1 **PREPRINT:** Mechanisms of Motoric Cognitive Risk – hypotheses based on 2 a systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal cohort studies of older

3 adults

- 4
- 5 Donncha S. Mullin MBChB MRCPsych,^{1-4*} Alastair Cockburn MBChB,⁴ Miles Welstead MSc,⁵
- 6 Michelle Luciano PhD,⁵ Tom C. Russ PhD MRCPsych,¹⁻⁵ Graciela Muniz-Terrera PhD^{2,3}
- 7
- 8 ^{1.} Alzheimer Scotland Dementia Research Centre, University of Edinburgh;
- 9 ^{2.} Edinburgh Dementia Prevention Group, University of Edinburgh;
- 10 ^{3.} Division of Psychiatry, Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh;
- 11^{4.} NHS Lothian, Royal Edinburgh Hospital, Edinburgh;
- 12 ^{5.} Lothian Birth Cohorts, Department of Psychology, University of Edinburgh.
- 13
- 14 * Dr Donncha S. Mullin, Division of Psychiatry, University of Edinburgh, Kennedy Tower,
- 15 Royal Edinburgh Hospital, Morningside Terrace, Edinburgh, EH10 5HF, UK
- 16 Telephone: +44 (0)131 537 6000; Email: <u>D.Mullin@ed.ac.uk</u>
- 17

Manuscript statistics: Main text of 5000 words, abstract of 150 words, 4 figures, 3 tables,
 research in context 139 words, 52 references, 4 supplementary tables, 2 supplementary boxes.

2

Contributions: DSM, TCR and GMT generated the idea for the present manuscript. DSM conducted the literature search; screened the titles, abstracts, and full texts; extracted data and performed quality assessment; carried out the meta-analyses; drafted the manuscript; and is the guarantor. AC acted as independent second reviewer; independently extracted all the data and assessed the reporting quality of all full texts. MW assessed the search and screening process. All authors edited the manuscript and meet authorship criteria. No others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

28

29 Funding: The present manuscript received no direct funding. All funded researchers are 30 independent of their funders with payments to institution. AC has no funding to declare. DSM is 31 undertaking a PhD Clinical Research Fellowship funded by a one-off grant from the Masonic 32 Charitable Foundation and the Royal College of Psychiatrists, United Kingdom. MW is funded 33 by an Age UK [MR/M01311/1] grant for PhD studentship. ML is funded by a Biotechnology 34 and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) project grant and is a previous recipient of 35 the Moray Award for travel from University of Edinburgh. TCR is Principal Investigator 2021-36 2024 £1,518,000 grant, Chief Scientist Office: "NRS Neuroprogressive and Dementia Network" 37 2021–22 £216,666 grant, UKRI: "Sharing the diagnosis of dementia in the post-Covid clinic: 38 patient and practitioner perspectives" 2019-21 £10,394 Catalytic grant, CSO: "Playlist for Life: 39 Can personalised music be rapidly implemented in care homes as a non-pharmacological 40 intervention for dementia?" 2017-18 £56,519 grant, NERC-MRC-CSO: "Modelling historical air 41 pollution and dementia/cognitive decline – towards a life course approach" 2016-2021 £750,000 42 grant from Alzheimer Scotland for Phase 2 of the Alzheimer Scotland Dementia Research 43 Centre Co-investigator 2019-2021 £733,246 Research grant, MRC: "Brain imaging and cognitive 44 ageing in the Lothian Birth Cohort 1936: IV" 2017-18 \$40,000 from the Japan Agency for 45 Medical Research and Development / New York Academy of Sciences Interstellar Initiative. 46 TCR occasionally completes medicolegal reports for Solicitors in Edinburgh. These payments are

47 made to him but relate solely to his clinical work and not the academic work under review. TCR

48 receives NHS study leave expenses (travel, accommodation, and registration). GMT is funded by

49 the Medical Research Council methodology board and received consulting fees for an NIH-

50 funded grant.

51

52

53

54 **Declarations of interest:** MW is vice-chair of the Scotland Research Ethics Committee. TCR

55 has participated on the Alzheimer's Society and Alzheimer Scotland Advisory Boards - no

56 payment. No other authors claim any disclosure.

57 58

59 Selected aspects of the present manuscript were presented in preliminary form as a poster at the

60 2021 Alzheimer's Association International Conference, online.

62 Abstract

63	We aimed to refine the hypothesis that Motoric Cognitive Risk (MCR), a syndrome combining
64	measured slow gait speed and self-reported cognitive complaints, is prognostic of incident
65	dementia and other major causes of morbidity in older age. We propose mechanisms on the
66	relationship between motor and cognitive function and describe a roadmap to validate these
67	hypotheses. We systematically searched major electronic databases from inception to August
68	2021 for original longitudinal cohort studies of adults aged ≥ 60 years that compared an MCR
69	group to a non-MCR group with any health outcome. Fifteen cohorts were combined by meta-
70	analysis. Participants with MCR were at an increased risk of cognitive impairment (adjusted
71	hazard ratio [aHR] 1.76, 95%CI 1.49-2.08; I ² =24.9%), dementia (aHR 2.12, 1.85-2.42; 33.1%),
72	falls (adjusted Relative Risk 1.38, 1.15-1.66; 62.1%), and mortality (aHR 1.49, 1.16-1.91; 79.2%).
73	The prognostic value of MCR is considerable and mechanisms underlying the syndrome are
74	proposed.
75	
76	Keywords: Motoric cognitive risk, gait, dementia, review, meta-analysis, mechanism,
77	pathophysiology, falls, mortality, subjective cognitive complaint, prognostic, prevention
78	Systematic review registration: PROSPERO CRD42020225183.

80 1. Narrative

81 **1.1 Central question**

82 Can a gait-based syndrome, Motoric Cognitive Risk (MCR), predict dementia and other age-

83 related negative health outcomes? If so, what are the possible underlying mechanisms?

84

85 1.2 Objective

86 This paper is a proposal for an update of the Hypothesis on the Motoric-cognitive Mechanism in

87 Neurodegeneration-Dementia-Alzheimer¹ syndrome (abbreviated hereafter as the Hypothesis)

88 based on a thorough systematic review and meta-analysis of the evidence. The present work

89 intends to: (1) promote new thinking about the prognostic value of MCR in dementia and other

90 major causes of morbidity in older age; and (2) propose shared mechanisms between MCR and

91 neurodegeneration and outline a roadmap for further work to validate these hypotheses. This

92 report aims to synthesize and critique current evidence on MCR and describe challenges to the

93 MCR concept and the use of MCR as a clinical tool.

94

95 **1.3 Current knowledge**

96 As there are still no effective treatments for dementia, any biomarker that supports early 97 identification of high-risk individuals would allow time for lifestyle modification, planning for 98 future care needs, and could ultimately contribute to a reduction in overall prevalence of 99 dementia. Slow gait speed and self-reported cognitive complaints show potential to be such 100 biomarkers as they are some of the earliest reported precursors in the pre-clinical stage of 101 dementia, occurring 10-15 years before dementia diagnosis.¹² Motoric cognitive risk (MCR) 102 syndrome is a high-risk state combining objective (measured) slow walking speed and subjective 103 (self-reported) cognitive complaint in those able to ambulate and in the absence of dementia.³

104	First defined by Verghese in 2013 ⁴ , MCR has incremental predictive ability over either slow gait
105	or cognitive complaint alone. ⁵ Gait is a complex task requiring coordination between widespread
106	brain regions, therefore MCR may reflect neurodegeneration occurring in the preclinical stage of
107	dementia. Imaging studies in the MCR field indicate atrophy of executive function areas (frontal
108	and pre-frontal lobe networks). ⁶

109

The only existing meta-analysis of MCR⁷ found that MCR predicts cognitive impairment and
dementia. However, this meta-analysis had significant methodological limitations, including

112 pooling the results of different effect measures (e.g., hazard ratios and odds ratios) and, focusing

113 on the term "MCR", thus only including studies published from 2013 onward and excluding

114 earlier papers examining the same construct without naming it as such. We address these

115 limitations in our study. Other studies report that MCR identifies those at risk of falls,⁸⁻¹⁰ post-

116 falls hip fractures,⁹ disability,¹¹ and mortality,^{12,13} but these studies have not yet been pooled in a

117 meta-analysis. Other non-systematic MCR reviews focused on risk factors for developing MCR¹⁴

118 or aimed to give a more general overview of the MCR construct.⁶

119

120 **1.4 Knowledge gap and importance of this study**

121 Important conditions such as dementia or falls are projected to affect such a large number of 122 people over the next 30 years that even small reductions in the incidence – or delaying the age of

123 onset which would have the same result – are likely to have significant effects on numbers of

124 people affected and consequently the huge associated public health costs.^{5,14} Could there be

- shared mechanisms explaining the association of MCR with both these outcomes? If so,
- 126 identifying and targeting these mechanisms could reduce the prevalence of these major causes of
- 127 morbidity and mortality in older adults. Furthermore, if a quick, inexpensive, and easy-to-
- 128 measure clinical construct could reliably identify people at high risk of developing either or both

dementia and falls, along with other adverse health outcomes such as cognitive impairment and
mortality, it would be an important public health tool and would be equally implementable in
low-to-middle income countries. Our study addresses this knowledge gap and proposes
hypotheses on the underlying mechanisms.

133

134 **1.5 Limitations**

135 We were unable to obtain raw data from every eligible study to allow for calculation of a

136 comparable summary effect measure for each study for inclusion in the meta-analysis – an

137 individual participant meta-analysis. Therefore, some studies had to be left out of the pooled

138 result, reducing the overall power. We believe this important compromise ensures our findings

139 are as valid and reliable as possible based on the published literature while avoiding potential

140 significant delays to undertaking this novel work. Most studies in our review had a degree of risk

141 of bias (ROB) due to how they managed missing data and confounding factors, and a lack of

142 generalizability (section 2.1.6). These are common limitations in cohort studies and partly explain

143 why they are lower down the hierarchy of evidence compared to randomized controlled trials.

144 We accounted for substantial heterogeneity in the mortality outcome by downgrading our

145 Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) certainty

146 assessment for inconsistency (see section 2.2.5). Although some might avoid pooling our

147 mortality data due to statistical heterogeneity, we believe the summary data provide an important

148 global perspective on MCR.¹³ There is a relatively small number of studies for each health

149 outcome in the meta-analysis, meaning that statistical tests for publication bias lacked power to

150 detect real asymmetry from chance, although visual inspection of funnel plots is reassuring

151 (section 2.3.5). Finally, dementia is a clinical diagnosis, but in the studies included it was often

152 determined using surrogate markers such as scores in cognitive tests, increasing heterogeneity

153 and decreasing the generalizability of our findings. This is a common issue in dementia research

154	using cohort data. Reassuringly, the results of studies that diagnosed dementia using clinical
155	criteria ^{4,5} were consistent with those using surrogate markers. ^{11,15}

156

157 **1.6 Discussion**

158	Our results for risk of cognitive impairment and dementia in participants with MCR at baseline
159	were consistent with the only existing meta-analysis on the topic. ⁷ This earlier meta-analysis
160	reported that individuals with MCR were at a 70% increased risk of developing cognitive
161	impairment (adjusted Hazard Ratio [aHR] 1.70, 95%CI 1.46-1.98) and a 150% increased risk of
162	developing dementia (aHR 2.50, 95%CI 1.75-2.39). The slight differences reflect our inclusion of
163	new studies and two major strengths of our study, namely our decisions to only pool summary
164	effect measures of the same type and to always use the most adjusted effect measure reported.
165	Accordingly, our findings have reduced confounding and are likely to be more conservative.
166	Furthermore, by focusing on the term "MCR", the previous meta-analysis only included studies
167	published from 2013 onward, unlike our search which captured any study combining slow gait
168	and subjective cognitive complaint since database inception.
169	
170	Our paper makes methodological advances on the existing meta-analysis with regards to
171	cognitive impairment and dementia outcomes, ⁷ and it is the first to meta-analyze MCR studies
172	reporting on falls and mortality outcomes. As MCR is a recently defined construct, more
173	research is needed to increase certainty in each of our findings, particularly falls prediction. Other
174	outcomes more likely in those with MCR at baseline include recurrent falls, post-falls hip
175	fractures, and disability, but these outcomes require further research to allow for robust meta-
176	analysis.

178 **1.6.1 Hypotheses on mechanisms underlying MCR**

Interactions between MCR, poor brain health, falls, and increased mortality are likely due to a
range of biological, psychological, and social mechanisms. Causality is likely to be bidirectional,
and the mechanisms may be multifactorial. There is unlikely to be one, unifying mechanism
linking MCR with these negative health outcomes, but, based on recent evidence, we propose
hypotheses to explain some of the potential underlying biological mechanisms.

184

185 Epidemiological and clinical

186 MCR prevalence increases with age with rates of 8.9% in the 60-74 years group and 10.6% in the

187 \geq 75 years group⁵. MCR may increase the risk of dementia, falls and mortality by contributing to

188 geriatric syndromes such as delirium, depression, and medication mismanagement. Lower

189 education is associated with increased risk of MCR^{5,13,16} and is an established risk factor for

190 dementia. Low physical activity is another lifestyle risk factor shared by MCR with dementia,

191 falls, disability, and increased mortality.^{11,13,17} Reduced concentration and psychomotor

192 retardation are well-recognized symptoms of depression, so it is no surprise that depression has

193 been associated with MCR.¹⁸ Personality traits such as neuroticism¹⁹ have also been associated

194 with MCR, which may in part be due to an increased likelihood in this population to report

195 subjective cognitive complaint. Pilot trials to improve executive function by cognitive training,

196 dual-task 'walking while talking', or brain stimulation have improved gait speed.⁶

197

198 Neuropathology

199 Emerging data suggest that both neurodegenerative and vascular changes may contribute to

200 progression to dementia in those with MCR.²⁰ It is widely accepted that cerebral small vessel

201 disease (SVD) is an important cause of dementia and it is estimated that over one third of

202 dementias could be prevented by preventing stroke.²¹ Lacunar infarcts in the frontal lobe were

203 associated with MCR even after adjusting for vascular risk factors and presence of white matter

204	hyperintensities (adjusted Odds Ratio (aOR): 4.67, 95% CI: 1.69-12.94). ²² SVD is also a
205	significant contributor to risk of falling and SVD, especially in the frontal lobes, and has been
206	linked to increased mortality. ¹² However, adults free of dementia with slow gait had associated
207	amyloid β brain deposition, independent of underlying vascular change. ²³
208	
209	Cognition and gait share many other risk factors such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes
210	mellitus ²⁴ so it is no surprise that a pooled meta-analysis found that MCR was associated with
211	both of these chronic conditions, as well as hypertension and stroke. ²⁵ These findings support
212	our hypothesis that a vascular mechanism may underlie the pathophysiology of MCR syndrome.
213	
214	Neuroimaging and neurophysiology
215	A 2019 review reported that MCR was associated with lower gray matter volume in the premotor
216	and prefrontal cortices, but had no significant association with white matter abnormalities. ⁷ The
217	authors concluded that the pathophysiology of MCR was more likely due to neurodegenerative
218	rather than ischemic lesions. ⁷ This conclusion was admittedly based on a small number of
219	imaging studies and it was hypothesized that MCR detects individuals at such an early stage of
220	the disease process leading to dementia that the consequences of the vascular component may
221	not yet be detected. ⁷ Furthermore, MCR was associated with frontal lacunar infarcts in a study of
222	139 older adults in India. ²²
223	
224	Genetics
225	The first study to investigate individual-level genetic burden in relation to a predementia

syndrome examined the polygenic inheritance of MCR in a sample of 4,915 older individuals.²⁶

227 The authors examined nine phenotypes associated with MCR and found that obesity-related

- 228 genetic traits increase the risk of MCR syndrome. Obesity in older adults is an established risk
- 229 factor in falls, disability and increased mortality.^{27,28}

230

231	A prospective examination of inflammatory cytokine genes found that polymorphisms which
232	lead to over-expression of the anti-inflammatory cytokine Interleukin-10 (IL-10) are associated
233	with increased MCR incidence. ²⁹ While this makes any shared neuroinflammatory pathway
234	between MCR and dementia less probable, an over-expression of IL-10 points toward a
235	proamyloidogenic hypothesis of cognitive decline. ²⁹ Early work in mice models found that IL-10
236	expression leads to increased amyloid β accumulation and reduction in synaptic proteins as well
237	as increasing expression of $\ensuremath{\mathcal{APOE}}$ and suppressed phagocytosis of $\ensuremath{\beta}$ -amyloid by microglia. ³⁰ This
238	link between $APOE$ and MCR is perhaps unsurprising as the $APOE \epsilon 4$ allele was independently
239	associated with increased risk of gait speed decline and disability in older men. ³¹
240	
240	
240 241	Cellular mechanisms
240 241 242	Cellular mechanisms No specific mechanistic work on MCR at the cellular level has been performed to date.
240241242243	Cellular mechanisms No specific mechanistic work on MCR at the cellular level has been performed to date. However, emerging evidence on the effects of Alzheimer's disease pathology on motor neuron
 240 241 242 243 244 	Cellular mechanisms No specific mechanistic work on MCR at the cellular level has been performed to date. However, emerging evidence on the effects of Alzheimer's disease pathology on motor neuron function in transgenic mice merit consideration. For example, many studies have reported on the
240 241 242 243 244 245	Cellular mechanisms No specific mechanistic work on MCR at the cellular level has been performed to date. However, emerging evidence on the effects of Alzheimer's disease pathology on motor neuron function in transgenic mice merit consideration. For example, many studies have reported on the impaired motor performance such as beam walking and significant motor neuron axonopathy in
240 241 242 243 244 244 245 246	Cellular mechanisms No specific mechanistic work on MCR at the cellular level has been performed to date. However, emerging evidence on the effects of Alzheimer's disease pathology on motor neuron function in transgenic mice merit consideration. For example, many studies have reported on the impaired motor performance such as beam walking and significant motor neuron axonopathy in transgenic mice with β-amyloid mutations. ^{1,32} It will be fascinating to assess if future studies
 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 	Cellular mechanisms No specific mechanistic work on MCR at the cellular level has been performed to date. However, emerging evidence on the effects of Alzheimer's disease pathology on motor neuron function in transgenic mice merit consideration. For example, many studies have reported on the impaired motor performance such as beam walking and significant motor neuron axonopathy in transgenic mice with β-amyloid mutations. ^{1,32} It will be fascinating to assess if future studies treating developed or preventing Alzheimer's disease pathologies improves or prevents further
 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 	Cellular mechanisms No specific mechanistic work on MCR at the cellular level has been performed to date. However, emerging evidence on the effects of Alzheimer's disease pathology on motor neuron function in transgenic mice merit consideration. For example, many studies have reported on the impaired motor performance such as beam walking and significant motor neuron axonopathy in transgenic mice with β-amyloid mutations. ^{1,32} It will be fascinating to assess if future studies treating developed or preventing Alzheimer's disease pathologies improves or prevents further declines of motor function. ¹

250 1.7 Major challenges for the Hypothesis

First, the definition of MCR requires standardization to allow for better comparison of MCR
prevalence rates and prognostic value across populations. The range of methods for diagnosing
subjective cognitive complaint highlights the need for a consistent definition of MCR in future
studies.

-	-	-
\mathbf{a}	E	E
1.	Э	0
_	~	~

256	Early work by Verghese et al. ⁴ found that MCR was better at predicting vascular dementia than
257	Alzheimer dementia, but more recent work in an independent cohort ¹⁵ found conversely that
258	MCR was better at predicting Alzheimer's dementia than non-Alzheimer's dementia. This
259	challenges the premise that early upstream vascular alterations degrade the brain structures
260	shared by cognitive and motor function systems, namely frontal and prefrontal motor cortex. ^{20,21}
261	
262	1.8 Conclusions and next steps
263	The motoric-cognitive hypothesis of neurodegeneration does not seem to have one unifying
264	underlying mechanism, so future steps to elucidate these will require a multidisciplinary approach
265	exploring the issue using complementary techniques.
266	
267	1. The relative contributions from cortical motor regions to neuropsychological tests that
268	comprise part of the clinical diagnosis of dementia remain to be addressed. ¹
269	
270	2. Longitudinal studies of at-risk populations with genetic, neurophysiological,
271	neuroimaging, or other biomarkers and pathological validation will help determine the
272	progress of motor and cognitive impairment in dementia. ³³
273	
274	3. A large-scale discovery genome-wide association study of MCR is an important step to
275	identify underlying biological mechanisms of MCR. This would identify targets for
276	further investigation and possibly treatment to reduce MCR and ultimately dementia,
277	falls, disability, and excess mortality. The generation of a reliable MCR polygenic risk
278	score might have clinical utility for early prediction, and thus prevention, of those at risk
279	of MCR.

280

281	4.	Interventional trials are important to assess whether targeting slow gait and subjective
282		cognitive impairment delays or reverses MCR, and whether this reduces transition to
283		cognitive impairment, dementia, falls, and excess mortality.
284		

285 2. Consolidated Results and Study Design

286 2.1 Methodology

287 This systematic review was conducted following the updated guidelines of Preferred Reporting

288 Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA 2020)³⁴ and the meta-analysis

289 followed the Meta-Analyses of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) guidelines.³⁵

290 The protocol was pre-registered in the international prospective register of systematic reviews

291 (PROSPERO CRD42020225183).

292

293 2.1.1 Search strategy

294 We searched the AMED, APA PsychInfo, CINAHL, Cochrane, EMBASE and Ovid

295 MEDLINE databases from conception to 20/08/2021, then carried out a backwards and

296 forwards citation search with no language or publication date restrictions. The search strategy

297 was devised iteratively with support from an academic librarian, and the strategy was peer

- reviewed using the Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies (PRESS) checklist.³⁶ The full
- search strategy is in supplementary table 1.

We used the PICOT (Population; Intervention; Comparator; Outcome; Timing/Type) system to

301 2.1.2 Eligibility criteria

303	design our review question (supplementary box 1). ³⁷ In summary, we examined longitudinal
304	cohort studies of community-based adults aged ≥ 60 years with an MCR group compared to a
305	non-MCR group for any health outcome with a minimum of one year follow-up. Only peer-
306	reviewed full-text articles were included in the meta-analysis and synthesis.
307	
308	2.1.3 Screening and selection
309	Two authors (DM and AC) independently reviewed all titles then all included abstracts using
310	Covidence software. ³⁸ If the study appeared to meet the selection criteria, the same two
311	investigators independently reviewed the full text. Discrepancies were resolved through open
312	discussion and verified by a third author when necessary.
313	
314	2.1.4 Data collection process
314 315	2.1.4 Data collection process We iteratively designed a bespoke data extraction tool based on the CHARMS-PF (CHecklist for
314315316	2.1.4 Data collection processWe iteratively designed a bespoke data extraction tool based on the CHARMS-PF (CHecklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic Reviews of prediction Modelling Studies,
314315316317	 2.1.4 Data collection process We iteratively designed a bespoke data extraction tool based on the CHARMS-PF (CHecklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic Reviews of prediction Modelling Studies, adapted for prognostic factors) template³⁷, which two authors (DM and AC) used independently
 314 315 316 317 318 	 2.1.4 Data collection process We iteratively designed a bespoke data extraction tool based on the CHARMS-PF (CHecklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic Reviews of prediction Modelling Studies, adapted for prognostic factors) template³⁷, which two authors (DM and AC) used independently to extract data from eligible studies (supplementary table 2). We then compared the extracted
 314 315 316 317 318 319 	 2.1.4 Data collection process We iteratively designed a bespoke data extraction tool based on the CHARMS-PF (CHecklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic Reviews of prediction Modelling Studies, adapted for prognostic factors) template³⁷, which two authors (DM and AC) used independently to extract data from eligible studies (supplementary table 2). We then compared the extracted data and resolved any discrepancies through discussion and referring to the study in question.
 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 	 2.1.4 Data collection process We iteratively designed a bespoke data extraction tool based on the CHARMS-PF (CHecklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic Reviews of prediction Modelling Studies, adapted for prognostic factors) template³⁷, which two authors (DM and AC) used independently to extract data from eligible studies (supplementary table 2). We then compared the extracted data and resolved any discrepancies through discussion and referring to the study in question. The combined data extraction tool was then double-checked for accuracy. Whenever study
 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 	2.1.4 Data collection process We iteratively designed a bespoke data extraction tool based on the CHARMS-PF (CHecklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic Reviews of prediction Modelling Studies, adapted for prognostic factors) template ³⁷ , which two authors (DM and AC) used independently to extract data from eligible studies (supplementary table 2). We then compared the extracted data and resolved any discrepancies through discussion and referring to the study in question. The combined data extraction tool was then double-checked for accuracy. Whenever study details were unclear, we contacted study authors for further information.
 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 	2.1.4 Data collection process We iteratively designed a bespoke data extraction tool based on the CHARMS-PF (CHecklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic Reviews of prediction Modelling Studies, adapted for prognostic factors) template ³⁷ , which two authors (DM and AC) used independently to extract data from eligible studies (supplementary table 2). We then compared the extracted data and resolved any discrepancies through discussion and referring to the study in question. The combined data extraction tool was then double-checked for accuracy. Whenever study details were unclear, we contacted study authors for further information.

323 2.1.5 Data items

324	We extracted the following data for the exposure variable (MCR): slow gait measurement
325	protocol, average gait speed, subjective cognitive complaint measurement method and MCR
326	prevalence rate. For our outcome variables, we recorded method of measurement as well as the
327	most adjusted model results of any health outcome result, whether reported as adjusted hazard
328	ratio (aHR), adjusted odds ratio (aOR), or adjusted relative risk (aRR), and their corresponding
329	95% confidence intervals (CI) and p-values, if available. Unadjusted model results were not
330	reported frequently enough to allow meaningful comparison on synthesis. To inform assessment
331	of residual confounding, we recorded the covariates adjusted for in each model. Where an
332	outcome was reported over various follow-up timepoints we selected those timepoints most
333	common across studies to minimize meta-analysis heterogeneity. Other data items extracted
334	included, author name, year, country, cohort, size, the study design, and participant
335	characteristics.

336

337 2.1.6 Study quality and risk of bias assessment

We performed a ROB assessment, using an expanded version of the Quality In Prognosis
Studies (QUIPS) tool recommended by the Cochrane Prognosis Methods Group to assess ROB
in prognostic factor studies.³⁷ We generated a summary ROB plot illustrating the overall ROB of
the literature base, and a ROB traffic light plot to illustrate the ROB of each study. The ROB
assessments were incorporated into our meta-analysis at the grading of evidence stage.

344 **2.2 Meta-analysis**

345 2.2.1 Eligibility for each synthesis

We tabulated the study outcome characteristics and compared each against our planned outcome to ensure that the study outcome was valid. We only included in the meta-analysis those studies with outcomes which were judged satisfactory by our clinical content experts. Only health outcomes reported from at least three cohorts were included in the meta-analysis, to ensure appropriate synthesis.

351

352 2.2.2 Effect measures

353 We used aHR and 95% CI to synthesize studies reporting cognitive impairment, dementia, and

354 mortality outcomes, and aRR and 95% CIs to synthesize studies reporting falls as the outcome.

355 These were the effect measures most reported in eligible studies for each of these outcomes,

thus allowing inclusion of most studies. When a study reported the effect measure in a way

357 incompatible with our analysis, we contacted the authors to request data to allow for our own

358 calculation (e.g., aHR) or we converted the effect measure (e.g., aOR to aRR), if possible and

appropriate, based on methods suggested by Tierney.³⁹ If these attempts were not successful, we

360 omitted the study from our meta-analysis to avoid comparing different effect measures in the

361 one analysis. In all cases, only the most adjusted effect measures were used.

362

363 2.2.3 Synthesis methods

364 We log-transformed our effect measures and their 95% CIs to make them normally distributed,

an assumption of our meta-analysis model. We then calculated log standard error using the

366 methods described in the Cochrane Handbook v6.2.40

368	We used a random-effect model (REM) to allow for within-study sampling error and between-
369	studies variability due to varying study characteristics. The relative lack of small studies
370	supported our decision to use the REM approach (as smaller studies receive larger weights in
371	REM in comparison to fixed-effect modelling). The degree of heterogeneity was calculated using
372	a restricted maximum-likelihood estimator, following recent guidance. ⁴⁰ The extent and impact
373	of between-study heterogeneity were visually displayed in forest plots and reported as the tau-
374	squared and I-squared statistic, accompanied by 95% CIs to judge our confidence about these
375	metrics. I-squared was chosen over Cochrane's Q to better account for the small number of
376	studies in each analysis. Prediction intervals are included in the forest plots to illustrate the range
377	for which we can expect the effects of future studies to fall, based on our present evidence in the
378	meta-analysis. Prediction intervals help overcome any limitations of the I-squared and tau-
379	squared methods. ⁴¹ Meta-analysis was performed by one author in R (version 4.0.2) using the
380	metafor (2.4.0) and dmetar (0.0.9) packages. ⁴²
381	
382	We tabulated our study characteristics structured by outcome domain, ordered from low to high

ROB to orientate readers to the most robust evidence (table 1). The results of the meta-analyses are displayed in forest plots for each outcome, displaying the effect estimates and confidence intervals of each study and the summary estimate. The plots are ordered by study weight to highlight any patterns in the data.

387

388 2.2.4 Assessing publication bias or outcome reporting bias

We produced funnel plots for meta-analysis of MCR for each health outcome to allow for visual assessment of small-study effects. These were assessed for asymmetry using Egger's test. To assess outcome reporting bias, two reviewers independently compared the outcomes reported in the methods and results sections of the studies.

394 2.2.5 Certainty assessment methods

Our default starting position regarding certainty in the level of evidence was in keeping with the Cochrane guidance to generally regard evidence from sound observational studies as low quality.⁴⁰ We modified the GRADE considerations adapted for prognosis research as recommended by Huguet⁴³ to assess the certainty of the body of evidence as it related to the studies included in the meta-analyses for each outcome. See section 3.1 and supplementary box 2 for full details.

401

402 **2.3 Results**

403 2.3.1 Study selection

404 We found 705 records on database searching, following de-duplication. We sought retrieval of 405 full-text reports for 94. We included 15 studies from the databases search, 4,5,8-13,15-17,44-47 with 11 406 of these proving eligible for meta-analysis. We then performed backwards and forwards citation 407 searching by reviewing the reference list of these studies, as well as those of three reviews^{7,14,48} 408 and one editorial paper³³ on MCR. Of the 1800 records found this way, we reviewed full-text 409 reports for 35 but included no additional papers. One longitudinal study which appeared to meet 410 inclusion criteria was excluded as the MCR group defined using slow gait speed as a criteria was 411 not followed up longitudinally.3 Figure 1 shows the PRISMA flow diagram of study selection. 412

413 2.3.2 Study characteristics

Error! Reference source not found. shows the key characteristics for each cohort included in the meta-analysis, structured by outcome, and ordered by ROB from low to high risk. More detail is available in supplementary table 3. All studies were published from 2013 onwards. Six cohorts were based in the USA, three from European countries, and one from each of Canada, Japan, China, Mexico, Australia, and New Zealand. Cohort sizes ranged from 176 to 6795

419 participants (average 2036). All participants were older adults at baseline with a mean age ranging 420 from 65 to 84.6 years (average 76 years). Gait speed was assessed using a stopwatch in most 421 studies other than the three which reported on cohorts that used a computerized walkway.^{4,5,8} 422 The measuring distance ranged from 2.4 to 6 meters and most cohorts measured usual walking 423 speed, although two studies measured maximum walking speed.^{10,46} Slow gait was defined as one 42.4 standard deviation or more below age- and sex-matched means in the population in all but two 425 cohorts, one of which classed as slow walkers all those walking <0.8 meters per second (or 426 <0.66 meters per second if female less than 1.45m in height)¹⁶ and the other which classed as 427 slow walkers all those in the lowest 20th percentile of the cohort population.⁴⁷ Subjective 428 cognitive complaint was measured using different methods in different cohorts, such as the 42.9 memory item from the 15-item Geriatric Depression Scale,^{8,10,11,15,17,44,46} the eight-item informant 430 interview (AD8),¹⁷ the Clinical Dementia Rating scale,¹⁷ the 15-item Consortium to Establish a 431 Registry for Alzheimer's Disease (CERAD) questionnaire.⁴ Of note, studies on the EPIDOS 432 cohort included in this review and meta-analysis used an objective measure of cognitive 433 complaint, namely any incorrect responses on the Short Portable Mental Status Questionnaire (SPMSQ). Accordingly, results should be treated with caution.^{9,13,15} In other studies, a positive 434 435 response from participants to a question such as "Is your memory worse than 10 years ago?" was 436 sufficient.12

437

438 2.3.3 Results of ROB assessments

Figure 2 contains a summary ROB of the pooled studies (top) as well as a traffic-light plot (bottom) showing the ROB of the individual studies, assessed against the nine domains. In the pooled summary, the domains with highest ROB were due to missing data, exposure variable measurement, confounding and generalizability. In the traffic-light plot, there was a high ROB in at least one domain in the majority (7/11) of studies, and all studies contained at least one

- 444 domain judged as being of some concern. Overall, six studies had low ROB, four studies had
- some concerns, and one study had a high ROB.

446

447 2.3.4 Meta-analysis of health outcomes predicted by MCR

- 448 The meta-analysis findings are summarized in the forest plots and described in more detail below
- 449 (figure 3).
- 450
- 451 Dementia
- 452 We combined six cohorts from four studies that examined dementia as an outcome, totaling
- 453 9,955 participants.^{4,5,11,45} Four cohorts were from two studies with a low ROB^{4,5} and two were
- 454 from studies with a moderate risk of overall bias.^{11,45} Individuals with MCR at baseline were over
- 455 twice as likely to develop dementia compared to those without MCR, over an average follow-up
- 456 of 4.3 years (aHR 2.12, 95%CI 1.85-2.42, p<0.0001, I²=33.1%, tau²=<0.0001, prediction interval
- 457 1.75-2.56).
- 458
- 459 Cognitive Impairment
- 460 Six cohorts from three studies, including a total of 6,458 participants, reported on cognitive
- 461 impairment as an outcome. Five cohorts were from two studies with a low risk of overall bias^{5,16}
- 462 and one⁴⁷ with a moderate risk of overall bias. Those with MCR at baseline were at an increased
- 463 risk of developing cognitive impairment compared to those without MCR, over an average
- 464 follow-up of 5.6 years (aHR 1.76, 95%CI 1.49-2.08, p < 0.0001, $I^2 = 24.9\%$, tau²=0.0095,
- 465 prediction interval 1.23-2.52).

467 F	Falls
-------	-------

468	We combined eight cohorts from three studies, including a total of 12,640 participants with falls
469	as an outcome. Two cohorts were from one study with a high risk of overall bias, mainly due to
470	this study's small sample size and method of dealing with confounders. ¹⁰ These cohorts were
471	weighted in the meta-analysis in accordance with their results imprecision, so their effect on the
472	overall result was minimal (combined weighting of 6.3%). One cohort was from a study with a
473	moderate ROB, ⁹ while the other five cohorts were from a study with a low ROB. ⁸ Those with
474	MCR at baseline were at a 38% relative risk increase of falls compared to those without MCR
475	(aRR 1.38, 95%CI 1.15-1.66, p=0.0005, I ² =62.1%, tau ² =0.039, prediction interval 0.91-2.36).
476	The average follow-up of all cohorts was 1.4 years. A subgroup analysis excluding the two
477	cohorts with a high risk of overall bias (total n=478 participants) made no difference to the
478	effect measure of prognostic ability for MCR at baseline with falls on follow-up (aRR 1.38,
479	95%CI 1.14-1.69, p=0.0013, I ² =70.2%, tau ² =0.043, prediction interval 0.73-2.63).
480	

481 Mortality

Four cohorts from two studies, including 19,818 participants, reported on mortality as an outcome. Three of these came from a study with a low risk of overall bias,¹² with the other study¹³ having a moderate risk of overall bias. Those with MCR at baseline were at an increased risk of mortality compared to those without MCR, over an average follow-up of 5.3 years (aHR 1.49, 95%CI 1.16-1.91, p<0.0001, I²=79.2%, tau²=0.0477, prediction interval 0.50-4.42).

488 2.3.5 Bias of studies or outcomes included in the meta-analysis

On visual inspection of the funnel plots, both the dementia and cognitive impairment outcomes appear to be missing smaller studies with a smaller effect size (figure 4). As there are fewer than ten studies for each outcome, any test for funnel plot asymmetry will have low power for

492	distinguishing chance	from real asymmetry. ⁴⁰	Nonetheless,	the results from	Egger's test did no
-----	-----------------------	------------------------------------	--------------	------------------	---------------------

493 support asymmetry for dementia (p=0.15), cognitive impairment (p=0.06), falls (p=0.69) or

494 mortality (p=0.54).

495

496 There was no evidence of selective non-reporting of results from any of the studies included in

497 this review or meta-analysis.

498 **3. Further detail on methods and results**

499 **3.1 Further methodological details**

500 3.1.2 Quality assessment of included studies

501 Prior to ROB assessment, two authors (DM and AC) independently evaluated the

502 methodological quality of the selected studies using a customized quality assessment tool that

503 builds on the 14 criteria of the Cochrane recommended National Institute for Health (NIH)

504 Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies.⁴⁹ An additional

505 15 criteria from the Strengthening The Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology

506 (STROBE) guidelines⁵⁰ were added to our tool, resulting in a total of 29 criteria by which each

507 study was assessed (supplementary table 4). Two authors independently rated each study quality

508 overall as "high" if most criteria were met and there was little risk of bias (ROB), "satisfactory" if

509 most criteria were met with some flaws in the study, or "low" when most criteria were not met,

510 and/or there were significant flaws relating to key aspects of study design. Any discrepancies in

511 judgements were resolved by discussion to reach a consensus. There were no discrepancies in

512 our independent overall impression of each study. Our approach fits with that recommended by

513 the Cochrane Handbook v6.2.⁴⁰

515	In addition to this detailed quality assessment, we performed a more succinct ROB assessment as
516	described in section 1.5.5. From the criteria in our quality assessment tool, we selected those
517	most relevant to ROB: (i) bias due to lack of study focus; (ii) bias arising from cohort used; (iii)
518	bias due to MCR measurement; (iv) bias due to outcome measurement; (v) bias due to missing
519	data; (vi) bias due to confounding; (vii) bias due to follow-up; (viii) bias due to results precision;
520	(ix) bias due to lack of generalizability. These criteria are more appropriate when assessing ROB
521	of studies describing a syndrome such as MCR than the recently developed Prediction model
522	Risk Of Bias ASsessment Tool (PROBAST) tool, ⁵¹ which assesses multivariable prediction
523	models. The risk of bias plots were created in the coding language R using the "robvis (0.3.0.9)"
524	package. ⁵² The code syntax is openly available on GitHub (<u>https://github.com/d-</u>
525	mullin?tab=repositories).

526

527 3.1.2 Assessment of certainty in the body of evidence

528 We assessed the certainty of the body of evidence for MCR as a predictor of each outcome in

529 the meta-analysis against the GRADE considerations adapted for prognosis research as

recommended by Huguet⁴³, see section 1.6.5. We graded the certainty in the results for MCR as a

531 predictor of dementia, cognitive impairment, falls, and mortality as low (see table 2). This low

532 certainty is typical for prognosis research using even sound observational studies.⁴⁰ The seven

GRADE criteria considered, and our impressions for each, are described in supplementary box 2of the appendix.

535

536 **3.2 Further results**

537 3.2.1 Studies excluded from meta-analysis

A further two eligible studies^{15,46} reported on MCR as a predictor of dementia and two more as a
predictor of cognitive impairment^{17,44} but, due to how the effect size was reported in each, (e.g.,

540 reporting OR rather than HR) we were unable to include them in our meta-analysis. Despite 541 correspondence with study authors, we did not obtain the data necessary to allow calculation of 542 the effect measure used in our meta-analysis. Reassuringly, these excluded studies share similar 543 characteristics and direction of effect size to those included in the meta-analysis (table 3). They 544 were judged as having either a moderate or high ROB. The effect precision was poor in three of 545 the studies and not reported in the other, so if it had been possible to include these in the meta-546 analysis, they would have had a relatively small weighting and therefore, a minimal impact on the 547 overall result. 548

549 MCR at baseline was reported to predict other health outcomes on follow-up, but there were not

enough different cohorts reporting on the same outcomes to allow for meta-analysis. One study

found that MCR was a predictor of incident disability after 2.5 years (aHR 2.25 (1.39-3.67)

552 p=0.001).¹¹ Disability was defined as a primary care doctor evaluated need for new long-term

553 care insurance certification. Another study, already included in our meta-analysis for falls at one

554 year, also reported on MCR as a predictor of recurrent falls, defined as two or more falls, (aHR

555 1.46 (1.04-2.05) p=0.030) and of post-falls hip fractures (aHR 2.54 (1.78-3.63) $p \le 0.001$).⁹

556

557 **Research in Context**

558 Systematic review: We systematically retrieved and reviewed the literature using traditional 559 sources and correspondence with authors. While the predictive value of MCR for cognitive 560 impairment, dementia, falls, and mortality have been reported in sufficient cohorts to allow for 561 meta-analysis, other outcomes such as disability were not, so were reported in narrative form. 562

563	Interpretation: Our findings led to an integrated hypothesis describing the pathophysiology of
564	MCR. This hypothesis is consistent with epidemiological, imaging, and genetic findings currently
565	in the public domain.
566	
567	Future directions: This manuscript proposes a framework for the generation of new hypotheses
568	and describes a roadmap to validate these hypotheses. Examples include: (a) clarifying the
569	definition of subjective cognitive complaint; (b) longitudinal studies with biomarkers and
570	pathological analysis; (c) genome wide association studies of MCR to identify genetic
571	polymorphisms and potential treatment targets of interest.
572 573	Correspondence
574	Dr Donncha S. Mullin, Division of Psychiatry, University of Edinburgh, Kennedy Tower,
575	Royal Edinburgh Hospital, Morningside Terrace, Edinburgh, EH10 5HF, UK
576	Telephone: +44 (0)131 537 6000; Email: <u>D.Mullin@ed.ac.uk</u>
577	
578	Acknowledgements
579	Ruth Jenkins, academic support librarian at the University of Edinburgh, helped with search
580	terms and recommending databases. Dr Sue Lord, Lecturer at the Auckland University of
581	Technology, New Zealand, supplied raw data from her study to allow for calculation of
582	appropriate effect measure.

584 585	REFE	CRENCES
586	1.	Albers MW Gilmore GC Kave I et al. At the interface of sensory and motor
587		dysfunctions and Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's Dement, 2015:11(1):70-98.
588		doi 10 1016 / LALZ 2014 04 514
589	2	Verghese I Wang C Linton RB Holtzer R Xue X Quantitative gait dysfunction and risk
590	2.	of cognitive decline and dementia I Neural Neurasura Psychiatry 2007;78(9):929-935
591		doi:10.1136/innp.2006.106914
592	3.	Avers E. Verghese I. Gait Dysfunction in Motoric Cognitive Risk Syndrome. Montero-
593	51	Odasso M Perry G eds I Alzheimer's Dis 2019:71(s1):S95-S103 doi:10.3233/IAD-
594		181227
595	4.	Verghese I Wang C Lipton RB Holtzer R. Motoric cognitive risk syndrome and the risk
596		of dementia Journals Gerontal - Ser A Biol Sci Med Sci 2013.68(4):412-418
597		doi:10.1093/gerona/gls191
598	5.	Verghese I Annweiler C Avers E et al. Motoric cognitive risk syndrome: Multicountry
599	51	prevalence and dementia risk Neurology 2014:83(8):718-726
600		doi:10.1212/WNL.000000000000717
601	6.	Meiner Z. Avers E. Verghese I. Motoric cognitive risk syndrome: A risk factor for
602		cognitive impairment and dementia in different populations. Ann Geriatr Med Res.
603		2020:24(1):3-14. doi:10.4235/agmr.20.0001
604	7.	Sekhon H, Allali G, Launay CP, et al. Motoric cognitive risk syndrome, incident cognitive
605		impairment and morphological brain abnormalities: Systematic review and meta-analysis.
606		Maturitas. 2019;123(February):45-54. doi:10.1016/j.maturitas.2019.02.006
607	8.	Callisaya ML, Ayers E, Barzilai N, et al. Motoric Cognitive Risk Syndrome and Falls Risk:
608		A Multi-Center Study. Montero-Odasso M, ed. J Alzheimer's Dis. 2016;53(3):1043-1052.
609		doi:10.3233/JAD-160230
610	9.	Beauchet O, Sekhon H, Schott A-MM, et al. Motoric Cognitive Risk Syndrome and Risk
611		for Falls, Their Recurrence, and Postfall Fractures: Results From a Prospective
612		Observational Population-Based Cohort Study. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2019;20(10):1268-
613		1273. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2019.04.021
614	10.	Lord S, Moyes S, Teh R, et al. Gait, cognition and falls over 5 years, and motoric
615		cognitive risk in New Zealand octogenarians: Te Puāwaitanga o Nga Tapuwae Kia Ora
616		Tonu, LiLACS NZ. BMC Geriatr. 2020;20(1):1-8. doi:10.1186/s12877-020-1420-8
617	11.	Doi T, Shimada H, Makizako H, et al. Motoric Cognitive Risk Syndrome: Association
618		with Incident Dementia and Disability. J Alzheimer's Dis. 2017;59(1):77-84.
619		doi:10.3233/JAD-170195
620	12.	Ayers E, Verghese J. Motoric cognitive risk syndrome and risk of mortality in older adults.
621		Alzheimer's Dement. 2016;12(5):556-564. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2015.08.167
622	13.	Beauchet O, Sekhon H, Launay CP, et al. Motoric cognitive risk syndrome and mortality:
623		results from the EPIDOS cohort. Eur J Neurol. 2019;26(5):794-e56.
624		doi:10.1111/ene.13891
625	14.	Semba RD, Tian Q, Carlson MC, Xue Q-LL, Ferrucci L. Motoric cognitive risk
626		syndrome. Integration of two early harbingers of dementia in older adults. Ageing Res Rev.
627		2020;58(January):101022. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2020.101022
628	15.	Beauchet O, Sekhon H, Launay CP, Rolland Y, Schott AM, Allali G. Motoric cognitive
629		risk syndrome and incident dementia: results from a population-based prospective and
630	4.7	observational cohort study. Eur J Neurol. 2020;27(3):468-474. doi:10.1111/ene.14093
631	16.	Aguilar-Navarro SG, Mimenza-Alvarado AJ, Aguilar-Esquivel JE, Yeverino-Castro SG,
632		Juarez-Cedillo I. Motoric Cognitive Kisk Syndrome: Prevalence and Kisk of Cognitive
055		Impairment in a Population Studied in the Mexican Health and Aging Study 2012–2015. J
034		1Nuir Fieal Aging. 2019;23(3):227-231. doi:10.1007/s12603-019-1160-7

635	17.	Allali G, Ayers EI, Verghese J. Motoric Cognitive Risk Syndrome Subtypes and Cognitive
636		Profiles, Journals Gerontol - Ser A Biol Sci Med Sci, 2016;71(3):378-384.
637		doi:10.1093/geropa/glv092
(20	10	Coltrar II Alloli C. Downlot O. The consistion of comin decomposition disorders and
020	10.	Seknon H, Allali G, Deauchet O. The association of anxio-depressive disorders and
639		depression with motoric cognitive risk syndrome: results from the baseline assessment of
640		the Canadian longitudinal study on aging. <i>GeroScience</i> . 2019;41(4):409-418.
641		doi:10.1007/s11357-019-00093-z
642	19.	Stephan Y, Sutin AR, Canada B, Terracciano A. Personality and Motoric Cognitive Risk
643		Syndrome. I Am Geriatr Soc. 2020;68(4):803-808. doi:10.1111/jps.16282
644	20	Khachaturian ZS Kuller LH Khachaturian AS Strategic goals and roadman for dementia
645	20.	newantian by stroke provention Alphaiman's Damant 2010;15(7):865-860
646		1.: 10.1016 /: :-1- 2010.06.002
040	04	doi:10.1010/1.1aiz.2019.00.003
647	21.	Hachinski V, Einhaupl K, Ganten D, et al. Preventing dementia by preventing stroke: The
648		Berlin Manifesto. <i>Alzheimer's Dement</i> . 2019;15(7):961-984. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2019.06.001
649	22.	Wang N, Allali G, Kesavadas C, et al. Cerebral Small Vessel Disease and Motoric
650		Cognitive Risk Syndrome: Results from the Kerala-Einstein Study. J Alzheimer's Dis.
651		2016;50(3):699-707. doi:10.3233/JAD-150523
652	23.	Nadkarni NK, Perera S, Snitz BE, et al. Association of brain amyloid- β with slowgait in
653		elderly individuals without dementia influence of cognition and apolipoprotein e
654		construct $I AM A N_{ward} 2017;74(1):82.00 doi:10.1001/jamanourol.2016.3474$
655	24	Cohen IA Varahasa I Zuvaling II. Coonition and exit in older people Maturita
055	Ζ4.	Conten JA, vergnese J, Zwennig JL. Cognition and gait in older people. <i>Maturnas</i> .
050		2010;93:73-77. doi:10.1016/j.maturitas.2016.05.005
657	25.	Beauchet O, Sekhon H, Barden J, et al. Association of motoric cognitive risk syndrome
658		with cardiovascular disease and risk factors: Results from an original study and meta-
659		analysis. J Alzheimer's Dis. 2018;64(3):875-887. doi:10.3233/JAD-180203
660	26.	Sathyan S, Wang T, Ayers E, Verghese J. Genetic basis of motoric cognitive risk
661		syndrome in the Health and Retirement Study. <i>Neurology</i> . 2019;92(13):E1427-E1434.
662		doi:10.1212/WNL.000000000007141
663	27.	Donini LM, Savina C, Gennaro E, et al. A systematic review of the literature concerning
664		the relationship between obesity and mortality in the elderly. I Nutr Heal aging 2012 161.
665		2011:16(1):89-98 doi:10.1007/\$12603-011-0073-X
666	28	G R Nori S S Oliveire I B Darie A M Lime R Tiedemann A Dees Obesity Increase the
600	20.	D'I IS CHURCHA, D'I A 160 X - 1011 DAS (
007		Kisk and Seventy of Falls in People Aged 60 Years and Older? A Systematic Review and
668		Meta-analysis of Observational Studies. Journals Gerontol Ser A. 2020; /5(5):952-960.
669		doi:10.1093/GERONA/GLZ2/2
670	29.	Sathyan S, Barzilai N, Atzmon G, Milman S, Ayers E, Verghese J. Association of anti-
671		inflammatory cytokine IL10 polymorphisms with motoric cognitive risk syndrome in an
672		Ashkenazi Jewish population. Neurobiol Aging. 2017;58:238.e1-238.e8.
673		doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2017.06.006
674	30.	P C, A L, C C-D, et al. IL-10 alters immunoproteostasis in APP mice, increasing plaque
675		burden and worsening cognitive behavior. <i>Neuron</i> , 2015:85(3):519-533.
676		doi:10.1016/INEURON.2014.11.020
677	31	Verghese I. Holtzer R. Wang C. Katz MI. Barzilai N. Lipton RB. Role of APOE genotype
679	51.	in goit degling and disability in going Journals Consultate Son A Rick Soi Mod Soi
670		In gan accure and usability in aging. Journals Geroniol - Ser A Diol Ser Ivieu Ser.
0/9	20	2013;00(11):1393-1401. doi:10.1093/gerona/git113
680	52.	Wirths O, Bayer IA. Motor impairment in Alzheimer's disease and transgenic
681		Alzheimer's disease mouse models. Authors J Compil #. 2008;/:1-5. doi:10.1111/j.1601-
682		183X.2007.00373.x
683	33.	Ayers E, Verghese J. Diagnosing motoric cognitive risk syndrome to predict progression
684		to dementia. Neurodegener Dis Manag. 2014;4(5):339-342. doi:10.2217/nmt.14.39
685	34.	Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated

686		guideling for reporting systematic reviews RMI 2021.372 p71 doi:10.1186/s13643.021
687		01626 A
600	25	Stroug DE Boolin IA Morton SC at al Mate analysis of Observational Studies in
000	33.	Exidential and A. Dreaser Condition SC, et al. Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in
600		<i>L</i> pidemology A Proposal for Reporting. <i>JAMA</i> . 2000;15:2008-2012.
690	26	uor:10.1001/jama.263.15.2006 MaCowan I. Sammaan M. Saluwadal DM. Coop E. Econoten V. Lafahwan C. DDESS Door
602	30,	Porior of Electronic Scarph Stateorics 2015 Chideline Statement I Cha Etidamic
692		2016.75-40 AC drift 101016 (i clinerei 2016 01 021
695	27	2010;75:40-40. doi:10.1010/j.jcinepi.2010.01.021
694 605	37.	Riley RD, Moon's KGM, Shell KIE, et al. A guide to systematic review and meta-analysis
695	20	or prognostic factor studies. <i>BINJ</i> . 2019;564. doi:10.1156/bmj.k459/
696	38.	Covidence systematic review software. Accessed August 24, 2021.
097	20	T' Est de la characteria de la
698	39.	Therney JF, Stewart LA, Ghersi D, Burdett S, Sydes MR. Practical methods for
099 700		incorporating summary time-to-event data into meta-analysis. <i>Triais</i> . 2007;8.
700	40	$\frac{dof(10.1180/1/45-0.215-8-10)}{11111111111111111111111111111111111$
701	40.	Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions
702		Cochrane Training. Vol 6.2. 6.2.; 2021. Accessed April 15, 2021.
703	44	https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current
704	41.	Harrer M, Cuppers P, Furukawa IA, Ebert DD. Doing Meta-Analysis in K: A Hands-on
705	40	G_{Mae} ; 2019. doi:10.5281/zenodo.2551805
706	42.	Viechtbauer W, Wolfgang V. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package.
707	4.2	Stat Software, 2010;50(5):1-48. http://www.jstatsoft.org/
708	43.	Huguet A, Hayden JA, Stinson J, et al. Judging the quality of evidence in reviews of
709		1 i 10 1196 /2016 4052 2 71
710	4.4	uor.10.1160/2040-4055-2-71 Beauchet O. Selthen H. Leuney C.B. Caudreau D. Moreia IAIA, Alleli C. Beletionshin
712	44.	between motoric cognitive risk sundrome, cardiovascular risk factors and diseases, and
712		incident cognitive impairment: Results from the "Nu A co" study. Maturitas
713		2020:138/Max):51-57. doi:10.1016/i.moturitae.2020.05.007
714	45	Beauchet O. Salthon H. Cooper Brown L. et al. Motoric cognitive rick syndrome and
716	43.	incident dementia in older adults from the Québec Nu Age schort. An Aging Dublished
717		online November 17, 2020, doi:10.1093/ageing/afaa235
718	46	Kumai K. Meguro K. Kasai M. et al. Neuroepidemiologic and Neurobehavioral
710	т 0,	Characteristics of Motoric Cognitive Risk Syndrome in an Old-Old Population: The
720		Kurihara Project Dement Ceriate Coan Dis Extra 2016;6(2):176-182
720		doi:10.1159/000445539
722	47	Liu V. Wei K. Cao X. et al. Development and Validation of a Nomogram Based on
723	• • •	Motoric Cognitive Risk Syndrome for Cognitive Impairment Front Aging Neurosci
724		2021:13:618833 doi:10.3389/fnagi 2021.618833
725	48.	Chhetri IK Zheng Z Xu X Ma C Chan P. The prevalence and incidence of frailty in
726		Pre-diabetic and diabetic community-dwelling older population: Results from Beijing
72.7		longitudinal study of aging II (BLSA-II). BMC Geriatr. 2017:17(1). doi:10.1186/s12877-
728		017-0439-v
729	49.	Study Quality Assessment Tools NHLBI, NIH. Accessed April 15, 2021.
730		https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools
731	50.	Vandenbroucke JP, Von Elm E, Altman DG, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of
732		Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): Explanation and elaboration. PLoS
733		Med. 2007;4(10):1628-1654. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0040297
734	51.	Wolff RF, Moons KGM, Riley RD, et al. PROBAST: A tool to assess the risk of bias and
735		applicability of prediction model studies. Ann Intern Med. 2019;170(1):51-58.
736		doi:10.7326/M18-1376

737 52. McGuinness L. robvis: An R package and web application for visualising risk-of-bias

738 assessments. Published online 2019.

- 740 Table 1 Characteristics of studies
- 741 Table 2 GRADE assessment of certainty in results
- 742 Table 3 Excluded studies

744 **Table 1** Characteristics and results of the studies included in the meta-analysis (further details in supplementary table 3)

MCR as a predictor of Dementia						
Stu dy	Size	MCR prevalence %	Age mean years	Result (95% CI)		
Doi et al. (2017)	4235	6.3	72	2.49 (1.52, 4.1) p<0.001		
Verghese et al. (2013)	767	6.8	79.9	2.72 (1.24, 5.97) p=0.013		
Verghese et al. (2014a1i)	1280	13	79.9	2.1 (1.43, 2.09)		
Verghese et al. (2014a2i)	1013	13	75.1	1.98 (1.44, 2.74)		
Verghese et al. (2014a3i)	1562	9	72.3	1.79 (1.31, 2.44)		
Beauchet et al. (2020c)	1098	4.2	73.8	5.18 (2.43, 11.03) p≤0.001		

MCR as a predictor of Cognitive Impairment

Stu dy	Size	MCR prevalence %	Age mean years	Result (95% CI)	
Aguilar-Navarro et al. (2019)	726	14.3	69.8	2.46 (1.25, 4.84) p=0.009	
Verghese et al. (2014a1)	1280	13	79.9	1.49 (1.08, 2.07) p=0.015	
Verghese et al. (2014a2)	1013	13	75.1	1.9 (1.44, 2.51) p=0.001	
Verghese et al. (2014a3)	1562	9	72.3	1.48 (1.16, 1.88) p=0.002	
Verghese et al. (2014a4)	700	8	74.1	2.74 (1.54, 4.86) p=0.001	
Liu et al. (2021)	1177	6.7	65	1.95 (1.21, 2.82)	

MCR as a predictor of Falls

Stu dy	Size	MCR prevalence %	Age mean years	Result (95% CI)
Callisaya et al. (2016a1)	509	11	75	1.06 (0.74, 1.52)
Callisaya et al. (2016a2)	817	12.1	79.7	1.18 (0.93, 1.49)
Callisaya et al. (2016a3)	3640	6.7	74.4	1.37 (1.18, 1.58)
Callisaya et al. (2016a4)	832	6.9	73.5	1.78 (1.23, 2.55)
Callisaya et al.	406	1.7	72	2.15 (1.57, 2.94)

(2016a5)					
Beauchet et al. (2019b)	5958	9.9	80.2	1.18 (1.02, 1.36)	
Lord et al. (2020a1)	302	1.9	84.6	1.67 (0.86, 3.23)	
Lord et al. (2020a2)	176	4.3	82.6	0.46 (0.07, 2.83)	

MCR as a predictor of Mortality

Stu dy	Size	MCR prevalence %	Age mean years	Result (95% CI)
Ayers and Verghese (2016a1)	4686	8	74.7	1.87 (1.54, 2.28)
Ayers and Verghese (2016a2)	6795	6.4	77.3	1.62 (1.21, 2.16)
Ayers and Verghese (2016a3)	4559	7	81.7	1.5 (1.04, 2.16)
Beauchet et al. (2019a)	3778	10.1	80.5	1.09 (0.89, 1.34) p=0.401

745 Note: Results are adjusted hazard ratios except for those cohorts with falls as the outcome, which are adjusted relative risk. MCR (Motoric Cognitive Risk); CI (Confidence Interval)

748 Table 2: GRADE assessment of certainty in the body of evidence for MCR as a predictor of each health outcome

Participants and setting: Longitudinal cohort studies of older adults in community settings Exposure: MCR or both of its components, objective slow gait speed and subjective cognitive complaint Comparator: a non-MCR group

Outcomes & Effect size (95%CI)	No.	Phase	ROB	Inconsist.	Imprecis.	Indirect.	Pub. bias	Effect size	GRADE certainty of evidence
Dementia aHR 2.12 (1.85-2.42)	9955	\bigcirc	\bigcirc			\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	
Cognitive Impairment aHR 1.76 (1.49-2.08)	6458	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	⊕⊕22 Low
Falls aRR 1.38 (1.15-1.66)	12640	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	
Mortality aHR 1.49 (1.16-1.91)	19818	\bigcirc		\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	

 $\begin{array}{c} 749 \\ 750 \end{array}$ Note: aHR (adjusted hazard ratio); aRR (adjusted relative risk); No. (Number of participants in pooled meta-analysis for each outcome); Phase

(Phase of Investigation); ROB (Risk of Bias); Inconsist. (Inconsistency); Imprecis. (Imprecision); Indirect. (Indirectness); Pub. Bias (Publication Bias)

751 High certainty: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect. Moderate certainty: We are moderately confident in 752 753 the effect estimate – the true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different. Low certainty: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited – the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect.

754

756 757

_

Table 3 Characteristics of studies excluded from meta-analysis due to incompatible effect measures or lack of similar studies

-										
Stu dy	Outcome	Country	Cohort	Size	Female %	MCR prevalence %	Age mean years	Time years	Result (95% CI)	ROB
Beauchet et al. (2020a)	Dementia	France	EPIDOS	651	100	13.5*	79.5	7	aOR 2.07 (1.06-4.02) p=0.033	Mod.
Kumai et al. (2016)	Dementia	Japan	Kurihara	516	61	11.1	79.8	4	aOR 1.38 (NR)	High
Allali et al. (2016)	Cognitive Impairment	USA	ССМА	314	32	8	79.4	2	aOR 3.59 (1.30-10.10) p=0.016	Mod.
Beauchet et al. (2020b)	Cognitive Impairment	Canada	NuAGE	1113	51.9	4.2	73.8	3	aOR 5.16 (CI 2.20- 12.08) p≤0.001	Mod.

Lack of similar studies

Stu dy	Outcome	Country	Cohort	Size	Female %	MCR prevalence %	Age mean years	Time years	Result (95% CI) p-value	ROB
Doi 2017	Disability	Japan	OSHPE	4235	50	6.3	72	2.5	aHR 2.25 (1.39-3.67) p=0.001	Low
Beauchet 2019b	Falls recurrence (>=2)	France	EPIDOS	5958	100	9.9	80.2	4	aHR 1.46 (1.04-2.05) p=0.030	Mod.
Beauchet 2019b	Post-fall hip fractures	France	EPIDOS	5958	100	9.9	80.2	4	aHR 2.54 (1.78-3.63) p≤0.001	Mod.

758

759 760 Note: *MCR prevalence is different to that reported in the study abstract as we calculated 88 / 651 had MCR (47 slowed walking, 41 slowed

walking and slowed five-times sit-to-stand).

761 MCR (Motoric Cognitive Risk); CI (Confidence Interval); ROB (Risk of Bias); aOR (adjusted odds ratio); aHR (adjusted hazards ratio); HR

762 (bazard ratio); NR (not reported); CCMA (Central Control of Mobility in Aging); OSHPE (Obu Study of Health Promotion for the Elderly);

763 NuAGE (Quebec Longitudinal Study on Nutrition and Successful Aging); EPIDOS (Epidemiologie de l'Osteoporose);



From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71. For more information, visit: <u>http://www.prisma-statement.org/</u>

Bias due to study focus Bias due to cohort Bias due to MCR measurement Bias due to outcome measurement Bias due to missing data Bias due to confounding Bias due to follow-up Bias due to results precision Bias due to generalisability Overall



+ Low

		Risk of bias domains									
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	D8	D9	Overall
	Aguilar-Navarro 2019	-	-	-	+	-	+	×	+	+	+
	Ayers 2016	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+
	Beauchet 2019a	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	X	-
	Beauchet 2019b	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	X	-
	Beauchet 2020c	+	-	+	-	-	×	+	X	-	•
Study	Callisaya 2016	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
	Doi 2017	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+
	Liu 2021	-	+	-	+	+	X	+	+	-	-
	Lord 2020	-	+	-	-	+	X	+	-	-	×
	Verghese 2013	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
	Verghese 2014	+	+	+	+	×	+	+	+	+	+
		D1: Bias due to	study focus								Judgement
		D3: Bias due to D4: Bias due to	MCR measurem outcome measu	ient rement							🗙 High - Unclear

D5: Bias due to missing data

D6: Bias due to confounding

D7: Bias due to follow-up

D8: Bias due to results precision D9: Bias due to generalisability





Lord et al. (2020a1)

Heterogeneity: I2 = 62.1%, tau2 = 0.039 p = 0.0005

LILACS Non-Maori

302

176

0.5

Cohort Size



1	.67	[0.86; 3.24] 5.7%
	.46	[0.07; 2.92] 0.9%
1 5 risk ratio	.38	[1.15; 1.66 [0.81; 2.36] 100.0%]



Random effect model total Prediction interval

Study

Heterogeneity: 12 = 79.2%, tau2 = 0.0447 p = 0.002





Adjusted HR

0

5

2.2

Cognitive Impairment