

1 **Title page**

2 **Depressive symptoms are associated with differential cognitive and neuroanatomical**
3 **alterations in young and older adults**

4 Eyal Bergmann^{1, 2*†}, Daniel Harlev^{1, 3, 4*}, Cam-CAN⁵, Noham Wolpe^{3, 6}

5

6 ¹Department of Psychiatry, Rambam Health Care Campus, Haifa, Israel

7 ²Department of Neuroscience, Mortimer B. Zuckerman Mind Brain Behavior Institute,
8 Columbia University, New York, NY

9 ³Department of Physical Therapy, The Stanley Steer School of Health Professions, Faculty
10 of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

11 ⁴Rappaport Faculty of Medicine, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel

12 ⁵Cambridge Centre for Ageing and Neuroscience, University of Cambridge and MRC
13 Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, Cambridge, UK.

14 ⁶Sagol School of Neuroscience, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.

15

16 *These authors contributed equally to this work.

17

18 Word count: 2941

19 Number of Tables: 3

20 Number of figures: 2

21

22 † Corresponding author:

23 Send correspondence to Dr. Bergmann (e_bergmann@rambam.health.gov.il), Department
24 of Psychiatry, Rambam Health Care Campus, POB 9649 Bat Galim, Haifa 31096, Israel

25

26

27 **Abstract**

28 **Objective:** Depression is a heterogeneous disorder. The purpose of this article is to
29 examine the contribution of age to this heterogeneity by characterizing the associations of
30 depressive symptoms with cognitive performance and brain structure across the lifespan.

31 **Methods:** The authors analyzed demographic variables (age, gender, education), affective
32 measures (Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale), and cognitive assessments (The
33 Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination Revised) from the Cambridge Centre for Ageing
34 Neuroscience (Cam-CAN) cohort (N=2591, age 18-99). A subset of this cohort (N=647)
35 underwent structural MRI, which was used for voxel-based brain morphometry.

36 **Results:** A linear regression model revealed a significant interaction between age and
37 depression score, indicating that depression-related cognitive dysfunction is more severe
38 in older adults. A comparison of different cognitive domains showed that this effect was
39 consistent across all tested domains but significantly more prominent for fluency. A
40 complementary voxel-based morphometry analysis, based on similar regression models,
41 revealed age by depression interactions in several brain regions, demonstrating preferential
42 age-related reduction in grey matter volume in the left and right hippocampi in older adults.

43 The reciprocal contrast revealed preferential reduction in grey matter in the left superior
44 frontal gyrus, left middle frontal gyrus, and left superior parietal lobule in younger adults.

45 **Conclusions:** These findings indicate that the associations of depression with cognitive
46 performance and brain structure are age-dependent, suggesting that the neuropathological
47 mechanisms underlying depression may differ between young and older adults.
48 Recognizing these differences will support the development of better diagnostic tools and
49 therapeutic interventions for depression across the lifespan.

50 **Introduction**

51 Depression is a complex and heterogeneous psychiatric disorder that affects many
52 individuals across the lifespan (1). The definition of clinical depression, or Major
53 Depressive Disorder (MDD), is based on categorical diagnoses as outlined in diagnostic
54 manuals, such as the ICD-11 and DSM 5 (2, 3). However, these diagnostic categories often
55 fall short of fully characterizing each individual's unique clinical profile and thus fail to
56 capture the significant heterogeneity of the disorder. This is important clinically, because
57 failing to distinguish between neurobiologically distinct clinical entities within depression
58 (4) can lead to ineffective treatment (5). A major goal in psychiatric research is thus to
59 better characterize patient variability to support better diagnosis of depression subtypes and
60 treatment personalization.

61

62 A major contributor to the clinical heterogeneity of depression is variability in symptoms.
63 For example, the criteria for MDD typically encompasses a wide spectrum of various, at
64 times contradictory, symptomatology (6), such as insomnia and hypersomnia. Moreover,
65 across symptoms, patients may present with very different symptomatology, but still be
66 diagnosed with depression. In the extreme case, two patients diagnosed with MDD may
67 share no single symptom, Symptom heterogeneity may also be expressed in symptom
68 severity, which can lead to 'subclinical' depressive symptoms that fall below the diagnostic
69 threshold for MDD (7). Studies adopting such a 'dimensional psychiatry' approach for
70 depression (8) have shown that such depressive symptoms still have a substantial impact
71 on well-being and psychosocial functioning (9), emphasizing the need for more patient-
72 specific intervention strategies.

73 Another major source of heterogeneity in depression is sociodemographic variation, and
74 particularly aging. When compared to Early Life Depression (ELD), Late Life Depression
75 (LLD) is often associated with poorer treatment response (10), as well as with distinct
76 symptomatology (11) and brain alterations (12). Moreover, multiple cognitive domains are
77 impacted in depression, and the specific domains impacted by depression may differ in
78 young vs. older adults, although conflicting evidence has been reported (13) .

79

80 The diverse symptomatology, brain changes, and cognitive impairments in ELD and LLD
81 suggest that these conditions, although diagnosed and treated similarly, may reflect distinct
82 pathophysiology. However, to date, studies have predominantly focused on either young
83 or elderly populations separately, often failing to capture the complex interaction between
84 normative aging processes, depressive symptoms and consideration of specific cognitive
85 changes. In addition, most studies define depression as a categorical disorder rather than a
86 dimensional condition (8). Here, we sought to investigate the interaction between age,
87 depressive symptoms and cognitive functions in a large, population-derived cohort of
88 individuals across the lifespan. We examined depressive symptoms along a continuum of
89 severity, while accounting for medication status, and compared the cognitive and
90 neuroanatomical differences associated with depressive symptoms between young and
91 older adults. Our overarching hypothesis is that depressive symptoms in young and older
92 adults represent distinct clinical entities. More specifically, we hypothesized that
93 depressive symptoms would be associated with distinct cognitive and brain differences in
94 older vs. young adults.

95 **Methods**

96 **Participants**

97 We conducted data analysis utilizing the extensive dataset from the Cambridge Centre for
98 Ageing and Neuroscience (Cam-CAN), which is a large-scale project focusing on
99 normative aging (14). The initial recruitment process involved an opt-out strategy to
100 maximize representation across different population groups, with a similar representation
101 across age deciles, as previously described (15). Data included in this study was from Stage
102 1 (CC3000) and Stage 2 (CC700). Ethical approval was granted by the local ethics
103 committee, Cambridgeshire 2 (now East of England – Cambridge Central) Research Ethics
104 Committee (reference: 10/H0308/50). Written informed consent was obtained from all
105 participants before commencing the study. The study conforms to the provisions of the
106 Declaration of Helsinki.

107

108 **Behavioral data acquisition**

109 In Stage 1, n=2681 participants completed a home interview, providing detailed
110 demographic questionnaires on age, sex, education level, lifestyle, and medical history.
111 Cognitive functioning was assessed using various neuropsychological tests, including the
112 Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination-Revised (16), which is a widely used cognitive
113 battery designed for dementia screening that assesses multiple cognitive domains, namely
114 orientation, memory, fluency, language, and visuospatial abilities. As the domains differ
115 in their maximal score, the values were normalized to a range between 0 and 1 for
116 interpretability. Affective symptoms were measured using the Hospital Anxiety and
117 Depression Scale (17), which is a 14-item self-reported questionnaire with depression

118 (HADS-D) and anxiety (HADS-A) subscales. After exclusion of participants with missing
 119 demographic or clinical information, the final cohort included 2591 participants. **Table 1**
 120 provides an overview of the key variables, including age, sex, scores on the HADS-D,
 121 HADS-A, and the ACE-R, across the age deciles.
 122

Age	N	Sex M/F	HADS-D mean (SD)	HADS-A mean (SD)	ACE-R mean (SD)	Education*			
						None	GCSE	A Levels	University
18-29	248	103 / 145	3.39 (2.73)	6.17 (3.56)	93.2 (6.92)	4	14	45	185
30-39	354	153 / 201	2.89 (3.11)	5.98 (3.32)	94.1 (6.33)	5	8	14	327
40-49	314	138 / 176	2.78 (2.75)	5.46 (3.26)	94.8 (5.36)	10	15	9	280
50-59	263	128 / 135	2.85 (3.22)	5.72 (3.68)	93.8 (6.46)	19	9	17	218
60-69	375	175 / 200	3.02 (2.74)	4.91 (3.18)	93.3 (6.75)	54	34	17	270
70-79	434	207 / 227	3.01 (3.33)	4.77 (3.39)	89.4 (8.07)	119	33	16	266
80-89	521	210 / 311	4.24 (2.92)	4.31 (3.14)	84.6 (10.8)	173	35	17	296
90-99	82	23 / 59	4.84 (3.14)	4.22 (3.26)	79.7 (11.5)	35	10	0	37
Total	2591	1137 / 1454	3.31 (2.9)	5.16 (3.39)	90.8 (8.97)	419	158	135	1879

123 **Table 1. demographic, affective and cognitive variables in Cam-CAN cohort**

124 * Categorized according to the British education system: “none” = no education over the
 125 age of 16 y; “GCSE” = General Certificate of Secondary Education; “A Levels” = General
 126 Certificate of Education Advanced Level; “University” = undergraduate or graduate
 127 degree.
 128

129 **Structural neuroimaging acquisition and pre-processing**

130 In Stage 2, a subset of participants (n=656) underwent more extensive cognitive testing
 131 and neuroimaging. Exclusion criteria are described at length in the original report (14)
 132 including: significant cognitive impairment, communication difficulties, significant

133 medical problems, mobility problems, substance abuse, and MRI/MEG safety and comfort
134 issues.

135

136 Neuroimaging data acquisition and pre-processing is described at length in Taylor et al.
137 (15). In brief, participants were scanned with a 3T Siemens TIM Trio with a 32-channel
138 head coil. A T1-weighted MPRAGE image was acquired (repetition time 2250 ms, echo
139 time 2.99 ms, inversion time 900 ms, field angle 9°, field-of-view
140 256 mm × 240 mm × 192 mm, isotropic 1 mm voxels.) The MRI data of six participants
141 were not included in the analysis due to technical problems during scanning or pre-
142 processing. Together with the exclusion of three participants due to missing
143 sociodemographic information, 647 participants were included in the structural imaging
144 analyses. A comparison between the clinical and demographic data of participants included
145 in stage 1 and stage 2 is shown in **Suppl. Table 1**. The structural images were pre-processed
146 for a voxel-based morphometry (VBM) analysis using SPM12
147 (www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm) as previously described (15). Multimodal segmentation was
148 used to reduce age-biased tissue priors. Diffeomorphic Anatomical Registration Through
149 Exponentiated Lie Algebra approach was applied to improve inter-participant alignment
150 (18) as follows. Segmented images were warped to a project-specific template while
151 modelling the shape of each brain. The resulting images were affine transformed to the
152 Montreal Neurological Institute space using the template and individual brain parameters.
153 Voxel size of the normalized images was 1 mm isotropic. These normalization steps were
154 followed by modulation by the Jacobean of the combined transformations (to preserve
155 volume) and smoothing with an 10-mm full width at half maximum (19).

156 **Statistical analysis**

157 Statistical analysis of behavior examined the relationship between depressive symptoms
158 and cognitive performance. Descriptive statistics and regression models were employed to
159 explore the associations of interest: to examine the effects of depression and age on total
160 ACE-R score, we used a linear regression model with HADS-D, age and their interaction
161 as covariates. Sex (categorical variable), education (ordinal variables), current use of
162 antidepressants (categorical variable), anxiety (HADS-A), and anxiety by age interaction
163 were included as covariates of no interest. All analyses were performed with R version
164 2023.09.0+463 (20). For the comparison between cognitive domains, a liner-mixed effects
165 model was used using *lmer* package (21). The interaction of cognitive domain, age and
166 depression was calculated using type III analysis of variance (22). Bayesian Information
167 Criteria was used to compare model goodness of fit (23).

168

169 For the structural imaging analyses, a multiple regression was conducted to generate a
170 statistical parametric map of differences in grey matter volume in relation to age and
171 depression. Depression, age, and the (mean-corrected and orthogonalized) interaction term
172 between depression and age were included as the main covariates of interest. Covariates of
173 no interest included those from the regression model of behaviour (above), in addition to
174 handedness as a numerical variable (24) and total intracranial volume. Clusters were
175 identified at $p < 0.05$, family-wise-error- (FWE-) corrected. Labelling of significant
176 clusters was down using MRIcron software (<https://people.cas.sc.edu/rorden/mricron/>).
177 For visualization purposes in the figures of interactions in both behavioural and
178 neuroimaging data, participant data were grouped into categorical age groups (18-39, 40-

179 64, 65+) and depression (HADS-D<4, HADS-D=4-7, HADS-D>7) groups (17). However,

180 all analyses were performed with age and depression as continuous variables.


181

182 **Results**

183 **Depression and cognition across age**

184 To characterize the relationship between depression and cognition across age, we
185 submitted these measures to a linear regression analysis. The model was significant
186 (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.279$, $P < 0.001$), and showed that both HADS-D and HADS-A were
187 significantly associated with ACE-R scores (**Supp. Table 2**), such that higher HADS-D
188 but lower HADS-A, were associated with lower ACE-R. Importantly, including age x
189 HADS-D and age x HADS-A interactions in the model significantly improved the model
190 fit ($R^2=0.289$, BIC of 17912 vs. 17930). This model (**Table 2**) showed a positive age x
191 HADS-D interaction, with an age-dependent increase in the effect of depression (**Fig. 1A**).
192 In addition, a negative age x HADS-A interaction was observed with an age-dependent
193 decrease in the effect of anxiety on ACE-R. Collectively, these results suggest differential
194 age-dependent relationship between affective symptoms and global cognitive performance.
195 We next examined the association between these affective symptoms and specific cognitive
196 domains.

197



198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210

Figure 1. The association between age, depression, and cognitive performance. (A) Illustration of the significant interaction effect of age x depression on total ACE-R score. Total ACE-R score plotted against age for different HADS-D scores. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean. Age and depression scores are grouped for visualization purposes only and were entered as continuous variables into the regression models. (B) Same as (A), but for the specific ACE-R domains. As the domains differ in their maximal score, the values were normalized to range between 0 and 1 for interpretability. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean. (C) Illustration of the effects of age x depression interaction on specific cognitive domains. Grey dot indicates mean beta coefficient of the interaction term for each domain, with error bars showing 95% confidence interval.

Variable	Total ACE-R score			
	β estimate	β SE	z-value	p-value
(Intercept)	93.26	1.05	88.95	< 0.001
Sex	-0.10	0.01	-7.13	0.82
Education	-0.07	0.30	-0.23	< 0.001
Antidepressants	2.33	0.14	16.76	0.034
Age	-1.37	0.64	-2.13	< 0.001
HADS-D	0.33	0.19	1.79	0.073
HADS-A	-0.43	0.15	-2.80	0.005
Age \times HADS-D	-0.02	0.00	-5.57	< 0.001
Age \times HADS-A	0.01	0.00	3.89	< 0.001

211 **Table 2. Demographic and affective predictors of total ACE-R score in the linear**
 212 **regression model.**
 213

214 A linear mixed model revealed as significant interactions between cognitive domain, age,
 215 and HADS-D (Wald $\chi^2(4) = 36.4$, $P < 0.001$) and cognitive domain, age and HADS-A
 216 (Wald $\chi^2(4) = 17.39$, $P = 0.002$). To break down this 3-way interaction, we repeated the
 217 analysis for each domain separately and compared the estimates of age \times HADS-D
 218 interactions between each pair of cognitive domains (**Fig. 1B**). While all domains showed
 219 a significant association with the interaction between age \times HADS-D, the magnitude of
 220 these associations differed (**Fig. 1C, Suppl. Table 3-6**). A statistical comparison between
 221 domains showed stronger interaction in fluency, compared to orientation ($t = 4.73$, $P <$
 222 0.001), memory ($t = 3.96$, $P < 0.001$) and language ($t = 4.61$, $P < 0.001$). A marginally
 223 significant difference was also observed between fluency and visuospatial abilities ($t =$
 224 2.67 , $P = 0.075$, all tests were Bonferroni corrected for multiple comparisons).
 225 Comparisons between other pairs of domains were insignificant (**Suppl. Table 7**).
 226 Together, these findings indicate a reduction in cognitive performance with increased

227 depressive symptoms and age, with fluency showing the most significant reduction across
228 most cognitive domains.

229

230 **Depression and brain structure across age**


231 To characterize the brain correlates of depressive symptoms by age, we used VBM in 647
232 participants that underwent brain imaging. This subset of participants was more balanced
233 in terms of age, sex distribution and level of education. Importantly, they all had lower
234 HADS-D and higher ACE-R scores compare to subset of participants that were not scanned
235 (**Suppl. Table 1**).

236

237 The structural brain imaging analyses showed five clusters where grey matter volume was
238 associated with age x HADS-D, i.e., with age-dependent effects of depression (**Fig. 2A**,
239 **Table 3**). To interpret this interaction, we plotted grey matter volume from these areas as
240 a function of age and HADS-D score (**Fig. 2B**). There was an age-dependent increase in
241 the relationship between HADS-D and brain volume in the left and right hippocampi. By
242 contrast, the left superior frontal gyrus (SFG), middle frontal gyrus (MFG) and left superior
243 parietal lobule (SPL) showed an age-dependent decrease in this relationship. Collectively,
244 these results indicate that depressive symptoms are associated with different brain
245 structures as a function of age.

Brain region	K_E	Coordinates			T-score
		x	y	z	
Positive interaction					
L Superior Frontal Gyrus	516	-21	44	47	5.3
L Middle Frontal Gyrus	511	-50	32	31	5.28
L Lateral Occipital Cortex	380	-27	-62	66	5.54
		-16	-70	64	4.58
Negative interaction					
L Hippocampus	898	-27	-12	-13	5.02
R Hippocampus	214	25	-13	-11	4.64

246 **Table 3: Summary of peak coordinates and statistics for the cluster showing an age x**
 247 **HADS-D interaction.** K_E indicates cluster size in number of voxels.
 248



249

250 **Figure 2. Age-dependent differences in structural correlates of depressive symptoms.**
251 (A) Voxel-based morphometry results showing significant interactions between age and
252 HADS-D. (B) Illustration of the effects of age and depression on grey matter volume from
253 (A). The results illustrate the differences grey matter volume (mean corrected) across age,
254 as a function of HADS-D score. Results are shown for the five clusters from (A), labelled
255 according to MRICron. Note that HADS-D and age are displayed as categorical variables
256 for illustration purposes but were entered as continuous variables in the analyses.
257

258 **Discussion**

259 Our findings show that the association between depression and reduced cognitive
260 performance is more pronounced with aging. This was found across different cognitive
261 domains and was particularly prominent for fluency. Moreover, structural brain imaging
262 revealed that depressive symptoms are associated with reduced grey matter volume in
263 different brain regions as a function of age. Together, our findings suggest that the
264 associations of depression with cognition and brain structure are different for young and
265 older adults. These results emphasize the possibly distinct pathophysiology underlying
266 depression across the lifespan.

267

268 Previous studies examined the effect of ELD and LLD on cognition separately. These
269 studies reported a modest reduction in executive functions and memory in ELD (25). In
270 LLD, a reduction in cognitive performance was found in multiple domains, including
271 attention, executive functions, memory, and processing speed (26). Among these domains,
272 reduced cognitive performance in LLD was most pronounced in executive functions (27),
273 with approximately 30% of depressed older adults exhibiting impaired performance in this
274 domain (28). Here, we replicated a depression-related reduction in cognitive performance
275 with age, which was most pronounced in the fluency domain – a cognitive domain strongly
276 dependent on executive control (29). Importantly, by analyzing these effects continuously
277 across the lifespan within the same study, we showed that this effect is age-specific, as it
278 was not observed in younger adults, which is consistent with a modest depression-related
279 cognitive changes in young adults (30).

280

281 Our finding that depressive symptoms in old age are associated with reduced executive
282 function is in close agreement with research on the so-called ‘Depression-Executive
283 Dysfunction’ (DED) syndrome. This clinical syndrome presents a unique combination of
284 neurocognitive and neuropsychiatric features (31). DED syndrome is characterized by a
285 combination of neurocognitive deficits, alongside neuropsychiatric symptoms such as
286 apathy and psychomotor retardation (32). These features collectively contribute to a
287 distinct clinical presentation in older adults with LLD. The clinical significance of the DED
288 syndrome is substantial, as executive dysfunction has been identified as a predictor of poor
289 response to antidepressant treatments in late-life depression (31). Additionally, it is
290 associated with early relapse and recurrence of depression in old age, highlighting the
291 importance of considering the cognitive dimension of depression in older adults when
292 designing treatment strategies (28).

293

294 The analysis of brain structure identified several brain regions that are differentially
295 affected by depression across the lifespan. In older adults, depressive symptoms were
296 associated with reduced hippocampal volume compared to their non-depressed
297 counterparts, whereas in young adults the opposite trend was observed. This finding is
298 consistent with a recent study pointing to a similar link in subclinical depressive symptoms
299 in older adults (33). Importantly, the age-dependent effect explains the variability reported
300 in previous studies of MDD, as differences in hippocampal volumes were observed in
301 older, but not young cohorts (34). Conversely, in younger adults, we found that depressive
302 symptoms are associated with reduced grey matter volume in frontal and parietal
303 association cortices. These regions are typically part of the Default, Dorsal Attention and

304 Frontoparietal networks – networks which typically show alterations in MDD as found in
305 a recent meta-analysis (35). Examining age distributions in this meta-analysis (c.f. eTable
306 1), the average age was 37.77 years with only 20% of the participants being older than 65.
307 Another meta-analysis by Zhukovsky et al. compared structural and functional alterations
308 in ELD with MDD and LLD (36). The results revealed that changes in frontoparietal and
309 dorsal attention networks were common to both age groups. Our findings are somewhat
310 inconsistent, we found preferential reduction in grey matter volume in young adults with
311 depressive symptoms in regions of these networks. This may stem from different
312 neuropathology underlying subclinical depression and MDD, but a more likely explanation
313 is age differences in the LLD group that was examined. In the 17 studies included in
314 Zhukovsky et al., the mean age was 68.4 years (SD = 6.1 years, range 55-79 years), and
315 the total number of ELD cases was much larger than the LLD (6362 vs. 535). In contrast, in our
316 study more than a third of the participants in the neuroimaging cohort were over 65 and
317 were recruited using the same approach as the young participants, reducing the risk for a
318 selection bias. Yet, further research is needed to address this question, and a promising
319 avenue is longitudinal imaging of participant over aging to examine within-participant
320 effects.

321

322 The distinct cognitive and neuroanatomical correlates of depressive symptoms found
323 across age support the possibility that depression in young and older adults reflects a
324 distinct clinical condition (37). This has important clinical implications, as most clinical
325 trials of depression treatment have been conducted in young adults, and, indeed, depressed
326 older adults show poorer clinical response to these treatments (10). Moreover, our study

327 is consistent with previous research showing that in LLD, depression may be both a risk
328 factor for, and a manifestation of cognitive decline (38). A better understanding of
329 depression heterogeneity in general, and with aging in particular, offers promising
330 prospects for more tailored interventions in the future.

331

332 **Strengths and limitations**

333 The presented research benefits from several noteworthy strengths. The study employs
334 validated scales and cognitive assessment tools with robust structural imaging analyses in
335 a large population-derived cohort across the lifespan. Participants were diverse and more
336 representative of the population, with balanced sociodemographic characteristics, spanning
337 all age groups and with a similar number of participants in each age decile. All analyses
338 were performed with age, affective symptoms, cognitive performance, and brain structure
339 measures as continuous variables, which takes into account the heterogeneity in population.
340 These features improve generalizability, which is so urgently needed in clinical research.
341 However, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of our study. First, its cross-
342 sectional nature hinders our ability to establish causal relationships or evaluate alterations
343 in depressive symptoms and neuroimaging patterns over time. Second, in the current study,
344 we looked at depressive symptoms without accounting for symptom identity, limiting
345 inferences about the contribution of specific symptoms to cognitive and brain structure
346 measures. Third, the assessment of depressive symptoms relied on self-report
347 questionnaires, which are inherently subjective and may be influenced by factors such as
348 the participant's honesty, self-awareness, and introspective abilities.

349

350 **Conclusion**

351 Our study reveals that while depression and aging are consistently associated with
352 cognitive deficits, cognitive domains are differentially affected by depression as a function
353 of age, with fluency being particularly affected with depressive symptoms in older adults.
354 Moreover, the distinct brain correlates of depression across age in our study raise the
355 possibility for different underlying biological underpinnings of this complex heterogenous
356 disorder across the lifespan. Further research is warranted to explore these dynamics in
357 greater detail, potentially paving the way for more targeted diagnostic markers and
358 therapeutic interventions tailored to specific age groups.

359

360 **Acknowledgements**

361 We are grateful to the Cam-CAN respondents and their primary care teams in Cambridge
362 for their participation in this study. We thank Dr. Ramit Ravona-Springer for her helpful
363 comments on this work.

364

365 **Conflict of interest:** EB, DH, and NW declare no conflict of interest in relation to the
366 subject of this study.

367

368 **Funding**

369 Cam-CAN research was supported by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences
370 Research Council (BB/H008217/1). NW was supported by an Israel Science Foundation
371 Personal Research Grant (1603/22).

372

373 **References**

- 374 1. Organization WH: WHO menu of cost-effective interventions for mental health.
375 World Health Organization, 2021
- 376 2. Reed GM, First MB, Kogan CS, et al.: Innovations and changes in the ICD-11
377 classification of mental, behavioural and neurodevelopmental disorders. *World*
378 *Psychiatry* 2019; 18:3–19
- 379 3. Regier DA, Kuhl EA, Kupfer DJ: The DSM-5: Classification and criteria changes.
380 *World Psychiatry* 2013; 12:92–98
- 381 4. Jablensky A: Psychiatric classifications: validity and utility. *World Psychiatry* 2016;
382 15:26–31
- 383 5. Alexopoulos GS: Mechanisms and treatment of late-life depression. *Transl*
384 *Psychiatry* 2019; 9:188
- 385 6. Goldberg D: The heterogeneity of “major depression.” *World Psychiatry* 2011;
386 10:226
- 387 7. Briley M, Lépine: The increasing burden of depression. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat*
388 2011; 3
- 389 8. Chmura Kraemer H, Noda A, O’Hara R: Categorical versus dimensional approaches
390 to diagnosis: methodological challenges. *J Psychiatr Res* 2004; 38:17–25
- 391 9. Cuijpers P, Smit F: Subclinical depression: a clinically relevant condition? *Tijdschr*
392 *Voor Psychiatr* 2008; 50:519–528
- 393 10. Roose SP, Schatzberg AF: The efficacy of antidepressants in the treatment of late-
394 life depression. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 2005; 25:S1–S7
- 395 11. Balsis S, Cully JA: Comparing depression diagnostic symptoms across younger and
396 older adults. *Aging Ment Health* 2008; 12:800–806
- 397 12. Du M, Liu J, Chen Z, et al.: Brain grey matter volume alterations in late-life
398 depression. *J Psychiatry Neurosci* 2014; 39:397–406
- 399 13. McDermott LM, Ebmeier KP: A meta-analysis of depression severity and cognitive
400 function. *J Affect Disord* 2009; 119:1–8
- 401 14. Shafto MA, Tyler LK, Dixon M, et al.: The Cambridge Centre for Ageing and
402 Neuroscience (Cam-CAN) study protocol: a cross-sectional, lifespan,
403 multidisciplinary examination of healthy cognitive ageing. *BMC Neurol* 2014;
404 14:1–25

- 405 15. Taylor JR, Williams N, Cusack R, et al.: The Cambridge Centre for Ageing and
406 Neuroscience (Cam-CAN) data repository: Structural and functional MRI, MEG,
407 and cognitive data from a cross-sectional adult lifespan sample. *NeuroImage* 2017;
408 144:262–269
- 409 16. Mioshi E, Dawson K, Mitchell J, et al.: The Addenbrooke’s Cognitive Examination
410 Revised (ACE-R): a brief cognitive test battery for dementia screening. *Int J Geriatr*
411 *Psychiatry* 2006; 21:1078–1085
- 412 17. Bjelland I, Dahl AA, Haug TT, et al.: The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and
413 Depression Scale: An updated literature review. *J Psychosom Res* 2002; 52:69–77
- 414 18. Ashburner J: A fast diffeomorphic image registration algorithm. *Neuroimage* 2007;
415 38:95–113
- 416 19. Kernel Method - an overview | ScienceDirect Topics [Internet][cited 2023 Nov 15]
417 Available from: [https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/biochemistry-genetics-and-](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/biochemistry-genetics-and-molecular-biology/kernel-method)
418 [molecular-biology/kernel-method](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/biochemistry-genetics-and-molecular-biology/kernel-method)
- 419 20. R Core Team: R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Internet].
420 Vienna, Austria, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2020 Available from:
421 <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 422 21. Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RH: lmerTest package: tests in linear
423 mixed effects models. *J Stat Softw* 2017; 82:1–26
- 424 22. Yates F, Cochran WG: The analysis of groups of experiments. *J Agric Sci* 1938;
425 28:556–580
- 426 23. Neath AA, Cavanaugh JE: The Bayesian information criterion: background,
427 derivation, and applications. *WIREs Comput Stat* 2012; 4:199–203
- 428 24. Oldfield RC: The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh inventory.
429 *Neuropsychologia* 1971; 9:97–113
- 430 25. Castaneda AE, Tuulio-Henriksson A, Marttunen M, et al.: A review on cognitive
431 impairments in depressive and anxiety disorders with a focus on young adults. *J*
432 *Affect Disord* 2008; 106:1–27
- 433 26. Thomas AJ, Gallagher P, Robinson LJ, et al.: A comparison of neurocognitive
434 impairment in younger and older adults with major depression. *Psychol Med* 2009;
435 39:725–733
- 436 27. Pimontel MA, Rindskopf D, Rutherford BR, et al.: A Meta-Analysis of Executive
437 Dysfunction and Antidepressant Treatment Response in Late-Life Depression. *Am J*
438 *Geriatr Psychiatry* 2016; 24:31–41

- 439 28. Butters MA, Young JB, Lopez O, et al.: Pathways linking late-life depression to
440 persistent cognitive impairment and dementia. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci* 2008;
441 10:345–357
- 442 29. Shao Z, Janse E, Visser K, et al.: What do verbal fluency tasks measure? Predictors
443 of verbal fluency performance in older adults [Internet]. *Front Psychol* 2014; 5[cited
444 2023 Nov 21] Available from:
445 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00772>
- 446 30. Grant MM, Thase ME, Sweeney JA: Cognitive disturbance in outpatient depressed
447 younger adults: evidence of modest impairment [Internet]. *Biol Psychiatry* 2001;
448 50:35–43[cited 2023 Oct 29] Available from:
449 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0006322300010726>
- 450 31. Alexopoulos GS: Depression in the elderly. *The lancet* 2005; 365:1961–1970
- 451 32. McLennan SN, Mathias JL: The depression-executive dysfunction (DED) syndrome
452 and response to antidepressants: a meta-analytic review. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*
453 2010; 25:933–944
- 454 33. Touron E, Moulinet I, Kuhn E, et al.: Depressive symptoms in cognitively
455 unimpaired older adults are associated with lower structural and functional integrity
456 in a frontolimbic network. *Mol Psychiatry* 2022; 27:5086–5095
- 457 34. Videbech P, Ravnkilde B: Hippocampal volume and depression: a meta-analysis of
458 MRI studies. *Am J Psychiatry* 2004; 161:1957–1966
- 459 35. Kaiser RH, Andrews-Hanna JR, Wager TD, et al.: Large-Scale Network
460 Dysfunction in Major Depressive Disorder: A Meta-analysis of Resting-State
461 Functional Connectivity. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2015; 72:603–611
- 462 36. Zhukovsky P, Anderson JAE, Coughlan G, et al.: Coordinate-Based Network
463 Mapping of Brain Structure in Major Depressive Disorder in Younger and Older
464 Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Am J Psychiatry* 2021; 178:1119–
465 1128
- 466 37. Fiske A, Wetherell JL, Gatz M: Depression in Older Adults. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol*
467 2009; 5:363–389
- 468 38. Taylor WD: Depression in the Elderly. *N Engl J Med* 2014; 371:1228–1236
- 469
- 470

471 **Supplementary Material**

472

473 **Supplementary Table 1. Demographic, affective, and cognitive variables in**
474 **participant subgroups with and without MRI data.**

Variables	Number (percentage %) or mean (standard deviation)		
	MRI+ (n=647)	MRI- (n=1944)	p-value
Age	54.7 (18.6)	62.2 (21.2)	p < 0.001
Sex (=female)	328 (50.7%)	1126(57.9%)	p < 0.001
Education			p < 0.001
None	49 (7.6%)	370 (19%)	
GCSE	43 (6.6%)	115 (5.9%)	
A levels	36 (5.6%)	99 (5.1%)	
University	519 (80.2%)	1360 (70%)	
HADS-D	2.77 (2.54)	3.49 (2.99)	p = 0.001
HADS-A	4.97 (3.31)	5.22 (3.42)	p < 0.001
ACE-R	94.9 (4.71)	89.4 (9.61)	p = 0.95

475

476 **Supplementary Table 2. First order demographic and affective predictors of**
477 **cognition (total ACE-R score).**

Predictors	β estimate	β SE	z-value	p-value
(Intercept)	93.02	0.77	120.16	<0.001
Age	-0.11	0.01	-13.00	<0.001
Sex	0.06	0.31	0.20	0.843
Education	2.38	0.14	16.98	<0.001
Antidepressants use	-1.21	0.65	-1.87	0.062
HADS-D	-0.65	0.06	-10.62	<0.001
HADS-A	0.15	0.04 – 0.25	2.78	0.006

478

479 **Supplementary Table 3. Demographic and affective predictors of orientation**

Orientation				
Predictors	β estimate	β SE	z-value	p-value
(Intercept)	0.95	0.01	86.66	<0.001
Age	0.00	0.00	-3.16	0.002
Sex	0.01	0.00	2.68	0.007
Education	0.02	0.00	10.83	<0.001
Antidepressants use	-0.01	0.01	-1.62	0.105
HADS-D	0.00	0.00	1.10	0.272
HADS-A	0.00	0.00	-1.34	0.181
Age \times HADS-D	0.00	0.00	-2.84	0.005
Age \times HADS-A	0.00	0.00	1.43	0.152
R^2 / R^2 adjusted		0.119		

480

481 **Supplementary Table 4. Demographic and affective predictors of memory**

Memory				
<i>Predictors</i>	β estimate	β SE	z-value	p-value
(Intercept)	0.95	0.02	52.26	< 0.001
Age	0.00	0.00	-8.11	< 0.001
Sex	-0.02	0.01	-4.04	< 0.001
Education	0.03	0.00	12.74	< 0.001
Antidepressants use	-0.03	0.01	-2.70	0.007
HADS-D	0.00	0.00	0.34	0.735
HADS-A	-0.01	0.00	-2.15	0.032
Age \times HADS-D	0.00	0.00	-2.81	0.005
Age \times HADS-A	0.00	0.00	2.89	0.004
R^2 / R^2 adjusted	0.221 / 0.219			

482

483 **Supplementary Table 4. Demographic and affective predictors of fluency**

Fluency				
Predictors	β estimate	β SE	z-value	p-value
(Intercept)	0.89	0.02	42.71	<0.001
Age	0.00	0.00	-5.90	<0.001
Sex	-0.01	0.01	-1.39	0.165
Education	0.04	0.00	12.73	<0.001
Antidepressants use	-0.01	0.01	-0.70	0.486
HADS-D	0.01	0.00	2.71	0.007
HADS-A	-0.01	0.00	-2.65	0.008
Age \times HADS-D	0.00	0.00	-6.14	<0.001
Age \times HADS-A	0.00	0.00	3.99	<0.001
R^2 / R^2 adjusted	0.221 / 0.219			

484

Supplementary Table 5. Demographic and affective predictors of language

Language

Predictors	β estimate	β SE	z-value	p-value
(Intercept)	0.91	0.01	70.35	<0.001
Age	0.00	0.00	-0.54	0.588
Sex	0.01	0.00	2.50	0.013
Education	0.02	0.00	9.41	<0.001
Antidepressants use	0.00	0.01	0.10	0.917
HADS-D	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.905
HADS-A	0.00	0.00	-1.48	0.138
Age \times HADS-D	0.00	0.00	-3.16	0.002
Age \times HADS-A	0.00	0.00	2.31	0.021
R^2 / R^2 adjusted		0.091 / 0.088		

485

486

Supplementary Table 6. Demographic and affective predictors of visuospatial abilities

Visuospatial

Predictors	β estimate	β SE	z-value	p-value
(Intercept)	0.96	0.01	71.54	<0.001
Age	0.00	0.00	-5.15	<0.001
Sex	0.01	0.00	3.30	0.001
Education	0.02	0.00	11.78	<0.001
Antidepressants use	-0.02	0.01	-2.16	0.031
HADS-D	0.01	0.00	3.16	0.002
HADS-A	0.00	0.00	-1.81	0.070
Age \times HADS-D	0.00	0.00	-5.13	<0.001
Age \times HADS-A	0.00	0.00	2.24	0.025
R^2 / R^2 adjusted	0.188 / 0.185			

488 **Supplementary Table 7. Comparison of age-related interaction with depression**
489 **across cognitive domains**

Domain 1	Domain 2	t-value	Uncorrected p-value*
Fluency	Orientation	4.73	< 0.001
Fluency	Language	4.61	< 0.001
Fluency	Memory	3.96	< 0.001
Fluency	Visuospatial	2.67	0.008
Visuospatial	Orientation	2.64	0.008
Visuospatial	Language	2.02	0.043
Visuospatial	Memory	1.17	0.242
Memory	Orientation	0.91	0.36
Memory	Language	0.32	0.752
Language	Orientation	0.75	0.464

490

491 * The significance level (alpha) was adjusted for multiple comparisons using the
492 Bonferroni correction. The original alpha level of 0.05 was divided by the number of
493 comparisons conducted (10), resulting in a Bonferroni-adjusted alpha of 0.005. Statistical
494 significance was determined using this adjusted alpha level.

495