

# Supplement

## Supplementary text

### Outliers

We excluded the datapoints (all measures of the timepoint) of all participants with measures deviating from the mean by 3SD for our core variables (LSNS-score, adjusted hippocampal volume, cognitive functions). In case of TICS-score deviations by 3SD we replaced the values with “NA” and hence did not include them in mediation analyses.

Considering confounders, highly implausible values ( $\pm 4$  SD) for CES-D-score or BMI were treated as missing datapoints and we replaced them with values imputed according to our imputation plans listed below in order not to overly reduce the sample size.

All outlier analyses were conducted separately for baseline and follow-up measurements.

### Imputation

The data on the control variables education, BMI, diabetes, hypertension, age, and gender were complete or mostly complete. Henceforth, we could impute missing datapoints without inducing severe bias by using the sample mean for continuous variables or values drawn from a distribution determined by the existing data for categorical variables.

However, CES-D-scores were an exception amongst our control variables because the questionnaires often missed a single or a few items. As suggested by Bono et al., we imputed up to 4 missing items per participant using the person mean (Bono et al., 2007). Similarly, we imputed up to one item in the LSNS and up to six items in the TICS using the person mean.

If results from one of the cognitive tests required to calculate a composite score for a cognitive function was missing, we calculated the score based on the average performance in the remainder of available tests contributing to the composite score, if at least two tests were available.

Fig. S3 provides an overview of missingness in relevant variables at different LSNS scores.

### Families of tests

The LMEs with hippocampal volume and the cognitive functions as dependent variables form one large family except for models regressing on the interaction of baseline LSNS and change in LSNS. In each family, we separately corrected model one and model two analyses resulting in two families of twelve tests. Additionally, we FDR-corrected each individual whole brain analysis using the sided two-stage adaptive FDR-correction in the FreeSurfer-toolbox.<sup>(66)</sup> All other analyses and the whole brain analyses were considered to be exploratory and must be evaluated as such.

### Education

The participants' education was assessed using an extensive questionnaire and given a score ranging from 1 (no degree at all) to 7 (A-levels + master's degree (or equivalent) or promotion) according to prior research (Lampert et al., 2012). The effects of education and the significance of different degrees are likely to be culture specific. Fortunately, a recent study

examined the effects of education in a population of elderly residents of the city of Leipzig. In this study education operationalised as having a tertiary degree or not was found to be a significant predictor of dementia incidence(Then et al., 2016). This is approximated with a cut-off at a score  $< 3.6$ .

## **Simulation Studies**

Although it is sometimes claimed that Bayesian Statistics do not require any multiplicity control(Gelman et al., 2012), we do not believe that this is the case in our study. A truly Bayesian approach would require researchers to adjust the priors to all other tests with non-independent hypotheses or datasets(Sjölander & Vansteelandt, 2019). This is hardly feasible and hence, in practice, Bayesian statistics are usually employed without taking all dependencies into account and their results are measured against thresholds similar to those of frequentist statistics. Fig. S4 shows how this results in an increasing familywise error rate (FWER) with an increasing number of tests in both Bayesian and frequentist statistics using an example from Keyzers et al.(Keyzers et al., 2020). De Jong has provided a solution for this problem for ANOVAs that has been implemented in the JASP software(Jong et al., 2019) but there is still a great lack of available tools for researchers using other statistical methods. Henceforth, we decided to conduct a simulation study to find a Bayes Factor threshold adjustment that should control our FWER similar to  $\alpha$ -adjustments in frequentist statistics.

To find the expected number of false positives for a given number of tests and threshold, we replaced the variables for baseline social isolation and change in social isolation with random normally distributed values with the same SD and kept the original dataset otherwise untouched. Then we calculated our 24 LMEs belonging to the families of tests with the modified dataset and repeated this process 42 times. At a BF threshold of 3, 14 of the 1008 tests were false positives and 881 were detected as true negatives. Fig. S5 shows a histogram of the resulting Bayes Factors. The study suggests that for the family size of twelve tests in our study a threshold of about 10.75 would ensure a FWER below 5%. Table S19 gives an overview of the false positives and FWERs.

Furthermore, we wanted to see how this threshold adjustment would affect the power of our study. For this simulation study we generated a dataset that closely resembles the actual dataset but has different regression coefficients for baseline social isolation and change in social isolation. Instead of the actual coefficients we set the effect size per point on the LSNS to 0.1, 0.2 or 0.5 years of baseline age. We simulated a dataset and calculated a Bayes Factor for each model and each effect size. As we only calculated the LMEs without interaction terms for reasons of simplicity this resulted in a number of 48 Bayes Factors from simulated data for each of our 13 runs totalling 624 tests. While our power for the smallest effect sizes was generally small ( $< 10\%$ ), it was 85.6% for baseline social isolation with an effect size of half a year of baseline age. Increasing the threshold to 10.75 would not substantially decrease it (81.7%). Tables S20-21 provide an overview of the percentages of false negatives and true positives using the thresholds 3 and 10.75.

## **Deviations from our Preregistration**

For the most part, we stuck closely to our preregistered plan in this study but departed from it at some points for different reasons.

We used the function `qvalue` instead of `p.adjust` for the FDR correction for the simple reason that it provides us with a more comprehensive output. As we set the argument `pi` to 1, `qvalue` is equivalent to the classic procedure (Storey, 2002).

We originally intended to first perform a full-null model comparison using an ANOVA and only follow this up with the function `drop1` in case of a significant value for the respective predictor of interest. Our intention was to avoid any multiplicity problems due to testing all predictors. Using the `scope` argument of `drop1` solved the problem more parsimoniously.

Our plan to exclude participants with two or more lesions in their MRI was the result of an internal equivocation regarding the meaning of an abbreviation. We excluded participants based on the type of lesions but not based on lesion count.

Furthermore, we used FIML for analyses using structural equation modelling. The similar results obtained using our preregistered approach can be found in the pre-print (Lammer et al., 2021).

Lastly, we changed from the term `sex` to `gender` as it seems more appropriate.

## **Software**

We performed most analyses using R (R Project for Statistical Computing, V3.6.1, RRID:SCR\_001905). For the whole brain analyses we used Matlab (MATLAB, V9.10 (2021a) RRID:SCR\_001622).

We used the package `lme4` (R package: `lme4`, RRID:SCR\_015654) to calculate LMEs in R. To obtain reliable p-values, we used the Satterthwaite option from the `lmerTest` package (R package: `lmerTest`, RRID:SCR\_015656) (Kuznetsova et al., 2017). In the whole brain analyses we employed the Matlab-toolbox provided by FreeSurfer to calculate vertex-wise LMEs (Bernal-Rusiel, Greve, et al., 2013). For mediation analyses and BLCS models we used the `sem` function from the `lavaan` package (Rosseel, 2012).

We calculated BFs for all LMEs in R using the `BayesFactor` package and the functions `posterior` and `generalTestBF` with default priors (Rouder & Morey, 2012).

FDR-correction was performed using the `qvalue` function (R package: `Qvalue`, RRID:SCR\_001073) in R and the sided two-stage adaptive FDR-correction in the `FreeSurfer-toolbox` (Bernal-Rusiel, Reuter, et al., 2013).

VIFs were calculated using the package `car` (J. Fox & Weisberg, 2019).

## **Reflexivity**

Reflexivity, a sensitivity to and acknowledgment of the ways in which scientists shape the collected data and research findings, is an established hallmark of scientific rigour in qualitative research (Mays & Pope, 2000; Sandelowski & Barroso, 2002). The challenges addressed by reflexivity are perhaps more pronounced in but by no means exclusive to qualitative studies. Nevertheless, (at least in an openly conducted form) it is largely absent from quantitative studies (Ryan & Golden, 2006). Methodological reforms in quantitative research like preregistrations and registered reports (Nosek et al., 2018; Nosek & Lakens, 2014) are valuable tools to limit the researchers' potential to make data fit their prior assumptions but their scope is limited. They do not address some of the most fundamental issues in epidemiology: Which analogies are used to make sense of the data, which questions

are being raised and answered and which theories are chosen to explain phenomena (Krieger, 2011)? Disclosing personal characteristics, researchers' values and positionality relative to the object of research (Berger, 2013) thus helps readers assess a study and its findings more thoroughly. Additionally, an external evaluation of the presence and prevalence of non-empirical decision vectors (Solomon, 2001) in a field of research can be greatly facilitated. Furthermore, as Stephen J. Gould has put it: "It is dangerous for a scholar even to imagine that he might attain complete neutrality, for then one stops being vigilant about personal preferences and their influences – and then one truly falls victim to the dictates of prejudice." (Gould, 1996)

Henceforth, I, as the first author, want to expand this study by a brief reflection on influences that might have played a role in the formation of this study. I am a medical doctoral student with no prior experience in research and conducted this study as the centrepiece of my planned dissertation. Thus, I entered this project with little prior knowledge. I believe that this both made me more flexible and restricted in my choices. On the one hand I was not dedicated to any specific research programme or topic, but on the other hand my reliance on the advice and support from more senior researchers made me emulate their work and methods in many aspects. Further, my worldview has probably made me tend to epidemiological theories (social epidemiology, eco-social theory) (Berkman et al., 2015; Krieger, 2014) broader than the study of lifestyle-factors and hence made me choose social isolation as my research topic. A further characteristic that might be of interest to readers, is that during the course of the research, two of my relatives struggled with dementia. Ultimately, this reflexivity is inherently limited, as the use of secondary data precludes me from reflecting on the pivotal processes of data acquisition and participant recruitment.

### **Explicit equations of all LMEs using the lme4 syntax.**

Variables in bold are dropped in the null model.

**H 1.1** Social isolation is negatively associated with hippocampal volume across individuals.

Model111: HCV ~ **LSNS\_bl** + LSNS\_change + age\_bl + age\_change + sex + (1|subject)

Model112: HCV ~ **LSNS\_bl** + LSNS\_change + age\_bl + age\_change + sex + hypertension  
+ diabetes + BMI + CESD + education + (1|subject)

**H 1.3** Social isolation is negatively associated with hippocampal volume within individuals.

Model131: HCV ~ LSNS\_bl + **LSNS\_change** + age\_bl + age\_change + sex + (1|subject)

Model132: HCV ~ LSNS\_bl + **LSNS\_change** + age\_bl + age\_change + sex + hypertension  
+ diabetes + BMI + CESD + education + (1|subject)

**H 1.5** Participants that are socially more isolated at baseline will experience aggravated age-related changes in hippocampal volume over the follow-up period.

Model151: HCV ~ LSNS\_bl + LSNS\_change + age\_bl + age\_change +  
**LSNS\_bl\*age\_change** + sex + (1|subject)

Model152: HCV ~ LSNS\_bl + LSNS\_change + age\_bl + age\_change +

**LSNS\_bl\*age\_change** + sex + hypertension + diabetes + BMI + CES.D +  
education + (1|subject)

**H 2.1** Social isolation is negatively associated with cognitive functions across individuals.

Model211a: executive function ~ **LSNS\_bl** + LSNS\_change + age\_bl + age\_change + sex +  
(1|subject)

Model212a: executive function ~ **LSNS\_bl** + LSNS\_change + age\_bl + age\_change + sex +  
hypertension + diabetes + BMI + CES.D + education + (1|subject)

Model211b: memory performance ~ **LSNS\_bl** + LSNS\_change + age\_bl + age\_change +  
sex + (1|subject)

Model212b: memory performance ~ **LSNS\_bl** + LSNS\_change + age\_bl + age\_change + sex  
+ hypertension + diabetes + BMI + CES.D + education + (1|subject)

Model211c: processing speed ~ **LSNS\_bl** + LSNS\_change + age\_bl + age\_change +  
sex + (1|subject)

Model212c: processing speed ~ **LSNS\_bl** + LSNS\_change + age\_bl + age\_change + sex +  
hypertension + diabetes + BMI + CES.D + education + (1|subject)

**H 2.2** Social isolation is negatively associated with cognitive functions within individuals.

Model221a: executive function ~ LSNS\_bl + **LSNS\_change** + age\_bl + age\_change + sex +  
(1|subject)

Model222a: executive function ~ LSNS\_bl + **LSNS\_change** + age\_bl + age\_change + sex +  
hypertension + diabetes + BMI + CES.D + education + (1|subject)

Model221b: memory performance ~ LSNS\_bl + **LSNS\_change** + age\_bl + age\_change +  
sex + (1|subject)

Model222b: memory performance ~ LSNS\_bl + **LSNS\_change** + age\_bl + age\_change + sex  
+ hypertension + diabetes + BMI + CES.D + education + (1|subject)

Model221c: processing speed ~ LSNS\_bl + **LSNS\_change** + age\_bl + age\_change +  
sex + (1|subject)

Model222c: processing speed ~ LSNS\_bl + **LSNS\_change** + age\_bl + age\_change + sex +  
hypertension + diabetes + BMI + CES.D + education + (1|subject)

**H 2.3** Participants that are socially more baseline will experience aggravated age-related  
changes in cognitive function over the follow-up period.

Model231a: executive function ~ LSNS\_bl + age\_bl + age\_change + **LSNS\_bl\*age\_change**

+ sex + (1|subject)

Model231a: executive function ~ LSNS\_bl + age\_bl + age\_change + **LSNS\_bl\*age\_change**  
+ sex + hypertension + diabetes + BMI + CES.D + education + (1|subject)

Model231b: memory performance ~ LSNS\_bl + age\_bl + age\_change +  
**LSNS\_bl\*age\_change** + sex + (1|subject)

Model231b: memory performance~ LSNS\_bl + age\_bl + age\_change +  
**LSNS\_bl\*age\_change** + sex + hypertension + diabetes + BMI + CES.D + education  
+ (1|subject)

Model231c: processing speed ~ LSNS\_bl + age\_bl + age\_change + **LSNS\_bl\*age\_change**  
+ sex + (1|subject)

Model231c: processing speed~ LSNS\_bl + age\_bl + age\_change + **LSNS\_bl\*age\_change**  
+ sex + hypertension + diabetes + BMI + CES.D + education + (1|subject)

**H 5.1** In people who are socially more isolated at baseline, an increase in social isolation from baseline to follow-up will have a stronger negative association with HCV than in people who are less socially isolated at baseline.

Model511: HCV ~ LSNS\_bl + LSNS\_change + **LSNS\_bl\*LSNS\_change** + age\_bl +  
age\_change + sex + (1|subject)

Model512: HCV ~ LSNS\_bl + LSNS\_change + **LSNS\_bl\*LSNS\_change** +  
age\_bl + age\_change + sex + hypertension + diabetes + BMI + CES.D +  
education + (1|subject)

**Explicit equations of all LMEs using the FreeSurfer LME syntax.**

**H 1.2** Social isolation is negatively associated with vertex-wise cortical thickness across individuals.

For model 1 we built a matrix consisting of six columns: intercept (all ones), age\_bl, age\_change, sex, LSNS\_bl and LSNS\_change.

The corresponding contrast matrix was [0 0 0 0 1 0].

For model 2 we built a matrix consisting of eleven columns: intercept (all ones), age\_bl, age\_change, sex, hypertension, diabetes, education, BMI, CES\_D, LSNS\_bl and LSNS\_change.

The corresponding contrast matrix was [0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0].

**H 1.4** Social isolation is negatively associated with vertex-wise cortical thickness within

individuals.

For model 1 we built a matrix consisting of six columns: intercept (all ones), age\_bl, age\_change, sex, LSNS\_bl and LSNS\_change.

The corresponding contrast matrix was [0 0 0 0 0 1].

For model 2 we built a matrix consisting of eleven columns: intercept (all ones), age\_bl, age\_change, sex, hypertension, diabetes, education, BMI, CES\_D, LSNS\_bl and LSNS\_change.

The corresponding contrast matrix was [0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1].

**H 1.6** Participants that are socially more isolated at baseline, will experience aggravated age-related changes in cortical thickness over the follow-up period.

For model 1 we built a matrix consisting of seven columns: intercept (all ones), age\_bl, age\_change, sex, LSNS\_bl, LSNS\_change and LSNS\_bl\*age\_change. The last term is an interaction between baseline LSNS and age\_change.


The corresponding contrast matrix was [0 0 0 0 0 0 1].

For model 2 we built a matrix consisting of twelve columns: intercept (all ones), age\_bl, age\_change, sex, hypertension, diabetes, education, BMI, CES\_D, LSNS\_bl, LSNS\_change and LSNS\_bl\*age\_change. The last term is an interaction between baseline LSNS and age\_change.

The corresponding contrast matrix was [0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1].

**Fig. S1**


Directed acyclic graphs demonstrating the theoretical underpinnings of model 1 and 2.





**Fig. S2**

Simplified plot of the bivariate latent change score models



LSNS, Lubben Social Network Scale; HCV, hippocampal volume; BL, baseline; FU, follow-up;  $\Delta$ , change in.


The blue arrows show our paths of interest.

Fig. S3

**A**




**B**




A) Histogram of LSNS scores by individual observation. B) Heatmap of proportional missingness of variables for different LSNS scores.

**Fig. S4**



**Fig. S5**

Histogram of BFs with randomly simulated values for our predictors of interest.



The red lines show the traditional thresholds at  $1/3$  and  $3$ .

**Table S1**

fit index	311	ok?	411a	ok?	411b	ok?	411c	ok?
chisq	3.765		0.842		0.238		0.160	
df	1.000		1.000		1.000		1.000	
p-value	0.052	good fit	0.359	good fit	0.625	good fit	0.689	good fit
chisq/df	3.765	unacceptable fit	0.842	good fit	0.238	good fit	0.160	good fit
rmsea	0.042	good fit	0.000	good fit	0.000	good fit	0.000	good fit
rmsea_lower	0.000		0.000		0.000		0.000	
rmsea_upper	0.091		0.065		0.053		0.050	
srmr	0.019	good fit	0.003	good fit	0.001	good fit	0.001	good fit
nnfi	0.945	unacceptable fit	1.003	unacceptable fit	1.012	unacceptable fit	1.021	unacceptable fit
cfi	0.996	good fit	1.000	good fit	1.000	good fit	1.000	good fit

**Fit indices of mediation analyses of model 1.** chisq, chi squared; df, degrees of freedom

311: Indirect effect of social isolation on hippocampal volume via chronic stress

411a: Indirect effect of social isolation on executive functions via hippocampal volume

411b: Indirect effect of social isolation on memory via hippocampal volume

411c: Indirect effect of social isolation on processing speed via hippocampal volume

**Table S2**

fit index	312	ok?	412a	ok?	412b	ok?	412c	ok?
chisq	9.260		0.083		0.958		0.068	
df	5.000		1.000		1.000		1.000	
p-value	0.099	good fit	0.773	good fit	0.328	good fit	0.794	good fit
chisq/df	1.852	good fit	0.083	good fit	0.958	good fit	0.068	good fit
rmsea	0.023	good fit	0.000	good fit	0.000	good fit	0.000	good fit
rmsea_lower	0.000		0.000		0.000		0.000	
rmsea_upper	0.047		0.045		0.066		0.043	
srmr	0.017	good fit	0.001	good fit	0.002	good fit	0.000	good fit
nnfi	0.972	good fit	1.014	unacceptable fit	1.001	unacceptable fit	1.026	unacceptable fit
cfi	0.994	good fit	1.000	good fit	1.000	good fit	1.000	good fit

**Fit indices of mediation analyses of model 2.** chisq, chi squared; df, degrees of freedom

312: Indirect effect of social isolation on hippocampal volume via chronic stress

412a: Indirect effect of social isolation on executive functions via hippocampal volume

412b: Indirect effect of social isolation on memory via hippocampal volume

412c: Indirect effect of social isolation on processing speed via hippocampal volume

**Table S3**

dv	Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR	BF
Hippo-campal Volume	1	LSNS_base	-5.500	-9.122, -1.878	0.0015**	0.0044**	14.61**
		LSNS_change	-4.894	-8.492, -1.29	0.0039**	0.0095**	2.9
		age_base	-25.755	-28.582, -22.929			
		age_change	-27.383	-29.659, -25.115			
		gender	-48.683	-85.261, -12.107			
	2	LSNS_base	-5.672	-9.503, -1.84	0.0019**	0.0075**	19.51**
		LSNS_change	-4.928	-8.741, -1.107	0.0058**	0.0174*	3.31*
		age_base	-23.879	-26.9, -20.858			
		age_change	-27.725	-30.141, -25.32			
		gender	-47.733	-85.365, -10.105			
		BMI	18.831	-0.946, 38.609			
		CESD	13.369	-5.716, 32.455			
		diabetes	-103.777	-155.724, -51.827			
		education	-85.695	-147.143, -24.244			
hypertension	-29.051	-69.373, 11.27					
Executive Functions	1	LSNS_base	-0.026	-0.035, -0.017	8.4e-09****	1.0e-07****	1.5e+06****
		LSNS_change	0.003	-0.011, 0.018	0.6787	0.787	0.08
		age_base	-0.020	-0.027, -0.013			
		age_change	-0.053	-0.063, -0.042			

<b>dv</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Predictor</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>FDR</b>	<b>BF</b>
		gender	-0.074	-0.166, 0.017			
	2	LSNS_base	-0.015	-0.025, -0.006	8e-04****	0.0046**	43.65***
		LSNS_change	0.006	-0.009, 0.021	0.7842	0.8555	0.07
		age_base	-0.014	-0.022, -0.007			
		age_change	-0.054	-0.065, -0.043			
		gender	-0.121	-0.214, -0.028			
		BMI	-0.079	-0.128, -0.031			
		CESD	-0.137	-0.183, -0.09			
		diabetes	-0.073	-0.201, 0.054			
		education	-0.351	-0.505, -0.196			
		hypertension	-0.078	-0.177, 0.021			
Memory	1	LSNS_base	-0.014	-0.022, -0.006	5e-04****	0.002**	49.05***
		LSNS_change	-0.013	-0.026, 0	0.0262*	0.0449*	1.12
		age_base	-0.036	-0.042, -0.029			
		age_change	-0.018	-0.027, -0.009			
		gender	-0.381	-0.465, -0.298			
	2	LSNS_base	-0.008	-0.016, 0.001	0.0452*	0.0775	1.25
		LSNS_change	-0.009	-0.023, 0.005	0.1046	0.1569	0.48
		age_base	-0.033	-0.04, -0.026			
age_change		-0.017	-0.027, -0.008				



dv	Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR	BF	
Processing Speed		gender	-0.424	-0.51, -0.338				
		BMI	-0.030	-0.076, 0.015				
		CESD	-0.117	-0.16, -0.073				
		diabetes	-0.045	-0.162, 0.072				
		education	-0.166	-0.306, -0.026				
		hypertension	0.025	-0.066, 0.116				
		1	LSNS_base	-0.018	-0.026, -0.011	1.7e-06****	1.0e-05****	9.4e+03****
			LSNS_change	-0.008	-0.021, 0.005	0.1087	0.163	0.39
			age_base	-0.038	-0.044, -0.032			
			age_change	-0.033	-0.043, -0.024			
			gender	-0.112	-0.188, -0.035			
		2	LSNS_base	-0.018	-0.026, -0.01	9.6e-06****	1e-04****	2.5e+03****
LSNS_change			-0.012	-0.025, 0.001	0.038*	0.076	1.33	
age_base			-0.036	-0.042, -0.029				
age_change			-0.031	-0.041, -0.022				
gender			-0.135	-0.214, -0.055				
BMI			-0.025	-0.066, 0.016				
CESD			-0.024	-0.063, 0.016				
diabetes			0.022	-0.086, 0.131				
education			-0.161	-0.29, -0.031				

<b>dv</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Predictor</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>FDR</b>	<b>BF</b>
		hypertension	-0.048	-0.132, 0.036			

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of models without interaction terms.** \*  
p<0.05, BF>3; \*\* p<0.01, BF>10; \*\*\* p<0.001, BF>30; \*\*\*\* p<0.0001, BF>100; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; LSNS\_base, baseline Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS\_change, change in Lubben Social Network Score; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression  
full model1: dv~LSNS\_base+LSNS\_change+age\_base+age\_change+gender  
full model2: model1 + hypertension+diabetes+education+BMI+CESD  
The unit of effect sizes on hippocampal volume and cognitive functions are mm<sup>3</sup>/point on the LSNS and standard deviation/point on the LSNS, respectively.

**Table S4**

<b>dv</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Predictor</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>FDR</b>	<b>BF</b>
Hippocampal Volume	1	LSNS_base*age_change	-0.556	-1.099, -0.014	0.0223*	0.0446*	0.52
		LSNS_base	-5.033	-8.682, -1.383			
		LSNS_change	-6.630	-10.591, -2.665			
		age_base	-25.728	-28.554, -22.902			
		age_change	-19.876	-27.531, -12.217			
		gender	-48.216	-84.786, -11.649			
	2	LSNS_base*age_change	-0.538	-1.107, 0.03	0.0318*	0.076	0.63
		LSNS_base	-5.211	-9.072, -1.35			
		LSNS_change	-6.541	-10.702, -2.374			
		age_base	-23.854	-26.874, -20.834			
		age_change	-20.416	-28.492, -12.334			
		gender	-47.198	-84.822, -9.579			
		BMI	18.804	-0.965, 38.576			
		CESD	13.639	-5.442, 32.721			
		diabetes	-103.725	-155.653, -51.793			
		education	-85.668	-147.094, -24.239			
		hypertension	-28.670	-68.981, 11.639			
		Executive Functions	1	LSNS_base*age_change	0.001	-0.001, 0.003	0.7946
LSNS_base	-0.028			-0.037, -0.018			
LSNS_change	0.006			-0.01, 0.021			
age_base	-0.020			-0.027, -0.013			

dv	Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR	BF
		age_change	-0.066	-0.098, -0.033			
		gender	-0.075	-0.166, 0.017			
	2	LSNS_base*age_change	0.002	-0.001, 0.004	0.9062	0.9062	0.07
		LSNS_base	-0.018	-0.028, -0.008			
		LSNS_change	0.010	-0.006, 0.026			
		age_base	-0.014	-0.022, -0.007			
		age_change	-0.076	-0.111, -0.041			
		gender	-0.122	-0.215, -0.029			
		BMI	-0.079	-0.127, -0.03			
		CESD	-0.137	-0.184, -0.091			
		diabetes	-0.075	-0.203, 0.053			
		education	-0.352	-0.507, -0.197			
		hypertension	-0.080	-0.179, 0.018			
Memory	1	LSNS_base*age_change	0.001	-0.001, 0.003	0.7214	0.787	0.06
		LSNS_base	-0.015	-0.024, -0.006			
		LSNS_change	-0.011	-0.026, 0.003			
		age_base	-0.036	-0.042, -0.029			
		age_change	-0.027	-0.057, 0.004			
		gender	-0.382	-0.465, -0.298			
	2	LSNS_base*age_change	0.001	-0.001, 0.003	0.7451	0.8555	0.08
		LSNS_base	-0.009	-0.018, 0.001			
		LSNS_change	-0.007	-0.022, 0.008			

<b>dv</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Predictor</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>FDR</b>	<b>BF</b>
		age_base	-0.033	-0.04, -0.026			
		age_change	-0.028	-0.059, 0.004			
		gender	-0.425	-0.51, -0.339			
		BMI	-0.030	-0.076, 0.015			
		CESD	-0.117	-0.16, -0.074			
		diabetes	-0.046	-0.163, 0.071			
		education	-0.167	-0.307, -0.027			
		hypertension	0.024	-0.067, 0.116			
Processing Speed	1	LSNS_base*age_change	-0.001	-0.003, 0.001	0.17	0.2266	0.25
		LSNS_base	-0.017	-0.025, -0.008			
		LSNS_change	-0.011	-0.025, 0.003			
		age_base	-0.038	-0.044, -0.032			
		age_change	-0.019	-0.05, 0.011			
		gender	-0.111	-0.187, -0.035			
	2	LSNS_base*age_change	-0.001	-0.003, 0.001	0.2411	0.3215	0.22
		LSNS_base	-0.017	-0.025, -0.008			
		LSNS_change	-0.014	-0.028, 0			
		age_base	-0.036	-0.042, -0.029			
		age_change	-0.021	-0.052, 0.011			
		gender	-0.134	-0.213, -0.055			
		BMI	-0.025	-0.066, 0.016			
		CESD	-0.023	-0.063, 0.016			
		diabetes	0.023	-0.085, 0.132			
		education	-0.160	-0.29, -0.031			

<b>dv</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Predictor</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>FDR</b>	<b>BF</b>
		hypertension	-0.047	-0.131, 0.037			

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of models with interaction term of baseline social isolation with change in age.** \*  $p < 0.05$ ,  $BF > 3$ ; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; LSNS\_base, baseline Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS\_change, change in Lubben Social Network Score; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression  
full model1:  $dv \sim LSNS\_base * age\_change + LSNS\_base + LSNS\_change + age\_base + age\_change + gender$   
full model2: model1 + hypertension + diabetes + education + BMI + CESD

**Table S5**

<b>dv</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Predictor</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>BF</b>
Hippocampal Volume	1	LSNS_base*LSNS_change	0.11	-0.61, 0.82	0.6146	0.03
		LSNS_base	-5.50	-9.12, -1.88		
		LSNS_change	-6.30	-16.43, 3.82		
		age_base	-25.75	-28.58, -22.93		
		age_change	-27.25	-29.69, -24.82		
		gender	-48.66	-85.24, -12.09		
	2	LSNS_base*LSNS_change	0.13	-0.62, 0.88	0.6335	0.06
		LSNS_base	-5.67	-9.5, -1.84		
		LSNS_change	-6.67	-17.4, 4.05		
		age_base	-23.88	-26.9, -20.86		
		age_change	-27.57	-30.14, -25.01		
		gender	-47.73	-85.36, -10.1		
		BMI	18.85	-0.92, 38.63		
		CESD	13.34	-5.74, 32.43		
diabetes	-103.63	-155.58, -51.68				
education	-85.72	-147.17, -24.27				
hypertension	-29.01	-69.34, 11.3				

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of models with interaction term of baseline social isolation with change in social isolation.** dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; LSNS\_base, baseline Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS\_change, change in Lubben Social Network Score; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression  
 full model1:  $dv \sim LSNS\_base + LSNS\_change + age\_base + age\_change + gender$   
 full model2:  $model1 + hypertension + diabetes + education + BMI + CESD$

**Table S6**

Mediator	dv	Model	Estimate	SE	z-value	p-value
TICS	Hippocampal Volume	1	-0.0005	0	-0.56	0.29
		2	-0.0004	0	-0.37	0.36
Hippocampal Volume	Executive Functions	1	-0.0010	0	-0.80	0.21
		2	-0.0013	0	-0.94	0.17
	Memory	1	-0.0010	0	-0.82	0.20
		2	-0.0013	0	-1.00	0.16
	Processing Speed	1	-0.0002	0	-0.27	0.40
		2	-0.0004	0	-0.38	0.35

**Indirect effects of social isolation on hippocampal volume and cognitive functions.** dv, dependent variable; SE, standard error; TICS, Trierer Inventar zum chronischen Stress (stress questionnaire)  
 model1: corrected for baseline age, change in age and gender  
 model2: model1 + hypertension+diabetes+education+BMI+CESD



**Table S7**

dv	Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	P-value	FDR	BF
Hippocampal Volume	1	LSNS_base	-5.5	-9.1, -1.9	0.0014**	0.0042**	18.65**
		LSNS_change	-5.4	-9, -1.8	0.0017**	0.0042**	7.6*
		age_base	-25.7	-28.6, -22.9			
		age_change	-25.5	-28.3, -22.7			
		pandemic	-38.5	-71.2, -5.8			
	2	LSNS_base	-5.7	-9.5, -1.9	0.0018**	0.0073**	20.97**
		LSNS_change	-5.5	-9.3, -1.7	0.0024**	0.0073**	6.8*
		age_base	-23.9	-26.9, -20.8			
		age_change	-25.8	-28.8, -22.9			
		pandemic	-38.8	-73.5, -3.8			

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of hippocampal volume models adjusting for the effect of lockdown measures.** \* p<0.05, BF>3; \*\* p<0.01, BF>10; \*\*\* p<0.001, BF>30; \*\*\*\* p<0.0001, BF>100; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; LSNS\_base, baseline Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS\_change, change in Lubben Social Network Score; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression; pandemic, 0/1 answered LSNS before/after beginning of 1st SARS-CoV-2 lockdown in Germany  
 full model1: dv~LSNS\_base+LSNS\_change+age\_base+age\_change+gender+pandemic  
 full model2: model1 + hypertension+diabetes+education+BMI+CESD  
 The effect sizes hardly change when including whether the LSNS was filled out after the begin of lockdown measures in the model. The effect of this control variable itself tends to be associated with smaller hippocampal volume but the confidence interval is very broad.

**Table S8**

<b>dv</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Predictor</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>FDR</b>	<b>BF</b>
Executive Functions	1	LSNS_base	-0.026	-0.035, -0.017	7.7e-09****	9.2e-08****	1.7e+06****
		LSNS_change	0.005	-0.01, 0.019	0.733	0.7911	0.08
		age_base	-0.020	-0.027, -0.013			
		age_change	-0.060	-0.073, -0.048			
		pandemic	0.133	0.004, 0.262			
	2	LSNS_base	-0.015	-0.025, -0.006	8e-04****	0.0046**	36.51***
		LSNS_change	0.007	-0.008, 0.022	0.8314	0.9067	0.09
		age_base	-0.014	-0.022, -0.007			
		age_change	-0.061	-0.074, -0.048			
		pandemic	0.136	0.001, 0.27			
Memory	1	LSNS_base	-0.014	-0.022, -0.006	5e-04****	0.0021**	49.92***
		LSNS_change	-0.014	-0.028, -0.001	0.0159*	0.0272*	1.89
		age_base	-0.036	-0.042, -0.029			
		age_change	-0.009	-0.02, 0.002			
		pandemic	-0.170	-0.29, -0.05			
	2	LSNS_base	-0.008	-0.017, 0.001	0.0444*	0.0761	1.33
		LSNS_change	-0.010	-0.024, 0.003	0.0698	0.1047	0.85
		age_base	-0.033	-0.04, -0.026			
		age_change	-0.010	-0.021, 0.002			

dv	Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR	BF
		pandemic	-0.158	-0.283, -0.031			
Processing Speed	1	LSNS_base	-0.018	-0.026, -0.011	1.7e-06****	1.0e-05****	9.7e+03****
		LSNS_change	-0.008	-0.021, 0.005	0.1055	0.1582	0.42
		age_base	-0.038	-0.044, -0.032			
		age_change	-0.032	-0.044, -0.021			
		pandemic	-0.020	-0.136, 0.097			
	2	LSNS_base	-0.018	-0.026, -0.01	9.6e-06****	1e-04****	2.3e+03****
		LSNS_change	-0.012	-0.025, 0.001	0.0366*	0.0732	1.49
		age_base	-0.036	-0.042, -0.029			
		age_change	-0.030	-0.042, -0.018			
		pandemic	-0.020	-0.14, 0.1			

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of cognitive function models adjusting for the effect of lockdown measures.** \* p<0.05, BF>3; \*\* p<0.01, BF>10; \*\*\* p<0.001, BF>30; \*\*\*\* p<0.0001, BF>100; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; LSNS\_base, baseline Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS\_change, change in Lubben Social Network Score; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression; pandemic, 0/1 answered LSNS before/after beginning of 1st SARS-CoV-2 lockdown in Germany  
full model1: dv~LSNS\_base+LSNS\_change+age\_base+age\_change+gender+pandemic  
full model2: model1 + hypertension+diabetes+education+BMI+CESD  
The effect sizes hardly change when including whether the LSNS was filled out after the begin of lockdown measures in the model. The effect of this control variable itself is inconsistent between the different models.

**Table S9**

<b>dv</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Predictor</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>FDR</b>	<b>BF</b>
Hippo- campal Volume	1	LSNS_base	-3.9	-7.3, -0.5	0.013*	0.0222*	2.39
		LSNS_change	-5.5	-8.5, -2.4	2e-04****	7e-04****	32.58***
		age_base	-27.3	-29.9, - 24.6			
		age_change	-28.6	-30.6, - 26.5			
	2	LSNS_base	-3.2	-6.8, 0.4	0.0399*	0.0684	0.97
		LSNS_change	-5.7	-9, -2.5	3e-04****	0.0017**	28.41**
		age_base	-25.5	-28.4, - 22.7			
		age_change	-29.0	-31.1, - 26.8			

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of hippocampal volume models based on datasets with reduced exclusion criteria.** \* p<0.05, BF>3; \*\* p<0.01, BF>10; \*\*\* p<0.001, BF>30; \*\*\*\* p<0.0001, BF>100; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; LSNS\_base, baseline Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS\_change, change in Lubben Social Network Score; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression  
full model1: dv~LSNS\_base+LSNS\_change+age\_base+age\_change+gender  
full model2: model1 + hypertension+diabetes+education+BMI+CESD

Participants were not excluded for intake of cancer or centrally active medication and cognitive impairment  
When applying less exclusion criteria, no major changes occur. For hippocampal volume baseline social isolation becomes deemphasized while the absolute effect size for change in social isolation becomes larger.

**Table S10**

dv	Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR	BF
Executive Functions	1	LSNS_base	-0.030	-0.038, -0.022	5.1e-13****	6.1e-12****	1.6e+10****
		LSNS_change	-0.009	-0.021, 0.003	0.0759	0.1138	0.5
		age_base	-0.017	-0.024, -0.011			
		age_change	-0.051	-0.06, -0.042			
	2	LSNS_base	-0.019	-0.028, -0.011	4.5e-06****	5.4e-05****	4.6e+03****
		LSNS_change	-0.005	-0.018, 0.008	0.2223	0.3335	0.27
		age_base	-0.011	-0.018, -0.005			
		age_change	-0.052	-0.062, -0.043			
Memory	1	LSNS_base	-0.017	-0.025, -0.009	2.6e-05****	1e-04****	745.27****
		LSNS_change	-0.015	-0.027, -0.003	0.0079**	0.0158*	3.1*
		age_base	-0.041	-0.048, -0.033			
		age_change	-0.024	-0.032, -0.015			
	2	LSNS_base	-0.009	-0.018, -0.001	0.0164*	0.0328*	2.91
		LSNS_change	-0.014	-0.026, -0.001	0.0143*	0.0328*	2.49
		age_base	-0.038	-0.045, -0.03			
		age_change	-0.025	-0.034, -0.016			
Processing Speed	1	LSNS_base	-0.015	-0.022, -0.008	6.1e-06****	3.7e-05****	2.6e+03****
		LSNS_change	-0.016	-0.026, -0.005	0.0022**	0.0053**	9.29*
		age_base	-0.038	-0.043, -0.033			

dv	Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR	BF
		age_change	-0.035	-0.043, -0.026			
	2	LSNS_base	-0.012	-0.019, -0.005	5e-04****	0.002**	58.77***
		LSNS_change	-0.017	-0.028, -0.006	0.0012**	0.0037**	21.76**
		age_base	-0.035	-0.04, -0.029			
		age_change	-0.033	-0.041, -0.025			

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of cognitive functions models based on datasets with reduced exclusion criteria.** \* p<0.05, BF>3; \*\* p<0.01, BF>10; \*\*\* p<0.001, BF>30; \*\*\*\* p<0.0001, BF>100; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; LSNS\_base, baseline Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS\_change, change in Lubben Social Network Score; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression  
full model1: dv~LSNS\_base+LSNS\_change+age\_base+age\_change+gender  
full model2: model1 + hypertension+diabetes+education+BMI+CESD

When applying less exclusion criteria, the direction and magnitude of effect sizes tends to stay the same. The direction of change in social isolation becomes negative but is still small. Most significances are more pronounced. Given the larger sample size, this is to be expected.

**Table S11**

dv	Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR	BF
Hippo-campal Volume	1	mean LSNS	-6.9	-11.3, -2.6	9e-04****	0.0036**	26.01**
		LSNS within	-4.7	-8.3, -1.1	0.0054**	0.0161*	1.92
		mean age	-26.1	-29.4, -22.7			
		age within	-26.5	-28.8, -24.2			
	2	mean LSNS	-6.7	-11.2, -2.1	0.0021**	0.0101*	17.76**
		LSNS within	-4.6	-8.4, -0.8	0.009**	0.027*	1.87
		mean age	-24.6	-28.1, -21			
		age within	-26.8	-29.2, -24.4			

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of hippocampal volume models only including participants with two timepoints.** \* p<0.05, BF>3; \*\* p<0.01, BF>10; \*\*\* p<0.001, BF>30; \*\*\*\* p<0.0001, BF>100; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; mean LSNS, subject's mean Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS within, within subject variation in Lubben Social Network Score; mean age, subject's mean age; age within, within subject variation in age; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression  
full model1: dv~LSNS\_base+LSNS\_change+age\_base+age\_change+gender  
full model2: model1 + hypertension+diabetes+education+BMI+CESD

In this sensitivity analysis only participants with two timepoints were included and standard mean and within scores rather than baseline and change scores were calculated. In terms of effect size and direction our original model is corroborated. Smaller measures of significance in this smaller sample were expectable.

**Table S12**

dv	Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR	BF
Executive Functions	1	mean LSNS	-0.027	-0.037, -0.016	5.9e-07****	7.1e-06****	2.7e+04****
		LSNS within	0.005	-0.011, 0.021	0.7316	0.7607	0.08
		mean age	-0.014	-0.023, -0.006			
		age within	-0.055	-0.066, -0.045			
	2	mean LSNS	-0.016	-0.027, -0.005	0.0025**	0.0101*	16.1**
		LSNS within	0.005	-0.012, 0.021	0.7176	0.7829	0.11
		mean age	-0.008	-0.016, 0.001			
		age within	-0.055	-0.065, -0.044			
Memory	1	mean LSNS	-0.010	-0.019, 0	0.0225*	0.045*	2.02
		LSNS within	-0.010	-0.024, 0.004	0.0874	0.1498	0.43
		mean age	-0.031	-0.039, -0.024			
		age within	-0.018	-0.027, -0.009			
	2	mean LSNS	-0.006	-0.016, 0.004	0.1243	0.2131	0.66
		LSNS within	-0.006	-0.021, 0.008	0.2046	0.307	0.3
		mean age	-0.027	-0.035, -0.02			
		age within	-0.016	-0.025, -0.006			
Processing Speed	1	mean LSNS	-0.015	-0.024, -0.006	4e-04****	0.0027**	58.1***
		LSNS within	-0.006	-0.02, 0.009	0.2218	0.3305	0.2
		mean age	-0.039	-0.046, -0.032			
		age within	-0.033	-0.043, -0.023			



dv	Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR	BF
	2	mean LSNS	-0.014	-0.024, -0.005	0.0017**	0.0101*	21.84**
		LSNS within	-0.011	-0.026, 0.004	0.0721	0.1441	0.66
		mean age	-0.038	-0.045, -0.031			
		age within	-0.031	-0.041, -0.021			

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of cognitive functions models only including participants with two timepoints.** \* p<0.05, BF>3; \*\* p<0.01, BF>10; \*\*\* p<0.001, BF>30; \*\*\*\* p<0.0001, BF>100; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; mean LSNS, subject's mean Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS within, within subject variation in Lubben Social Network Score; mean age, subject's mean age; age within, within subject variation in age; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression  
full model1: dv~LSNS\_base+LSNS\_change+age\_base+age\_change+gender  
full model2: model1 + hypertension+diabetes+education+BMI+CESD  
In this sensitivity analysis only participants with two timepoints were included and standard mean and within scores rather than baseline and change scores were calculated. As for hippocampal volume, this sensitivity analysis corroborates our original model.

**Table S13**

dv	Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	P-value	FDR	BF
Hippocampal Volume	1	LSNS_base	-5.5	-9.1, -1.9	0.0015**	0.0044**	19.53**
		LSNS_change	-4.9	-8.5, -1.3	0.0038**	0.0091**	2.34
		age_base	-25.8	-28.6, -22.9			
		age_change	-27.4	-29.6, -25.1			
	2	LSNS_base	-5.7	-9.5, -1.9	0.0018**	0.0073**	17.34**
		LSNS_change	-4.9	-8.7, -1.1	0.0055**	0.0164*	3.37*
		age_base	-24.2	-27.2, -21.1			
		age_change	-27.7	-30.1, -25.3			
		hypertension	-15.6	-57.1, 25.8			

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of hippocampal volume models using a hypertension cut-off of 140mmHg.** \* p<0.05, BF>3; \*\* p<0.01, BF>10; \*\*\* p<0.001, BF>30; \*\*\*\* p<0.0001, BF>100; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; mean LSNS, subject's mean Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS within, within subject variation in Lubben Social Network Score; mean age, subject's mean age; age within, within subject variation in age; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression  
full model1: dv~LSNS\_base+LSNS\_change+age\_base+age\_change+gender  
full model2: model1 + hypertension+diabetes+education+BMI+CESD  
Social isolation significantly predicts hippocampal volume after multiplicity control. Bayes Factors provide strong evidence in favour of the alternative hypotheses for baseline social isolation and anecdotal to moderate evidence for change in social isolation. The effect size of one point on the LSNS is equivalent to a baseline age difference of around two and a half months.

**Table S14**



<b>dv</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Predictor</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>FDR</b>	<b>BF</b>
Executive Functions	1	LSNS_base	-0.026	-0.035, -0.017	8.2e-09	9.9e-08	1.5e+06
		LSNS_change	0.003	-0.011, 0.018	0.6775	0.7893	0.08
		age_base	-0.019	-0.026, -0.012			
		age_change	-0.053	-0.063, -0.042			
	2	LSNS_base	-0.015	-0.025, -0.006	8e-04	0.0047	50.05
		LSNS_change	0.006	-0.009, 0.021	0.78	0.851	0.09
		age_base	-0.013	-0.021, -0.006			
		age_change	-0.054	-0.065, -0.044			
		hypertension	-0.120	-0.222, -0.018			
	Memory	1	LSNS_base	-0.014	-0.022, -0.006	5e-04	0.002
LSNS_change			-0.013	-0.026, 0	0.0265	0.0454	1.11
age_base			-0.036	-0.042, -0.029			
age_change			-0.018	-0.027, -0.009			
2		LSNS_base	-0.007	-0.016, 0.001	0.0501	0.086	1.15
		LSNS_change	-0.009	-0.023, 0.005	0.1033	0.1549	0.49
		age_base	-0.032	-0.039, -0.025			
		age_change	-0.018	-0.027, -0.008			
		hypertension	-0.006	-0.1, 0.089			
Processing Speed		1	LSNS_base	-0.018	-0.025, -0.01	2.4e-06	1.4e-05
	LSNS_change		-0.008	-0.021, 0.005	0.1074	0.1611	0.36
	age_base		-0.038	-0.044, -0.032			
	age_change		-0.034	-0.043, -0.024			

dv	Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	P-value	FDR	BF
	2	LSNS_base	-0.018	-0.026, -0.009	1.2e-05	1e-04	1.8e+03
		LSNS_change	-0.012	-0.025, 0.001	0.0371	0.0741	1.56
		age_base	-0.037	-0.043, -0.031			
		age_change	-0.032	-0.041, -0.022			
		hypertension	-0.002	-0.088, 0.085			

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of cognitive functions models using a hypertension cut-off of 140mmHg.** \*  $p < 0.05$ ,  $BF > 3$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ,  $BF > 10$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ ,  $BF > 30$ ; \*\*\*\*  $p < 0.0001$ ,  $BF > 100$ ; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; mean LSNS, subject's mean Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS within, within subject variation in Lubben Social Network Score; mean age, subject's mean age; age within, within subject variation in age; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression  
full model1:  $dv \sim LSNS\_base + LSNS\_change + age\_base + age\_change + gender$   
full model2: model1 + hypertension + diabetes + education + BMI + CESD  
Baseline social isolation significantly predicts cognitive functions after FDR-correction and BFs provide very strong to decisive evidence in favour of the alternative hypotheses. Only for model 2 of memory evidence is weak. No association of change in social isolation with executive functions is detected and evidence for associations with memory and processing speed are limited.

**Table S15**

<b>dv</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Predictor</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>FDR</b>	<b>BF</b>
Hippo-campal Volume	1	LSNS_base	-7.3	-11.2, -3.4	1e-04	4e-04	192.27
		LSNS_change	-4.5	-8.2, -0.8	0.0093	0.0223	1.18
		age_base	-24.5	-27.5, -21.6			
		age_change	-27.7	-30.1, -25.3			
	2	LSNS_base	-7.1	-11.2, -3	4e-04	0.0042	81.34
		LSNS_change	-4.6	-8.6, -0.7	0.0103	0.0309	1.7
		age_base	-22.4	-25.6, -19.2			
		age_change	-27.7	-30.2, -25.2			

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of hippocampal volume models excluding participants with MMSE score < 27.** \* p<0.05, BF>3; \*\* p<0.01, BF>10; \*\*\* p<0.001, BF>30; \*\*\*\*

p<0.0001, BF>100; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; mean LSNS, subject's mean Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS within, within subject variation in Lubben Social Network Score; mean age, subject's mean age; age within, within subject variation in age; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression

full model1: dv~LSNS\_base+LSNS\_change+age\_base+age\_change+gender

full model2: model1 + hypertension+diabetes+education+BMI+CESD

Social isolation significantly predicts hippocampal volume after multiplicity control. Bayes Factors provide strong evidence in favour of the alternative hypotheses for baseline social isolation and anecdotal to moderate evidence for change in social isolation. The effect size of one point on the LSNS is equivalent to a baseline age difference of around two and a half months.

**Table S16**

Model	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR	BF
1	LSNS_base	-0.023	-0.033, -0.013	1.9e-06	2.3e-05	9.4e+03
	LSNS_change	0.004	-0.01, 0.019	0.7159	0.7159	0.08
	age_base	-0.016	-0.024, -0.009			
	age_change	-0.058	-0.068, -0.047			
2	LSNS_base	-0.014	-0.024, -0.003	0.0049	0.0194	8.81
	LSNS_change	0.007	-0.008, 0.022	0.8175	0.8384	0.09
	age_base	-0.012	-0.02, -0.004			
	age_change	-0.058	-0.069, -0.048			
1	LSNS_base	-0.014	-0.023, -0.005	0.0011	0.0034	24.53
	LSNS_change	-0.013	-0.027, 0.001	0.0308	0.0615	1.08
	age_base	-0.033	-0.039, -0.026			
	age_change	-0.028	-0.038, -0.018			
2	LSNS_base	-0.009	-0.018, 0.001	0.0355	0.0852	1.66
	LSNS_change	-0.009	-0.023, 0.006	0.1181	0.169	0.51
	age_base	-0.029	-0.036, -0.021			
	age_change	-0.026	-0.036, -0.016			
1	LSNS_base	-0.016	-0.024, -0.008	1e-04	4e-04	198.61
	LSNS_change	-0.007	-0.02, 0.006	0.1509	0.2012	0.31
	age_base	-0.038	-0.045, -0.032			
	age_change	-0.038	-0.047, -0.028			
2	LSNS_base	-0.014	-0.023, -0.005	8e-04	0.005	40.5
	LSNS_change	-0.010	-0.023, 0.004	0.0827	0.1418	0.8
	age_base	-0.036	-0.043, -0.029			
	age_change	-0.035	-0.045, -0.025			

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of cognitive functions models excluding participants with MMSE score < 27.** \* p<0.05, BF>3; \*\* p<0.01, BF>10; \*\*\* p<0.001, BF>30; \*\*\*\* p<0.0001, BF>100; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; BF, Bayes Factor in favour of alternative hypothesis; mean LSNS, subject's mean Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS within, within subject variation in Lubben Social Network Score; mean age, subject's mean age; age within, within subject variation in age; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression  
full model1: dv~LSNS\_base+LSNS\_change+age\_base+age\_change+gender  
full model2: model1 + hypertension+diabetes+education+BMI+CESD  
Baseline social isolation significantly predicts cognitive functions after FDR-correction and BFs provide very strong to decisive evidence in favour of the alternative hypotheses. Only for model 2 of memory evidence is weak. No association of change in social isolation with executive functions is detected and evidence for associations with memory and processing speed are limited.

**Table S17**



dv	Model	gender	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR
Hippocampal Volume	1	female	LSNS_base	-7.265	-12.546, -1.984	0.0036*	0.0142*
			LSNS_change	-3.826	-8.389, 0.75	0.0503	0.1006
			LSNS_base*age_change	-0.311	-0.992, 0.37	0.1847	0.2463
			LSNS_base*LSNS_change	-0.026	-0.865, 0.812	0.4755	
	1	male	LSNS_base	-4.418	-9.407, 0.572	0.0414*	0.0827
			LSNS_change	-5.821	-11.462, -0.17	0.0218*	0.0655
			LSNS_base*age_change	-0.793	-1.656, 0.066	0.0356*	0.0827
			LSNS_base*LSNS_change	0.426	-0.831, 1.696	0.7466	
	2	female	LSNS_base	-9.402	-15.042, -3.762	6e-04****	0.0068*
			LSNS_change	-3.452	-8.28, 1.395	0.0807	0.1614
			LSNS_base*age_change	-0.255	-0.971, 0.462	0.2422	0.3229
			LSNS_base*LSNS_change	0.027	-0.842, 0.895	0.5248	
	2	male	LSNS_base	-3.046	-8.299, 2.207	0.1277	0.2554
			LSNS_change	-6.344	-12.289, -0.39	0.0185*	0.1111
			LSNS_base*age_change	-0.796	-1.692, 0.095	0.0403*	0.1209
			LSNS_base*LSNS_change	0.448	-0.876, 1.783	0.7464	
Executive Functions	1	female	LSNS_base	-0.032	-0.045, -0.018	1.6e-06****	1.9e-05****
			LSNS_change	-0.006	-0.026, 0.014	0.2797	0.3357

dv	Model	gender	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR	
	1	male	LSNS_base*age_change	0.001	-0.002, 0.004	0.7135	0.7135	
			LSNS_base	-0.022	-0.034, -0.009	4e-04****	0.0022*	
			LSNS_change	0.013	-0.007, 0.033	0.9021	0.9021	
	2	female	LSNS_base*age_change	0.001	-0.002, 0.005	0.8056	0.8789	
			LSNS_base	-0.020	-0.034, -0.006	0.0032*	0.019*	
			LSNS_change	0.001	-0.02, 0.022	0.547	0.6564	
	2	male	LSNS_base*age_change	0.002	-0.002, 0.005	0.8642	0.8642	
			LSNS_base	-0.012	-0.025, 0	0.0293*	0.1173	
			LSNS_change	0.012	-0.009, 0.033	0.8653	0.8653	
	Memory	1	female	LSNS_base*age_change	0.000	-0.003, 0.003	0.5141	0.5609
				LSNS_base	-0.011	-0.023, 0.001	0.0345*	0.0827
				LSNS_change	-0.017	-0.034, -0.001	0.0218*	0.0655
1		male	LSNS_base*age_change	0.001	-0.002, 0.005	0.7892	0.8789	
			LSNS_base	-0.016	-0.028, -0.004	0.0035*	0.0141*	
			LSNS_change	-0.007	-0.028, 0.013	0.2454	0.4081	
2		female	LSNS_base	-0.004	-0.017, 0.008	0.2417	0.3229	
			LSNS_base*age_change	0.000	-0.002, 0.003	0.612	0.6677	
			LSNS_change	-0.015	-0.032, 0.003	0.0494*	0.1185	
2		male	LSNS_base	-0.010	-0.022, 0.003	0.0644	0.1544	

dv	Model	gender	Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	FDR
Processing Speed			LSNS_change	-0.002	-0.023, 0.02	0.4446	0.5928
			LSNS_base*age_change	0.001	-0.002, 0.004	0.7429	0.8653
	1	female	LSNS_base	-0.017	-0.028, -0.005	0.0028*	0.0142*
			LSNS_change	-0.009	-0.026, 0.009	0.1632	0.2448
			LSNS_base*age_change	-0.002	-0.005, 0.001	0.127	0.2177
	1	male	LSNS_base	-0.020	-0.03, -0.01	6.6e-05****	8e-04****
			LSNS_change	-0.006	-0.025, 0.013	0.2721	0.4081
			LSNS_base*age_change	0.000	-0.003, 0.003	0.4427	0.5903
	2	female	LSNS_base	-0.016	-0.029, -0.004	0.0053*	0.0211*
			LSNS_change	-0.015	-0.033, 0.002	0.0449*	0.1185
			LSNS_base*age_change	-0.001	-0.004, 0.002	0.1922	0.3229
	2	male	LSNS_base	-0.018	-0.029, -0.008	4e-04****	0.0051*
LSNS_change			-0.007	-0.028, 0.013	0.2368	0.4059	
LSNS_base*age_change			0.000	-0.003, 0.003	0.4265	0.5928	

**Adjusted regression coefficients and measures of significance of models stratified by gender.** \* p<0.05; \*\* p<0.01; \*\*\* p<0.001; \*\*\*\* p<0.0001; dv, dependent variable; CI, confidence interval; FDR, p-values after FDR-correction; LSNS\_base, baseline Lubben Social Network Score; LSNS\_change, change in Lubben Social Network Score; CESD, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression  
full model1: dv~LSNS\_base+LSNS\_change+age\_base+age\_change  
full model2: model1 + hypertension+diabetes+education+BMI+CESD  
The unit of effect sizes on hippocampal volume and cognitive functions for non-interaction models are mm<sup>3</sup>/point on the LSNS and standard deviation/point on the LSNS, respectively. For interaction models the unit in the denominator is multiplied by year or point on the LSNS.

**Table S18**

<b>dv</b>	<b>predictor</b>	<b>estimate</b>	<b>se</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>q value</b>
$\Delta$ HCV	LSNS_base	-0.002	0.005	0.315	0.420
$\Delta$ LSNS	HCV_base	-0.139	0.175	0.213	0.284
$\Delta$ EF	LSNS_base	-0.014	0.007	0.029*	0.116
$\Delta$ LSNS	EF_base	-0.149	0.170	0.189	0.284
$\Delta$ Memo	LSNS_base	0.001	0.006	0.576	0.576
$\Delta$ LSNS	Memo_base	-0.308	0.168	0.033*	0.133
$\Delta$ PS	LSNS_base	-0.005	0.008	0.250	0.420
$\Delta$ LSNS	PS_base	-0.102	0.179	0.285	0.285

**Relevant Regressions of Bivariate Latent Change Score Models.** \*,  $p < 0.05$ ; dv, dependent variable; se, standard error; \_base, baseline score of;  $\Delta$ , change in; LSNS, Lubben Social Network Score; HCV, z-transformed hippocampal volume; EF, executive functions; Memo, memory; PS, processing speed

**Table S19**

<b>BFA0</b>	<b>FWER in %</b>	<b>n</b>
15.744	1.18	1
13.634	2.36	2
13.139	3.51	3
10.926	4.66	4
10.632	5.79	5
9.196	6.91	6
8.728	8.02	7
8.510	9.12	8
7.749	10.20	9
7.191	11.28	10
6.081	12.34	11
4.746	13.39	12
4.044	14.42	13
4.003	15.45	14

**Simulated Bayes Factors above the threshold of 3.** BFA0, Sided Bayes factor in favour of the alternative hypothesis; FWER, familywise error rate if the threshold would be set just below BFA0

In the simulation with randomly simulated values for our predictors of interest, 14 BFs exceeded the standard threshold of three. Given a family size of 12 tests, a threshold of 10.75 would maintain the FWER below 5%.

**Table S20**

Category	BFA0b > 3 in %	$3 \geq$ BFA0b $\geq$ 1/3 in %	BFA0b < 1/3 in %	BFA0c > 3 in %	$3 \geq$ BFA0c $\geq$ 1/3 in %	BFA0c < 1/3 in %	n
overall	44.23	31.41	24.36	28.85	30.45	40.71	312
model 1	45.51	30.13	24.36	30.13	30.13	39.74	156
model 2	42.95	32.69	24.36	27.56	30.77	41.67	156
effect = 0.1	9.62	38.46	51.92	5.77	24.04	70.19	104
effect = 0.2	37.50	44.23	18.27	21.15	39.42	39.42	104
effect = 0.5	85.58	11.54	2.88	59.62	27.88	12.50	104

**Results of Power Simulation of Bayes Factors.** BFA0b, Sided Bayes factor in favour of the alternative hypothesis of baseline social isolation; BFA0c, Sided Bayes factor in favour of the alternative hypothesis of change in social isolation; n, number of simulations in the category; model 1, model with reduced number of control variables; model 2, model with full number of control variables; effect, effect size per point in the Lubben Social Network Scale in years of baseline age  
Percentages of Bayes Factors giving moderate or stronger evidence in favour of the alternative hypothesis ( $>3$ ), giving anecdotal evidence ( $3 \geq \text{BF} \geq 1/3$ ) and giving moderate or stronger evidence in favour of the null hypothesis ( $< 1/3$ ).

**Table S21**

Category	BFA0b > 10.75 in %	10.75 >= BFA0b >= 1/3 in %	BFA0b < 1/3 in %	BFA0c > 10.75 in %	10.75 >= BFA0c >= 1/3 in %	BFA0c < 1/3 in %	n
overall	37.18	38.46	24.36	20.83	38.46	40.71	312
model 1	38.46	37.18	24.36	21.79	38.46	39.74	156
model 2	35.90	39.74	24.36	19.87	38.46	41.67	156
effect = 0.1	5.77	42.31	51.92	0.96	28.85	70.19	104
effect = 0.2	24.04	57.69	18.27	14.42	46.15	39.42	104
effect = 0.5	81.73	15.38	2.88	47.12	40.38	12.50	104

**Results of Power Simulation of Bayes Factors with adjusted thresholds for a family of 12 tests.** BFA0b, Sided Bayes factor in favour of the alternative hypothesis of baseline social isolation; BFA0c, Sided Bayes factor in favour of the alternative hypothesis of change in social isolation; n, number of simulations in the category; model 1, model with reduced number of control variables; model 2, model with full number of control variables; effect, effect size per point in the Lubben Social Network Scale in years of baseline age. Percentages of Bayes Factors giving moderate or stronger evidence in favour of the alternative hypothesis ( $>10.75$ ), giving anecdotal evidence ( $10.75 \geq BF \geq 1/3$ ) and giving moderate or stronger evidence in favour of the null hypothesis ( $< 1/3$ ).

## References

72. C. Bono, L. D. Ried, C. Kimberlin, B. Vogel, Missing data on the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale: a comparison of 4 imputation techniques. *Res. Social Adm. Pharm.* 3, 1–27 (2007).
73. A. Gelman, J. Hill, M. Yajima, Why We (Usually) Don't Have to Worry About Multiple Comparisons. *J. Res. Educ. Eff.* 5, 189–211 (2012).
74. A. Sjölander, S. Vansteelandt, Frequentist versus Bayesian approaches to multiple testing. *Eur. J. Epidemiol.* 34, 809–821 (2019).
75. T. Jong, M. Marsman, E.-J. Wagenmakers, A Bayesian Approach to the Correction for Multiplicity (2019).
76. J. D. Storey, A direct approach to false discovery rates. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B (Statistical Methodol.)* 64, 479–498 (2002).
77. L. Lammer, F. Beyer, M. Lupp, C. Sander, R. Baber, C. Engel, K. Wirkner, M. Loeffler, S. Riedel-Heller, A. Villringer, V. Witte, Social isolation and the aging brain. Social isolation is linked to declining grey matter structure and cognitive functions in the LIFE-Adult panel study. *medRxiv* (2021) (available at [doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267787](https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267787)).
78. A. Kuznetsova, P. B. Brockhoff, R. H. B. Christensen, lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. *J. Stat. Softw.* 82, 1–26 (2017).
79. J. L. Bernal-Rusiel, D. N. Greve, M. Reuter, B. Fischl, M. R. Sabuncu, Statistical analysis of longitudinal neuroimage data with Linear Mixed Effects models. *Neuroimage.* 66, 249–260 (2013).
80. Y. Rosseel, {lavaan}: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *J. Stat. Softw.* 48, 1–36 (2012).
81. J. N. Rouder, R. D. Morey, Default Bayes Factors for Model Selection in Regression. *Multivariate Behav. Res.* 47, 877–903 (2012).
82. J. L. Bernal-Rusiel, M. Reuter, D. N. Greve, B. Fischl, M. R. Sabuncu, Spatiotemporal linear mixed effects modeling for the mass-univariate analysis of longitudinal neuroimage data. *Neuroimage.* 81, 358–370 (2013).
83. J. Fox, S. Weisberg, *An {R} Companion to Applied Regression* (Sage, Thousand Oaks {CA}, Third., 2019).
84. N. Mays, C. Pope, Assessing quality in qualitative research. *BMJ.* 320, 50–52 (2000).
85. M. Sandelowski, J. Barroso, Finding the findings in qualitative studies. *J. Nurs. Scholarsh.* 34, 213–219 (2002).
86. L. Ryan, A. Golden, 'Tick the Box Please': A Reflexive Approach to Doing Quantitative Social Research. *Sociology.* 40, 1191–1200 (2006).
87. B. A. Nosek, C. R. Ebersole, A. C. DeHaven, D. T. Mellor, The preregistration revolution. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 115, 2600–2606 (2018).
88. B. A. Nosek, D. Lakens, Registered reports: A method to increase the credibility of published results. *Soc. Psychol. (Gott.)* 45, 137–141 (2014).



89. N. Krieger, *Epidemiology and the people's health: Theory and context*. (Oxford University Press, New York, NY, US, 2011).
90. R. Berger, Now I see it, now I don't: researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qual. Res.* 15, 219–234 (2013).
91. M. Solomon, *Social Empiricism* (MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2001).
92. S. J. Gould, *The mismeasure of man: Revised and expanded* (Norton, New York, 1996).
93. L. F. Berkman, I. Kawachi, M. M. Glymour, *Social Epidemiology* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2015).
94. N. Krieger, Got Theory? On the 21st c. CE Rise of Explicit use of Epidemiologic Theories of Disease Distribution: A Review and Ecosocial Analysis. *Curr. Epidemiol. Reports.* 1, 45–56 (2014).