

Diabetes and Cognitive Health in India: A Nationally Representative Survey of Adults Aged 45 Years and Older

David Flood^{1,2*}, Hunter Green³, Alden L. Gross^{4,5}, Lindsay C. Kobayashi^{2,6}, Deborah A. Levine^{1,7}, Jinkook Lee^{3,8}, Caroline R. Wixom¹, Kenneth M. Langa^{1,2,9-11}

1. Department of Internal Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA
2. Institute for Healthcare Policy and Innovation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA
3. Center for Economic and Social Research, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, USA
4. Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland, USA
5. Department of Mental Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland, USA
6. Department of Epidemiology, University of Michigan School of Public Health, Ann Arbor, MI, USA
7. Department of Neurology, University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, MI, USA
8. Department of Economics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, USA
9. Veterans Affairs Center for Clinical Management Research, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA
10. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA
11. Institute of Gerontology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

Manuscript word count: 3,361

References: 50

Tables and figures: 4

*Corresponding Author

David Flood, MD, MSc

Department of Internal Medicine

University of Michigan

F4315 University Hospital South, Unit 4

Ann Arbor, MI 48109

(734) 232-4891

dcflood@umich.edu

ABSTRACT

Background: Few studies have assessed the relationship between diabetes and cognitive health outside of high-income countries. We described this relationship in India, a middle-income country of 1.4 billion people.

Methods: Data were analyzed from 58,027 adults aged ≥ 45 years in the baseline wave of the nationally representative Longitudinal Aging Study in India, from 2017 to 2019. Outcomes were scaled cognitive scores (mean of 0 and standard deviation [SD] of 1) and cognitive impairment, defined as a cognitive score 1.5 standard deviations or below the age- and education-matched mean. Diabetes was defined as a self-report of a prior diabetes diagnosis made by a health professional or having a measured hemoglobin A1c $\geq 6.5\%$ at the time of the LASI survey. To describe the cross-sectional relationship between cognitive health and diabetes, we constructed survey-weighted multivariable linear and logistic regression models controlling for prespecified covariates, including age, sex, sociodemographic characteristics, and rural versus urban residence.

Results: In age- and sex-adjusted models, people with diabetes had cognitive scores that were 0.25 SD higher (95% CI: 0.23 to 0.27) and had a 1.3% (95% CI: 0.7 to 1.8) lower prevalence of cognitive impairment than people without diabetes. Differences persisted even when adjusting for demographic, socioeconomic, and geographic characteristics. Rural versus urban residence modified the relationships of diabetes with cognitive score ($P = 0.001$) and cognitive impairment ($P = 0.004$). In fully adjusted models, rural respondents with diabetes had 0.05 SD (95% CI: 0.03 to 0.07) greater cognitive scores and 1.7% (95% CI: 0.9 to 2.5) lower prevalence of cognitive impairment than those without diabetes. In urban areas, respondents with and without diabetes had similar cognitive scores and prevalence of cognitive impairment.

Conclusion: Urban-rural health differences, the nutrition transition, and social conditions likely influence the observed cross-sectional relationship between diabetes and cognitive dysfunction in India, leading to different associations than previously reported in many high-income countries.

Funding: National Institutes of Health, USA and the Ministry and of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India

INTRODUCTION

The burden of diabetes and dementia is influenced by powerful epidemiologic and demographic trends. The “nutrition transition” is an epidemiologic trend in which a population experiences rapid increases in the prevalence of diseases attributable to overnutrition, such as diabetes,¹ while key subpopulations continue to have high levels of hunger and undernutrition. This phenomenon is referred to as the “double burden of malnutrition.”² A “demographic transition” also has been observed in many countries around the world as gains in life expectancy and reductions in fertility shift population age structures upwards.³ This trend of population aging is expected to contribute to a substantial increase in the global burdens of dementia and diabetes.^{4,5} India is a lower-middle-income country of 1.4 billion people that is experiencing both epidemiologic and demographic trends. Approximately 4 million adults in India are estimated to have dementia and more than 50 million to have diabetes.^{4,6} These numbers are expected to rise sharply in the coming decades.^{4,6}

High-quality longitudinal cohort studies have shown that diabetes increases risks of dementia and cognitive impairment.⁷⁻⁹ Proposed biological mechanisms for cognitive dysfunction among individuals with diabetes include increases in cerebrovascular disease, neurotoxicity due to hyperglycemia, changes in amyloid metabolism, and other pathways.¹⁰ Most prior research on the relationship between diabetes and cognitive health has been conducted in high-income countries, and it is unknown whether the same biological mechanisms and risk factor patterns will be observed in low- and middle-income countries where most of the world's population resides.¹¹ In India, for example, a few small population-based surveys have suggested that older adults with diabetes have *better* cognitive performance than those without diabetes.^{12,13} However, these studies have had limitations including small sample sizes, lack of national samples, and the absence of diabetes biomarkers.¹²⁻¹⁶ Understanding the relationship between diabetes and cognitive health in India is important. The country will become the world's most

populous nation within the decade,¹⁷ yet its population is under-represented in the global dementia evidence base. Moreover, India's diversity makes it an ideal setting to explore the complex relationship between diabetes and cognition. An example of India's diversity is the striking variation of diabetes and other non-communicable disease risk factors across rural versus urban areas of the country.¹⁸⁻²⁰

The objective of this study was to describe the cross-sectional relationship between diabetes and cognitive health in India, using nationally representative baseline data from the Longitudinal Aging Study in India (LASI), and explore how sociodemographic characteristics such as rural and urban residence modify this relationship.

METHODS

Study design and sample

We conducted a cross-sectional analysis of baseline LASI data, collected between 2017 and 2019. We have described details of LASI in previous reports.²¹⁻²³ Briefly, LASI is a nationally representative, longitudinal study of N=72,262 Indian men and women aged 45 and older and their spouses of all ages. While follow-up waves of data collection are in progress, at present only baseline LASI data are available. Comprehensive information was collected on respondents' health, social, and economic well-being through interviews and physical assessments. The LASI sample was selected using a multistage stratified area probability cluster design using the 2011 census as the sampling frame. Respondents therefore were representative of the country of India and of 35 Indian states and union territory.

In this analysis, we restricted the sample to 56,889 participants with non-missing data on the outcomes and covariates used in this study. The response rate for blood-based biomarkers was

87.9%.²¹ Of note, while LASI collected data on spouses younger than 45 years of age, we excluded these individuals as they are not representative of the population.

Outcomes

Our primary outcome was cognitive performance, assessed continuously as a general cognitive score and dichotomously as cognitive impairment.

General cognitive score

We calculated general cognitive scores using a graded response item response theory model.²⁴ To ensure optimal performance of this model, we incorporated intensive neuropsychological tests and geriatric assessments from a sub-study of 4,096 LASI respondents in the harmonized Diagnostic Assessment of Dementia for the LASI (LASI-DAD) study.^{25,26} Leveraging both the 11 common and 42 non-common items between LASI and LASI-DAD, we created an overall general cognitive score that is scaled to have a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1 within the LASI-DAD population, with higher scores reflecting higher cognitive function. We assessed the precision of our score using model-estimated standard errors for each observation and observed that 97% of observations had marginal reliabilities above 70%, a level generally accepted for epidemiologic research.²⁷ Importantly, our derived cognitive scores were not sensitive to inclusion of items dependent on literacy (correlation between scores using literacy vs. scores using non-literacy items of 0.995).

Cognitive impairment

We defined cognitive impairment as a general cognitive score that was 1.5 standard deviations or below the age- and education-matched mean for the full LASI sample. Our definition follows the updated 2011 U.S. National Institute on Aging—Alzheimer’s Association diagnostic

guidelines²⁸ and has been used in analyses of data from other studies in the Health and Retirement Study international network.²⁹

Exposure

Diabetes was our exposure of interest. We defined diabetes as a self-report of a prior diabetes diagnosis made by a health professional or having a measured hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) $\geq 6.5\%$ at the time of the LASI survey. Our diabetes biomarker criterion is supported by the World Health Organization,³⁰ American Diabetes Association,³¹ and national diabetes guidelines in India.^{32,33} We measured HbA1c from dried blood on the Cobas Integra 400 Plus Biochemistry analyzer (Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland). Additional details on our validated methodology for HbA1c collection, storage, and measurement using dried blood spots has been reported previously.^{18,34}

Statistical analysis

The objective of our statistical analysis was *description*,³⁵ i.e., to describe the cross-sectional relationship between diabetes and cognitive health in India, and how this relationship varied by sociodemographic characteristics such as rural or urban residence. We first calculated survey-weighted descriptive statistics in the overall sample and the sample stratified by diabetes status. Next, we estimated the distribution of general cognitive score and the prevalence of cognitive impairment by diabetes status and generated survey-weighted density plots of general cognitive scores by diabetes status.

We then constructed a series of survey-weighted multivariable linear and logistic regression models for the outcomes of general cognitive score and cognitive impairment, respectively. The two series of models included the same prespecified sociodemographic covariates chosen based on our prior research in India.^{12,18,36} Model 1 was unadjusted except for indicators for

state. Model 2 added demographic covariates of age and sex. Model 3 added socioeconomic covariates, including education (no education, less than secondary education, and secondary education or higher), household economic status (assessed as per-capita consumption based on household expenditures), relationship status (married, widowed, separated/ divorced, or never married), and self-reported caste (scheduled caste, scheduled tribe, other backwards class, or no caste or other caste). Model 4 added area of residence (urban or rural) and an interaction between diabetes and area of residence.¹⁸ We specified continuous covariates of age and household economics status using restricted cubic splines with five knots at 5%, 27.5%, 50%, 72.5%, and 95%, as recommended by Harrell.³⁷ We visualized the regression output using average marginal effects, which are the average difference in the model's predicted outcome that occurs with a one-level difference in a covariate.^{38,39} Analyses used sample weights corrected for differences in nonresponse and accounted for LASI's complex survey design. P values and confidence intervals were not adjusted for multiple comparisons. We used Stata version 16.1.

Sensitivity analysis

In a sensitivity analysis, we defined clinically meaningful HbA1c categories based on American Diabetes Association guidelines:⁴⁰ (1) HbA1c <5.7%, which is considered in the normal range; (2) HbA1c 5.7-6.4%, which is considered in the prediabetes range; (3) HbA1c 6.5-7.9%, which is in the diabetes range with reasonably good disease control; (4) HbA1c 8.0-9.9%, which is in the diabetes range with moderate-poor disease control; and (5) HbA1c ≥10%, which is in the diabetes range with very poor disease control.

RESULTS

Sample characteristics

Characteristics of the sample are in Table 1. The sample included 58,027 middle-age and older

adults, of whom 53.4% (95% confidence interval [CI]: 52.9% to 53.9%) of the weighted sample were men and 46.6% (95% CI: 46.1% to 47.1%) were women. Overall, using survey weights, 52.4% (95% CI: 52.9% to 53.9%) of respondents had no education, 28.8% (95% CI: 28.4% to 29.2%) had less than secondary education, and 18.8% (95% CI: 18.4% to 19.2%) had secondary education or higher. More than two-thirds of the weighted sample of older adults in India (67.9% [95% CI: 67.4% to 68.4%]) lived in a rural as opposed to an urban area.

The population-weighted diabetes prevalence in India based on the LASI sample was 19.8% (95% CI: 19.4% to 20.2%). Additional details of sample characteristics by diabetes status are in Supplementary Table 1.

Cognitive outcomes

Cognitive outcomes in the overall sample and by diabetes status are shown in Figure 1 and Supplementary Tables 2-3. The mean general cognitive score across the weighted sample was 0.29 (standard deviation [SD]: 0.94). Overall, 5.6% (95% CI: 5.4% to 5.9%) of individuals had cognitive impairment, as defined by general cognitive score of -1.5 standard deviations or below the age- and education-adjusted mean. The mean weighted cognitive score among people with and without diabetes was 0.48 (SD: 0.96) and 0.25 (SD: 0.93), respectively. In rural areas, mean weighted cognitive score was 0.25 (SD: 0.92) among respondents with diabetes and 0.08 (SD: 0.88) among those without diabetes. In urban areas, mean weighted cognitive score was 0.73 (SD: 0.93) among respondents with diabetes and 0.67 (SD: 0.94) among those without diabetes.

Multivariable regression analysis

The average marginal effects from the multivariable linear regression models for the outcome of cognitive score are presented in Figure 2A. Compared to respondents without diabetes, those

with diabetes had 0.21 (95% CI 0.18 to 0.23) greater cognitive scores in the unadjusted model (Model 1), 0.25 (95% CI 0.23 to 0.27) greater cognitive scores in the age- and sex-adjusted model (Model 2), 0.05 (95% CI 0.03 to 0.07) greater cognitive scores in the model adding sociodemographic covariates model (Model 3), and 0.03 (95% CI 0.01 to 0.05) greater cognitive scores in the model also adjusting for area of residence and an interaction between diabetes and area of residence (Model 4).

The average marginal effects from the multivariable logistic regression models for the outcome of cognitive impairment are presented in Figure 2B. Compared to respondents without diabetes, those with diabetes had approximately 1% lower prevalence of cognitive impairment in all models (Figure 2B). Complete output for the regression models is in Supplementary Tables 4-5.

Interaction between diabetes status and area of residence on cognitive outcomes

In fully adjusted models, we found evidence that rural versus urban residence modified the relationship between diabetes and cognitive score (P interaction term in Model 4 = 0.001), as well as diabetes and cognitive impairment (P interaction term in Model 4 = 0.004). In rural areas, respondents with diabetes had 0.05 (95% CI 0.03 to 0.07) greater cognitive scores and 1.7% (95% CI 0.9 to 2.5) lower prevalence of cognitive impairment than respondents without diabetes (Figure 3). In urban areas, respondents with and without diabetes had similar cognitive scores and probability of cognitive impairment.

Sensitivity analysis

In the sensitivity analysis using clinically relevant HbA1c categories rather than a dichotomous diabetes variable, the findings were generally similar to the main analysis. (See Supplementary Tables 6-8 and Supplementary Figures 1-3.) One additional observation was that, in rural areas,

respondents in higher HbA1c categories appeared to have increasingly better cognitive outcomes in the fully adjusted model 4. For example, compared to rural respondents with normal HbA1c, rural respondents with HbA1c from 6.5% to <8%, 8% to <10%, and \geq 10% had 1.9% (95% CI: 0.7 to 3.1), 2.9% (95% CI: 1.2 to 4.6), and 3.6% (95% CI: 2.2 to 5.0), respectively, *lower* probability of cognitive impairment.

DISCUSSION

In a national survey conducted in India between 2017 to 2019, we found that middle-aged and older adults with diabetes living in rural areas had better cognitive health than those without diabetes even when adjusting for a full suite of demographic, socioeconomic, and geographic characteristics. Rural versus urban area of residence modified this relationship such that rural respondents with diabetes had substantially better cognitive health than those without diabetes, while in urban areas cognitive health did not differ by diabetes status. To our knowledge, this study is the largest and first nationally representative study in India that has reported the relationship between diabetes and cognitive health.

Our study builds on prior research in India showing that the relationship between diabetes and cognitive health in India differs from that observed in high-income countries where diabetes is often associated with higher risks of cognition dysfunction and dementia.⁷⁻¹⁰ In India, a recent study assessing potentially modifiable risk factors for dementia and cognitive function used data from three cross-sectional surveys conducted between 2003 to 2010 (10/66 Dementia Research Group survey, Study of global AGEing [SAGE], and LASI pilot survey),¹³ each with 2,500 or fewer individuals from between one and four Indian states. While much smaller than the present analysis, this prior study similarly found that individuals with self-reported diabetes had better cognitive performance in two of the three surveys. Another recent study used data from the Longitudinal Aging Study in India–Diagnostic Assessment of Dementia and the U.S. Health and

Retirement Study–Harmonized Cognitive Assessment Protocol (HRS-HCAP), which are dementia-focused substudies of LASI and HRS, respectively,¹² also found that HbA1c was independently associated with better cognition in India and worse cognition in the U.S. Several other studies have assessed the diabetes-cognition relationship in India but have tended to be limited by small convenience samples.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ Notably, while few prior studies have assessed diabetes and cognitive health in other low- and middle-income countries, prior research from Mexico^{41,42}, China^{43,44}, and Brazil⁴⁵ have tended to show associations more similar to high-income countries than our results from India.

Given that our data are cross-sectional, we are unable to explore longitudinal relationships or causal mechanisms underlying our findings. Future waves of data collection in LASI will permit such analyses. Nevertheless, our study is useful as population-based descriptive research to guide health policy and as hypothesis generation for future research. From a health policy perspective, our findings enhance understanding of current epidemiologic patterns in India where 50 million adults age 45 years or older have diabetes¹⁸ and 4 million adults have dementia.⁴ The 2017 National Health Policy in India has a strong focus on improving diabetes primary care, yet it is useful for policymakers and clinicians to consider that the cognitive health of people with diabetes differs from those without diabetes.

From a hypothesis-generation perspective, our findings suggest that there are complex factors influencing the interplay between diabetes and cognitive dysfunction in India that may differ from factors observed in other countries. Our leading hypothesis is that many populations in India are at a stage in the nutrition transition where *increases* in living standards cause *increases* in diabetes prevalence through consumption of processed foods, sedentarism, and shifting work patterns.¹ In contrast, in high-income countries, many populations with high living standards revert to diet and lifestyle patterns that are protective against diabetes. According to this

hypothesis, diabetes (and higher glycemic levels generally) serves as a proxy marker for greater socioeconomic status in India, and there may be residual confounding between diabetes and cognitive health despite our attempts to control for a wide suite of sociodemographic covariates.

Another possibility is that there is a selective survival bias in India contributing to the diabetes-cognition association observed using cross-sectional data. Specifically, this analysis includes individuals with prevalent diabetes who survived to the time of the survey, and these individuals may have unmeasured, protective characteristics for maintaining cognitive health.⁴⁶ Given differences in life expectancy and access to health care between urban and rural regions, differences in the probability of survival among people with diabetes could lead to the observed urban-rural differences in the diabetes-cognition associations. Selective survival bias in the context of the diabetes-cognition association in India requires further investigation.

One potential explanation for the divergent findings by area of residence is that people with diabetes in urban versus rural areas have a different prevalence of diabetes subtypes that make them more predisposed to certain complications such as cognitive dysfunction. A substantial body of prior research shows that people with diabetes in India have different biological and demographic characteristics than those observed in high-income countries. For example, a study using medical records from a large network of diabetes specialty centers found that Indian patients with type 2 diabetes had different clusters of diabetes phenotypes than found in Western populations.⁴⁷ One of the novel Indian subtypes of diabetes was characterized by both insulin resistance and insulin sensitivity. This subtype was associated with a very high clinical risk for developing microvascular diabetes complications in the form of kidney disease.⁴⁷ While cognitive outcomes were not assessed in this study, it is interesting to consider whether these novel phenotypes might also contribute to biological pathways that predispose some Indians to cognitive decline.

Given that one of every seven people with diabetes worldwide lives in India, there is intense interest in exploring pathways and subtypes of diabetes in the country.⁴⁸ One pathophysiologic hypothesis that remains under-studied in India and globally is the relationship between early-life undernutrition and adult development of cardiometabolic diseases such as diabetes, referred to as the “double burden of malnutrition.”⁴⁹ Early-life undernutrition, which remains highly prevalent in India, may establish metabolic set points that make these individuals susceptible to diabetes as the nutrition transition generates a more obesogenic food environment.^{1,50} LASI’s future waves of data collection have the potential to substantially advance the understanding of diabetes and its complications, including cognitive dysfunction, given LASI’s large national sample including many participants recruited from rural areas, which differs from most prior epidemiologic studies of diabetes in India that have focused on urban populations.

Our study has several strengths. LASI used rigorous survey methodology with respondents from all Indian states and union territories, permitting us to make inferences from a large, nationally representative sample. Data were also collected relatively recently (2017 to 2019), which is an important advantage given that India is undergoing rapid shifts in nutritional outcomes, population aging, and urbanization. Our cognition measure was calibrated with a rich battery of neuropsychological tests administered in LASI-DAD, which are harmonized to those used in the HRS-HCAP and its international network of HCAP studies. A final strength is that we were able to incorporate a blood-based diabetes biomarker, HbA1c, into our definition of diabetes.

Our study also has limitations. First, while we attempt to control for a suite of sociodemographic covariates in our multivariable models, there is potential for selection bias in our definitions of diabetes exposure (diabetes diagnosis or HbA1c ≥ 6.5). Specifically, as health care access is limited in India, individuals who report a diabetes diagnosis might have distinct socioeconomic

characteristics compared to those who do not report a diabetes diagnosis, and these differences are not fully accounted for using HbA1c criterion. Second, as our analysis used cross-sectional data, we did not capture incident diabetes or cognitive impairment and therefore are limited in our ability to make causal inferences or analyze mechanistic pathways between diabetes and cognitive health. Third, our outcomes of cognitive health were dependent on a summary cognition score, and we did not assess specific cognitive domains such as memory, executive functioning, or language. Fourth, it is possible that survey questions used to generate the summary cognitive measure may elicit subtly different responses across languages.²⁶ At the same time, the LASI instrument was carefully translated and implemented in 16 regional languages, and our prior analysis of LASI-DAD data revealed similar performance across languages. Finally, while our use of HbA1c was an important strength in this study, measurement variations are possible given that we used a dried blood protocol rather than the gold standard of venous collection.

In conclusion, we found that urban-rural differences in health and social conditions likely influence the observed cross-sectional relationship between diabetes and cognitive dysfunction in India, leading to different associations than observed in many high-income. Given rapid and ongoing shifts in nutrition and population aging in India, our findings show the need for future research to assess pathways underlying patterns of diabetes and cognitive outcomes in this setting.

Acknowledgements: We thank Dr. Peifeng Hu, Dr. Alan Potter and Mr. Jake Cofferen for supporting the dried blood spot validation study, Ms. Varsha Kale for carrying out DBS dried blood assays, Dr. Marco Angrisani for constructing sample weights, Dr. Erik Meijer for imputing missing cognitive values, and all LASI and LASI-DAD team members and collaborators for their contribution to the wave 1 LASI and LASI-DAD data collection.

Contributors: Conceptualization: DF, JL, KML. Data curation: HG. Formal analysis: DF, HG. Funding acquisition: DB, JL, TS. Methodology (cognitive scores): ALG. Administration: CRW. Visualization: DF, HG. Writing, original draft: DF. Writing, review, and editing: HG, ALG, DAL, JL, CRW, KML.

Funding: LASI data collection was funded by the National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health (NIA/NIH), U.S.A. (R01AG042778); the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India (T22011/02/2015-NCD). The NIA/NIH provided funding for a nationally representative sample, drawing samples from the 15 largest states. The Government of India provided additional funding to make the study representative of each state and union territory and enable oversampling of older adults and four metropolitan cities. LASI data processing was funded by the National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health (NIA/NIH) (R01AG030153). LASI-DAD data collection was funded by the National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health (NIA/NIH), U.S.A. (R01AG051125, U01AG065958). The preparation of this paper was supported by the NIA/NIH (RF1AG055273) and by the National Heart, Lung, And Blood Institute of the NIH under Award Number K23HL161271. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH.

Competing interests: We declare no competing interests.

Ethical approval: LASI obtained approval from the University of Southern California Institutional Review Board (IRB) (UP-CG-14_00005), the Harvard University IRB (CR- 16715-10), the International Institute for Population Sciences IRB (Sr. No. 12/1054), and Health Ministry's Screening Committee clearance from the Indian Council of Medical Research (F.No.T.21012/07/ 2012-NCD).

Data sharing: LASI data used in this study, with the exception of DBS biomarkers, are publicly available on the websites of the Gateway to Global Aging (<https://g2aging.org/>) and International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS; <https://www.iipsindia.ac.in/content/LASI-data>). DBS biomarkers will be made public after data are approved for release by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. To access data, users must register, provide an email address, and sign a data use agreement.

REFERENCES

1. Popkin BM, Ng SW. The nutrition transition to a stage of high obesity and noncommunicable disease prevalence dominated by ultra-processed foods is not inevitable. *Obes Rev* 2022; 23(1): e13366.
2. Popkin BM, Corvalan C, Grummer-Strawn LM. Dynamics of the double burden of malnutrition and the changing nutrition reality. *The Lancet* 2020; 395(10217): 65-74.
3. Vollset SE, Goren E, Yuan C-W, et al. Fertility, mortality, migration, and population scenarios for 195 countries and territories from 2017 to 2100: a forecasting analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study. *The Lancet* 2020; 396(10258): 1285-306.
4. Nichols E, Steinmetz JD, Vollset SE, et al. Estimation of the global prevalence of dementia in 2019 and forecasted prevalence in 2050: an analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet Public Health* 2022; 7(2): e105-e25.
5. International Diabetes Federation. IDF Diabetes Atlas, 10th edition: International Diabetes Federation, 2021.
6. Tandon N, Anjana RM, Mohan V, et al. The increasing burden of diabetes and variations among the states of India: the Global Burden of Disease Study 1990–2016. *The Lancet Global Health* 2018; 6(12): e1352–e62.
7. Crane PK, Walker R, Hubbard RA, et al. Glucose levels and risk of dementia. *N Engl J Med* 2013; 369(6): 540-8.
8. Barbiellini Amidei C, Fayosse A, Dumurgier J, et al. Association Between Age at Diabetes Onset and Subsequent Risk of Dementia. *JAMA* 2021; 325(16): 1640-9.
9. Blaum CS, Ofstedal MB, Langa KM, Wray LA. Functional status and health outcomes in older americans with diabetes mellitus. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003; 51(6): 745-53.
10. McCrimmon RJ, Ryan CM, Frier BM. Diabetes and cognitive dysfunction. *The Lancet* 2012; 379(9833): 2291-9.

11. Xue M, Xu W, Ou YN, et al. Diabetes mellitus and risks of cognitive impairment and dementia: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 144 prospective studies. *Ageing Res Rev* 2019; 55: 100944.
12. Hu P, Lee J, Beaumaster S, et al. Cognitive Function and Cardiometabolic-Inflammatory Risk Factors Among Older Indians and Americans. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2020; 68 Suppl 3: S36-S44.
13. Belessiotis-Richards C, Livingston G, Marston L, Mukadam N. A cross-sectional study of potentially modifiable risk factors for dementia and cognitive function in India: A secondary analysis of 10/66, LASI, and SAGE data. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2021; 37(2).
14. Lalithambika CV, Arun CS, Saraswathy LA, Bhaskaran R. Cognitive Impairment and its Association with Glycemic Control in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Patients. *Indian J Endocrinol Metab* 2019; 23(3): 353-6.
15. Yerrapragada DB, Rao CR, Karunakaran K, Lee HSE. Cognitive Dysfunction Among Adults With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Karnataka, India. *Ochsner J* 2019; 19(3): 227-34.
16. Khullar S, Kaur G, Dhillon H, et al. The prevalence and predictors of cognitive impairment in type 2 diabetic population of Punjab, India. *Journal of Social Health and Diabetes* 2018; 05(01): 047-53.
17. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. World Population Ageing 2020 Highlights: Living arrangements of older persons. Geneva: United Nations, 2020.
18. Flood D, Green H, Hu P, et al. Prevalence, Awareness, Treatment, and Control of Diabetes in India: A Nationally Representative Survey of Adults Aged 45 Years and Older (2/28/2022). Available at SSRN: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4066713>. 2022.
19. Lee J, Wilkens J, Meijer E, Sekher TV, Bloom DE, Hu P. Hypertension awareness, treatment, and control and their association with healthcare access in the middle-aged and older Indian population: A nationwide cohort study. *PLoS Med* 2022; 19(1): e1003855.

20. Dandona L, Dandona R, Kumar GA, et al. Nations within a nation: variations in epidemiological transition across the states of India, 1990–2016 in the Global Burden of Disease Study. *The Lancet* 2017; 390(10111): 2437–60.
21. International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS), National Programme for Health Care of Elderly (NPHCE), Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health (HSPH) and the University of Southern California (USC). Longitudinal Ageing Study in India (LASI) wave 1. Mumbai, 2020.
22. Perianayagam A, Bloom D, Lee J, et al. Cohort profile: the Longitudinal Ageing Study in India (LASI). *Int J Epidemiol* 2022.
23. Bloom DE, Sekher TV, Lee J. Longitudinal Aging Study in India (LASI): new data resources for addressing aging in India. *Nature Aging* 2021; 1(12): 1070–2.
24. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. Mplus User's Guide (Version 8). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén, 2017.
25. Lee J, Dey AB. Introduction to LASI-DAD: The Longitudinal Aging Study in India-Diagnostic Assessment of Dementia. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2020; 68 Suppl 3: S3-S4.
26. Gross AL, Khobragade PY, Meijer E, Saxton JA. Measurement and Structure of Cognition in the Longitudinal Aging Study in India-Diagnostic Assessment of Dementia. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2020; 68 Suppl 3: S11-S9.
27. Nunnally J. Psychometric Theory (2nd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
28. Langa KM, Levine DA. The diagnosis and management of mild cognitive impairment: a clinical review. *JAMA* 2014; 312(23): 2551-61.
29. Kobayashi LC, Mateen FJ, Montana L, et al. Cognitive Function and Impairment in Older, Rural South African Adults: Evidence from "Health and Aging in Africa: A Longitudinal Study of an INDEPTH Community in Rural South Africa". *Neuroepidemiology* 2019; 52(1-2): 32-40.
30. WHO. Use of glycated haemoglobin (HbA1c) in the diagnosis of diabetes mellitus. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2011.

31. American Diabetes Association. Classification and diagnosis of diabetes: standards of medical care in diabetes—2021. *Diabetes Care* 2021; 44(Suppl 1): S15–S33.
32. Indian Council of Medical Research. ICMR guidelines for management of type 2 diabetes. Ansari Nagar, New Delhi: Indian Council of Medical Research, 2018.
33. Chawla R, Madhu SV, Makkar BM, et al. RSSDI-ESI clinical practice recommendations for the management of type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Indian J Endocrinol Metab* 2020; 24(1): 1–122.
34. Hu P, Edenfield M, Potter A, et al. Validation and modification of dried blood spot-based glycosylated hemoglobin assay for the longitudinal aging study in India. *Am J Hum Biol* 2015; 27(4): 579–81.
35. Shmueli G. To Explain or to Predict? *Statistical Science* 2010; 25(3).
36. Farron MR, Kabeto MU, Dey AB, Banerjee J, Levine DA, Langa KM. Hypertension and Cognitive Health Among Older Adults in India. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2020; 68 Suppl 3: S29-S35.
37. Harrell Jr. FE. Regression Modeling Strategies, Second Edition: Springer, 2015.
38. Norton EC, Dowd BE, Maciejewski ML. Marginal Effects-Quantifying the Effect of Changes in Risk Factors in Logistic Regression Models. *JAMA* 2019; 321(13): 1304-5.
39. Williams R. Using the margins command to estimate and interpret adjusted predictions and marginal effects. *The Stata Journal* 2012; 12(2): 308-31.
40. American Diabetes Association Professional Practice Committee. 2. Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes-2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022; 45(Suppl 1): S17-S38.
41. Avila JC, Mejia-Arangom S, Jupiter D, Downer B, Wong R. The Effect of Diabetes on the Cognitive Trajectory of Older Adults in Mexico and the United States. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2021; 76(4): e153-e64.
42. Salinas RM, Hiriart M, Acosta I, Sosa AL, Prince MJ. Type 2 diabetes mellitus as a risk factor for dementia in a Mexican population. *J Diabetes Complications* 2016; 30(7): 1234-9.

43. Jia L, Du Y, Chu L, et al. Prevalence, risk factors, and management of dementia and mild cognitive impairment in adults aged 60 years or older in China: a cross-sectional study. *The Lancet Public Health* 2020; 5(12): e661-e71.
44. Zhang L, Yang J, Liao Z, et al. Association between Diabetes and Cognitive Function among People over 45 Years Old in China: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019; 16(7).
45. Teixeira MM, Passos VMA, Barreto SM, et al. Association between diabetes and cognitive function at baseline in the Brazilian Longitudinal Study of Adult Health (ELSA- Brasil). *Sci Rep* 2020; 10(1): 1596.
46. Banack HR, Kaufman JS, Wactawski-Wende J, Troen BR, Stovitz SD. Investigating and Remediating Selection Bias in Geriatrics Research: The Selection Bias Toolkit. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2019; 67(9): 1970-6.
47. Anjana RM, Baskar V, Nair ATN, et al. Novel subgroups of type 2 diabetes and their association with microvascular outcomes in an Asian Indian population: a data-driven cluster analysis: the INSPIRED study. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2020; 8(1).
48. Narayan KMV, Kanaya AM. Why are South Asians prone to type 2 diabetes? A hypothesis based on underexplored pathways. *Diabetologia* 2020; 63(6): 1103-9.
49. Wells JC, Sawaya AL, Wibaek R, et al. The double burden of malnutrition: aetiological pathways and consequences for health. *The Lancet* 2020; 395(10217): 75-88.
50. Luke N, Munshi K, Oommen A, Singh S. Economic development, the nutrition trap and metabolic disease: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2021.


Table 1: Sample characteristics

Characteristic	N	% (95% CI) ^a
Overall	58,027	100
Age (years) ^b		
45-49	11,668	20.1 (19.6 to 20.5)
50-54	9,697	19.0 (18.6 to 19.5)
55-59	8,950	17.7 (17.3 to 18.1)
60-64	9,075	14.0 (13.7 to 14.3)
65-69	7,900	12.7 (12.4 to 13.0)
70-74	5,092	7.9 (7.6 to 8.1)
≥75	5,645	8.7 (8.4 to 9.0)
Sex		
Men	26,966	53.4 (52.9 to 53.9)
Women	31,061	46.6 (46.1 to 47.1)
Education		
None	27,090	52.4 (51.8 to 52.9)
Less than secondary	20,088	28.8 (28.4 to 29.3)
Secondary or higher	10,849	18.8 (18.4 to 19.2)
Household economic status ^{b,c}		
First quartile	14,507	27.2 (26.8 to 27.7)
Second quartile	14,512	25.9 (25.5 to 26.4)
Third quartile	14,502	24.3 (23.9 to 24.8)
Fourth quartile	14,506	22.5 (22.1 to 22.9)
Relationship status		
Married	43,417	76.6 (76.2 to 77.0)
Widowed	12,683	20.3 (19.9 to 20.7)
Separated, divorced, or never married	1,927	3.1 (2.9 to 3.3)
Caste		
Scheduled caste	9,813	19.7 (19.3 to 20.2)
Scheduled tribe	10,184	8.6 (8.3 to 8.8)
Other backward class	22,043	44.7 (44.2 to 45.2)
No caste or other caste	15,987	27.0 (26.6 to 27.5)
Area of residence		
Rural	37,912	67.9 (67.4 to 68.4)
Urban	20,115	32.1 (31.6 to 32.6)


^aValues are estimated using survey weights. ^bAge and household economic status are maintained as continuous variables in regression models but are shown in categories in this table to assist with interpretation. ^cThe quartile cut points for household economic status as measured by yearly per-capita consumption in nominal rupees were: (1) 0 to 23,221, (2) 23,223 to 35,973, (3) 35,978 to 57,467, and (4) 57,471 to 3,000,000.

Figure 1: General cognitive score distribution by diabetes status and area of residence


A. Urban and rural participants



B. Rural participants only




C. Urban participants only




This graph depicts density plots of general cognitive scores generated using survey-weighted Epanechnikov kernel density functions with bin width of 0.5. The density within each category is normalized at 1. See Supplementary Tables 2-3 for underlying data

Figure 2: Average marginal effects of diabetes on general cognitive score and cognitive impairment from multivariable regression models

A. General cognitive score




B. Cognitive impairment




These figures depict the average marginal effects of diabetes on general cognitive score using multivariable linear regression (panel A) and of diabetes on cognitive impairment using multivariable logistic regression (panel B). Model 1 includes only indicators for state. Model 2 added age and sex. Model 3 added sociodemographic covariates, including education, household economic status, relationship status, and self-reported caste. Model 4 added area of residence (urban or rural) and an interaction between diabetes and area of residence. Continuous covariates of age and household economics status were specified using restricted cubic splines with five knots at 5%, 27.5%, 50%, 72.5%, and 95%. The complete regression output is provided in Supplementary Tables 4-5.

Figure 3: Average marginal effects of interaction between diabetes status and area of residence on general cognitive score and cognitive impairment from multivariable regression models

A. General cognitive score



B. Cognitive impairment



These figures depict the average marginal effects of the interaction between diabetes status and area of residence from Model 4. Panel A refers to the multivariable linear regression of diabetes on general cognitive score. Panel B refers to the multivariable logistic regression of diabetes on cognitive impairment. Model 4 includes the following covariates: age, sex, education, household economic status, relationship status, self-reported caste, area of residence (urban or rural), an interaction between diabetes and area of residence, and indicators for state. Continuous covariates of age and household economics status were specified using restricted cubic splines with five knots at 5%, 27.5%, 50%, 72.5%, and 95%. Complete regression output is provided in Supplementary Tables 4-5.