

14 **Abstract**

15 The widely cited Lancet Commission concluded that 40% of dementia cases may be
16 preventable through interventions targeting what they refer to as modifiable risk factors. These
17 risk factors have been widely studied individually, but rarely investigated collectively and across
18 many countries. If these factors are “true” (i.e., impactful) modifiable risk factors, then their
19 independent relationship should be robust across countries and comorbidities. We analyze the
20 cross-country consistency of relationships between these modifiable risk factors and episodic
21 memory, a common predictor of cognition and dementia. Using internationally comparable aging
22 studies in 31 countries including the United States, England and Europe, we estimate regressions
23 of combined immediate and delayed word recall with modifiable risk factors and demographic
24 characteristics. Cross-country differences in culture, policies, economy, and other collective
25 experiences lead to significant variation in lifecycle outcomes, including cognitive decline and
26 modifiable risk factors. Our approach does not conclusively affirm a causal relationship but can
27 identify relationships that are weak or nonexistent. We find a limited number of robust relations:
28 education, depression, and hearing loss show clear, consistent associations with our cognition
29 measure. The evidence for other factors, including obesity, smoking, diabetes, and hypertension
30 is weaker and becomes almost non-existent when correcting for multiple hypotheses testing.
31 The inconsistent relationships across countries between episodic memory and obesity, smoking,
32 diabetes, and hypertension suggest the lack of a causal mechanism leading to cognitive decline –
33 a necessary condition for these risk factors to be modifiable and effective targets for policy
34 interventions aimed at controlling dementia prevalence and cost.

35 **Introduction**

36 The prevalence and cost of dementia are substantial: 55 million people worldwide
37 estimated to rise to 78 million in 2030 and 139 million by 2050 [1]; the global cost of
38 dementia was \$263 billion in 2019, and is projected to reach over \$1.5 trillion in 2050
39 [2]. Reducing this upward trend in prevalence and cost is an international public health
40 priority.

41 The widely cited Lancet Commission concluded that 40% of dementia cases may be
42 preventable, through appropriate interventions targeting what they refer to as modifiable
43 risk factors. These factors include:

- 44 1. Education
- 45 2. Hearing loss
- 46 3. Diabetes
- 47 4. Hypertension
- 48 5. Obesity
- 49 6. Smoking
- 50 7. Depression
- 51 8. Physical inactivity
- 52 9. Social isolation
- 53 10. Traumatic brain injury (TBI)
- 54 11. Alcohol
- 55 12. Air pollution

56 These factors have been widely studied individually, but rarely investigated
57 collectively and across many countries.

58 Abating the rise in dementia prevalence and cost requires identifying risk factors that
59 contribute to cognitive decline (i.e., identifying a causal mechanism) and that are
60 modifiable by a person's behaviors and choices. If these factors are "true" (i.e.,
61 impactful) modifiable risk factors, that is they cause differences in cognitive levels, then
62 there should exist a measurable relationship between the risk factor and measures of
63 cognition. Further, the causal relationship should be robust enough that it is measurable

64 when considering other demographic and risk factors and replicable across
65 environmental contexts, such as across different countries.

66 Our analysis addresses the cross-country consistency of relationships between these
67 modifiable risk factors and cognition. We do not aim to prove these are causal
68 relationships. Rather, we approach the question from the opposite direction – if these
69 relationships are causal, then they should be robust to confounders and be identifiable in
70 many countries. Cross-country differences in culture, policies, economy, and other
71 collective experiences lead to significant variations in lifecycle outcomes, including
72 dementia onset and modifiable risk factors. As we demonstrate, many of these
73 modifiable risk factors are inconsistently associated with our measure of cognition,
74 particularly after accounting for concurrent factors. For factors with inconsistent
75 relationships, this raises the possibility that these factors are more signals of other
76 conditions or dementia itself rather than causal modifiable risk factors of dementia.

77 We examine the relationship between these modifiable risk factors and a measure of
78 cognitive function by analyzing data from an internationally comparable set of aging
79 studies with nationally representative samples covering the United States (Health and
80 Retirement Study, HRS), most of Europe (Survey of Health, Ageing, and Retirement in
81 Europe, SHARE), and England (English Longitudinal Study of Ageing, ELSA) [3–5].
82 These studies have been widely used for aging research. We examine the first seven
83 measures – the remaining five (physical inactivity, social isolation, TBI, alcohol, and air
84 pollution) are left out of our analysis due to the limited availability of common measures
85 for these risk factors across surveys at this time. We measure cognitive function using
86 10-word immediate and delayed word recall, measures of episodic memory, that are

87 consistently asked across surveys. Memory is a key symptom of dementia, and longer
88 word recall tests have a successful history of predicting dementia and cognitive
89 impairment [6,7].

90 **Past research on modifiable risk factors**

91 We briefly review past research on each risk factor's likely mechanisms for affecting
92 cognition and potential analytical challenges when assessing the validity of those mechanisms.

93 **Education**

94 Higher educational attainment is associated with a lower risk of dementia [8–11]. The
95 cognitive reserve hypothesis suggests that those with higher educational attainment may be more
96 able to delay age-related neurodegeneration, but more research is needed to reveal the precise
97 mechanisms [12]. Mediation through socioeconomic status accounts for some of this association
98 [13]. Additionally, performance on cognitive tests improves with education, raising the
99 possibility of misclassification bias [14].

100 **Hearing Loss**

101 Age-related hearing loss in both the peripheral and central auditory systems (detecting and
102 processing sound, respectively) have been associated with an increased risk of dementia [15].
103 Two common, non-mutually exclusive theories on the mechanism for this relationship exist. The
104 sensory deprivation hypothesis proposes that reduced sensory input leads to social isolation and
105 structural changes in the brain that are associated with dementia [16]. The cognitive load
106 hypothesis posits that the increased cognitive resources required for auditory processing diminish
107 the resources required for cognitive processing [17]. Correlations with dementia may arise from
108 unmeasured confounders such as vascular disease and inflammation as well as testing bias due to
109 difficulties with hearing instructions. More research is needed on the impact of hearing aid use

110 on dementia risk, but a recent randomized control trial comparing hearing and health education
111 interventions found that hearing treatment reduced global cognitive decline among participants
112 with greater cognitive impairment risk at baseline but not among healthy participants [18].

113 **Diabetes**

114 Both type 1 and type 2 diabetes increase the risk of dementia, and a younger age at the onset
115 of diabetes is associated with a greater risk [19]. The link between diabetes and dementia is
116 complex, but possible pathways include the increased risk of vascular disease, insulin resistance,
117 hyperglycemia, impaired amyloid beta clearance, hyperphosphorylation of tau protein, oxidative
118 stress, and inflammation [20]. A healthy diet and physical exercise are recommended for
119 diabetes management and have been associated with slowing cognitive decline [21,22]. There is
120 limited evidence on the efficacy of antidiabetic medications and intranasal insulin administration
121 in lowering the risk of dementia [23,24].

122 **Hypertension**

123 There is strong evidence that high blood pressure leads to vascular dementia via
124 cerebrovascular disease [25]. Hypertension exhibits an age-dependent association with dementia,
125 with the greatest increase in risk observed in those with midlife hypertension, as well as those
126 who have persistent hypertension from mid to late life [26]. Late-onset hypertension seems to
127 have no significant association with dementia and may even have a protective effect for those
128 over the age of 80 [27]. Analysis of the impact of antihypertensive medication use remains
129 inconclusive [28].

130 **Obesity**

131 Mid-life obesity is associated with higher dementia risk, potentially through the development
132 of cerebrovascular disease, an increase in inflammation, and changes in the brain structure that

133 elevate dementia risk [29]. In contrast, late-life obesity seems to exert a protective effect on
134 dementia, an association that may be influenced by survival bias, although other mechanisms
135 have been proposed, such as cognitive enhancement by the hormone leptin which is secreted by
136 fat tissues and overexpressed in genes of obese individuals [30,31]. Being underweight in late
137 life has also been associated with a higher risk of dementia, potentially signaling, rather than
138 causing, dementia [32].

139 **Smoking**

140 Current smoking has been associated with an increased risk of dementia but not former
141 smoking [33,34]. Plausible mechanisms include oxidative stress and inflammation that increases
142 amyloid beta concentrations, and increased risk of vascular disease which leads to vascular
143 dementia [35]. In studying the smoking-dementia association, it is necessary to account for the
144 competing risk of death and the selection of “healthy smokers” who survive to old age and may
145 have unmeasured factors that could be protecting them from cognitive decline [9,36].

146 **Depression**

147 Current and recent depression have been associated with a higher likelihood of incident
148 dementia compared to no depression and remitted depression [37]. Depression may increase the
149 risk of vascular dementia through its association with chronic inflammation, high blood pressure,
150 small vessel disease, white matter hyperintensities, and reduced blood flow in the brain [38].
151 Reverse causation could arise if a dementia diagnosis or circumstances around cognitive decline
152 trigger depressive symptoms [39]. There is limited evidence on the effectiveness of
153 antidepressants in lowering the risk of dementia [40].

154 **Implications**

155 The research discussed above documents several physiological connections that may
156 be plausible mechanisms for how the identified modifiable risk factors effect cognition.
157 It also reveals that many of the relationships, as measured, have empirical limitations
158 that raise questions about whether there exists a causal mechanism leading to cognitive
159 decline. Since an experimental design across countries is infeasible, we examine the
160 consistency of relationships between the potentially modifiable risk factors and episodic
161 memory (a key proxy for cognition) across countries, reflecting a wide variety of
162 settings. If these factors are “true” (i.e., impactful) modifiable risk factors, then their
163 independent relationship should be robust across countries and comorbidities. Our
164 approach does not conclusively affirm a causal relationship but can identify
165 relationships that are likely weak or nonexistent.

166 **Methods**

167 **Data**

168 We use data from nationally representative samples of the population age 50 and
169 older from HRS, SHARE, and ELSA for a total of 31 countries in our analysis. All three
170 studies are longitudinal, interview the same respondents biannually, and collect
171 substantial information on respondents and their spouses, including health, cognition,
172 and behaviors. We use data from a respondent’s first interview: there is one observation
173 per respondent, and observations are derived from different interview waves, however
174 the questions used are largely the same. A key motivation for using the respondent’s
175 first interview is that research has found that questions aimed at eliciting cognitive
176 function exhibit improved test scores with re-testing [41]. Sample sizes range from 529

177 in Cyprus to 35,409 in the US, with a total of 173,020 first interviews across the 31
178 countries. Supplementary Appendices A and B provide additional detail on our data,
179 including country and sample selection, summary statistics, and regression results that
180 are relevant for readers interested in the studies, specific questions asked, or wanting to
181 replicate our analyses.

182 **Measures**

183 Our measure of cognitive function is the sum of words recalled from an immediate
184 test and a delayed test in each survey. In these tests, an interviewer reads a list of 10
185 words, and the respondent lists as many words as they can remember (immediate recall).
186 This exercise is repeated after a few questions on a different topic, taking about 5
187 minutes (delayed recall). The word lists vary by study, but are common, simple words.
188 Each respondent's scores are added to create a summary score, which we refer to as the
189 total word recall (TR) score.

190 Measures of modifiable risk factors are self-reported and include years of education,
191 censored at 17 years; hearing ability (possibly when using a hearing aid) on a five-point
192 scale; whether the respondent has been told by a doctor that they have: diabetes or high
193 blood sugar, or high blood pressure or hypertension; a constructed categorical measure
194 of being either obese (body mass index at or above 30), underweight (less than 18.5), or
195 neither based on reported height and weight; a constructed categorical measure of
196 smoking based on whether they report currently being or ever having been a smoker,
197 defined by a smoking period of at least one year; and for depression, a mental health
198 index ranging from 0 to 12 in SHARE, based on EURO-D, and 0 to 8 in HRS and
199 ELSA, based on CESD (see Appendix A.2 for details on differences in survey questions

200 across time and study), that consider a respondent's recent feelings of depression,
201 sadness, happiness, and loneliness, among other indicators of mental health.

202 Risk factors are measured on different scales making comparisons of effect sizes
203 difficult. To facilitate interpretation, we standardize each continuous risk factor (except
204 binary and categorical variables), by country, so that the coefficient estimates are
205 expressed in terms of their standard deviation or as the effect of the presence of a risk
206 factor within each country (i.e., we compute z-scores). Additionally, we standardize TR
207 scores to make the interpretation of the results across countries comparable since
208 interview waves 1 and 2 of HRS provided 20 words instead of 10. We standardize
209 within each interview wave the immediate and delayed recall score, and then sum them
210 together to obtain the TR score, as a way to account for this difference in how the
211 variable is measured. The score is then normalized once again across all waves. This
212 process is discussed in detail in Appendix A.3.

213 We maintain more than 97% of the original sample that has a TR score at their first
214 interview in each country (Appendix A.4 discusses sample restrictions). Appendix A.5
215 summarizes sample means for the TR score, risk factors, and remedies. A key takeaway
216 from these summary statistics is that there exist significant cross-country differences in
217 risk factor experience and remedy use in the 31 countries included in our analysis. For
218 example, the average duration of respondents' education ranges from 6.3 years in
219 Portugal to 12.9 years in Denmark.

220 **Regression models**

221 For each modifiable risk factor and country, we estimate a simple bivariate model (Model 1)
222 where we regress TR on each risk factor separately and a complete model (Model 2) where we

223 include all risk factors as covariates in the regression model, plus a variable for sex, and a
224 categorical variable for age (age groups: 50-59, 60-69, 70-79, 80+). Model 2's specification is:

$$225 \quad TR_i = \beta r_i + \gamma x_i + \varepsilon_i$$

226 where TR_i is the standardized total word recall score for respondent i the first time he or she was
227 interviewed; r_i is the vector of standardized or binary risk factors and x_i is a vector of background
228 variables; ε_i is the error term. We estimate each model separately by country.

229 We consider one extension to Model 2. We investigate the role of a risk factor's possible
230 remedy (e.g., taking blood pressure medication, quitting smoking) in abating the relationships
231 between TR and the risk factor.

232 When presenting results, we report model coefficients from ordinary least squares regression
233 on the standardized TR measure using robust standard errors. Our analysis was conducted using
234 STATA 16.1.

235 **Results**

236 **Relationship consistency between risk factors and cognitive function**


237 Models 1 and 2 are estimated separately by country to allow the estimated relationships to
238 differ in magnitude (i.e., the relationships do not have to be identical across countries). Figure 1
239 presents the cross-country estimates for years of education (panel A), high blood pressure (panel
240 B), and current smoking (panel C). The vertical axis is the coefficient of years of education on
241 cognition (as measured by total word recall). The dotted line is the cross-country average.

242

243 **Figure 1: Standardized coefficients by country from regressing TR on risk factors**

244


Panel A: Years of Education



245

246


Panel B: Hypertension



247

248

Panel C: Current Smoking



249

250

251

■ Model 1 ■ Model 2 Model 1 average Model 2 average


252 We find a strong positive relationship between education and cognition. An increase of one
253 standard deviation (sd) in years of education was associated with an average 0.35 sd increase
254 across the 31 countries in TR. This relationship persists accounting for other risk factors, age,
255 and sex. The average relationship across the 31 countries is 0.25 sd in Model 2. For some
256 countries the relationship is notably smaller, but in all countries it is significantly different from
257 zero. This indicates a consistently significant relationship between education and cognition.

258 In Figure 1, Panel B, we find a consistent negative relationship for Model 1, which shows the
259 relationship between hypertension and cognition not accounting for comorbidities. The
260 relationship is significant and negative for 29 of the 31 countries (94%) with a cross country
261 average of -0.22 sd. However, accounting for age, sex, and other risk factors in model 2, we find
262 no relationship on average, with only 5 countries having significant negative relationships
263 (Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Poland, US), and 4 having significantly positive relationships
264 (Greece, Netherlands, Romania, Switzerland). This suggests a relationship that is not consistent
265 with this risk factor determining cognitive levels at older ages.

266 In Figure 1, Panel C, we counterintuitively find many countries with positive relationships
267 for Model 1, which suggests current smoking is associated with higher cognition levels. The
268 relationship is significant and positive for 17 of the 31 countries (55%) with a cross country
269 average of +0.11 sd. Only four countries have the expected significant, negative relationship.
270 Accounting for age, sex, and other risk factors in Model 2, we find a slight negative relationship
271 on average (-0.04 sd), with 9 (29%) countries having significant negative relationships. This too
272 suggests a relationship that is not consistent with this risk factor determining cognitive levels at
273 older ages.

274 Figure 2 summarizes the standardized coefficients for the risk factors, arranged from largest
 275 to smallest relationship with cognitive function based on the simple model (Model 1). Figure 2
 276 presents the US as a separate counterpoint to the cross-country average as many existing studies
 277 use a US-based sample.

278 **Figure 2: Standardized coefficients from regressing TR on risk factors, cross-country mean**
 279 **and US value.**



280 Notes: Risk factors are sorted by the largest to smallest based on the cross-country mean of the
 281 absolute standardized coefficient in Model 1.
 282

283
 284 Table 1 summarizes the proportion of countries that have a positive or negative sign and how
 285 many coefficients are statistically significant. In Table 1, we also report how many coefficients

286 are statistically significant following a Bonferroni correction for multiple hypotheses testing.
 287 With 31 countries, there is an 80% ($1 - 0.95^{31} = 0.80$) probability of at least one Type 1 error
 288 (i.e., false positive), where statistical significance is judged at the 5% level. Our conservative
 289 correction is to require statistical significance at the $5/31 = 0.161\%$ level in each country. In this
 290 way, the joint probability of a Type 1 error is only 5% ($1 - (1 - 0.00161)^{31} = 0.05$).

291 **Table 1: Distribution of coefficients across countries between positive, negative, positive**
 292 **and significant, and negative and significant.**

Model	Relationship with Cognition	Years of Education	Diabetes Ever	Hearing Loss	Hypertension Ever	Depression Score	Current Smoker	Obese
1	Negative	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	19%	71%
	Negative & significant	0%	94%	100%	94%	94%	16%	35%
	Corrected for Multiple Hypotheses	0%	84%	100%	87%	94%	6%	19%
	Positive	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	81%	29%
	Positive & significant	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	55%	10%
	Corrected for Multiple Hypotheses	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	39%	3%
2	Negative	0%	94%	97%	45%	97%	68%	61%
	Negative & significant	0%	48%	87%	16%	94%	29%	16%
	Corrected for Multiple Hypotheses	0%	13%	68%	6%	84%	13%	3%
	Positive	100%	6%	3%	55%	3%	32%	39%
	Positive & significant	100%	0%	0%	13%	0%	0%	10%
	Corrected for Multiple Hypotheses	97%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

293 Notes: Table reports, by model (column 1), the percentage of the 31 countries estimated to have
 294 the relationship with cognition (column 2). Risk factors follow the same order as Figure 2. The
 295 correction for multiple hypotheses adjusts the significance test by a factor of 31, corresponding
 296 to the number of countries.

297 We define a risk factor as having a consistent cross-country relationship with cognitive levels
 298 (as measured by TR score) if at least half of the countries have significant common directional
 299 relationships and no countries having significant reverse relationships. The bivariate

300 relationships between the risk factors and cognitive function are consistent with relationships in
301 Livingston et al.'s (2017) life-course model with education, hearing loss, and depression having
302 substantial and significant relationships. As noted above, an increase of one sd in years of
303 education was associated with an average 0.35 sd increase across countries in TR (USA: 0.35
304 sd), with all relationships being positive and statistically significant. An increase of one sd in
305 difficulty hearing or the depression score was associated with an average 0.23 and 0.20 sd
306 decrease in TR (USA: 0.17 and 0.15 sd), respectively, with all relationships being negative and
307 statistically significant.

308 Using the simple model, we also find a substantial relationship across countries for the
309 comparatively less impactful risk factors in Livingston et al. (2017). Ever having diabetes,
310 hypertension, or being obese were associated with an average 0.30, 0.22, and 0.03 sd decrease in
311 TR (USA: 0.24, 0.17, 0.01 sd), respectively, and a substantial majority (74% or more) of
312 countries show negative and statistically significant relationships. In contrast with what one
313 would expect based on Livingston et al.'s (2017) model, current smoking was associated with an
314 average *increase* in TR (0.10 sd) and was positive for 81% of countries in our analysis and
315 statistically significant for 55% of the countries. For the USA, the simple model is associated
316 with a statistically significant 0.13 sd decrease in TR, which is consistent with Livingston et al.
317 (2017) and more recent research suggesting smoking has a negative impact on cognitive
318 function.

319 Accounting for sex, age, and the comorbid risk factors (Model 2), the relationship between
320 cognitive function and risk factors substantially diminishes in magnitude. Among the risk factors
321 with substantial and significant relationships in Livingston et al. (2017) – education, hearing loss,
322 and depression – we found the relationships remain consistent in direction and statistically

323 significant for a substantial majority of countries, but the magnitude of the relationship is
324 smaller. For years of education, a one sd in years of education was associated with an average
325 0.25 sd increase across countries in TR, about 30% smaller than in the simple model. An
326 increase of one sd in difficulty hearing or the depression score was associated with an average
327 0.07 and 0.12 sd decrease in TR, about 70% and 40% smaller than the magnitude in the simple
328 model, respectively. For years of education, hearing loss, and depression, the findings are
329 statistically significant in 97%, 68%, and 84% of countries even with our correction for multiple
330 hypotheses.

331 Accounting for comorbidities markedly reduces the negative relationships across countries
332 for ever having diabetes, hypertension, or being obese, and those relationships are only negative
333 and statistically significant for 48%, 16%, and 16% of the countries, respectively. Correcting for
334 multiple hypotheses, we find that the relationship between TR score and these risk factors is
335 robust for 13% or fewer countries. A minority of countries (13%) exhibit positive and
336 statistically significant relationships between ever having had hypertension and TR, but none of
337 these relationships are robust to our correction for multiple hypotheses.

338 For those currently smoking, 68% of countries exhibit a negative coefficient, compared to
339 only 19% in the simpler model. However, only 29% of countries exhibit negative and significant
340 relationships, and this shrinks to 13% after correcting the significance levels for multiple
341 hypotheses. For these risk factors, the relationship with TR may not be fully captured by our
342 model, or the relationship is weak or non-existent.

343 Summarizing, we find inconsistency across countries in the relationship between cognitive
344 function and hypertension, diabetes, obesity, and smoking. These findings suggest that these
345 relationships may be reflecting omitted factors that vary by country, rather than representing a

346 risk factor where modifications to behavior may potentially alter the trajectory of cognitive
347 aging. In Online Appendix C, we consider a couple of supplementary analyses:


- 348 1. Does accounting for the age of diabetes diagnosis affect our finding that diabetes is
349 inconsistently associated with our cognition measure?
350 2. Does the relationship with risk factors change with age?

351 We address the first question by accounting for differential timing of diabetes diagnosis, and
352 the second question by allowing for the relationship between risk factors and our measure of
353 cognition to vary by age. Neither supplementary analysis substantively changes our findings.

354 **Do risk factor remedies reduce negative relationships with cognitive** 355 **function?**

356 We consider an extension of Model 2 that incorporates remedies for potential risk factors as
357 additional covariates. Figure 3 compares the coefficients from the risk factors to the coefficients
358 on the remedies themselves (coefficients in Figure 3 may differ from Figure 2 because of the
359 extended model).

360 **Figure 3: Standardized coefficients of the risk factors and their respective remedies, cross-**
 361 **country mean and US value.**



362 Notes: Reported coefficients are based on an extension to Model 2 that adds indicator variables
 363 for whether a respondent takes medication for diabetes, depression, or hypertension, has a
 364 hearing aid, or is a former smoker. In most cases, the coefficients are added to determine the net
 365 effect on the TR score, that is the blue bars are the sum of the effect of having a condition and
 366 the separate effect of using a remedy. The exception is smoking (*), where the remedy (being a
 367 former smoker) is mutually exclusive to the risk factor (i.e., current smoker). In this case, the net
 368 effect on the TR score of the remedy is just the remedy's standardized coefficient.
 369

370
 371 With the exception of smoking and quitting (smoking's remedy), the coefficients are
 372 additive: if a respondent has the risk factor and uses the remedy, then the total effect is the sum
 373 of the red and blue bars. If a remedy reduces the relationship between the risk factor and
 374 cognitive decline, then the blue bar will point in the opposite direction of the red bar. However,

375 this is only the case for the country mean of taking medications for hypertension. In all other
376 cases, the blue and red bars point in the same direction (we discuss the case of smoking
377 separately below). In the case of hypertension, the country mean suggests that having the risk
378 factor and using the remedy (i.e., having high blood pressure and taking medication) is as good
379 as not having the condition (the blue and red bars point in opposite directions, and are of equal
380 length). However, that does not appear to be the case for the US, where the remedy has minimal
381 effect.

382 For diabetes, hearing loss, and depression the figure suggests that the remedy makes the
383 effect on memory worse. A plausible interpretation is that the use of a remedy is an indicator of
384 the severity of a condition. Hearing loss is a case in point. The question asks if a respondent has
385 difficulty hearing, also when wearing a hearing aid. Having difficulty hearing with a hearing aid
386 likely implies worse hearing than having difficulty without a hearing aid. The interpretation for
387 diabetes and depression is less straightforward, but it still seems plausible that medication is
388 more likely to be prescribed if the condition is more severe.

389 As noted, the bars in Figure 3 should be interpreted differently for smoking. The reference
390 category is never having smoked. The red bars indicate memory for current smokers, while the
391 blue bars indicate former smokers. Thus it appears that former smokers actually score better than
392 never smokers. This pattern hides considerable heterogeneity across countries. Current smoking
393 has a significant negative relationship with the TR score in the US, but this relationship is not
394 significantly different from a null effect in other countries, with the exception of England,
395 Latvia, the Netherlands, and Slovakia (for Austria, France, and Spain, it is significantly positive).
396 If past smoking was associated with lower cognition at older ages, we would have expected to
397 observe a negative coefficient for the remedy. However, only in Romania is there a statistically

398 significant negative relationship between past smoking and TR score. A significant positive
399 relationship exists in 10 of 31 countries (including Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, and Spain).

400 Three possible interpretations of this relationship are that the act of quitting smoking could
401 either lead to greater cognitive levels in old age (a causal interpretation), smoking cessation
402 could lead to the adoption of other healthy behaviors that are beneficial for cognition such as
403 exercise and healthy eating (a mediation interpretation), or the estimated relationships could
404 indicate that people with better cognition are more likely to quit (a selection interpretation).

405 Overall, while the majority of modifiable risk factors have known remedies, with the
406 exception of hypertension and smoking, we do not find evidence that the remedies reduce the
407 negative relationship between these risk factors and measured cognition. In the case of
408 hypertension and smoking, as noted in Table 1, the relationship between the risk factor and TR
409 score is inconsistent and not typically significantly different from a null effect. For factors that
410 are consistently related to TR score (e.g., depression, hearing loss), our results suggest there is
411 sorting into the use of the remedy based on the severity of the condition, leading to limited
412 insights from point-in-time data. To test whether remedies for those risk factors are causally able
413 to limit cognitive decline, a longitudinal experiment is required.

414 **Discussion**

415 Establishing causal patterns affecting dementia risk at older ages is challenging based on
416 observational data. On the other hand conducting randomized controlled trials that
417 experimentally vary factors that are thought to influence dementia risk are generally infeasible,
418 except in limited interventions aimed at slowing cognitive decline. Many factors affecting
419 dementia risk are likely to exert their influence over long periods. Examples include education,
420 early life conditions, occupational experiences, and pollution. Establishing causal effects of

421 experimental manipulations of such factors would likely take several decades, and in most cases
422 would raise grave ethical concerns. This leaves us with exploiting natural experiments, such as
423 changes in compulsory schooling laws [43,44]. Another source of arguably exogenous variation
424 can be found in international variations in institutions and policies.

425 This paper exploits harmonized data from 31 countries. Before addressing the effects of
426 policy and institutional variation, the first step is to investigate the robustness of associations
427 proposed in the literature. Taking the widely cited Lancet Commission report as our starting
428 point, we only find a limited number of robust relations: education, depression, and hearing loss
429 show clear associations with our cognition measure, the sum of immediate and delayed recall.
430 The evidence for the other factors is weaker and becomes almost non-existent when correcting
431 for multiple hypotheses testing.

432 The lack of robustness may have different reasons. The measures used in the study may not
433 be perfectly comparable across countries, but in view of the harmonized nature of the surveys
434 from the different countries, that is likely to play a relatively minor role. It seems more likely
435 that several of the hypothesized relations at least partly proxy for omitted factors. For example,
436 obesity or smoking reflect lifestyles and personal circumstances that may affect dementia risk
437 beyond these two observed factors. The correlation between the observed and unobserved factors
438 is likely to differ across countries. For example, smoking rates vary across countries, and so does
439 its relation with socio-economic background. If smoking is a proxy for these other background
440 variables, then we expect the observed relation between smoking and memory to vary across
441 countries. And that is precisely what we find.

442 **Limitations**

443 The primary limitation of this study is undoubtedly that it is an observational study, but as noted,
444 in many ways that is inevitable. The study uses only cross-sectional data, even though the
445 underlying datasets are all panels. The reason for only using data from the first time a respondent
446 answers a survey is to avoid practice effects. Additionally, because cross-sectional data cannot
447 establish temporality, it is susceptible to reverse causality. For example, it is possible that the
448 significant and negative association between depression and memory may have been a result of
449 depression being a prodrome, or early symptom, of dementia. Our analysis is not intended to
450 conclusively affirm a causal relationship but identifies relationships that are weak or nonexistent.
451 Finally, we do not have a measure of dementia diagnosis, rather use measures of memory as a
452 proxy for cognitive function. Clinical assessments of dementia are not practical in large panel
453 surveys, like those used in our analysis. Risk factors may contribute to cognitive decline through
454 alternative pathways other than memory (e.g., attention or executive functions, such as
455 reasoning).

456 **Acknowledgments**

457 We thank the study participants and coordinators of ELSA, HRS, and SHARE for providing
458 valuable data for our study.

459 **References**

- 460 1. WHO. Dementia [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2023 Jan 27]. Available from:
461 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/dementia>
- 462 2. Velandia PP, Miller-Petrie MK, Chen C, Chakrabarti S, Chapin A, Hay S, et al. Global and
463 regional spending on dementia care from 2000-2019 and expected future health spending
464 scenarios from 2020-2050: An economic modelling exercise. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2022
465 Mar;45:101337.

- 466 3. Health and Retirement Study, public use dataset. Ann Arbor, MI; 2018.
- 467 4. Börsch-Supan A. Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) Wave 1-7.
468 2022.
- 469 5. Banks J. English Longitudinal Study of Ageing: Waves 0-9, 1998-2019. 2021.
- 470 6. Hudomiet P, Hurd MD, Rohwedder S. Dementia Prevalence in the United States in 2000 and
471 2012: Estimates Based on a Nationally Representative Study. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc*
472 *Sci*. 2018 Apr;73(Suppl 1):S10–9.
- 473 7. Knopman DS, Ryberg S. A Verbal Memory Test With High Predictive Accuracy for
474 Dementia of the Alzheimer Type. *Arch Neurol*. 1989 Feb 1;46(2):141–5.
- 475 8. Faul JD, Ware EB, Kabeto MU, Fisher J, Langa KM. The Effect of Childhood
476 Socioeconomic Position and Social Mobility on Cognitive Function and Change Among
477 Older Adults: A Comparison Between the United States and England. *J Gerontol B Psychol*
478 *Sci Soc Sci*. 2021 Jun 8;76(Suppl 1):S51-s63.
- 479 9. Prince M, Albanese E, Guerchet M, Prina M. World Alzheimer Report 2014: Dementia and
480 risk reduction: An analysis of protective and modifiable risk factors. 2014;
- 481 10. Xu W, Tan L, Wang HF, Tan MS, Tan L, Li JQ, et al. Education and Risk of Dementia:
482 Dose-Response Meta-Analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies. *Mol Neurobiol*. 2016 Jul
483 1;53(5):3113–23.
- 484 11. Zhang MY, Katzman R, Salmon D, Jin H, Cai GJ, Wang ZY, et al. The prevalence of
485 dementia and Alzheimer’s disease in Shanghai, China: impact of age, gender, and
486 education. *Ann Neurol*. 1990 Apr;27(4):428–37.
- 487 12. Stern Y, Arenaza-Urquijo EM, Bartrés-Faz D, Belleville S, Cantilon M, Chetelat G, et al.
488 Whitepaper: Defining and investigating cognitive reserve, brain reserve, and brain
489 maintenance. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2020 Sep;16(9):1305–11.
- 490 13. McDowell I, Xi G, Lindsay J, Tierney M. Mapping the connections between education and
491 dementia. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol*. 2007 Feb 6;29(2):127–41.
- 492 14. Pellicer-Espinosa I, Díaz-Orueta U. Cognitive Screening Instruments for Older Adults with
493 Low Educational and Literacy Levels: A Systematic Review. *J Appl Gerontol*.
494 2022;41(4):1222–31.
- 495 15. Yuan J, Sun Y, Sang S, Pham JH, Kong WJ. The risk of cognitive impairment associated
496 with hearing function in older adults: a pooled analysis of data from eleven studies. *Sci*
497 *Rep*. 2018 Feb 1;8(1):2137.
- 498 16. Griffiths TD, Lad M, Kumar S, Holmes E, McMurray B, Maguire EA, et al. How Can
499 Hearing Loss Cause Dementia? *Neuron*. 2020 Nov 11;108(3):401–12.

- 500 17. Uchida Y, Sugiura S, Nishita Y, Saji N, Sone M, Ueda H. Age-related hearing loss and
501 cognitive decline — The potential mechanisms linking the two. *Auris Nasus Larynx*. 2019
502 Feb 1;46(1):1–9.
- 503 18. Lin FR, Pike JR, Albert MS, Arnold M, Burgard S, Chisolm T, et al. Hearing intervention
504 versus health education control to reduce cognitive decline in older adults with hearing loss
505 in the USA (ACHIEVE): a multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2023 Sep
506 2;402(10404):786–97.
- 507 19. Smolina K, Wotton CJ, Goldacre MJ. Risk of dementia in patients hospitalised with type 1
508 and type 2 diabetes in England, 1998-2011: a retrospective national record linkage cohort
509 study. *Diabetologia*. 2015 May;58(5):942–50.
- 510 20. Mohseni-Moghaddam P, Ghobadian R, Khaleghzadeh-Ahangar H. Dementia in diabetes
511 mellitus and atherosclerosis: Two interrelated systemic diseases. *Brain Res Bull*. 2022 Apr
512 1;181:87–96.
- 513 21. Solfrizzi V, Custodero C, Lozupone M, Imbimbo BP, Valiani V, Agosti P, et al.
514 Relationships of Dietary Patterns, Foods, and Micro- and Macronutrients with Alzheimer’s
515 Disease and Late-Life Cognitive Disorders: A Systematic Review. *J Alzheimers Dis*.
516 2017;59(3):815–49.
- 517 22. Stephen R, Hongisto K, Solomon A, Lönnroos E. Physical Activity and Alzheimer’s
518 Disease: A Systematic Review. *J Gerontol Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2017 Jun 1;72(6):733–9.
- 519 23. Bendlin BB. Antidiabetic therapies and Alzheimer disease. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci*. 2019
520 Mar;21(1):83–91.
- 521 24. Hallschmid M. Intranasal Insulin for Alzheimer’s Disease. *CNS Drugs*. 2021 Jan;35(1):21–
522 37.
- 523 25. Iadecola C. Hypertension and dementia. *Hypertens Dallas Tex 1979*. 2014 Jul;64(1):3–5.
- 524 26. McGrath ER, Beiser AS, DeCarli C, Plourde KL, Vasan RS, Greenberg SM, et al. Blood
525 pressure from mid- to late life and risk of incident dementia. *Neurology*. 2017;89(24):2447–
526 54.
- 527 27. Corrada MM, Hayden KM, Paganini-Hill A, Bullain SS, DeMoss J, Aguirre C, et al. Age of
528 onset of hypertension and risk of dementia in the oldest-old: The 90+ Study. *Alzheimers*
529 *Dement*. 2017 Feb;13(2):103–10.
- 530 28. Walker KA, Power MC, Gottesman RF. Defining the Relationship Between Hypertension,
531 Cognitive Decline, and Dementia: a Review. *Curr Hypertens Rep*. 2017 Mar;19(3):24.
- 532 29. Emmerzaal TL, Kiliaan AJ, Gustafson DR. 2003-2013: a decade of body mass index,
533 Alzheimer’s disease, and dementia. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2015;43(3):739–55.

- 534 30. McGregor G, Harvey J. Regulation of Hippocampal Synaptic Function by the Metabolic
535 Hormone, Leptin: Implications for Health and Neurodegenerative Disease. *Front Cell*
536 *Neurosci.* 2018;12:340.
- 537 31. Obradovic M, Sudar-Milovanovic E, Soskic S, Essack M, Arya S, Stewart AJ, et al. Leptin
538 and Obesity: Role and Clinical Implication. *Front Endocrinol Lausanne.* 2021;12:585887.
- 539 32. den Brok M, Eggink E, Hoevenaar-Blom MP, van Gool WA, Moll van Charante EP, Richard
540 E, et al. Low Values for Blood Pressure, BMI, and Non-HDL Cholesterol and the Risk of
541 Late-Life Dementia. *Neurology.* 2022 Oct 11;99(15):e1630–9.
- 542 33. Anstey KJ, von Sanden C, Salim A, O’Kearney R. Smoking as a risk factor for dementia and
543 cognitive decline: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2007 Aug
544 15;166(4):367–78.
- 545 34. Cho H, Kim C, Kim HJ, Ye BS, Kim YJ, Jung NY, et al. Impact of smoking on
546 neurodegeneration and cerebrovascular disease markers in cognitively normal men. *Eur J*
547 *Neurol.* 2016;23(1):110–9.
- 548 35. Durazzo TC, Mattsson N, Weiner MW. Smoking and increased Alzheimer’s disease risk: a
549 review of potential mechanisms. *Alzheimers Dement.* 2014 Jun;10(3 Suppl):S122-45.
- 550 36. Zhong G, Wang Y, Zhang Y, Guo JJ, Zhao Y. Smoking is associated with an increased risk
551 of dementia: a meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies with investigation of potential
552 effect modifiers. *PLoS One.* 2015;10(3):e0118333.
- 553 37. Gerritsen L, Twait EL, Jonsson PV, Gudnason V, Launer LJ, Geerlings MI. Depression and
554 Dementia: The Role of Cortisol and Vascular Brain Lesions. *AGES-Reykjavik Study. J*
555 *Alzheimers Dis.* 2022;85:1677–87.
- 556 38. Hakim A. Perspectives on the complex links between depression and dementia. *Front Aging*
557 *Neurosci.* 2022 Aug 24;
- 558 39. Brzezińska A, Bourke J, Rivera-Hernández R, Tsolaki M, Woźniak J, Kaźmierski J.
559 Depression in Dementia or Dementia in Depression? Systematic Review of Studies and
560 Hypotheses. *Curr Alzheimer Res.* 2020;17(1):16–28.
- 561 40. Enache D, Winblad B, Aarsland D. Depression in dementia: epidemiology, mechanisms, and
562 treatment. *Curr Opin Psychiatry.* 2011 Nov;24(6):461–72.
- 563 41. Dal Bianco C, Garrouste C, Paccagnella O. Early-life circumstances and cognitive
564 functioning dynamics in later life. In Berlin, Boston: DE GRUYTER; 2013. p. 209–24.
- 565 42. Livingston G, Sommerlad A, Orgeta V, Costafreda SG, Huntley J, Ames D, et al. Dementia
566 prevention, intervention, and care. *Lancet.* 2017 Dec 16;390(10113):2673–734.
- 567 43. Banks J, Mazzone F. The Effect of Education on Old Age Cognitive Abilities: Evidence
568 from a Regression Discontinuity Design. *Econ J.* 2012 May 1;122(560):418–48.


569 44. Courtin E, Nafilyan V, Glymour M, Goldberg M, Berr C, Berkman LF, et al. Long-term
570 effects of compulsory schooling on physical, mental and cognitive ageing: a natural
571 experiment. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2019;73(4):370–6.

572


573 **Supporting information**

574 S1 Appendix


Panel A: Years of Education



Panel B: Hypertension



Panel C: Current Smoking



■ Model 1
 ■ Model 2
 ⋯ Model 1 average
 ⋯ Model 2 average

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3