	.366
Dot Matrix Score	0.096	0.001	0.093	.340	.664
Stop Signal Reaction Time	0.221	0.000	0.221	**.009**	.934
Simon Task Score	0.059	0.005	0.058	.708	.805
Digit Span Total Score	0.162	0.003	0.159	.067	.667
MoCA	0.253	0.217	0.073	.778	**< .001**
Composite Cognition Score	0.231	0.066	0.176	**.040**	**.033**
Mood					
DASS-21	0.119	0.075	0.063	.769	**.044**
CESD-10	0.073	0.045	0.037	.920	.118
Composite Mood Score	0.091	0.059	0.046	.888	.075
Motor Function					
Tapping Test Score	0.161	0.057	0.122	.244	.084
Stride Length Relative to Height	0.118	0.009	0.108	.242	.384
Tremor (*n*=73)	0.065	0.012	0.060	.717	.552
Balance (*n*=73)	0.140	0.004	0.140	.131	.855
Response Time (*n*=73)	0.179	0.066	0.110	.192	**.022**
Composite Motor Function Score (*n*=73)	0.234	0.076	0.174	.052	**.028**

ANOVA = analysis of variance. CESD-10 = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale short form. DASS-21 = Depression Anxiety Stress Scale. MoCA = Montreal cognitive assessment. MRI = magnetic resonance imaging. *p* = *p*-value. R^2 = proportion of variance explained by predictor.

3.6 Moderator analyses

As mentioned, structural brain measures were a significant predictor of CR levels (see Table 4), and these are the most commonly used indicator of brain status in the CR literature when using MRI (see Supplementary Material Table 1). These structural indices were captured best by PC4, which, as well as possessing a significant association with CR, was the most important predictor for overall motor function and explained a modest amount of variance in overall cognition (see Table 4). Thus, to directly test the premise of CR, we explored its moderating effect on the relationship between only PC4 and cognition, motor function and mood. As with previous regression analyses, age and sex were regressed out of each variable for this post-hoc analysis and only CR, PC4, and the CR-PC4 interaction were included as predictors. CR's moderating effect on the PC4-outcome relationship was only significant for overall cognition (14.3% of variance explained by the total model). The interaction effect was positive and accounted for 6% of variance in overall cognition ($\beta = 0.268$, $p = .036$). An illustration of this significant moderating effect can be viewed in Fig 2. These plots used a median split to divide subjects into high and low CR groups for illustration purposes only (note that the continuous CR scores were used in the regression model). The PC4-cognition plot is consistent with the proposed CR hypothesis, showing that the association between brain volume decreasing (PC4 increasing) and worse cognitive performance only occurred in the low CR group. While there were no significant moderating effects of CR on overall motor function or mood, these interactions were also trending in expected directions; i.e., motor scores decreased, and mood disturbance scores increased with lower brain volume (higher PC4 scores) mostly in the low CR group (see Fig 2).

3.7 Age group comparisons

In an exploratory analysis, age effects were investigated by splitting the cohort into younger (37 subjects, mean age = 44.84 ± 11.58 years) and older (37 subjects, mean age = 67.01 ± 6.03 years) groups. The overall motor function model was only significant for the older group, while all other models for main functional outcomes were non-significant (see Supplementary Material Tables 9, 10 and 11). PC1 (RSN FC measure) and CR were significant predictors of overall motor function in older subjects, while PC1 and PC5 (mixture of brain measures, largely basal ganglia nuclei measures) were significant for the younger cohort. Another notable result was that PC4 (structural volume measure) was a more important predictor of CR in the younger group, but this changed to PC6 (mixture of brain measures, largely cerebellar measures) for older subjects. Also, CR was a significant predictor of overall mood in older, but not younger, subjects (see Supplementary Material Fig 4). Despite the reduced statistical power, these findings highlight discrepancies in the variance that CR and MRI brain explain across different age groups.



Fig 2. Interaction plots showing the moderating influence of cognitive reserve on the relationship between PC4 (capturing mostly brain volume and cortical thickness) and main functional outcomes. Subjects were classified as High or Low cognitive reserve depending on whether they scored above or below the median cognitive reserve composite score, respectively. Note that higher mood scores indicate more adverse symptoms. * = uncorrected p-values ≤ .05. β = beta coefficient. CR = cognitive reserve.

4 Discussion

In healthy individuals, CR theory postulates that lifetime experiences enhance cognitive processing, enabling more successful task completion regardless of differences in neuroanatomical features associated with these tasks (Stern, 2002). Thus, CR should account for variance in task performance that cannot be attributed to any brain characteristics. While past studies have outlined possible biological substrates of CR, they have not yet determined the variance in functional outcome differences that CR can account for beyond brain measures. Furthermore, the current study demonstrated that out of all composite MRI brain measures, only PC4 (brain structural volume and cortical thickness) explained a significant amount of variance in CR proxies. PC4 was interpreted as a neuroanatomical structural measure, since volumetric and cortical thickness measures had the largest loadings for this PC, and, henceforth, it will be referred to as 'brain structure' for convenience in discussion. CR proxies were a significant predictor of both overall cognitive and motor function, with brain structure a significant predictor of only motor function. However, while brain structure was not a significant predictor of overall cognition, CR proxies moderated the relationship between brain structure and overall outcome scores only in the case of cognition. Neither MRI brain measures nor CR proxies were significantly associated with overall mood. Finally, the relative importance of CR proxies was higher for global outcome assessments, whereas MRI brain measures explained more variance in specific outcome tests.

4.1 Association between neuroanatomy and cognitive reserve proxies

CR proxies were positively associated with greater brain volume and cortical thickness, and reduced ventricular CSF volume. It is unsurprising that brain structure emerges as the most important neuroanatomical feature for determining individual differences in CR, given that structural measures are most commonly used in the studies of CR (as illustrated in

Supplementary Material Table 1). Strong relationships between CR proxies and brain structure have already been extensively reported in previous literature. Lifetime experiences thought to contribute to CR have been linked with volumetric increases in certain gyri (Conti et al., 2021; Šneidere et al., 2024), more hippocampal volume after controlling for cognitive ability (W. Yang et al., 2024), greater cerebellar lobule volumes (Devita et al., 2024), and increased regional cortical thickness (Liu et al., 2012). These regions identified in previous studies were similar to the volumetric measures of structural areas contributing to the brain structure PC (see Table 2). Healthy subjects with more education years have also been shown to possess lower CSF volume (Coffey et al., 1999), suggesting that those with greater CR levels may accumulate less age-related pathology and consequently show lower amounts of brain atrophy. Past studies have shown that single MRI brain measures are significantly associated with CR; however, our findings demonstrated that a combination of several structural metrics, representing a global brain structure measure, was a significant predictor of CR.

The greater relative importance of brain structure compared to other MRI brain measures could suggest a mechanism related to CR that helps to prevent or minimise brain atrophy. In other words, enriching cognitive activities that contribute to CR may function similarly to how exercise can induce neurogenesis to lessen or even prevent cognitive decline (Ma et al., 2017). In support of this, cognitively stimulating activities have been suggested to counteract hippocampal atrophy (Valenzuela et al., 2008) and pathological aggregation (Landau et al., 2012). Therefore, lifetime experiences that contribute to CR may not only help maintain sufficient functioning despite pathology, but also assist in avoiding or reducing neuroanatomical damage associated with ageing or disease.

Despite prior work demonstrating associations between CR proxies and RSN FC (Bozzali et al., 2015; Conti et al., 2021; Franzmeier et al., 2017; Montemurro et al., 2023; Varela-López

et al., 2022; Weiler et al., 2018; Ye et al., 2022), our findings suggest that brain structure was a more influential predictor of CR proxies than RSN FC. Unlike most previous studies, the current research analysed FC across entire RSNs. This approach makes it less likely to detect individual differences in FC associated with CR at the whole-network level, compared to focusing on specific regions within an RSN. For example, Conti et al. (2021) found significant changes in RSN FC in younger healthy adults, however, only in very specific anatomical regions within investigated networks. Our approach was deliberately more conservative, whereby we refrained from focusing on select regions. While this removed the possibility of detecting significant effects it ensured our findings more accurately represented connectivity across entire RSNs. Of note, the multiple linear regression model we performed also included microstructural and structural measures that could have impacted the variance explained by PC1. Non-negligible loadings from MRI brain measures that did not reflect RSN FC likely confounded the representativeness of PC1 as a RSN FC metric. Exploring RSN FC as a predictor independent of other MRI brain measures may have explained additional variance in CR that could not be captured by PC1. Additionally, CR is known to differentially affect functionality of brain networks in young and old healthy adults (Stern et al., 2005). The broad age range of our sample may have led to varying effects of CR proxies on the FC of RSNs, potentially contributing to the minimal variance attributed to PC1. Including younger subjects could have also limited RSN FC heterogeneity, given that ageing has been shown to increase individual differences in brain network connectivity (Ferreira et al., 2016).

4.2 Variance in overall cognition

In our sample of healthy adults, CR proxies were more strongly associated with overall cognition compared to any of the six MRI brain measure composite scores. CR was the only significant, and most important, predictor in the model, suggesting that those with higher CR

levels possessed a greater cognitive ability. The positive relationship between CR proxies and overall cognition is consistent with findings from previous studies of healthy adults (Opdebeeck et al., 2016b; Panico et al., 2022). Crucially, however, since our analysis included a diverse set of MRI measures, it showed that the CR composite score accounted for neuroanatomically unexplainable individual differences in cognitive performance, regardless of age or sex. Interestingly, although each MRI brain measure explained some variance in overall cognition, none were significant predictors. However, the ANOVA comparing variance explained by the overall cognition model, with and without the inclusion of all six MRI brain composite measures, revealed that these measures, as a collective, accounted for a significant proportion of individual differences in cognitive performance. This distribution of variance across the MRI brain measure PCs could suggest that each one may have captured differences in performance on the specific cognitive tests used to derive the overall cognition composite score. ANOVAs of individual outcome assessments (see Table 5) further support this possibility. Excluding Raven's Matrices and the MoCA, variation in scores of each specific cognitive test was better explained by MRI brain measure PCs than CR.

Consistent with our finding that the variance explained in overall cognition was significantly reduced when removing the MRI brain measures (suggesting they account for unique variance beyond CR), several previous longitudinal studies exploring regional brain atrophy have identified relationships between the hippocampus and memory (Gorbach et al., 2017), whole-brain tissue and reasoning ability (Schott et al., 2008), frontal gyri and executive function (Cardenas et al., 2011), and WMHs and processing speed (Ramirez et al., 2014). Removing either CR or the MRI brain measure PCs from the regression model significantly impacted variance explained, suggesting that both explained unique variance in overall cognitive performance. Perhaps the remaining variance that CR accounts for in overall cognition, that MRI brain measure PCs cannot capture, is better captured by global cognitive,

rather than specific, measures. CR theory was developed according to consistent findings that those with more enriching lifetime experiences tend to have a better general cognitive ability (Stern, 2009). Associations between CR proxies and cognitive assessments that test different cognitive domains have been reported to vary (Lavrencic et al., 2018). Further, after controlling for brain structure and demographics, in healthy older adults, CR proxies have been shown to have a more pronounced effect on global cognition compared to individual tests of processing speed, memory, abstract thinking and reaction time (Jin et al., 2023). Thus, it is possible that CR exerts its influence on cognitive processes and brain networks broadly, preserving overall cognition rather than enhancing only specific abilities.

Additionally, a moderation effect was found in which greater brain structural volume and cortical thickness was associated with better cognition in low CR individuals. The observation that a higher CR reduces the association between different brain structural characteristics and cognition in healthy individuals has been described previously (Jin et al., 2023; Querbes et al., 2009; Stern et al., 2018; Vuoksimaa et al., 2013). The same moderation effect that we observed has also been reported when substituting a brain structure measure with markers of typical age-related pathology (Brickman et al., 2011; Rentz et al., 2010). This finding supports the wider literature and demonstrates that CR accounts for differences in cognitive performance that cannot be explained by brain structure.

4.3 Variance in overall motor function

Likewise, higher CR and greater brain volume and cortical thickness were each associated with better motor function. Removing either CR or all MRI brain measure PCs resulted in significant reductions in variance explained by the model. These findings suggest that while brain structure is associated with motor function test performance, CR proxies still explain some variance beyond brain measures. To our knowledge, the association between CR and

motor function has been largely under-investigated in healthy subjects. CR has been shown to mitigate the impact of vascular brain damage on motor function (Elbaz et al., 2013), and in movement disorders like PD, to reduce the level of motor impairment (Guzzetti et al., 2019). In our study, overall cognition and motor function correlated highly, even after controlling for age. This is not surprising, since some motor tasks required cognitive planning and execution of voluntary movements (Kobayashi-Cuya et al., 2018; Leisman et al., 2016). Healthy ageing studies support the association between cognition and motor function, given that both these abilities are affected by neural changes such as reduced brain volume or connectivity (Clouston et al., 2013; Kong et al., 2020; Sánchez-Izquierdo & Fernández-Ballesteros, 2021). Thus, if CR helps protect against age-related neuroanatomical changes linked to cognitive ageing, then theoretically it should also moderate motor function decline. The reliance on higher-level cognitive abilities for successful movements may also explain why CR's neuroprotective effects indirectly extend to motor function by strengthening cognitive processing. Notably, unlike overall cognition, brain structure showed a significant association with overall motor function, with the variance explained by model predictors less evenly distributed across the MRI brain measures. Given that a majority of the volumetric neuroanatomical metrics that loaded onto the brain structure composite measure are associated with motor function (i.e., striatum, globus pallidus, thalamus, cerebellum; Lanciego et al., 2012; Seidler et al., 2010) it is unsurprising that brain structure was associated with motor function. This relationship may also explain why brain structure accounted for more variance than CR in overall motor function, especially if CR's influence on motor abilities occurs indirectly via enhancing, or protecting, related cognitive abilities. Alternatively though, it is also important to consider that CR may exert its neuroprotective effects on motor function directly.

4.4 Variance in overall mood

Neither CR nor the MRI brain measures were significant predictors of overall mood, but CR's relative importance in the model was greater than that of all MRI brain measure PCs combined. The directionality of the relationship between CR and mood aligned with previous literature; however, our results only demonstrated a weak association between CR proxies and better mood outcomes. In one study, negative associations between CR and poorer mood outcomes were found among healthy middle-aged and older adults (Porricelli et al., 2024). Notably, however, this study did not control for, or consider, a measure of brain status/pathology, an important gap that we aimed to fill in the current work. Nevertheless, the findings from the older demographic of this previous study were consistent with our supplementary analyses assessing age differences. More specifically, the significant relationship between higher CR and better mood outcomes only occurred in the older cohort. CR has been shown to moderate the relationship between mood and cognitive outcomes in healthy adults, such that, regardless of mood, those with a higher CR maintain superior cognitive performance (Opdebeeck et al., 2015, 2018). While this may represent CR's influence on cognition, it also supports the notion that CR's neuroprotective effects may generalise to mood. The neuroanatomical features selected for the MRI brain measure PCA may also explain the non-significant model and the greater proportion of variance explained by CR compared to neuroanatomy. Brain regions such as the amygdala and insular cortex, which were excluded due to the lack of previous literature linking them to CR, have previously demonstrated strong associations with neuropsychiatric functions (Paulus & Stein, 2006; Price & Drevets, 2010). Thus, including these brain structures in the MRI brain measure PCA may have potentially altered the distribution of variance explained by predictors for overall mood.

4.5 Specific functional outcomes

Another key finding of our study was that the relative importance of CR changed across outcomes, exerting greater influence on tests of global function, while MRI brain measures were more important predictors of individual outcome test performance. More specifically, removing CR significantly reduced explained variance in models for the following outcomes: Raven's Matrices, MoCA, overall cognition score, DASS-21, response time and overall motor function score. Interestingly, for Raven's Matrices, MoCA, and all mood assessments, CR as a single predictor explained more variance in outcome performance than all six MRI brain measure PCs combined. Greater non-verbal reasoning ability has been previously associated with tests of reading comprehension (Cockcroft & Israel, 2011) and lifetime experiences that contribute to CR (Tucker-Drob et al., 2009). Additionally, CR has been shown to be associated with reasoning ability (Tucker & Stern, 2011), suggesting that individuals with higher CR can more efficiently utilise neural resources to solve novel problems, such as those in Raven's Matrices. In contrast, more basic cognitive abilities, such as visuomotor processing speed (Ritchie et al., 2013), which are among the first to decline with age-related pathology, are less likely to be preserved by CR (Lavrencic et al., 2018). The low relative importance attributed to CR proxies in our models of cognitive measures like two-choice reaction time (decision time), SST, digit span, and Simon task, provides further evidence for this claim.

Notably, the combined amount of variance explained by all six MRI brain measure PCs was only significant for SSRT derived from the SST, a measure of response inhibition. In this model, CR proxies accounted for almost no unique variance. MRI brain measures from the basal ganglia structures had the strongest loading on PC5, which was the most influential predictor of SSRT. Brain structures included in the basal ganglia are known to influence pathways that play a role in inhibiting unwanted movements (Obeso et al., 2014), but given

that PC5 contained mixed loadings that are not solely represented by basal ganglia structures, this result should be interpreted with caution. Furthermore, while not significant, other specific outcome tests for cognition and motor function, but not mood, trended in the same direction. Thus, most of the differences in task performance were associated with MRI brain measures, rather than CR proxies.

4.6 Limitations and future directions

There are several limitations that should be considered when interpreting findings of the current study. Although our modest sample size was comparable to previous exploratory analyses of CR and MRI brain measures (Conti et al., 2021), it limited our statistical power for investigating CR's effect across age groups. One study demonstrated that early-life CR proxies (i.e., education years) was crucial for maintaining cognitive performance, while late-life proxies (i.e., social engagement) were more important for preventing cognitive decline (Y. Yang et al., 2022). Future studies should aim to explore CR proxies, brain measures and outcomes in a larger sample that allows age group comparisons. Further, CR was evaluated using a composite score as it generates a better estimation of the construct (Grotz et al., 2017), however, also analysing the effects of individual proxies may provide additional information regarding CR's neuroprotective influence.

We restricted the number of investigated brain measures to those associated with CR in previous literature, thereby preserving statistical power with our limited sample size. However, this led to the exclusion of brain measures that might have been associated with outcomes, and therefore potential relationships that CR may have modulated. Additionally, using composite scores that represent different MRI brain measure types limited our ability to make confident inferences about any given measure. PC4, for example, while interpreted as a structural volume and thickness measure, also has strong striatal and globus pallidus MD

loadings. Thus, it becomes challenging to determine with full confidence whether the effects related to PC4 are solely linked to structural measures or influenced by other factors. This was necessary though, as we needed to perform some dimensionality reduction on the many brain measures identified by our literature search, in order to maintain adequate statistical power.

Lastly, without a direct pathological measure, like number of AD plaques in brain regions of interest, it was difficult to delineate between pathology and BR, as they can be expressed simultaneously in the same brain areas (Stern et al., 2020). In other words, in our cross-sectional study, it was impossible to distinguish whether the effects of neuroanatomical features were due to age-related changes over time or individual differences in neurobiological capital at the time of testing. Applying a similar methodology as the current study, but using a longitudinal design or incorporating a positron emission topography tracer targeted at pathological markers like amyloid beta or hyperphosphorylated tau, could help differentiate between the effects of age-related pathology and premorbid brain characteristics more clearly.

5 Conclusion

Our results suggest that CR and brain measures are both critical variables to account for when analysing healthy adult task performance. Higher CR was also associated with better neuroanatomical structural characteristics in a cohort of healthy adults. Interestingly, the impact of these factors appears to change depending on the outcome of interest, which has implications for how future studies might investigate CR's neuroprotective effect. Performance in global outcome tasks, which rely on a several functional abilities, was associated with CR, and importantly this relationship persisted beyond the influence of multiple key brain characteristics. Alternatively, variance in scores on tests that targeted specific abilities depended more different types of task-contingent brain measures, whereas CR had a negligible effect on performance on these specific tests. Therefore, an investigation of individual cognitive abilities might yield results that are quite different compared to broad global measures of cognition that amalgamate several cognitive functions. Simultaneously investigating both socio-behavioural proxies and various brain measures could improve estimations of the unique variance CR accounts for in specific functional outcomes, thereby enhancing understanding of individual differences in both clinical and research settings.

List of abbreviations

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
AD	Alzheimer's Disease
BR	Brain Reserve
CESD-10	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale short form
CR	Cognitive Reserve
CRIq	Cognitive Reserve Index questionnaire
CSF	Cerebrospinal Fluid
DASS-21	Depression Anxiety Stress Scale
DMN	Default Mode Network
FA	Fractional Anisotropy
FC	Functional Connectivity
FLAIR	Fluid Attenuated Inversion Recovery
GM	Grey Matter
ICs	Independent Components
ICA	Independent Component Analysis
fMRI	Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging
FSL	FMRIB Software Library
MCI	Mild Cognitive Impairment
MD	Mean Diffusivity
MoCA	Montreal Cognitive Assessment
MRI	Magnetic Resonance Imaging
PC	Principal Component
PCA	Principal Component Analysis
PD	Parkinson's Disease
PFC	Prefrontal Cortex
RSN	Resting-state Network
SST	Stop Signal Task
SSRT	Stop Signal Reaction Time
WM	White Matter
WMH	White Matter Hyperintensities

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare no competing interests and have nothing to disclose.

Funding

This work was supported by grants to LCP, MJ, IB, AD, and AW from the Medical Research Future Fund (2020/MRF1202188; Forecasting Impairment and Neurodegenerative Disease risk following Traumatic Brain Injury (FIND-TBI): A computational neurology-driven method to predict long-term prognosis) and the Australian Research Council Discovery Project to IB and LCP (DP190103600; Investigating differences in decision-making ability in older adults: Computational modelling and neurogenetics of the basal ganglia). IS was supported by the University of Adelaide Research Scholarship.

Data Availability Statement

Due to the current study using a subset of data from a larger project, the dataset used in this study is not publicly available. However, upon completion of the larger project, all data collected will be made widely accessible. In the meantime, the data used in this study may be available upon request.

Authorship contribution statement (CRediT)

Isaac Saywell: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Methodology, Visualisation, Investigation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualisation. **Sabrina Sghirripa:** Writing – review & editing, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Conceptualisation. **Angela Walls:** Writing – review & editing, Funding acquisition. **Andrew Dwyer:** Writing – review & editing, Funding acquisition. **Brittany Child:** Writing – review & editing, Project administration, Data curation, Visualisation, Software. **John Salamon:** Writing – review & editing, Visualisation, Software. **Lyndsey Collins-Praino:** Writing –

review & editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition, Project administration, Conceptualisation. **Mark Jenkinson:** Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Investigation, Project administration, Software, Formal analysis, Conceptualisation. **Irina Baetu:** Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Investigation, Project administration, Formal analysis, Conceptualisation.

Supplementary material

Supplementary material associated with this article can be found in the online version of the article.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge all study participants and research assistants who contributed to data collection. The authors would also like to acknowledge the facilities and scientific and technical assistance of the National Imaging Facility, a National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy (NCRIS) capability.

References

Akhtar-Danesh, N., & Landeen, J. (2007). Relation between depression and sociodemographic factors. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, *1*(1), 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/1752-4458-1-4

Andersson, J. L. R., Skare, S., & Ashburner, J. (2003). How to correct susceptibility distortions in spin-echo echo-planar images: Application to diffusion tensor imaging. *NeuroImage*, *20*(2), 870–888. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-8119(03)00336-7

Andersson, J. L. R., & Sotiropoulos, S. N. (2016). An integrated approach to correction for off-resonance effects and subject movement in diffusion MR imaging. *NeuroImage*, *125*, 1063–1078. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.10.019

Andresen, E. M., Malmgren, J. A., Carter, W. B., & Patrick, D. L. (1994). Screening for depression in well older adults: Evaluation of a short form of the CES-D (Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale). *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *10*(2), 77–84.

Antony, M. M., Bieling, P. J., Cox, B. J., Enns, M. W., & Swinson, R. P. (1998). Psychometric properties of the 42-item and 21-item versions of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales in clinical groups and a community sample. *Psychological Assessment*, *10*(2), 176–181. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.10.2.176

Baddeley, A., Emslie, H., & Nimmo-Smith, I. (1993). The Spot-the-Word test: A robust estimate of verbal intelligence based on lexical decision. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *32*(1), 55–65. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1993.tb01027.x

Beckmann, C. F., DeLuca, M., Devlin, J. T., & Smith, S. M. (2005). Investigations into resting-state connectivity using independent component analysis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, *360*(1457), 1001–1013. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2005.1634

Beckmann, C. F., & Smith, S. M. (2004). Probabilistic independent component analysis for functional magnetic resonance imaging. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, *23*(2), 137–152. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging. https://doi.org/10.1109/TMI.2003.822821

Boyle, R., Knight, S. P., De Looze, C., Carey, D., Scarlett, S., Stern, Y., Robertson, I. H., Kenny, R. A., & Whelan, R. (2021). Verbal intelligence is a more robust cross-sectional measure of cognitive reserve than level of education in healthy older adults. *Alzheimer's Research & Therapy*, *13*(1), 128. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13195-021-00870-z

Bozzali, M., Dowling, C., Serra, L., Spanò, B., Torso, M., Marra, C., Castelli, D., Dowell, N. G., Koch, G., Caltagirone, C., & Cercignani, M. (2015). The impact of cognitive reserve on brain functional connectivity in Alzheimer's disease. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease: JAD*, *44*(1), 243–250. https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-141824

Brickman, A. M., Siedlecki, K. L., Muraskin, J., Manly, J. J., Luchsinger, J. A., Yeung, L.-K., Brown, T. R., DeCarli, C., & Stern, Y. (2011). White matter hyperintensities and cognition: Testing the reserve hypothesis. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *32*(9), 1588–1598. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2009.10.013

Brown, T. A., Chorpita, B. F., Korotitsch, W., & Barlow, D. H. (1997). Psychometric properties of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) in clinical samples. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *35*(1), 79–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0005-7967(96)00068-x

Bugané, F., Benedetti, M. G., Casadio, G., Attala, S., Biagi, F., Manca, M., & Leardini, A. (2012). Estimation of spatial-temporal gait parameters in level walking based on a single accelerometer: Validation on normal subjects by standard gait analysis.

Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine, *108*(1), 129–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpb.2012.02.003

Cardenas, V. A., Chao, L. L., Studholme, C., Yaffe, K., Miller, B. L., Madison, C., Buckley, S. T., Mungas, D., Schuff, N., & Weiner, M. W. (2011). Brain atrophy associated with baseline and longitudinal measures of cognition. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *32*(4), 572–580. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2009.04.011

Chen, H., Zhu, H., Huang, L., Chen, H., Liu, R., Qin, R., Shao, P., Xu, H., Ma, J., Cheng, Y., Xu, Y., & Ye, Q. (2022). The flexibility of cognitive reserve in regulating the frontoparietal control network and cognitive function in subjects with white matter hyperintensities. *Behavioural Brain Research*, *425*, 113831. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2022.113831

Clark, R. A., Bryant, A. L., Pua, Y., McCrory, P., Bennell, K., & Hunt, M. (2010). Validity and reliability of the Nintendo Wii Balance Board for assessment of standing balance. *Gait & Posture*, *31*(3), 307–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2009.11.012

Clouston, S. A. P., Brewster, P., Kuh, D., Richards, M., Cooper, R., Hardy, R., Rubin, M. S., & Hofer, S. M. (2013). The Dynamic Relationship Between Physical Function and Cognition in Longitudinal Aging Cohorts. *Epidemiologic Reviews*, *35*(1), 33–50. https://doi.org/10.1093/epirev/mxs004

Cockcroft, K., & Israel, N. (2011). The Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices: A Comparison of Relationships with Verbal Ability Tests. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *41*(3), 363–372. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124631104100310

Coffey, C. E., Saxton, J. A., Ratcliff, G., Bryan, R. N., & Lucke, J. F. (1999). Relation of education to brain size in normal aging. *Neurology*, *53*(1), 189–189. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.53.1.189

Contador, I., Alzola, P., Stern, Y., de la Torre-Luque, A., Bermejo-Pareja, F., & Fernández-Calvo, B. (2023). Is cognitive reserve associated with the prevention of cognitive decline after stroke? A Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ageing Research Reviews*, *84*, 101814. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arr.2022.101814

Conti, L., Riccitelli, G. C., Preziosa, P., Vizzino, C., Marchesi, O., Rocca, M. A., & Filippi, M. (2021). Effect of cognitive reserve on structural and functional MRI measures in healthy subjects: A multiparametric assessment. *Journal of Neurology*, *268*(5), 1780–1791. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-020-10331-6

Dagenbach, D., & Carr, T. H. (Eds.). (1994). *Inhibitory processes in attention, memory, and language* (pp. xiv, 461). Academic Press.

Daneault, J.-F., Carignan, B., Codère, C. É., Sadikot, A. F., & Duval, C. (2013). Using a Smart Phone as a Standalone Platform for Detection and Monitoring of Pathological Tremors. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *6*, 357. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00357

Davidson, R. J., & Irwin, W. (1999). The functional neuroanatomy of emotion and affective style. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *3*(1), 11–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(98)01265-0

Devita, M., Debiasi, G., Anglani, M., Ceolin, C., Mazzonetto, I., Begliomini, C., Cauzzo, S., Raffaelli, C., Lazzarin, A., Ravelli, A., Bordignon, A., De Rui, M., Sergi, G., Bertoldo, A., Mapelli, D., & Coin, A. (2024). The Role of Cognitive Reserve in Protecting Cerebellar Volumes of Older Adults with mild Cognitive Impairment. *Cerebellum (London, England)*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12311-024-01695-w

Elbaz, A., Vicente-Vytopilova, P., Tavernier, B., Sabia, S., Dumurgier, J., Mazoyer, B., Singh-Manoux, A., & Tzourio, C. (2013). Motor function in the elderly: Evidence for

the reserve hypothesis. *Neurology*, *81*(5), 417–426. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e31829d8761

Elshiekh, A., Subramaniapillai, S., Rajagopal, S., Pasvanis, S., Ankudowich, E., & Rajah, M. N. (2020). The association between cognitive reserve and performance-related brain activity during episodic encoding and retrieval across the adult lifespan. *Cortex*, *129*, 296–313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2020.05.003

Ferreira, L. K., Regina, A. C. B., Kovacevic, N., Martin, M. da G. M., Santos, P. P., Carneiro, C. de G., Kerr, D. S., Amaro, E., Jr, McIntosh, A. R., & Busatto, G. F. (2016). Aging Effects on Whole-Brain Functional Connectivity in Adults Free of Cognitive and Psychiatric Disorders. *Cerebral Cortex*, *26*(9), 3851–3865. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhv190

Ferrucci, L., & Kuchel, G. A. (2021). Heterogeneity of Aging: Individual Risk Factors, Mechanisms, Patient Priorities, and Outcomes. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, *69*(3), 610–612. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.17011

Franzmeier, N., Caballero, M. Á. A., Taylor, A. N. W., Simon-Vermot, L., Buerger, K., Ertl-Wagner, B., Mueller, C., Catak, C., Janowitz, D., Baykara, E., Gesierich, B., Duering, M., Ewers, M., & for the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. (2017). Resting-state global functional connectivity as a biomarker of cognitive reserve in mild cognitive impairment. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*, *11*(2), 368–382. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-016-9599-1

Gorbach, T., Pudas, S., Lundquist, A., Orädd, G., Josefsson, M., Salami, A., de Luna, X., & Nyberg, L. (2017). Longitudinal association between hippocampus atrophy and episodic-memory decline. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *51*, 167–176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2016.12.002

Griffanti, L., Zamboni, G., Khan, A., Li, L., Bonifacio, G., Sundaresan, V., Schulz, U. G., Kuker, W., Battaglini, M., Rothwell, P. M., & Jenkinson, M. (2016). BIANCA (Brain Intensity AbNormality Classification Algorithm): A new tool for automated segmentation of white matter hyperintensities. *NeuroImage*, *141*, 191–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.07.018

Groemping, U. (2005). *relaimpo: Relative Importance of Regressors in Linear Models* (p. 2.2-7) [Dataset]. https://doi.org/10.32614/CRAN.package.relaimpo

Grotz, C., Seron, X., Van Wissen, M., & Adam, S. (2017). How should proxies of cognitive reserve be evaluated in a population of healthy older adults? *International Psychogeriatrics*, *29*(1), 123–136. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1041610216001745

Guzzetti, S., Mancini, F., Caporali, A., Manfredi, L., & Daini, R. (2019). The association of cognitive reserve with motor and cognitive functions for different stages of Parkinson's disease. *Experimental Gerontology*, *115*, 79–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2018.11.020

Harrell, F. E. (2001). *Regression Modeling Strategies: With Applications to Linear Models, Logistic and Ordinal Regression, and Survival Analysis*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19425-7

Haut, M. W., Moran, M. T., Lancaster, M. A., Kuwabara, H., Parsons, M. W., & Puce, A. (2007). White Matter Correlates of Cognitive Capacity Studied With Diffusion Tensor Imaging: Implications for Cognitive Reserve. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*, *1*(3), 83–92. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-007-9008-x

Henry, J. D., & Crawford, J. R. (2005). The short-form version of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS-21): Construct validity and normative data in a large non-clinical sample. *The British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *44*(Pt 2), 227–239. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466505X29657

Henschel, L., Conjeti, S., Estrada, S., Diers, K., Fischl, B., & Reuter, M. (2020). FastSurfer—A fast and accurate deep learning based neuroimaging pipeline. *NeuroImage*, *219*, 117012. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117012

Hoopes, A., Mora, J. S., Dalca, A. V., Fischl, B., & Hoffmann, M. (2022). SynthStrip: Skull-stripping for any brain image. *NeuroImage*, *260*, 119474. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2022.119474

Jenkinson, M., Bannister, P., Brady, M., & Smith, S. (2002). Improved optimization for the robust and accurate linear registration and motion correction of brain images. *NeuroImage*, *17*(2), 825–841. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-8119(02)91132-8

Jenkinson, M., & Smith, S. (2001). A global optimisation method for robust affine registration of brain images. *Medical Image Analysis*, *5*(2), 143–156. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1361-8415(01)00036-6

Jin, Y., Lin, L., Xiong, M., Sun, S., & Wu, S.-C. (2023). Moderating effects of cognitive reserve on the relationship between brain structure and cognitive abilities in middle-aged and older adults. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *128*, 49–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2023.04.003

Jones, R. N., Manly, J., Glymour, M. M., Rentz, D. M., Jefferson, A. L., & Stern, Y. (2011). Conceptual and measurement challenges in research on cognitive reserve. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society: JINS*, *17*(4), 593–601. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617710001748

Katzman, R., Terry, R., DeTeresa, R., Brown, T., Davies, P., Fuld, P., Renbing, X., & Peck, A. (1988). Clinical, pathological, and neurochemical changes in dementia: A subgroup with preserved mental status and numerous neocortical plaques. *Annals of Neurology*, *23*(2), 138–144. https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.410230206

Kensinger, E. A., & Leclerc, C. M. (2009). Age-related changes in the neural mechanisms supporting emotion processing and emotional memory. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *21*(2–3), 192–215. https://doi.org/10.1080/09541440801937116

Kobayashi-Cuya, K. E., Sakurai, R., Suzuki, H., Ogawa, S., Takebayashi, T., & Fujiwara, Y. (2018). Observational Evidence of the Association Between Handgrip Strength, Hand Dexterity, and Cognitive Performance in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Epidemiology*, *28*(9), 373–381. https://doi.org/10.2188/jea.JE20170041

Koçer, A., & Oktay, A. B. (2016). Nintendo Wii assessment of Hoehn and Yahr score with Parkinson's disease tremor. *Technology and Health Care: Official Journal of the European Society for Engineering and Medicine*, *24*(2), 185–191. https://doi.org/10.3233/THC-151124

Kong, T. S., Gratton, C., Low, K. A., Tan, C. H., Chiarelli, A. M., Fletcher, M. A., Zimmerman, B., Maclin, E. L., Sutton, B. P., Gratton, G., & Fabiani, M. (2020). Age-related differences in functional brain network segregation are consistent with a cascade of cerebrovascular, structural, and cognitive effects. *Network Neuroscience*, *4*(1), 89–114. https://doi.org/10.1162/netn_a_00110

Lanciego, J. L., Luquin, N., & Obeso, J. A. (2012). Functional Neuroanatomy of the Basal Ganglia. *Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Medicine*, *2*(12), a009621. https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a009621

Landau, S. M., Marks, S. M., Mormino, E. C., Rabinovici, G. D., Oh, H., O'Neil, J. P., Wilson, R. S., & Jagust, W. J. (2012). Association of Lifetime Cognitive Engagement and Low β-Amyloid Deposition. *Archives of Neurology*, *69*(5), 623–629. https://doi.org/10.1001/archneurol.2011.2748

Lavrencic, L. M., Churches, O. F., & Keage, H. A. D. (2018). Cognitive reserve is not associated with improved performance in all cognitive domains. *Applied Neuropsychology: Adult*, *25*(5), 473–485. https://doi.org/10.1080/23279095.2017.1329146

Law, D. J., Morrin, K. A., & Pellegrino, J. W. (1995). Training effects and working memory contributions to skill acquisition in a complex coordination task. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *7*(3), 207–234. https://doi.org/10.1016/1041-6080(95)90011-X

Leisman, G., Moustafa, A. A., & Shafir, T. (2016). Thinking, Walking, Talking: Integratory Motor and Cognitive Brain Function. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *4*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2016.00094

Liu, Y., Julkunen, V., Paajanen, T., Westman, E., Wahlund, L.-O., Aitken, A., Sobow, T., Mecocci, P., Tsolaki, M., Vellas, B., Muehlboeck, S., Spenger, C., Lovestone, S., Simmons, A., Soininen, H., & AddNeuroMed Consortium. (2012). Education increases reserve against Alzheimer's disease—Evidence from structural MRI analysis. *Neuroradiology*, *54*(9), 929–938. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00234-012-1005-0

Lovibond, P. F., & Lovibond, S. H. (1995). The structure of negative emotional states: Comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck Depression and Anxiety Inventories. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *33*(3), 335–343. https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(94)00075-u

Lu, C. H., & Proctor, R. W. (1995). The influence of irrelevant location information on performance: A review of the Simon and spatial Stroop effects. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *2*(2), 174–207. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03210959

Ma, C.-L., Ma, X.-T., Wang, J.-J., Liu, H., Chen, Y.-F., & Yang, Y. (2017). Physical exercise induces hippocampal neurogenesis and prevents cognitive decline. *Behavioural Brain Research*, *317*, 332–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2016.09.067

MacLullich, A. M. J., Ferguson, K. J., Deary, I. J., Seckl, J. R., Starr, J. M., & Wardlaw, J. M. (2002). Intracranial capacity and brain volumes are associated with cognition in healthy elderly men. *Neurology*, *59*(2), 169–174. https://doi.org/10.1212/wnl.59.2.169

Malek-Ahmadi, M., Lu, S., Chan, Y., Perez, S. E., Chen, K., & Mufson, E. J. (2017). Static and Dynamic Cognitive Reserve Proxy Measures: Interactions with Alzheimer's Disease Neuropathology and Cognition. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease & Parkinsonism*, *7*(6), 390. https://doi.org/10.4172/2161-0460.1000390

Montemurro, S., Filippini, N., Ferrazzi, G., Mantini, D., Arcara, G., & Marino, M. (2023). Education differentiates cognitive performance and resting state fMRI connectivity in healthy aging. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, *15*, 1168576. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2023.1168576

Murman, D. L. (2015). The Impact of Age on Cognition. *Seminars in Hearing*, *36*(3), 111–121. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0035-1555115

Nasreddine, Z. S., Phillips, N. A., Bédirian, V., Charbonneau, S., Whitehead, V., Collin, I., Cummings, J. L., & Chertkow, H. (2005). The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: A brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, *53*(4), 695–699. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53221.x

Nelson, M. E., Jester, D. J., Petkus, A. J., & Andel, R. (2021a). Cognitive Reserve, Alzheimer's Neuropathology, and Risk of Dementia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Neuropsychology Review*, *31*(2), 233–250. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-021-09478-4

Nelson, M. E., Jester, D. J., Petkus, A. J., & Andel, R. (2021b). Cognitive Reserve, Alzheimer's Neuropathology, and Risk of Dementia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Neuropsychology Review*, *31*(2), 233–250. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-021-09478-4

Nickerson, L. D., Smith, S. M., Öngür, D., & Beckmann, C. F. (2017). Using Dual Regression to Investigate Network Shape and Amplitude in Functional Connectivity Analyses. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *11*, 115. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2017.00115

Nogueira, J., Gerardo, B., Santana, I., Simões, M. R., & Freitas, S. (2022). The Assessment of Cognitive Reserve: A Systematic Review of the Most Used Quantitative Measurement Methods of Cognitive Reserve for Aging. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.847186

Nucci, M., Mapelli, D., & Mondini, S. (2012). Cognitive Reserve Index questionnaire (CRIq): A new instrument for measuring cognitive reserve. *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research*, *24*(3), 218–226. https://doi.org/10.3275/7800

Nunes, I., & Silva Nunes, M. V. (2021). The influence of cognitive reserve in the protection of the cognitive status after an acquired brain injury: A systematic review. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, *43*(9), 839–860. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803395.2021.2014788

Obeso, J. A., Rodriguez-Oroz, M. C., Stamelou, M., Bhatia, K. P., & Burn, D. J. (2014). The expanding universe of disorders of the basal ganglia. *The Lancet*, *384*(9942), 523–531. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62418-6

Opdebeeck, C., Martyr, A., & Clare, L. (2016a). Cognitive reserve and cognitive function in healthy older people: A meta-analysis. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, *23*(1), 40–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2015.1041450

Opdebeeck, C., Martyr, A., & Clare, L. (2016b). Cognitive reserve and cognitive function in healthy older people: A meta-analysis. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, *23*(1), 40–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2015.1041450

Opdebeeck, C., Matthews, F. E., Wu, Y.-T., Woods, R. T., Brayne, C., & Clare, L. (2018). Cognitive reserve as a moderator of the negative association between mood and cognition: Evidence from a population-representative cohort. *Psychological Medicine*, *48*(1), 61–71. https://doi.org/10.1017/S003329171700126X

Opdebeeck, C., Quinn, C., Nelis, S. M., & Clare, L. (2015). Does cognitive reserve moderate the association between mood and cognition? A systematic review. *Reviews in Clinical Gerontology*, *25*(3), 181–193. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959259815000155

Panico, F., Sagliano, L., Magliacano, A., Santangelo, G., & Trojano, L. (2022). The relationship between cognitive reserve and cognition in healthy adults: A systematic review. *Current Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03523-y

Patenaude, B., Smith, S. M., Kennedy, D. N., & Jenkinson, M. (2011). A Bayesian model of shape and appearance for subcortical brain segmentation. *NeuroImage*, *56*(3), 907–922. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.02.046

Paulus, M. P., & Stein, M. B. (2006). An Insular View of Anxiety. *Biological Psychiatry*, *60*(4), 383–387. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.03.042

Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., Vanderplas, J., Passos, A., Cournapeau, D., Brucher, M., Perrot, M., & Duchesnay, É. (2011). Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, *12*(null), 2825–2830.

Persson, K., Eldholm, R. S., Barca, M. L., Cavallin, L., Ferreira, D., Knapskog, A.-B., Selbæk, G., Brækhus, A., Saltvedt, I., Westman, E., & Engedal, K. (2017). MRI-assessed atrophy subtypes in Alzheimer's disease and the cognitive reserve

hypothesis. *PLoS ONE*, *12*(10), e0186595. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186595

Piras, F., Cherubini, A., Caltagirone, C., & Spalletta, G. (2011). Education mediates microstructural changes in bilateral hippocampus. *Human Brain Mapping*, *32*(2), 282–289. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.21018

Poldrack, R. A., Mumford, J. A., & Nichols, T. E. (2011). *Handbook of Functional MRI Data Analysis*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511895029

Porricelli, D., Tecilla, M., Pucci, V., Di Rosa, E., Mondini, S., & Cappelletti, M. (2024). Cognitive reserve modulates mental health in adulthood. *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research*, *36*(1), 139. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40520-024-02776-w

Price, J. L., & Drevets, W. C. (2010). Neurocircuitry of Mood Disorders. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, *35*(1), 192–216. https://doi.org/10.1038/npp.2009.104

Querbes, O., Aubry, F., Pariente, J., Lotterie, J.-A., Démonet, J.-F., Duret, V., Puel, M., Berry, I., Fort, J.-C., Celsis, P., & The Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. (2009). Early diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease using cortical thickness: Impact of cognitive reserve. *Brain*, *132*(8), 2036–2047. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awp105

R Core Team. (2022). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.* [Computer software]. https://www.R-project.org/

Ramirez, J., McNeely, A. A., Scott, C. J., Stuss, D. T., & Black, S. E. (2014). Subcortical hyperintensity volumetrics in Alzheimer's disease and normal elderly in the Sunnybrook Dementia Study: Correlations with atrophy, executive function, mental processing speed, and verbal memory. *Alzheimer's Research & Therapy*, *6*(4), 49. https://doi.org/10.1186/alzrt279

Ratcliff, R., & Smith, P. L. (2004). A Comparison of Sequential Sampling Models for Two-Choice Reaction Time. *Psychological Review*, *111*(2), 333–367. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.111.2.333

Raven, J., & Raven, J. (2003). Raven Progressive Matrices. In *Handbook of nonverbal assessment* (pp. 223–237). Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-0153-4_11

Reed, B. R., Mungas, D., Farias, S. T., Harvey, D., Beckett, L., Widaman, K., Hinton, L., & DeCarli, C. (2010). Measuring cognitive reserve based on the decomposition of episodic memory variance. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, *133*(Pt 8), 2196–2209. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awq154

Rentz, D. M., Locascio, J. J., Becker, J. A., Moran, E. K., Eng, E., Buckner, R. L., Sperling, R. A., & Johnson, K. A. (2010). Cognition, reserve, and amyloid deposition in normal aging. *Annals of Neurology*, *67*(3), 353–364. https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.21904

Ritchie, S. J., Bates, T. C., Der, G., Starr, J. M., & Deary, I. J. (2013). Education is associated with higher later life IQ scores, but not with faster cognitive processing speed. *Psychology and Aging*, *28*(2), 515–521. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030820

Salimi-Khorshidi, G., Douaud, G., Beckmann, C. F., Glasser, M. F., Griffanti, L., & Smith, S. M. (2014). Automatic denoising of functional MRI data: Combining independent component analysis and hierarchical fusion of classifiers. *NeuroImage*, *90*, 449–468. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.11.046

Salthouse, T. A. (2011). Neuroanatomical substrates of age-related cognitive decline. *Psychological Bulletin*, *137*(5), 753–784. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023262

Sánchez-Izquierdo, M., & Fernández-Ballesteros, R. (2021). Cognition in Healthy Aging. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(3), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18030962

Saywell, I., Foreman, L., Child, B., Phillips-Hughes, A. L., Collins-Praino, L., & Baetu, I. (2024). Influence of cognitive reserve on cognitive and motor function in α-synucleinopathies: A systematic review and multilevel meta-analysis. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *161*, 105672. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2024.105672

Schott, J. M., Crutch, S. J., Frost, C., Warrington, E. K., Rossor, M. N., & Fox, N. C. (2008). Neuropsychological correlates of whole brain atrophy in Alzheimer's disease. *Neuropsychologia*, *46*(6), 1732–1737. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2008.02.015

Seidler, R. D., Bernard, J. A., Burutolu, T. B., Fling, B. W., Gordon, M. T., Gwin, J. T., Kwak, Y., & Lipps, D. B. (2010). Motor Control and Aging: Links to Age-Related Brain Structural, Functional, and Biochemical Effects. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *34*(5), 721–733. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2009.10.005

Serra, L., Cercignani, M., Petrosini, L., Basile, B., Perri, R., Fadda, L., Spanò, B., Marra, C., Giubilei, F., Carlesimo, G. A., Caltagirone, C., & Bozzali, M. (2011). Neuroanatomical correlates of cognitive reserve in Alzheimer disease. *Rejuvenation Research*, *14*(2), 143–151. https://doi.org/10.1089/rej.2010.1103

Šneidere, K., Zdanovskis, N., Mondini, S., & Stepens, A. (2024). Relationship between lifestyle proxies of cognitive reserve and cortical regions in older adults. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1308434

Solé-Padullés, C., Bartrés-Faz, D., Junqué, C., Vendrell, P., Rami, L., Clemente, I. C., Bosch, B., Villar, A., Bargalló, N., Jurado, M. A., Barrios, M., & Molinuevo, J. L. (2009). Brain structure and function related to cognitive reserve variables in normal aging,

mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *30*(7), 1114–1124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2007.10.008

Stern, Y. (2002). What is cognitive reserve? Theory and research application of the reserve concept. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, *8*(3), 448–460. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617702813248

Stern, Y. (2009). Cognitive reserve. *Neuropsychologia*, *47*(10), 2015–2028. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.03.004

Stern, Y., Albert, M., Barnes, C. A., Cabeza, R., Pascual-Leone, A., & Rapp, P. R. (2023). A framework for concepts of reserve and resilience in aging. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *124*, 100–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2022.10.015

Stern, Y., Arenaza-Urquijo, E. M., Bartrés-Faz, D., Belleville, S., Cantilon, M., Chetelat, G., Ewers, M., Franzmeier, N., Kempermann, G., Kremen, W. S., Okonkwo, O., Scarmeas, N., Soldan, A., Udeh-Momoh, C., Valenzuela, M., Vemuri, P., Vuoksimaa, E., & and the Reserve, Resilience and Protective Factors PIA Empirical Definitions and Conceptual Frameworks Workgroup. (2020). Whitepaper: Defining and investigating cognitive reserve, brain reserve, and brain maintenance. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, *16*(9), 1305–1311. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2018.07.219

Stern, Y., Gazes, Y., Razlighi, Q., Steffener, J., & Habeck, C. (2018). A task-invariant cognitive reserve network. *NeuroImage*, *178*, 36–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.05.033

Stern, Y., Habeck, C., Moeller, J., Scarmeas, N., Anderson, K. E., Hilton, H. J., Flynn, J., Sackeim, H., & van Heertum, R. (2005). Brain Networks Associated with Cognitive Reserve in Healthy Young and Old Adults. *Cerebral Cortex (New York, N.Y.□: 1991)*, *15*(4), 394–402. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhh142

Tucker, A. M., & Stern, Y. (2011). Cognitive reserve in aging. *Current Alzheimer Research*, *8*(4), 354–360. https://doi.org/10.2174/156720511795745320

Tucker-Drob, E. M., Johnson, K. E., & Jones, R. N. (2009). The cognitive reserve hypothesis: A longitudinal examination of age-associated declines in reasoning and processing speed. *Developmental Psychology*, *45*, 431–446. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014012

Valenzuela, M. J., & Sachdev, P. (2006a). Brain reserve and cognitive decline: A non-parametric systematic review. *Psychological Medicine*, *36*(8), 1065–1073. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291706007744

Valenzuela, M. J., & Sachdev, P. (2006b). Brain reserve and dementia: A systematic review. *Psychological Medicine*, *36*(4), 441–454. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291705006264

Valenzuela, M. J., Sachdev, P., Wen, W., Chen, X., & Brodaty, H. (2008). Lifespan Mental Activity Predicts Diminished Rate of Hippocampal Atrophy. *PLOS ONE*, *3*(7), e2598. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0002598

Varela-López, B., Cruz-Gómez, Á. J., Lojo-Seoane, C., Díaz, F., Pereiro, A. X., Zurrón, M., Lindín, M., & Galdo-Álvarez, S. (2022). Cognitive reserve, neurocognitive performance, and high-order resting-state networks in cognitively unimpaired aging. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *117*, 151–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2022.05.012

Vickers, D., Nettelbeck, T., & Willson, R. J. (1972). Perceptual Indices of Performance: The Measurement of ‘Inspection Time’ and ‘Noise’ in the Visual System. *Perception*, *1*(3), 263–295. https://doi.org/10.1068/p010263

Vuoksimaa, E., Panizzon, M. S., Chen, C.-H., Eyler, L. T., Fennema-Notestine, C., Fiecas, M. J. A., Fischl, B., Franz, C. E., Grant, M. D., Jak, A. J., Lyons, M. J., Neale, M. C., Thompson, W. K., Tsuang, M. T., Xian, H., Dale, A. M., & Kremen, W. S. (2013).

Cognitive reserve moderates the association between hippocampal volume and episodic memory in middle age. *Neuropsychologia*, *51*(6), 1124–1131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2013.02.022

Weiler, M., Casseb, R. F., de Campos, B. M., de Ligo Teixeira, C. V., Carletti-Cassani, A. F. M. K., Vicentini, J. E., Magalhães, T. N. C., de Almeira, D. Q., Talib, L. L., Forlenza, O. V., Balthazar, M. L. F., & Castellano, G. (2018). Cognitive Reserve Relates to Functional Network Efficiency in Alzheimer's Disease. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, *10*, 255. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2018.00255

Wilson, R. S., Beckett, L. A., Barnes, L. L., Schneider, J. A., Bach, J., Evans, D. A., & Bennett, D. A. (2002). Individual differences in rates of change in cognitive abilities of older persons. *Psychology and Aging*, *17*(2), 179–193. https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.17.2.179

Woods, D. L., Kishiyama, M. M., Yund, E. W., Herron, T. J., Edwards, B., Poliva, O., Hink, R. F., & Reed, B. (2011). Improving digit span assessment of short-term verbal memory. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, *33*(1), 101–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803395.2010.493149

Yang, W., Wang, J., Guo, J., Dove, A., Qi, X., Bennett, D. A., & Xu, W. (2024). Association of Cognitive Reserve Indicator with Cognitive Decline and Structural Brain Differences in Middle and Older Age: Findings from the UK Biobank. *The Journal of Prevention of Alzheimer's Disease*, *11*(3), 739–748. https://doi.org/10.14283/jpad.2024.54

Yang, Y., Chen, Y., Yang, C., Chen, K., Li, X., & Zhang, Z. (2022). Contributions of early-life cognitive reserve and late-life leisure activity to successful and pathological cognitive aging. *BMC Geriatrics*, *22*(1), 831. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-022-03530-5

Ye, Q., Zhu, H., Chen, H., Liu, R., Huang, L., Chen, H., Cheng, Y., Qin, R., Shao, P., Xu, H., Ma, J., & Xu, Y. (2022). Effects of cognitive reserve proxies on cognitive function and frontoparietal control network in subjects with white matter hyperintensities: A cross-sectional functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *CNS Neuroscience & Therapeutics*, *28*(6), 932–941. https://doi.org/10.1111/cns.13824

Zhang, Y., Brady, M., & Smith, S. (2001). Segmentation of brain MR images through a hidden Markov random field model and the expectation-maximization algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, *20*(1), 45–57. https://doi.org/10.1109/42.906424

Zimmerman, M. E., Brickman, A. M., Paul, R. H., Grieve, S. M., Tate, D. F., Gunstad, J., Cohen, R. A., Aloia, M. S., Williams, L. M., Clark, C. R., Whitford, T. J., & Gordon, E. (2006). The Relationship Between Frontal Gray Matter Volume and Cognition Varies Across the Healthy Adult Lifespan. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, *14*(10), 823–833. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.JGP.0000238502.40963.ac


Overall CR
1%
9%
8%
0%
20%
62%
Overall Cognition
15%
26%
14%
15%
8%
13%
9%
CR
PC1
PC2
PC3
PC4
PC5
PC6
Overall Motor Function
0%
2%
15%
30%
39%
4%
10%
Overall Mood
1%
3%
1%
3%
5%
29%
57%


Cognition
(β = 0.268, p = .036*)
Motor Function
(β = 0.133, p = .222)
Mood
(β = -0.151, p = .269)
Outcome Performance
2
0
-2
-4
-2
0
2
4
PC4
CR group
High
Low