AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

Ageing and Decision-making: A systematic review and meta-analysis

*Nicole Ee^{a,b,c,d,e}, BSc(Psych)/LLB, ORCID: 0000-0002-4561-4204

Brooke Brady^{a,b,c,d}, PhD, ORCID: 0000-0002-6084-5027

Craig Sinclair^{a,b,c,d}, PhD, ORCID: 0000-0003-2734-2951

Kaarin J. Anstey^{a,b,c,d}, PhD, ORCID: 0000-0002-9706-9316

Ruth Peters^{a,e}, PhD, ORCID: 0000-0003-0148-3617

- a. School of Psychology, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
- b. Neuroscience Research Australia, Sydney, Australia
- c. UNSW Ageing Futures Institute, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
- ARC Centre of Excellence in Population Ageing Research, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
- e. The George Institute for Global Health, Australia

*Corresponding author:

Nicole Ee

Email: n.ee@unsw.edu.au

Tel: +61 430 910 661

Number of Tables: 2

Number of Figures: 1

Word count: 4458 (excluding tables and references)

Key words: cognition, cognitive ageing, decision-making, older adults

Funding: This work was supported by a grant from the Australian Research Council Centre

of Excellence in Population Ageing Research.

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

Abstract

Objectives

This systematic review aimed to synthesise the evidence on potential differences in financial, social, health and safety-related decision-making between younger and older adults.

Methods

Trial, experimental, and prospective studies including older (60+) and younger adults that reported on quantitative decision-making outcome measures (i.e., performance in relation to achieving a specific prespecified goal) were included.

Results

Decision-making was significantly poorer (i.e., further from prespecified goals) in older compared to younger adults (k = 57, d_{random} = -0.17, 95% CI -0.29, -0.04, I^2 = 92.92%), with high heterogeneity between studies. Age differences were observed for financial and social but not health decision-making domains.

Discussion

Older adults performed more 'poorly' on financial and social decision-making than younger adults. Reasons for observed differences may vary (e.g., different motivation and values) and require exploration in future research. This has implications for how people of different ages are supported, especially at times of important decision-making.

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

Introduction

Decision-making refers to the cognitive processes that result in a final belief, choice, or course of action (Wang and Ruhe 2007). It is integral to daily life and to successful ageing. Since decision-making is influenced by multiple factors including performance in cognitive domains that are thought to change with ageing (e.g., learning, memory, information processing speed) it has been suggested that decision-making performance may change with increasing age (Del Missier et al. 2020; Lim and Yu 2015; Phillips et al. 2016). However, the degree, directionality, and implications of this remain unclear (Bruine de Bruin et al. 2012; E. Peters et al. 2007). Older age has also been associated with positive decision-making tendencies such as a reduced influence of irrelevant options on final choice (Kim and Hasher 2005) and avoidance of sunk cost bias (e.g., the tendency to continue investments with poor return) (Bruine de Bruin et al. 2007; Strough et al. 2008). Conversely, negative associations between age and decision-making have also been observed, including inconsistent application of decision rules (Bruine de Bruin et al. 2007), worse decision-making with increasing options (Besedeš et al. 2012) and susceptibility to framing effects (Bruine de Bruin et al. 2007; Finucane et al. 2005). Alongside this there is a growing awareness of the factors that might impact upon decision-making and the need to take this into account in a societal setting (Fontaine et al. 2021; Weissberger et al. 2021).

Increasing attention is also being paid to capacity assessments and the development of frameworks for assisted and supported decision-making in clinical populations (Moye et al. 2006). Understanding this potential change in decision-making with age is important in the context of our ageing populations. Building upon this knowledge will be critical to developing appropriate and well-targeted information, interventions, and policies for adults at different stages of life. Whilst the assessment of this is complex and there are multiple factors that might impact on decision-making, (Kusev et al. 2017; Lerner et al. 2015) the use

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

of experimental decision-making tasks allows a level of standardisation in this area and the potential to examine age effects or to compare performance at different ages on the same or similar standard tasks. Furthermore, experimental decision-making studies provide important insights into the possible mechanisms underpinning age differences in cognitive task performance (Pachur et al. 2017). In particular tasks that enable proxy measurement of the mental processes underpinning real-world decision-making and instrumental activities of daily living and the assessment of decision-making under conditions simulating those that would likely accompany real-world financial, social, health and safety decisions (e.g., risk and uncertainty), given relevant goals (e.g., increasing monetary profit, social benefit). For example, the widely used Iowa Gambling Task (IGT), measures how averse or inclined individuals are to risk using a card game involving selecting cards from one of four decks. Two of the decks either yield a penalty (\$100) or high monetary reward (\$250) and the other two decks are low risk (\$50 deduction) low reward (\$50). Participants are instructed to maximise their winnings over multiple selections. Examples of other well-known and widely used tasks include the Ultimatum game (UG), which assesses generosity and reciprocity through participants deciding how to split a monetary sum between themselves and another person and the game of dice task which requires participants to predict a dice roll through selecting high risk high reward or low risk low reward odds (full details in Online Resource: Supplementary Table VI).

Several reviews target ageing and decision-making, but few have adhered to systematic review methodology or have drawn existing data together quantitatively. Three have been systematic with the most recent published in 2015 (Best and Charness 2015; Mata et al. 2011; Thornton and Dumke 2005). Thornton and Dumke (2005) explored age differences in everyday problem solving and decision-making in 28 studies published until 2003. The authors observed a reliable deterioration of everyday problem-solving and

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

decision-making effectiveness with older age. Mata et al. (2011) explored age differences in risky decision-making, including an exploration of framing effects. They reported no overall or framing differences between younger and older adults on risky moral and financial decision-making. More recently, Best and Charness included publications until 2013 and found younger adults were more likely to make risky decisions in positively framed (but not negatively framed) conditions (Best and Charness 2015). Moderator analysis revealed age differences were exclusive to small-reward financial and large-reward morality scenarios in positively framed conditions. Both reviews highlighted the potential impact of task characteristics on age-related decision-making. Overall, these reviews provide inconsistent evidence for age-related variability in decision-making and serve to highlight important gaps in the extant literature. These include limited generalisability of current evidence due to an underrepresentation of studies on non-risky decision-making or decisions in real-world contexts (e.g., financial decision-making, health, and safety decision-making), the need for consideration of potential moderators (such as task characteristics, demographic factors) in research design and interpretation of results, and where possible, appropriate statistical analyses accounting for these factors.

To address current knowledge gaps and improve translatability of available research, an updated, comprehensive review is required. The primary aim of this review was to synthesise the trial, experimental and prospective evidence for the impact of adult ageing on decision-making with applicability to real world outcomes and in key domains, including financial, social, health and safety-related decisions. The secondary aim of this review was to explore if task characteristics influence observed effects.

Method

Three databases, Embase, Medline and PsycINFO, were searched from inception to 18 January 2019, using the following search terms: (exp *ageing/ or exp *cognitive ageing)

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

AND (exp *decision-making/ OR cognitive ageing) supplemented with an additional targeted search in title, abstract and keyword fields (((ageing OR ageing) AND cognitive) AND (decision making OR decision)). Reference lists of reviews on ageing and decision-making were manually searched and field experts consulted to identify additional publications. Non-English publications were translated using the Google Translate web-based software.

Study Selection

Two independent reviewers (NE and RP) carried out title and abstract screening for all publications returned by the searches and identified through reference lists followed by subsequent full text screening. Discrepancies in study selection were resolved through discussion and consensus at both stages.

Eligibility Criteria and Rationale

To capture the widest possible evidence, liberal eligibility criteria were used. Experimental, observational studies, and trials including older adults aged over 60 years and reporting on the relationship between decision-making and age were included. Studies reporting on age-related changes in adulthood (within-subject comparison) or age-related differences between a younger and older adult group (between-subjects comparison) were included. Studies of only paediatric, adolescent, animal or clinical populations were excluded. We also chose to focus on published original research and excluded editorials, commentaries, reviews, dissertation, and conference abstracts.

The literature covers a wide range of studies exploring age differences in decisionmaking outcomes, tendencies, and underlying mechanisms, but many do not allow for the determination of whether older age is associated with better or worse overall decisions making. While real-world decisions are often incredibly nuanced and multifaceted, in balance, better outcomes generally are those that result in better financial standing, are socially favourable e.g., more altruistic, improve health and safety, or avoid physical harm

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

and damage or emotional distress. In these terms, this review specifically focuses on evidence relating to whether older adults are likely to be worse real-world decision-makers than their younger counter parts. To ensure applicability to real world outcomes, only studies where decisions could be quantified as positive or negative in relation to a task-specific goal were included. These primarily comprised of decision-making tasks which resulted in a final amount of points or money earned or lost. Studies exclusively investigating neutral decision response tendencies (i.e., preferencing certain options over others e.g., colour or brand preference; informational presentation type) were excluded. For example, studies investigating older adults' car colour preferences would be excluded, as there is no way to ascertain whether choosing a blue over a red car is indicative of superior decision-making. Conversely, studies investigating older adults' decisions to purchase a car based on set of constraints or goals would be included, as some car choices would take them closer to the goal parameters for the task than others.

Eligible studies were included in meta-analyses if they reported effect sizes in the form of correlation coefficients (Pearson's *r*, Spearman's ρ), unstandardised regression coefficients (β), Cohen's *d*, or provided sufficient data (e.g., means and standard deviations, *t* or *F* statistics, Chi-squared tests, Mann-Whitney U tests, two-way ANOVA) to calculate Cohen's *d*. Where multiple publications were derived from the same dataset, the most comprehensive data was included to eliminate duplication.

Data Extraction

Data were extracted by a team of four reviewers (NE, RP, CS, BB) into an *a priori* study extraction table. All the entries were then checked by a second reviewer, identified errors were corrected and checked by a third reviewer against the original publication. Data was collected on study name, publication year, sample size, mean age and standard deviation, proportion female, decision-making task and domain, type of statistical analyses, control

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

variables, and a summary of results. If multiple age comparisons were reported, the older (aged 60+) versus younger (aged 30-60) comparisons were preferentially extracted. The classification of performance as better/poorer was based on the classification reported in the constituent studies and the prespecified goals that the studies used in their experimental decision-making tasks. Where a significant relationship between age and decision-making was reported, any secondary analyses investigating potential mechanisms were also extracted. Multiple studies within a single publication were numbered for differentiation, and publications with overlapping data sources were identified and labelled. Data on effect size were extracted. Unstandardised regression coefficients (β) (Borenstein et al. 2011) and Spearman's rank correlations (p) corresponding to large sample sizes were directly substituted as r statistics. Imputing missing correlations with β and ρ have been found to produce relatively accurate and precise population-effects estimates, while also reducing sampling bias within meta-analyses (Peterson and Brown 2005; Rupinski and Dunlap 1996). Average effect sizes were calculated for studies reporting multiple conditions of the same task (e.g., gains and loss conditions, familiar and non-familiar conditions) to ascertain the overall age effects. Effect size direction was standardised such that a negative effect size represented poorer decision-making as a function of increasing age. Multiple rows of data were extracted if the same participants performed more than one decision-making task, and a weighted average effect size computed for tasks of the same decision-making domain. Each outcome was coded for study characteristics including decision-making tasks (Iowa Gambling Task (IGT), Ultimatum Game (UG), Game of Dice Task (GDT), Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART), other), decision-making domain (financial, social, health, safety, other), additional task demands (altruism, risk, intertemporal judgement, inferencing, or exploration/exploitation factors), and independent age variable (categorical/continuous).

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

Meta-analysis

Meta-analysis was performed with Jamovi MAJOR, with Correlations Coefficients, and variance for age effects on decision-making outcomes as the principal outcome variable. Due to variability in sampling characteristics and methodology of included studies, random effects Restricted Maximum Likelihood models were employed. Heterogeneity of outcomes was quantified with the I² index, funnel plots and summary effect size confidence intervals, with values closer to 100 per cent and a wider interval indicating greater heterogeneity, respectively (Borenstein et al. 2010; Borenstein et al. 2017; Sterne and Egger 2001) (Online Resource: Supplementary Fig. II)

Meta-analyses were carried out pooling all compatible studies, and, where possible by subgroup of decision-making domain (i.e., financial, social, health, safety). The risk of overestimation of effect sizes from small samples sizes (N < 50) associated with use of Cohen's *d* was examined with post-hoc sensitivity analyses. Sensitivity analyses were performed with Jamovi MAJOR. These assessed the potential impact of moderators on the relationship between age and decision-making (publication year, mean age, task type, presence of additional task demands), whether age was measured as a categorical or continuous variable, adjustment for socio-economic factors, and effect size conversion.

Risk of Bias Assessment

The review team developed a quality rating tool informed by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council's Guidelines for Assessing Risk of Bias (National Health and Medical Research Council, 2019). The quality rating tool contained 11 items which critically appraised risk of bias in five assessment domains: Selection bias (age range, sex distribution, sample size, screening), confounding bias (task administration), attrition bias, statistical analyses (appropriateness, adjustment for confounding effects), study design (suitability, clear description) (detailed in Online Resource: Supplementary Table III and IV).

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

Level of bias was rated low, moderate, or high for each item and overall risk of bias for the body of evidence summarised as a percentage of items rated low, moderate, or high bias per domain. A numerical scoring scheme was not employed as this can lead to a loss of subtlety when assessing quality (Jüni et al. 1999). Each study was assessed by two independent reviewers (NE, RP, CS, BB). Any discrepancies between bias ratings were resolved by discussion and consensus. The systematic review is reported in accordance with the PRISMA checklist (Online Resource: Supplementary Table V).

Results

A total of 1591 abstracts were screened from the first search and 467 from the second, with 213 publications assessed at the full text stage (Online Resource: Supplementary Fig. I). One hundred and thirty-seven full texts were deemed ineligible for reasons provided in Online Resource: Supplementary Table I. A final 76 publications containing 87 studies met the review eligibility criteria. Thirty-eight per cent of the included publications were published within the last five years, and 75 per cent within the last decade. Sample sizes were reasonable across studies, with only 10 of the 87 studies reporting small sample sizes (N < 50). The mean sample ages ranged from 18.7 to 83.5, and most studies included both male and female participants, albeit in different proportions (Table I shows the characteristics of the included studies).

Most studies employed tasks that involved financial decision-making (k = 36). There were limited numbers of studies with tasks representing social (k = 14), health (k = 5), and safety (k = 4) decision-making processes. Twenty-five studies employed tasks that did not fall into financial, social, health or safety domains. Twenty-eight studies involved tasks covering two or more decision-making domains (e.g., financial and social).

Table II shows the results and analyses in detail. Overall, the majority of the 87 studies found that older age was associated with poorer decision-making on one or more

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

outcome measure. Twenty-two studies reported no significant associations between age and decision-making, and 16 reported better decision-making amongst older as compared to younger adults on one or more measures. Three studies provided narrative summaries of overall age differences without numerical results, preventing their inclusion into meta-analysis (Cavanagh et al. 2012; Hess et al. 2012; Ma and Chen 2015). The relationship between age and decision-making was primarily investigated using a between-subjects design, with only two studies reporting on intra-individual age-related changes in decision-making (Bauer et al. 2013; Boyle, Yu, Buchman, et al. 2012; Li et al. 2013; Li et al. 2015). A total of 57 studies from 53 publications were compatible for meta-analyses and the data were pooled to allow for estimates of age differences on decision-making tasks.

Table I

Summary Characteristics of Included Studies

Reference			Fem	nale	M Ag	ge (SD)	Task, outcome			
	n(YA)	n(OA)	YA	OA	YA	OA	-			
Bailey, Ruffman and Rendell 2013	35	34	51.0%	71.0%	21.3	73.9	UG, responder			
					(3.1)	(7.14)	UG, proposer			
Bakos et al. 2008	10	10	90.0%	90.0%	62	80	IGT			
					(2.1)	(3.3)				
Bangma et al. 2017	1	80	57.2	2%	49.6	(18.4)	IGT			
							CDR			
Bauer et al. 2013 (Denburg 2009	2	65	Sex stratified		59.10 (16.71)		IGT, A'B'C'D' score (higher monetary gain)			
sample)							IGT, E'F'G'H' score (lower monetary loss)			
Beadle et al. 2012	40	40	62.5%	57.5%	30.8	66.2	UG, payoff ratio			
					(6.6)	(7.6)	UG, prosocial behaviour			
Besedes et al. 2012b	Age Qu	artiles =	73.8	8%			Multi-attribute decision problems requiring selection			
	17, 17	, 15, 16					of option which includes given attribute			
Best and Freund 2018	1	30	67.0	07%	4	5.2	48 decisions in risky framing decision task			
Blanco et al. 2016 (1)	58	52	60.3%	59.6%	21.8	67.02	Leapfrog task (in lab)			
						(5.1)				
Blanco et al. 2016 (2)	139	137					Remote completion of Leapfrog task			
Boyle, Yu, Buchman, et al 2012	6	06	74.0	5%	82.4 (7.5)		12-item DM Competence Assessment Tool on			

(RUSH sample)							healthcare and financial DM		
Boyle, Yu, Wilson, et al 2012	42	20	76	5.0%	83.5 (7.4)		12-item DM Competence Assessment Tool on		
(RUSH sample)							healthcare and financial DM, overall score		
							5-item self-report measure, susceptibility to scams		
Brand and Schiebener 2013	53	538 51		.0%	40.3	(16.7)	GDT		
	22	21	53	.4%	39.6	(16.5)	IGT		
Bruine de Bruin, Strough and	33	35	58.5%		54.0	(13.8)	Sunk cost scenarios with large or small irrecoverable		
Parker 2014							losses		
Caird et al. 2005	Age Qu	Age Quartiles =		50.0%, 50.0%,		69.3	Modified Flicker Method (intersection turn DM)		
	16, 16, 16, 14		50.0%, 57.1%		(2.1)	(2.2)			
					38.8	78.4			
					(13.8)	(3.8)			
Carvalho et al. 2012	40	40	55.0%	75.0%	25.5	67.4	IGT		
					(4.7)	(5.0)			
Cassimiro et al. 2017	16	54	100	0.0%			IGT		
Cavanagh et al. 2012	23	29	52.2%	75.9%	21	73	BART, amount of money acquired		
Chung, Tymula and Glimcher 2017	3	9	35	.9%	72	2.4	Behavioural paradigm measuring economic		
							irrationality		
Cooper et al. 2017 (1)	22	21			23.5	67.6	Adapted exploratory DM task		
					(4.0)	(6.4)			
Cooper et al. 2017 (2)	110	111			25.9	64.5	Adapted exploratory DM task from		

					(2.9)	(4.6)	
Cooper et al. 2013	47	42				67.4	Hypothetical scenario of testing two oxygen
							extraction systems on Mars with the goal of collecting
							enough oxygen to sustain life.
Cooper, Worthy and Maddox 2016	75	58			20.3	67.2	DM task - deck selection with goal of maximising
					(2.3)	(5.3)	total
Deakin et al. 2004	41	45	29.0%	51.0%			Decision-Gamble Task
	46	45	54.0%	27.0%			
Denburg et al. 2009	73	79	63.0%	63.0%	48.6	74.0	IGT
					(11.9)	(5.6)	
Denburg et al. 2007 (1)	:	80	50.0%	53.0%	41.0	70.4	IGT
Denburg et al. 2007 (2) (Includes	20	29					Advertising study with deceptive vs nondeceptive
Denburg et al. 2007 (1) sample)							claims
Denburg, Travel and Bechara 2005	:	80	50.0%	50.0%			Gambling task (Similar to IGT)
Di Rosa et al. 2017	21	15	47.6%	66.7%	42.5	63.1	IGT
					(19.0)	(7.5)	
Eberhardt, de Bruin and Strough	9	26	51.2	2%	48.3 ((15.9)	Resistance to sunk costs task and credit card
2019							repayment task.
Eppinger, Heekeren and Li 2017	25	25	48.0%	52.0%	24.8	71.2	A delay discounting task with small immediate
					(2.5)	(5.6)	rewards and large delayed reward
Fein, McGillivray and Finn 2007	112	52	56.3%	65.4%	37.8	73.7	IGT

					(10.7)	(7.4)	
Fernandes et al. 2019	YA =	29	YA =	62.1%	YA =	64.5	UG
	30		50.0%		26.6	(4.1)	
	MA =		MA =		(4.0)		
	30		55.3%		MA =		
					48.3		
					(5.5)		
Girardi, Sala and MacPherson 2018	22	30	86.4%	70.0%	19.6	69.7(6.	UG
					(1.6)	6)	
Harle and Sanfey 2012	18	20	55.6%	65.0%	22.4	64.1	UG
Henninger, Madden and Huettel	58	54	47.0%	50.0%	23.4	70.7	IGT (higher quality decisions associated with lower
2010					(4.4)	(3.0)	risk)
							CGT (higher quality decisions associated with lower
							risk)
							BART (higher quality decisions associated with
							higher risk)
Hess et al. 2018 (1)	96	97	53.1%	53.6%	32.2	74.4	DM task with low/high risk bet options over 60 trials,
					(6.4)	(5.7)	overall winnings
							DM task with low/high risk bet options over 60 trials,
							optimal Choice
Hess et al. 2018 (2)	63	60	55.6%	50.0%	32.2	74.4	DM task with low/high risk bet options over 60 trials,

					(6.4)	(5.7)	but with overweighting of small probabilities
Hess, Queen and Patterson 2012	54	55					2 Everyday DM tasks - choosing which grocery store
							to shop at/which apartment to buy
Huang et al. 2015	65	65	64.6%	72.3%	24.5	75.3(6.	IGT and CCT, combined standardised scores
					(3.8)	4)	IGT
James et al. 2012 (RUSH sample)		525	76.0%			82.6	12-item version of the DM Competence Assessment
						(6.7)	tool
Jimura et al. 2011	20	20	•				Immediate/delayed monetary rewards DM task
Koscienlniak 2016	81	77	100.0%	100.0%	19.9	69.2	BART
					(1.0)	(4.3)	
Li et al. 2017	40	60	57.5%	63.3%	28.8	76.2	BART (higher quality decisions associated with
					(5.4)	(6.5)	higher risk)
Li et al. 2013	173	163	67.1%	64.4%	24.8	66.39	Temporal discounting task
					(2.9)	(4.9)	
Li et al. 2015		478	59.3	3%	4	6.6	2 Financial DM task, credit scores
							2 Financial DM task, optimal health/credit repayment
							plan
Lobjos and Cavallo 2007	26	OA = 26	50.0%	OA =			Road crossing decision task with time constraint and
		Older-		50.0%			without
		OA = 26		Older-			
				OA =			

				50.0%			
Lockenhoff et al. 2016 (1)	30	30	50.0%	50.0%	28.9	65.0	Dread sensitivity choice paradigm (electrodermal
					(4.8)	(8.5)	shock)
Lockenhoff et al. 2016 (2)	12	2	52.0)%	50.0	(17.4)	Dread sensitivity choice paradigm (hypothetical)
Ma and Chen 2015	40	40	55.0%	65.0%	19.7	71.0(8.	Car purchasing task
					(1.6)	2)	
MacPherson, Phillips and Sala	YA =	29	YA =	50.0%	YA =	69.9	Gambling tasks using card selection
2002	30		50.0%		28.8	(5.5)	
	MA =		MA =		(6.0)		
	30		50.0%		MA =		
					50.3		
					(5.7)		
Mata, Schooler and Rieskamp 2007	83	83	49.4%	59.0%	24	71	Inference task on which diamonds was more
					(3.3)	(4.9)	expensive
Mata, von Helversen and Rieskamp	50	50	54.0%	58.0%	24.1	69.0	Bespoke probabilistic inference task - decisions about
2010					(3.9)	(3.6)	profitability of stocks in a year's time on the basis
							characteristics
Mikels et al. 2013	30	30	63.0%	70.0%	20.6	75.0	Ratio bias paradigm
					(3.1)	(6.0)	
Mikels et al. 2010	60	60	48.0%	48.0%	22.6	72.4	Hypothetical choices amongst health care plans,
					(3.0)	(5.1)	physicians, medical treatments, homecare aids

Pachur, Mata and Hertwig 2017	60	62	76.7%	50.0%	23.6	71.3	Gain, loss, and mixed-domain choice problems
					(3.1)	(6.4)	
Pachur et al. 2009 (1)	40	40	60.0%	37.5%	25.3	71.0	Inference task (judgments in environment with
							low/high recognition)
Pachur et al. 2009 (2)	60	60	55.0wa%	58.3%	24.2	69.7	Inference task (judgements environment with low
							recognition validity) and additional estimation task.
Pertl et al. 2017	18	19					Real life DM task containing 12 short test problems in
							health context
Queen and Hess 2010	62	75	46.8%	50.7%	19.4	71.0	Two decision contexts (choosing and apartment/bank)
					(2.0)	(5.9)	
Rieger and Mata 2013		707	10.0%		53	(15)	Risk game (measuring amount invested in risky
							option)
							Dictator game (decision to donate money to others)
		696					Public goods game (decision to contribute to public
							good)
Roalf et al. 2012	29	30	48.0%	50.0%	30.2	71.3	UG
					(5.5)	(4.4)	Delay discounting task
							Dictator game (decision on amount of endowment to
							keep or give away to unknown partner)
Rogalsky et al. 2012		15	60.0%		7	7	IGT
Rolison, Hanoch and Wood 2012	40	44			19.3	76.6	BART

					(1.8)	(5.9)	
Rolison, Wood and Hanoch 2017	39	39	46.0%	61.0%	23.2	72.6	Vignette judgements on health, fraud, and weather
(1)							(with audio informational updates) assessing posterior
							DM
Rolison, Wood and Hanoch 2017	40	40	55.0%	60.0%	21.8	73.9	Vignette judgements on health, fraud, and weather
(2)							(with audio and written informational updates)
							assessing posterior DM
Rosen, Brand and Kalbe 2016	1	97	61.9%		45.9	(18.4)	Moral DM task (decision between altruistic and
							egoistic choice
Rutledge et al. 2016	25189 (of which				•	The Great Britain experiment
	931	OA)					
Rydzewska et al. 2018 (1)	52	52	67.3%	69.2%	23.4	68.2	Sequential DM task, requiring participants to choose
					(2.6)	(3.5)	cheapest offer
Rydzewska et al. 2018 (2)	64	64	64.1%	62.5%	23.0	69.4	Sequential DM task, requiring participants to choose
					(2.5)	(3.2)	cheapest, with short/long optimal search times
Schiebener and Brand 2017	42	42	35.7%	61.9%	22.9	67.45	IGT
(Includes Brand and Schiebener	42		40.5%		(2.8)	(5.9)	GDT
2013 sample)	42		45.2%		33.6		
	42		52.4%		(2.8)		
			38.1%		44.7		
					(3.1)		

					54.2		
					(2.6)		
Seaman et al. 2018	75	5	56.0)%	49.7	(17.9)	Effort expenditure reward task, physical effort vs
							monetary reward
							Probability discounting DM paradigm
							Temporal discounting task
Seaman et al. 2016	92	2	59.8%		49.6		Mixed discounting task, overall score
	YA =	30	YA =	63.3%	YA =	70.2	Temporal discounting with money, social and health
	31		58.8%		28.8	(6.7)	reward
	MA =		MA =		(5.0)		Probability discounting with money, social and health
	31		61.3%		MA =		reward
					50.6		Effort discounting with money, social and health
					(6.5)		reward
Sparrow and Spaniol 2018 (1)	32	30	62.0%	63.0%	25.3	70.6	Bespoke intertemporal financial choice (higher score
					(5.2)	(4.9)	indicated choices which maximised earnings)
Sparrow and Spaniol 2018 (2)	31	23	61.0%	61.0%	20.8	71.4	Online bespoke intertemporal financial choice task
					(2.7)	(7.0)	
Stewart et al. 2018 (RUSH Sample)	93	7	76.4	4%	81.2	(7.6)	Modified 12-Item version of well-validated healthcare
							and financial DM measure
Strough et al. 2016	39	7	60.8	3%	47.1	(15.0)	Sunk cost scenarios with large or small irrecoverable
							losses

Tymula et al. 2013	(Adoles	36	(Adolescen	50.0%		•	Computerised monetary choice task with option to
	cents =		ts =				lose/gain fixed amount or lottery
	33)		51.2%)				
	YA =		YA =				
	34		52.9%				
	MA =		MA =				
	32		53.1%				
Von Helversen and Mata 2012	32	32	56.3%	53.1%	24.2	69.0	Sequential DM task in the form of a computerised
					(2.7)	(3.5)	shopping task
Walker, Fisk and Mcguire 1997	33	30			19.7	71.6	Simulated route selection interface with traffic
					(1.5)	(4.6)	information
Wayde et al. 2017	55	46			18.7	73.8	Purchasing choice task with varying product
					(1.5)	(8.1)	familiarity
Wood et al. 2005	88	67	75.0%	74.6%	22.1	77.3	IGT
					(4.5)	(4.6)	
Wood et al. 2011	12	1	60.3%		55.7	(23.9)	DM scenario requiring choice of drug plan according
							to lower annual cost
Worthy et al. 2014	91	91			22.5	67.6	Dynamic DM task with increasing and decreasing
							conditions and 2/4 choice optimising rewards task
Worthy et al. 2016	18	18	55.6%	44.4%	23.6	67	2 option state-based dynamic DM task where current
							rewards depended on past choices

Worthy et al. 2011 (1)	28	28	64.3%	67.9%	20.3	68.6	Choice independent DM task
Worthy et al. 2011 (2)	51	52			20.4	67.5	Choice-dependent DM task
Zamarian et al. 2008	33	52	66.7%	65.4%	36.1	69.3	IGT
					(13.7)	(7.0)	PAG

^aAbbreviations as follows: DM, decision-making; YA, younger adult group; OA, older adult group; MA, middle-aged adult group; BART, Balloon Analogue Risk Task; CDR, Competence in Decision Rules; CGT, Cambridge Gambling Task; GDT, Game of Dice task; IGT, Iowa Gambling Task; PAG, Probability-Associated Gambling Task; UG, Ultimatum Game.

^bFor a summary of key decision making tasks see Online Resource: Supplementary Table VII.

Table II

Summary of results and analyses of included studies

				Age	DM
Reference	Analysis	Adjustments/Controls		effect	domain
Bailey, Ruffman	2x2x2 ANOVA		Main effect of age rejection rates: $F(1,67) =$	ns	F
and Rendell 2013			0.52 , p = .47, η p2 = 0.01.		
	2x2 ANOVA		Main effect of age generosity in offer:	+	SO/F
			$F(1,67) = 5.42, p < .05, \eta p 2 = 0.08$		
Bakos et al. 2008	Independent		t(18) = 3.34, p = .04, d = 1.52	-	F
	samples t-test		β = -0.65, t(18) = -3.67, p < .01	-	
	Regression				
Bangma et al.	Hierarchical	Control variables education, income,	IGT net score, $b = -0.62$, $\Delta R2 = 0.071$,	-	F
2017	regression	employment status, gender.	$p(\Delta F) < .001$		
	Hierarchical	Education included as main predictor.	Competence in decision rules, $b = -0.07$,	-	F
	regression	Control variables education, income,	$\Delta R2 = 0.15, p(\Delta F) < .001$		
		employment status, gender.			
Bauer et al. 2013	Linear regression	Covariates demographic and	Lower immediate reward/delayed	-	F
(Denburg 2009	Correlation	neuropsychological variables.	punishment condition, unstandardised β		
sample)			coefficient = -0.32 , t(263) = -2.59 , p = $.01$		
			r = -0.16, ns		

	Linear regression	Covariates demographic and	Higher immediate reward/delayed	ns	F
	Linear regression	neuropsychological variables	punishment condition, unstandardised β		
	Correlation		coefficient = -0.16 , t(263) = -1.19 , p = .24		
			r = -0.07, ns		
				ns	
Beadle et al. 2012	Repeated measures		Main effect of age group on payoff ratio:	ns	F
	2x2x2 ANOVA		$F(3,36) = 0.56, p = .46, \eta p 2 = 0.02$		
	Post-hoc t-test		Age x Cognitive empathy interaction:	+	
			$F(3,36) = 5.9, p < .05, \eta p 2 = 0.14$		
			High cognitive empathy, OA vs YA payoff		
			ratio: M = 1.49, (SE = .13) vs M = 0.99,		
			(SE = 0.13); t(21) = 2.64, p < .05, d = 1.15		
	Repeated measures		Main effect of age group on prosocial	ns	SO/F
	2x2x2 ANOVA		behaviour (rejection of unfair/fair offers):		
	Post-hoc t-test		$F(1,34) = 1.90, p = .18, \eta p = 0.05$		
			Age x Cognitive empathy x offer type		
			interaction: F (1,34) = 4.31, p < .05, $\eta p2 =$	+	
			0.11		
			High cognitive empathy, OA vs YA		
			rejection of unfair offers: $M = 79.0\%$ (SE =		
			7.46) vs M = 42.7% (SE = 10.60), t(20) =		

		2.69, p < .05, d = 1.20		
		Low/High cognitive empathy, OA vs YA		
		rejection of fair offers: $t(15) = 1.23$, $p =$		
		.24, $d = 0.63$		
		t(20) = 0.27, p = .79, d = 0.12		
Besedes et al. 2012	Regressions with	. Optimal Choice: $r = -0.04$ (probit = 0.01), p	-	F
	Probit and OLS	< .01		
	Models	Choice efficiency: $r = -0.02$ (OLS = 0.01),	-	
		p < .01		
Best and Freund	Bivariate	Gain framed condition: $r = 0.11$, $p = 0.22$	ns	0
2018	correlations	Loss framed condition: ns (numerical data		
		NR)	ns	
Blanco et al. 2016	Independent	. $t(108) = 2.40, p = .02, d = 0.46$	-	0
(1)	samples t-test			
Blanco et al. 2016	2x2 ANOVA	. Main effect of age ns.	ns	0
(2)	Post-hoc	Age x Condition Interaction: $F(1,272) =$	-	
	Independent	4.45, p = .04		
	samples t-test	Independent condition, YA vs OA: $t(136) =$		
		2.09, p = .04, d = 0.36		
		Dependent condition, YA vs OA: $t(136) =$		
		0.86, p = .39, d = 0.15		

Boyle, Yu,	Bivariate		Decision making performance, r = -0.30 p	-	H/F
Buchman, et al.	correlations		<.001		
2012 (1)	Linear regression		Estimate = -0.12, (SE = 0.01), p < .001	-	
	model				
Boyle, Yu,	Bivariate	Baseline age, gender, and years of	Decision making performance, $r = -0.26$, p	-	H/F
Wilson, et al. 2012	correlations	education.	<.001		
(2) (RUSH	Linear regression		Cognitive decline and DM in persons		
sample)	model		without dementia: $EST = 20.06$ ($SE = 0.02$)		
	Bivariate	Baseline age, gender, and years of	Susceptibility to scams, $r = 0.29$, $p < .001$	-	H/F
	correlations	education.	Cognitive decline and DM in persons		
	Linear regression		without dementia: $EST = 20.02$ ($SE = 0.01$)		
	model				
Brand and	Correlation	Gender and education considered	GDT, r = -0.16, p < .001	-	F
Schiebener 2013	Analysis of variance	independent factors.	GDT, Main effect of age: $F(1,538) = 11.37$,	-	
	of overall GDT		p < .001		
	performance with				
	gender, education as				
	independent factors,				
	age as covariate.				
	Correlation		IGT, r = -0.17, p = .01	-	F

Bruine de Bruin,	Repeated measures	Controlled for presence of a friend	Willingness to cancel failing plans: $B =$	+	SO/H
Strough and Parker	multilevel model		0.02, SE = 0.01 , $p = .01$		
2015	with age and size of		Age x high/low irrecoverable loss	+	
	irrecoverable loss as		interaction: $B = 0.02$, SE = 0.01, $p = .02$		
	predictors		High irrecoverable loss, older age: $B =$	+	
			0.02, SE = 0.01 , $p = .001$		
			Low irrecoverable loss, older age: $B =$	ns	
			0.01, SE = 0.01, <i>p</i> = .18		
	4.2.4.0044				C A
Caird et al. 2005	4x2 ANOVA	Multiple comparisons using a	Main effect of age on accuracy: $F(3,58) =$	-	SA
		Bonferroni correction	18.78, p < .001		
Carvalho et al.	Student t-test		p = .28	ns	F
2012					
Cassimiro et al.	Spearman's		Net score and age: $rho = -0.01 p = .88$	ns	F
2017	correlation				
Cavanagh et al.	Hierarchical		Main effect of age: ns (No numerical	ns	0
2012	Bayesian model		results reported)		
			Age x condition interaction: ns (No	ns	
			numerical results reported)		

Chung, Tymula	Pearson correlation	. $r(36) = -0.2, p = .22$	ns	F
and Glimcher 2017				
Cooper et al. 2017	2x2x2x8 ANOVA	. Main effect of age: F(1,39) = 12.59, p =	-	0
(1)	Post-hoc t-test	.001, partial- $\eta 2 = 0.24$		
		Age x condition interaction: $F(1,39) = 7.29$,	-	
		$p = .01$, partial- $\eta 2 = 0.16$		
		Gains condition, YA vs OA: $t(41) = 1.05$, p		
		= .30		
		Loss condition, YA vs OA: t(41), YA vs		
		OA, = 3.49, p = .001		
Cooper et al. 2017	2x2x2x8 ANOVA	. Main effect of age: p = .76	ns	0
(2)		Age x condition interaction: $F(1,217) =$	-	
		7.47, p < .001, partial- $\eta 2 = 0.03$		
		Condition x age x order interaction:		
		$F(1,217) = 3.14$, p = .01, partial- $\eta 2 = 0.01$		
Cooper et al. 2013	2×2 ANOVA	. Main effect of age: p > .10	ns	0
	Post-hoc a priori	Age X pressure interaction: $F(1,85) =$	-	
	comparisons	$11.21, p < .001, partial-\eta 2 = 0.12$		
		Pressure, YA vs OA: $t(45) = 2.88$, p < .006,		
		d = 0.86		

			No pressure, YA vs OA: $t(40) = -1.83$, p =		
			.08, $d = 0.58$		
Cooper, Worthy	2×2ANOVA		Main effect of age: $F(1,86) = 1.13$, $p = .29$,	ns	0
and Maddox 2016	Post-hoc t-tests		partial $\eta 2 = 0.01$		
			Age x forgone reward condition	+	
			interaction: $F(1,86) = 6.27$, p = .01, partial		
			$\eta 2 = 0.07$		
			No information about foregone rewards,		
			YA vs OA: $p > .1$		
			Information about true foregone rewards,		
			YA vs OA: M = 8380 vs M = 7295, t(43) =		
			2.35, p = .02, d = 0.72		
			Information about false foregone rewards,		
			YA vs OA: M = 10940 vs M = 10987, t(41)		
			= 0 .15, p = .88, d - 0.05		
Deakin et al. 2004	Pearson's correlation	Bonferroni correction	Age and decision quality: $r = -0.17$, $p = .03$	ns	0
	ANCOVA		(uncorrected result; became non-significant		
			after Bonferroni correction)		
			Effect of age on decision quality: F(3,172)	-	
			= 4.33, p = .006		
Denburg et al.	Correlation	Demographic variables of age, gender,	r = -0.22, p < .01, d = 0.48	-	F

2009	Hierarchical	and education were entered first into	Age: $\beta = 0.19$, ns	ns	
	regression	hierarchical regression.			
Denburg et al.	2x5 ANOVA		IGT, main effect of age: $F(1,78) = 11.89$, p	-	F
2007 (1)			< .01		
			Age x trial block interaction: $F(4,312) =$	-	
			3.65, p <0.05		
Denburg et al.	2x3 ANOVA		Purchase intentions for deceptive claims,	NR	Ο
2007 (2) (Includes	Post-hoc t-test		main effect of age group: NR		
Denburg et al.			Version x age group interaction: $F(2,43) =$	-	
2007 (1) sample)			4.31, p < .02		
			OA impaired vs YA: $t = 1.99$, $p < .06$		
Denburg, Travel	2x5 ANOVA		Main effect of age: F(1,78) = 11.89, p < .01	-	F
and Bechara 2005	Follow-up analysis		Main effect of group (OA impaired vs YA):		
	comparing OA		ns		
	impaired vs YA,				
	2x5 ANOVA				
Di Rosa et al. 2017	Spearman's		Age and total budget: $r(34) = -0.50$; p <	-	F
	correlation		0.005		
	Mann-Whitney U		Total budget, YA vs OA: $U = 95$; $p < .05$	-	
	Test				
Eberhardt, de	Pearson correlations	Adjusted for demographic	Age and resistance to sunk cost: r = 0.11; p	+	F

Bruin and Strough	Linear and ordinal	characteristics in linear regression.	< 0.001		
2019	regressions		Age and credit card repayment: $r = 0.17 = ;$	+	
			p < 0.001		
			Resistance to sunk cost, unstandardised β	+	
			coefficient = 0.01 (SE = 0.00), p <.001		
			Credit card repayment unstandardised β	+	
			coefficient = 0.02 (SE = 0.00), p <.001		
Eppinger,	2x2 ANOVA		Main effect of age on discounting delayed	-	F
Heekeren and Li	Post-hoc test		rewards: $F(1,48) = 9.99$, p = .003, $\eta g =$		
2017			0.14		
			Age x decision conflict interaction: F(1,48)	-	
			$= 11.42 \text{ p} = .001, \eta \text{g} = 0.05$		
			High conflict condition, YA vs OA: p <		
			$.001, \eta g2 = 0.21$		
			Low conflict condition, YA vs OA: $p = .10$		
Fein, McGillivray	Analysis of variance	No adjustments, but association	F(1,160) = 14.08, p < .001	-	F
and Finn 2007	Polynomial	between gender, education and	Best fit was IGT performance as quadratic	ns	
	regression	premorbid intelligence and	function of age: F(2,161) = 13.20, p < .001,		
		performance examined.	IGT = 12.05 + 1.38 * age - 0.01 * age2,		
		Gender: ns	adjusted $r2 = 0.13$		
		Premorbid intelligence: r = 0.11, p =			

		.15			
		Education: $r = 0.18$, $p < .03$			
Fernandes et al.	Independent one-		Main effect of age group in respondent	ns	F/SO
2019	way ANOVAs		role: $F(186) = 1.82$, $p = .17$, $\eta 2p = 0.04$		
			Offer x group interaction: $F(286) = 5.07$, p	-	
			$= .01, \eta 2p = 0.10$		
			Unfair offers, OA vs YA: $p = .03$		
Girardi, Sala and	Logistic regression		Main effect of age on offer acceptance:	-	F/SO
MacPherson 2018	Post-hoc pairwise		$\chi 2(5) = 76.65, p < .001$		
	comparisons		Group x offer type interaction: $\chi^2(4) =$	-	
			35.45, p < .001		
			Fair offers, YA vs OA: ns		
			Unfair offers, YA vs OA: p < .01		
Harle and Sanfey	Linear mixed-model	Age as covariate made slopes more	Amount x age group interaction: F(3,260) =	-	F/SO
2012	(with random	negative	4.9, p < .005		
	intercept at the		Age group difference in acceptance of \$3	-	
	subject		offers: beta = -27.3% , p < .005		
	level and with age		Age group difference in acceptance of \$1,		
	group)		\$2, \$5 offers: ns		

Henninger,	Hierarchical		Decision quality, YA vs OA: p > .01	ns	F
Madden and	approach with age		Decision quality on low probability of	-	F
Huettel 2010	as categorical		winning options, YA vs OA: p < .001		0
	variable		Decision quality on BART, YA vs OA: p	-	
			<.001		
Hess et al. 2018	2x2x4 ANOVA		Age effects on winnings: p > .08	ns	F
(1)					
	2x2x4 ANOVA	Controlled for memory measured as	Main effect of age on optimal choice: ns	ns	F
	Moderator analysis	whether participant recalled critical	Moderator effect of age on optimal choice:	ns	
		strategy	$F(1,181) = 4.98$, p = .005, $\eta 2$ partial = 0.07.		
			Description only condition, YA vs OA: p =		
			.08 (ns after controlling for memory)		
			Description and experience condition, YA		
			vs OA: ns		
			Experience only condition, YA vs OA: ns		
Hess et al. 2018	2x3x2x3 ANOVA		Main effect of age on proportion of times	ns	F
(2)			Age x probability interaction: $F(1, 117) =$		
			$3.51 \text{ p} = 06 \text{ n}^2 \text{ partial} = 0.03$		
			YA Low probability vs High probability		
			11, 20% producinty vo mgn producinty		

			condition: F(1,120) = 125.36, p < .001, η2		
			partial = 0.68		
			OA, Low probability vs High probability		
			condition: $F(1,114) = 29.32$, p< .001, $\eta 2$		
			partial = 0.34.		
Hess, Queen and	Logistic regression		Main effect of age: ns (No numerical	ns	0
Patterson 2012			results reported)		
Huang et al. 2015	2x2 mixed-model	Education as covariate	CCT, Main effect of age: NR	NR	F/O
	ANOVA		CCT, Age x task interaction: F(1,127) =	-	
			7.90, p = .01, $\eta 2p = 0.06$		
	2x4 mixed-model	Education as covariate	IGT, Main effect of age: NR	NR	F
	ANOVA		IGT, Age x deck A and B selection: NS	ns	
			IGT, Age x deck C and D selection:	-	
			$F(1,127) = 6.59, p = .011, \eta 2p 0.05$		
			Decks A/B (Disadvantageous decks), YA		
			vs OA: both ns (No numerical results		
			reported)		
			Deck C/D (Advantageous decks), YA vs		
			OA: M = 17.80 (SD = 10.28) vs M = 21.49		
			(SD = 9.72), t(128) = 2.10, p = .04, d =		
			0.37/M = 31.20 (SD = 14.74) vs M = 26.86		

			(SD = 11.64), t(128) = 1.86, p = .07, d =		
			0.33		
James et al. 2012	Linear Regression	Adjusted for age, sex, education and	Total literacy, $r = -0.34$, $p < .001$	-	F/H
(RUSH sample)	Interaction models	global cognition, income, depression,	Total literacy x age interaction: estimate =	ns	
	testing for effect	and chronic medical conditions	0.02, SE = 0.01, p = .02		
	variation		Health literacy, $r = -0.32$, $p < .001$	-	
			Health literacy x age interaction: estimate =		
			0.01, SE = 0.01, p = .05	-	
			Financial literacy, r = -0.25, p <.001		
			Financial literacy x age interaction:	-	
			estimate = 0.02, SE = 0.01, p = .02		
Jimura et al. 2011	2x2 ANOVA		Main effect of age: NR	NR	F/O
	Post-hoc t-test		Age x reward domain interaction: $F(1,38) =$	+	
			5.09, p < .05		
			Discounting of monetary rewards, YA vs		
			OA: t(38) = 2.14, p < .05		
			Discounting of liquid rewards, YA vs OA:		
			t(38) =80, p = .42		
Koscienlniak 2016	2 x 2 ANVOVA		Main effect of age on adjusted number of	-	0
			pumps: F(1,157) = 23.07, p < .001		
			Main effect of age total points: $F(1,157) =$	-	

			10.16, p = .002		
			Main effect of age on number of explosions	-	
			experienced: F(1,157) = 12.88, p < .001		
Li et al. 2017	Three-factor	Ran one-way ANOVAs with gender	Main effect of age on average adjusted	-	0
	ANOVA		pumps: F(1,185) = 27.53, p < .001		
Li et al. 2013	Structural equation		$\beta = 0.12, p < .10$	ns	F
	model				
Li et al. 2015	Structural equation	Controlling for crystallised and fluid	Main effect of age: 0.99 (SE = 0.34), p <	+	F
	model	intelligence	.01		
	Structural equation		Main effect of age on optimal credit card	ns	F
	model		repayment plan: 0.03 (SE = 0.04), p > .05		
			Main effect of age on optimal choice of		
			health plan: 0.02 (SE = 0.01), p > .05	ns	
Lobjois and	3x2x2 ANOVA		Main effect of age on unsafe decisions: NR	NR	SA
Cavallo 2007					
Lockenhoff et al.	Chi-square test	Age differences in pain sensitivity,	Dread sensitivity, $\chi 2$ (1, N = 60) = 0.07, p =	ns	SA
2016 (1)	Non-parametric	and gender, ethnicity held constant in	.80	ns	
	correlation	sampling	Dread sensitivity, $\rho = 0.05$, $p = .71$, 95%CI		
			[-0.21, 0.3]		
Lockenhoff et al.	Non-parametric	Screened for potentially confounding	Dread sensitivity, $\rho = -0.07$, $p = .47$,	ns	SA
2016 (2)	correlation	variables and other variables recorded	95%CI [-0.25, 0.11]		

		and taken as covariates in follow up			
		analysis.			
Ma and Chen 2015	Logistic regression		Main effect of age on accuracy: ns (No	ns	F/O
	(with maximum		numerical results reported)		
	utility choice as DV				
	and age and emotion				
	condition as IV)				
MacPherson,	Two-way ANOVA	Adjusted for education	Main effect of age: $F(2,87) = 0.73$, MSE =	ns	F
Phillips and Sala			147.80, $\eta 2p = 0.02$		
2002			Block x age interaction: $F(8,348) = 0.93$,	ns	
			$MSE = 55.80, \eta 2p = 0.02$		
Mata, Schooler	Repeated measures	Education as a covariate	$F(1,159)=21.92,p<.001,\eta 2p=0.12$	-	F/O
and Rieskamp	2x2 ANOVA				
2007					
Mata, von	Repeated measures		Effect of age: F(1,96) = 34.94, p < .001,	-	F
Helversen and	2x2 ANOVA		$\eta 2p = 0.27$		
Rieskamp 2010			Block x age x environment: $F(6,91) = 2.76$,	-	
			$p = .02, \eta 2p = 0.15$		
Mikels et al. 2013	Chi-square test	Cognitive ability (as measured with	$\chi 2(1, N = 60) = 9.93, p < .005$	-	0
	2x2x2 ANOVA	verbal fluency and digit symbol	Main effect of age on nonoptimal choice	-	
		substitution score)	selection: $F(1,58) = 8.54$, $p < .01$, $\eta 2p =$		

			0.12		
Mikels et al. 2010	2x3x3 ANOVA		Main effect of age on non-optimal	-	Н
	Post-hoc t-test		responding: $F(1,114) = 8.16$, $p < .01$, $\eta 2p =$		
			0.05		
			Age x condition interaction: F(2,114) =	-	
			$6.83,p<.005,\eta 2p=0.11$		
			Information-focused condition, YA vs OA:		
			t(38) = 2.21, p < .05		
			Emotion-focused condition, YA vs OA:		
			t(38) = 0.84, p > .35		
Pachur, Mata and	Mixed effects	Gender, educational attainment, assets	Gain domain: b = -0.24, 95%CI [-0.45,	ns	F
Hertwig 2017	logistic regression	as covariates	–0.04], OR = 0.78, 95%CI [0.64, 0.96]		
			Loss domain: b = -0.43 95%CI [-0.67,		
			-0.19], OR = 0.65, 95% CI [0.51, 0.83]		
			Mixed domain: $b = -0.21, 95\%$ CI [-0.44,		
			0.02], OR = 0.81, 95%CI [0.64, 1.02]		
Pachur et al. 2009	2x2x2 ANOVA	Education, age, environment, task	Accuracy in inference task, main effect of	ns	0
(1)		order as covariates	age in both environments: $F(1,76) = 1.45$, p		
			= .23		
Pachur et al. 2009	2x2 ANOVA		Accuracy in inference task, main effect of	+	0
(2)			age: F(1,110) = 4.7, p = .03		

Pertl et al. 2017	Man-Whitney U		U = 72.50, p = .002, d = 1.13	-	Н
	tests		Easy Items, YA vs OA: U= 77.00, p = .002,		
	Post-hoc analyses		d = 1.06		
			Difficult items, YA vs OA: $p > .05$		
Queen and Hess	Binomial test		Deliberative, Unconscious thought	NA	0
2010	comparing YA		condition		
	performance vs		YA vs chance: 0.41, ns		
	chance; OA		OA vs chance: 0.28, ns		
	performance vs		Deliberative, Conscious thought condition		
	chance		YA vs chance: 0.50, p < .05		
			OA vs chance: 0.38, ns		
			Intuitive, Unconscious thought condition		
			YA vs chance: 0.72, p< .05		
			OA vs chance: 0.47, p<.05		
			Intuitive, Conscious thought condition		
			YA vs chance: 0.62, p< .05		
			OA vs chance: 0.46, p<.05		
Rieger and Mata	Mixed effects	Controlled for potential variables of	Risk taking, B = -0.01 , SE = 0.005 , p <	-	F
2013	regression	interest, such as gender, literacy, and	.05, R2 = 0.15		
		household size to account for cohort			
		effects			

	Mixed effects	Controlled for potential variables of	Generosity in dictator game, $B = 0.01$, SE	ns	SO/F
	regression	interest, such as gender, literacy, and	= 0.01 p > .05, R2 = 0.10		
		household size to account for cohort			
		effects			
	Mixed effects	Controlled for potential variables of	Public goods game, $B = 0.02$, $SE = 0.01$, p	+	SO/F
	regression	interest, such as gender, literacy, and	< .05, R2 = 0.15		
		household size to account for cohort			
		effects			
Roalf et al. 2012	Repeated measures	Income as covariate	UG, main effect of age on offer acceptance:	-	F
	2x5 mixed ANOVA		F(1,57) = 6.15, p = .01		
	Regression		UG, age x offer acceptance interaction:	ns	
			F(4,228) = 1.64, p = .19		
			Economic decision-making (UG and	-	
			Dictator game), age as individual predictor		
			in hierarchical regression model: $F(1,58) =$		
			5.59, p = .02, R2 = 0.9		
	Repeated measures		Dictator game, main effect of age on delay	ns	F
	mixed-model		discounting: F(1,53) = 1.47, p = .23		
	ANOVA		Dictator game, age as individual predictor		
	Regression		in hierarchical regression model: $F(1,54) =$	ns	
			2.91, p = .09, R2 = 0.5		

	T-test		Dictator game, amount offered to others,	ns	SO/F
	Chi-square test		YA vs OA: t(53) = 0.40, p = .70		
	Regression		Dictator game, YA/OA funds distribution	NA	
			equally vs unequally: Pearson X2(1) =		
			ns/Pearson X2(1) = 3.87 , p = $.05$		
			Dictator game, age as individual predictor		
			in hierarchical regression model: F(1,54) =	ns	
			0.41, p = .53, R2 = 0.1		
Rogalsky et al.	Correlation		r = -0.18 p = .27	ns	F
2012					
Rolison, Hanoch	Correlation		Age and Average Adjusted Pumps: r = -	ns	0
and Wood 2012	2x3 ANOVA		0.12, p = 0.28		
			Main effect of age: ns (No numerical	ns	
			results reported)		
Rolison, Wood	Random effects	Including age and scenario as factors,	Posterior decision-making, OR = 0.09, t =	+	F/H/O
and Hanoch 2017	logistic regression	and controlled for prior decisions	5.39, p < .001		
(1)					
Rolison, Wood	Random effects	Controlled for prior decisions	Posterior decision-making, $OR = 0.38$	+	F/H/O
and Hanoch 2017	logistic regression		(0.16, 0.92), p < .05		
(2)					
Rosen, Brand and	Pearson's		Age and moral decisions: $r = 0.24$, $p < $	+	SO

Age and Low emotional moral decisions: r $+$ = 0.29 p < .001 Age and High emotional moral decisions: r ns = 0.08, p = .25	
= 0.29 p < .001 Age and High emotional moral decisions: r ns = 0.08, p = .25	
Age and High emotional moral decisions: r ns $= 0.08$, p = .25	
= 0.08, p = .25	
Rutledge et al.Pearson's correlationTest model in sample controlled forMixed trails, Earnings: $r = -0.004$, $p > .10$ ns	F
2016 education, region, android vs apple Gains trials, Earnings: $r = -0.05$, $p < .001$	
smartphone use Loss trials, Earnings: $r = -0.01$, $p > .10$ -	
ns	
Rydzewska et al. Linear mixed-model . Sequential decision-making, main effect of -	F/O
2018 (1) age: $b = 1.67$, $SE = 0.41$, $t(102) = 4.11$, $p < $	
.001	
Rydzewska et al. Linear mixed Sequential decision-making, main effect of -	F/O
2018 (2) models age: $b = 1.46$, $SE = 0.62$, $t(122) = 2.35$, $p =$	
.02	
Age x Task phase interaction: b = 1.52, SE	
= 0.75, t (122) = 2.03, p = .05	
Age x Order x Task phase interaction: b = -	
2.93, SE = 1.06, t (122) = -2.76, p = .01	
Schiebener and ANOVA Controlled for gender on analyses of Effect of age group on overall IGT net -	F
Brand 2017 last 60 trials score: $p = .005$	

	Reasoning and	Effect of age group on IGT net score, first	ns	
		40 trials: $F(4,205) = 1.37 p = .25$, partial $\eta 2$		
		= .03		
		Effect of age group on IGT net score, , last	-	
		60 trials: F(4,205) = 4.41 p = .002, partial		
		$\eta 2 = .08$		
ANOVA		GDT, Net score, F (4,205) = 2.67, p = .03,	-	F
		partial $\eta 2 = .05$		
Partial correlation	Bias corrected and accelerated	Decision preference (proportion of sooner	ns	F/O
	bootstrapped	options chosen): 0.06 [-0.18, 0.28]		
		Discount rate: -0.02 [-0.25, 0.21]		
			ns	
Partial correlation	Bias corrected and accelerated	Decision preference (proportion of higher	ns	F
	bootstrapped	probability chosen): 0.11 [-0.13, 0.33]		
		Discount rate: 0.23 [0, 0.44]		
			-	
Partial correlation	Bias corrected and accelerated	Decision preference (proportion of sooner	ns	F
	bootstrapped	options chosen): 0.22 [-0.01, 0.42]	ns	
		Discount rate: 0.1 [-0.13, 0.32]		
3x3 ANCOVA	Age as covariate	Discounting, main effect of age: $F(1,90) =$	-	F/SO/H
		3.94, p = .050, ng2 = 0.01		
	ANOVA Partial correlation Partial correlation Partial correlation 3x3 ANCOVA	Reasoning andANOVAPartial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedPartial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedPartial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedPartial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedSatial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedPartial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedSatial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedSatial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedBias corrected and accelerated 	Reasoning andEffect of age group on IGT net score, first 40 trials: $F(4,205) = 1.37 p = .25$, partial $\eta 2$ $= .03$ Effect of age group on IGT net score, , last 60 trials: $F(4,205) = 4.41 p = .002$, partial $\eta 2 = .08$ ANOVA.GDT, Net score, F (4,205) = 2.67, p = .03, partial $\eta 2 = .05$ Partial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedDecision preference (proportion of sooner options chosen): $0.06 [-0.18, 0.28]$ Discount rate: $-0.02 [-0.25, 0.21]$ Partial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedPartial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedPartial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedPartial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedPartial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedDecision preference (proportion of higher probability chosen): $0.11 [-0.13, 0.33]$ Discount rate: $0.23 [0, 0.44]$ Partial correlationBias corrected and accelerated bootstrappedDecision preference (proportion of sooner options chosen): $0.22 [-0.01, 0.42]$ Discount rate: $0.1 [-0.13, 0.32]$ 3x3 ANCOVAAge as covariateBiscounting, main effect of age: $F(1,90) =$ $3.94, p = .050, ng2 = 0.01$	Reasoning andEffect of age group on IGT net score, firstns40 trials: $F(4,205) = 1.37 p = .25$, partial η_2 $= .03$ $= .03$ Effect of age group on IGT net score, , last $-$ 60 trials: $F(4,205) = 4.41 p = .002$, partial $\eta_2 = .08$ ANOVA.GDT, Net score, F (4.205) = 2.67, p = .03, -Partial correlationBias corrected and acceleratedDecision preference (proportion of sconerbootstrappedoptions chosen): 0.06 [-0.18, 0.28]Discount rate: -0.02 [-0.25, 0.21]nsPartial correlationBias corrected and acceleratedbootstrappedDecision preference (proportion of highernsnsprobability chosen): 0.11 [-0.13, 0.33]nsPartial correlationBias corrected and acceleratedbootstrappedDecision preference (proportion of sconernsnsstaft correlationBias corrected and acceleratedbootstrappedDecision preference (proportion of highernsnsstaft correlationBias corrected and acceleratedbootstrappedoptions chosen): 0.21 [-0.13, 0.33]Discount rate: 0.23 [0, 0.44]nsbootstrappedoptions chosen): 0.22 [-0.01, 0.42]nsDiscount rate: 0.1 [-0.13, 0.32]3x3 ANCOVAAge as covariateDiscounting, main effect of age: F(1,90) =- $3.94, p = .050, ng2 = 0.01$

		Discounting factor	-	
		(temporal/probability/effort) x age		
		interaction: F(2,180) = 6.29, p < .002, ng2		
		= 0.03		
Multiple linear	Tested quadratic effect of age to test	Temporal discounting, Money: Age = 0.14	ns	F/SO/H
regression	for non-linearity	[- 0.07, 0.35], R2 = 0.019, p > .05		
		Temporal discounting, social: Age = 0.26	-	
		[0.06, 0.47], R2 = 0.07, p < .05		
		Temporal discounting, health: Age $= 0.36$	-	
		[0.17, 0.56], R2 = 0.13 p < .001		
Multiple linear	Tested quadratic effect of age to test	Probability discounting, money: $Age = 0.04$	ns	F/SO/H
regression	for non-linearity	[- 0.17, .25], R2 = 0.00, p > .05		
		Probability discounting, social: Age2 = -	+	
		0.28 [- 0.48, - 0.08], R2 Change = 0.08, p <		
		.01		
		Probability discounting, health: Age = 0.22	-	
		[0.02, 0.43], R2 = 0.05, p < .05		
Multiple linear	Tested quadratic effect of age to test	Effort discounting, money: Age = -0.24 [-	+	F/SO/H
regression	for non-linearity	0.43, - 0.04], p < .05; Age2 = - 0.29 [0.09,		
		0.49], R2 Change = 0.08, p < .01		
		Effort discounting, social: Age $2 = 0.25$	-	

			[0.05, 0.45], R2 Change = 0.06, p < .05		
			Effort discounting, health: Age = - 0.13 [-	ns	
			0.33, 0.08], R2 = 0.02, p > .05		
Sparrow and	Omnibus 2x3		Main effect of age in reward index: NR	NR	F/SO
Spaniol 2018 (1)	ANOVA		Age x reward type interaction: $F(1,52) =$	+	
	Post-hoc t-tests		91.29 = 15.92, p < .01		
			Gain condition, YA vs OA: $t(60) = 4.53$, p		
			< .01, d = 1.13		
			Loss condition, YA vs OA: $t(60) = 1.76$, p		
			= .09, d = 0.44		
			Donation condition, YA vs OA: t(60) =		
			2.27, p = .03, d = 0.57		
Sparrow and	Omnibus ANOVA		Main effect of age in reward index: ns (No	ns	F/SO
Spaniol 2018 (2)			numerical results reported)		
Stewart et al. 2018	Bivariate correlation	Modified conceptual model by	r = -0.32, p <.001	-	F/H
(RUSH Sample)	Multiple regression,	removing paths linking age and	Total standard effect of age on DM: Est = -		
	path analysis	education to risk aversion	0.28, SE = 0.03, p < .001		
			Direct age effect: $Est = -0.11$, $SE = 0.02$, p		
			< .001		
Strough et al. 2016	Stepped linear	,	Willingness to cancel failing plans: $B =$	+	SO/H
	regression		0.01, SE = 0.01, t = 2.19, p = .03		

Tymula et al. 2013	T-test	Robust to demographic, financial, and	Loss in expected earnings, YA vs OA:	-	F
		psychological	19.3% vs 46.1%, p < .001		
		variables	Loss in expected earnings, MA vs OA:	-	
			9.6% vs 46.1%, p < .001		
Von Helversen and	T-test		Performance, YA vs OA: $t(43.19) = 3.8$, p	-	F
Mata 2012			< .001, d = 0.97		
Walker, Fisk and	2x5x4 ANOVA		Main effect of age on optimal route	ns	0
Mcguire 1997			selection: ns (No numerical results		
			reported)		
Wayde et al. 2017	Chi-square test		Inferencing condition, YA vs OA: familiar	-	0
	Wilcoxon signed		condition - $\chi 2(1) = 9.98$, p = .002; non-		
	ranks test		familiar condition - $\chi 2(1) = 0.60$, p > .05		
			Non-inferencing condition, YA vs OA:		
			familiar condition - $\chi 2(1) = 0.40$, p = .52;	ns	
			non-familiar condition - $\chi 2$ (1) = 3.04, p =		
			.08		
Wood et al. 2005	2X4 Mixed		Main effect of age on gambling score:	ns	F
	ANOVA		F(1,153) = 0.38, p = .54		
Wood et al. 2011	Multivariate logistic	Added control measures to model,	Adjusted OR = 0.96 [0.94, 0.98], p < .01	-	F
	regression	female, other race/ethnicity, college			
		graduate, married			

Worthy et al. 2014	2x2x2x5 Repeated	. Overall (both task), main effect of age:	+	0
	measures ANOVA	$F(1,174) = 13.42$, p< .001, partial $\eta 2 =$		
	ANOVA for	0.07,		
	increasing/decreasin	Increasing-optimal task, main effect of age:	ns	
	g optimal task	F(1,82) = 2.74, p = .10		
	separately	Decreasing-optimal task, main effect of	+	
		age: $F(1,92) = 14.97$, p< .001, partial $\eta 2 =$		
		0.14		
Worthy et al. 2016	Mixed ANOVA	. Main effect of age: both $F < 1$; ns (No	ns	0
		numerical results reported)		
Worthy et al. 2011	Independent	. $t(54) = -2.17, p < .05$	ns	0
(1)	samples t-test			
Worthy et al. 2011	2x2x5 repeated	. Main effect of age: NR	NR	0
(2)	measures ANOVA	Main effect of age: $F(1,100) = 4.80$, p< .05,	+	
	2x2 ANOVA	$\eta 2 = 0.05$		
	(excluding block)			
Zamarian et al.	5x2 Repeated	. Main effect of age on performance: F(1,83)	-	F
2008	measures ANOVA	= 0.45, MSE $= .14$, p $= .50$		
	Chi-square test	. Proportion classified as good decision	ns	F
		makers YA vs OA: 69.7% vs 67.3%; χ2-		
		tests, p >.1		

^aAbbreviations as follows: Rush memory and ageing project, RUSH; Decision-making, DM; YA, younger adults; OA, older adults; MA, middle aged adults; ANOVA, analysis of variance; ANCOVA, analysis of covariance; CI, confidence interval; [,], CI lower limit, CI upper limit; DV, dependent variable; IV, independent variable; MSE, mean standard error; OR, odds ratio; vs, versus; SD, standard deviation; SE, standard error; n, sample size; MANOVA, multivariate analysis of variance; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported, M, mean; Ms, mean squares; ns, non-significant; ns, non-significant; -/+, significant negative/positive association between decision-making and older age; F, financial; SO, social; H, health; SA, safety; O, other.

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

Meta-analysis of studies comparing decision-making in older and younger adult

When meta-analysis was carried out the combined estimate was statistically significant in indicating poorer decision-making in older as compared to younger adults (k = $57, d_{random} = -0.17, 95\%$ CI -0.29, -0.04, $I^2 = 92.92\%$) (shown in Fig. I) however, heterogeneity was high and individual studies varied considerably (for funnel plots refer to Online Resource: Supplementary Fig. III). This finding was magnified when studies of intertemporal judgement tasks were excluded ($k = 46, d_{random} = -0.24, 95\%$ CI -0.39, -0.09, I^2 = 93.38%) (Online Resource: Supplementary Table II).

Older compared to younger adults, decision-making domain

Meta-analysis by decision-making domain (financial, social or health related decisions) found combined estimates showing poorer financial (k = 36, $d_{random} = -0.25$, 95% CI -0.45, -0.04, $I^2 = 94.68\%$) and social decision-making (k = 14, $d_{random} = -0.38$, 95% CI -0.72, -0.03, $I^2 = 92.9\%$) in older adults as compared to younger adults, as shown in Online Resource: Supplementary Fig. II). However, these were not significant for health decisionmaking $(k = 5, d_{random} = 0.34, 95\%$ CI -0.31, 0.99, $I^2 = 95.02\%$; Online Resource: Supplementary Fig. II). Task demands, specifically risk and independent variable type moderated the effect of age on social decision-making. Post-hoc sensitivity analyses excluding one study of risky choice resulted in non-significant negative summary effect, (d $r_{random} = -0.26, 95\%$ CI -0.54, 0.25, $I^2 = 92.84\%$). However, the exclusion of studies which employed age as continuous variable did not materially affect the results, ($d_{\text{random}} = -0.59$, 95% CI -1.01, -0.18, $I^2 = 88.5\%$). There were insufficient studies (k = 2) to allow for meaningful meta-analysis of safety-related decision-making. Moderators including mean sample age, task type, additional task demands, and adjustment for socio-economic factors did not materially alter the results for the financial and health decision-making domains (see Online Resource: Supplementary Table IV).

Figure I

Forest plot showing individual and summary effects for 55 studies on ageand overall decision-making

[INSERT FIGURE I]

Note. Cohen's d effects summary effects and 95% CI represented, with positive effects representing better decision making in older adults as compared to younger adults. A restricted maximum likelihood model was employed.

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

Assessment of bias

Included studies were broadly similar in their overall reviewer-rated risk of bias (Online Resource: Supplementary Table IV). High risk of bias generally resulted from inadequate sample size, no a priori sample size calculation, a lack of statistical adjustment for potential confounders, and the use of a cross-sectional design. On the other hand, many studies reported using validated decision-making tasks (e.g., IGT, UG, GDT, BART), recruiting roughly even numbers of older and younger adults and exposing them to the same experimental conditions.

Discussion

This review systematically synthesizes the available evidence comparing decisionmaking in earlier and later life across three real-world decision-making domains. More than half of the studies included in the systematic review provided support for an age-related change in decision-making with older adults performing more poorly when judged against achieving prespecified goals in standard decision tasks. Differences in studies could be explained to some extent by the nature of the decision tasks. In particular, positive associations between age and decision-making were observed across decision-tasks that involved altruism or prosocial considerations (Bailey et al. 2013; Beadle et al. 2012; Rosen et al. 2016; Sparrow and Spaniol 2018), response to risk (Rolison et al. 2017), inferencing (Pachur et al. 2009), resistance to sunk cost (Strough et al. 2015) and real-world credit scores (Li et al. 2015). Age differences in overall and financial decision-making were robust, with older adults performing more poorly than their younger counterparts although individual studies estimates varied widely.

Previous reviews (Best and Charness 2015; Thornton and Dumke 2005) have identified interpersonal considerations as an important moderator of age-differences in decision-making. Thornton and Dumke observed that age-associated declines in everyday

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

problem-solving and decision-making effectiveness were attenuated when decisions had interpersonal significance. In their review, older adults appear to perform more favourably when outcomes resulted in mutual benefit. Broader research has also shown that older age is linked to increased altruism , better interpersonal problem solving, and prioritisation of social considerations in decision-making (Best and Charness 2015; Blanchard-Fields et al. 2007), Best and Charness similarly highlighted the important interplay between decisions involving interpersonal factors and age. Older adults were less risk-seeking than younger adults in positively framed morality-based scenario conditions.

Whilst the focus of our review was to summarise the existing evidence rather than to delve into the potential drivers behind the differences, we highlight two potential explanatory theories that may provide insight to help to explain age differences in decision outcomes. The Selection, Optimisation and Compensation model (SOC) and Socioemotional Selectivity Theory (SST). SOC hypothesises that individuals use selection (elective and loss-based selection), optimisation and compensation based strategies to function effectively in different situations (Baltes and Carstensen 1996). Increasing age may be associated with better use of strategies for dealing with changing situations. However, in older age, structural changes in the prefrontal cortex and associated declines in cognitive abilities and processing speed may mean greater dependence on strategies like selection and optimisation, and less use of effortful, deliberative decision-making processes (Kahneman 2003). Reduced reliance upon deliberative processing may have stronger effects in financial decision-making tasks, particularly those completed under explicit risk conditions (Bangma et al. 2017; Ellen Peters et al. 2007). SST by contrast posits that shrinking time horizons in later life lead older adults to increasingly prioritise emotionally meaningful goals with short term rewards (e.g., charity) over goals facilitating self-sustenance and long-term payoff (e.g., building wealth) (Lockenhoff et al. 2016). The prioritisation of socio-emotional goals may result in lower

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

motivation to perform on tasks with individual financial reward and increased drive to act in favour of a decision partner, even if this strategy results in negative individual consequences. The role of age-related neurobiological changes on individual and prosocial decision-making is less clear (Han et al. 2015; James et al. 2015).

In summary, older adults perform marginally worse that younger adults overall in decision-making tasks with a level of applicability to real-world outcomes. This appears to be driven by an overrepresentation of financial compared to social and health decision-making studies and greater consistency across summary effects within the financial domain. The small number of studies that have explored age-differences in social, health and safety decision-making have produced inconsistent results.

Strengths and Limitations

There are several methodological strengths and limitations of the present research. The final search terms were selected based on sensitivity and specificity and applied to three leading scientific databases; however, we did not include the 'grey' literature and it is therefore possible some studies were not captured. To minimise this risk, the reference list of existing systematic reviews was also searched. The inclusive eligibility criteria led to heterogeneity in the study populations but allowed us to capture the widest possible scope of evidence resulting in a substantial body of data with representation across financial, social, health and non-risky decisions which was further explored using a series of potential moderators (Doi et al. 2011). However, we were inevitably limited by the published evidence, the types of decision-making paradigms that were available in the literature and the quality of constituent studies. One possible alternative for future consideration would be to conduct an individual participant data-analysis, which, while time-intensive, allows for verification of published results, the inclusion of unreported findings, and standardisation of statistical analysis albeit at the cost of standardising disparate outcomes. Evidence on

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

decision-making response tendencies or preferences that could not be categorised as better or worse were deemed as less relevant to the interpretation of the results, and thus excluded.

Overall, the evidence base in this area is also lacking published prospective data. While experimental research facilitates greater methodological rigour, replicability, and a closer approximation of causal relationships , prospective studies have been argued to be better suited for investigating gradual and long-term processing changes across the life course. Furthermore, the scope of this high-level synthesis on age differences in financial, social, health and safety decision-making prohibited investigation into the mechanisms underlying observed age effects. Nevertheless, this review summarises valuable high-level evidence regarding age differences in decision-making, illuminates methodological issues and knowledge gaps and points to future directions for the field.

Future Directions

As highlighted by the overrepresentation of financial decision-making evidence, more studies of social, health and safety-related decision-making with greater ecological validity would be a welcome addition to the literature. Secondly, the consistent application of validated decision-making measures across future studies will be critical to overcoming issues of generalisability, and replicability. Relative to clinical or neuroimageing tools, decision-making tasks often require minimal supervision and clinical interpretation, which may enhance their utility and accessibility across different contexts. Thirdly, synthesising the evidence from studies of decisions outcomes that are not categorisable as better or worse (e.g., preferences for advertisements with more or less information) and the mechanisms underpinning observed age differences in decision-making would build upon the work of the present review. There is also a clear need for further in-depth reviews of the potential mechanisms, which, whilst beyond the scope of this work would help to further disentangle the results from the experimental studies and help in the design of future data collection.

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

Fourthly, the generation of prospective data will be necessary to understand how decision processes change with age on an intra-individual level. The inclusion of decision-making measures within ongoing longitudinal studies, albeit with the need to take account of learning effects, may be one efficient way to achieve this research goal. Lastly, consensus on terminology and operationalising decision-making across gerontological and psychological research will strengthen the interpretability and comparability of future findings.

Statements and declarations

Impact Statement

Age differences in decision-making have important implications for the ways that decision-making is supported, and the information that is provided to adults at different ages. This is particularly relevant for decisions that may have significant health, financial or social consequences. Currently our policies and practices do not take explicit account of the potential changes in decision-making ability with ageing. Our review speaks to the importance of taking this into account and highlights the need for further research.

Ethical statement

An ethics statement was not required for this study type, no human or animal subjects or materials were used.

Competing interest and Funding

We have no conflicts of interest to disclose. Nicole Ee co-conceived the research, carried out the review processes and wrote the first draft. Brooke Brady carried out the review processes, refined the protocol and contributed to the writing of the article. Craig Sinclair carried out the review processes, refined the protocol and contributed to the writing of the article. Kaarin Jane Anstey co-conceived the research and commented on the article. Ruth Peters co-conceived the research, carried out the review processes and contributed to the

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

writing of the article. This work was supported by a grant from the Australian Research

Council Centre of Excellence in Population Ageing Research.

Data availability statement

All data used or generated in this study are from previously published work. Further

enquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

References

- Bailey PE, Ruffman T, Rendell PG (2013) Age-related differences in social economic decision making: the ultimatum game. J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci 68(3):356-363. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbs073
- Bakos DS, Couto MC, Melo WV, Parente MA, Koller SH, Bizarro L (2008) Executive functions in the young elderly and oldest old: a preliminary comparison emphasizing decision making. Psychol Neurosci 1(2):183-189.
- Baltes MM, Carstensen LL (1996) The Process of Successful Ageing. Ageing Soc 16(4):397-422. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X00003603
- Bangma DF, Fuermaier AB, Tucha L, Tucha O, Koerts J (2017) The effects of normal ageing on multiple aspects of financial decision-making. PLoS One 12(8):e0182620.
- Bauer AS, Timpe JC, Edmonds EC, Bechara A, Tranel D, Denburg NL (2013) Myopia for the future or hypersensitivity to reward? Age-related changes in decision making on the Iowa Gambling Task. Emotion 13(1):19-24. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029970
- Beadle JN, Paradiso S, Kovach C, Polgreen L, Denburg NL, Tranel D (2012) Effects of agerelated differences in empathy on social economic decision-making. Int Psychogeriatr 24(5):822-833. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1041610211002547
- Besedeš T, Deck C, Sarangi S, Shor M (2012) Decision-making Strategies and Performance among Seniors. J Econ Behav Organ 81(2):524-533. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2011.07.016
- Besedeš T, Deck C, Sarangi S, Shor M (2012) Age effects and heuristics in decision making. Rev Econ Stat 94(2):580-595.
- Best R, Charness N (2015) Age differences in the effect of framing on risky choice: a metaanalysis. Psychol Ageing 30(3):688-698. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039447

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

- Best R, Freund AM (2018) Age, loss minimization, and the role of probability for decisionmaking. Gerontology 64(5):475-484.
- Blanchard-Fields F, Mienaltowski A, Seay RB (2007) Age differences in everyday problemsolving effectiveness: older adults select more effective strategies for interpersonal problems. J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci 62(1):P61-P64.
- Blanco NJ, Love BC, Ramscar M, Otto AR, Smayda K, Maddox WT (2016) Exploratory decision-making as a function of lifelong experience, not cognitive decline. J Exp Psychol Gen 145(3):284-297. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000133
- Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, Rothstein HR (2010) A basic introduction to fixed
 effect and random effects models for meta analysis. Res Synth Methods
 1(2):97-111.
- Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, Rothstein HR (2011) Introduction to meta-analysis. John Wiley & Sons.
- Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, Rothstein HR (2017) Basics of meta-analysis: I(2) is not an absolute measure of heterogeneity. Res Synth Methods 8(1):5-18. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1230
- Boyle PA, Yu L, Buchman AS, Bennett DA (2012) Risk Aversion is Associated with Decision Making among Community-Based Older Persons. Front Psychol 3:205. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00205

Boyle PA, Yu L, Wilson RS, Gamble K, Buchman AS, Bennett DA (2012) Poor decision making is a consequence of cognitive decline among older persons without Alzheimer's disease or mild cognitive impairment. PLoS One 7(8):e43647. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043647

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

- Brand M, Schiebener J (2013) Interactions of age and cognitive functions in predicting decision making under risky conditions over the life span. J Clin Exp Neuropsychol 35(1):9-23. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803395.2012.740000
- Bruine de Bruin W, Parker AM, Fischhoff B (2007) Individual differences in adult decisionmaking competence. J Pers Soc Psychol 92(5):938.

Bruine de Bruin W, Parker AM, Fischhoff B (2012) Explaining adult age differences in decision □ making competence. J Behav Decis Mak 25(4):352-360.

- Bruine de Bruin W, Strough J, Parker AM (2014) Getting older isn't all that bad: better decisions and coping when facing "sunk costs". Psychol Aging 29(3):642.
- Caird JK, Edwards CJ, Creaser JI, Horrey WJ (2005) Older driver failures of attention at intersections: using change blindness methods to assess turn decision accuracy. Hum Factors 47(2):235-249. https://doi.org/10.1518/0018720054679542
- Carvalho JC, de Oliveira Cardoso C, Shneider-Bakos D, Kristensen CH, Fonseca RP (2012) The effect of age on decision making according to the Iowa gambling task. Span J Psychol 15(2):480-486. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22774421
- Cassimiro L, Fuentes D, Nitrini R, Yassuda MS (2017) Decision-making in Cognitively Unimpaired Illiterate and Low-educated Older Women: results on the iowa gambling task. Arch Clin Neuropsychol 32(1):71-80. https://doi.org/10.1093/arclin/acw080
- Cavanagh JF, Neville D, Cohen MX, Van de Vijver I, Harsay H, Watson P, Buitenweg JI, Ridderinkhof KR (2012) Individual differences in risky decision-making among seniors reflect increased reward sensitivity. Front Neurosci 6:11.
- Chung HK, Tymula A, Glimcher P (2017) The Reduction of Ventrolateral Prefrontal Cortex Gray Matter Volume Correlates with Loss of Economic Rationality in Ageing. J Neurosci 37(49):12068-12077. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1171-17.2017

- Cooper JA, Worthy DA, Gorlick MA, Maddox WT (2013) Scaffolding across the lifespan in history-dependent decision-making. Psychol Aging 28(2):505-514.
- Cooper JA, Worthy DA, Maddox WT (2016) Information about foregone rewards impedes dynamic decision-making in older adults. Neuropsychol Dev Cogn B Ageing Neuropsychol Cogn 23(1):103-116. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2015.1052364
- Deakin J, Aitken M, Robbins T, Sahakian BJ (2004) Risk taking during decision-making in normal volunteers changes with age. J Int Neuropsychol Soc 10(4):590-598.
- Del Missier F, Hansson P, Parker AM, Bruine de Bruin W, Mäntylä T. (2020) Decisionmaking competence in older adults: a rosy view from a longitudinal investigation. Psychol Aging 35(4):553.
- Denburg NL, Weller JA, Yamada TH, Shivapour DM, Kaup AR, LaLoggia A, Cole CA, Tranel D, Bechara A (2009) Poor decision making among older adults is related to elevated levels of neuroticism. Ann Behav Med 37(2):164-172.
- Denburg NL, Cole CA, Hernandez M, Yamada TH, Tranel D, Bechara A, Wallace RB (2007) The orbitofrontal cortex, real-world decision making, and normal ageing. Ann N Y Acad Sci 1121(1):480-498. https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1401.031
- Denburg NL, Tranel D, Bechara A (2005) The ability to decide advantageously declines prematurely in some normal older persons. Neuropsychologia 43(7):1099-1106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2004.09.012
- Di Rosa E, Mapelli D, Arcara G, Amodio P, Tamburin S, Schiff S (2017) Ageing and risky decision-making: new ERP evidence from the iowa gambling task. Neurosci Lett 640:93-98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2017.01.021
- Doi SA, Barendregt JJ, Mozurkewich EL (2011) Meta-analysis of heterogeneous clinical trials: an empirical example. Contemp Clin Trials 32(2):288-298.

- Eberhardt W, Bruine de Bruin W, Strough J (201) Age differences in financial decision making: the benefits of more experience and less negative emotions. J Behav Decis Mak 32(1):79-93.
- Eppinger B, Heekeren HR, Li SC (2017) Age Differences in the Neural Mechanisms of Intertemporal Choice Under Subjective Decision Conflict. Cereb Cortex 28(11):3764-3774. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhx239
- Fein G, McGillivray S, Finn P (2007) Older adults make less advantageous decisions than younger adults: cognitive and psychological correlates. J Int Neuropsychol Soc 13(3):480-489. https://doi.org/10.1017/S135561770707052X
- Fernandes C, Gonçalves AR, Pasion R, Ferreira-Santos F, Barbosa F, Martins IP, Marques-Teixeira J (2019) Age-related changes in social decision-making: an electrophysiological analysis of unfairness evaluation in the Ultimatum Game. Neurosci Lett 692:122-126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2018.10.061
- Finucane ML, Mertz CK, Slovic P, Schmidt ES (2005) Task complexity and older adults' decision-making competence. Psychol Aging 20(1):71.
- Fontaine M, Le Floch V, Lemercier C (2021) Gambling and ageing: less illusion but more risk. Aging Soc 43(3):556-75.
- Girardi A, Sala SD, MacPherson SE (2018) Theory of mind and the Ultimatum Game in healthy adult ageing. Exp Aging Res 44(3):246-257. https://doi.org/10.1080/0361073X.2018.1449590
- Han SD, Boyle PA, James BD, Yu L, Bennett DA (2015) Mild cognitive impairment is associated with poorer decision-making in community-based older persons. J Am Geriatr Soc 63(4):676-683. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.13346

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

Harlé KM, Sanfey AG (2012) Social economic decision-making across the lifespan: an fMRI investigation. Neuropsychologia 50(7):1416-1424.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.02.026

Henninger DE, Madden DJ, Huettel SA (2010) Processing speed and memory mediate agerelated differences in decision making. Psychol Aging 25(2):262-270.

Hess TM, O'Brien EL, Growney CM, Hafer JG (2018) Use of descriptive and experiential information in decision making by young and older adults. Neuropsychol Dev Cogn B Ageing Neuropsychol Cogn 25(4):500-519.

https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2017.1327014

- Hess TM, Queen TL, Patterson TR (2012) To deliberate or not to deliberate: interactions between age, task characteristics, and cognitive activity on decision making. Behav Decis Mak 25(1):29-40.
- Huang YH, Wood S, Berger DE, Hanoch Y (2015) Age differences in experiential and deliberative processes in unambiguous and ambiguous decision making. Psychol Aging 30(3):675-687. https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000038
- James BD, Boyle PA, Bennett JS, Bennett DA (2012) The impact of health and financial literacy on decision making in community-based older adults. Gerontology 58(6):531-539.
- James BD, Boyle PA, Yu L, Han SD, Bennett DA (2015) Cognitive decline is associated with risk aversion and temporal discounting in older adults without dementia. PLoS One 10(4):e0121900. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0121900
- Jimura K, Myerson J, Hilgard J, Keighley J, Braver TS, Green L (2011) Domain independence and stability in young and older adults' discounting of delayed rewards. Behav Processes 87(3):253-259.

- Jüni P, Witschi A, Bloch R, Egger M (1999) The hazards of scoring the quality of clinical trials for meta-analysis. JAMA 282(11):1054-1060.
- Kahneman D (2003) A perspective on judgment and choice: mapping bounded rationality. Am Psychol 58(9):697-720.
- Kim S, Hasher L (2005) The attraction effect in decision making: superior performance by older adults. Q J Exp Psychol A 58(1):120-133.
- Koscielniak M, Rydzewska K, Sedek G (2016) Effects of age and initial risk perception on balloon analog risk task: the mediating role of processing speed and need for cognitive closure. Front Psychol 7:659.
- Kusev P, Purser H, Heilman R, Cooke AJ, Van Schaik P, Baranova V, Martin R, Ayton P (2017) Understanding Risky Behavior: the influence of cognitive, emotional and hormonal factors on decision-making under risk. Front Psychol 8:102.
- Lerner JS, Li Y, Valdesolo P, Kassam KS (2015) Emotion and decision making. Annu Rev Psychol 66:799-823. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115043
- Li L, Cazzell M, Zeng L, Liu H (2017) Are there gender differences in young vs. ageing brains under risk decision-making? An optical brain imageing study. Brain Imaging Behav 11(4):1085-1098.
- Li Y, Baldassi M, Johnson EJ, Weber EU (2013) Complementary cognitive capabilities, economic decision making, and ageing. Psychol Aging 28(3):595-613.
- Li Y, Gao J, Enkavi AZ, Zaval L, Weber EU, Johnson EJ (2015) Sound credit scores and financial decisions despite cognitive ageing. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 112(1):65-69. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1413570112
- Lim KT, Yu R (2015) Aging and wisdom: age-related changes in economic and social decision making. Front Ageing Neurosci 7:120. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2015.00120

- Lobjois R, Cavallo V (2007) Age-related differences in street-crossing decisions: the effects of vehicle speed and time constraints on gap selection in an estimation task. Accid Anal Prev 39(5):934-943.
- Lockenhoff CE, Rutt JL, Samanez-Larkin GR, O'Donoghue T, Reyna VF, Ganzel B (2016) Dread sensitivity in decisions about real and imagined electrical shocks does not vary by age. Psychol Aging 31(8):890-901. https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000136
- Ma X, Chen Y (2015) Age Differences in Trade-off Decisions: different strategies but similar outcomes. Can J Ageing 34(2):247-256. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0714980815000033
- MacPherson SE, Phillips LH, Della Sala S (2002) Age, executive function, and social decision making: a dorsolateral prefrontal theory of cognitive ageing. Psychol Aging 17(4):598-609. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12507357
- Mata R, Josef AK, Samanez-Larkin GR, Hertwig R (2011) Age differences in risky choice: a meta-analysis. Ann N Y Acad Sci 1235(1):18-29. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06200.x
- Mata R, Schooler LJ, Rieskamp J (2007) The ageing decision maker: cognitive ageing and the adaptive selection of decision strategies. Psychol Aging 22(4):796-810. https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.22.4.796
- Mata R, von Helversen B, Rieskamp J (2010) Learning to choose: cognitive ageing and strategy selection learning in decision making. Psychol Aging 25(2):299-309. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018923
- Mikels A, Cheung E, Cone J, Gilovich T (2013) The dark side of intuition: ageing and increases in nonoptimal intuitive decisions. Emotion 13(2):189-195. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030441
- Mikels JA, Löckenhoff CE, Maglio SJ, Carstensen LL, Goldstein MK, Garber A (2010) Following your heart or your head: focusing on emotions versus information

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

differentially influences the decisions of younger and older adults. J Exp Psychol Appl 16(1):87.

Moye J, Karel MJ, Gurrera RJ, Azar AR (2006) Neuropsychological predictors of decisionmaking capacity over 9 months in mild-to-moderate dementia. J Gen Intern Med 21(1):78-83. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2005.00288.x

Pachur T, Mata, R, Hertwig R (2017) Who Dares, Who Errs? Disentangling Cognitive and Motivational Roots of Age Differences in Decisions Under Risk. Psychol Sci 28(4):504-518. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616687729

Pachur T, Mata R, Schooler LJ (2009) Cognitive ageing and the adaptive use of recognition in decision making. Psychol Ageing 24(4):901-915. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017211

Pertl MT, Benke T, Zamarian L, Delazer M (2017) Effects of Healthy Ageing and Mild Cognitive Impairment on a Real-Life Decision-Making Task. J Alzheimers Dis 58(4):1077-1087. https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-170119

Peters E, Hess TM, Vastfjall D, Auman C (2007) Adult Age Differences in Dual Information Processes: implications for the role of affective and deliberative processes in older adults' decision making. Perspect Psychol Sci 2(1):1-23. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00025.

- Peters E, Hess TM, Västfjäll D, Auman C (2007) Adult age differences in dual information processes: implications for the role of affective and deliberative processes in older adults' decision making. Perspect Psychol Sci 2(1):1-23.
- Peterson RA, Brown SP (2005) On the use of beta coefficients in meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology 90(1):175.
- Phillips WJ, Fletcher JM, Marks AD, Hin DW (2016) Thinking styles and decision making: a meta-analysis. Psychol Bull 142(3):260.

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

Queen TL, Hess TM (2010) Age differences in the effects of conscious and unconscious thought in decision making. Psychol Aging 25(2):251-261.

https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018856

- Rieger M, Mata R (2015) On the generality of age differences in social and nonsocial decision making. J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci 70(2):202-214. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbt088
- Roalf DR, Mitchell SH, Harbaugh WT, Janowsky JS (2012) Risk, reward, and economic decision making in ageing. J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci 67(3):289-298. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbr099
- Rogalsky C, Vidal C, Li X, Damasio H (2012) Risky decision-making in older adults without cognitive deficits: an fMRI study of VMPFC using the Iowa gambling task. Soc Neurosci 7(2):178-190.
- Rolison JJ, Hanoch Y, Wood S (2012) Risky decision making in younger and older adults: the role of learning. Psychol Ageing 27(1):129-140. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024689
- Rolison JJ, Wood S, Hanoch Y (2017) Age and Adaptation: stronger decision updating about real world risks in older age. Risk Anal 37(9):1632-1643. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.12710
- Rosen JB, Brand M, Kalbe E (2016) Empathy Mediates the Effects of Age and Sex on Altruistic Moral Decision Making. Front Behav Neurosci 10:67. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2016.00067
- Rupinski MT, Dunlap WP (1996) Approximating Pearson product-moment correlations from Kendall's tau and Spearman's rho. Educa Psychol Meas 56(3):419-429.
- Rutledge RB, Smittenaar P, Zeidman P, Brown HR, Adams RA, Lindenberger U, Dayan P,
 Dolan RJ (2016) Risk Taking for Potential Reward Decreases across the Lifespan.
 Curr Biol 26(12):1634-1639. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.05.017

- Rydzewska K, von Helversen B, Kossowska M, Magnuski M, Sedek G (2018) Age-related within-task adaptations in sequential decision making: considering cognitive and motivational factors. Psychol Ageing 33(2):297-314.
- Schiebener J, Brand M (2017) Age-related variance in decisions under ambiguity is explained by changes in reasoning, executive functions, and decision-making under risk. Cogn Emot 31(4):816-824. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2016.1159944
- Seaman KL, Brooks N, Karrer TM, Castrellon JJ, Perkins SF, Dang LC, Hsu M, Zald DH, Samanez-Larkin GR (2018) Subjective value representations during effort, probability and time discounting across adulthood. Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci 13(5):449-459. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsy021
- Seaman KL, Gorlick MA, Vekaria KM, Hsu M, Zald DH, Samanez-Larkin GR (2016) Adult age differences in decision making across domains: increased discounting of social and health-related rewards. Psychol Aging 31(7):737-746. https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000131
- Sparrow EP, Spaniol J (2018) Ageing and altruism in intertemporal choice. Psychol Ageing 33(2):315-324. https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000223
- Sterne JA, Egger M (2001) Funnel plots for detecting bias in meta-analysis: guidelines on choice of axis. J Clin Epidemiol 54(10):1046-1055.
- Stewart CC, Yu L, Wilson RS, Bennett DA, Boyle PA (2018) Correlates of healthcare and financial decision making among older adults without dementia. Health Psychol 37(7):618-626. https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000610
- Strough J, Bruine de Bruin W, Parker AM, Karns T, Lemaster P, Pichayayothin N, Delaney R, Stoiko R (2016) What were they thinking? Reducing sunk-cost bias in a life-span sample. Psychol Aging 31(7):724.

- Strough J, Bruin WB, Peters E (2015) New perspectives for motivating better decisions in older adults. Front Psychol 6:783.nhttps://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00783
- Strough J, Mehta CM, McFall JP, Schuller KL (2008) Are older adults less subject to the sunk-cost fallacy than younger adults? Psychol Sci 19(7):650-652.
- Thornton WJ, Dumke HA (2005) Age differences in everyday problem-solving and decisionmaking effectiveness: a meta-analytic review. Psychol Aging 20(1):85-99. https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.20.1.85
- Tymula A, Rosenberg Belmaker LA, Ruderman L, Glimcher PW, Levy I (2013) Like cognitive function, decision making across the life span shows profound age-related changes. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 110(42):17143-17148.
- von Helversen B, Mata R (2012) Losing a dime with a satisfied mind: positive affect predicts less search in sequential decision making. Psychol Aging 27(4) 825-839. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027845
- Walker N, Fain B, Fisk AD, McGuire CL (1997) Ageing and decision making: drivingrelated problem solving. Hum Factors 39(3):438-444. https://doi.org/10.1518/001872097778827188
- Wang YX, Ruhe G (2007) The Cognitive Process of Decision Making. International Conference on Cognitive Informatics 1(2):73-85.
- Wayde EN, Black SR, Gilpin A (2017) Decision-making quality of younger and older adults in familiar and unfamiliar domains. Neuropsychol Dev Cogn B Ageing Neuropsychol Cogn 24(2):135-157. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2016.1176110
- Weissberger GH, Han SD, Yu L, Barnes LL, Lamar M, Bennett DA, Boyle PA (2021)
 Impact of Early Life Socioeconomic Status on Decision Making in Older Adults
 Without Dementia. Arch Gerontol Geriatr 95:04432.
 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2021.104432

AGEING AND DECISION-MAKING

- Wood S, Busemeyer J, Koling A, Cox CR, Davis H (2005) Older Adults as Adaptive
 Decision Makers: evidence from the iowa gambling task. Psychol Aging 20(2):220-225.
- Wood S, Hanoch Y, Barnes A, Liu PJ, Cummings J, Bhattacharya C, Rice T (2011)
 Numeracy and Medicare Part D: the importance of choice and literacy for numbers in optimizing decision making for Medicare's prescription drug program. Psychol Aging 26(2):295-307. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022028
- Worthy DA, Cooper JA, Byrne KA, Gorlick MA, Maddox WT (2014) State-based versus reward-based motivation in younger and older adults. Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci 14(4):1208-1220. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-014-0293-8
- Worthy DA, Davis T, Gorlick MA, Cooper JA, Bakkour A, Mumford JA, Poldrack RA, Maddox WT (2016) Neural correlates of state-based decision-making in younger and older adults. Neuroimage 130:13-23.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.12.004

- Worthy DA, Gorlick MA, Pacheco JL, Schnyer DM, Maddox WT (2011) With age comes wisdom: decision making in younger and older adults. Psychol Sci 22(11):1375-1380.
- Zamarian L, Sinz H, Bonatti E, Gamboz N, Delazer M (2008) Normal ageing affects decisions under ambiguity, but not decisions under risk. Neuropsychology 22(5):645-657. https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.22.5.645

themes 20034 Des 220000 Danksy 20003 Danksy 20003 Danksy 20003 12.000 20123 12.000 20123 12.000 20136 (1) 12.000 20123 (218:100/28)? Carpanene 2016 Carried 2017 Garney 2017 Compared 2017 Compared 2017 Compared 2017 (1) Compared 2017 International 2017 International 2017 International 2017 International 2017 Carried 2017 Carried 2017 Carried 2017 Carried 2017 E Remaine en 200 mil E Remaine en 200 mil E Dicense 200 mil LS Merica

3 2 4 9 1 2

SLOC-Notes of the second second Ø ł i ne 10.00 ALTZ [NOR, ALM]