A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel study investigating the efficacy of a whole coffee cherry extract and phosphatidylserine formulation on cognitive performance of healthy adults with self-perceived memory problems

Katarina M. Doma[1], Erin D. Lewis[1*], Jane Barracato[2], Lauren R. Brink[2], Alejandra Gratson[2], Neeraj Pandey[3], David C. Crowley[1], Malkanthi Evans[1]

[1]KGK Science Inc, 275 Dundas Street, Tower A Suite A1605, London, ON N6B 3L1 Canada
[2]Global Medical Science, Reckitt, 399 Interpace Parkway, P.O. Box 225 Parsippany, NJ 07054-0225 USA
[3]Medical and Scientific Affairs, Reckitt, Turner House 103-105 Bath Road Slough Berkshire SL1 3UH, UK

*Denotes corresponding author

Correspondence: elewis@kgkscience.com.

Table S1. CONSORT 2010 checklist of information to include when reporting a randomised trial*.

Section/Topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page No
Title and abstract			
	1a	Identification as a randomised trial in the title	1
	1b	Structured summary of trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT for abstracts)	1
Introduction			
Background and objectives	2a	Scientific background and explanation of rationale	2
	2b	Specific objectives or hypotheses	3
Methods			
Trial design	3a	Description of trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	3
	3b	Important changes to methods after trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	N/A
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	3
	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	3
Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were actually administered	3
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they were assessed	4 and 7
	6b	Any changes to trial outcomes after the trial commenced, with reasons	N/A
Sample size	7a	How sample size was determined	7
	7b	When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines	N/A
Randomisation:			
Sequence generation	8a	Method used to generate the random allocation sequence	4
	8b	Type of randomisation; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)	4
Allocation concealment mechanism	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers), describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	4
Implementation	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions	4
Blinding	11a	If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those assessing outcomes) and how	4
	11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	4
Statistical methods	12a	Statistical methods used to compare groups for primary and secondary outcomes	7
	12b	Methods for additional analyses, such as subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses	N/A
Results			
Participant flow (a diagram is strongly recommended)	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were analysed for the primary outcome	8-9, Figure 2
	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	8-9, Figure 2
Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	3

	14b	Why the trial ended or was stopped	N/A
Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	8-9, Table 2
Numbers analysed	16	For each group, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis and whether the analysis was by original assigned groups	8-12
Outcomes and estimation	17a	For each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its precision (such as 95% confidence interval)	8-12
	17b	For binary outcomes, presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes is recommended	N/A
Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing pre-specified from exploratory	N/A
Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms)	12
Discussion			
Limitations	20	Trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias, imprecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses	15
Generalisability	21	Generalisability (external validity, applicability) of the trial findings	12-15
Interpretation	22	Interpretation consistent with results, balancing benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence	12-15
Other information			
Registration	23	Registration number and name of trial registry	N/A
Protocol	24	Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available	N/A
Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	15

*We strongly recommend reading this statement in conjunction with the CONSORT 2010 Explanation and Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also recommend reading CONSORT extensions for cluster randomised trials, non-inferiority and equivalence trials, non-pharmacological treatments, herbal interventions, and pragmatic trials. Additional extensions are forthcoming: for those and for up-to-date references relevant to this checklist, see www.consort-statement.org.

Table S2. Change in COMPASS scores for memory, accuracy, focus and concentration, and learning as assessed by Numeric Working Memory and Picture Recognition tasks from baseline at day 42 for Neuriva® and placebo in the PP population (n=128).

Score	Neuriva® (n=64) Mean ± SD	Placebo (n=64) Mean ± SD	Neuriva vs. Placebo P-value
Numeric Working Memory (Memory, Accuracy*, Focus and Concentration)			
Accuracy: Overall (%)	5.6 ± 9.7	2.0 ± 8.8	0.024
Accuracy: Yes (%)	8.1 ± 13.5	3.1 ± 12.8	0.010
Reaction Time: Correct (msec)	-314.8 ± 402.7	-170.7 ± 376.7	0.031
Reaction Time: Yes (msec)	-341.9 ± 393.5	-166.8 ± 388.0	0.016
Picture Recognition (Memory, Accuracy, Learning)			
Accuracy: Overall (%)	1.5 ± 6.2	0.1 ± 2.6	0.035

*Accuracy was assessed by accuracy outcomes only.
msec, milliseconds; n, number; SD, standard deviation.
Change in scores were compared between groups using a two-sample t-test with p<0.05 considered statistically significant.
Nonsignificant results are not shown.

Table S3. Change in Go/No-Go: test forms "1 of 2" and "2 of 5" scores from baseline at day 42 for Neuriva® and placebo in the PP population (n=128).

Parameter	Neuriva® Mean ± SD n Within-group P-value	Placebo Mean ± SD n Within-group P-value	Neuriva vs. Placebo P-value
Test form "1 of 2"			
Correct reactions	-0.1 ± 2.8 n=62 0.641	-0.1 ± 2.6 n=62 0.126	0.186
False alarms/errors	-1.0 ± 3.9 n=62 <0.001	-0.8 ± 3.0 n=62 0.002	0.549
Outlier ("lapses of attention"; if established)	0.0 ± 0.7 n=62 1.0	-0.1 ± 0.7 n=62 0.241	0.323
Median of RT	-0.7 ± 105.8 n=61 0.065	-0.9 ± 86.6 n=61 0.696	0.229
Mean of RT	-1.6 ± 111.6 n=61 0.107	-5.8 ± 82.8 n=61 0.558	0.292
Misses	0.1 ± 2.8 n=62 0.641	0.1 ± 2.6 n=62 0.126	0.186
Standard deviation of RT	-13.8 ± 63.5 n=61 0.085	-8.9 ± 38.7 n=61 0.052	0.984
Test form "2 of 5"			
Correct reactions	2.1 ± 5.3 n=64 0.001	1.5 ± 4.4 n=63 0.002	0.488
False alarms / errors	-2.7 ± 4.8 n=64 <0.001	-2.6 ± 5.5 n=63 <0.001	0.831
Outlier ("lapses of attention"; if established)	0.1 ± 0.8 n=64 0.254	-0.1 ± 0.8 n=63 0.522	0.189
Median of RT	-26.5 ± 94.7 n=64 0.021	-12.3 ± 65.8 n=63 0.142	0.272
Mean of RT	-28.6 ± 100.5 n=64 0.017	-17.1 ± 70.4 n=63 0.015	0.457
Misses	-2.1 ± 5.3 n=64 0.001	-1.5 ± 4.4 n=63 0.002	0.488
Standard deviation of RT	-18.7 ± 54.8 n=64 0.022	-16.3 ± 56.3 n=63 0.053	0.717

n, number; RT, reaction time; SD, standard deviation.
Change in scores were compared between groups using Wilcoxon's rank sum test with p<0.05 considered statistically significant.
Changes within group were evaluated using a paired t-test with p<0.05 considered statistically significant.