

1 Long-term cognitive effects of menopausal hormone therapy: Findings from 2 the KEEPS Continuation Study

3
4 Carey E. Gleason^{1,2, * †}, N. Maritza Dowling^{3, †}, Firat Kara^{4, †}, Taryn T. James¹, Hector Salazar⁵, Carola
5 Ferrer Simo¹, Sherman M. Harman⁶, JoAnn E. Manson⁷, Dustin B. Hammers⁸, Frederick N. Naftolin⁹,
6 Lubna Pal¹⁰, Virginia M. Miller¹¹, Marcelle I. Cedars¹², Rogerio A. Lobo¹³, Michael Malek-Ahmadi¹⁴, Kejal
7 Kantarci⁴

8
9 ¹Department of Medicine, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA

10 ²Geriatric Research, Education and Clinical Center (GRECC), William S. Middleton Memorial VA
11 Hospital, Madison, WI, USA

12 ³Department of Acute & Chronic Care, George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA

13 ⁴Department of Radiology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

14 ⁵Department of Health and Community Systems, University of Pittsburgh School of Nursing, Pittsburgh,
15 PA, USA

16 ⁶Phoenix VA Health Care System, Phoenix, AZ, USA

17 ⁷Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

18 ⁸Department of Neurology, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN, USA

19 ⁹ e-Bio Corp., New York, NY, USA

20 ¹⁰Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences, Yale University, New Haven, CT,
21 USA

22 ¹¹Department of Surgery, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

23 ¹²Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

24 ¹³Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

25 ¹⁴Banner Alzheimer Institute Phoenix, AZ, USA

26 ***Corresponding Author**

27 Email: ceg@medicine.wisc.edu (CEG)

28
29
30 [†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

31 **Abstract**

32

33 **Background**

34

35 Findings from Kronos Early Estrogen Prevention Study (KEEPS)-Cog trial suggested no cognitive benefit
36 or harm after 48 months of menopausal hormone therapy (mHT) initiated within three years of
37 menopause onset. Long-term effects of mHT exposure during early postmenopause remain
38 understudied. To clarify the long-term effects of mHT initiated in early postmenopause, the
39 observational KEEPS-Continuation Study reevaluated cognition, mood, and neuroimaging effects in
40 participants enrolled in the KEEPS-Cog and its parent study the KEEPS approximately 10 years after trial
41 completion. We hypothesized that the participants randomized to one of two active estrogen
42 formulations during early postmenopause would demonstrate differential longitudinal change in
43 cognitive performance during the approximately ten years following randomization in the parent
44 KEEPS trial when compared to women who received placebo. Specifically, transdermal estradiol (tE2)
45 would demonstrate benefit over placebo, and oral conjugated equine estrogens (oCEE) demonstrate
46 no effect compared to placebo.

47 **Methods and Findings**

48

49 The KEEPS-Cog was an ancillary study to the KEEPS, in which women were randomized to placebo or
50 one of two forms of mHT, oCEE (Premarin, 0.45 mg/d) or tE2 (Climara, 50 µg/d) for 48 months.
51 Micronized progesterone (Prometrium, 200 mg/d) was used by those in mHT arms. Approximately 10
52 years (M(SD)=9.57(1.08) years; range: 8-14 years) after randomization, women returned to repeat the
53 original KEEPS-Cog test battery. Cognitive tests were analyzed as 4 factor scores and a global cognitive
54 score. Because KEEPS-Continuation visits occurred 8-14 years post-randomization, linear latent growth

55 models with distal outcomes tested whether cognitive performance at baseline in KEEPS and the
56 change-in-cognition across KEEPS visits predicted “distal” KEEPS cognition, and whether mHT
57 randomization of KEEPS modified this relationship. Covariates included education, age at continuation
58 visit, and *APOEε4* allele carrier status.

59
60 All 727 postmenopausal participants in the KEEPS interventions were eligible for the KEEPS-
61 Continuation. Among those participants, 622 (86%) had valid contact information and were invited to
62 the study. Of these, 194 did not respond, 10 were deceased, and 119 declined to participate, resulting
63 in 299 participants enrolled in the KEEPS-Continuation at seven sites. Of the 299 KEEPS-Continuation
64 participants, 275 had cognitive data to estimate cognitive factors scores both at KEEPS and KEEPS-
65 Continuation. Similar health characteristics were observed at KEEPS randomization for KEEPS-
66 Continuation participants and nonparticipants (i.e. women not returning for the KEEPS-Continuation).

67
68 Among the women enrolled in the KEEPS-Continuation, cognitive performance was not influenced by
69 either mHT formulation employed in KEEPS. Models showed strong associations between baseline
70 cognition and change-in-cognition during KEEPS and the same measures in KEEPS-Continuation, i.e.,
71 the strongest predictor of cognitive performance in KEEPS-Continuation was cognitive performance in
72 KEEPS. KEEPS-Continuation cross-sectional comparisons confirmed that participants assigned to mHT in
73 KEEPS (oCEE and tE2 groups) performed similarly on cognitive measures to those randomized to
74 placebo, approximately 10 years after women completion of the randomized treatments.

75

76 **Conclusions**

77

78 In these KEEPS-Continuation analyses, there were no long-term cognitive effects of short-term

79 exposure to mHT started in early menopause vs. placebo. These data offer reassurance regarding long

80 term neurocognitive safety of mHT used by healthy recently postmenopausal women for symptom

81 management.

82 **Author summary**

83

84 **Why was this study done?**

85

86 Little is known about the long-term cognitive effects of short-term use of menopausal hormone

87 therapies (mHT) – i.e, the use of mHT during the menopausal transition or in early postmenopause for

88 symptoms of menopause, leaving women and their providers with concerns about long-term

89 consequences of short-term mHT use. We invited women who participated in a study examining the

90 cognitive effects of short-term mHT to return for re-evaluation approximately a decade after they were

91 randomized to 4 years of treatment with one of two forms of mHT or a placebo. Importantly, the

92 original study only enrolled women who were recently postmenopausal and at low cardiovascular risk.

93 The goals for the follow-up study were to examine the long-term cognitive effects of using mHT for a

94 brief period shortly after menopause onset and to assess if these effects differed for the two forms of

95 mHT.

96 **What did the researchers do and find?**

97

98 > The observational Kronos Early Estrogen Prevention Study (KEEPS)-Continuation explored

99 cognitive effects of short-term (4 year) randomized assignment to mHT vs. placebo, initiated

100 within 3 years of menopause onset, after an average of 10 years following randomization in the

101 original KEEPS trial.

102 > We tested whether long term cognitive performance was influenced by prior exposure to HT

103 formulation (e.g., transdermal 17 β -estradiol or oral conjugated equine estrogens), controlling

104 for covariates using linear latent growth models.

- 105 > Among the women enrolled in the KEEPS-Continuation, cognitive performance was not
106 influenced by earlier exposure to either HT formulation.
- 107 > Linear growth models showed strong associations between baseline cognition (intercept) and
108 its change (slope) during KEEPS and the same measures in the KEEPS-Continuation.
- 109 > KEEPS-Continuation cross-sectional comparisons confirmed that both oral and transdermal
110 mHT groups performed similarly to placebo on cognitive measures approximately 10 years after
111 they were randomized to either HT or placebo.

112

113 **What do these findings mean?**

114

- 115 > We detected no long-term cognitive benefit or harm of short-term mHT vs placebo.
- 116 > Our findings suggest that there are no long-term cognitive effects of exposure to short-term
117 mHT vs placebo in recently postmenopausal women who have low cardiovascular risk.
- 118 > These data offer reassurance to recently postmenopausal women with good cardiovascular
119 health who are considering mHT for the management of menopausal symptoms.

120 **Introduction**

121

122 It is estimated that around three-quarters of women will experience symptoms linked to the
123 menopausal transition and approximately one-quarter describe the symptoms as moderately to
124 severely bothersome (1, 2). Common symptoms include vasomotor (hot flashes) and vaginal
125 (vulvovaginal atrophy) symptoms, disturbed sleep, depressed mood, and cognitive difficulties (3, 4).
126 The most effective treatment for these symptoms is menopausal hormone therapy (mHT) (5). Still,
127 women and their health care providers avoid using mHT based on concerns about its safety, as
128 highlighted in a prominent lay audience publication (6).

129

130 Concern about the safety of mHT stems in part from the unexpected findings from the Women’s
131 Health Initiative (WHI) study and its ancillary Memory Study (WHIMS). Specifically, findings from the
132 WHI indicated that treatment with oral conjugated equine estrogens (oCEE) plus medroxyprogesterone
133 acetate (MPA) was associated with elevations in risk for coronary heart disease (CHD) and
134 cerebrovascular disease (CVD) events in older women, who were more than 10 years from the onset of
135 menopause – in addition to the known risk for breast cancer (7, 8). Directly related to cognition, the
136 WHIMS examined the effects of oCEE with MPA and oCEE-alone administered to women aged 65 and
137 older. Altogether, the WHIMS found that both formulations of mHT exhibited deleterious effects on
138 global cognitive function and risk for incident cognitive impairment (9, 10), with oCEE + MPA in
139 particular demonstrating an association with risk of incident mild cognitive impairment and dementia
140 (11).

141


142 Typical use of mHT would rarely involve starting therapy at ages above 65. Critics of the WHIMS design
143 were quick to highlight how initiating hormone therapy (HT) in older women may have profoundly
144 different brain effects than starting therapy around onset of menopause e.g., Henderson and Brinton
145 (12), suggesting a critical window for initiation of mHT – one close to menopause onset. Discussion
146 about a critical window led to a shift in terminology, distinguishing HT from mHT – therapy timed to
147 occur during or close to the menopausal transition.

148

149 Randomized controlled clinical trials including the Kronos Early Estrogen Prevention Study (KEEPS) (13),
150 and its ancillary Cognitive and Affective study (KEEPS-Cog), examined mHT use proximate to
151 menopause onset (early postmenopausal mHT), finding no evidence of harm to cognitive performance
152 with short term use of two different forms of mHT, oCEE and transdermal estradiol (tE2) (14, 15).
153 Equally importantly, mood benefits were found for women treated with oCEE formulation compared to
154 placebo (14).

155

156 We report here the primary cognitive findings of the KEEPS-Continuation study, the primary aims of
157 which were to examine the long-term effects of exposure to mHT on cognitive aging and Alzheimer's
158 disease pathology. In KEEPS-Continuation, participants from the original KEEPS study were re-
159 evaluated approximately a decade after their randomization to four-years of exposure to one of two
160 forms of mHT (oCEE or tE2 with cyclical micronized progesterone) versus placebo. **Fig 1** describes the
161 chronological relationship between the three study phases. We hypothesized that, compared to
162 women treated with placebo, exposure to mHT would influence cognitive performance at long-term
163 follow-up with the direction of influence differing depending upon the mHT formulation. Specifically,



164 **Fig 1. Timeline for KEEPS, KEEPS-Cog and KEEPS-Continuation studies.** The Kronos Early Estrogen Prevention Study (KEEPS) initiated
 165 randomization in July of 2005. In some instances, ancillary studies were started later. The KEEPS-Cognitive and Affective study was
 166 started in August of 2005. **KEEPS:** Kronos Early Estrogen Prevention Study. Parent study examining cardiovascular effects of early
 167 postmenopausal hormone therapy in women at low risk for cardiovascular disease. **KEEPS-Cog: KEEPS Cognitive and Affective**
 168 **study,** an ancillary study to the KEEPS. Enrolled most but not all women enrolled in the KEEPS. Studied cognitive and mood effect.
 169 **KEEPS-Continuation:** Re-enrolled women in KEEPS to study long-term effects of mHT administered in early postmenopause.

170 because tE2 was associated with better preservation of prefrontal cortex volume over time compared
171 to placebo three years after the KEEPS study (16), we hypothesized that tE2 would demonstrate
172 cognitive benefits over placebo, and oCEE would show no difference from placebo.


173 **Methods**

174

175 **KEEPS-Continuation participants**

176

177 The KEEPS-Continuation study conducted follow-up assessments of women previously enrolled in the
178 parent KEEPS study, most of whom were also enrolled in the ancillary KEEPS-Cog (662 out of 727 or
179 91%). However, all women enrolled in the parent KEEPS (n=727) were eligible for participation in the
180 KEEPS-Continuation. Outcomes assessed included cognition and mood, and neuroimaging for
181 Alzheimer's disease proteinopathies; analyses presented here are limited to the cognitive outcomes.
182 Of the 727 postmenopausal participants of KEEPS interventions, valid contact information was
183 available for 622 (86%), all of whom were invited to participate in the KEEPS-Continuation study. Of the
184 622, 194 did not respond to the invitation, 10 were deceased, and 119 declined to participate. Overall,
185 KEEPS-Continuation enrolled 299 KEEPS trial participants at seven sites (Albert Einstein College of
186 Medicine-Montefiore, Banner Alzheimer's Institute, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Columbia
187 University, Mayo Clinic, University of California San Francisco, University of Utah, and Yale University).
188 Of the 299 KEEPS-Continuation participants, 275 (overall, 92%; oCEE, 31%; tE2, 33%; placebo, 36%) had
189 cognitive data available both from KEEPS and KEEPS-Continuation (**Fig 2**). For the 387 KEEPS-Cog
190 women who either declined to participate in KEEPS-Continuation or who could not be located,
191 cognitive data were obtained from the original KEEPS database. These women were considered a
192 nonparticipant group in the current analysis of cognitive outcomes.



193
 194 **Fig 2. Study flowchart.** *COVID-19-related concerns, inconvenient to travel, scheduling conflicts, or moved. KEEPS, Kronos Early
 195 Estrogen Prevention Study; oCEE, oral conjugated equine estrogens; PI, principal investigator; tE2, transdermal 17 β -estradiol.

196 **Enrollment sites and ethics approvals**

197
198 Seven of the original nine sites participated in the KEEPS-Continuation. One site's original contact PI
199 was deceased (University of Washington). No new contact PI was available at another site (Albert
200 Einstein College of Medicine-Montefiore), but these participants were evaluated at the Columbia
201 University Site. The parent KEEPS PI (SMH) contacted participants enrolled at the Kronos Longevity
202 Research Institute site, transferring interested participants to a contact PI at the Banner Institute. All
203 other sites from the original KEEPS remained involved, serving as primary contact for participants.
204 Institutional Review Boards at the six enrollment sites and the University of Wisconsin, Madison
205 reviewed and approved the research protocol.

206

207 **KEEPS and KEEPS-Continuation**

208
209 KEEPS employed a randomized, controlled clinical trial design wherein women were administered
210 either 0.45mg/day oCEE; 50 µg/day tE2; or placebo tablets and patches. All participants in KEEPS had
211 an intact uterus. Therefore, micronized progesterone (Prometrium, 200 mg/d) was given orally for 12
212 days at the beginning of each month to both mHT groups for endometrial protection (17). Altogether,
213 participants (1) took a tablet daily containing either oCEE or placebo, (2) wore a patch with tE2 or
214 placebo, and (3) cyclically took a capsule with either micronized progesterone or placebo. Further
215 details regarding study participants are available in publications describing the primary findings (14,
216 17). Enrollment in the original KEEPS occurred between July 2005 and June 2008.

217

218 Women who had participated the original KEEPS trial were recontacted for the KEEPS-Continuation
219 study, even if they did not participate in the KEEPS-Cog ancillary study or have baseline cognitive

220 assessments. KEEPS-Continuation enrollment occurred between May 2019 and June 2022. No
221 medications or non-pharmaceutical interventions were administered in the KEEPS-Continuation study.
222 Women were contacted for re-enrollment through their original enrollment site and invited to return
223 for observational data collection visits. Data collected included medical history, cognitive and mood
224 data collection, biometric examination, magnetic resonance imaging of the brain and positron emission
225 tomography (PET) measurement of brain amyloid and tau (amyloid and tau PET). Comparison of the
226 cardiometabolic status of women enrolled in the KEEPS-Continuation and those in the original KEEPS
227 were published previously (18). Data collected from MRI and PET will be the focus of a future
228 publication. This report focuses on the cognitive outcomes.

229

230 **Approach for recontacting**

231
232 All participants enrolled in the original KEEPS were eligible for the KEEPS-Continuation, not just those
233 enrolled in the ancillary KEEPS-Cog. Thus, following IRB approval, all women enrolled in the original
234 KEEPS were first sent informational letters from personnel at their original enrollment site, inviting
235 them to enroll in the KEEPS-Continuation study. Follow-up telephone communication was attempted
236 for those who did not respond to letters. If letters were returned due to a change of address, staff
237 conducted brief on-line searches for new address or contact information. Participants from the original
238 KEEPS who were enrolled at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine/Montefiore Medical Center site in
239 New York were approached for KEEPS-Continuation enrollment at the Columbia University site in New
240 York. Women enrolled at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine-Montefiore site were sent letters
241 from a staff member involved in the original study, inviting them to contact the Columbia University
242 site for enrollment into the KEEPS-Continuation study.

243

244 **Primary outcomes**

245

246 Cognitive assessments from the original KEEPS-Cog (14) were replicated for the KEEPS-Continuation
247 study. A battery of eleven cognitive tests were administered and summarized into *four cognitive factor*
248 *scores*: Verbal Learning and Memory (VLM), Auditory Attention and Working Memory (AAWM), Visual
249 Attention and Executive Function (VAEF), and Speeded Language and Mental Flexibility (SLMF). Details
250 on the derivation of factor scores have been previously published (14). Additionally, *global cognitive*
251 *function* was assessed with the Modified Mini-Mental State examination (3MSE) (19). Data collection
252 and analysis at the KEEPS-Continuation visit focused on changes occurring during the interval between
253 the participants' original KEEPS study participation, and their KEEPS-Continuation study involvement.
254 Data available from the original KEEPS study included cognitive variables, demographic, biometric, and
255 medical history data, and the carrier status for apolipoprotein E epsilon4 (*APOEε4*), a genetic risk factor
256 for Alzheimer's disease (20).

257

258 **mHT use between end of KEEPS and recontact for KEEPS-Continuation**

259

260 Women were interviewed regarding their use of mHT after the end of KEEPS: “Have you taken
261 hormone therapy since ending participation in the KEEPS trial?”. Out of the 299 participants in KEEPS-
262 Continuation, 41 (overall, 13.71%; oCEE, 41.5%; tE2, 36.6%; placebo, 22%) continued with the mHT
263 regimens used in the KEEPS trial or switched to another type of systemic mHT after the end of the
264 study. Most of the KEEPS-Continuation participants who went on to use systemic mHT or switched to
265 another type of systemic mHT after the end of the study (n=40; oCEE, 42.5%; tE2, 35%; placebo, 22.5%)
266 also had cognitive data in the original KEEPS trial.

267

268 **Statistical methods**

269

270 All statistical analyses were performed with R software, Version 4.3.3 (21). To examine the influence of

271 attrition, we compared baseline characteristics from the original KEEPS trial between women who

272 participated and those who did not participate in the KEEPS-Continuation, referred to here as,

273 nonparticipants (i.e., those to either declined to participate or who were lost to follow-up).

274 Characteristics were summarized using means and standard deviations for continuous variables and

275 counts and percentages for categorical variables. Data from participants and nonparticipant

276 characteristics were compared using Fisher exact test (for categorical variables) or Student t-test (for

277 continuous variables) as appropriate. For each statistical test the type I error was set at 5% and the

278 tests were two sided.

279

280 **Primary Analyses: Latent growth model with a distal outcome**

281

282 The time interval between KEEPS randomization and KEEPS-Continuation visits varied from 8-14 years

283 across participants. Latent growth models (LGM) with a distal (long-term) outcome were estimated to

284 investigate whether participants' baseline cognition and changes in cognition across original KEEPS

285 visits (growth factors) predicted cognitive performance 8-14 years later and whether mHT

286 randomization modified this relationship (22-24). Changes across time were modeled as linear

287 reflecting unequally spaced time points fixed at 0, 18, 36, and 48. The latent intercept and slope factors

288 were allowed to correlate. The influence of mHT assignment was incorporated via direct effects on

289 both the intercept and slope factors of cognitive performance during KEEPS trial and the distal

290 outcome. LGM models were fitted separately for all the four cognitive factor outcomes and the global

291 cognitive outcome measured by the 3MSE. All LGM models controlled for education, age, and *APOEε4*
292 carrier status.

293

294 Model fit was evaluated using multiple indices: the (standardized) root mean square residual (SRMR)
295 and comparative fit index (CFI) (25-27). Values of the $CFI \geq 0.95$ and the $SRMR \leq 0.08$ were deemed to
296 reflect good model fit (28). To allow for estimations based on all available data and produce more
297 efficient and less biased parameter estimates in the presence of non-normality and missing data, all
298 LGM model parameters were estimated using robust maximum likelihood estimation procedures (29,
299 30).

300

301 *Post hoc* sensitivity analyses

302

303 To clarify effects of mHT withdrawal, we conducted a *post hoc* sensitivity analysis excluding the 40
304 participants who had either continued the mHT regimens used in the KEEPS trial or switched to
305 another type of systemic mHT after the end of the KEEPS trial. This exclusion was specifically directed
306 to the primary goal of describing whether randomization to 4 years of mHT (in KEEPS) modified
307 cognition 8-14 years later. For this reason, a simplified category of ‘any use’ of systemically active mHT
308 during the interval was used as an exclusionary criterion for these *post hoc* sensitivity analyses.
309 Analyses were conducted separately for all four cognitive factor score outcomes and global cognition
310 (3MSE).

311

312 Secondary Analyses: Cross-sectional comparison of cognitive outcomes

313

314 Data from 292 participants were available to derive factors scores for women returning for a KEEPS-
315 Continuation visit. Using these data, we assessed differences in mean performance by KEEPS
316 randomization groups across the four cognitive latent factor scores and global cognition using one-way
317 analysis of variance models.

318 **Results**

319

320 **Participant characteristics**

321

322 **Table 1** provides a summary of participant characteristics at the time of enrollment into the KEEPS for
323 the 275 women enrolled in the KEEPS-Continuation. Also included in **Table 1** is a comparison of
324 baseline characteristics between women who returned for the KEEPS-Continuation and the non-
325 participants enrolled in the original KEEPS for whom we had KEEPS baseline cognitive data. In general,
326 KEEPS baseline characteristics of women returning for the KEEPS-Continuation were similar to the
327 those not returning with the exception of blood pressure readings and baseline 3MSE scores.
328 Women who did not return for re-evaluation had a slightly but significantly higher baseline systolic
329 blood pressure ($p = 0.021$). Differences in diastolic blood pressure and 3MSE scores were marginally
330 significant ($p = 0.047$ and $p=0.044$, respectively).

331

332 **Linear latent growth models**

333

334 **Table 2** presents the model fit indices and parameter estimates for analyses conducted for each of the
335 five primary outcomes. An examination of the fit indices suggests that the models provide a good fit to

336 **Table 1.** Baseline characteristics from the original KEEPS trial in participants and nonparticipants of the
 337 KEEPS Continuation. Characteristics represent original KEEPS trial data collected between years 2005
 338 and 2008.
 339

Variable	KEEPS-Continuation Nonparticipants (n=387) <i>KEEPS Baseline characteristics</i>	KEEPS-Continuation Participants with Cognitive Data (n=275) <i>KEEPS Baseline characteristics</i>	p-value
Age ^a at entry into KEEPS trial (mean, SD)	52.556 (2.706)	52.789 (2.427)	0.254
Time since Menopause in years (mean, SD)	1.410 (0.706)	1.458 (0.760)	0.203
Waist/Hip ratio (mean, SD)	0.820 (0.079)	0.812 (0.085)	0.206
Systolic BP (mm Hg) (mean, SD)	119.952 (15.367)	117.219 (14.303)	0.021
Diastolic BP (mm Hg) (mean, SD)	75.444 (9.213)	74.018 (8.81)	0.047
Glucose (mg/dL) (mean, SD)	89.111 (10.179)	89.178 (9.168)	0.931
Insulin (mcU/mL) (mean, SD)	6.099 (8.211)	6.203 (9.736)	0.883
HOMA-IR ^b (mean, SD)	1.301 (2.553)	1.26 (2.127)	0.830
3MSE (mean score out of 100 total possible points, SD)	96.37 (4.607)	96.96 (3.716)	0.044
Education level, n (%)			
Some High School	2 (0.522 %)	1 (0.365 %)	0.850
High School Diploma or GED	25 (6.527 %)	21 (7.664 %)	
Some College/Vocational School	78 (20.366 %)	45 (16.423 %)	
College Graduate	151 (39.426 %)	115 (41.971 %)	
Some Graduate or professional school	17 (4.439 %)	13 (4.745 %)	
Graduate or Professional degree	110 (28.721 %)	79 (28.832 %)	
<i>APOE</i> ε4 allele carrier, n (%)	84 (24.46%)	66 (26.40%)	0.797
Current or past smoker, n (%)	100 (25.907%)	56 (20.364%)	0.098

340 Characteristics represent original KEEPS trial data collected between years 2005 and 2008 before the time when women were recontacted for the KEEPS
 341 continuation. Data shown are mean (SD) or n (%). P values are from Fisher exact test or Student t test as appropriate. The statistically significant findings
 342 are in bolded font. BP, blood pressure; HOMA-IR, homeostasis model assessment of insulin resistance; 3MSE, Mini-Mental State Examination; KEEPS,
 343 Kronos Early Estrogen Prevention Study. ^aAge was recorded and shared by participant's report of their age and not date of birth in KEEPS. Age was
 344 calculated based on date of birth in KEEPS-Continuation. ^bLog-transformed HOMA-IR.
 345

346 **Table 2.** Linear latent growth models for cognitive outcomes showing the association between
 347 intercept and slope for cognitive performance during menopausal hormone therapy and later cognitive
 348 function measured at KEEPS-Continuation.

Variable	Estimate	S.E.	P-Value	95% Confidence Intervals
Verbal Attention & Executive Function				
Intercept for cognitive performance	0.396	0.055	<0.001	(0.289 - 0.504)
Slope for cognitive performance	0.528	0.056	<0.001	(0.418 - 0.638)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on slope for cognitive performance</i>				
oCEE	0.011	0.050	0.832	(-0.088 - 0.110)
tE2	-0.022	0.050	0.657	(-0.121 - 0.077)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on later cognitive function</i>				
oCEE	-0.012	0.04	0.760	(-0.090 - 0.066)
tE2	-0.046	0.041	0.254	(-0.126 - 0.033)
Fit Indices				
CFI=0.970; SRMR=0.058				
AIC=6813.782; BIC=6931.443				
Speeded Language & Mental Flexibility				
Intercept for cognitive performance	0.480	0.075	<0.001	(0.334 - 0.627)
Slope for cognitive performance	0.476	0.096	<0.001	(0.289 - 0.664)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on slope for cognitive performance</i>				
oCEE	-0.005	0.052	0.924	(-0.108 - 0.098)
tE2	-0.013	0.052	0.800	(-0.114 - 0.088)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on later cognitive function</i>				
oCEE	-0.021	0.037	0.579	(-0.094 - 0.052)
tE2	-0.032	0.041	0.437	(-0.112 - 0.048)
Fit Indices				
CFI=0.955; SRMR=0.064				
AIC=7501.294; BIC=7534.425				
Auditory Attention & Working Memory				
Intercept for cognitive performance	0.593	0.045	<0.001	(0.505 - 0.681)
Slope for cognitive performance	0.400	0.046	<0.001	(0.311 - 0.489)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on slope for cognitive performance</i>				
oCEE	-0.062	0.057	0.279	(-0.173 - 0.050)
tE2	-0.042	0.056	0.445	(-0.152 - 0.067)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on later cognitive function</i>				
oCEE	0.011	0.047	0.817	(-0.082 - 0.104)
tE2	0.052	0.042	0.222	(-0.031 - 0.134)
Fit Indices				
CFI=0.960; SRMR=0.047				
AIC=6053.908; BIC=6171.570				

349 **Table 2.** (continued)
350

Variable	Estimate	S.E.	P-Value	95% Confidence Intervals
Verbal Learning & Memory				
Intercept for cognitive performance	0.418	0.051	<0.001	(0.319 - 0.517)
Slope for cognitive performance	0.455	0.063	<0.001	(0.331 - 0.579)
<i>Effect of mHT allocation during KEEPS trial on slope for cognitive performance</i>				
oCEE	-0.076	0.055	0.167	(-0.183 - 0.032)
tE2	-0.068	0.053	0.203	(-0.172 - 0.036)
<i>Effect of mHT allocation during KEEPS trial on later cognitive function</i>				
oCEE	-0.084	0.049	0.086	(-0.181 - 0.012)
tE2	-0.076	0.051	0.138	(-0.177 - 0.024)
Fit Indices				
CFI=0.980; SRMR=0.038				
AIC=8874.730; BIC=8992.392				
Global Cognition (Modified Mini-Mental State Test)				
Intercept for cognitive performance	0.951	0.219	<0.001	(0.522 - 1.380)
Slope for cognitive performance	0.421	0.334	0.207	(-0.233 - 1.076)
<i>Effect of mHT allocation during KEEPS trial on slope for cognitive performance</i>				
oCEE	0.170	0.137	0.214	(-0.098 - 0.439)
tE2	0.100	0.107	0.350	(-0.110 - 0.310)
<i>Effect of mHT allocation during KEEPS trial on later cognitive function</i>				
oCEE	0.0001	0.06	0.995	(-0.118 - 0.017)
tE2	-0.103	0.064	0.106	(-0.228 - 0.022)
Fit Indices				
CFI=0.991; SRMR=0.031				
AIC=12684.378; BIC=12742.698				

351 The statistically significant findings are in bold font. HT, menopausal hormone therapy; KEEPS, Kronos Early Estrogen Prevention Study; oCEE, oral
352 conjugated equine estrogens; tE2, transdermal estradiol; S.E, standard error; CFI, Comparative Fit Index; AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian
353 Information Criterion; SRMR, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.
354

355 the data and that mHT randomization did not differentially influence cognitive outcomes during mHT
356 nor when measured approximately 10 years after the end of the KEEPS trial. Specifically, women
357 randomized to oCEE or tE2 demonstrated cognitive trajectories similar to those of women randomized
358 to placebo in KEEPS. This was the case for all four cognitive factors and for performance on the global
359 cognitive measure. Confirming findings from previous study analyses, during 4 years of randomization,
360 the slope or growth curve for cognitive function on the 4 cognitive factors and the 3MSE (global
361 cognition) was similar for women randomized to either form of mHT, oCEE or tE2, when compared to
362 those randomized to placebo. Follow-up at KEEPS-Continuation suggested a similar null effect of
363 randomization. Rather than HT randomization, cognitive performance at the KEEPS-Continuation visit
364 (distal outcome) appeared to be more closely associated with performance at KEEPS baseline and
365 cognitive performance over KEEPS study visits. That is, the strongest predictor of cognitive
366 performance in KEEPS-Continuation was cognitive performance in KEEPS trial both at baseline
367 (intercept) and across time (slope).

368

369 ***Post hoc sensitivity analyses***

370

371 Of those who indicated any use of mHT after the KEEPS ended most had been randomized to an active
372 arm during the KEEPS; oCEE, n=17(42.5%); tE2, n=14(35%); placebo, n=9(22.5%). The results of the
373 sensitivity analyses after removing participants (n=40) who continued the use of systemic mHT or
374 switched to another type of systemic mHT or started to use a systemic mHT (from placebo group) after
375 the end of KEEPS are presented in the **S1 Table**. The overall impact on parameter estimates was
376 relatively trivial.

377

378 **Cross-sectional comparison of cognitive outcomes**

379

380 As shown in **Table 3**, the comparison of cognitive performance at the KEEPS-Continuation visit revealed
381 no significant group differences between the mHT and placebo groups on the four cognitive factors
382 and global cognition. P values for the factor scores were all >0.40 and effect sizes (η^2) < 0.006 .
383 Although the P value for the 3MSE was marginal ($p=0.059$), differences did not reach statistical
384 significance for this global cognitive measure. **Fig 3** illustrates the consistent trends in cognitive
385 performance by HT group across all factor scores and global cognition. Additionally, a comparison of
386 the proportion of participants with cognitive data using systemic HT after KEEPS did not reach
387 statistical significance among the treatment groups ($p = 0.097$).

388

389 **Discussion**

390

391 The primary aim of the KEEPS-Continuation study was to examine whether prior exposure to mHT was
392 associated with long-term and lasting effects on cognition. This was not addressed earlier in the
393 original KEEPS or its ancillary KEEPS-Cog study, which examined the short-term effects of mHT. In the
394 present study, approximately ten years after 48 months of early menopausal therapy, i.e. mHT in
395 KEEPS trial, the cognitive performance of women randomized to oCEE or tE2 did not differ from those
396 randomized to placebo. This was demonstrated as an outcome relative to KEEPS baseline performance
397 and cognitive performance over time while enrolled in the KEEPS, and when cognition at the KEEPS-
398 Continuation was compared cross-sectionally across the KEEPS randomization groups. Thus, there

399
400


Table 3. Cross-sectional comparisons of cognitive performance at the time of KEEPS-Continuation.

Cognitive Performance	Sum of Squares	df	MS	F	p	η²
<i>Verbal Learning & Memory</i>						
Treatment Group	0.661	2	0.331	0.36	0.698	0.005
Residuals	265.109	289	0.917			
<i>Speeded Language and Mental Flexibility</i>						
Treatment Group	0.304	2	0.152	0.18	0.835	0.002
Residuals	243.511	289	0.843			
<i>Auditory Attention and Working Memory</i>						
Treatment Group	0.593	2	0.296	0.38	0.684	0.003
Residuals	225.432	289	0.78			
<i>Visual Attention and Executive Function</i>						
Treatment Group	1.486	2	0.743	0.877	0.417	0.004
Residuals	244.889	289	0.847			
<i>Global Cognition (3MS)</i>						
Treatment Group	62.238	2	31.119	2.857	0.059	0.020
Residuals	3202.315	294	10.892			

401

df, Degrees of Freedom; MS, Mean Square; F, F-statistic; p, p-value; η², Eta Squared.

402



403

404 **Fig 3. Cross-sectional Cognitive results.** Distribution of cognitive factor scores and the modified mini-mental
405 state examination (global cognition) by treatment group in the KEEPS-Continuation study. oCEE, oral
406 conjugated equine estrogens; tE2, transdermal estradiol. Total possible score was 100 points on the
407 Modified Mini-Mental State Examination (3MS).
408

409

410 appears to be no long-term beneficial or harmful cognitive effects of HT use when initiated around the
411 time of menopause.

412

413 These data counter concerns for cognitive harms associated with mHT from the WHIMS study (9-11).
414 It is important to point out that women enrolled in WHIMS were all age 65 years or older at the time of
415 enrollment and mHT randomization, with a mean age of 69 at baseline compared to women in KEEPS
416 whose mean age was 52 years. In addition, some women in WHIMS had increased CVD risk at
417 baseline, whereas women in KEEPS did not have increased risk for CVD. In other words, the WHIMS did
418 not investigate effects of *early postmenopausal* HT on cognitive outcomes. Rather, the study offered
419 important insights on the cognitive effects of *late postmenopausal* HT.

420

421 The KEEPS-Continuation finding of no long-term influence on cognitive performance adds to our
422 understanding of the safety of mHT use in early postmenopausal women who are at low CVD risk.
423 Moreover, these data contribute to the emerging understanding of the hypothetical 'critical window'
424 for mHT use. Briefly, after the surprising findings from the WHIMS were published, it was theorized
425 that the peri- or early postmenopause period was a critical window (31) for HT use, and that mHT
426 could result in both deleterious or beneficial effects on cognitive health, depending on the timing of
427 administration (32). Biological explanations for timing theories linked time-since-menopause to the
428 health of underlying cells and substrates (i.e., the healthy cell bias and intact mitochondrial
429 bioenergetics) (33).

430

431 Several studies partly tested the critical window hypothesis for brain health by examining the short-
432 term effects of mHT, including the KEEPS-Cog study (14), an ancillary study to the KEEPS. Findings from
433 the KEEPS-Cog suggested that women treated with tE2 plus micronized progesterone, oCEE plus
434 micronized progesterone, or placebo exhibited no significant cognitive benefits or harms on four
435 cognitive domains and a global cognitive measure with 48 months of therapy. Notably, participants
436 who received oCEE reported fewer depression and anxiety symptoms over the course of four years
437 compared to those on placebo. Another randomized control trial, the Early versus Late Intervention
438 Trial with Estradiol (ELITE) (15), administered an oral estradiol for up to 5 years to both women who
439 were within six years of menopause and women who were ten or more years past menopause. Like
440 KEEPS-Cog, ELITE findings revealed no cognitive harm nor benefit for younger women. In contrast to
441 WHIMS, the ELITE data also suggested no harm or benefit on cognition for the women randomized to
442 HT a decade after onset of menopause. The KEEPS-Continuation findings extend our understanding of
443 the cognitive effects of mHT beyond short-term effects; specifically, use of HT within the time frame of
444 early menopause appears to have no long-term cognitive effects.

445

446 To explore the critical window hypothesis, the WHIMS investigators re-examined their data, also
447 concluding that HT use proximal to menopause was not associated with long-term cognitive effects.
448 The WHIMS of Younger Women (WHIMSY)(34) re-evaluated women enrolled in the WHI oCEE-alone or
449 CEE+MPA trials when they were between the ages 50 and 55, approximately 7 years after their
450 discontinuation of HT, or placebo (34, 35). However, cognitive data from these younger cohort were
451 not collected during the participants' active intervention phases with study medications. Thus,
452 cognitive performance could only be compared cross-sectionally. Participants receiving mHT at ages

453 50-55 showed no differences in cognitive performance compared to women randomized to placebo.
454 KEEPS-Continuation data provide consistent evidence that both mHT-groups performed similarly to
455 placebo on cognitive measures approximately 10 years after they were randomized to either mHT or
456 placebo. Our KEEPS-Continuation models add to our understanding by examining cognition
457 performance indicators prior to and during mHT exposure. Overall, models showed strong associations
458 between baseline and change-in-cognition during KEEPS and the same measures in KEEPS-
459 Continuation, i.e., strongest predictor of cognitive performance in KEEPS-Continuation was cognitive
460 performance in KEEPS.

461

462 Altogether, these findings add to our understanding of the importance of timing of mHT
463 administration, but do not fully support the original critical window hypothesis for cognition.
464 Specifically, while exposure to specific forms of mHT well past menopause appear to be associated
465 with cognitive harms, mHT in early postmenopause demonstrates neither harm nor benefits.
466
467 KEEPS neuroimaging studies investigating structural and metabolic changes following mHT supported
468 the importance of timing, but also highlighted continued discrepancies in the extant literature -
469 possibly related to form of mHT. For example, in another single-site ancillary KEEPS study focused on
470 neuroimaging, Kantarci et al. (36) demonstrated that approximately seven years post randomization
471 and three years after the end of KEEPS trial, tE2 but not oCEE was associated with decreased amyloid
472 β deposition on PET, especially in *APOE ϵ 4* carriers. Furthermore, women treated with both forms of
473 mHT had increased ventricular volume, when receiving oCEE and tE2 compared to women randomized
474 to placebo, but the difference was significant only in the oCEE group (37). However, this increase in

475 ventricular volume was no longer present 3 years after the end of hormone therapies, suggesting that
476 this may be a physiological effect only present during the hormone therapy phase. The authors noted
477 that initiation of mHT may have to fall within three years of menopause in order to reduce the risk of
478 ventricular expansion. The KEEPS-Continuation included neuroimaging data collection. Findings in this
479 larger sample will clarify the long-term effects of mHT on Alzheimer's disease biomarkers and brain
480 structure.

481
482 Importantly, multiple key study design features and participant characteristics may contribute to the
483 findings in the KEEPS-Continuation – all of which may reduce risk for cognitive declines. Not only were
484 all women in the KEEPS baseline within three years of their final menstrual period and with low CVD
485 risk, but also none were diabetic, and none had undergone hysterectomy. The KEEPS utilized a lower
486 oCEE dose than that used in the WHIMS, and unlike WHIMS included a tE2 formulation randomization
487 group. Finally, estrogen was administered with cyclic micronized progesterone in an attempt to mimic
488 a more physiologic paradigm, while the WHIMS trial utilized continuous administration of synthetic
489 progestin (MPA). These key differences in study design and study population likely contributed in some
490 part to the discrepant findings between the KEEPS-Cog and KEEPS-Continuation, and the WHIMS.

491
492 KEEPS-Continuation was not without limitations. Only 299 out of the 727 of the original KEEPS cohort
493 (41%) participated in the KEEPS-Continuation. A significant portion of this recruitment occurred during
494 the COVID-19 pandemic (2020-2022), which severely hindered enrollment efforts. The pandemic led to
495 reluctance among participants to travel or attend the study sites, and many procedures were delayed
496 or canceled due to institutional closures, creating numerous scheduling challenges. Despite these

497 obstacles, the KEEPS-Continuation successfully recruited 299 participants, a substantial number for a
498 follow-up study of a clinical trial that randomized participants to an intervention up to 14 years earlier.
499 Of these 299 participants, the majority (275 or 92%) had KEEPS trial data on cognitive outcomes. Data
500 regarding the type, dose, and duration of mHT used post KEEPS were self-reported, raising concerns
501 about potential for recall bias. Although our analyses relied only on the simplified report of any use of
502 systemic HT vs. no use, the effects of the more granular and often imprecise reports about
503 formulation, dose, length of use were not assessed. Participants of KEEPS-Continuation were primarily
504 non-Hispanic and white, generally well educated and by KEEPS design, free from many comorbid
505 conditions; thus, population characteristics limit the generalizability of results to more racially and
506 ethnically diverse populations who have varying level of education and health status. In particular,
507 KEEPS baseline participants had low CVD risk. So, the results may not be generalizable for those with
508 greater CVD risk. Finally, like other research involving a prolonged period of time between original
509 study involvement and follow-up, the participants who returned for the KEEPS-Continuation study
510 were likely more advantaged than those who did not return for follow-up - often in unmeasured
511 factors that influence cognition (income, geographic settings, employment, family support).

512

513 The WHIMS findings and WHI data showing increased risk for cardiovascular events and breast cancer
514 (7) led to dramatic shifts in mHT use. Prevalence of use declined to nearly half of pre-WHI levels in the
515 first years after findings were published (38), but marginally rebounded in subsequent years (39). In
516 the decades since the WHI publications, women using HT at menopause do so at lower doses and in a
517 greater variety of forms and routes of administration (40). In general, data from the Study of Women

518 Across the Nation suggest that women entering menopause are avoiding HT altogether, even when
519 they are symptomatic (39).

520

521 In contrast, mHT is an effective therapy for menopause associated symptoms e.g., vasomotor
522 symptoms (5). Data presented here add to the accumulating data from several clinical trials, including
523 KEEPS and KEEPS-Cog, which point toward mHT in early menopause being safe for both short- and
524 long-term cognitive health. On the other hand, there are health risks associated with mHT use,
525 including possibility of certain cancers. This can be mitigated by limiting the dosage, length of time, and
526 possibly the route and formulation of mHT that is administered, although randomized trials of these
527 approaches are lacking.

528

529 A tailored or precision medicine approach would be optimal, allowing clinicians to fully understand
530 characteristics that would make it unsafe for women to initiate therapy. Espeland et al.(41) found that
531 among women enrolled in the WHIMS, those with diabetes who were randomized to oCEE
532 demonstrated the highest risk of developing cognitive impairment and probable dementia compared
533 to those without diabetes regardless of mHT assignment. Likewise, data from the KEEPS highlighted
534 the need to further characterize pharmacogenomic interactions, describing how genetic variants
535 appeared to interact with mHT status to affect cardiovascular phenotypes (42).

536

537 Altogether, data are still needed to guide the healthcare of women entering the menopausal
538 transition. Specifically, data to assist women in making personalized, informed decisions regarding
539 management of their menopausal symptoms and the prevention of future adverse health outcomes.

540 Ideally, a woman seeking to manage symptoms occurring during early postmenopause with HT would
541 have specific and personalized guidance, such that she need not carry undue concerns, or be unaware
542 of real risks should she opt to use HT to manage her menopausal symptoms.

543 **Conclusions**

544
545 Approximately a decade after randomization, women treated with four years of mHT performed
546 similarly on cognitive factors assessing four domains and a global cognitive measure to women treated
547 with placebo. Findings may reassure women opting to use hormone therapy in early menopause, to
548 manage menopausal symptoms, that four years of therapy started within 3 years of menopause had no
549 long-term deleterious impact on cognition.

551 **Acknowledgments**

552

553 The authors gratefully acknowledge the study participants and staff of the KEEPS-Continuation for their
554 time and effort.

555

556

557 **References**

558

- 559 1. Gartoulla P, Bell RJ, Worsley R, Davis SR. Moderate-severely bothersome vasomotor symptoms
560 are associated with lowered psychological general wellbeing in women at midlife. *Maturitas*.
561 2015;81(4):487-92.
- 562 2. Gartoulla P, Worsley R, Bell RJ, Davis SR. Moderate to severe vasomotor and sexual symptoms
563 remain problematic for women aged 60 to 65 years. *Menopause*. 2015;22(7):694-701.
- 564 3. Santoro N, Epperson CN, Mathews SB. Menopausal Symptoms and Their Management.
565 *Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am*. 2015;44(3):497-515.
- 566 4. Monteleone P, Mascagni G, Giannini A, Genazzani AR, Simoncini T. Symptoms of menopause -
567 global prevalence, physiology and implications. *Nat Rev Endocrinol*. 2018;14(4):199-215.
- 568 5. Faubion SS, Crandall CJ, Davis L, El Khoudary SR, Hodis HN, Lobo RA, et al. The 2022
569 hormone therapy position statement of The North American Menopause Society. *Menopause-the Journal*
570 *of the North American Menopause Society*. 2022;29(7):767-94.
- 571 6. Dominus S. Women have been misled about menopause. *The New York Times Magazine*. 2023
572 February 5, 2023.
- 573 7. Rossouw JE, Anderson GL, Prentice RL, LaCroix AZ, Kooperberg C, Stefanick ML, et al. Risks
574 and benefits of estrogen plus progestin in healthy postmenopausal women: principal results From the
575 Women's Health Initiative randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 2002;288(3):321-33.
- 576 8. Chlebowski RT, Anderson GL, Aragaki AK, Manson JE, Stefanick ML, Pan K, et al.
577 Association of Menopausal Hormone Therapy With Breast Cancer Incidence and Mortality During
578 Long-term Follow-up of the Women's Health Initiative Randomized Clinical Trials. *JAMA*.
579 2020;324(4):369-80.
- 580 9. Shumaker SA, Legault C, Kuller L, Rapp SR, Thal L, Lane DS, et al. Conjugated equine
581 estrogens and incidence of probable dementia and mild cognitive impairment in postmenopausal
582 women: Women's Health Initiative Memory Study. *JAMA*. 2004;291(24):2947-58.
- 583 10. Espeland MA, Rapp SR, Shumaker SA, Brunner R, Manson JE, Sherwin BB, et al. Conjugated
584 equine estrogens and global cognitive function in postmenopausal women: Women's Health Initiative
585 Memory Study. *Jama*. 2004;291(24):2959-68.
- 586 11. Shumaker SA, Legault C, Rapp SR, Thal L, Wallace RB, Ockene JK, et al. Estrogen plus
587 progestin and the incidence of dementia and mild cognitive impairment in postmenopausal women: the
588 Women's Health Initiative Memory Study: a randomized controlled trial. *Jama*. 2003;289(20):2651-62.
- 589 12. Henderson VW, Brinton RD. Menopause and mitochondria: windows into estrogen effects on
590 Alzheimer's disease risk and therapy. *Prog Brain Res*. 2010;182:77-96.
- 591 13. Harman SM, Brinton EA, Cedars M, Lobo R, Manson JE, Merriam GR, et al. KEEPS: The
592 Kronos Early Estrogen Prevention Study. *Climacteric*. 2005;8(1):3-12.
- 593 14. Gleason CE, Dowling NM, Wharton W, Manson JE, Miller VM, Atwood CS, et al. Effects of
594 Hormone Therapy on Cognition and Mood in Recently Postmenopausal Women: Findings from the
595 Randomized, Controlled KEEPS-Cognitive and Affective Study. *PLoS Med*. 2015;12(6):e1001833;
596 discussion e.
- 597 15. Henderson VW, St John JA, Hodis HN, McCleary CA, Stanczyk FZ, Shoupe D, et al. Cognitive
598 effects of estradiol after menopause: A randomized trial of the timing hypothesis. *Neurology*.
599 2016;87(7):699-708.
- 600 16. Kantarci K, Tosakulwong N, Lesnick TG, Zuk SM, Lowe VJ, Fields JA, et al. Brain structure
601 and cognition 3 years after the end of an early menopausal hormone therapy trial. *Neurology*.
602 2018;90(16):e1404-e12.

- 603 17. Harman SM, Black DM, Naftolin F, Brinton EA, Budoff MJ, Cedars MI, et al. Arterial imaging
604 outcomes and cardiovascular risk factors in recently menopausal women: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern*
605 *Med*. 2014;161(4):249-60.
- 606 18. Kantarci K, Tosakulwong N, Lesnick TG, Kara F, Kendall-Thomas J, Kapoor E, et al.
607 Cardiometabolic outcomes in Kronos Early Estrogen Prevention Study continuation: 14-year follow-up
608 of a hormone therapy trial. *Menopause*. 2024;31(1):10-7.
- 609 19. Teng EL, Chui HC. The Modified Mini-Mental State (3MS) examination. *J Clin Psychiatry*.
610 1987;48(8):314-8.
- 611 20. Blair CK, Folsom AR, Knopman DS, Bray MS, Mosley TH, Boerwinkle E. APOE genotype and
612 cognitive decline in a middle-aged cohort. *Neurology*. 2005;64(2):268-76.
- 613 21. R Development Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,
614 Austria: R foundation for Statistical Computing; 2010.
- 615 22. Mcardle JJ, Nesselroade JR, editors. *Growth Curve Analysis in Contemporary Psychological*
616 *Research*2003.
- 617 23. *Handbook of psychology: Research methods in psychology*, Vol. 2. Schinka JA, Velicer WF,
618 editors. Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 2003. xxiii, 711-xxiii, p.
- 619 24. Duncan TE, Duncan SC, Strycker LA. An introduction to latent variable growth curve modeling
620 concepts, issues, and applications. Second edition / Terry E. Duncan, Susan C. Duncan, Lisa A.
621 Strycker. ed. Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2006.
- 622 25. Coffman DL. Model error in covariance structure models: Some implications for power and
623 Type I error. *Methodology (Gott)*. 2008;4(4):159-67.
- 624 26. Hu L-t, Bentler PM. Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to
625 underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*. 1998;3(4):424-53.
- 626 27. Bentler PM. Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*.
627 1990;107(2):238-46.
- 628 28. Hu L-t, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional
629 criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*. 1999;6(1):1-55.
- 630 29. Woithke W. Longitudinal and multigroup modeling with missing data. *Modeling longitudinal*
631 *and multilevel data: Practical issues, applied approaches, and specific examples*. Mahwah, NJ, US:
632 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers; 2000. p. 219-40, 69-81.
- 633 30. Savalei V. Expected versus observed information in SEM with incomplete normal and
634 nonnormal data. *Psychol Methods*. 2010;15(4):352-67.
- 635 31. Resnick SM, Henderson VW. Hormone therapy and risk of Alzheimer disease: a critical
636 time.[see comment][comment]. *JAMA*. 2002;288(17):2170-2.
- 637 32. Henderson VW. Estrogen-containing hormone therapy and Alzheimer's disease risk:
638 understanding discrepant inferences from observational and experimental research. *Neuroscience*. 2005.
- 639 33. Yao J, Brinton RD. Estrogen regulation of mitochondrial bioenergetics: implications for
640 prevention of Alzheimer's disease. *Adv Pharmacol*. 2012;64:327-71.
- 641 34. Espeland MA, Shumaker SA, Leng I, Manson JE, Brown CM, LeBlanc ES, et al. Long-term
642 effects on cognitive function of postmenopausal hormone therapy prescribed to women aged 50 to 55
643 years. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2013;173(15):1429-36.
- 644 35. Vaughan L, Espeland MA, Snively B, Shumaker SA, Rapp SR, Shupe J, et al. The rationale,
645 design, and baseline characteristics of the Women's Health Initiative Memory Study of Younger Women
646 (WHIMS-Y). *Brain Res*. 2013;1514:3-11.

- 647 36. Kantarci K, Lowe VJ, Lesnick TG, Tosakulwong N, Bailey KR, Fields JA, et al. Early
648 Postmenopausal Transdermal 17beta-Estradiol Therapy and Amyloid-beta Deposition. *Journal of*
649 *Alzheimer's disease : JAD*. 2016.
- 650 37. Kantarci K, Tosakulwong N, Lesnick TG, Zuk SM, Gunter JL, Gleason CE, et al. Effects of
651 hormone therapy on brain structure: A randomized controlled trial. *Neurology*. 2016;87(9):887-96.
- 652 38. Buist DS, Newton KM, Miglioretti DL, Beverly K, Connelly MT, Andrade S, et al. Hormone
653 therapy prescribing patterns in the United States. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2004;104(5 Pt 1):1042-50.
- 654 39. Crawford SL, Crandall CJ, Derby CA, El Khoudary SR, Waetjen LE, Fischer M, et al.
655 Menopausal hormone therapy trends before versus after 2002: impact of the Women's Health Initiative
656 Study Results. *Menopause*. 2018;26(6):588-97.
- 657 40. Tsai SA, Stefanick ML, Stafford RS. Trends in menopausal hormone therapy use of US office-
658 based physicians, 2000-2009. *Menopause*. 2011;18(4):385-92.
- 659 41. Espeland MA, Brinton RD, Hugeschmidt C, Manson JE, Craft S, Yaffe K, et al. Impact of Type
660 2 Diabetes and Postmenopausal Hormone Therapy on Incidence of Cognitive Impairment in Older
661 Women. *Diabetes Care*. 2015;38(12):2316-24.
- 662 42. Miller VM, Jenkins GD, Biernacka JM, Heit JA, Huggins GS, Hodis HN, et al.
663 Pharmacogenomics of estrogens on changes in carotid artery intima-medial thickness and coronary
664 arterial calcification: Kronos Early Estrogen Prevention Study. *Physiol Genomics*. 2016;48(1):33-41.

Supporting information

S1 Table: Linear latent growth models for cognitive outcomes showing the association between intercept and slope for cognitive performance during hormone therapy and later cognitive function after excluding n= 40 participants who continue the use of systemic mHT.

Variable	Estimate	S.E.	P-Value	95% Confidence Intervals
Verbal Attention & Executive Function				
Intercept for cognitive performance	0.379	0.059	<0.001	(0.262, 0.495)
Slope for cognitive performance	0.550	0.062	<0.001	(0.429, 0.672)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on slope for cognitive performance</i>				
oCEE	0.014	0.052	0.783	(-0.088, 0.117)
tE2	-0.031	0.052	0.548	(-0.132, 0.070)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial later cognitive function</i>				
oCEE	-0.019	0.042	0.655	(-0.102, 0.064)
tE2	-0.074	0.044	0.089	(-0.160, 0.011)
Fit Indices				
CFI=0.968; SRMR=0.058				
AIC=6319.646; BIC=6435.568				
Speeded Language & Mental Flexibility				
Intercept for cognitive performance	0.501	0.078	<0.001	(0.349, 0.653)
Slope for cognitive Performance	0.461	0.100	<0.001	(0.266, 0.657)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on Slope for Cognitive Performance</i>				
oCEE	-0.006	0.054	0.910	(-0.111, 0.099)
tE2	-0.015	0.054	0.777	(-0.120, 0.090)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on later cognitive function</i>				
oCEE	-0.009	0.04	0.830	(-0.088, 0.070)
tE2	-0.048	0.042	0.259	(-0.131, 0.035)
Fit Indices				
CFI=0.963; SRMR=0.061				
AIC=6921.232; BIC=7041.448				
Auditory Attention & Working Memory				
Intercept for cognitive performance	0.588	0.049	<0.001	(0.491, 0.684)
Slope for cognitive performance	0.400	0.051	<0.001	(0.300, 0.500)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on slope for cognitive performance</i>				
oCEE	-0.073	0.058	0.210	(-0.187, 0.041)
tE2	-0.046	0.057	0.419	(-0.159, 0.066)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on later cognitive function</i>				
oCEE	0.031	0.051	0.543	(-0.069, 0.131)
tE2	0.067	0.044	0.132	(-0.020, 0.154)
Fit Indices				
CFI=0.957; SRMR=0.048				
AIC=5593.496; BIC=5709.418				

S1 Table (continued)

Variable	Estimate	S.E.	P-Value	95% Confidence Intervals
Verbal Learning & Memory				
Intercept for cognitive performance	0.396	0.063	<0.001	(0.274, 0.519)
Slope for cognitive performance	0.444	0.082	<0.001	(0.284, 0.603)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on slope for cognitive performance</i>				
oCEE	-0.087	0.056	0.122	(-0.196, 0.023)
tE2	-0.070	0.055	0.205	(-0.179, 0.038)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on later cognitive function</i>				
oCEE	-0.087	0.054	0.106	(-0.192, 0.018)
tE2	-0.070	0.056	0.210	(-0.180, 0.040)
Fit Indices				
CFI=0.978; SRMR=0.040				
AIC=8198.018; BIC=8313.940				
Global Cognition (Modified Mini-Mental State Test)				
Intercept for cognitive performance	0.867	0.320	0.007	(0.239, 1.393)
Slope for cognitive performance	0.254	0.509	0.618	(-0.744, 1.091)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on slope for cognitive performance</i>				
oCEE	0.226	0.176	0.200	(-0.119, 0.516)
tE2	0.105	0.117	0.368	(-0.124, 0.297)
<i>Effect of HT allocation during KEEPS trial on later cognitive function</i>				
oCEE	0.032	0.091	0.722	(-0.146, 0.183)
tE2	-0.112	0.073	0.128	(-0.256, 0.009)
Fit Indices				
CFI=0.990; SRMR=0.039				
AIC=10361.520; BIC=10481.160				

See Table 2 for abbreviations. The statistically significant findings are in bold font.