| 1 | AROMHA Brain Health Test: A Remote Olfactory |
|-------------------------|---|
| 2 | Assessment as a Screen for Cognitive Impairment |
| 3 4 5 | Benoît Jobin ^{1,2} , Colin Magdamo ^{1,3} , Daniela Delphus ¹ , Andreas Runde ¹ , Sean Reineke ⁴ , Alysa Alejandro Soto ¹ , Beyzanur Ergun ¹ , Alefiya Dhilla Albers ^{5,1*} , Mark W. Albers ^{1,3*} . |
| 6 7 9 10 11 | Department of Neurology, Massachusetts General Hospital. Department of Psychology, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières. Harvard Medical School. AROMHA Inc. Department of Psychology, Endicott College. |
| 13 | *Corresponding authors: Alefiya Dhilla Albers, <u>aalbers@endicott.edu;</u> |
| 14 | Mark W Albers, <u>albers.mark@mgh.harvard.edu</u> |
| 15 | |
| 16 | Contact author: Mark W. Albers, 114 16th Street, Room 2003, Charlestown, MA 02129, United |
| 17 | States. Phone: 617-724-7401. |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |

23 Abstract

24

- Cost-effective, noninvasive screening methods for preclinical Alzheimer's disease (AD) and 25 other neurocognitive disorders remain an unmet need. The olfactory neural circuits develop AD pathological changes prior to symptom onset. To probe these vulnerable circuits, we developed 26 27 the digital remote AROMHA Brain Health Test (ABHT), an at-home odor identification,
- 28 discrimination, memory, and intensity assessment.
- 29 The ABHT was self-administered among cognitively normal (CN) English and Spanish speakers
- 30 (n=127), participants with subjective cognitive complaints (SCC; n=34), and mild cognitive
- 31 impairment (MCI; n=19). Self-administered tests took place remotely at home under unobserved
- (among interested CN participants) and observed modalities (CN, SCC, and MCI), as well as in-32
- 33 person with a research assistant present (CN, SCC, and MCI).
- 34 Olfactory performance was similar across observed and unobserved remote self-administration and between English and Spanish speakers. Odor memory, identification, and discrimination 35 scores decreased with age, and olfactory identification and discrimination were lower in the MCI 36 37 group compared to CN and SCC groups, independent of age, sex, and education.
- The ABHT revealed age-related olfactory decline, and discriminated CN older adults from those 38 39 with cognitive impairment. Replication of our results in other populations would support the use 40 of the ABHT to identify and monitor individuals at risk for developing dementia.
- 41 Keywords: Remote assessment, screening, Alzheimer's disease, Mild cognitive impairment, 42 olfaction.
- 43

44 Introduction

45 Alzheimer's disease (AD) affects over 6.9 million Americans, and this number is expected to grow to 13.9 million by 2060 with devastating economic consequences for society 46 (>\$335B / year in the US) and families (>\$330B in unpaid care provided predominantly by 47 family members)¹. The dementia syndrome of AD is now considered an advanced stage of the 48 disease since radiological and pathological evidence demonstrate that pathology begins to 49 accumulate 15-20 years before the onset of memory symptoms $^{2-5}$. At the onset of self-reported 50 51 memory symptoms, neuropsychological testing is often normal -a stage termed subjective cognitive decline or subjective cognitive complaints $(SCC)^6$. As the disease progresses to 52 amnestic memory deficits revealed by psychometric testing, this stage becomes mild cognitive 53 54 impairment (MCI), a stage preceding dementia where activities of daily living are not impaired 55 yet by cognitive deficits. While most clinical trials have focused on the symptomatic stage of the disease, many investigators hypothesize that treatment during these preclinical SCC and MCI 56 stages is likely to be more efficacious^{7–9}. A cost-effective, noninvasive screen for preclinical AD 57 performed at home would enable important research in this area by affording a means for more 58 efficient screening, such as blood-based biomarkers and imaging, for eligibility criteria for 59 clinical trials targeting preclinical or early-stage disease^{10–12}. 60

61

The measurement of early olfactory impairment is a prime candidate as a component of an early
detection assessment¹³. Many brain regions process olfactory input from primary olfactory
neurons^{14–16}, and these regions are damaged early in the disease – with both the olfactory bulb
and entorhinal cortex among the first sites of tau pathology¹⁷. The amygdala and piriform

| 66 | cortices are also early sites of tau pathology ^{17,18} . In addition, the olfactory epithelium shows |
|----|--|
| 67 | evidence of amyloid and tau deposition ¹⁹ . MRI studies demonstrated reduced olfactory bulb |
| 68 | volume in AD patients and a smaller primary olfactory cortex (i.e., piriform cortex, amygdala, |
| 69 | and entorhinal cortex) in MCI compared to cognitively unimpaired older adults ^{20–23} . |
| 70 | |
| 71 | The hypothesis that cognitive processing of odor input may be compromised at early stages of |
| 72 | the disease has been tested predominantly with smell identification performance, usually |
| 73 | assessed by forced-choice measures like the University of Pennsylvania Smell Identification Test |
| 74 | $(\text{UPSIT})^{24}$ or Sniffin Sticks ²⁵ where the four odor name choices are viewed prior to or in parallel |
| 75 | with sniffing the odor. Smell identification performance has been associated with AD |
| 76 | biomarkers, elevated levels of CSF and PET tau ^{18,26–30} and worse performance is associated with |
| 77 | smaller hippocampal volume in older adults ^{31,32} and in patients with cognitive impairment on the |
| 78 | AD clinical continuum ^{22,33–37} . Smell identification score is related to declarative memory in older |
| 79 | adults ³⁸ and survives in models to predict the conversion from MCI to dementia ^{$14,39-43$} . |
| 80 | Furthermore, smell identification scores have been shown to help predict cognitive decline in |
| 81 | cognitively unimpaired older adults ^{$44-49$} and the conversion to MCI ^{$42,50,51$} . |
| 82 | |
| 83 | However, additional olfactory cognitive assessment tasks that probe other neural circuits |
| 84 | vulnerable to aging and neurodegeneration could add sensitivity and specificity for olfactory |
| 85 | screens of early damage in aging and a variety of neurodegenerative diseases, including AD, |
| 86 | Parkinson's ^{14,52} and Traumatic Brain Injury ⁵³ . For instance, odor memory and olfactory |
| 87 | discrimination tasks have been associated with earlier preclinical stages of the disease ^{43,48,54} , and |

1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

| 88 | selective odor memory deficits, after correction for odor identification and odor discrimination |
|----|---|
| 89 | performance, have been associated with AD biomarkers ⁴³ . The incorporation of self-confidence |
| 90 | within olfactory testing could additionally improve the sensitivity and specificity of olfactory |
| 91 | testing since metacognition and self-awareness were found to be predictive of cognitive decline |
| 92 | and biomarkers in patients with AD or MCI^{55-59} . |

1 (* *

93

~~

94 While olfaction has been suggested as a potential screening tool for AD, logistical challenges and questions of specificity have hindered its widespread adoption^{43,60,61}. To address these 95 limitations, we developed a battery of olfactory tests. This battery includes an odor percept 96 identification (OPID) test, where participants smell an odor, answer a question, and then choose 97 from four provided odor names. The battery also includes a percepts of odor episodic memory 98 99 (POEM) test, where participants distinguish between new odors and those presented earlier; and 100 an odor discrimination (OD) test, where participants identify pairs of smells as either the same or 101 different. This battery was administered using an olfactometer to deliver odors in earlier work, and we demonstrated selective odor memory loss in participants at risk of developing MCI⁴³. In 102 103 response to the urgency of the COVID pandemic and the respiratory transmission of the SARS-104 CoV2 virus, our team moved to the use of one-time use labels with embedded odors and developed an abbreviated COVID Smell Test⁶² as an early at-home screen for SARS-CoV2 105 106 infection. Subsequent testing using one-time odor labels in both English and Spanish in 30 states and Puerto Rico⁶³, as well as in Argentina (manuscript in preparation), provided valuable pilot 107 108 data that allowed us to adapt our olfactory battery into a bilingual at-home self-administered 109 brain health test to screen for both nasal and cognitive deficits in processing olfactory deficits.

110

| 111 | Here, we describe and validate this digital accessible remote olfactory-mediated health |
|---|--|
| 112 | assessment: the AROMHA Brain Health Test (ABHT). We aimed (1) to validate unobserved |
| 113 | remote self-administration of the ABHT by comparing results with observed remote self- |
| 114 | administration and (2) to compare the results of the ABHT between cognitively healthy English |
| 115 | and Spanish-speaking populations. We also aimed to validate the ABHT by comparing metrics |
| 116 | between a group of clinical anosmic patients and a control group of cognitively normal |
| 117 | individuals. Finally, we aimed to assess the feasibility of using the ABHT in a population at risk |
| 118 | of dementia due to AD by determining whether it is sensitive to aging and cognitive decline in a |
| 119 | cohort of cognitively normal healthy adults without cognitive complaints (CN), with subjective |
| 120 | cognitive complaints (SCC), and with MCI. |
| | |
| 121 122 123 | Results |
| 121 122 123 124 | Results Design and Implementation of the AROMHA Brain Health Test |
| 121 122 123 124 125 | Results Design and Implementation of the AROMHA Brain Health Test |
| 121 122 123 124 125 126 | Results Design and Implementation of the AROMHA Brain Health Test The workflow of the self-administered ABHT includes tests of odor percept identification |
| 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 | Results Design and Implementation of the AROMHA Brain Health Test The workflow of the self-administered ABHT includes tests of odor percept identification (OPID), percepts of odor episodic memory (POEM), and odor discrimination (Fig. 1), which |
| 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 | Results Design and Implementation of the AROMHA Brain Health Test The workflow of the self-administered ABHT includes tests of odor percept identification (OPID), percepts of odor episodic memory (POEM), and odor discrimination (Fig. 1), which parallels our previous researcher-administered tests, where odors were delivered through an |
| 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 | Results Design and Implementation of the AROMHA Brain Health Test The workflow of the self-administered ABHT includes tests of odor percept identification (OPID), percepts of odor episodic memory (POEM), and odor discrimination (Fig. 1), which parallels our previous researcher-administered tests, where odors were delivered through an olfactometer ⁴³ or through hand-held, repeat use devices (Whispis) ⁶⁴ . The ABHT leverages the |
| 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 | Results Design and Implementation of the AROMHA Brain Health Test The workflow of the self-administered ABHT includes tests of odor percept identification (OPID), percepts of odor episodic memory (POEM), and odor discrimination (Fig. 1), which parallels our previous researcher-administered tests, where odors were delivered through an olfactometer ⁴³ or through hand-held, repeat use devices (Whispis) ⁶⁴ . The ABHT leverages the remote administration aspects of our COVID Smell Test ⁶² by delivering the odor stimuli using |
| 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 | Results Design and Implementation of the AROMHA Brain Health Test The workflow of the self-administered ABHT includes tests of odor percept identification (OPID), percepts of odor episodic memory (POEM), and odor discrimination (Fig. 1), which parallels our previous researcher-administered tests, where odors were delivered through an olfactometer ⁴³ or through hand-held, repeat use devices (Whispis) ⁶⁴ . The ABHT leverages the remote administration aspects of our COVID Smell Test ⁶² by delivering the odor stimuli using odor labels arrayed on mailable cards, by including an odor intensity measure, and by enabling |

133 ABHT adds a meta-cognition measure embedded in the odor percept identification tasks. 134 Participants were instructed by the web-based app to sample the odor, and then choose an odor 135 name from a forced choice list of 4 options. They are then asked to evaluate their confidence in 136 each odor identification decision with a scale that includes the following options: "I Guessed," "I 137 Narrowed Down to Three," "I Narrowed Down to Two," or "I Am Certain.". This confidence metric is quantified for the OPID9 and OPID18 odor identification tests as the number answered 138 139 correct among items paired with the "I am Certain", "I Narrowed Down to Three", and "I 140 Narrowed Down to Two" responses (OPID9noguess, OPID18noguess scores). 141 Three sets of bilingual (English / Spanish) cards, which are arrayed with odor labels, were 142 143 designed to administer the OPID9 odor percept identification and odor intensity test (Part 1, Card 144 A), the OPID18 odor percept identification and POEM memory test (Part 2, Cards B and C), and 145 the OD10 odor discrimination test (Part 3, Cards D and E) (Figure 1). Numerous concentrations 146 of each odor were packaged in different labels, and perceptions of odor intensity using a 10-point 147 Likert scale that ranges from 0 (no odor) to 10 (strongest odor imaginable) were obtained from 148 healthy college-aged participants in pilot studies. The final label-embedded odorant 149 concentrations were selected with a mean perceived intensity of 7-7.5. To ensure that the 150 headspace for each label was not contaminated by one or more components of the adhesive to 151 hold the labels together, we performed gas chromatography / mass spectrometry for each odor 152 label (Extended Data Figure 1). We did not find a common component in the headspace of all 153 labels, which could confound olfactory performance.



154

Figure 1. AROMHA Brain Health Test Schematic. Following online prescreening, online 155 156 consent, the web-based program instructs you through the 5 bilingual (English / Spanish) cards 157 (A). Card A is comprised of a practice odor P followed by the 9 odor labels comprising the OPID9 test. Adjacent in the blue box (B) is the workflow for these tests as directed by 158 159 the testyourbrainhealth.com software to generate the OPID9, OPID9noguess, and average 160 intensity scores. After a 10-minute break, participants are instructed to work through Cards B 161 and C using the workflow in the green box (B) to generate the POEM, OPID18, and 162 OPID18noguess scores. Then participants are instructed to move on to Cards D and E using the 163 workflow in the purple box (B) to generate an OD10 odor discrimination score.

164

| 165 | We revamped the foil choices so they are more orthogonal to the target odor and more |
|-----|--|
| 166 | specifically evocative rather than generalized. For example, we avoided using foils describing |
| 167 | fruit odors when the target odor was a fruit. We also incorporated foil names like "coconut" or |
| 168 | "fresh bread" in order to include evocative odor names. We specifically avoided foils that may |
| 169 | have a contextual association with the target odor because they are often co-presented in the real |
| 170 | world, to reduce bias from the other foils. Finally, we expanded our set of odor names so that |
| 171 | each odor name was only presented once within the OPID9 or OPID18 odor identification tests, , |
| 172 | either as a target odor or a foil, (Extended Data Tables 1& 2). When the 9 odors, presented in |
| 173 | the first OPID9 odor identification and intensity test, were presented again (after a 10-minute |
| 174 | break) in the OPID18 odor identification and POEM memory test, new sets of foils were |
| 175 | presented with the correct name for each target odor to vary the identification experience and |
| 176 | reduce learning carryover from OPID9 (Extended Data Tables 1& 2). |
| 177 | |
| 178 | Validation of Unobserved Remote Testing of the AROMHA Brain Health Test in |
| 179 | Cognitively Normal Individuals |
| 180 | |
| 181 | In the first phase of self-administered testing (between 5/9/23 and 8/11/23), all participants |
| 182 | completed the ABHT in an observed setting (remote via Zoom or in person) during a scheduled |
| 183 | appointment with the research assistant ($n = 70$). Participants shared their testing screen and |
| 184 | video with the research assistant via Zoom during remote observed testing or completed the |
| 185 | testing in person with their testing screen visible to the research assistant. In both these |
| 186 | conditions, the research assistant observed and noted participant interactions with the software |
| 187 | and the cards and remained on standby if there were questions or confusion. Once we felt |

| 188 | confident that the self-administered testing workflow ran smoothly, we offered an unobserved |
|-----|---|
| 189 | (vs observed) self-administration option to interested cognitively normal participants in order to |
| 190 | validate the feasibility of this administration mode and our ability to scale future data collection. |
| 191 | When cognitively healthy participants, enrolled in our study after 8/11/23, were given the option |
| 192 | to self-administer remotely, independent of a research assistant, 70% chose to test on their own |
| 193 | with the option of live help over the telephone, if needed. The overall distribution of participants |
| 194 | by each administration modality is described in Extended Data Table 3. |
| 195 | |
| 196 | When comparing olfactory scores between CN observed and unobserved groups, there were no |
| 197 | significant differences in the olfactory outcomes after Bonferroni correction. Age ($p < .001$) was |
| 198 | significantly greater and Spanish ($p < .001$) language was significantly more common in the |
| 199 | unobserved group, due to operational factors such as the availability of the unobserved option |
| 200 | during phases of recruitment, scheduling, and participant preference. Test duration ($p < .001$) |
| 201 | was also significantly greater in the unobserved group compared to the observed group, which |
| 202 | may have biased the unobserved group to perform less well on olfactory measures. Sex and |
| 203 | education were not different between the observed and unobserved groups (Table 1). |
| 204 | |

| | CN Observed Self-administration (n = 71) | CN Unobserved Self-administration (n = 56) | p values |
|-------------------------------|--|--|----------|
| Age (years) | 44.89 (22.18) | 67.77 (16.60) | < .001 |
| | (19 to 93 years) | (20 to 92 years) | |
| Sex (female %) | 66% | 64% | .82 |
| Education | 16.80 (3.86) | 16.68 (2.99) | .84 |
| Speaking language (Spanish %) | 51% | 9% | <.001 |
| OPID9 (/9) | 5.93 (1.38) | 5.89 (1.40) | .88 |
| OPID9noguess (/9) | 5.54 (1.58) | 5.25 (1.92) | .37 |
| OPID18 (/18) | 11.85 (2.79) | 11.05 (2.57) | .10 |
| OPID18noguess (/18) | 10.83 (3.24) | 9.46 (3.57) | .03 |

| OD10 (/10) | 8.59 (1.23) | 8.36 (1.41) | .33 |
|-------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|
| POEM (-1 to +1) | 0.36 (0.32) | 0.33 (0.28) | .57 |
| Average intensity (/10) | 5.53 (1.83) | 5.79 (1.70) | .41 |
| Test Duration (minutes) | 31.87 (8.70) | 41.16 (16.35) | <.001 |

205 Table 1. Demographic information and olfactory function in cognitively normal

206 participants who underwent observed and unobserved self-administration conditions of the

207 **AROMHA Brain Health Test.** Values are means (SD). T-tests were performed across groups

for age, education, olfactory scores, and test duration. Chi-square test was performed on sex and

209 speaking-language proportions across groups. **Bold** indicates a statistically significant difference

210 that remained significant after Bonferroni correction.

211

212 Validation of the AROMHA Brain Health Test in Anosmic patients.

Table 2 displays the demographics and olfactory scores of 7 patients with anosmia recruited froma smell loss clinic and CN participants. As expected, the anosmic group performed significantly

worse on every olfactory metric (p < .001) in our battery, as compared to the CN group although

they did not take significantly longer to complete the battery when grouped across various

217 modalities (Extended Data Table 3). The anosmic group did not perform statistically different

218 from chance performance on every olfactory measure, which was not the case for the CN control

219 group.

220

| | Score of chance performance | Anosmic (n=7) | CN (n=127) | P values |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------|
| Age (years) | NA | 54.14 (20.28) | 54.98 (22.88) | .91 |
| | | (23 to 77 years) | (19 to 93 years) | |
| Sex (female %) | NA | 57% | 65% | .97 |
| Education (years) | NA | 16.43 (2.44) | 16.75 (3.49) | .96 |
| OPID9 (/9) | 2.25 | 2.57 (0.79) | 5.91 (1.38) | <.001 |
| OPID9noguess (/9) | 2.25 | 1.00 (1.29) | 5.41 (1.14) | <.001 |
| OPID18 (/18) | 4.5 | 5.00 (1.29) | 11.50 (2.71) | <.001 |
| OPID18noguess (/18) | 4.5 | 1.14 (1.46) | 10.23 (3.45) | <.001 |
| OD10 (/10) | 5 | 6.14 (1.57) | 8.49 (1.31) | <.001 |
| POEM (-1 to +1) | 0 | -0.02 (0.10) | 0.35 (0.30) | <.001 |
| Average intensity (/10) | NA | 1.80 (1.33) | 5.64 (1.77) | <.001 |
| Test Duration (minutes) | NA | 33.46 (11.33) | 35.96 (13.42) | .50 |

221 Table 2. Distribution of olfactory scores of anosmic patients and CN participants on the

222 AROMHA Brain Health Test. The first column lists the score following random selection of

the answers for each test, e.g., the participant had no olfactory information to guide selection of

the answers. Values are means (SD). NA = not applicable. Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were

225 performed across groups for age, education, olfactory scores, and test duration. The chi-square

test was performed for sex. **Bold** indicates a statistically significant difference that remained

227 significant after Bonferroni correction.

228

229 Equivalence of the AROMHA Brain Health Test in English vs. Spanish-speaking

230 Cognitively Normal Participants

231 When assessing the potential effect of language, no significant differences were found across

232 olfactory scores between cognitively normal English-speaking and Spanish-speaking

233 participants. Demographically only age was significantly different, as the English-speaking

group was significantly older than the Spanish-speaking group (p = .001) (Table 3).

235

| | CN English-speaking participants (n = 86) | CN Spanish-speaking participants (n = 41) | p values |
|-------------------------|---|---|----------|
| Age (years) | 59.16 (23.36) | 46.20 (19.32) | .001 |
| | (19 to 93 years) | (19 to 79 years) | |
| Sex (female %) | 63% | 71% | .38 |
| Education | 16.47 (2.84) | 17.34 (4.56) | .26 |
| OPID9 (/9) | 5.86 (1.46) | 6.02 (1.21) | .51 |
| OPID9noguess (/9) | 5.33 (1.86) | 5.59 (1.47) | .40 |
| OPID18 (/18) | 11.28 (2.92) | 11.95 (2.18) | .15 |
| OPID18noguess (/18) | 10.00 (3.62) | 10.71 (3.04) | .25 |
| OD10 (/10) | 8.42 (1.35) | 8.63 (1.22) | .37 |
| POEM (-1 to 1) | 0.31 (0.30) | 0.42 (0.30) | .06 |
| Average intensity (/10) | 5.62 (1.77) | 5.70 (1.80) | .82 |
| Test Duration (minutes) | 36.28 (14.63) | 35.30 (10.58) | .67 |

236 Table 3. Demographic information and olfactory function in cognitively normal English-

237 speaking and Spanish-speaking participants. Values are means (SD). T-tests were performed

238 across groups for age, education, clinical variables, olfactory scores, and test duration. Chi-

square test was performed on sex and speaking-language proportions across groups. **Bold**

240 indicates a statistically significant difference that remained significant after Bonferroni

- correction.
- 242

243 Diminished Olfactory Measures in the AROMHA Brain Health Test with increasing age

244 When assessing the effect of age on olfaction, linear regression models of olfactory scores as a

function of age of the CN participants showed that greater age was significantly associated with

246 lower OPID9noguess (β = -0.02, p = .002), OPID18 (β = -0.04, p < .001), lower OPID18noguess

247 ($\beta = -0.06, p < .001$), lower OD10 ($\beta = -0.02, p < .001$), and lower POEM ($\beta = -0.004, p < .001$)

- scores, while the association with OPID9 ($\beta = -0.01$, p = .01) and average intensity ($\beta = -0.007$, p
- 249 = .28) scores did not reach significance after Bonferroni correction (Figure 2).



250



252 Greater age was significantly associated with lower (b) OPID9noguess ($\beta = -0.02$, SE = .007, p =

- 253 .002, adj. $R^2 = .06$), (c) OPID18 ($\beta = -0.04$, SE = 0.001, p < .001, adj. $R^2 = .12$), (d)
- 254 OPID18noguess ($\beta = -0.06$, SE = 0.03, p < .001, adj, $R^2 = .13$), (e) OD10 ($\beta = -0.02$, SE = -0.02, SE = -0.02
- 255 0.005, p < .001, adj. $R^2 = .16$), and (f) POEM ($\beta = -0.004$, SE = 0.001, p < .001, adj. $R^2 = .08$)
- scores, while the association with (a) OPID9 ($\beta = -0.01$, SE = 0.005 p = .01, adj. $R^2 = .04$) and

| 257 | (f) average intensity ($\beta = -0.007$, $SE = 0.007$, $p = .28$, adj. $R^2 = .001$) scores did not reach |
|-----|--|
| 258 | significance after Bonferroni correction for 21 comparisons ($p < .002$). |

259

260 Performance of AROMHA Brain Health Test Distinguishes Participants Aged +55 who are

261 Cognitively Normal, with Subjective Cognitive Concerns or with Mild Cognitive

- 262 Impairment.
- 263 The sex and education of participants across the CN, SCC, and MCI groups were not
- significantly different after Bonferroni correction. Participants in the MCI group were, as
- expected, older than those in the CN group (p=0.01). Comparisons of each olfactory score of the
- 266 ABHT for participants who are CN, have SCC, or have MCI reveal significant olfactory
- 267 differences between subgroups, other than in the OD10, POEM odor memory score, and
- evaluations of average odor intensity (Table 4). Comparisons across cognitive groups in this +55
- sample revealed no demographic differences in sex and education, or in the test duration time.
- 270

| | | | | | p values | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------|----------|---------|
| | CN | SCC | MCI | CN vs. | CN vs. | SCC vs. |
| | (n=73) | (n=31) | (n=19) | SCC | MCI | MCI |
| Age (years) (56 to 95 years) | 72.25 (9.13) | 75.48 (9.22) | 78.00 (8.07) | .11 | .01 | .32 |
| Sex (female %) | 63% | 62% | 53% | .99 | .57 | .76 |
| Education (years) | 16.42 (3.62) | 16.26 (2.50) | 16.53 (3.49) | .78 | .91 | .77 |
| OPID9 (/9) | 5.71 (1.51) | 5.19 (1.45) | 3.95 (1.43) | .10 | <.001 | .005 |
| OPID9noguess (/9) | 5.16 (1.93) | 4.29 (1.79) | 3.16 (1.77) | .03 | <.001 | .04 |
| OPID18 (/18) | 10.79 (2.74) | 10.68 (2.95) | 7.26 (2.86) | .62 | <.001 | <.001 |
| OPID18noguess (/18) | 9.4 (3.47) | 8.03 (4.02) | 5.16 (3.35) | .11 | <.001 | .009 |
| OD10 (/10) | 8.12 (1.35) | 7.42 (1.52) | 6.95 (1.96) | .03 | .02 | .38 |
| POEM (-1 to +1) | 0.27 (0.29) | 0.24 (0.25) | 0.22 (0.20) | .61 | .37 | .72 |
| Average intensity (/10) | 5.55 (1.85) | 4.93 (1.34) | 4.71 (2.30) | .06 | .15 | .71 |
| Test Duration (minutes) | 40.10 (14.67) | 40.49 (14.89) | 40.69 (11.01) | .66 | .85 | .83 |

271 **Table 4. Olfactory function across cognitive status among participants aged 55+.** Values are

272 means (SD). T-tests were performed across groups for age, education, clinical variables,

| 275 Onactory scores, and test unation. Chi-square test was performed on sex proportion |
|--|
|--|

- 274 groups. Bold indicates a statistically significant difference that remained significant after
- 275 Bonferroni correction for 21 comparisons (p < .002).
- 276
- 277 When assessing the effect of cognitive status group on olfactory test components, ANCOVAs
- 278 revealed a significant effect on OPID9, OPID9noguess, OPID18, OPID18noguess, and OD10
- scores (Table 5). No effects of cognitive status group were found for the POEM or average
- intensity scores. After Bonferroni correction for 21 comparisons (p < .002), post-hoc pairwise
- 281 comparisons revealed significantly lower scores in the MCI group compared to CN older adults
- for the OPID9, OPID18, OPID18noguess, OD10 and to the SCC group for the OPID18 and
- 283 OPID9 scores.
- 284
- 285 Interaction effects were found with age for the OPID9noguess, OPID18 no guess scores, and
- 286 OD10, however they did not remain significant after Bonferroni correction for 7 comparisons (p
- 287 < .007). Other olfactory components did not interact with age (p > .05). No interaction effect

with sex or education were found with any olfactory scores (p > .05) (Table 4).

289

| | | | | | Post-hoc | comparaisons? | p values ^a |
|-------------------|----|-------|-------|------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Source | DF | F | р | ηp^2 | CN VS SCC | CN VS MCI | SCC VS MCI |
| OPID9 | | | | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 11.07 | <.001 | 0.17 | .28 | <.001 | .0017 |
| Age | 1 | 3.08 | .08 | 0.03 | | | |
| Sex | 1 | 0.009 | .92 | <.001 | | | |
| Education | 1 | 0.28 | .60 | 0.003 | | | |
| Group * Age | 2 | 1.90 | .15 | 0.03 | | | |
| Group * Sex | 2 | 0.22 | .80 | 0.004 | | | |
| Group * Education | 2 | 2.37 | .10 | 0.04 | | | |

| | | | | | Post-hoc | comparaisons | p values ^a |
|---------------------|-----|-------|-------|------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Source | DF | F | р | ηp^2 | CN VS SCC | CN VS MCI | SCC VS MCI |
| Residuals | 111 | | | | | | |
| OPID9noguess | | | | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 10.35 | <.001 | 0.16 | .10 | <.001 | .01 |
| Age | 1 | 8.92 | .003 | 0.07 | | | |
| Sex | 1 | 0.80 | .37 | 0.007 | | | |
| Education | 1 | 0.05 | .83 | <.001 | | | |
| Group * Age | 2 | 3.96 | .02 | 0.07 | | | |
| Group * Sex | 2 | 1.79 | .17 | 0.03 | | | |
| Group * Education | 2 | 0.28 | .76 | 0.004 | | | |
| Residuals | 111 | | | | | | |
| OPID18 | | | | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 12.84 | <.001 | 0.19 | .76 | <.001 | <.001 |
| Age | 1 | 2.49 | .12 | 0.02 | | | |
| Sex | 1 | 2.53 | .11 | 0.02 | | | |
| Education | 1 | 0.01 | .93 | <.001 | | | |
| Group * Age | 2 | 3.34 | .04 | 0.06 | | | |
| Group * Sex | 2 | 1.35 | .26 | 0.02 | | | |
| Group * Education | 2 | 0.48 | .62 | 0.008 | | | |
| Residuals | 111 | | | | | | |
| OPID18noguess | | | | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 11.93 | <.001 | 0.18 | .16 | <.001 | .003 |
| Age | 1 | 8.11 | .005 | 0.07 | | | |
| Sex | 1 | 0.33 | .57 | 0.003 | | | |
| Education | 1 | 0.18 | .68 | 0.002 | | | |
| Group * Age | 2 | 4.79 | .01 | 0.08 | | | |
| Group * Sex | 2 | 1.81 | .17 | 0.03 | | | |
| Group * Education | 2 | 0.67 | .52 | 0.01 | | | |
| Residuals | 111 | | | | | | |
| OD10 | | | | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 6.09 | .003 | 0.10 | .03 | .001 | .14 |
| Age | 1 | 2.65 | .11 | 0.02 | | | |
| Sex | 1 | 0.22 | .64 | 0.001 | | | |
| Education | 1 | 0.001 | .96 | <.001 | | | |
| Group * Age | 2 | 4.81 | .01 | 0.08 | | | |
| Group * Sex | 2 | 1.08 | .34 | 0.02 | | | |
| Group * Education | 2 | 1.10 | .34 | 0.02 | | | |
| Residuals | 111 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | Post-hoo | c comparaisons | p values ^a |
|-------------------|-----|-------|-----|------------|-----------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Source | DF | F | р | ηp^2 | CN VS SCC | CN VS MCI | SCC VS MCI |
| РОЕМ | | | | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 0.35 | .71 | 0.006 | .55 | .68 | .96 |
| Age | 1 | 3.44 | .07 | 0.03 | | | |
| Sex | 1 | 0.44 | .51 | 0.004 | | | |
| Education | 1 | 0.28 | .60 | 0.003 | | | |
| Group * Age | 2 | 0.41 | .66 | 0.007 | | | |
| Group * Sex | 2 | 2.83 | .06 | 0.05 | | | |
| Group * Education | 2 | 0.52 | .60 | 0.009 | | | |
| Residuals | 111 | | | | | | |
| Average intensity | | | | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 2.29 | .11 | 0.04 | .16 | .27 | .99 |
| Age | 1 | 1.36 | .25 | 0.01 | | | |
| Sex | 1 | 3.75 | .06 | 0.03 | | | |
| Education | 1 | 0.007 | .93 | <.001 | | | |
| Group * Age | 2 | 0.063 | .94 | 0.003 | | | |
| Group * Sex | 2 | 0.052 | .95 | <.001 | | | |
| Group * Education | 2 | 0.80 | .45 | 0.01 | | | |
| Residuals | 111 | | | | | | |

290 Table 5. ANCOVA models comparing different olfactory scores across groups. DF =

291 Degrees of Freedom, F = F-statistic, p = p-value, $\eta p^2 = partial$ Eta squared. CI = Confidence

interval. **Bold** represents post-hoc *p* values that remained significant after Bonferroni correction

293 for 21 comparisons (p < .002).

 $^{a} p$ values from pairwise post-hoc comparisons adjusted for age, sex, and education.

295

296 Discussion

297

298 In this study, we tested and validated a self-administered olfactory test battery on cognitively

- 299 healthy English and Spanish-speaking cohort in the home setting, under observed and
- 300 unobserved self-administered conditions. We began with observed self-administered testing of

301 participants who were cognitively normal, had expressed subjective cognitive concerns (SCC), 302 and had a diagnosis of Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI). Both participants with SCC and MCI are at risk of developing Alzheimer's disease dementia^{66,67}. The majority of this observed testing 303 304 was completed with the convenience of a remote in-home setting, using Zoom to share the 305 testing screen and a video of the participant with a research assistant observing the workflow, 306 noting challenges, and being available if questions or concerns arose. Some of the participants 307 chose to self-administer the test without the Zoom interface and with a research assistant in the 308 room for questions because they preferred this or found it more convenient. After about three 309 months of observed and largely remote self-administered testing across the spectrum of cognitive 310 impairment (from CN to MCI), we shifted to a completely unobserved remote testing option for 311 any cognitively normal participants who felt comfortable engaging with the test entirely on their 312 own. When given the option to self-administer the test remotely, independent of a research 313 assistant, the majority of cognitively healthy participants, representing a wide age spectrum 314 ranging from 20 to 92 years old, chose unobserved self-administration.

315

We found equivalent olfactory performance when comparing observed and unobserved selfadministration of the ABHT among CN participants in unadjusted analyses, other than shorter test duration and a younger population on average in the observed setting. We also validated the test on an anosmic subsample, demonstrating that anosmic patients performed as expected at chance level for each olfactory test. When comparing the olfactory battery scores between languages, no differences were found regarding olfactory subtest scores between CN English and Spanish-speaking populations in unadjusted analyses. We also found that lower odor percept

| 323 | identification (OPID9 and OPID18noguess and OPID18 scores), odor memory (POEM) and odor |
|-----|---|
| 324 | discrimination (OD10) scores were negatively associated with age. Finally, by comparing |
| 325 | olfactory scores between participants aged 55+ with CN, SCC, and MCI, we found that the |
| 326 | means of all odor percept identification scores (OPID9, OPID9noguess, OPID18, |
| 327 | OPID18noguess) and the odor discrimination score were associated with cognitive decline, i.e., |
| 328 | lower scores in the MCI subgroup relative to the older CN subgroup. The negative relationships |
| 329 | observed in our analyses between identification measures adjusted for metacognition |
| 330 | (OPID9noguess and OPID18noguess) and increasing age and cognitive impairment are |
| 331 | intriguing, given prior work on the general prevalence of olfactory overconfidence in relation to |
| 332 | the emotionality of odors and eventual identification accuracy ^{68,69} . Further work on these new |
| 333 | "noguess" measures is needed in relation to AD biomarkers and longitudinal outcomes in order |
| 334 | to better understand this finding. |
| 335 | |
| 336 | By leveraging our experience during the COVID pandemic, we were able to successfully adapt |

337 and evolve our previous brain health test for remote at home self-administration in our target populations of interest. This included protocols for online screening for eligibility, online 338 339 consenting, and an optimized remote user interface to guide participants through various 340 olfactory tasks. We also modified odor delivery by using odor labels on mailable cards. Unlike our COVID test^{62,63}, the ABHT is particularly targeted for participants aged 55+, a population 341 342 generally less familiar with fully online test administration. We enrolled participants as old as 88 343 in the CN and SCC groups and 95 in the MCI group, who were able to successfully self-344 administer the test and enter responses on the web-based platform. The remote administration

345 paradigm afforded participation from 21 different US states and Puerto Rico through online 346 recruitment via an MGH and clinicaltrials.gov websites. The robust engagement of older 347 participants in entirely independent, unobserved testing—yielding olfactory performance outcomes statistically indistinguishable from those obtained in observed settings—constitutes a 348 349 significant finding. This challenges the prevailing assumption that older individuals are either 350 unable or unwilling to effectively engage in self-administered remote screening methods such as 351 ours. This screen was designed to address the unmet need of early detection of biomarkers in 352 participants who are CN and those who have SCC but may not meet testing thresholds for MCI. 353 We recruited patients with MCI to validate the efficacy of this screen to detect differences in our 354 355 olfactory tests under conditions of more apparent cognitive impairment, as we and others previously demonstrated^{40,43,60,70}. Each olfactory identification score from the ABHT, including 356 357 the 9-item sub scores (i.e., OPID9, OPID9 no guess), was lower in the MCI group compared to 358 CN aged +55 groups. This result indicates that the ABHT could be used as a marker of cognitive decline in older adults and replicates the findings of two meta-analyses that demonstrated a 359 360 specific pattern of olfactory impairment targeting more severely olfactory identification in patients with Alzheimer's disease dementia⁵² and MCI⁷⁰. This early decline in odor identification 361 likely reflects damage in specific limbic and medial temporal lobe olfactory areas involved in 362 olfactory identification in the earliest stages of AD (i.e., piriform cortex, amygdala, entorhinal 363 cortex, hippocampus)^{20,21,31–37,71,72}. At the cognitive level, olfactory identification tasks are 364 associated with declarative memory^{38,73} and are predictive of cognitive decline in CN older 365 adults^{44–49} and of the conversion to MCI^{42,50,51}. Future studies should aim to replicate these 366

367 findings and assess the predictive value of the ABHT and odor percept identification sub-scores368 on AD biomarkers and longitudinal cognitive decline in CN older adults.

369

370 Olfactory discrimination (OD10) was also lower in the MCI group compared to CN aged 55+ 371 group. This result replicates and is aligned with the results of previous studies showing a lower olfactory discrimination performance in MCI⁵⁴ and predictive value of olfactory discrimination 372 in further cognitive decline⁴⁸. Unlike the basic detection of odors, both identification and 373 374 discrimination of odors require high-level cognitive functions such as working memory and decision making, which could explain our results⁵⁴. The hippocampal network is also associated 375 with olfactory discrimination⁷⁴, early damages to this structure in AD could explain these 376 377 findings. Future studies should investigate the relationship between hippocampal damage and 378 olfactory discrimination tasks in participants at risk of AD using volumetric magnetic resonance 379 imaging and tau PET^{18} .

380

381 Objective measurements of olfactory identification, discrimination, and memory were negatively 382 associated with age in the asymptomatic CN sample. These results are not surprising and 383 replicate the robust literature on the effect of normal aging on olfactory function. Indeed, 384 according to a meta-analysis including 175,073 participants (18-101 years), olfactory impairment would be prevalent at 34.5% in studies with a mean age above 55 years, while the prevalence 385 would be at 7.5% in studies with a mean age below 55 years⁷⁵. The decline starts in the fifth 386 decade of life⁷⁶ and is general across different olfactory capacities such as olfactory detection, 387 discrimination, identification⁷⁷, and memory^{78,79}. Our results indicate that perceived olfactory 388

average intensity was not related to age. While some studies using magnitude estimation
procedures to assess the perceived intensity of odors across different concentrations found no
significant age-related differences^{80,81}, another study found that older individuals perceived
increases in menthol concentration as less intense than younger individuals⁸². These mixed
results suggest that while perceived odor intensity may not always show a clear age-related
decline, other aspects of olfactory function, such as identification, discrimination, and memory,
are consistently negatively impacted by aging.

396

397 Having validated remote unobserved self-administration in CN people and demonstrated that 398 remote observed self-administration of the ABHT is feasible in an MCI population (95% of MCI 399 participants completed testing in this mode), and by finding expected differences in olfactory 400 identification scores as shown in previous studies, we are poised to begin studies in deeply 401 phenotyped populations to quantify the predictive value of ABHT outcomes on biomarkers of 402 neurodegenerative disease, including Alzheimer's, Lewy Body disease, and concussive and non-403 concussive head trauma. These studies can incorporate both English and Spanish-speaking 404 participants, as we did not find any differences in olfactory scores among the CN English and 405 Spanish-speaking participants. Different olfactory-behavioral profiles are hypothesized to emerge depending on disease neuropathology, as different brain areas and networks of the 406 central olfactory system are associated with different olfactory tasks^{83–85}. While previous studies 407 showed that MCI and AD predominantly affect olfactory identification^{52,70}, the olfactory bulb is 408 409 affected at the earliest stage of Parkinson's disease resulting in a general olfactory impairment with reduced olfactory detection performance and leads to a decrease in various olfactory tasks 410

411 (e.g., discrimination of odors, identification of odors)^{52,86}. Other conditions such as Lewy body
412 dementia⁸⁷, frontotemporal dementia⁸⁸, and exposure to head impacts and traumatic brain
413 injury^{89–91} can also cause olfactory impairments.

414

415 When combined with other digital biomarkers, a mobile self-administrated and diverse smell 416 assessment like ours could accelerate screening for neurodegenerative diseases in asymptomatic or newly symptomatic individuals who would benefit from more definitive subsequent tests^{92,93}. 417 418 such as blood-based, image-based, or cerebrospinal fluid (CSF)-based diagnostics, especially in 419 individuals presenting additional risk factors for dementia such as subjective cognitive decline⁶⁶. depression⁹⁴, and genetic risks factors such as the APOE-4 allele⁹⁵. Home-based tests also have 420 421 the potential to enhance the involvement of underrepresented groups in research settings⁹⁶ and to 422 save time and cost of transportation, to save costs for the healthcare system, and to increase 423 patient satisfaction^{97,98}.

424

This study has certain limitations. The main limit is the restricted availability of
neuropsychological testing for a proportion of the participants (unverified vs verified) in the
sample. Additionally, the results of this study correlate with a robust body of literature, and
demonstrate its utility in real-world settings. Future longitudinal studies will assess the predictive
value of the ABHT on longitudinal cognitive decline and highlight the utility of this olfactory
battery in mapping correlations between patterns olfactory decline and the progression of various
neurodegenerative diseases. While not a limitation in this preliminary validation of the

432 AROMHA Brain Health Test, biomarker availability will be an essential component in future 433 studies that assess the predictive power that this noninvasive preliminary screen may hold. 434 435 Conclusion 436 The ABHT is a novel remote olfactory battery that exhibited similar performance across 437 observed and unobserved self-administration among CN participants as well as among English 438 and Spanish-speaking CN participants, while anosmic patients performed at chance level as 439 expected. Odor percept identification, discrimination, and memory subtests were sensitive to the 440 aging effect on the olfactory system. Each olfactory identification subtest, including the short 9-441 item version, and the olfactory discrimination subtest showed lower performance in the MCI group, mirroring results in the literature. These results suggest that the ABHT could be used in 442 443 clinical research settings in different languages to explore the utility of olfactory biomarkers to

444 predict the presence of blood-based, image-based, or cerebrospinal fluid (CSF)-based biomarkers

445 of neurodegenerative disease and longitudinal development of clinical symptoms.

446

447 Methods

448

449 Development and Quality Control of the AROMHA Brain Health Test

450

451 The ABHT was updated for remote at-home self-administration of previously developed Odor

452 Percept Identification (OPID), Percepts of Odor Episodic Memory (POEM), and Odor

453 Discrimination (OD) subtests⁴³. All pre-screening, informed consent, and administration of the

454 test occurs online through a web-based interface (testyourbrainhealth.com). This updated version

455 of the test consisted of five different 8.5 " x 11" single-use cards that were packaged in one

456 envelope and mailed to the participant's home. We expanded the manufacturing of odor labels from the three odors utilized in the COVID smell test⁶² to include additional 15 odors. Odor 457 labels were manufactured by MFR Samplings using Living LibraryTM odors purchased from 458 International Flavors and Fragrances (IFF)⁶². Odors were presented to participants in a peel-and-459 460 sniff manner and contained proprietary naturalistic odors from the Living Library developed by IFF (https://www.iff.com/). Gas chromatography/mass spectrometry were conducted at the Mass 461 462 Spectrometry core at the Bauer Laboratory in the Harvard Chemistry Department. Briefly, each 463 odor label was completely opened in a stoppered 15 ml conical tube and allowed to reach 464 equilibrium for 1 minute at room temperature. Then a Hamilton Syringe was used to inject a 465 representative sample of the headspace into the GC/MS instrument. The peaks were normalized 466 to 2-methyl-3-heptanone equivalents, and analyzed for common set of peaks that might represent 467 a common contaminant from the adhesive. All samples were run the same day to eliminate batch 468 effects (Extended Data Figure 1).

469

470 Participant responses to all components of the ABHT were collected on a web-based application 471 at testyourbrainhealth.com designed for independent self-administration of the survey questions 472 and the olfactory battery (Extended Data Figure 2). The data is stored on a HIPPA-compliant 473 AWS server. The prescreening module and the informed consent module were developed on a 474 RedCAP platform at the Massachusetts General Hospital. All protected health information was 475 kept on RedCAP platform. Participants had the option to call a research assistant for live help in 476 English or Spanish at any time during remote testing. The web-based AHBT application directed participants to a RedCap secure e-consent project to collect identifiers. Once consented, 477 478 participants were sent back to the AROMHA, Inc. app to walk through all three parts of the

479 battery and collect olfactory information associated with their card ID. The app was designed to 480 lead participants through every stage of testing, including directions on how to peel odor labels 481 and sample odors as well as respond to questions regarding odor intensity, odor identification & 482 naming confidence, odor memory, and odor discrimination. The application has the ability to run 483 in an English or Spanish language mode, based on participant preference. During testing, it 484 collects participant responses for all aspects of the olfactory battery in addition to the timing of 485 those inputs. The app generates summary and item-specific data on these metrics that can be 486 downloaded by researchers for analysis and joined offline to demographic information collected 487 in RedCap following the e-consent process. These results are not shared with participants.

488

489 Part 1: Odor Percept Identification Test (OPID9). Participants first completed the OPID9, 490 which involved identifying nine distinct odors: menthol, clove, leather, strawberry, lilac, 491 pineapple, smoke, soap, and grape. These odors were selected for their predictive value in 492 identifying the conversion to Alzheimer's disease (AD) in patients with mild cognitive impairment (MCI)³⁹. After each odor presentation, participants rated the intensity on a Likert 493 494 scale from 0 to 10. Subsequently, they were presented with four odor names, asked to choose the 495 label that best represented the odor they sampled, and asked to rate their confidence in their 496 identification choice using the following scale: "I Guessed," "I Narrowed Down to Three," "I 497 Narrowed Down to Two," or "I Am Certain." (Extended Data Figure 2B). This process was 498 repeated for all nine odors. Following the completion of the OPID9 test, there was a 10-minute 499 delay during which participants answered demographic, medical, nasal, and memory-related 500 questions.

501

502 Part 2: Percepts of Odor Episodic Memory (POEM) / OPID18. After the 10-minute break, 503 participants completed the POEM/OPID18 tests. These tests included the nine odors from Part 1 504 and nine additional odors: coffee, peach, chocolate, orange, dirt, banana, lemon, bubble gum, and 505 rose. The odors were presented in a stereotyped random order that was held consistent across all 506 participants. For each odor, participants first indicated whether the odor sampled was presented in Part 1 (yes/no), OPID9. As in the earlier odor identification test, they then selected the odor 507 508 name most representative of the odor from four choices and rated their confidence in their 509 selection.

510

511 *Part 3: Odor Discrimination (OD10)*. In Part 3, participants were presented with 10 pairs of
512 odors, all of which were previously presented in Parts 1 and 2. They were asked to determine
513 whether the paired odors were the same or different (yes/no).

514

515 The POEM index was calculated as the difference between the proportion of correct and incorrect recognitions, with scores ranging from -1 to 1. OPID9 and OPID18 scores were 516 517 calculated as the total number of correctly identified odors, with maximum scores of 9 and 18, 518 respectively. The OD10 score was the total number of correctly discriminated odor pairs, with a 519 maximum score of 10. The average intensity score was derived from the mean intensity ratings 520 of the nine odors from Part 1 on the Likert scale. OPID9noguess and OPID18noguess scores 521 were calculated as the total number of odors identified correctly where the participant did not 522 select "I Guessed" for the confidence question immediately following identification.

523

| 524 | After verifying participants' comfort with using the web-based application in conjunction with |
|-----|---|
| 525 | the AROMHA Brain Health Test's smell cards through the use of research assistant observation, |
| 526 | cognitively healthy participants were given the option to complete the test with or without the |
| 527 | observation of a research assistant. Verified cognitively impaired participants were not given this |
| 528 | option and were only able to self-administer the smell test remotely or in person under the |
| 529 | observation of a research assistant. |
| 530 | |
| 531 | Participants |
| 532 | Since May 2023, 127 CN, 34 SCC, and 19 MCI participants were recruited across 21 states in |
| 533 | the United States, and from Puerto Rico, from the Longitudinal Cohort at the Massachusetts |
| 534 | Alzheimer's Disease Research Center (ADRC), through an internet posting on the Massachusetts |
| 535 | General Hospital research site, and through clinicaltrials.gov (NCT05881239). Anosmic |
| 536 | participants were recruited from the Smell Clinic of Dr. Mark Albers at Massachusetts General |
| 537 | Hospital. |
| 538 | |
| 539 | The cognitive status classification was verified for subjects recruited from the ADRC |
| 540 | Longitudinal Cohort ($n = 59$), whereas participants recruited from the internet were classified |
| 541 | cognitively based on self-reported cognitive complaints or medical diagnoses affecting cognitive |
| 542 | function ($n = 118$). All participants underwent informed consent before participation. The |
| 543 | research protocol was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by |
| 544 | the Institutional Review Board of Partners Health. |
| 545 | |

| 546 | Unverified CN ($n = 99$) were recruited from the internet and were aged 18 years old and over and |
|-----|--|
| 547 | reported no cognitive complaints or medical diagnoses affecting cognitive function. From the |
| 548 | unverified CN participants, we created a subgroup of unverified CN aged $55 + (n = 45)$. Verified |
| 549 | CN aged 55+ recruited from the ADRC (n = 28), had a Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) |
| 550 | score within the normal range adjusted for age, sex, and education level, a Clinical Dementia |
| 551 | Rating (CDR) global score of 0, and a performance within the normal range on the Logical |
| 552 | Memory II subscale delayed paragraph recall (LM-IIa) of the Wechsler Memory Scale-Revised |
| 553 | (WMS-R) (\geq 16 years of education: \geq 9; 8-15 years: \geq 5; 0-7 years: \geq 3). In total, we recruited 127 |
| 554 | CN participants, 73 of them were aged 55+. |
| 555 | |
| 556 | Unverified Subjective Cognitive Concern (SCC) participants ($n = 13$) were aged 55+ and |
| 557 | reported SCC based on the following 3 questions: 1) Have you experienced a change in your |
| 558 | memory in the last 1-3 years? 2) Has this been a persistent change over the last 6 months? and 3) |
| 559 | Are you concerned about this change? Responses were on a Likert scale: "Not at all," "Slightly," |
| 560 | "Moderately," "Considerably," and "Extremely." If participants endorse "Slightly" or worse to |
| 561 | all 3 questions, they will be categorized as SCC. Verified SCC participants ($n = 18$) were |
| 562 | assigned using the same criteria as verified CN older adults, as well as reporting significant |
| 563 | subjective memory concerns based on the three questions presented above. Three participants |
| 564 | under 55 reported SCC and were removed from the analyses. In total, we included 31 |
| 565 | participants with SCC. |
| 566 | |

| 567 | Unverified MCI participants ($n = 4$) were aged 55+ and reported a clinical diagnosis of MCI by a |
|-----|--|
| 568 | certified physician. Verified MCI participants ($n = 15$) were aged 55+, met the National Institute |
| 569 | on Aging-Alzheimer's Association (NIA-AA) diagnostic criteria for MCI ⁹⁹ , with a performance |
| 570 | below an education-adjusted cut-off score on the WMS-R LM-IIa (≥ 16 years: ≤ 8 ; 8-15 years: ≤ 4 ; |
| 571 | 0-7 years: \leq 2), or had a MoCA score indicating MCI adjusted for age, sex, and education level, |
| 572 | had a CDR global score from 0.5 to 1 (with memory box score of 0.5 or 1), had preserved IADL |
| 573 | (determined by a clinician), and were not demented. In total, we recruited 19 participants with |
| 574 | MCI. |
| 575 | |
| 576 | We performed Wilcoxon rank sum/Mann Whitney tests to compare the median performance on |
| 577 | each olfactory measure between verified and unverified participants in each subgroup (CN, SCC, |
| 578 | and MCI). Since, after adjustment for multiple comparisons, no difference was significant at a |
| 579 | threshold of 0.05 we combined the verified and unverified participants within a subgroup for the |
| 580 | purposes of these analyses. Clinical data comparing the verified participants in each group are |
| 581 | presented and compared in Extended Data Table 4. |
| 582 | |
| 583 | Statistical Analysis |

All analyses were conducted in R using *Base R, effectsize, emmeans, and rstatix* packages.
Student T-tests were used to compare demographics and olfactory variables between observed
and unobserved conditions and between English and Spanish-speaking groups, while the
Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to compare anosmic patients with CN participants. To assess

| 588 | the effect of age on olfaction, we conducted linear regression models with age and olfactory |
|--------------------------|---|
| 589 | scores. We performed this analysis for each olfactory subtests (OPID9, OPID9noguess, OPID18 |
| 590 | OPID18noguess, OD10, POEM, and average intensity). To assess the effect of cognitive status |
| 591 | on olfaction, ANCOVAs were performed to compare olfactory functioning (OPID9, |
| 592 | OPID9noguess, OPID18, OPID18noguess, OD10, POEM, and average intensity) among older |
| 593 | adults without cognitive impairment, participants with SCC, and with MCI, including age, sex, |
| 594 | and education as covariates. For all the analyses, we set the alpha value at 0.05 and used |
| 595 | Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. |
| 596 | |
| 597 | Acknowledgements |
| 598 | We thank the participants and their families for their dedication to the study. We thank |
| 599 | Dr. Jennifer Wang and Dr. Sunia Traeger from the Mass Spectrometry core at the Bauer |
| c00 | |
| 600 | Laboratory in the Harvard Chemistry Department for the GC/MS analysis, Jay Lockwood for |
| 601 | Laboratory in the Harvard Chemistry Department for the GC/MS analysis, Jay Lockwood for software development, Dr. Matthias Tabert at IFF for advice about odors, Daniel Tater for |
| 601 602 | Laboratory in the Harvard Chemistry Department for the GC/MS analysis, Jay Lockwood for software development, Dr. Matthias Tabert at IFF for advice about odors, Daniel Tater for software advice, Pablo Ripoli and Juan Manual Arias at MFR Samplings for advice about odor |
| 600 601 602 603 | Laboratory in the Harvard Chemistry Department for the GC/MS analysis, Jay Lockwood for software development, Dr. Matthias Tabert at IFF for advice about odors, Daniel Tater for software advice, Pablo Ripoli and Juan Manual Arias at MFR Samplings for advice about odor labels, Emily Rusk for input about quality controls and regulatory advice, Patrizia Vannini and |
| 601 602 603 604 | Laboratory in the Harvard Chemistry Department for the GC/MS analysis, Jay Lockwood for software development, Dr. Matthias Tabert at IFF for advice about odors, Daniel Tater for software advice, Pablo Ripoli and Juan Manual Arias at MFR Samplings for advice about odor labels, Emily Rusk for input about quality controls and regulatory advice, Patrizia Vannini and Gad Marshall for discussions about metacognition in smell testing, Judy Johanson, Teresa |

Gomez-Isla M.D., Ph.D., and Brad Hyman, M.D., Ph.D. for their assistance with recruitingADRC subjects.

BJ is supported by scholarships from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the
Fonds de Recherche Québec Santé, the Quebec Bio-Imaging Network, the Université du Québec
à Trois-Rivières, and MITACS. The study was funded by NIH R41AG062130 and NIHR42AG
062130 (awarded to S.R.), and U01DC019579 (awarded to M.W.A.).

611

612 Author Contributions

- 613 S.R., A.D.A., and M.W.A. conceptualized and designed the study. B.J., C.M., D.D., A.R.,
- 614 A.A.S., B.E., acquired and analyzed data. B.J., C.M., A.R., A.D.A., and M.W.A. drafted text and
- 615 prepared figures. All authors revised content.
- 616

617 **Competing interests**

- 618
- 619 S.R. and M.W.A. are co-founders and own shares in Aromha, Inc. C.M. and A.D.A. are
- 620 consultants for Aromha, Inc. M.W.A. and A.D.A.'s participation in this research was reviewed
- by the MGB Office of Industrial Interactions. M.W.A is a consultant for Sudo Bioscience
- 622 Limited, Transposon Therapeutics, and has received in kind donations from IFF and from Eli
- 623 Lilly. He has received speaking fees from Biohaven and Incyte.
- 624

625 Data availability statement

- 626 The dataset generated and analyzed for the current study are available to academic researchers627 with a Data Use Agreement with MGH and Aromha, Inc.
- 628
- 629 References
- 630 1. 2023 Alzheimer's disease facts and figures. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* **19**, 1598–1695 (2023).
- 631 2. Jack, C. R. et al. Longitudinal tau PET in ageing and Alzheimer's disease. Brain 141, 1517-

632 1528 (2018).

- 633 3. Bateman, R. J. et al. Clinical and Biomarker Changes in Dominantly Inherited Alzheimer's
- 634 Disease. *n engl j med* 10 (2012).
- 635 4. Villemagne, V. L. *et al.* Amyloid β deposition, neurodegeneration, and cognitive decline in
- 636 sporadic Alzheimer's disease: a prospective cohort study. **12**, 11 (2013).
- 5. Jia, J. *et al.* Biomarker Changes during 20 Years Preceding Alzheimer's Disease. *N Engl J*
- 638 *Med* **390**, 712–722 (2024).
- 639 6. Munro, C. E. et al. Recent contributions to the field of subjective cognitive decline in aging: A
- 640 literature review. *Alz & Dem Diag Ass & Dis Mo* **15**, e12475 (2023).
- 641 7. Knopman, D. S. et al. Alzheimer disease. Nat Rev Dis Primers 7, 33 (2021).

- 8. Cummings, J., Feldman, H. H. & Scheltens, P. The "rights" of precision drug development for
- 643 Alzheimer's disease. *Alz Res Therapy* **11**, 76 (2019).
- 9. Sperling, R. A., Jack, C. R. & Aisen, P. S. Testing the Right Target and Right Drug at the
- 645 Right Stage. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **3**, (2011).
- 10. Kim, C. K. *et al.* Alzheimer's disease: key insights from two decades of clinical trial
- failures. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease* **87**, 83–100 (2022).
- 648 11. Cummings, J. *et al.* Re-engineering Alzheimer clinical trials: Global Alzheimer's Platform
 649 network. *The journal of prevention of Alzheimer's disease* 3, 114 (2016).
- 12. Reiss, A. B. *et al.* Alzheimer's disease: many failed trials, so where do we go from here?
- 651 *Journal of Investigative medicine* **68**, 1135–1140 (2020).
- 13. Murphy, C. Olfactory and other sensory impairments in Alzheimer disease. *Nat Rev*
- 653 *Neurol* **15**, 11–24 (2019).
- Albers, M. W., Tabert, M. H. & Devanand, D. P. Olfactory dysfunction as a predictor of
 neurodegenerative disease. *Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep* 6, 379–386 (2006).
- Pashkovski, S. L. *et al.* Structure and flexibility in cortical representations of odour
 space. *Nature* 583, 253–258 (2020).
- 16. Sosulski, D. L., Bloom, M. L., Cutforth, T., Axel, R. & Datta, S. R. Distinct
- representations of olfactory information in different cortical centres. *Nature* 472, 213–216
 (2011).
- 661 17. Braak, H. & Braak, E. Neuropathological stageing of Alzheimer-related changes. *Acta*662 *Neuropathol* 82, 239–259 (1991).
- 18. Diez, I. *et al.* Tau propagation in the brain olfactory circuits is associated with smell
 perception changes in aging. *Nat Commun* **15**, 4809 (2024).
- 665 19. Arnold, S. E. *et al.* Olfactory epithelium amyloid-β and paired helical filament-tau
- 666 pathology in Alzheimer disease. Ann Neurol. 67, 462–469 (2010).

- 667 20. Jobin, B., Boller, B. & Frasnelli, J. Volumetry of Olfactory Structures in Mild Cognitive
- 668 Impairment and Alzheimer's Disease: A Systematic Review and a Meta-Analysis. *Brain*

669 *Sciences* **11**, 1010 (2021).

- 670 21. Jobin, B., Boller, B. & Frasnelli, J. Smaller grey matter volume in the central olfactory
 671 system in mild cognitive impairment. *Experimental Gerontology* (2023).
- 672 22. Lu et al. Functional Connectivity between the Resting-State Olfactory Network and the

673 Hippocampus in Alzheimer's Disease. *Brain Sciences* **9**, 338 (2019).

23. Vasavada, M. M. *et al.* Olfactory cortex degeneration in Alzheimer's disease and mild

675 cognitive impairment. *Journal of Alzheimer's disease* **45**, 947–958 (2015).

- 676 24. Doty, R. L., Shaman, P., Kimmelman, C. P. & Dann, M. S. University of Pennsylvania
- 677 Smell Identification Test: a rapid quantitative olfactory function test for the clinic. *The*
- 678 *Laryngoscope* **94**, 176–178 (1984).
- 679 25. Hummel, T., Sekinger, B., Wolf, S. R., Pauli, E. & Kobal, G. 'Sniffin'sticks': olfactory

680 performance assessed by the combined testing of odor identification, odor discrimination and

681 olfactory threshold. *Chemical senses* **22**, 39–52 (1997).

- 682 26. Lafaille-Magnan, M.-E. *et al.* Odor identification as a biomarker of preclinical AD in older
 683 adults at risk. *Neurology* 89, 327–335 (2017).
- 684 27. Risacher, S. L. *et al.* Olfactory identification in subjective cognitive decline and mild
- 685 cognitive impairment: Association with tau but not amyloid positron emission tomography.

686 Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment & Disease Monitoring **9**, 57–66 (2017).

- 687 28. Tu, L. *et al.* Association of Odor Identification Ability With Amyloid-β and Tau Burden: A
- 688 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front. Neurosci.* **14**, 586330 (2020).
- Klein, J. *et al.* Olfactory Impairment Is Related to Tau Pathology and Neuroinflammation
 in Alzheimer's Disease. *JAD* 80, 1051–1065 (2021).
- 30. Reijs, B. L. R. *et al.* Relation of Odor Identification with Alzheimer's Disease Markers in
- 692 Cerebrospinal Fluid and Cognition. *JAD* **60**, 1025–1034 (2017).

- 693 31. Devanand, D. P. *et al.* Olfactory identification deficits and MCI in a multi-ethnic elderly
- 694 community sample. *Neurobiology of Aging* **31**, 1593–1600 (2010).
- 695 32. Kose, Y. *et al.* Association between the inability to identify particular odors and physical
- 696 performance, cognitive function, and/or brain atrophy in community-dwelling older adults from
- the Fukuoka Island City study. *BMC Geriatr* **21**, 421 (2021).
- 698 33. Hagemeier, J. et al. Odor identification deficit in mild cognitive impairment and
- Alzheimer's disease is associated with hippocampal and deep gray matter atrophy.
- 700 Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging **255**, 87–93 (2016).
- 701 34. Kjelvik, G. et al. The brain structural and cognitive basis of odor identification deficits in
- mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. *BMC Neurol* **14**, 168 (2014).
- 35. Murphy, C., Jernigan, T. L. & Fennema-Notestine, C. Left hippocampal volume loss in
- Alzheimer's disease is reflected in performance on odor identification: A structural MRI study.
- 705 *J Int Neuropsychol Soc* **9**, 459–471 (2003).
- 706 36. Yoshii, F., Onaka, H., Kohara, S., Ryo, M. & Takahashi, W. Association of Smell
- 707 Identification Deficit with Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale-Cognitive Subscale,
- Japanese Version Scores and Brain Atrophy in Patients with Dementia. *Eur Neurol* 81, 145–
 151 (2019).
- 710 37. Yu, H., Chen, Z., Zhao, J., Duan, S. & Zhao, J. Olfactory Impairment and Hippocampal
- Volume in a Chinese MCI Clinical Sample. *Alzheimer Disease & Associated Disorders* 33,
 124–128 (2019).
- 71338.Jobin, B., Roy-Côté, F., Frasnelli, J. & Boller, B. Olfaction and Declarative Memory in
- Aging: A Meta-analysis. *Chemical Senses* bjad045 (2023) doi:10.1093/chemse/bjad045.
- 715 39. Tabert, M. H. *et al.* A 10-item smell identification scale related to risk for Alzheimer's
 716 disease. *Ann Neurol.* 58, 155–160 (2005).
- 717 40. Devanand, D. P. et al. Combining Early Markers Strongly Predicts Conversion from Mild
- 718 Cognitive Impairment to Alzheimer's Disease. *Biological Psychiatry* **64**, 871–879 (2008).

41. Conti, M. Z. *et al.* Odor Identification Deficit Predicts Clinical Conversion from Mild
Cognitive Impairment to Dementia Due to Alzheimer's Disease. *Archives of Clinical*

721 Neuropsychology **28**, 391–399 (2013).

- 42. Roberts, R. O. et al. Association between olfactory dysfunction and amnestic mild
- cognitive impairment and Alzheimer disease dementia. *JAMA neurology* **73**, 93–101 (2016).
- 43. Dhilla Albers, A. *et al.* Episodic memory of odors stratifies Alzheimer biomarkers in
- normal elderly: POEM: Odor Memory Biomarker in Normal Elderly. *Ann Neurol.* 80, 846–857
 (2016).
- 727 44. Devanand, D. P. et al. Olfactory deficits predict cognitive decline and Alzheimer
- dementia in an urban community. *Neurology* **84**, 182–189 (2015).
- 729 45. Dintica, C. S. et al. Impaired olfaction is associated with cognitive decline and
- neurodegeneration in the brain. *Neurology* **92**, e700–e709 (2019).
- Growdon, M. E. *et al.* Odor identification and Alzheimer disease biomarkers in clinically
 normal elderly. *Neurology* 84, 2153–2160 (2015).
- 733 47. Olofsson, J. K., Larsson, M., Roa, C., Wilson, D. A. & Jonsson Laukka, E. Interaction
- 734Between Odor Identification Deficit and APOE4 Predicts 6-Year Cognitive Decline in Elderly
- 735 Individuals. *Behav Genet* **50**, 3–13 (2020).
- 48. Sohrabi, H. R. *et al.* Olfactory discrimination predicts cognitive decline among
 community-dwelling older adults. *Transl Psychiatry* 2, e118–e118 (2012).
- 49. Windon, M. J., Kim, S. J., Oh, E. S. & Lin, S. Y. Predictive value of olfactory impairment
- for cognitive decline among cognitively normal adults. *The Laryngoscope* **130**, 840–847
- 740 (2019).
- 50. Wheeler, P. L. & Murphy, C. Olfactory Measures as Predictors of Conversion to Mild
 Cognitive Impairment and Alzheimer's Disease. *Brain Sciences* 11, 1391 (2021).
- 51. Wilson, R. S. et al. Olfactory Identification and Incidence of Mild Cognitive Impairment in
- 744 Older Age. Arch Gen Psychiatry **64**, 802 (2007).

- 745 52. Rahayel, S., Frasnelli, J. & Joubert, S. The effect of Alzheimer's disease and
- Parkinson's disease on olfaction: A meta-analysis. *Behavioural Brain Research* 231, 60–74
 (2012).
- 53. Schofield, P. W., Moore, T. M. & Gardner, A. Traumatic Brain Injury and Olfaction: A
 Systematic Review. *Front. Neurol.* 5, (2014).
- 750 54. Audronyte, E., Pakulaite-Kazliene, G., Sutnikiene, V. & Kaubrys, G. Odor Discrimination
- as a Marker of Early Alzheimer's Disease. JAD 1–10 (2023) doi:10.3233/JAD-230077.
- 55. Bastin, C. *et al.* Anosognosia in Mild Cognitive Impairment: Lack of Awareness of
- 753 Memory Difficulties Characterizes Prodromal Alzheimer's Disease. Front. Psychiatry 12,
- 631518 (2021).
- 56. Gallo, D. A., Cramer, S. J., Wong, J. T. & Bennett, D. A. Alzheimer's disease can spare
- 756 local metacognition despite global anosognosia: Revisiting the confidence–accuracy

relationship in episodic memory. *Neuropsychologia* **50**, 2356–2364 (2012).

57. Cosentino, S., Metcalfe, J., Butterfield, B. & Stern, Y. Objective Metamemory Testing

759 Captures Awareness of Deficit in Alzheimer's Disease. *Cortex* **43**, 1004–1019 (2007).

- 760 58. Vannini, P. et al. Decreased meta-memory is associated with early tauopathy in
- cognitively unimpaired older adults. *NeuroImage: Clinical* **24**, 102097 (2019).
- 762 59. López-Martos, D. et al. Awareness of episodic memory and meta-cognitive profiles:
- associations with cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers at the preclinical stage of the Alzheimer's
- 764 continuum. *Front. Aging Neurosci.* **16**, 1394460 (2024).
- Albers, M. W. *et al.* At the interface of sensory and motor dysfunctions and Alzheimer's
 disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* **11**, 70–98 (2015).
- 767 61. Patel, Z. M. *et al.* International consensus statement on allergy and rhinology: Olfaction.
- 768 Int Forum Allergy Rhinol **12**, 327–680 (2022).

- 769 62. Rodriguez, S. et al. Innate immune signaling in the olfactory epithelium reduces odorant
- receptor levels: modeling transient smell loss in COVID-19 patients. Preprint at
- 771 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.14.20131128 (2020).
- 63. Ergun, B. et al. Longitudinal Assessment Of Subjective And Objective Changes In
- 773 Olfactory Function Following Sars-Cov-2 Infection: A Focus On Odor Identification, Intensity,
- And General Smell Function. in (Bonita Springs, FL, 2024).
- 775 64. Jobin, B. et al. Olfactory function is predictive of brain volumes and memory of former
- professional football players in the Harvard Football Players Health Study. in (Reykjavík,
- 777 Iceland., 2024).
- Runde, A. *et al.* Digital Accessible Remote Olfactory Mediated Health Assessments For
 Preclinical AD. in (Bonita Springs, FL, 2024).
- 66. Jessen, F. *et al.* A conceptual framework for research on subjective cognitive decline in
 preclinical Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* **10**, 844–852 (2014).
- 782 67. Sperling, R. A. *et al.* Toward defining the preclinical stages of Alzheimer's disease:
- 783 Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups
- on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* **7**, 280–292 (2011).
- 785 68. Jonsson, F. U. Olfactory Metacognition. *Chemical Senses* 28, 651–658 (2003).
- 786 69. Jonsson, F. U. Odor Emotionality Affects the Confidence in Odor Naming. *Chemical*787 Senses **30**, 29–35 (2005).
- 788 70. Roalf, D. R. *et al.* A quantitative meta-analysis of olfactory dysfunction in mild cognitive
 789 impairment. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 88, 226–232 (2017).
- 790 71. Kjelvik, G. et al. The Human Brain Representation of Odor Identification in Amnestic Mild
- Cognitive Impairment and Alzheimer's Dementia of Mild Degree. *Frontiers in Neurology* **11**,
 1779 (2021).
- 793 72. Patin, A. & Pause, B. M. Human amygdala activations during nasal chemoreception.
- 794 *Neuropsychologia* **78**, 171–194 (2015).

- 73. Larsson, M. *et al.* Olfactory memory in the old and very old: relations to episodic and
 semantic memory and APOE genotype. *Neurobiology of Aging* 38, 118–126 (2016).
- 797 74. Martin, C., Beshel, J. & Kay, L. M. An Olfacto-Hippocampal Network Is Dynamically
- Involved in Odor-Discrimination Learning. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **98**, 2196–2205 (2007).
- 799 75. Desiato, V. M. *et al.* The Prevalence of Olfactory Dysfunction in the General Population:
- A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Am J Rhinol Allergy* **35**, 195–205 (2021).
- 801 76. Zhang, C. & Wang, X. Initiation of the age-related decline of odor identification in
- humans: A meta-analysis. *Ageing Research Reviews* **40**, 45–50 (2017).
- 803 77. Oleszkiewicz, A., Schriever, V., Croy, I., Hähner, A. & Hummel, T. Updated Sniffin'Sticks
- 804 normative data based on an extended sample of 9139 subjects. European Archives of Oto-
- 805 *Rhino-Laryngology* **276**, 719–728 (2019).
- 806 78. Moberg, P. J. & Raz, N. Aging and Olfactory Recognition Memory: Effect of Encoding
- 807 Strategies and Cognitive Abilities. *International Journal of Neuroscience* **90**, 277–291 (1997).
- 808 79. Murphy, C., Nordin, S. & Acosta, L. Odor learning, recall, and recognition memory in
 809 young and elderly adults. *Neuropsychology* **11**, 126 (1997).
- 810 80. Rovee, C. K., Cohen, R. Y. & Schlapack, W. Life-span stability in olfactory sensitivity.
- 811 Developmental Psychology **11**, 311 (1975).
- 812 81. Cowart, B. J. Relationships between taste and smell across the adult life span a. *Annals*813 of the New York academy of Sciences 561, 39–55 (1989).
- 814 82. Murphy, C. Age-related effects on the threshold, psychophysical function, and 815 pleasantness of menthol. *Journal of Gerontology* **38**, 217–222 (1983).
- 816 83. Frasnelli, J. *et al.* Neuroanatomical correlates of olfactory performance. *Exp Brain Res*817 **201**, 1–11 (2010).
- 818 84. Savic, I., Gulyas, B., Larsson, M. & Roland, P. Olfactory Functions Are Mediated by
- 819 Parallel and Hierarchical Processing. *Neuron* **26**, 735–745 (2000).

- 85. Wilson, D. A. *et al.* Cortical Odor Processing in Health and Disease. in *Progress in Brain Research* vol. 208 275–305 (Elsevier, 2014).
- 822 86. Haehner, A., Hummel, T. & Reichmann, H. Olfactory Loss in Parkinson's Disease.
- 823 *Parkinson's Disease* **2011**, 450939 (2011).
- 824 87. Yoo, H. S. *et al.* Olfactory dysfunction in Alzheimer's disease– and Lewy body–related 825 cognitive impairment. *Alzheimer's & amp; Dementia* **14**, 1243–1252 (2018).
- 826 88. Carnemolla, S. E. *et al.* Olfactory dysfunction in frontotemporal dementia and psychiatric
 827 disorders: A systematic review. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* **118**, 588–611
- 828 (2020).
- 829 89. Lecuyer Giguere, F. et al. Early Parosmia Signs and Affective States Predict Depression
- and Anxiety Symptoms 6 Months After a Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *Chemical Senses* **45**,
- 831 483–490 (2020).
- 832 90. Alosco, M. L. et al. Olfactory Function and Associated Clinical Correlates in Former

833 National Football League Players. *Journal of Neurotrauma* **34**, 772–780 (2017).

- 834 91. Zigrand, C. *et al.* Olfactory perception in patients with a mild traumatic brain injury: a
 835 longitudinal study. *Brain Injury* **36**, 985–990 (2022).
- 836 92. Doraiswamy, P. M., Narayan, V. A. & Manji, H. K. Mobile and pervasive computing
- technologies and the future of Alzheimer's clinical trials. *Npj Digital Medicine* **1**, 1 (2018).

838 93. Kaye, J. et al. Using digital tools to advance Alzheimer's drug trials during a pandemic:

- the EU/US CTAD task force. *The journal of prevention of Alzheimer's disease* 8, 513–519
 (2021).
- 841 94. Green, P., Rohling, M. L., Iverson, G. L. & Gervais, R. O. Relationships between
 842 olfactory discrimination and head injury severity. *Brain Injury* 17, 479–496 (2003).
- 843 95. Tsai, M. S. et al. Apolipoprotein E: risk factor for Alzheimer disease. Am J Hum Genet
- **54**, 643–649 (1994).

- 845 96. Weiner, M. W. et al. Increasing participant diversity in AD research: plans for digital
- screening, blood testing, and a community-engaged approach in the Alzheimer's Disease
- 847 Neuroimaging Initiative 4. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* **19**, 307–317 (2023).
- 848 97. Kruse, C. S. *et al.* Telehealth and patient satisfaction: a systematic review and narrative
- 849 analysis. *BMJ Open* **7**, e016242 (2017).
- 850 98. Atmojo, J. T. et al. Telemedicine, Cost Effectiveness, and Patients Satisfaction: A
- 851 Systematic Review. J HEALTH POLICY MANAGE 5, 103–107 (2020).
- 852 99. Albert, M. S. et al. The diagnosis of mild cognitive impairment due to Alzheimer's
- disease: Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association
- 854 workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* **7**,
- 855 270–279 (2011).
- 856

857 Figure legends.

Figure 1. AROMHA Brain Health Test. Following online prescreening, online consent, the

859 web-based program instructs you through the 5 bilingual (English / Spanish) cards (A). Card A is

comprised of a practice odor P followed by the 9 odor labels comprising the OPID9 test.

Adjacent in the blue box (B) is the workflow for these tests as directed by

the <u>testyourbrainhealth.com</u> software to generate the OPID9, OPID9noguess, and average

- 863 intensity scores. After a 10-minute break, participants are instructed to work through Cards B
- and C using the workflow in the green box (B) to generate the POEM, OPID18, and

865 OPID18noguess scores. Then participants are instructed to move on to Cards D and E using the

866 workflow in the purple box (B) to generate an OD10 odor discrimination score.

867

868 Figure 2. Linear regression model between olfactory scores and age across CN participants.

- Greater age was significantly associated with lower (b) OPID9noguess ($\beta = -0.02$, SE = .007, p =
- 870 .002, adj. $R^2 = .06$), (c) OPID18 ($\beta = -0.04$, SE = 0.001, p < .001, adj. $R^2 = .12$), (d)
- 871 OPID18noguess ($\beta = -0.06$, SE = 0.03, p < .001, adj. $R^2 = .13$), (e) OD10 ($\beta = -0.02$, SE =
- 872 0.005, p < .001, adj. $R^2 = .16$), and (f) POEM ($\beta = -0.004$, SE = 0.001, p < .001, adj. $R^2 = .08$)

scores, while the association with (a) OPID9 ($\beta = -0.01$, SE = 0.005 p = .01, adj. $R^2 = .04$) and (f) average intensity ($\beta = -0.007$, SE = 0.007, p = .28, adj. $R^2 = .001$) scores did not reach significance after Bonferroni correction for 21 comparisons (p < .002).

876

877 Table legends.

878 Table 1. Demographic information and olfactory function in cognitively normal

879 participants who underwent observed and unobserved self-administration conditions of the

AROMHA Brain Health Test. Values are means (SD). T-tests were performed across groups
for age, education, olfactory scores, and test duration. Chi-square test was performed on sex and
speaking-language proportions across groups. Bold indicates a statistically significant difference

that remained significant after Bonferroni correction.

884

Table 2. Distribution of olfactory scores of anosmic patients and CN participants on the

AROMHA Brain Health Test. The first column lists the score following random selection of
the answers for each test, e.g., the participant had no olfactory information to guide selection of
the answers. Values are means (SD). NA = not applicable. Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were
performed across groups for age, education, olfactory scores, and test duration. The chi-square
test was performed for sex. Bold indicates a statistically significant difference that remained
significant after Bonferroni correction.

892

893 Table 3. Demographic information and olfactory function in cognitively normal English-

speaking and Spanish-speaking participants. Values are means (SD). T-tests were performed
across groups for age, education, clinical variables, olfactory scores, and test duration. Chisquare test was performed on sex and speaking-language proportions across groups. Bold
indicates a statistically significant difference that remained significant after Bonferroni
correction.

899

900 **Table 4. Olfactory function across cognitive status among participants aged 55+.** Values are

901 means (SD). T-tests were performed across groups for age, education, clinical variables,

902 olfactory scores, and test duration. Chi-square test was performed on sex proportion across

- 903 groups. Bold indicates a statistically significant difference that remained significant after
- 904 Bonferroni correction for 21 comparisons (p < .002).
- 905

906 Table 5. ANCOVA models comparing different olfactory scores across groups. DF =

- 907 Degrees of Freedom, F = F-statistic, p = p-value, $\eta p^2 = partial$ Eta squared. CI = Confidence
- 908 interval. **Bold** represents post-hoc *p* values that remained significant after Bonferroni correction
- 909 for 21 comparisons (p < .002). ^a p values from pairwise post-hoc comparisons adjusted for age,
- 910 sex, and education.