

- 1 Running Title: Intraindividual variability in physically frail older adults
- 2 Intraindividual Variability Differentiated Older Adults with Physical Frailty and the
- 3 Role of Education in the Maintenance of Cognitive Intraindividual Variability
- 4 Jingyi Wu, MSc¹; Jinyu Chen, MSc¹; Juncen Wu, MSc¹; Chun Liang Hsu, PhD^{1*}
- 5 1. Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, Faculty of Health and Social Sciences, The
- 6 Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong SAR, China
- 7 * Corresponding author:
- 8 E-mail: chun-liang.hsu@polyu.edu.hk

9 **Abstract**

10 **Objectives**

11 Physical frailty is associated with increased risk of cognitive impairment. However, its
12 impact on sustained cognitive processing as evaluated by intraindividual variability
13 (IIV), and factors beneficial to IIV in physically frail older adults remain unexplored.
14 This study aimed to quantify differences in IIV between older adults with and without
15 physical frailty, and examine whether education facilitated maintenance of IIV.

16 **Methods**

17 This cross-sectional study included 121 community-dwelling older adults 65-90 years
18 with/without physical frailty (PF and non-PF; n=41 and n=80 respectively). Physical
19 frailty was determined via Short Physical Performance Battery. Dispersion across the
20 seven components of the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) was computed to
21 ascertain IIV. Multivariate analysis of covariance was used to determine group
22 differences in total score and IIV. Four moderation models were constructed to test the
23 effects of education on age-total score and age-IIV relationships in PF and non-PF.

24 **Results**

25 Compared with non-PF, PF showed greater IIV ($p = .022$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.044$). Among
26 PF, education moderated age-total score (R-sq = 0.084, $F = 5.840$, $p < 0.021$) and age-
27 IIV (R-sq = 0.101, $F = 7.454$, $p = 0.010$) relationships. IIV increased with age for those
28 with five years ($\beta = 0.313$, $p = 0.006$) or no formal education ($\beta = 0.610$, $p = 0.001$).
29 Greater than seven years of education ($\beta = 0.217$, $p = 0.050$) may be required to

30 maintain IIV at older age.

31 **Conclusion**

32 IIV may be a sensitive method to differentiate physically frail older adults. Additionally,
33 perceived cognitive benefits of education may be dependent on physical functioning.

34 **Keywords**

35 Intraindividual variability, dispersion, physical frailty, cognition, education

36 **Introduction**

37 Physical frailty is a clinical syndrome characterized by diminished strength, endurance,
38 and reduced physiological function in individuals (1). It is a prevalent geriatric
39 condition that impacts 11% of older adults over 65 years old worldwide (2, 3).
40 Physically frail older adults are more vulnerable to external and internal stressors than
41 non-frail older adults, leading to a significantly increased risk for cognitive impairment,
42 a loss of independent living, hospitalization, and death (4).

43 Physical frailty is significantly associated with mild cognitive impairment (MCI)
44 and dementia (5-7). Specifically, a longitudinal study involving 2,305 older adults over
45 the age of 70 years found that those with physical frailty showed significantly greater
46 cognitive decline over 5 years, compared with older adults without physical frailty (8).
47 Likewise, results from the Rush Memory and Aging Project showed that each increase
48 of one point in frailty score (computed as a composite score based on grip strength,
49 timed walk, body composition, and fatigue) at baseline was correlated with 60%
50 increase in the risk of subsequently developing MCI after adjusting age, sex, and
51 education (9).

52 While MCI is commonly identified via evaluating the total score on the Montreal
53 Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) (10) or the Mini-Mental State Examination (11), such
54 static representation of cognitive function only reflect one aspect of an individual's
55 cognitive capabilities; wherein the ability to sustain cognitive processing across
56 different cognitive domains (12) is another important facet of cognition.

57 Intraindividual variability (IIV) is a construct of sustained cognitive processing
58 (13). Distinct from cognitive performance identified by total scores, IIV is measured by
59 calculating the variability or fluctuations across different cognitive domains within a

60 standardized neuropsychological test, or across different tests (14). The three most well-
61 established indices of IIV include: (1) variability within a person on a single test over
62 long periods of observation (e.g., across multiple years), referred to as *intraindividual*
63 *changes*; (2) variability within a person on repeated trials of a single test on one
64 occasion or over multiple occasions (i.e., hours, days, or weeks), referred to as
65 *inconsistency*; and (3) variability within a person on a single occasion across multiple
66 cognitive domains, referred to as *dispersion* (15, 16).

67 Notably, IIV has been shown to be linked with neurogenerative disorders (17). For
68 instance, study showed significant differences in IIV as indexed by inconsistency
69 between older adults who were cognitively intact vs. those who were cognitively
70 impaired or had dementia (18). Burton et al. (19) found that individuals with
71 Alzheimer's Disease exhibited greater IIV as indexed by inconsistency compared to
72 those with Parkinson's disease. Moreover, studies demonstrated that greater IIV, as
73 indexed by dispersion, was associated with increased risk of MCI and dementia (20,
74 21). While the majority of the current literature assessed IIV through inconsistency, a
75 recent meta-analysis concluded that compared with inconsistency, dispersion is a more
76 sensitive index of IIV in detecting psychiatric and neurological conditions.
77 Nevertheless, evidence on whether physically frail older adults demonstrate poorer
78 sustained cognitive processing remains unexplored (17).

79 Years of education have been widely regarded as a protective factor that mitigated
80 cognitive decline (22). For example, compared with older adults with more than two
81 years of education, those with no formal education were ten times more likely to
82 develop cognitive impairment (23). A systematic review concluded that lower
83 education level was associated with an increased risk of AD and dementia (24).
84 Importantly, Alley et al. (25) suggested that an average of 16 years of education can

85 slow the rate of decline in global cognitive function in older adults relative to their
86 counterparts with four years of education. However, no studies to date have identified
87 the number of years of education required to prevent decline in sustained cognitive
88 processing in physically frail older adults who are at significantly greater risk for
89 cognitive impairment and dementia.

90 Therefore, this study aimed to address two primary questions: (1) compared with
91 older adults without physical frailty, whether older adults with physical frailty exhibit
92 greater IIV; and (2) whether education can moderate the negative effects of aging on
93 IIV in older adults with physical frailty. We hypothesized that older adults with physical
94 frailty would display greater IIV, and years of education would significantly moderate
95 the association between age and IIV as indexed by dispersion.

96 **Materials and Method**

97 **Study Design and Participants**

98 This was a cross-sectional study involving a total of 121 physically frail (PF) (n=41)
99 and non-PF community-dwelling older adults (n=80) between the age of 65-90 years.
100 Participants were recruited from local community centers and non-government
101 organizations (i.e., institutional research hubs) using posters and advertisements
102 through email, and mobile phone applications (i.e., WhatsApp) from August 2023 to
103 February 2024. Data were collected at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University from
104 September 2023 to March 2024. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional
105 Review Board (IRB) of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
106 (HSEARS20230131001). Written informed consent was obtained for all study
107 participants enrolled into the study.

108 **Descriptors**

109 Age of participants was recorded in years. Height and weight were measured in units
110 of centimeters (cm) and kilograms (kg).

111 **Physical Frailty Characterization**

112 As recommended by the European Medicines Agency (EMA) (26-28), physical frailty
113 was evaluated by the Short Physical Performance Battery (SPPB) (29). The SPPB is a
114 validated standardized test for evaluating general mobility and balance (30). The SPPB
115 has been shown to have excellent psychometric properties when used in the elderly

116 to discriminate between frail and non-frail older adults (31). The test consists of
117 three subscales (balance test, 4-meter walk at usual pace, and timed chair sit-to-stand
118 test). During the balance test, participants were first instructed to stand with their feet
119 together, then moving into semi-tandem and full-tandem positions. Participants were
120 asked to maintain each position for 10 seconds. During the 4-meter walk, participants
121 were asked to walk four meters at comfortable speed with an initial and terminal spatial
122 buffer of 1-meter to remove potential effects from acceleration/deceleration. The 4-
123 meter walk was performed twice, and the averaged time taken to perform the test was
124 calculated. During the chair sit-to-stand test, participants were instructed to fold their
125 arms across their chest, stand up from a sitting position on the designated chair, and
126 return to the seated position as quickly as possible five times. The time was recorded
127 from the initial sitting position to the final stand position. Each subscale is scored with
128 a maximum of four points for a total of 12 points, with a higher score indicating better
129 general mobility. A score of $\leq 9/12$ is indicative of physical frailty (32).

130 **Inclusion criteria**

131 Older adults were included if they: (1) were between 65 and 90 years old; (2) were
132 living in the community; (3) were able to ambulate up to four meters with or without
133 assistive devices; (4) were able to provide written informed consent; (5) had access to
134 the internet.

135 **Exclusion criteria**

136 All participants who met any of the following criteria were excluded: (1) diagnosed
137 with central nerve system diseases that substantially affect cognitive function (i.e.,
138 dementia, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's disease, Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, and stroke);

139 (2) living in nursing home or other care facilities/institutions; (3) taking psychotropic
140 medication that influences cognitive and physical function; (4) unable to understand,
141 speak, and read Cantonese/Chinese/English.

142 **Primary Outcome Measures**

143 **Education.** Education level attained by each study participant was recorded in units
144 of years.

145 **Cognitive Function.** The Hong Kong version of the MoCA was administered (33).
146 The MoCA is a validated measure of global cognitive function with high specificity
147 and sensitivity in identifying individuals with MCI (10). The MoCA is comprised of
148 seven domain-specific components (visual-spatial, naming, attention, language,
149 abstraction, delay, and orientation). An additional point was given to participants who
150 received ≤ 12 years of education (10). The total score ranges from 0-30 points, with a
151 score $\geq 26/30$ indicating unimpaired global cognition (10), 18-25/30 indicating MCI,
152 and $< 18/30$ indicating signs of dementia (34). The MoCA was used to compute IIV.

153 **Computation of Intra-Individual Variability.** Computation of IIV as indexed
154 by dispersion was performed through four steps. For clarity, within the context of the
155 present paper we refer to IIV as IIV indexed by dispersion. First, each raw subset score
156 of MoCA was Z-transformed separately according to the distribution of entire older
157 adults ($n = 121$) (Eqs. (1)) (35). Second, the sum of each participant's z-transformed
158 score for each of the seven components of MoCA - A_i was calculated by Eqs. (2) (20).
159 Third, the variability in each of the seven components of MoCA was calculated by Eqs.
160 (3) (20). Finally, the square root of the sum of variability in the seven components of
161 MoCA was calculated by Eqs (4) to derive the amount of dispersion across the seven

162 components of MoCA (36).

$$163 \quad Z_{ik} = \frac{X - \mu}{\sigma} \quad \text{Eqs}$$

$$164 \quad (1)$$

$$165 \quad A_i = \sum_{k=1}^K Z_{ik} \quad \text{Eqs (2)}$$

$$166 \quad \text{Variability} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (Z_{ik} - A_i)^2}{(k - 1)}} \quad \text{Eqs}$$

$$167 \quad (3)$$

$$168 \quad \text{IIV} = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(Z_{ik} - A_i)^2}{(k - 1)}} \quad \text{Eqs}$$

$$169 \quad (4)$$

170 Z_{ik} was the k th cognitive test score for the i th individual. μ was the mean value of all
171 tests. X was the raw score of each test. σ represented the standard deviation of all tests.
172 K represented the number of cognitive tests. A_i was the individual's sum Z transformed
173 score based on the number of tests. Note that the number of tests reflects the number of
174 components within the MoCA.

175 **Statistical Analysis**

176 R software v.4.3.2 (R Development Core Team, 2010) was used to perform all
177 statistical analyses. First, the Shapiro-Wilk's test was used to ensure the normality of
178 the distribution of all variables (37). Independent t-tests, Mann-Whitney U tests, and
179 chi-squared tests (for ratio and nominal data, respectively) were performed to compare
180 the differences in demographic variables and clinical parameters between the two
181 groups. Mahalanobis distance was used to detect multivariable outliers.

182 Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) was used to determine
183 whether there were differences between groups in MoCA total score and IIV adjusting
184 for the effects of age (38). The statistics significance level was set at $p < 0.05$, with

185 correction for multiple comparisons via Bonferroni adjustments at $p < 0.025$. The effect
186 size of the difference between groups was calculated by partial eta squared, where 0.01,
187 0.06, and 0.14 represented small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively (39).

188 Moderation analyses were conducted using the PROCESS macro in R software
189 version 4.3.2 (40). Four separate moderation models were constructed (Fig 1). Two
190 separate models were constructed (one for the non-PF group and one for the PF group)
191 to test the direct effect of age on the MoCA total score and investigate the moderation
192 effect of education on the association between age and the MoCA total score. Two
193 additional models were constructed (one for the non-PF group and one for the PF group)
194 to test the direct effect of age on IIV and investigate the moderation effect of education
195 on the association between age and IIV. The bias-corrected bootstrap confidence
196 intervals were calculated to test the significance of the interaction effect and to control
197 for the possibility of the non-normal distribution of sampling (41). The bootstrap
198 estimates were based on 10,000 bootstrap samples. The interaction effects were
199 considered significant if the upper and lower limits of the 95th percentile CI did not
200 contain zero. To further understand the nature of this interaction, the conditional effect
201 of age (simple slopes) on MoCA total score and IIV was estimated, independently, at
202 five levels of the values of the moderator (i.e., years of education): very low (i.e., 10th
203 percentile), low (i.e., 25th percentile), middle (i.e., 50th percentile), high (i.e., 75th
204 percentile), and very high (i.e., 90th percentile). We also utilized the Johnson-Neyman
205 technique to identify the values of the moderator (i.e., years of education) where the
206 slope of the predictors (i.e., age) is statistically significant (40). The statistical
207 significance level was set at $p < 0.05$ for all tests.

208 **Fig 1. Moderation Model.**

209 Results

210 Participants

211 Study participants were stratified into the PF (n=41) or the non-PF (n=80) groups. After
212 removing one outlier (i.e., in MoCA and IIV) from the PF group, the PF group included
213 40 older adults. Participant characteristics are reported in Table 1. The PF group was
214 older and shorter in height than the non-PF group ($p<0.01$ and $p<0.05$ respectively).
215 No other significant differences in characteristics were observed ($p>0.05$). There were
216 trend-level differences in the number of males and females between the two groups
217 ($p<0.08$) (Table 1).

218 **Table 1. Participant Characteristics**

Demographic data	Physically Frail Group	Non-Physically Frail Group	<i>p</i> value
	(n=40)	(n=80)	
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Age (years)	76.250 (4.960)	72.938 (3.931)	< 0.001*
Sex (M/F)	9/31	33/47	0.068
Education (years)	8.225 (5.512)	11.900 (4.040)	< 0.001*
Weight (kg)	56.799 (10.389)	59.125 (9.926)	0.320
Height (cm)	156.087 (8.282)	160.666 (8.222)	0.013*

SPPB (max 12 points)	7.325 (1.439)	11.188 (0.731)	< 0.001*
MoCA total score (max 30 points) ^a	22.642 (0.493) ^a	26.192 (0.342) ^a	< 0.001* ^a
IIV ^a	3.945 (0.419) ^a	2.725 (0.290) ^a	0.022* ^a

219 * $p < 0.05$

220 M: male; F: female; SPPB: Short Physical Performance Battery; MoCA: Montreal

221 Cognitive Assessment; IIV: intraindividual variability as indexed by dispersion.

222 a. Covariate was evaluated at age = 74.084; mean (SE); SE: standard error.

223 **MoCA Total Score and IIV between the two groups**

224 The mean MoCA total score, mean IIV, and the group differences adjusted for age are
225 reported in **Table 1**. We found that compared with the non-PF group, the PF group had
226 a significantly lower MoCA total score (mean difference = -3.550; $p < .001$; partial $\eta^2 =$
227 0.221). Further, compared with the non-PF group, the PF group showed significantly
228 greater IIV (mean difference = 1.220; $p = .022$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.044$). Fig 2 illustrates the
229 differences in the MoCA total score and IIV between non-PF and PF groups.

230 **Fig 2. Differences in MoCA total score and IIV between PF group and non-PF**
231 **group.**

232 **Moderation Effects of Education on the Association between** 233 **Age and MoCA Total Score**

234 Years of education had a significant moderation effect on the association between age
235 and MoCA total score in the PF group. The overall model was statistically significant

236 (R-sq = 0.482, $F = 11.146$, $p < 0.001$) (Table 2). Specifically, age exerted a significant
237 negative main effect on the MoCA total score ($\beta = -0.671$, $SE = 0.182$, $p = 0.001$, 95%
238 CI [-1.041, -0.301]). We found a significant two-way interaction between education
239 and age in the PF group ($\beta = 0.058$, $SE = 0.024$, $t = 2.417$, $p = 0.021$, 95% CI [0.009,
240 0.107]; Fig 3A) (Table 2), accounting for 8.410% of the variance in the MoCA total
241 score ($F = 5.840$, $p = 0.021$).

242 In the PF group, for older adults who had no formal education, a negative
243 association between age and the MoCA total score was observed ($\beta = -0.671$, $SE = 0.$
244 182 , $p = 0.001$, 95% CI [-1.041, -0.301]; Fig 3A). For those with five years of education,
245 we observed a significantly weaker negative association between age and MoCA total
246 score ($\beta = -0.380$, $SE = 0.118$, $p = 0.003$, 95% CI [-0.620, -0.140]; Fig 3A). For those
247 with 12 and 16 years of education, we observed a notable but non-statistically
248 significant positive relationship between age and MoCA total score ($\beta = 0.029$, $SE =$
249 0.190 , $p = 0.879$, 95% CI [-0.356, 0.414] and $\beta = 0.263$, $SE = 0.273$, $p = 0.342$, 95% CI
250 [-0.290, 0.815] respectively; Fig 3A). Using the Johnson–Neyman technique, we found
251 that the negative association between age and MoCA total score weakened as years of
252 education increased. This association was not statistically significant when years of
253 education exceeded seven years after adjusting for multiple comparisons with
254 Bonferroni correction ($\beta = -0.247$, $SE = 0.122$, $p = 0.050$, 95% CI [-0.495, -0.000]; Fig
255 3B). Similarly, after applying bootstrap estimation, we found a significant two-way
256 interaction effect between education and age on MoCA total score ($\beta = 0.058$, $SE =$
257 0.029 , 95% CI [0.001, 0.116]).

258 No significant moderation effect of education on the associations between age and
259 MoCA total score was observed in the non-PF group (R-sq = 0.019, $F = 1.507$, $p =$
260 0.223).

261 **Fig 3. Moderation Effects of Education on the Association between age-MoCA in**
262 **the Physically Frail Group.**

263 (A) the association between age and MoCA total score. (B) Jonnson-Neyman plot for
264 visualizing the moderating effect of education between age and MoCA total score.

265 **Moderation Effects of Education on the Association between**
266 **Age and IIV**

267 Years of education had a significant moderation effect on the association between age
268 and IIV in the PF group. The overall model was statistically significant ($R\text{-sq} = 0.512$,
269 $F = 12.573$, $p < 0.001$) (Table 2). Specifically, age exerted a significant positive main
270 effect on IIV (i.e., older age was correlated with greater IIV) ($\beta = 0.610$, $SE = 0.165$, p
271 $= 0.001$, 95% CI [0.276, 0.944]). We found a significant two-way interaction between
272 education and age in the PF group ($\beta = -0.060$, $SE = 0.022$, $p = 0.010$, 95% CI [-0.104,
273 -0.015]; Fig 4A) (Table 2), accounting for 10.110 % of the variance in IIV ($F = 7.454$,
274 $p = 0.010$).

275 In the PF group, for older adults who had no formal education, a positive
276 association between age and IIV was observed ($\beta = 0.610$, $SE = 0.165$, $p = 0.001$, 95%
277 CI [0.276, 0.944]; Fig 4A). For those with five years of education, we observed a
278 significantly weaker positive association between age and IIV ($\beta = 0.313$, $SE = 0.107$,
279 $p = 0.006$, 95% CI [0.096, 0.529]; Fig 4A); for those with 12 and 16 years of education,
280 there was also a non-statistically significant negative association between age and IIV
281 (i.e., older age was correlated with reduced IIV) ($\beta = -0.104$, $SE = 0.171$, $p = 0.548$,
282 95% CI [-0.451, 0.243] and $\beta = -0.342$, $SE = 0.246$, $p = 0.173$, 95% CI [-0.841, 0.157]
283 respectively; Fig 4A). Using the Johnson–Neyman technique, we observed that the
284 positive association between age and IIV weakened as years of education increased and

285 the association was not statistically significant when years of education exceeded seven
 286 years after adjusting for multiple comparisons with Bonferroni correction ($\beta = 0.217$,
 287 $SE = 0.107$, $p = 0.050$, 95% CI [0.000, 0.430]; Fig 4B). Similarly, after applying
 288 bootstrap estimation, we found a significant two-way interaction effect between
 289 education and age on IIV ($\beta = -0.060$, $SE = 0.028$, 95% CI [-0.115, -0.007]).

290 No significant moderation effect of education on the associations between age and
 291 IIV was observed in the non-PF group ($R\text{-sq} = 0.006$, $F = 0.439$, $p = 0.510$).

292 **Table 2. Line Regression Models for the Physically Frail Group**

		β	se	t	p	95%CI	
						LL	UL
MoCA total score		70.918	14.241	4.980	0.000	42.036	99.800
constant							
Age		-0.671	0.182	-3.680	0.001	-1.041	-0.301
Education		-4.096	1.829	-2.240	0.031	-7.805	-0.387
Age * Education		0.058	0.024	2.417	0.021	0.009	0.107
	10th	-0.671	0.182	-3.680	0.001	-1.041	-0.301
Education Levels	25th	-0.380	0.118	-3.208	0.003	-0.620	-0.140
	50th	-0.263	0.120	-2.186	0.035	-0.507	-0.019

	#	-0.247	0.122	-2.028	0.050	-0.495	-0.000
	75th	0.029	0.190	0.153	0.879	-0.356	0.414
	90th	0.263	0.273	0.963	0.342	-0.290	0.815
IIV							
constant		-39.720	12.847	-3.092	0.004	-65.776	-13.665
Age		0.610	0.165	3.706	0.001	0.276	0.944
Education		4.158	1.650	2.520	0.016	0.812	7.504
Age * Education		-0.060	0.022	-2.730	0.010	-0.104	-0.015
	10th	0.610	0.165	3.706	0.001	0.276	0.944
Education Levels	25th	0.313	0.107	2.927	0.006	0.096	0.529
	#	0.217	0.107	2.028	0.050	0.000	0.433
	50th	0.194	0.109	1.784	0.083	-0.027	0.414
	75th	-0.104	0.171	-0.607	0.548	-0.451	0.243
	90th	-0.342	0.246	-1.391	0.173	-0.841	0.157

293 β are unstandardized coefficients.

294 Bootstrap method: Age*Education on MoCA score ($\beta = 0.058$, SE = 0.029, 95% CI

295 [0.001, 0.116]).

296 Bootstrap method: Age*Education on IIV ($\beta = -0.060$, SE = 0.028, 95% CI [-0.115, -
297 0.007]).

298 10th: No formal education; 25th: five years of education; 50th: seven years of education;

299 75th: twelve years of education; 90th: sixteen years of education

300 #Moderator value(s) defining Johnson-Neyman significance: 7.266 for MoCA total
301 score and 6.613 for IIV.

302 **Figure 4. Moderation Effects of Education on the Association between age-IIV in**
303 **the Physically Frail Group.**

304 (A) the association between age and IIV. (B) Jonnson-Neyman plot for visualizing the

305 moderating effect of education between age and IIV.

306 **Discussion**

307 In this cross-sectional study, we compared differences in IIV between older adults with
308 and without physical frailty, and subsequently examined whether education level
309 moderated the effects of aging on MoCA performance as assessed via MoCA total score
310 as well as IIV. We found that compared with older adults without physical frailty, those
311 with physical frailty demonstrated significantly lower MoCA total score and greater
312 IIV. Additionally, our findings revealed that the cognitive benefits of education may
313 vary depending on the health status of the individuals (i.e., with or without physical
314 frailty); and whether cognitive function was evaluated as a static representation of their
315 general cognition (i.e., MoCA total score), or as an index of sustained cognitive
316 processing (i.e., IIV).

317 **Comparing Total Score between the PF and the non-PF**

318 **Groups**

319 Our findings revealed that compared with non-physically frail older adults, physically
320 frail older adults had lower global cognitive function. This finding was in agreement
321 with earlier studies (42, 43). For example, a cross-sectional that examined 4649
322 individuals aged 50 years and older indicated that physically frail individuals had worse
323 MMSE and MoCA total scores compared with non-physically frail individuals (43).

324 **Comparing IIV between the PF and the non-PF Groups**

325 We found that individuals with physical frailty showed greater IIV than those without
326 physical frailty. These findings were in line with evidence documented in both healthy
327 and cognitively impaired populations. Specifically, a study demonstrated that IIV, as

328 indexed by dispersion across four cognitive domains (i.e., perceptual speed, semantic
329 memory, episodic memory, and fluid reasoning) assessed by nine separate cognitive
330 tests, can effectively discriminate between older adults with and without signs of
331 cognitive decline (44). Halliday et al. (45) have also found that greater IIV as indexed
332 by dispersion was associated with greater impairment in cognitive function across eight
333 cognitive domains (i.e., attention, memory, executive function, processing speed, etc.)
334 assessed by twelve separate cognitive tests among healthy older adults, older adults
335 with MCI, and older adults with AD. Our results confirmed and extended these findings
336 to the physically frail older population and showed that it may be possible to distinguish
337 older adults with and without physical frailty via IIV calculated from a single cognitive
338 test.

339 Notably, it is plausible that greater IIV displayed among PF older adults may be
340 reflective of an impaired neural underpinnings of cognitive processing. A recent study
341 suggested that greater IIV as indexed by dispersion was linked to neural noises -
342 irregular neural activities that hinder cognitive processing - and reductions in the
343 efficiency of neural information processing in the central nervous system (CNS) (46).
344 Several neuroimaging studies indicated that the greater IIV as indexed by dispersion
345 was notably associated with aberrant rest-state functional connectivity of the default
346 mode network (DMN) (47, 48). For instance, greater intranetwork DMN connectivity
347 was correlated with poorer dual-task performance; and greater connectivity between
348 DMN and supplementary motor area was correlated with slower gait speed and greater
349 postural sway in older adults with MCI (49). These findings further support the notion
350 that IIV as indexed by dispersion may be a sensitive and promising indicator for
351 cognitive decline and CNS dysfunction among older adults with physical frailty.

352 **Moderation Effects of Education on the Impact of Aging on** 353 **IIV between the PF and the non-PF Groups**

354 Early evidence suggested that the protective effects of education against cognitive
355 decline may be dependent on physical frailty status. Specifically, study showed that
356 compared with healthy older adults, physically frail older adults exhibited a stronger
357 positive correlation between education and MMSE (50). Extending these findings, we
358 found that education level moderated the association of age with sustained cognitive
359 processing only in older adults with physical frailty. Education level is a well-
360 established proxy of cognitive reserve (50, 51). Importantly, cognitive reserve
361 describes an individual's intrinsic capacity to withstand age- or disease-related
362 pathologies and maintain cognitive function through efficient and effective adaptation
363 of brain networks (52, 53). Stern (53, 54) proposed that older adults with higher
364 cognitive reserve would be able to process cognitive tasks more efficiently, as the brain
365 networks of those with high cognitive reserve were more adaptive, thereby these
366 individuals were more capable in slowing aging-related cognitive decline when faced
367 with the similar levels of age- or disease-related brain pathology. This was supported
368 by neuroimaging studies. One study used graph theory compute human brain
369 connectome and found that greater cognitive reserve was linked to greater global
370 efficiency of brain networks (55). Additionally, by using years of education and scores
371 of intelligence tests as proxies of cognitive reserve, Steffener et al. (56) found that
372 cognitive reserve had a significantly indirect effect on memory performance through
373 reducing the activation (i.e., greater neural efficiency) of the functional networks in
374 older adults. These results suggest that older adults with higher education levels may
375 have greater neural efficiency compared with those with lower education levels.
376 Importantly, our findings aligned with a cross-sectional investigation that showed when

377 compared with those with less education, older adults with 16 or more years of
378 education displayed less IIV as indexed by dispersion (i.e., more stable, robust cognitive
379 processing) (44).

380 Additionally, our results suggest that cognitive benefits from education may be
381 more related to the ability to sustain robust cognitive processing (i.e., IIV), as opposed
382 to a snapshot of the overall cognitive function (i.e., MoCA total score). This aligns well
383 with previous study that administered 14 cognitive tests to older adults and only found
384 notable differences in cognitive function indexed by IIV between the old and very older
385 groups (57). It is plausible that education may mitigate impairments to sustained
386 cognitive processing via maintaining neural efficiency of the neural networks that
387 underpinned sustained cognitive processing. For instance, previous study found that
388 education level was positively associated with local efficiency of brain networks by
389 promoting more modular network configuration that is conducive to nodal
390 communication and integration of information (55).

391 Notably, our findings suggest that the relationship between aging, cognitive
392 function (i.e., MoCA total score and IIV), and education may be complex. Previous
393 evidence also demonstrated the complex association between education and global
394 cognitive function in older adults. Specifically, a longitudinal study that examined 260
395 older adults aged 60 years or older showed that eight years of education was linked to
396 slower decline in MMSE score, but greater than nine years of education did not offer
397 additional protection against cognitive decline (58). Similarly, in a cohort study,
398 Mathuranath and colleagues (59) administered MMSE to 488 cognitively intact older
399 adults and found that more than nine years of education did not offer further benefits in
400 preventing cognitive decline. We extended these findings to physically frail older adults
401 by reporting that years of education of more than 6.6 years did not further protect older

402 physically frail individuals against decline in sustained cognitive processing. However,
403 it is important to also note that while it was not statistically significant, the protective
404 effects of education persisted beyond 6.6 years and were observed in those with more
405 than 12 years, as well as 14 years with incremental increases in the protective effects.
406 This suggests that there may be a ceiling effect in the obtainable cognitive benefits of
407 education. Also, it is plausible that this ceiling effect may be population-dependent, as
408 we observed significantly different moderation effects of education between those with
409 and without physical frailty.

410 In the non-PF group, no significant moderation effect of education on the
411 association between age and IIV was observed. It is probable that the non-PF group
412 may exhibit greater brain reserve capacity. Brain reserve capacity is determined by
413 brain structural integrity (53). The construct posited that individuals with greater brain
414 reserve capacity have greater tolerance to pathologies, enabling the brain to have a
415 higher threshold against insults (52). Hence, within the context of our findings, non-
416 frail older adults may inherently possess greater brain reserve capacity such that the
417 neuroprotective benefits of education were not required in these healthier individuals.
418 Of note, our results align with previous study that reported no significant interaction
419 effect between age and education on memory and general fluid intelligence among 603
420 healthy older adults over 70 (60). This evidence, in conjunction with our findings,
421 suggests that attainable cognitive-protective effects of education may vary depending
422 on the amount of available reserve capacity whereby the ceiling may be lower for those
423 with a greater amount of reserve capacity. However, future studies will be needed to
424 elucidate the relationship between physical frailty, brain reserve, and sustained
425 cognitive processing.

426 The primary strength of our study is the novelty in using IIV computed from a
427 single cognitive test to discriminate older adults with and without physical frailty. This
428 may potentially reduce the time and effort required for clinical diagnosis. However, this
429 study has several limitations. First, we enrolled physically frail older adults who were
430 healthy enough to take part in research studies, therefore our findings cannot be
431 generalized beyond this population. Second, some of the study participants included
432 may be cognitively impaired, therefore we cannot rule out the potential confounding
433 effects of mild cognitive impairment. Third, a single cognitive test was used to compute
434 IIV, therefore our results cannot reflect sustained cognitive processing across multiple
435 cognitive tests in this population. Additionally, longitudinal studies are needed to fully
436 understand the impact of physical frailty on the trajectory of cognitive decline.

437 **Conclusion**

438 This cross-section study provided evidence to support the use of IIV as a measure to
439 identify physically frail older adults. Our findings also suggested that among older
440 adults, the cognitive-protective benefits of education may be directly related to
441 mitigating impaired capacity to sustain robust cognitive processing. However, the
442 attainable protective effects of education may be dependent upon the overall health
443 status of the older individuals.

444 **Funding**

445 This work was supported by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (grant No.
446 P0043317). CLH is the Kuok Group Young Scholar in Aging and Neuroimaging.

447 **Institutional Review Board statement**

448 This study received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of The Hong
449 Kong Polytechnic University (HSEARS20230131001).

450 **Informed consent statement**

451 Informed consent was obtained from all participants involved in the study.

452 **Data availability statement**

453 All the data are available in this paper.

454 **Declaration of Interests Statement**

455 The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research,
456 authorship, and/or publication of this article.

457 **Competing Interests Statement**

458 None

459 **Acknowledgments**

460 The authors thank all participants for their valuable contributions.

461 **Authors Contribution**

462 **Conceptualization:** Chun Liang HSU and Jingyi WU.

463 **Data curation:** Chun Liang HSU.

464 **Formal analysis:** Jingyi WU.

465 **Funding acquisition:** Chun Liang HSU.

466 **Investigation:** Chun Liang HSU, Jingyi WU, Jinyu Chen, and Juncen Wu.

467 **Methodology:** Jingyi WU.

468 **Project administration:** Chun Liang HSU.

469 **Resources:** Chun Liang HSU.

470 **Software:** Jingyi WU.

471 **Supervision:** Chun Liang HSU.

472 **Visualization:** Jingyi WU.

473 **Writing – original draft:** Jingyi WU.

474 **Writing – review & editing:** Chun Liang HSU

475 **References**

- 476 1. Morley JE, Vellas B, Van Kan GA, Anker SD, Bauer JM, Bernabei R, et al. Frailty
477 consensus: a call to action. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*.
478 2013;14(6):392-7.
- 479 2. O’Caoimh R, Sezgin D, O’Donovan MR, Molloy DW, Clegg A, Rockwood K, et
480 al. Prevalence of frailty in 62 countries across the world: a systematic review and meta-
481 analysis of population-level studies. *Age and ageing*. 2021;50(1):96-104.
- 482 3. Feng Z, Lugtenberg M, Franse C, Fang X, Hu S, Jin C, et al. Risk factors and
483 protective factors associated with incident or increase of frailty among community-
484 dwelling older adults: A systematic review of longitudinal studies. *PloS one*.
485 2017;12(6):e0178383.
- 486 4. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, Newman AB, Hirsch C, Gottdiener J, et al.
487 Frailty in older adults: evidence for a phenotype. *The Journals of Gerontology Series*
488 *A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*. 2001;56(3):M146-M57.
- 489 5. Buchman AS, Boyle PA, Wilson RS, Tang Y, Bennett DA. Frailty is associated
490 with incident Alzheimer’s disease and cognitive decline in the elderly. *Psychosomatic*
491 *medicine*. 2007;69(5):483-9.
- 492 6. Ávila - Funes JA, Amieva H, Barberger - Gateau P, Le Goff M, Raoux N, Ritchie
493 K, et al. Cognitive impairment improves the predictive validity of the phenotype of
494 frailty for adverse health outcomes: the three - city study. *Journal of the American*
495 *Geriatrics Society*. 2009;57(3):453-61.
- 496 7. Boyle PA, Buchman AS, Wilson RS, Leurgans SE, Bennett DA. Physical frailty is
497 associated with incident mild cognitive impairment in community - based older
498 persons. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2010;58(2):248-55.
- 499 8. Mitnitski A, Fallah N, Rockwood M, Rockwood K. Transitions in cognitive status
500 in relation to frailty in older adults: a comparison of three frailty measures. *The journal*
501 *of nutrition, health & aging*. 2011;15:863-7.
- 502 9. Boyle PA, Buchman AS, Wilson RS, Leurgans SE, Bennett DA. Physical Frailty
503 Is Associated with Incident Mild Cognitive Impairment in Community-Based Older
504 Persons. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society (JAGS)*. 2010;58(2):248-55.
- 505 10. Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bédirian V, Charbonneau S, Whitehead V, Collin I,
506 et al. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: a brief screening tool for mild
507 cognitive impairment. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2005;53(4):695-9.

- 508 11. Judge D, Roberts J, Khandker RK, Ambegaonkar B, Black CM. Physician practice
509 patterns associated with diagnostic evaluation of patients with suspected mild cognitive
510 impairment and Alzheimer's disease. *International Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*.
511 2019;2019.
- 512 12. Boker SM, Molenaar P, Nesselroade JR. Issues in intraindividual variability:
513 individual differences in equilibria and dynamics over multiple time scales. *Psychology*
514 and aging. 2009;24(4):858.
- 515 13. Hultsch DF, MacDonald SW. Intraindividual variability in performance as a
516 theoretical window onto cognitive aging. *New frontiers in cognitive aging*. 2004:65-88.
- 517 14. Hultsch DF, Strauss E, Hunter MA, MacDonald SW. Intraindividual variability,
518 cognition, and aging. *The handbook of aging and cognition*: Psychology Press; 2011.
519 p. 497-562.
- 520 15. Christensen H, Mackinnon A, Korten A, Jorm A, Henderson A, Jacomb P.
521 Dispersion in cognitive ability as a function of age: A longitudinal study of an elderly
522 community sample. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*. 1999;6(3):214-28.
- 523 16. MacDonald SW, Stawski RS. Intraindividual variability—an indicator of
524 vulnerability or resilience in adult development and aging? *Handbook of*
525 *intraindividual variability across the life span*: Routledge; 2014. p. 231-57.
- 526 17. Aita SL. *Neuropsychological intra-individual variability: Review and meta-*
527 *analysis in clinical adult samples*: University of South Alabama; 2020.
- 528 18. Christensen H, Dear KB, Anstey KJ, Parslow RA, Sachdev P, Jorm AF. Within-
529 occasion intraindividual variability and preclinical diagnostic status: is intraindividual
530 variability an indicator of mild cognitive impairment? *Neuropsychology*.
531 2005;19(3):309.
- 532 19. Burton CL, Strauss E, Hultsch DF, Moll A, Hunter MA. Intraindividual variability
533 as a marker of neurological dysfunction: a comparison of Alzheimer's disease and
534 Parkinson's disease. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*.
535 2006;28(1):67-83.
- 536 20. Holtzer R, Verghese J, Wang C, Hall CB, Lipton RB. Within-person across-
537 neuropsychological test variability and incident dementia. *Jama*. 2008;300(7):823-30.
- 538 21. Vaughan L, Leng I, Dagenbach D, Resnick SM, Rapp SR, Jennings JM, et al.
539 Intraindividual variability in domain-specific cognition and risk of mild cognitive
540 impairment and dementia. *Current gerontology and geriatrics research*. 2013;2013.
- 541 22. Brayne C, Ince PG, Keage HA, McKeith IG, Matthews FE, Polvikoski T, et al.
542 Education, the brain and dementia: neuroprotection or compensation? EClipSE
543 Collaborative Members. *Brain*. 2010;133(8):2210-6.

- 544 23. Brigola AG, Alexandre TdS, Inouye K, Yassuda MS, Pavarini SCI, Mioshi E.
545 Limited formal education is strongly associated with lower cognitive status, functional
546 disability and frailty status in older adults. *Dementia & neuropsychologia*.
547 2019;13:216-24.
- 548 24. Sharp ES, Gatz M. The relationship between education and dementia an updated
549 systematic review. *Alzheimer disease and associated disorders*. 2011;25(4):289.
- 550 25. Alley D, Suthers K, Crimmins E. Education and cognitive decline in older
551 Americans: Results from the AHEAD sample. *Research on aging*. 2007;29(1):73-94.
- 552 26. Cerreta F, Group EMAGE. New harmonized considerations on the evaluation
553 instruments for baseline characterization of frailty in the European Union. *British*
554 *Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*. 2020;86(10):2017-9.
- 555 27. Cerreta F, Ankri J, Bowen D, Cherubini A, Cruz Jentoft AJ, Guðmundsson A, et
556 al. Baseline Frailty Evaluation in Drug Development. *J Frailty Aging*. 2016;5(3):139-
557 40.
- 558 28. European Medicines Agency. Reflection paper on physical frailty: instruments for
559 baseline characterisation of older populations in clinical trials.
560 [https://www.ema.europa.eu/documents/scientific-guideline/reflection-paper-physical-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/documents/scientific-guideline/reflection-paper-physical-frailtyinstruments-baseline-characterisation-older-populations-clinical_en.pdf)
561 [frailtyinstruments-baseline-characterisation-older-populations-clinical_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/documents/scientific-guideline/reflection-paper-physical-frailtyinstruments-baseline-characterisation-older-populations-clinical_en.pdf) 2018
562 Accessed December 29, 2021.
- 563 29. Guralnik JM, Simonsick EM, Ferrucci L, Glynn RJ, Berkman LF, Blazer DG, et
564 al. A short physical performance battery assessing lower extremity function: association
565 with self-reported disability and prediction of mortality and nursing home admission.
566 *Journal of gerontology*. 1994;49(2):M85-M94.
- 567 30. Guralnik JM, Ferrucci L, Pieper CF, Leveille SG, Markides KS, Ostir GV, et al.
568 Lower extremity function and subsequent disability: consistency across studies,
569 predictive models, and value of gait speed alone compared with the short physical
570 performance battery. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and*
571 *Medical Sciences*. 2000;55(4):M221-M31.
- 572 31. da Câmara SMA, Alvarado BE, Guralnik JM, Guerra RO, Maciel ÁCC. Using the
573 Short Physical Performance Battery to screen for frailty in young - old adults with
574 distinct socioeconomic conditions. *Geriatrics & gerontology international*.
575 2013;13(2):421-8.
- 576 32. Bandinelli S, Lauretani F, Boscherini V, Gandi F, Pozzi M, Corsi AM, et al. A
577 randomized, controlled trial of disability prevention in frail older patients screened in
578 primary care: the FRASI study. Design and baseline evaluation. *Aging clinical and*
579 *experimental research*. 2006;18:359-66.

- 580 33. Yeung P, Wong L, Chan C, Leung JL, Yung C. A validation study of the Hong
581 Kong version of Montreal Cognitive Assessment (HK-MoCA) in Chinese older adults
582 in Hong Kong. *Hong Kong Medical Journal*. 2014;20(6):504.
- 583 34. Yeung PY, Wong LL, Chan CC, Yung CY, Leung LJ, Tam YY, et al. Montreal
584 cognitive assessment—single cutoff achieves screening purpose. *Neuropsychiatric
585 Disease and Treatment*. 2020:2681-7.
- 586 35. Dawson B, Trapp RG. *Basic & clinical biostatistics*. Basic & clinical
587 biostatistics2004. p. 438-.
- 588 36. Mascarenhas Fonseca L, Sage Chaytor N, Olufadi Y, Buchwald D, Galvin JE,
589 Schmitter-Edgecombe M, et al. Intraindividual Cognitive Variability and Magnetic
590 Resonance Imaging in Aging American Indians: Data from the Strong Heart Study.
591 *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*. 2023(Preprint):1-13.
- 592 37. Yap B, Sim C. Comparison of various types of normality tests. *Journal of Statistical
593 Computation and Simulation*. 2011;81(12):2141-55.
- 594 38. MacDonald SW, DeCarlo CA, Dixon RA. Linking biological and cognitive aging:
595 toward improving characterizations of developmental time. *Journals of Gerontology
596 Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*. 2011;66(suppl_1):i59-i70.
- 597 39. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. 2nd ed. Hillsdale,
598 N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates; 1988.
- 599 40. Hayes AF. *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis:
600 A regression-based approach*: Guilford publications; 2017.
- 601 41. Yzerbyt V, Muller D, Batailler C, Judd CM. New recommendations for testing
602 indirect effects in mediational models: The need to report and test component paths.
603 *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 2018;115(6):929.
- 604 42. Macuco CRM, Batistoni SST, Lopes A, Cachioni M, da Silva Falcão DV, Neri AL,
605 et al. Mini-Mental State Examination performance in frail, pre-frail, and non-frail
606 community dwelling older adults in Ermelino Matarazzo, São Paulo, Brazil.
607 *International psychogeriatrics*. 2012;24(11):1725-31.
- 608 43. Robertson DA, Savva GM, Coen RF, Kenny RA. Cognitive function in the
609 prefrailty and frailty syndrome. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*.
610 2014;62(11):2118-24.
- 611 44. Hilborn JV, Strauss E, Hultsch DF, Hunter MA. Intraindividual variability across
612 cognitive domains: Investigation of dispersion levels and performance profiles in older
613 adults. *Journal of clinical and experimental neuropsychology*. 2009;31(4):412-24.

- 614 45. Halliday DW, Stawski RS, Cerino ES, DeCarlo CA, Grewal K, MacDonald SW.
615 Intraindividual variability across neuropsychological tests: Dispersion and disengaged
616 lifestyle increase risk for Alzheimer's disease. *Journal of Intelligence*. 2018;6(1):12.
- 617 46. Halliday DW, Gawryluk JR, Garcia-Barrera MA, MacDonald SW. White matter
618 integrity is associated with intraindividual variability in neuropsychological test
619 performance in healthy older adults. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*. 2019;13:352.
- 620 47. Mulet-Pons L, Solé-Padullés C, Cabello-Toscano M, Abellaneda-Pérez K,
621 Perellón-Alfonso R, Cattaneo G, et al. Brain connectivity correlates of cognitive
622 dispersion in a healthy middle-aged population: influence of subjective cognitive
623 complaints. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*. 2023;78(11):1860-9.
- 624 48. Costa AS, Dogan I, Schulz JB, Reetz K. Going beyond the mean: Intraindividual
625 variability of cognitive performance in prodromal and early neurodegenerative
626 disorders. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*. 2019;33(2):369-89.
- 627 49. Crockett RA, Hsu CL, Best JR, Liu-Ambrose T. Resting state default mode
628 network connectivity, dual task performance, gait speed, and postural sway in older
629 adults with mild cognitive impairment. *Frontiers in aging neuroscience*. 2017;9:423.
- 630 50. Ihle A, Gouveia ÉR, Gouveia BR, Freitas DL, Jurema J, Odim AP, et al. The
631 relation of education, occupation, and cognitive activity to cognitive status in old age:
632 the role of physical frailty. *International psychogeriatrics*. 2017;29(9):1469-74.
- 633 51. Farina M, Paloski LH, de Oliveira CR, de Lima Argimon II, Irigaray TQ. Cognitive
634 reserve in elderly and its connection with cognitive performance: A systematic review.
635 *Ageing International*. 2018;43:496-507.
- 636 52. Stern Y. Cognitive reserve in ageing and Alzheimer's disease. *The Lancet*
637 *Neurology*. 2012;11(11):1006-12.
- 638 53. Stern Y. What is cognitive reserve? Theory and research application of the reserve
639 concept. *Journal of the international neuropsychological society*. 2002;8(3):448-60.
- 640 54. Stern Y, Habeck C, Moeller J, Scarmeas N, Anderson KE, Hilton HJ, et al. Brain
641 networks associated with cognitive reserve in healthy young and old adults. *Cerebral*
642 *cortex*. 2005;15(4):394-402.
- 643 55. Marques P, Moreira P, Magalhães R, Costa P, Santos N, Zihl J, et al. The functional
644 connectome of cognitive reserve. *Human brain mapping*. 2016;37(9):3310-22.
- 645 56. Steffener J, Reuben A, Rakitin BC, Stern Y. Supporting performance in the face of
646 age-related neural changes: testing mechanistic roles of cognitive reserve. *Brain*
647 *imaging and behavior*. 2011;5:212-21.

- 648 57. Lindenberger U, Baltes PB. Intellectual functioning in old and very old age: cross-
649 sectional results from the Berlin Aging Study. *Psychology and aging*. 1997;12(3):410.
- 650 58. Lyketsos CG, Chen L-S, Anthony JC. Cognitive decline in adulthood: an 11.5-year
651 follow-up of the Baltimore Epidemiologic Catchment Area study. *American Journal of*
652 *Psychiatry*. 1999;156(1):58-65.
- 653 59. Mathuranath P, Cherian JP, Mathew R, George A, Alexander A, Sarma SP. Mini
654 mental state examination and the Addenbrooke's cognitive examination: Effect of
655 education and norms for a multicultural population. *Neurology India*. 2007;55(2):106-
656 10.
- 657 60. Der G, Allerhand M, Starr JM, Hofer SM, Deary IJ. Age-related changes in
658 memory and fluid reasoning in a sample of healthy old people. *Aging,*
659 *Neuropsychology, and Cognition*. 2009;17(1):55-70.
- 660

Education (Years)

Age (Years)

MoCA total score
or
IIV derived from the MoCA

Fig 1.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.16.24307475>; this version posted May 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




Fig 2.




Fig 3A.





Fig 3B.

Conditional Effect of Age
on MoCA Total Score



— Range of
observed
data

■ n.s.

■ p < .05

Fig 4A.




Fig 4B.