

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

The efficacy of Computerized Cognitive Training on cognitive outcomes in Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-027062
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	05-Oct-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Zhang, Haifeng; University College London Division of Psychiatry; Peking University Institute of Mental Health (Sixth Hospital); National Clinical Research Center for Mental Disorders & Key Laboratory of Mental Health, Ministry of Health, Peking University; Beijing Dementia Key Lab Huntley, Jonathan; University College London, Division of Psychiatry Cahill, Jack; Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience. King's College London Holmes, Benjamin; University College London Division of Psychiatry Bhome, Rohan; University College London, Division of Psychiatry Gould, Rebecca; University College London Division of Psychiatry Wang, Huali; Peking University Institute of Mental Health (Sixth Hospital); National Clinical Research Center for Mental Disorders & Key Laboratory of Mental Health, Ministry of Health, Peking University; Beijing Dementia Key Lab Yu, Xin; Peking University Institute of Mental Health (Sixth Hospital); National Clinical Research Center for Mental Disorders & Key Laboratory of Mental Health, Ministry of Health, Peking University; Beijing Dementia Key Lab Howard, R; University College London Division of Psychiatry,
Keywords:	Mild cognitive training (MCI), computerised, cognitive training, cognitive outcomes, meta-analysis



1
2
3
4 1 **The efficacy of Computerized Cognitive Training on cognitive**
5
6 2 **outcomes in Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Systematic Review and**
7
8 3 **Meta-Analysis**
9

10 4 Haifeng Zhang^{1,3}, J. D. Huntley¹, R. Bhome¹, B. Holmes¹, J.T. Cahill², R.L. Gould², Huali Wang³,
11
12
13 5 Xin Yu³ and R. J. Howard¹
14

15 6 1. Division of Psychiatry, University College London, London W1T 7NF, United Kingdom

16
17 7 2. Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London
18
19 8 SE5 8AF, United Kingdom

20
21
22 9 3. Peking University Institute of Mental Health (Sixth Hospital); National Clinical
23
24 10 Research Center for Mental Disorders & Key Laboratory of Mental Health, Ministry
25
26 11 of Health, Peking University; Beijing Dementia Key Lab, Beijing 100191, China
27
28

29
30 12 * **Address correspondence**

31
32 13 Dr. Huntley: j.huntley@ucl.ac.uk
33

34
35 14 6th Floor Maple House, 149 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 7NF,
36

37
38 15 University College London, United Kingdom.
39
40
41

42 17 **Running title:** A meta-analysis of computerised cognitive training on MCI
43

44 18 **Key words:** Mild cognitive training (MCI), computerised, cognitive training, cognitive
45
46 19 outcomes, meta-analysis.
47

48 20 **Word count:** 4050
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 22 **The efficacy of Computerized Cognitive Training on cognitive outcomes in**
4
5 23 **Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis**
6
7
8
9

10
11 25 Haifeng Zhang^{1, 3}, J. D. Huntley¹, R. Bhome¹, B. Holmes¹, J.T. Cahill², R.L. Gould², Huali Wang³,
12
13 26 Xin Yu³ and R. J. Howard¹
14

15 27 1. Division of Psychiatry, University College London, London W1T 7NF, United Kingdom

16
17 28 2. Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London
18
19 29 SE5 8AF, United Kingdom

20
21 30 3. Peking University Institute of Mental Health (Sixth Hospital); National Clinical
22
23 31 Research Center for Mental Disorders & Key Laboratory of Mental Health, Ministry
24
25 32 of Health, Peking University; Beijing Dementia Key Lab, Beijing 100191, China
26
27

28
29 33 * Address correspondence to Dr. Huntley: j.huntley@ucl.ac.uk
30
31

32 34

33
34
35 35 Running title: A meta-analysis of computerised cognitive training on MCI
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 36 **Abstract:**
4

5 37 **Objectives** To determine the efficacy of CCT in improving cognitive function for older adults with
6
7 38 MCI.
8
9

10 39 **Methods** Literature searches were performed using three online databases. Randomised controlled
11
12 40 trials (RCTs) comparing CCT with control conditions in those with MCI aged 55+ were included. Data
13
14 41 were extracted regarding participants, CCT and control interventions, trial quality and for all
15
16 42 reported cognitive outcomes. A random-effects meta-analysis was conducted to estimate overall
17
18 43 efficacy on cognitive function.
19
20

21 44 **Results** 18 studies met the inclusion criteria and were included in the analyses, involving 690
22
23 45 participants. Meta-analysis revealed small to moderate positive treatment effects compared to
24
25 46 controls intervention in 4 domains as follows: Global Cognitive Function ($g = 0.23$, 95% CI = 0.03,
26
27 47 0.44), Memory ($g = 0.30$, 95% CI = 0.11, 0.50), Working Memory ($g = 0.39$, 95% CI = 0.12, 0.66) and
28
29 48 Executive function ($g = 0.20$, 95% CI = -0.03, 0.43). Statistical significance was reached in all domains
30
31 49 apart from executive function.
32
33

34 50 **Conclusion** This meta-analysis provides evidence that CCT improves cognitive function in older
35
36 51 people with MCI. However, the long-term transfer of these improvements and potential to reduce
37
38 52 dementia prevalence remains unknown. Various methodological issues such as heterogeneity in
39
40 53 outcome measures, interventions and MCI symptoms and lack of intention-to-treat (ITT) analyses
41
42 54 limit the quality of the literature and represent areas for future research to improve in the future.
43
44
45

46 55
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 56 **Strengths and limitations of this study**
4

- 5
6 57 1. This is a comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating the evidence for the
7
8 58 efficacy of computerised cognitive training in old adults with mild cognitive impairment on
9
10 59 cognitive outcomes.
11
12 60 2. Data for four main cognitive domains were extracted from individual studies (global cognitive
13
14 61 function, episodic memory, working memory and executive function) and where appropriate
15
16 62 composite measures were calculated for meta-analyses.
17
18 63 3. The studies included in the systematic review are generally of a moderate quality and several
19
20 64 methodological issues, particularly a lack of follow up data makes it impossible to draw
21
22 65 conclusions regarding long term effects or impact on prevalence of dementia.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29 67

68 INTRODUCTION

69 There are currently estimated to be over 46 million people worldwide living with dementia. This
70 number is expected to grow to approximately 131.5 million by 2050.¹ There is therefore an urgent
71 need to develop therapeutic treatments that may delay or prevent dementia in population groups
72 considered 'at risk'.² Interventions that delay the onset of AD by an average of two years would
73 decrease the worldwide prevalence rate by 22.8 million cases,³ which in turn, would ease the huge
74 burden placed on individuals, families and society. For these reasons, evidence-based interventions
75 that reduce the risk of dementia are urgently required.

76 Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI) refers to an intermediate stage between normal age-related
77 cognitive decline (ARCD) and dementia.⁴ Although many older adults experience a degree of
78 deterioration in cognitive performance, MCI is described as a greater than expected cognitive
79 decline for an individual's age and education, but without notable interference in everyday
80 functioning.⁵ Within the older adult population, the estimated prevalence rate of MCI ranges from
81 15-20%.⁶ Although MCI can present with a variety of symptoms, when memory loss is the
82 predominant symptom it is termed "amnesic MCI" and is frequently seen as a prodromal stage of
83 Alzheimer's disease.⁶ When individuals have impairments in domains other than memory it is
84 classified as non-amnesic single- or multiple-domain MCI and these individuals are believed to be
85 more likely to convert to other types of dementia.⁶

86 The lack of therapeutic benefit or delay in progression from MCI to AD with pharmacological
87 interventions has meant that the focus has shifted towards non-pharmacological interventions.⁷

88 Cognitive remediation is the term used for interventions designed to mediate cognitive decline and
89 can be typically identified as involving one of three different approaches: cognitive stimulation (CS),
90 cognitive rehabilitation (CR) and cognitive training (CT). Interventions based on CS and CR are more
91 focused on individuals with established dementia, often with the aim of overcoming specific
92 difficulties with daily living and improving general quality of life. In comparison, CT can be used for

1
2
3 93 subjects without significant cognitive or functional difficulties, and is therefore well suited for
4
5 94 individuals with MCI.

6
7
8 95 CT refers to interventions that aim to improve cognitive domains through repeated practice on
9
10 96 theoretically driven skills and strategies.⁸ Each CT exercise aims to target one or two specific
11
12 97 domains in an adaptive manner with a possibility of transfer effects whereby performance in other
13
14 98 untrained cognitive domains is also improved⁹.

15
16 99 Computerised cognitive training (CCT) utilises computers for the delivery of the intervention and
17
18 100 differs from traditional CT, which usually incorporates face-to-face contact with a professional and
19
20 101 paper-and-pencil paradigms.⁸ CCT has several advantages including cost-effectiveness, increased
21
22 102 accessibility and ability to customise the content and difficulty of the training.¹⁰⁻¹² Research involving
23
24 103 older adults has found that CCT programs are associated with high satisfaction levels, and that they
25
26 104 are also a feasible option for individuals with MCI, with equal or better adherence rates when
27
28 105 compared to traditional CT.^{10 13} In addition, evidence suggests that studies utilising CCT show a
29
30 106 pattern of stronger effect sizes and enhanced generalisation of benefits compared to traditional
31
32 107 strategy training in MCI.¹⁴ A previous meta-analysis found that CT is not effective in people with
33
34 108 established dementia.¹⁵ However, there is growing interest as to whether CCT has the potential to
35
36 109 prevent or slow the progression from MCI to dementia particularly given the association between
37
38 110 higher participation in mental activity and reduced dementia risk.¹⁶

39
40
41 111 Studies investigating the effectiveness of CT in improving cognitive performance in people with MCI
42
43 112 have demonstrated small to moderate improvement but existing research suffers from
44
45 113 methodological concerns and limitations.^{14 17-19} CT research in individuals with MCI has been
46
47 114 criticised for the failure to include an appropriate control group,²⁰⁻²² use of subsets of participants
48
49 115 from previous studies,²³ and pooling of MCI data with that from non-impaired adults²⁴ as well as
50
51 116 those with probable AD.²⁵⁻²⁷ Another issue raised in treatment studies has been the use of
52
53 117 ecologically valid outcome measures. For example, the inclusion of functional outcome measures is
54
55 118 important to monitor progression from MCI to dementia but given that individuals with MCI are, by

1
2
3 119 definition, not significantly impaired in functioning, it is a challenge to measure the functional effects
4
5 120 of the intervention.¹⁷
6
7
8 121
9
10 122 CCT is far from a single construct and factors such as the content, platform, context and dose of
11
12 123 training may differ.²⁸ Unfortunately, despite increasing scientific scrutiny, there is a limited
13
14 124 understanding as to which, if any, dimensions are associated with cognitive benefit. Critical analysis
15
16 125 of research using CCT for MCI should reveal insight into any effective components of CCT, however,
17
18 126 it is important to establish the overall efficacy of CCT in individuals with MCI.
19
20
21 127 Systematic reviews and meta-analysis of cognitive intervention in MCI have reported mixed results,¹⁹
22
23 128 ²⁹⁻³⁴ and when exploring the efficacy of cognitive training in MCI have largely not distinguished
24
25 129 between studies evaluating computerised and non-computerised training. This makes it difficult to
26
27 130 draw conclusions specifically on the efficacy of CCT in MCI. One previous meta-analysis by Hill et al
28
29 131 specially explored the effectiveness of CCT in MCI on cognition and behavioural outcomes,³²
30
31 132 however, further relevant studies have been published subsequently.^{32 35-37}
32
33
34 133 This paper investigates the efficacy of CCT on improving cognitive outcomes in individuals diagnosed
35
36 134 with MCI using random effects meta-analyses. To address some of the problems identified in the
37
38 135 literature, only peer-reviewed RCTs were selected and all cognitive outcome measures were
39
40 136 extracted for analysis. Variables that may moderate the efficacy of CCT, such as the type of
41
42 137 programme or dose of the intervention, were reviewed. The purpose of the current review was to: a)
43
44 138 evaluate the efficacy of CCT in older adults with MCI on cognitive outcomes; b) evaluate the content
45
46 139 and methodological quality of the intervention studies; and c) suggest future directions in CCT
47
48 140 research in this group based on findings.
49
50
51
52 141

142 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

143 **Search strategy and selection criteria**

144 A literature search was completed during January 2018 of three online literature databases and trial
145 registers: Embase, Web of Science and Cochrane library. The search terms are shown in
146 supplementary table 1. Previous meta-analyses and systematic reviews of cognitive interventions in
147 MCI were also searched. Furthermore, reference lists of included studies were manually scanned for
148 additional relevant papers.

149 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

150 Types of studies: Published, peer-reviewed studies with a RCT design investigating the use of CCT
151 interventions in older people with MCI were considered for inclusion. Studies were included if
152 sufficient data were available for calculation of effect sizes in each treatment arm (unavailable
153 information was requested from authors and included if obtained). The date of publication was not
154 limited, but only studies published in English were included.

155 Participants: Inclusion criteria were a mean age of participants greater than 55 years, a diagnosis of
156 MCI using core criteria according to Petersen⁴ and no other psychiatric diagnosis or neurological
157 disorder. The number of participants in each arm needed to be at least five. Studies with
158 non-impaired older people or those with probable AD were excluded unless separate data for
159 participants with MCI was provided.

160 Types of interventions: Studies were included if they compared any CCT intervention, administered
161 on a personal computer or gaming console, to an active or non-active control. Computerised training
162 had to represent the primary intervention, not simply one of multiple broader non-computerised
163 cognitive interventions, in order to be included. Active controls were classified as interventions that
164 controlled for non-specific therapeutic effects, whereas non-active control groups included waiting
165 list conditions, treatment as usual (TAU) or a non-matched minimal intervention. Each study was

1
2
3 166 independently screened, selected for inclusion and its data extracted by independent researchers.

4
5 167 Any disagreements were resolved through discussion with another author.

6
7
8 168 Types of outcome measures: All primary and secondary outcomes that measured objective cognitive
9
10 169 performance were included, and were categorised into 4 domains: episodic memory (referred to as
11
12 170 memory), working memory, executive function, and global cognitive functioning.

13 14 15 171 **Risk of bias assessment**

16
17 172 The Cochrane Collaboration Risk of Bias tool was used to assess study methodological quality³⁸. Risk
18
19 173 of bias was assessed in multiple domains: sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of
20
21 174 participants and investigators, incomplete outcome data and selective reporting of outcomes. In
22
23 175 each of these categories, the methodological quality of each assessed domain was rated as 'low risk',
24
25 176 'unclear' or 'high risk'. Studies were excluded if unsure or high risk in all assessed domains.

26 27 28 177 **Statistical analysis**

29
30
31 178 Intervention and control groups' post-intervention score were compared using Review manager
32
33 179 (RevMan) software version 5.3. The programme uses Hedges' adjusted g ³⁹ to calculate a
34
35 180 standardised mean difference (SMD) which is adjusted for small sample bias. Pooling of standardized
36
37 181 mean Hedges' g estimates of <0.30 , ≥ 0.30 and < 0.60 , and ≥ 0.60 were considered small, moderate,
38
39 182 and large, respectively. Meta-analyses were performed where three or more studies investigated a
40
41 183 comparable intervention and outcome using a random effects model. Heterogeneity was quantified
42
43 184 using the I^2 statistic, considered as low, moderate, or large when at 25%, 50%, or 75%, respectively.⁴⁰

44
45
46 185 Where a study reported multiple outcome measures for one cognitive domain (e.g., within memory
47
48 186 function), a composite measure was calculated to provide a single quantitative measure for
49
50 187 meta-analysis.⁴¹ Publication bias was examined using funnel plots. We also performed subgroup
51
52 188 analysis, for example we compared the effectiveness of single and multi-domain training.
53
54 189 Furthermore, we subgrouped studies with the training dose less than 10 hours and more than 30
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 190 hours to see if there is a dose-response correlation. Sensitivity analyses was performed to identify
4
5 191 potential sources of heterogeneity. Further details of statistical methods are found in the
6
7 192 supplementary material (see supplementary appendix 1).
8
9

10 193 **Patient and public involvement**

11
12 194 There was no direct patient or public involvement in this review.
13
14

15 195
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

196

RESULTS**Description of studies**

The PRISMA checklist was used to guide reporting of results.⁴²

Following the initial literature review a total of 691 studies were found. Of these 673 were excluded and 18 studies met inclusion criteria. Figure 1 presents a flowchart of study selection. The total number of participants included was 690 and the summary characteristics of each study are presented in table 1. Sample sizes ranged from 12 to 106, and dropout rates ranged from 0% to 32%.

One study was excluded from the meta-analysis because of suspected inclusion of participants with probable AD based on the reported average Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) score.⁴³

Another two studies were excluded from the meta-analysis as post-intervention cognitive data could not be obtained.^{44 45}

13 studies reported outcomes assessing memory, 5 studies reported outcomes assessing working memory, 11 studies reported outcomes assessing executive function, and 11 studies reported global cognitive functioning outcomes (see table 2.).

Quality of studies

The quality of each study was evaluated in regard to certain methodological aspects and summarised in supplementary figure 1. 11 of the 18 studies did not report blinding of participants.

Participant characteristics

The total amount of participants from all studies included was 690 (CCT: n=351, mean group size: n=20, control: n=339, mean group size: n=19). The average age of participants in both conditions was 73.4 years. 52.5% of all participants were male. The disparity and lack of reporting of the ratio of participants' years of education precluded mean calculations, although the available data suggests

1
2
3 219 most participants had at least secondary school education. The pooled average baseline score for
4
5 220 the MMSE was 26.9 in both groups, although the range of scores indicated heterogeneity within
6
7 221 participants.
8
9

10 222 **Cognitive Training Interventions**

11
12 223 Interventions were mostly delivered on a personal computer (PC), using commercially available or
13
14 224 purpose built CT packages, with two studies utilising a video game on a games console.^{13 37} All
15
16 225 interventions were specifically designed to improve various aspects of cognition. The most common
17
18 226 type of intervention used was multi-domain (11/18 studies), where the programme targeted two or
19
20 227 more cognitive domains. In the seven single domain intervention studies, three evaluated memory
21
22 228 training and executive function training while one used working memory training. The dose and
23
24 229 duration of the CT intervention was variable, with the total length of training ranging from 4 hours⁴⁶
25
26 230 to 80 hours⁴⁷ and the duration of training from 2 weeks⁴⁸ to 26 weeks.⁴⁷
27
28
29

30 231 **Outcome Measures**

31
32
33 232 Supplementary Table 2 summarises the 60 different cognitive outcome measures used by studies
34
35 233 included in the meta-analyses. A considerable variability in measures reported was also noted; only
36
37 234 three outcome measures were reported three or more times; seven studies used the MMSE as a
38
39 235 measure of global cognition, three studies used Paired-associates learning (PAL) to measure memory
40
41 236 and in four studies used the Trail Making Test (TMT) as a measure of executive function.
42
43

44 237 **Meta-analysis of specific outcomes**

45
46
47 238 Separate meta-analyses were conducted on four different cognitive domains. The most commonly
48
49 239 tested domains were memory, with thirteen studies exploring this domain. The results of the
50
51 240 meta-analyses are presented in table 2.
52
53

54 241 Global Cognition function
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 242 Overall, there was a significant benefit of CCT on global cognition compared to the control group.
4
5 243 The meta-analysis revealed a small but statistically significant pooled effect size of 0.23 (95% CI [0.03,
6
7 244 0.44], $z = 2.22$, $p = 0.03$) with low heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 6\%$) (see figure 2.). The funnel
8
9 245 plot did not reveal significant asymmetry (see supplementary figure 2.). The effect size across
10
11 246 active-controlled trials ($n=7$, $g=0.23$, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.51], $I^2=27\%$) was smaller than that of trials with
12
13 247 non-active control groups ($n=4$, $g=0.31$, 95% CI [-0.06, 0.68], $I^2=0\%$) (see supplementary figure 3-4.),
14
15 248 but was non-significant in both analyses.
16

249

250 Memory

251 The pooled effect size of CCT on memory outcomes, when compared with control conditions, was
252 moderate and statistically significant ($g = 0.30$, 95% CI = [0.11, 0.50], $z = 3.03$, $p = 0.002$), with
253 moderate heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 46\%$) (see figure 3.). The funnel plot did not reveal
254 significant asymmetry (see supplementary figure 5.). The effect size across active-controlled trials
255 ($n=8$, $g=0.36$, 95% CI [0.11, 0.61], $I^2=52\%$) was statistically significant and was larger than that of
256 trials with passive control groups ($n=5$, $g=0.20$, 95% CI [-0.14, 0.54], $I^2=43\%$) (see supplementary
257 figure 6-7.). However, there was moderate heterogeneity between studies in both analyses.

258 Due to the moderate heterogeneity between studies, a sensitivity analysis was also conducted, in
259 which one study at a time was removed and the others analysed to estimate whether the results
260 could have been markedly affected by a single study. The combined Hedges' g were consistent and
261 without apparent fluctuation, with a range from 0.23 [0.07, 0.39] to 0.35[0.15, 0.55].
262

263

264 Working Memory

265 The meta-analysis revealed a statistically significant moderate effect size of 0.39 in favour of CCT
266 compared with controls (95% CI [0.12, 0.66], $z = 2.85$, $p = 0.004$) with low heterogeneity between
studies ($I^2 = 0\%$) (see figure 3.). The funnel plot did not reveal significant asymmetry (see

1
2
3 267 supplementary figure 5.). Due to there being fewer than three non-active we did not compare the
4
5 268 effect size between active-controlled trials and non-active trials.

6
7 269

8
9 270 Executive function

10
11 271 The overall effect of CCT on executive function compared with control conditions was small and
12
13 272 non-significant. The meta-analysis revealed a pooled effect size of 0.20 (95% CI [-0.03, 0.43], $z = 1.74$,
14
15 273 $p = 0.08$) with high heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 51%$) (see figure 3.). The funnel plot did not
16
17 274 reveal significant asymmetry (see supplementary figure 5.). The effect size across active-controlled
18
19 275 trials ($n=7$, $g=0.13$, 95% CI [-0.08, 0.35], $I^2=20%$) was smaller than for the non-active control groups
20
21 276 ($n=4$, $g=0.32$, 95% CI [-0.23, 0.87], $I^2=74%$), but was non-significant in both analyses (see
22
23 277 supplementary figure 8-9.).

24
25
26 278 Considering the large heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 51%$), a sensitivity analysis was also
27
28 279 conducted as described above. The combined Hedges' g were consistent and without apparent
29
30 280 fluctuation, with a range from 0.12 [-0.05, 0.28] to 0.35 [0.03, 0.48].

31
32 281

33
34 282 Subgroup analysis

35
36 283 A priori, we stipulated that meta-analysis would only be performed if three studies report outcomes
37
38 284 in the same cognitive domain and so subgroup analysis could only compare single and multi-domain
39
40 285 memory training. Similarly, only global cognition could be used for subgroup analysis to compare the
41
42 286 training interventions less than ten hours and more than thirty hours. Our subgroup analyses
43
44 287 suggested that multi-domain CCT remains more efficacious than single-domain CCT as the former
45
46 288 had a significant effect ($g = 0.30$, 95% CI (0.08, 0.53)) while the later was non-significant ($g = 0.31$,
47
48 289 95% CI (-0.19, 0.81)) (see supplementary figure 10-11). There is also no clear evidence for a
49
50 290 dose-response relationship. Our subgroup analysis found that studies that provided more than 30
51
52 291 hours of CCT had a smaller overall effect on global cognitive function ($g = 0.20$, 95% CI (-0.31, 0.71))
53
54 292 compared to studies providing less than 10 hours of CCT ($g = 0.30$, 95% CI (-0.01, 0.61) (see
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

293 supplementary figure 12-13). The subgroup analyses need to be interpreted with caution due to the
294 small number of studies and heterogeneity, however, they illustrate the lack of clear factors that are
295 associated with efficacy.

For peer review only

296 **DISCUSSION**

297 **Main findings**

298 Based on results from 18 RCTs, it is likely that CCT is a viable intervention for improving cognition in
299 older people with MCI. There were small to moderate positive effect sizes found in all domains, with
300 statistical significance reached for global cognitive function ($g=0.23$, 95% CI = [0.03, 0.44]), memory
301 ($g=0.30$, 95% CI=[0.11, 0.50]) and working memory ($g=0.39$, 95% CI=[0.12, 0.66]), but not executive
302 function ($g=0.20$, 95% CI=[-0.03, 0.43]). The largest effect sizes were found for working memory and
303 memory (although statistically significant heterogeneity was found for the latter domain). This is
304 unsurprising given its central focus in most interventions and promising given this is the primary
305 complaint in most cases of MCI.

306 The findings from our meta-analyses are largely in keeping with the results of previous research that
307 has examined CCT³² or combined computerised and non-computerised studies and demonstrated
308 positive effect sizes for global cognition, memory, working memory and executive function³³. The
309 current meta-analysis employed strict eligibility criteria to overcome the methodological issues
310 reported in the literature^{49 50} such as inappropriate control groups and CCT being combined with
311 other interventions. The combination of an overall large sample size (N=690) and stringent eligibility
312 criteria make this meta-analysis a useful contribution to the growing evidence for the efficacy of CCT
313 in MCI. Nevertheless, various methodological issues were identified that limit the ability to make
314 recommendations for the optimal format, frequency or intensity of CCT. Further, the lack of
315 longitudinal studies make it unclear whether observed post-intervention benefits contribute in any
316 way to the goal of delaying or preventing the progression from MCI to dementia.

317 **Validity of observations and limitations**

318 **Sources of bias**

1
2
3 319 Several methodological issues were identified. Studies were rarely double-blinded, and whilst it may
4
5 320 be considered impractical to blind therapists and participants given the nature of the intervention,
6
7 321 this nevertheless introduces the risk of expectation bias and exaggerated results. In addition, data
8
9 322 concerning dropouts were rarely included in the analyses and ITT analysis was only used in two
10
11 323 studies.^{46 51} Whilst most of the remaining studies reported no significant differences at baseline for
12
13 324 those who dropped out, these differences may have only become apparent post-intervention, and
14
15 325 baseline differences may have been more obvious with the large number of participants in the
16
17 326 meta-analysis. Thus, the absence of ITT may have introduced an attrition bias.

19
20 327 Further bias may have arisen due to the decision in this study not to differentiate between amnesic
21
22 328 and non-amnesic forms of MCI. This classification is an example of the heterogeneity of MCI
23
24 329 symptoms. This heterogeneity is supported in descriptions by Petersen⁵² and in the results of a study
25
26 330 revealing MCI as a highly nuanced and complex clinical entity.⁵³ This may lead to considerably
27
28 331 different intervention effects between participants and render it difficult to evaluate the efficacy of
29
30 332 the cognitive intervention and the generalisability of the current results.

31
32
33 333 This meta-analysis calculated composite effect sizes when multiple outcome measures were
34
35 334 provided for the same domain in each study. Whilst this method maximises the amount of data
36
37 335 drawn from the reviewed studies, it also has certain limitations. Firstly, this approach necessitated
38
39 336 an arbitrary measure of correlation between outcome measures, in this case set at 0.5. This may be
40
41 337 inaccurate, with outcome measures being more or less heterogeneous. Unfortunately, data on
42
43 338 composite heterogeneity was not available, however, choosing between outcome measures to
44
45 339 decide which best represents a particular domain would have posed a significant risk of selection
46
47 340 bias. This partly stems from the fact that 'gold standard' tests for the different cognitive domains
48
49 341 have not been identified.

50
51
52
53 342 The literature suggests multiple factors may influence the efficacy of cognitive interventions.⁵⁴ An
54
55 343 aim of the current analysis was to provide insight regarding CCT design choices and training

1
2
3 344 outcomes to inform decisions on interventions to use both clinically and in future studies. Due to the
4
5 345 limited number of studies and heterogeneity of interventions and outcome measures, it is difficult to
6
7 346 make clear recommendations for the optimal form of CCT.
8
9

10 347 This meta-analysis has demonstrated efficacy of CCT in MCI patients for a very specific outcome:
11
12 348 performance on a neuropsychological test immediately post-intervention. Whilst promising, this is
13
14 349 far removed from the goal of slowing progression to or preventing dementia in MCI patients. There
15
16 350 was a lack of follow-up data, with only three studies^{47 55 56} including long-term outcome measures, so
17
18 351 no conclusions can be drawn regarding the longevity of the small to moderate effects or the transfer
19
20 352 of immediate effects. In addition, benefits on neuropsychological testing may not translate to
21
22 353 clinically meaningful benefits in everyday function. Barnett and Ceci⁵⁷ describe the immediate
23
24 354 outcomes measured here as 'near transfer' and the long-term transfer to untrained cognitive
25
26 355 abilities as 'far transfer'. If there is any possibility of dementia being prevented or delayed using CCT
27
28 356 then 'far transfer' of some sort is likely necessary. A review by Zelinski⁵⁸ outlines how 'far transfer'
29
30 357 from cognitive training has been observed in aging population, though this is not specific to CCT or
31
32 358 MCI. Demonstration of 'far transfer' as a result of cognitive training in healthy adults is very rare and
33
34 359 there is increasing evidence that even 'near transfer' is difficult to demonstrate convincingly.⁵⁹ More
35
36 360 research into long-term transfer effects of CCT in patients with MCI is vital in determining its
37
38 361 potential to reduce the dementia burden.
39
40

41 42 362 **Suggestions for future research** 43

44 363 The discussion highlights factors limiting the reliability and transferability of the results of the
45
46 364 meta-analysis. These limitations may be potentially overcome by more RCTs examining long-term
47
48 365 cognitive outcomes to assess transfer of CCT to everyday life and provide more insight on whether
49
50 366 CCT can influence progression to dementia. It is feasible to conduct large and longitudinal studies of
51
52 367 CCT, as it can be delivered online and therefore be easily and widely available. The standardization
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 368 of outcome measures between RCTs would also avoid problems associated with heterogeneity and
4
5 369 overall higher methodological quality of RCTs would reduce bias.
6
7

8 370 **Conclusion**

9
10 371 This meta-analysis has demonstrated support for the hypothesis that CCT improves cognitive
11
12 372 function in older people with MCI. However, the long-term transfer of these improvements and
13
14 373 relevance to reducing dementia prevalence remains unknown. Various methodological issues such
15
16 374 as heterogeneity in outcome measures, interventions and MCI symptoms and lack of ITT analyses
17
18 375 are significant limitations of the literature. Long-term outcomes are the next priority for CCT in MCI
19
20 376 patients to further explore its efficacy with respect to influencing dementia progression.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 378 **Contributors**
4

5 379 HZ, RB, JDH, RG, HW, XY and RJH all contributed to the conception and design of the review. HZ, BH,
6
7 380 CJT, JDH read and screened abstracts and titles of potentially relevant studies. HZ, RB, and JDH read
8
9 381 the retained papers and were responsible for extracting data and rating their quality independently.
10
11 382 HZ drafted the paper with all the authors critically reviewing it and suggesting amendments prior to
12
13 383 submission. All the authors had access to all the data in the study and can take responsibility for the
14
15 384 integrity of the reported findings.
16
17

18
19 385 **Funding**
20

21 386 Haifeng Zhang is supported by the China Scholarship Council (CSC) (No. 201706010329) to be a
22
23 387 visiting Ph.D. student at University College London, UK. RB is supported by a NIHR Academic Clinical
24
25 388 Fellowship. JH and RH are supported by the NIHR UCLH BRC.
26
27

28 389 **Competing interests**
29

30
31 390 None declared.
32
33

34 391 **Patient consent**
35

36 392 Not required.
37
38

39 393 **Provenance and peer review**
40

41
42 394 Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
43
44

45 395 **Data sharing statement**
46

47 396 Details of excluded papers are available from the first author on request.
48
49

50 397
51

52
53 398
54

55
56 399
57
58
59
60

400 **REFERENCES**

- 401 1. Alzheimer's Disease International. World Alzheimer Report 2015. 2015
- 402 2. Huckans M, Hutson L, Twamley E, et al. Efficacy of cognitive rehabilitation therapies for mild
403 cognitive impairment (MCI) in older adults: working toward a theoretical model and
404 evidence-based interventions. *Neuropsychol Rev* 2013;23(1):63-80. doi:
405 10.1007/s11065-013-9230-9
- 406 3. Brookmeyer R, Johnson E, Ziegler-Graham K, et al. Forecasting the global burden of Alzheimer's
407 disease. *Alzheimer's & dementia : the journal of the Alzheimer's Association*
408 2007;3(3):186-91. doi: 10.1016/j.jalz.2007.04.381
- 409 4. Petersen RC, Smith GE, Waring SC, et al. Mild cognitive impairment: clinical characterization and
410 outcome. *Archives of neurology* 1999;56(3):303-8.
- 411 5. Gauthier S, Reisberg B, Zaudig M, et al. Mild cognitive impairment. *Lancet*
412 2006;367(9518):1262-70. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(06)68542-5
- 413 6. Petersen RC. Mild Cognitive Impairment. *Continuum (Minneapolis Minn)* 2016;22(2
414 Dementia):404-18. doi: 10.1212/CON.0000000000000313
- 415 7. Karakaya T, Fusser F, Schroder J, et al. Pharmacological Treatment of Mild Cognitive Impairment
416 as a Prodromal Syndrome of Alzheimer's Disease. *Curr Neuropharmacol* 2013;11(1):102-8.
417 doi: 10.2174/157015913804999487
- 418 8. Gates N, Valenzuela M. Cognitive Exercise and Its Role in Cognitive Function in Older Adults.
419 *Current Psychiatry Reports* 2010;12(1):20-27. doi: 10.1007/s11920-009-0085-y
- 420 9. Ball K, Berch DB, Helmers KF, et al. Effects of cognitive training interventions with older adults: a
421 randomized controlled trial. *Jama* 2002;288(18):2271-81.
- 422 10. Kueider AM, Parisi JM, Gross AL, et al. Computerized cognitive training with older adults: a
423 systematic review. *PloS one* 2012;7(7):e40588. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0040588
- 424 11. Jak AJ, Seelye AM, Jurick SM. Crosswords to computers: a critical review of popular approaches
425 to cognitive enhancement. *Neuropsychology review* 2013;23(1):13-26.

- 1
2
3 426 12. Owen AM, Hampshire A, Grahn JA, et al. Putting brain training to the test. *Nature*
4
5 427 2010;465(7299):775-78. doi: 10.1038/nature09042
6
7 428 13. Hughes TF, Flatt JD, Fu B, et al. Interactive video gaming compared with health education in older
8
9 429 adults with mild cognitive impairment: a feasibility study. *International journal of geriatric*
10
11 430 *psychiatry* 2014;29(9):890-8. doi: 10.1002/gps.4075
12
13 431 14. Gates NJ, Sachdev PS, Singh MAF, et al. Cognitive and memory training in adults at risk of
14
15 432 dementia: A Systematic Review. *BMC geriatrics* 2011;11 doi: Artn 55
16
17
18 433 10.1186/1471-2318-11-55
19
20 434 15. Huntley JD, Gould RL, Liu K, et al. Do cognitive interventions improve general cognition in
21
22 435 dementia? A meta-analysis and meta-regression. *Bmj Open* 2015;5(4) doi: ARTN e005247
23
24
25 436 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005247
26
27 437 16. Wilson RS, Mendes De Leon CF, Barnes LL, et al. Participation in cognitively stimulating activities
28
29 438 and risk of incident Alzheimer disease. *Jama* 2002;287(6):742-8.
30
31 439 17. Belleville S. Cognitive training for persons with mild cognitive impairment. *International*
32
33 440 *Psychogeriatrics* 2008;20(01) doi: 10.1017/s104161020700631x
34
35 441 18. Mowszowski L, Hermens DF, Diamond K, et al. Cognitive training enhances pre-attentive
36
37 442 neurophysiological responses in older adults 'at risk' of dementia. *Journal of Alzheimer's*
38
39 443 *disease : JAD* 2014;41(4):1095-108. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.3233/JAD-131985>
40
41
42 444 19. Reijnders J, van Heugten C, van Boxtel M. Cognitive interventions in healthy older adults and
43
44 445 people with mild cognitive impairment: a systematic review. *Ageing Res Rev*
45
46 446 2013;12(1):263-75. doi: 10.1016/j.arr.2012.07.003
47
48 447 20. Gunther VK, Schafer P, Holzner BJ, et al. Long-term improvements in cognitive performance
49
50 448 through computer-assisted cognitive training: a pilot study in a residential home for older
51
52 449 people. *Aging & mental health* 2003;7(3):200-06. doi: 10.1080/1360786031000101175
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

- 1
2
3 450 21. Cipriani G, Bianchetti A, Trabucchi M. Outcomes of a computer-based cognitive rehabilitation
4
5 451 program on Alzheimer's disease patients compared with those on patients affected by mild
6
7 452 cognitive impairment. Archives of gerontology and geriatrics 2006;43(3):327-35. doi:
8
9 453 10.1016/j.archger.2005.12.003
10
11 454 22. Gonzalez-Palau F, Franco M, Bamidis P, et al. The effects of a computer-based cognitive and
12
13 455 physical training program in a healthy and mildly cognitive impaired aging sample. Aging &
14
15 456 mental health 2014;18(7):838-46. doi: 10.1080/13607863.2014.899972
16
17 457 23. Rosen AC, Sugiura L, Kramer JH, et al. Cognitive training changes hippocampal function in mild
18
19 458 cognitive impairment: a pilot study. Journal of Alzheimer's disease : JAD 2011;26 Suppl
20
21 459 3:349-57. doi: 10.3233/jad-2011-0009
22
23 460 24. Eckroth-Bucher M, Siberski J. Preserving cognition through an integrated cognitive stimulation
24
25 461 and training program. Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Demen 2009;24(3):234-45. doi:
26
27 462 10.1177/1533317509332624
28
29 463 25. Galante E, Venturini G, Fiaccadori C. Computer-based cognitive intervention for dementia:
30
31 464 preliminary results of a randomized clinical trial. G Ital Med Lav Ergon 2007;29(3 Suppl
32
33 465 B):B26-32.
34
35 466 26. Gaitan A, Garolera M, Cerulla N, et al. Efficacy of an adjunctive computer-based cognitive
36
37 467 training program in amnesic mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease: a
38
39 468 single-blind, randomized clinical trial. International journal of geriatric psychiatry
40
41 469 2013;28(1):91-9. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/gps.3794>
42
43 470 27. Zhuang JP, Fang R, Feng X, et al. The impact of human-computer interaction-based
44
45 471 comprehensive training on the cognitive functions of cognitive impairment elderly
46
47 472 individuals in a nursing home. Journal of Alzheimer's disease : JAD 2013;36(2):245-51. doi:
48
49 473 10.3233/jad-130158
50
51 474 28. Bavelier D, Green CS, Han DH, et al. Brains on video games. Nat Rev Neurosci 2011;12(12):763-8.
52
53 475 doi: 10.1038/nrn3135
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 476 29. Li H, Li J, Li N, et al. Cognitive intervention for persons with mild cognitive impairment: A
4
5 477 meta-analysis. *Ageing research reviews* 2011;10(2):285-96. doi: 10.1016/j.arr.2010.11.003
6
7 478 30. Martin M, Clare L, Altgassen AM, et al. Cognition-based interventions for healthy older people
8
9 479 and people with mild cognitive impairment. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*
10
11 480 2011(1):CD006220. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006220.pub2
12
13 481 31. Simon SS, Yokomizo JE, Bottino CM. Cognitive intervention in amnesic Mild Cognitive
14
15 482 Impairment: a systematic review. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2012;36(4):1163-78. doi:
16
17 483 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2012.01.007
18
19 484 32. Hill NT, Mowszowski L, Naismith SL, et al. Computerized Cognitive Training in Older Adults With
20
21 485 Mild Cognitive Impairment or Dementia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Am J*
22
23 486 *Psychiatry* 2016:appiajp201616030360. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2016.16030360
24
25 487 33. Sherman DS, Mauser J, Nuno M, et al. The Efficacy of Cognitive Intervention in Mild Cognitive
26
27 488 Impairment (MCI): a Meta-Analysis of Outcomes on Neuropsychological Measures.
28
29 489 *Neuropsychol Rev* 2017;27(4):440-84. doi: 10.1007/s11065-017-9363-3
30
31 490 34. Coyle H, Traynor V, Solowij N. Computerized and virtual reality cognitive training for individuals
32
33 491 at high risk of cognitive decline: systematic review of the literature. *The American journal of*
34
35 492 *geriatric psychiatry : official journal of the American Association for Geriatric Psychiatry*
36
37 493 2015;23(4):335-59. doi: 10.1016/j.jagp.2014.04.009
38
39 494 35. Djabelkhir L, Wu YH, Vidal JS, et al. Computerized cognitive stimulation and engagement
40
41 495 programs in older adults with mild cognitive impairment: comparing feasibility, acceptability,
42
43 496 and cognitive and psychosocial effects. *Clinical interventions in aging* 2017;12:1967-75. doi:
44
45 497 10.2147/cia.s145769
46
47 498 36. Han JW, Son KL, Byun HJ, et al. Efficacy of the Ubiquitous Spaced Retrieval-based Memory
48
49 499 Advancement and Rehabilitation Training (USMART) program among patients with mild
50
51 500 cognitive impairment: a randomized controlled crossover trial. *Alzheimers Res Ther* 2017;9:8.
52
53 501 doi: 10.1186/s13195-017-0264-8
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 502 37. Savulich G, Piercy T, Fox C, et al. Cognitive Training Using a Novel Memory Game on an iPad in
4
5 503 Patients with Amnesic Mild Cognitive Impairment (aMCI). *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol* 2017
6
7 504 doi: 10.1093/ijnp/pyx040
8
9 505 38. Higgins JPT GS, (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version*
10
11 506 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. : The Cochrane Collaboration 2011.
12
13 507 39. Hedges LV OI. *Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis*: New York: Academic Press 1985.
14
15 508 40. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*
16
17 509 2003;327(7414):557-60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557
18
19 510 41. Borenstein M. *Introduction to meta-analysis*2009.
20
21 511 42. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and
22
23 512 meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009;339:b2535. doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2535
24
25 513 43. Optale G, Urgesi C, Busato V, et al. Controlling memory impairment in elderly adults using virtual
26
27 514 reality memory training: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Neurorehabilitation and neural*
28
29 515 *repair* 2010;24(4):348-57. doi: 10.1177/1545968309353328
30
31 516 44. Barnes DE, Yaffe K, Belfor N, et al. Computer-based cognitive training for mild cognitive
32
33 517 impairment: results from a pilot randomized, controlled trial. *Alzheimer disease and*
34
35 518 *associated disorders* 2009;23(3):205-10. doi: 10.1097/WAD.0b013e31819c6137
36
37 519 45. Chandler MJ, Locke DEC, Duncan NL, et al. Computer versus Compensatory Calendar Training in
38
39 520 Individuals with Mild Cognitive Impairment: Functional Impact in a Pilot Study. *Brain*
40
41 521 *sciences* 2017;7(9):10. doi: 10.3390/brainsci7090112
42
43 522 46. Han JW, Lee H, Hong JW, et al. Multimodal cognitive enhancement therapy for patients with mild
44
45 523 cognitive impairment and mild dementia: A multi- center, randomized, controlled,
46
47 524 double-blind, crossover trial. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease* 2017;55(2):787-96. doi:
48
49 525 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3233/JAD-160619>
50
51 526 47. Fiatarone Singh MA, Gates N, Saigal N, et al. The Study of Mental and Resistance Training
52
53 527 (SMART) study-resistance training and/or cognitive training in mild cognitive impairment: a
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 528 randomized, double-blind, double-sham controlled trial. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*
4
5 529 2014;15(12):873-80. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2014.09.010
6
7 530 48. Gagnon LG, Belleville S. Training of attentional control in mild cognitive impairment with
8
9 531 executive deficits: results from a double-blind randomised controlled study.
10
11 532 *Neuropsychological rehabilitation* 2012;22(6):809-35. doi:
12
13 533 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09602011.2012.691044>
14
15 534 49. Papp KV WS, Snyder PJ. Immediate and delayed effects of cognitive interventions in healthy
16
17 535 elderly: a review of current literature and future directions. . 2009
18
19 536 50. Martin M CL, Altgassen AM, Cameron MH, Zehnder F. Cognition-based interventions for healthy
20
21 537 older people and people with mild cognitive impairment. . 2011
22
23 538 51. Vidovich MR, Lautenschlager NT, Flicker L, et al. The PACE study: A randomized clinical trial of
24
25 539 cognitive activity strategy training for older people with mild cognitive impairment.
26
27 540 *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 2015;23(4):360-72. doi:
28
29 541 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jagp.2014.04.002>
30
31 542 52. Petersen RC. Mild cognitive impairment clinical trials. 2003
32
33 543 53. Libon DJ XS, Eppig J, Wicas G, Lamar M, Lippa C, Bettcher BM, Price CC, Giovannetti T, Swenson R,
34
35 544 Wambach DM. The heterogeneity of mild cognitive impairment: a neuropsychological
36
37 545 analysis. 2009
38
39 546 54. V. Solfrizzi FP, A.M. Colacicco, A. D'Introno, C. Capurso, F. Torres, F. Grigoletto, S. Maggi, A. Del
40
41 547 Parigi, E.M. Reiman, R.J. Caselli, E. Scafato, G. Farchi, A. Capurso. Vascular risk factors,
42
43 548 incidence of MCI, and rates of progression to dementia. 2004
44
45 549 55. Herrera C, Chambon C, Michel BF, et al. Positive effects of computer-based cognitive training in
46
47 550 adults with mild cognitive impairment. *Neuropsychologia* 2012;50(8):1871-81. doi:
48
49 551 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.04.012
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59


- 1
2
3 552 56. Hyer L, Scott C, Atkinson MM, et al. Cognitive Training Program to Improve Working Memory in
4
5 553 Older Adults with MCI. Clin Gerontologist 2016;39(5):410-27. doi:
6
7 554 10.1080/07317115.2015.1120257
8
9 555 57. Barnett SM CS. When and where do we apply what we learn? A taxonomy for far transfer. 2002
10
11 556 58. Meta-Analysis CCTiOAWMCIoDASRa. Far transfer in cognitive training of older adults. 2014
12
13 557 59. Stojanoski B, Lyons KM, Pearce AAA, et al. Targeted training: Converging evidence against the
14
15 558 transferable benefits of online brain training on cognitive function. Neuropsychologia 2018
16
17 559 doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.07.013
18
19
20 560
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

561
562**Table 1.** Characteristics of studies using computerised cognitive training in persons with MCI

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Included for meta-analysis
Barban et al 2016	N = 46 Ratio = 54.3% Age = 74.4 (5.7) Edu = 9 MMSE = 27.3 (2.1)	N = 60 Ratio = 51.7% Age = 72.9 (6.0) Edu = 11 MMSE = 28.1 (1.4)	EC: multi domain training. CC: passive(rest)	60 minute sessions, 2 sessions per week for 3 months. Total = 24 hours	n/s	Computerised software: 'SOCIALABLE' using touch screen. Multi-component -CT including Memory, attentional Executive Function, orientation, logical reasoning, constructional Praxis, language.	Before and after training, follow-up (n/s)#	Yes
Chandler et al 2017	N = 27 Ratio = 73.3% Age = 77.4 (7.2) Edu = 16.2 (2.6) MMSE = 26.7 (3.0)	N = 30 Ratio = 50.0 % Age = 76.2 (7.0) Edu = 16.0 (2.4) MMSE = 25.8 (3.2)	EC: Auditory memory training CC: Active(Memory Support System (MSS))	Frequency: n/s Duration: n/s Total = 10 hours	EC:4 CC:3 Total:10.9 4%	"Auditory Brain Training" software: 6 adaptive modules exercises to recognize and differentiate sounds, match or repeat sounds, remember increasingly difficult directions, and remember details from stories.	n/s	No*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Include d for meta-analysis
Ciarmiello et al. 2015	N = 15 Ratio = 35.7% Age = 71.2 (7.7) Edu = 9.3 (3.02) MMSE = 27.9 (1.8)	N = 15 Ratio = 46.7% Age = 72.0 (7.1) Edu = 7.8 (2.6) MMSE = 27.8(1.9)	EC: multi domain CC: semi-active (meeting with psychologist – no computer)	45 minute sessions, 2 days per week for 4 months. Total = 24 hours.	EC: 0 CC: 0 0%	Computerised training with multiple difficulty levels. Includes dual-task training, executive function training, working memory updating, visual exploration, spatial orienting tasks.	Before and after training follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Djabelkhjr et al 2017	N = 10 Ratio = 30.0 % Age = 75.2 (6.4) Edu = 60.0% (6) (of college level) MMSE = 27.7 (1.9)	N = 10 Ratio = 40.0 % Age = 78.2 (7.0) Edu = 44.4% (4) (of college level) MMSE = 27.4 (2.0)	EC: multi-domain CC: Active(multi-component)	90 mins per session 1 sessions/week, 12 weeks. Total = 18 hours.	EC: 1 CC: 0 Total: 5%	'KODRO' (Altera-Group, Paris, France), a web-based platform with several applications (ie, appointment and event reminding, cognitive games, communication, entertainment, videos and a library).	Before and after training. Follow-up (n/s)	Yes



Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Include d for meta-analysis
Fiatarone Singh et al. 2014	N = 24 Ratio = n/s Age = >55 Edu = n/s MMSE = 28.0 (2.0)	N = 27 Ratio = n/s Age = >55 Edu = n/s MMSE = 27.0 (2.0)	EC: multi domain CC: active (sham)	75 minute sessions, 2 or 3 days per week for 26 weeks. Total = 80 hours.	EC: 2 CC: 3 Total: 9.8%	COGPACK program: Computer-based multimodal and multi domain exercises targeting memory, executive function, attention, and speed of information processing	At baseline and 6 months and at least 72 hours after the previous training session Follow-up: at 18 months	Yes
Finn & McDonald 2011	N = 8 ratio = 37.5% age = 69.0 Edu = 13.3 MMSE = 28.5 (2.3)	N = 8 ratio = 62.5% age = 76.4 Edu = 12.0 MMSE = 27.5 (2.4)	EC: Multi-domain CC: Waiting list (Passive)	30 minute sessions, 4-5 sessions a week for an average of 11.43 weeks. Total = 25 hours	EC: 4 CC: 5 Total: 32%	Lumosity Inc CCT package. Four broad cognitive domains targeted: attention, processing speed, visual memory and cognitive control	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)	Yes

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Include d for meta-analysis
Finn and McDonald 2015	N = 12 ratio = 66% age = 72.8 Edu = 13.8 MMSE = 27.8 (1.3)	N = 12 ratio = 75% age = 75.1 Edu = 13.7 MMSE = 27.8 (1.9)	EC: Single memory domain CC: Passive	2 sessions per week for 4 weeks Total = n/s	EC: 4 CC: 3 Total:22.6 %	Repetition-lag training to improve recollection memory	First and last training session Follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Gagnon & Belleville 2012	N = 12 ratio = n/s age = 67.0 Edu = 15.0 MMSE = 28.1 (1.2)	N = 12 ratio = n/s age = 68.4 Edu = 13.1 MMSE = 27.8 (1.5)	EC: Single domain(attentional control) CC: Active	60 minute sessions, 3 times a week for 2 weeks. Total = 6 hours	EC: 1 CC: 1 Total: 8%	Programme targeting attentional control using Variable Priority (VP) training in a dual task with selected priorities and feedback.	One week pre and after intervention Follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Gooding et al. 2016 study 1	N = 31 ratio = 58.1% age = 75.6 Edu = 15.1 MMSE = n/s	N = 10 ratio = 58.1% age = 75.6 Edu = 15.1 MMSE = n/s	EC: Multi-domain CC: Active	60 min sessions, two days per week for 16 weeks Total = approx. 30 hours	EC: 12 CC: 1 Total: 20.3%	Posit Science's BrainFitness – repeated drill-and-practice adaptive exercises involving memory, attention and executive functions.	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)	Yes

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Include d for meta-analysis
Gooding et al. 2016 study 1	N = 23 ratio = 58.1% age = 75.6 Edu = 15.1 MMSE = n/s	N = 10 ratio = 58.1% age = 75.6 Edu = 15.1 MMSE = n/s	EC: Multi-domain in CC: Active	60 min sessions, two days per week for 16 weeks Total = approx. 30 hours	EC: 12 CC: 1 Total: 20.3%	Posit Science's BrainFitness – repeated drill-and-practice adaptive exercises involving memory, attention and executive functions.	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Hagovska and Olekszyova 2016	N = 40 ratio = 55% age = 68 Edu = 75% of secondary education MMSE = 26.0 (2.6)	N = 40 ratio = 48% age = 65.9 Edu = 70% of secondary education MMSE = 26.0 (1.5)	EC: Multi domain + balance training CC: Passive(just balance training)	30 minute sessions, 2 times a week for 10 weeks. Total = 10 hours	EC: 0 CC: 2 Total: 2.5%	CogniPlus training program Battery contains subprograms for attention, Working Memory, long-term memory, executive functions, spatial processing and visuomotor coordination.	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)	Yes

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Include d for meta-a nalysis
Han et al 2017	N = 23 Ratio = 56.5% Age = 73.7 ± 4.8 Edu = 13.5 ± 3.2 MMSE = 25.7 ± 3.2	N = 20 Ratio = 50.0% Age = 74.5 ± 6.4 Edu = 12.7 ± 3.7 MMSE=24.5 ± 2.4	EC: single memory training CC: Passive (Usual Care)	30 min per session 1 hour per day 2 sessions/week, 4 weeks. Total = 4 hours	EC:3 CC:5 Total: 16%	USMART program involving spaced retrieval-based memory training, using a self-administered application on an iPad tablet.	Week 0, 5 Follow-up (n/s)#	Yes
Herrera et al 2012	N = 11 ratio = 54% age = 75 Edu = n/s MMSE = 27.4 (0.5)	N = 11 ratio = 45% age = 78 Edu = n/s MMSE = 27.2 (0.4)	EC: Multidomain CC: Active	60 minute sessions, 2 days a week for 12 weeks. Total = 24 hours	0%	Several computer-based training exercises designed to improve memory and attention	0, 12 weeks ± 15 days Follow-up: at 24 weeks	Yes
Hughes et al 2014	N = 10 ratio = 20% age = 78.5 (7.1) Edu = 13.8 (2.4) MMSE = 27.2 (1.9)	N = 10 ratio = 40% age = 76.2 (4.3) Edu = 13.1 (1.9) MMSE = 27.1 (1.8)	EC: Multidomain CC: Active	90 minute sessions, once a week for 24 weeks. Total = 36 hours	0%	Group-based Nintendo Wii sports package. Group-based Interactive video gaming	0, 24 weeks ± 1 weeks Follow-up: (n/s)	Yes

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Included for meta-analysis
Hyer Lee et al. 2016	N = 34 ratio = 50% age = 75.1 Edu = 70% secondary MMSE = n/s	N = 34 ratio = 44% age = 75.2 Edu = 66% secondary MMSE = n/s	EC: Single domain (working memory) CC: Active (Sham)	25 days of 40 min sessions, completed over 5 to 7 weeks. Total = 16.7 hours	EC: 4 CC: 5 Total: 11.7%	Cogmed – adaptive WM training	Before and after training Follow-up: 3 months after intervention	Yes
Lin et al 2016	N = 10 Ratio = 50.0% Age = 75.2 ± 7.4 Edu = 15.9 ± 1.3 MMSE = 26.6 ± 2.9	N = 11 Ratio = 54.5% Age = 75.2 ± 7.4 Edu = 15.9 ± 1.3 MMSE = 26.6 ± 2.9	EC: Single domain speed-of-processing CC: active control (mental leisure activities)	1 hour per day 4 days per week for 6 weeks in their homes. Total = 24 hours	EC:2 CC:1 Total: 12.5%	INSIGHT online program: (vision-based speed-of-processing) which included five training tasks: eye for detail, peripheral challenge, visual sweeps, double decision, and target tracker.	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)#	Yes
Optale et al 2010	N = 15 ratio = 59.1% age = 78.5 Edu = 5.3 MMSE = 22.9 (5.0)	N = 16 ratio = 31.25% age = 81.6 Edu = 6 MMSE = 21.0 (4.8)	EC: Single domain - Memory CC: Active	30 minute sessions, 3 times a week for 3 months. Total = 58.5 hours	EC: 3 CC: 2 Total: 16.1%	A Virtual Reality-based memory training programme	Before and after training Follow-up: 3 months after intervention	No**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Include d for meta-a nalysis
Rosen et al 2011	N = 6 ratio = n/s age = 70.7 Edu = 16.7 MMSE = 29.3 (1.2)	N = 6 ratio = n/s age = 78.0 Edu = 18.3 MMSE = 27.8 (2.3)	EC: processing speed and accuracy in auditory processing CC: computer-based activities(Active)	100 minute sessions, 5 times a week for 8 weeks. Total = 36 hours	0%	processing speed and accuracy in auditory processing	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Rozzini et al 2007	N = 15 ratio = n/s age = 63 - 78 Edu = n/s MMSE = 26.0 (1.6)	N = 22 ratio = n/s age = 63 - 78 Edu = n/s MMSE = 26.4 (1.9)	EC: Multidomain and medication CC: Medication only (Passive)	60 minute session, 5 days a week for 4 weeks in 3 discrete blocks. Total = 60 hours	0%	Cognitive exercises based on Neuropsychology Training combined with a cholinesterase inhibitor	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)	Yes

For peer review only

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Include d for meta-a nalysis
Savulich et al 2017	N = 21 Ratio = 52.4% Age = 75.2 ± 7.4 Edu = 15.9 ± 1.3 (Age left education) MMSE = 26.6 ± 2.9	N = 21 Ratio = 66.7% Age = 76.9 ± 8.3 Edu = 16.0 ± 2.1 (Age left education) MMSE = 26.8 ± 2.2	EC: a novel memory game CC: negative (clinic visits as usual)	1 hour per session, 8 hours within 4 weeks. Total = 8 hours.	0 %	Gameshow program: Computer-based episodic memory training.	At a maximum of 4 weeks after the baseline testing session Follow-up (n/s)	Yes

Notes: MMSE: Mini Mental State Examination, SD: Standard deviation, n/s: not stated, EC: Experimental condition, CC: Control condition.

*Excluded from meta-analysis due to immediate cognitive outcomes not stated, ** Excluded from meta-analysis due to suspected inclusion of individuals with AD. # cross-over studies, no available data could be used.

567

Table 2 Results of Meta-analysis of computerised cognitive training (CCT) on cognitive domains

Analysis of CCT	No. of studies	N Tx*/control	Pooled Effect size g (95% CI)	Overall effect: Z (P value)	Heterogeneity: I ² % (P value)
Global Cognition	11	258/245	0.23 (0.03, 0.44)	z= 2.22, p = 0.03	6% p = 0.39
Memory	13	245/232	0.30 (0.11, 0.50)	z = 3.03, p = 0.002	46% p = 0.04
Working Memory	5	82/83	0.39 (0.12, 0.66)	z = 2.85, p = 0.004	0% p = 0.81
Executive Function	11	171/182	0.20 (-0.03, 0.43)	z= 1.74, p = 0.08	51% p = 0.03

568

*Tx = training group.

569

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5 570 Figure 1 Flow chart of the study selection process

6
7 571 Figure 2 Forest plot demonstrating the efficacy of CCT on global cognition function

8
9 572 Figure 3 Forest plot demonstrating the efficacy of CCT on memory, working memory and executive function

10
11 573

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

For peer review only




Figure 1. Flow chart of the study selection process

155x115mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2 Forest plot demonstrating the efficacy of CCT on global cognitive function

195x62mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 3 Forest plot demonstrating the efficacy of CCT on memory, working memory and executive function

195x173mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3 Supplement to: Zhang H, Huntley J, et al. The efficacy of Computerized Cognitive Training on
4 cognitive outcomes in Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.
5
6

7
8 Supplementary Figure 1 summary of risk of bias for included studies
9

10
11 Supplementary Figure 2 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on global cognitive function
12

13
14 Supplementary Figure 3 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on global cognition stratified by
15 the type of control group
16

17
18 Supplementary Figure 4 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on global cognition stratified by the
19 type of control group
20

21
22 Supplementary Figure 5 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on memory, working memory and
23 executive function
24

25
26 Supplementary Figure 6 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on memory stratified by the type
27 of control group
28

29
30 Supplementary Figure 7 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on memory stratified by the type of
31 control group
32

33
34 Supplementary Figure 8 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on executive function stratified by
35 the type of control group
36

37
38 Supplementary Figure 9 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on executive cognition stratified by
39 the type of control group
40


41
42 Supplementary Figure 10 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on memory stratified by single
43 memory domain or multi-domain intervention
44

45
46 Supplementary Figure 11 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on memory stratified by single
47 memory domain or multi-domain intervention
48


49
50 Supplementary Figure 12 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on global cognition stratified by
51 dose of the intervention
52

53
54 Supplementary Figure 13 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on global cognition stratified by
55 dose of the intervention
56
57
58
59
60


A.




B.




Supplementary Figure 1 (A-B). Summary of risk of bias for included studies. (A). Risk of bias graph: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item presented as percentages across all included studies. (B). Risk of bias summary: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item for each included study.




Supplementary Figure 2. Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on global cognitive function



Supplementary Figure 3. Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on global cognition stratified by the type of control group




Supplementary Figure 4. Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on global cognition stratified by the type of control group




Supplementary Figure 5. Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on memory, working memory and executive function


review only




Supplementary Figure 6. Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on memory stratified by the type of control group




Supplementary Figure 7. Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on memory stratified by the type of control group




Supplementary Figure 8. Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on executive function stratified by the type of control group




Supplementary Figure 9. Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on executive cognition stratified by the type of control group




Supplementary Figure 10 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on memory stratified by single memory domain or multi-domain intervention



Supplementary Figure 11 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on memory stratified by single memory domain or multi-domain intervention



Supplementary Figure 12 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on global cognition stratified by dose of the intervention



Supplementary Figure 13 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on global cognition stratified by dose of the intervention

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Supplement to: Zhang H, Huntley J, et al. The efficacy of Computerized Cognitive Training on cognitive outcomes in Mild Cognitive Impairment:
A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.

Supplementary Table 1 Search terms used for literature search

Supplementary Table 2. Brief description of the specific outcome measures included in the meta-analysis

Supplementary Appendix 1 Statistical methods

Supplementary Table 1. Search terms used for literature search

Intervention Terms	<p>“cognitive stimulation” OR “cognitive rehabilitation” OR “cognitive training” OR “cognitive therapy” OR “cognitive retraining” OR “cognitive support” OR “cognitive intervention” OR “cognitive exercise” OR “cognitive strategy” OR “cognitive aid” OR “memory function” OR “memory rehabilitation” OR “memory therapy” OR “memory aid” OR “memory group” OR “memory training” OR “memory retraining” OR “memory support” OR “memory stimulation” OR “memory strategy” OR “memory management” OR “brain training” OR “brain rehabilitation” OR “brain stimulation” OR “brain retraining” OR “brain exercise” OR “neuropsychological training” OR “neuropsychological therapy” OR “neuropsychological strategy” OR “neuropsychological aid” OR “neuropsychological stimulation” OR “neuropsychological rehabilitation” OR “neuropsychological exercise” OR “neuropsychological intervention” OR “neuropsychological retraining” OR “neuropsychological support” OR “psychostimulation” OR “executive training” OR “executive stimulation” OR “executive rehabilitation” OR “attention training” OR “attentional training” OR “attentional rehabilitation” OR “global stimulation” OR “reality orientation”</p>
Study Terms	<p>“RCT” OR “controlled trial” OR random*</p>
Subject Terms	<p>“Mild cognitive impairment” OR “memory impairment” OR “cognitive impairment” OR “memory disorder” OR “cognitive disorder” OR “memory dysfunction” OR “cognitive dysfunction” OR “MCI” OR “AAMI” OR “MCD” OR “mild cognitive disorder”</p>

Supplementary Table 2. Brief description of the specific outcome measures included in the meta-analysis

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE)	GEN COG	A 30-point questionnaire used to estimate severity of cognitive impairment including orientation and memory functions	Barben et al, 2016 Ciarmiello et al. 2015 Djabelkhir et al 2017 Han et al 2017 Hagovska et al. 2015 Rozzini et al 2007 Savulich et al 2017
Modified Mini Mental State Examination (mMMSE)	GEN COG	This instrument included all items from the standard MMSE, plus the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale–Revised Digit Span subtest and additional attention/calculation and general knowledge, language, and construction items.	Gooding et al 2015 study 1&2
Alzheimer’s Disease Assessment Scale-Cognitive (ADAS-Cog)	GEN COG	Measuring severity of cognitive dysfunction associated with Alzheimer’s disease, and is widely used in pharmacological studies of dementia and MCI. Higher scores indicate more dysfunction.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014
Computerised Assessment of Mild Cognitive Impairment (CAMCI)	GEN COG	A battery of tests to assess cognitive performance including domains of attention, executive functioning, memory and processing speed	Hughes et al 2014
Milan Overall Dementia Assessment (MODA)	GEN COG	The MODA is a paper and pencil test, composed of three sections: an autonomy scale, a section testing orientation and a section testing a wide range of cognitive domains.	Ciarmiello et al. 2015
16-item free and cued reminding test	MEM	Participants search a card containing four pictures of items with matched category cues before subjected to tests of free and cued recall	Herrera et al 2012 Djabelkhir et al 2017
BEM-144 recall test	MEM	A 12-word immediate recall test from BEM-144 memory battery	Herrera et al 2012

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
Description of the visual recognition memory task (DMS48)	MEM	Participants asked to remember a sample before making a delayed forced-choice match to original sample	Herrera et al 2012 Ciarmiello et al. 2015
Doors Recognition subtest	MEM	Participants are shown a variety of different coloured doors which they must remember and later recognise from a selection of similar doors	Herrera et al 2012
MMSE - Recall Test	MEM	Participants presented with stimuli before being asked to recall as many as possible	Herrera et al 2012
Paired-associates learning (PAL)	MEM	Visual patterns revealed in different boxes before participant tested on where pattern originally located	Finn & McDonald 2011 Finn & McDonald 2015 Savulich et al 2017
Pattern Recognition Memory (PRM)	MEM	Test of visual pattern recognition in a forced discrimination paradigm	Finn & McDonald 2011
Recall of Rey's Complex Figure	MEM	Subjects shown complex figure and then tested on their delayed recall of the figure	Herrera et al 2012 Rozzini et al 2007
Rey's figure copy	MEM	Participants are to reproduce a drawing by i) copying (reproduction) and ii) memory (recall) using a 18-point scoring system	Rozzini et al 2007
List Learning Memory Sum from ADAS-Cog	MEM	List learning assessed across the three memory recall trials of the ADAS-Cog. Higher scores indicate better memory.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014
Benton Visual Retention Test-Revised (BVRT-R)	MEM	BVRT-R is a visual memory test which assesses visual perception and visual constructional abilities as participants are required to draw from memory simple designs. Higher scores indicate better function.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014 Savulich et al 2017
The Logical Memory subtest of the Wechsler Memory Scale 3rd edition (immediately and delayed)	MEM	The logic memory is used to measure both immediate (I) and delayed (II) memory for verbal information. Participants are presented with a simple narrative and are required to recall as many details of the story as they can immediately after presentation. Higher scores indicate better memory.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014
Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (RAVLT)	MEM	RAVLT includes a list of 15 words to be recalled immediately after each of the 5 verbal presentations and after a 30-min delay	Barben et al, 2016 Ciarmiello et al. 2015

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
Prose memory	MEM	A subset of The Memory Assessment Scales, is an auditory verbal prose recall task which requires the subject to recall a short story. Subjects are asked to recall the story from memory and are then asked nine questions about details of the story.	Ciarmiello et al. 2015
visuospatial memory test (VST)	MEM	From the Cognitive Efficiency Profile	Djabelkhir et al 2017
Buschke Selective Reminding Test (BSRT)	MEM	The test provides 12 words which are selectively rehearsed by the subject until they are memorized. That is, only those words not recalled on the immediately preceding trial are presented. The subject then attends to an interference task or verbal list. Subsequently, after a delay, the subject is asked to recall the words.	Gooding et al 2015 study 1&2
WMS-R Visual Reproductions (VR) I and II subtests	MEM	VR assesses visual memory. Cards with printed designs is shown to the participants. Following each exposure and a 30 minutes delay, subjects draw what they remember of the design.	Gooding et al 2015 study 1&2
WMS-R Logical Memory (LM)Subtests I and II subtests	MEM	LM. The examiner reads two stories, stopping after each reading for an immediate free recall. And a 30 minutes delayed recall.	Gooding et al 2015 study 1&2
The Word List Memory Test (WLMT)	MEM	Word list task that contains 10 semantically unrelated words The words are presented to the subject one at a time and are read aloud Three trials are administered in this fashion, with the order of the 10 words being randomized for each trial The examiner records the order of recall and notes any intrusions that might occur The primary Indices of Interest are the number of words recalled on each trial	Han et al 2017
The Word List Recall Test (WLRT)	MEM	Words, displayed one at a time for one second each. Participants read each of the words, and try to remember them without taking notes.	Han et al 2017

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
WLRcT(The Word List Recognition)	MEM	A word list was designed so that half its words would denote targets when any of a number of target classes were defined. After scanning this list for targets, subjects were unexpectedly tested on their ability to recognize the words they had scanned.	Han et al 2017
RBANS Memory Score	MEM	It consists of 12 subtests, which yield five Index scores (i.e., Attention, Language, Visuospatial/Constructional, Immediate Memory, and Delayed Memory) and a Total Scale score.	Rosen et al 2011
Dot counting test	WM	The task dot counting requires examinees to count the dots as quickly as possible by the fastest means possible.	Lin et al 2016
1-back test	WM	In the 1-Back task, participants are presented a sequence of stimuli one-by-one. For each stimulus, they need to decide if the current stimulus is the same as the one presented 1 trials ago.	Lin et al 2016
Digit Span Test	WM	Sequence of digits is read aloud. Subjects asked to immediately recall digits in the correct order. If correct, a sequence with an additional digit is presented.	Herrera et al 2012 Ciarmiello et al 2015
LNS (Letter-Number Sequencing)	WM	The task involves listening to and remembering a string of digits and letters read aloud at a speed of one per second, then recalling the information by repeating the numbers in chronological order, followed by the letters in alphabetical order.	Hyer et al 2016
Spatial Span	WM	Participants tested on ability to remember the location of objects on a spatial grid.	Hyer et al 2016
Spatial Span (Corsi test)	WM	Corsi is a short term memory task conceptually similar to the digit span test. the experimenter (the person who carries out the study) shows nine blocks arranged in front of the participant, the experimenter taps a sequence of blocks (for example, the experimenter taps a sequence of 3 different blocks, one after another), the participant needs to tap the blocks that the experimenter showed, in the same order, steps 1-3 are repeated multiple times with different lengths of blocks.	Ciarmiello et al. 2015

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
Spatial working memory (SWM)	WM	A test that requires retention and manipulation of visuospatial information to collect 'tokens' and fill a column	Finn & McDonald 2011
Symbol Span	WM	This subtest assesses visual working memory using novel visual stimuli. Beginning with two symbols, abstract visual symbols are exposed for 5 seconds. In the test phase, the participant has to correctly recall not only the correct symbols from distractor items, but also the order in which they were presented from left to right. The number of symbols presented increases by one at intervals as the test progresses. Higher scores indicate better visual working memory.	Finn & McDonald et al 2015
Word span	WM	Participants tested on ability to remember a list of words in order.	Ciarmiello et al. 2015
Alpha span task	WM	In the alpha span test, short lists of words are presented and the participant's task is to mentally reorder the words and give them back in correct alphabetical order.	Ciarmiello et al. 2015
Intra-/extra-dimensional set shifting (IED)	EXE	A test of rule acquisition and reversal. It is computerised analogue of the Wisconsin Card Sorting test and measured the total errors made	Finn & McDonald 2011
Modified Dual Task	EXE	Participants completed a modified dual task consisting of a visual detection task (responding to an appearance of a stimuli) and alpha-arithmetic task (responding 'true' or 'false' to equations of letters and numbers e.g. 'U-1 = T') simultaneously and were recorded in accuracy of responses in each task	Gagnon & Belleville 2012
Raven's coloured matrices	EXE	60 patterns present in order of difficulty. Subjects asked to identify the missing element that completes a pattern	Rozzini et al 2007
Short Story	EXE	Participants are asked to recall a short story	Rozzini et al 2007
Telephone Search Dual Task	EXE	Participants complete the telephone search test whilst simultaneously counting audible tones	Gagnon & Belleville 2012
Telephone Search Test	EXE	Participants circle key stimuli while searching entries in a simulated classified telephone directory	Gagnon & Belleville 2012

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
Trial making test	EXE	The task requires participants to 'connect the dots' in two parts, firstly numerically and secondly, alphanumerically	Gagnon & Belleville 2012, Hughes et al 2014, Djabelkhir et al 2017 Hyer et al 2016
Verbal fluency	EXE	Participants generate as many words in one minute from a given letter.	Rozzini et al 2007, Djabelkhir et al 2017
Visual Elevator Test	EXE	Participants count up and down according to visual stimuli in an elevator, the time-per-direction-change score was calculated	Gagnon & Belleville 2012
Raven's progressive matrices - non-verbal test (PM47)	EXE	The Raven Standard Progressive Matrices (PM47) assess the logical-deductive skill. ?	Ciarmiello et al. 2015
Rey–Osterrieth complex figure test (ROCF)	EXE	ROCF is a neuropsychological assessment in which examinees are asked to reproduce a complicated line drawing, first by copying it freehand (recognition), and then drawing from memory (recall).	Ciarmiello et al. 2015
Categorical verbal fluency (animals)	EXE	Participants generate as many animal names as possible in one minute.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014 Djabelkhir et al 2017
Number sequencing Number-Letter switching	EXE	In Number Sequencing, the participant is asked to draw a line connecting numbers in order from low to high as quickly as possible without making mistakes, and is a measure of attention. In Number-Letter switching, the task is to switch between connecting numbers and letters, in order, from lowest to highest, e.g., 1-A, 2-B, 3-C etc., and is a measure of cognitive flexibility.	Finn & McDonald et al 2015
Tracking A, Tracking B	EXE	Two tracking tasks requiring participants to (1) track numbers (from 24-1) in reverse order (Tracking A), and (2) months forward (January – December) and numbers in reverse (Tracking B).	Hughes et al 2014
Useful field of view (UFOV)	EXE	UFOV is a computerized test assessing visual processing speed and attention.	Lin et al 2016
Verbal fluency	EXE	(Phonemic and categorical fluency)?	Lin et al 2016
Cognitive control	EXE	Set shifting and flanker tasks?	Lin et al 2016

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
Cross-modality dual task (Divided)	EXE	Participants were subjected to a dual-task simultaneously consisting of a visual detection (as above) with a digit span task (orally recalling a list of digits) and recorded span items recalled correctly in %.	Gagnon & Belleville 2012
The CANTAB CRT(speed)	EXE	It is used to assess motor speed and thus acts as a control measure of general alertness to help interpret other cognitive tasks. An arrow will appear on either the left or right side of a computer screen. After the arrow appears, the participant is instructed to press a corresponding left or right button, using a response box, as quickly as possible.	Savulich et al 2017
WAIS-III Similarities	EXE	WAIS Similarities is a subtest from the WAIS-III used to measure verbal conception formation and abstractive thinking. Higher scores indicate better function.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014
WAIS-III Matrices	EXE	WAIS Matrices is a perceptual subtest of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-III and is used to assess executive functions posing four types of non-verbal reasoning tasks including pattern completion, classification, abstraction and serial reasoning, and all items require visual perception, organization, and synthesis of visual spatial information. Higher scores indicate better function.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014
COWAT	EXE	Combined Oral Word Association Test is a language-based task assessing association fluency, and is often used as a measure of executive functioning. The most commonly used letters are F, A, and S. or C, F, and L, based upon word prevalence rates. Higher scores indicate better function.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014
SDMT (Attention/speed)	EXE	Symbol Digit Modalities Test measures divided attention, visual scanning, tracking, and motor speed. It uses a substitution format presenting symbols with matching numbers, and participants are required to provide name the numbers corresponding to each given symbol. Higher scores indicate better function.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014

Notes: General cognition (GEN COG), episodic memory (MEM), working memory (WM), executive function (EXE)

Supplementary Appendix 1

Statistical methods

Effect size calculation

Effect sizes were calculated using RevMan software version 5.3. Standardised mean differences were calculated using Hedges' adjusted g^1 . Pre-intervention standard deviations were used as these are most likely to be comparable across studies and therefore provide the most accurate estimate of effect size.³

The Hedges' adjusted g formula used in RevMan is as follows:

$$g = [M_{\text{post intervention}} - M_{\text{post control}} / SD_{\text{pre-pooled}}] * [1 - 3 / (4N - 9)]$$

Where $N = n_{\text{intervention group}} + n_{\text{control group}}$

and

$$SD_{\text{pre-pooled}} = \sqrt{[(n_{\text{intervention-1}}) SD_{\text{pre intervention}}^2 + (n_{\text{control-1}}) SD_{\text{pre control}}^2] / N - 2}$$

Meta-analyses

Meta-analyses were performed using RevMan software version 5.3. A random effects method as described by DeSirmonian and Laird⁴ was used, adjusting standard errors of the effect sizes in each study to account for the heterogeneity for intervention effects observed between different studies.

The pooled effect size of each meta-analysis was calculated by attributing a weight to the average effect size in each study according to sample size. The z statistic was used to evaluate whether the pooled effect size was significantly different to no effect.

Heterogeneity was quantified using the I^2 statistic.

Composite measure calculation

Composite scores were calculated where a study reported multiple outcomes falling within a particular outcome domain (e.g. objective cognitive performance). This approach was pragmatic in allowing one score to represent each intervention in the meta-analysis regardless of the number of outcomes reported. In turn this prevents more weight being given to studies with multiple outcomes.² The variance of the sum of variables was calculated as described below.

Using the example of a study with two relevant outcomes, there will be two effect sizes, namely y_1 and y_2 . The overall mean effect size for the composite measure will be:

1
2
3 $\bar{y} = 1/2(y_1 + y_2)$
4
5

6 The variance of this mean is calculated as follows:
7

8
9 $V_{\bar{y}} = \frac{1}{4} (V_{y_1} + V_{y_2} + 2r\sqrt{V_{y_1}}\sqrt{V_{y_2}}),$
10
11

12 where r is the correlation coefficient describing to what extent y_1 and y_2 co-vary.
13
14

15 If the correlation is set at 0, the outcomes are essentially treated as independent of each other and if the correlation is set at 1, the variance is
16 an average of each outcome's variance. The former will lead to an underestimate of the variance and overestimate of precision while the latter
17 will have the opposite effect. Consequently, in the absence of existing literature to identify a suitable correlation, we reported composite effect
18 sizes calculated using a correlation of 0.5.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 29
30 1. Hedges LV, Olkin I. Statistical methods for meta-analysis. New York, Academic Press 1985.
31
32 2. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, et al. Introduction to Meta-Analysis. Chichester, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd 2009.
33
34 3. Morris S. Estimating Effect Sizes From Pretest-Posttest-Control Group Designs. Organ. Res. Meth 2008;11 (2):364-386.
35
36
37 4. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials 1986; 7(3):177-188
38
39
40
41
42

PRISMA checklist

Section/topic	Checklist item	Page number/ Figure/Table
Title		
Title	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
Abstract		
Structured summary	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	2-3
Introduction		
Rationale	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	4-6
Objectives	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	6
Methods		
Protocol and registration	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	n/a
Eligibility criteria	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	8
Information sources	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	8
Search	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Supplementary

Section/topic	Checklist item	Page number/ Figure/Table
Table 1		
Study selection	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	9
Data collection process	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	9
Data items	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	n/a
Risk of bias in individual studies	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	9
Summary measures	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	9
Synthesis of results	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	9
Risk of bias across studies	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	9
Additional analyses	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	10
Results		
Study selection	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	Figure 1

Section/topic	Checklist item	Page number/ Figure/Table
Study characteristics	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	Table 1 11-12
Risk of bias within studies	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	Supplementary Figure 1
Results of individual studies	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	Figs 2-3
Synthesis of results	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	13-14
Risk of bias across studies	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	Supplementary Figure 1
Additional analysis	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	13-14
Discussion		
Summary of evidence	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	16
Limitations	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	16-17
Conclusions	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	19
Funding		
Funding	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the	n/a

Section/topic	Checklist item	Page number/ Figure/Table
	systematic review.	

For peer review only

BMJ Open

The effect of Computerized Cognitive Training on cognitive outcomes in Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-027062.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Apr-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Zhang, Haifeng; University College London Division of Psychiatry; Peking University Sixth Hospital, Peking University Institute of Mental Health, NHC Key Laboratory of Mental Health (Peking University), National Clinical Research Center for Mental Disorders (Peking University Sixth Hospital), Beijing Dementia Key Lab Huntley, Jonathan; University College London, Division of Psychiatry Bhome, Rohan; University College London, Division of Psychiatry Holmes, Benjamin; University College London Division of Psychiatry Cahill, Jack; Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience. King's College London Gould, Rebecca; University College London Division of Psychiatry Wang, Huali; Peking University Sixth Hospital, Peking University Institute of Mental Health, NHC Key Laboratory of Mental Health (Peking University), National Clinical Research Center for Mental Disorders (Peking University Sixth Hospital), Beijing Dementia Key Lab Yu, Xin; Peking University Sixth Hospital, Peking University Institute of Mental Health, NHC Key Laboratory of Mental Health (Peking University), National Clinical Research Center for Mental Disorders (Peking University Sixth Hospital), Beijing Dementia Key Lab Howard, R; University College London Division of Psychiatry,
Primary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Keywords:	Mild cognitive training (MCI), computerised, cognitive training, cognitive outcomes, meta-analysis

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The effect of Computerized Cognitive Training on cognitive outcomes in Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Haifeng Zhang^{1,3}, J. D. Huntley¹, R. Bhome¹, B. Holmes¹, J.T. Cahill², R.L. Gould¹, Huali Wang³,
Xin Yu³ and R. J. Howard¹

1. Division of Psychiatry, University College London, London W1T 7NF, United Kingdom

2. Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London SE5 8AF, United Kingdom

3. Peking University Sixth Hospital, Peking University Institute of Mental Health, NHC Key Laboratory of Mental Health (Peking University), National Clinical Research Center for Mental Disorders (Peking University Sixth Hospital), Beijing Dementia Key Lab, Beijing 100191, China

* Address correspondence

Dr. Huntley: j.huntley@ucl.ac.uk

6th Floor Maple House, 149 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 7NF,
University College London, United Kingdom.

Running title: A meta-analysis of computerised cognitive training in MCI

Key words: Mild cognitive training (MCI), computerised, cognitive training, cognitive outcomes, meta-analysis.

Word count: 4050

1
2
3 **23 Abstract:**
4
5

6 **24 Objectives** To determine the effect of computerised cognitive training (CCT) on improving cognitive
7
8 **25** function for older adults with mild cognitive impairment (MCI).
9

10
11 **26 Design** Systematic review and meta-analysis.
12

13
14 **27 Data Sources** PubMed, Embase, Web of Science and the Cochrane Library were searched through
15
16 **28** January 2018.
17

18
19 **29 Eligibility Criteria** Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) comparing CCT with control conditions in
20
21 **30** those with MCI aged 55+ were included.
22

23
24 **31 Data extraction and synthesis** Two independent reviewers extracted data and assessed the risk of
25
26 **32** bias. Effect sizes (Hedges' g and 95% CIs) were calculated and random effects meta-analyses were
27
28 **33** performed where three or more studies investigated a comparable intervention and outcome.
29
30 **34** Heterogeneity was quantified using the I^2 statistic.
31
32

33
34 **35 Results** 18 studies met the inclusion criteria and were included in the analyses, involving 690
35
36 **36** participants. Meta-analysis revealed small to moderate positive treatment effects compared to
37
38 **37** control interventions in 4 domains as follows: Global Cognitive Function ($g = 0.23$, 95% CI = 0.03,
39
40 **38** 0.44), Memory ($g = 0.30$, 95% CI = 0.11, 0.50), Working Memory ($g = 0.39$, 95% CI = 0.12, 0.66) and
41
42 **39** Executive function ($g = 0.20$, 95% CI = -0.03, 0.43). Statistical significance was reached in all domains
43
44 **40** apart from executive function.
45
46

47
48 **41 Conclusions** This meta-analysis provides evidence that CCT improves cognitive function in older
49
50 **42** people with MCI. However, the long-term transfer of these improvements and the potential to
51
52 **43** reduce dementia prevalence remains unknown. Various methodological issues such as
53
54 **44** heterogeneity in outcome measures, interventions and MCI symptoms and lack of intention-to-treat
55
56 **45** (ITT) analyses limit the quality of the literature and represent areas for future research.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 47 **Strengths and limitations of this study**
4
5

- 6 48 1. This is a comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating the effects of
7
8 49 computerised cognitive training in older adults with mild cognitive impairment on cognitive
9
10 50 outcomes.
11
12 51 2. We excluded studies that did not utilise strict clinical diagnostic criteria for MCI to reduce the
13
14 52 heterogeneity often found between participants in MCI studies.
15
16 53 3. Data for four main cognitive domains most significantly affected by MCI and targeted by
17
18 54 cognitive interventions were extracted from individual studies (global cognitive function,
19
20 55 episodic memory, working memory and executive function) and where appropriate composite
21
22 56 measures were calculated for meta-analyses.
23
24 57 4. The studies included in the systematic review are generally of moderate quality, however
25
26 58 several methodological issues may limit the interpretation of results.
27
28 59 5. A lack of follow up data makes it impossible to draw conclusions regarding long term effects or
29
30 60 impact on the prevalence of dementia.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

62 INTRODUCTION

63 There are currently estimated to be over 46 million people worldwide living with dementia. This
64 number is expected to grow to approximately 131.5 million by 2050.¹ There is therefore an urgent
65 need to develop therapeutic treatments that may delay or prevent dementia in population groups
66 considered 'at risk'.² Interventions that delay the onset of AD by an average of two years would
67 decrease the worldwide prevalence rate by 22.8 million cases,³ which in turn, would ease the huge
68 burden placed on individuals, families and society. For these reasons, evidence-based interventions
69 that reduce the risk of dementia are urgently required.

70 Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI) refers to an intermediate stage between normal age-related
71 cognitive decline (ARCD) and dementia.⁴ Although many older adults experience a degree of
72 deterioration in cognitive performance, MCI is described as a greater than the expected cognitive
73 decline for an individual's age and education, but without notable interference in everyday
74 functioning.⁵ Within the older adult population, the estimated prevalence rate of MCI ranges from
75 15-20%.⁶ Although MCI can present with a variety of symptoms, when memory loss is the
76 predominant symptom it is termed "amnesic MCI" and is frequently seen as a prodromal stage of
77 Alzheimer's disease.⁶ When individuals have impairments in domains other than memory it is
78 classified as non-amnesic single- or multiple-domain MCI and these individuals are believed to be
79 more likely to convert to other types of dementia.⁶

80 The lack of therapeutic benefit or delay in progression from MCI to AD with pharmacological
81 interventions has meant that the focus has shifted towards non-pharmacological interventions.⁷

82 Cognitive remediation is the term used for interventions designed to mediate cognitive decline and
83 can be typically identified as involving one of three different approaches: cognitive stimulation (CS),
84 cognitive rehabilitation (CR) and cognitive training (CT). Interventions based on CS and CR are more
85 focused on individuals with established dementia, often with the aim of overcoming specific
86 difficulties with daily living and improving general quality of life. In comparison, CT can be used for

1
2
3 87 subjects without significant cognitive or functional difficulties, and is therefore well suited for
4
5 88 individuals with MCI.
6
7

8 89 CT refers to interventions that aim to improve cognitive domains through repeated practice on
9
10 90 theoretically driven skills and strategies.⁸ Each CT exercise aims to target one or two specific
11
12 91 domains in an adaptive manner with a possibility of transfer effects whereby performance in other
13
14 92 untrained cognitive domains is also improved.⁹
15
16

17 93 Computerised cognitive training (CCT) utilises computers for the delivery of the intervention and
18
19 94 differs from traditional CT, which usually incorporates face-to-face contact with a professional and
20
21 95 paper-and-pencil paradigms.⁸ CCT has several advantages including cost-effectiveness, increased
22
23 96 accessibility and ability to customise the content and difficulty of the training.¹⁰⁻¹² Research involving
24
25 97 older adults has found that CCT programs are associated with high satisfaction levels, and that they
26
27 98 are also a feasible option for individuals with MCI, with equal or better adherence rates when
28
29 99 compared to traditional CT.¹⁰⁻¹³ In addition, evidence suggests that studies utilising CCT show a
30
31 100 pattern of stronger effect sizes and enhanced generalisation of benefits compared to traditional
32
33 101 strategy training in MCI.¹⁴ A previous meta-analysis found that CT is not effective in people with
34
35 102 established dementia.¹⁵ However, there is growing interest as to whether CCT has the potential to
36
37 103 prevent or slow the progression from MCI to dementia particularly given the association between
38
39 104 higher participation in mental activity and reduced dementia risk.¹⁶
40
41
42
43

44 105 Studies investigating the effectiveness of CT in improving cognitive performance in people with MCI
45
46 106 have demonstrated small to moderate improvement but existing research suffers from
47
48 107 methodological concerns and limitations.¹⁴⁻¹⁷⁻¹⁹ CT research in individuals with MCI has been
49
50 108 criticised for the failure to include an appropriate control group,²⁰⁻²² use of subsets of participants
51
52 109 from previous studies,²³ and pooling of MCI data with that from non-impaired adults²⁴ as well as
53
54 110 those with probable AD.²⁵⁻²⁷ Another issue raised in treatment studies has been the use of
55
56 111 ecologically valid outcome measures. For example, the inclusion of functional outcome measures is
57
58 112 important to monitor progression from MCI to dementia but given that individuals with MCI are, by
59
60

1
2
3 113 definition, not significantly impaired in functioning, it is a challenge to measure the functional effects
4
5 114 of the intervention.¹⁷
6
7

8 115 CCT is far from a single construct and factors such as the content, platform, context and dose of
9
10 116 training may differ.²⁸ Unfortunately, despite increasing scientific scrutiny, there is a limited
11
12 117 understanding as to which, if any, dimensions are associated with cognitive benefit. Ideally, critical
13
14 118 analysis of research using CCT for MCI would reveal insight into which specific components of CCT
15
16 119 are necessary for it to be effective, however, it is important to establish the overall effect of CCT on
17
18 120 individuals with MCI.
19
20
21

22 121 Systematic reviews and meta-analyses of cognitive interventions in MCI have reported mixed results,
23
24 122^{19 29-34} and when exploring the effect of cognitive training in MCI have largely not distinguished
25
26 123 between studies evaluating computerised and non-computerised training. This makes it difficult to
27
28 124 draw conclusions, specifically on the efficacy of CCT in MCI. For example, a systematic review by Ge
29
30 125 et al summarised the findings of CCT studies among people with MCI, however no meta-analyses
31
32 126 were performed and the review included non-randomized controlled studies, studies that combined
33
34 127 CCT with other interventions and studies not using Petersen's core MCI diagnosis criteria, making it
35
36 128 challenging to draw rigorous conclusions.³⁵ A previous meta-analysis by Hill et al (2017) specially
37
38 129 explored the effectiveness of CCT in MCI on cognition and behavioural outcomes,³² however the
39
40 130 field is progressing rapidly, as highlighted by Ge et al's observation that 42% of the studies in their
41
42 131 review were published between 2016 and 2017,³⁵ and further relevant studies have been published
43
44 132 subsequently.^{32 36-38} Another more recently published meta-analysis by Gates et al only included
45
46 133 studies where the intervention period lasted for more than 12 weeks and excluded a significant
47
48 134 number of studies with shorter training duration.³⁹ Thus, it is necessary to conduct an updated
49
50 135 meta-analysis to include more recent articles and all intervention durations.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 137 This paper investigates the effect of CCT on improving cognitive outcomes in individuals diagnosed
4
5 138 with MCI using random effects meta-analyses. To address some of the problems identified in the
6
7 139 literature, only peer-reviewed Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) were selected and cognitive
8
9
10 140 outcome measures were extracted for analysis. Variables that may moderate the effect of CCT, such
11
12 141 as the type of programme or dose of the intervention, were reviewed. The purpose of the current
13
14 142 review was to: a) evaluate the effect of CCT in older adults with MCI on cognitive outcomes; b)
15
16 143 evaluate the content and methodological quality of the intervention studies; and c) suggest future
17
18
19 144 directions in CCT research in this group based on findings.
20
21
22 145

146 MATERIALS AND METHODS

147 Search strategy and selection criteria

148 A literature search was completed during January 2018 of four online literature databases and trial
149 registers: PubMed, Embase, Web of Science and Cochrane library. The search terms are shown in
150 supplementary table 1. Previous meta-analyses and systematic reviews of cognitive interventions in
151 MCI were also searched. Furthermore, reference lists of included studies were manually scanned for
152 additional relevant papers.

153 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

154 Types of studies: Published, peer-reviewed studies with an RCT design investigating the use of CCT
155 interventions in older people with MCI were considered for inclusion. Studies were included if
156 sufficient data were available for calculation of effect sizes in each treatment arm (unavailable
157 information was requested from authors and included if obtained). The date of publication was not
158 limited, but only studies published in English were included.

159 Participants: Inclusion criteria were a mean age of participants greater than 55 years, a diagnosis of
160 MCI using core criteria according to Petersen⁴ and no other psychiatric diagnosis or neurological
161 disorder. The number of participants in each arm needed to be at least five. Studies with
162 non-impaired older people or those with probable AD were excluded unless separate data for
163 participants with MCI was provided.

164 Types of interventions: Studies were included if they compared any CCT intervention, administered
165 on a personal computer or gaming console, to an active or non-active control. Computerised training
166 had to represent the primary intervention, not simply one of multiple broader non-computerised
167 cognitive interventions, in order to be included. Active controls were classified as interventions that
168 controlled for non-specific therapeutic effects, whereas non-active control groups included waiting
169 list conditions, treatment as usual (TAU) or a non-matched minimal intervention. Each study was

1
2
3 170 independently screened, selected for inclusion and its data extracted by independent researchers.

4
5 171 Any disagreements were resolved through discussion with another author.

6
7
8 172 Types of outcome measures: We focused on cognitive domains that are reported to be most
9
10 173 significantly affected by MCI and targeted by cognitive interventions, namely episodic memory,
11
12 174 executive function, working memory/attention and general cognitive function.⁴⁰ Available data from
13
14 175 all relevant cognitive outcomes was extracted. Cognitive outcomes used in the included studies and
15
16 176 their classification into the main cognitive domains are shown in supplementary table 2.

17 177 **Risk of bias assessment**

18
19
20 178 The Cochrane Collaboration Risk of Bias tool was used to assess study methodological quality⁴¹. Risk
21
22 179 of bias was assessed in multiple domains: sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of
23
24 180 participants and investigators, incomplete outcome data and selective reporting of outcomes. In
25
26 181 each of these categories, the methodological quality of each assessed domain was rated as 'low risk',
27
28 182 'unclear' or 'high risk'. Studies were excluded if unsure or high risk in all assessed domains.

29 183 **Statistical analysis**

30
31
32 184 Intervention and control groups' post-intervention outcome scores were compared using Review
33
34 185 Manager (RevMan) software version 5.3. The programme uses Hedges' adjusted g ⁴² to calculate a
35
36 186 standardised mean difference (SMD) which is adjusted for small sample bias. Pooling of standardized
37
38 187 mean Hedges' g estimates of <0.30 , ≥ 0.30 and < 0.60 , and ≥ 0.60 were considered small, moderate,
39
40 188 and large, respectively. Meta-analyses were performed where three or more studies investigated a
41
42 189 comparable intervention and outcome using a random effects model. Heterogeneity was quantified
43
44 190 using the I^2 statistic, considered as low, moderate, or large when at 25%, 50%, or 75%, respectively.

45
46 191⁴³ Where a study reported multiple outcome measures for one cognitive domain (e.g., within
47
48 192 memory function), a composite measure was calculated to provide a single quantitative measure for
49
50 193 meta-analysis.⁴⁴ Publication bias was examined using funnel plots. We also performed subgroup

1
2
3 194 analysis and meta-regression using the "metafor" program in R (<https://www.R-project.org/>), for
4
5 195 example we compared the effectiveness of single and multi-domain training. Furthermore, we
6
7 196 subgrouped studies with a training dose of less than 10 hours and more than 30 hours to see if there
8
9
10 197 is a dose-response correlation. We also compared studies with active vs. non-active control
11
12 198 conditions, following a reviewer's suggestion. Sensitivity analyses were performed to identify
13
14 199 potential sources of heterogeneity. Further details of statistical methods are found in the
15
16 200 supplementary material (see supplementary appendix 1).
17
18

19 201 **Patient and public involvement**
20

21
22 202 There was no direct patient or public involvement in this review.
23
24

25 203
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

204

RESULTS**Description of studies**

The Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) checklist was used to guide reporting of results.⁴⁵

Following the initial literature review a total of 8893 studies were found. Of these 8875 were excluded and 18 studies met inclusion criteria. Figure 1 presents a flowchart of study selection. The total number of participants included was 690 and the brief summary characteristics of each study are presented in table 1 and detailed in supplementary table 3. Sample sizes ranged from 12 to 106, and dropout rates ranged from 0% to 32%. One study was excluded from the meta-analysis because of suspected inclusion of participants with probable AD based on the reported average Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) score.⁴⁶ Another two studies were excluded from the meta-analysis as post-intervention cognitive data could not be obtained.^{47 48}

Thirteen studies reported outcomes assessing memory, five studies reported outcomes assessing working memory, 11 studies reported outcomes assessing executive function, and 11 studies reported global cognitive functioning outcomes (see table 2.).

Quality of studies

The quality of each study was evaluated in regard to certain methodological aspects and summarised in supplementary figure 1. 11 of the 18 studies did not report blinding of participants.

Participant characteristics

The total number of participants from all studies included was 690 (CCT: n=351, mean group size: n=20, control: n=339, mean group size: n=19). The average age of participants in both conditions was 73.4 years. 52.5% of all participants were male. The disparity and lack of reporting of the ratio of

1
2
3 227 participants' years of education precluded mean calculations, although the available data suggests
4
5 228 most participants had at least secondary school education. The pooled average baseline score for
6
7 229 the MMSE was 26.9 in both groups, although the range of scores indicated heterogeneity within
8
9
10 230 participants.

11 12 13 231 **Cognitive Training Interventions**

14
15
16 232 Interventions were mostly delivered on a personal computer (PC), using commercially available or
17
18 233 purpose built CT packages, with two studies utilising a video game on a games console. ^{13 38} All
19
20 234 interventions were specifically designed to improve various aspects of cognition. The most common
21
22 235 type of intervention used was multi-domain (11/18 studies), where the programme targeted two or
23
24 236 more cognitive domains. In the seven single domain intervention studies, three evaluated memory
25
26 237 training and executive function training while one used working memory training. The dose and
27
28 238 duration of the CT intervention was variable, with the total length of training ranging from 4 hours ⁴⁹
29
30 239 to 80 hours ⁵⁰ and the duration of training from 2 weeks⁵¹ to 26 weeks. ⁵⁰

31 32 33 34 240 **Outcome Measures**

35
36
37 241 Supplementary Table 2 summarises the 60 different cognitive outcome measures used by studies
38
39 242 included in the meta-analyses. A considerable variability in measures reported was also noted; only
40
41 243 three outcome measures were reported three or more times; seven studies used the MMSE as a
42
43 244 measure of global cognition, three studies used Paired-associates learning (PAL) to measure memory
44
45 245 and in four studies used the Trail Making Test (TMT) as a measure of executive function.

46 47 48 49 246 **Meta-analysis of specific outcomes**

50
51
52 247 Separate meta-analyses were conducted on four different cognitive domains. The most commonly
53
54 248 tested domains were memory, with thirteen studies exploring this domain. The results of the
55
56 249 meta-analyses are presented in table 2.

57
58
59
60 250 Global Cognition function

1
2
3 251 Overall, there was a significant benefit of CCT on global cognition compared to the control group.
4
5 252 The meta-analysis revealed a small but statistically significant pooled effect size of 0.23 (95% CI [0.03,
6
7 253 0.44], $z = 2.22$, $p = 0.03$) with low heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 6\%$) (see figure 2.). The funnel
8
9 254 plot did not reveal significant asymmetry (see supplementary figure 2.). The effect size across
10
11 255 active-controlled trials ($n=7$, $g=0.23$, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.51], $I^2=27\%$) was smaller than that of trials with
12
13 256 non-active control groups ($n=4$, $g=0.31$, 95% CI [-0.06, 0.68], $I^2=0\%$) (see supplementary figure 3-4.),
14
15 257 but was not statistically significantly different ($z = -0.11$, $p = 0.91$).
16
17
18

258

259 Memory

22
23 260 The pooled effect size of CCT on memory outcomes, when compared with control conditions, was
24
25 261 moderate and statistically significant ($g = 0.30$, 95% CI = [0.11, 0.50], $z = 3.03$, $p = 0.002$), with
26
27 262 moderate heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 46\%$) (see figure 3.). The funnel plot did not reveal
28
29 263 significant asymmetry (see supplementary figure 5.). The effect size across active-controlled trials
30
31 264 ($n=8$, $g=0.36$, 95% CI [0.11, 0.61], $I^2=52\%$) was larger than that of trials with passive control groups ($n=5$,
32
33 265 $g=0.20$, 95% CI [-0.14, 0.54], $I^2=43\%$) (see supplementary figure 6-7.), but was not statistically
34
35 266 significantly different ($z = -0.32$, $p = 0.75$). However, there was moderate heterogeneity across
36
37 267 studies in both analyses.
38
39

40 268 Due to the moderate heterogeneity between studies, a sensitivity analysis was also conducted, in
41
42 269 which one study at a time was removed and the others analysed to estimate whether the results
43
44 270 could have been markedly affected by a single study. The combined Hedges' g were consistent and
45
46 271 without apparent fluctuation, with a range from 0.23 [0.07, 0.39] to 0.35[0.15, 0.55].
47
48

272

273 Working Memory

51
52 274 The meta-analysis revealed a statistically significant moderate effect size of 0.39 in favour of CCT
53
54 275 compared with controls (95% CI [0.12, 0.66], $z = 2.85$, $p = 0.004$) with low heterogeneity between
55
56 276 studies ($I^2 = 0\%$) (see figure 3.). The funnel plot did not reveal significant asymmetry (see
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 277 supplementary figure 5.). Due to there being fewer than three non-active we did not compare the
4
5 278 effect size between active-controlled trials and non-active trials.
6

7
8 279

9
10 280 Executive function

11
12 281 The overall effect of CCT on executive function compared with control conditions was small and
13
14 282 non-significant. The meta-analysis revealed a pooled effect size of 0.20 (95% CI [-0.03, 0.43], $z = 1.74$,
15
16 283 $p = 0.08$) with high heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 51%$) (see figure 3.). The funnel plot did not
17
18 284 reveal significant asymmetry (see supplementary figure 5.). The effect size across active-controlled
19
20 285 trials ($n=7$, $g=0.13$, 95% CI [-0.08, 0.35], $I^2=20%$) was smaller than for the non-active control groups
21
22 286 ($n=4$, $g=0.32$, 95% CI [-0.23, 0.87], $I^2=74%$) (see supplementary figure 8-9.), but was not statistically
23
24 287 significantly different ($z = 0.95$, $p = 0.35$).
25
26

27
28 288 Considering the large heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 51%$), a sensitivity analysis was also
29
30 289 conducted as described above. The combined Hedges' g were consistent and without apparent
31
32 290 fluctuation, with a range from 0.12 [-0.05, 0.28] to 0.35 [0.03, 0.48].
33

34 291

35
36 292 A priori subgroup analysis

37
38
39 293 A priori, we stipulated that meta-analysis would only be performed if three studies report outcomes
40
41 294 in the same cognitive domain and so subgroup analysis could only compare single and multi-domain
42
43 295 memory training. Similarly, only global cognition could be used for subgroup analysis to compare the
44
45 296 training interventions less than ten hours and more than thirty hours. Our subgroup analyses and
46
47 297 meta-regression suggested that there is no difference between multi-domain CCT and single-domain
48
49 298 CCT ($z = 0.09$, $p = 0.93$), although the former had a significant effect ($g = 0.30$, 95% CI (0.08, 0.53))
50
51 299 while the latter was non-significant ($g = 0.31$, 95% CI (-0.19, 0.81)) (see supplementary figure 10-11).
52
53
54 300 There is also no clear evidence for a dose-response relationship. Our subgroup analysis found that
55
56 301 studies that provided more than 30 hours of CCT had a smaller overall effect on global cognitive
57
58 302 function ($g = 0.20$, 95% CI (-0.31, 0.71)) compared to studies providing less than 10 hours of CCT ($g =$
59
60

1
2
3 303 0.30, 95% CI (-0.01, 0.61) (see supplementary figure 12-13). We did not perform a meta-regression
4
5 304 for training dose because fewer than ten studies were included. The subgroup analyses need to be
6
7 305 interpreted with caution due to the small number of studies and heterogeneity, however, they
8
9 306 illustrate the lack of clear factors that are associated with efficacy.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

307 DISCUSSION

308 Main findings

309 Based on results from 18 RCTs, it is likely that CCT is a viable intervention for improving cognition in
310 older people with MCI. There were small to moderate positive effect sizes found in all domains, with
311 statistical significance reached for global cognitive function ($g=0.23$, 95% CI = [0.03, 0.44]), memory
312 ($g=0.30$, 95% CI=[0.11, 0.50]) and working memory ($g=0.39$, 95% CI=[0.12, 0.66]), but not executive
313 function ($g=0.20$, 95% CI=[-0.03, 0.43]). The largest effect sizes were found for working memory and
314 memory (although statistically significant heterogeneity was found for the latter domain). This is
315 unsurprising given its central focus in most interventions and promising given this is the primary
316 complaint in most cases of MCI.

317 The present meta-analyses updated the literature search and added eight new studies^{23 36-38}
318 ⁵¹⁻⁵⁴compared with the previous study conducted by Hill et al³². The present findings are largely in
319 keeping with the results of Hill et al ³² that demonstrated positive effect sizes for global cognition
320 ($g=0.38$, 95% CI=[0.14–0.62]), memory ($g=0.42$, 95% CI = [0.21, 0.63]), working memory ($g=0.74$, 95%
321 CI =[0.32, 1.15]) and executive function ($g=0.20$, 95% CI=[-0.05, 0.44]). However, our results are in
322 contrast with the results reported by Gates et al which found that there were no clear effects of CCT
323 on cognition for people with MCI ³⁹. Methodological reasons for this inconsistency may be that Gates
324 et al only included studies with a minimum intervention period of 12 weeks and included a broader
325 range of participants at risk of cognitive decline. As a result, fewer studies (eight) met their eligibility
326 criteria, of which two studies did not require a strict MCI diagnosis ^{46 47} and one used self or
327 informant–reported cognitive complaints.⁵⁵

328 The current meta-analysis employed strict eligibility criteria to overcome the methodological issues
329 reported in the literature ^{56 57} such as inappropriate control groups and CCT being combined with
330 other interventions. The combination of an overall large sample size (N=690) and stringent eligibility
331 criteria make this meta-analysis a useful contribution to the growing evidence for the efficacy of CCT

1
2
3 332 in MCI. Nevertheless, various methodological issues were identified that limit the ability to make
4
5 333 recommendations for the optimal format, frequency or intensity of CCT. Further, the lack of
6
7 334 longitudinal studies make it unclear whether observed post-intervention benefits contribute in any
8
9
10 335 way to the goal of delaying or preventing the progression from MCI to dementia.
11

12 13 336 **Validity of observations and limitations**

14 15 16 337 **Sources of bias**

17
18 338 Several methodological issues were identified. Studies were rarely double-blinded, and whilst it may
19
20 339 be considered impractical to blind therapists and participants given the nature of the intervention,
21
22 340 this nevertheless introduces the risk of expectation bias and exaggerated results. In addition, data
23
24 341 concerning dropouts were rarely included in the analyses and ITT analysis was only used in two
25
26 342 studies.^{49 58} Whilst most of the remaining studies reported no significant differences at baseline for
27
28 343 those who dropped out, these differences may have only become apparent post-intervention, and
29
30 344 baseline differences may have been more obvious with the large number of participants in the
31
32 345 meta-analysis. Thus, the absence of ITT may have introduced an attrition bias.
33
34
35

36
37 346 Further bias may have arisen due to the decision in this study not to differentiate between amnesic
38
39 347 and non-amnesic forms of MCI. This classification is an example of the heterogeneity of MCI
40
41 348 symptoms. This heterogeneity is supported in descriptions by Petersen⁵⁹ and in the results of a
42
43 349 study revealing MCI as a highly nuanced and complex clinical entity.⁶⁰ This may lead to considerably
44
45 350 different intervention effects between participants and render it difficult to evaluate the efficacy of
46
47 351 the cognitive intervention and the generalisability of the current results.
48
49

50
51 352 This meta-analysis calculated composite effect sizes when multiple outcome measures were
52
53 353 provided for the same domain in each study. Whilst this method maximises the amount of data
54
55 354 drawn from the reviewed studies, it also has certain limitations. Firstly, this approach necessitated
56
57 355 an arbitrary measure of correlation between outcome measures, in this case set at 0.5. This may be
58
59
60

1
2
3 356 inaccurate, with outcome measures being more or less heterogeneous. Unfortunately, data on
4
5 357 composite heterogeneity was not available, however, choosing between outcome measures to
6
7 358 decide which best represents a particular domain would have posed a significant risk of selection
8
9 359 bias. This partly stems from the fact that 'gold standard' tests for the different cognitive domains
10
11
12 360 have not been identified.

13
14
15 361 Another limitation of the present meta-analysis is the lack of registration on Prospero. The
16
17 362 registration could ensure that the protocol and results are available to other researchers for
18
19 363 replication and updating.⁶¹ However unfortunately at the stage of registration of our
20
21
22 364 protocol, data extraction was complete and the study was therefore ineligible to be
23
24
25 365 registered on Prospero.

26
27
28 366 The literature suggests multiple factors may influence the efficacy of cognitive interventions.⁶² An
29
30 367 aim of the current analysis was to provide insight regarding CCT design choices and training
31
32 368 outcomes to inform decisions on interventions to use both clinically and in future studies. Of note,
33
34 369 the sub-groups analyses and meta-regression did not find any significant differences between
35
36
37 370 studies with active and non-active control conditions for any domain, or between multi-domain and
38
39
40 371 single-domain CCT. Due to the limited number of studies and heterogeneity of interventions and
41
42 372 outcome measures, it is difficult to make clear recommendations for the optimal form of CCT.

43
44
45 373 This meta-analysis has demonstrated efficacy of CCT in MCI patients for a very specific outcome:
46
47 374 performance on a neuropsychological test immediately post-intervention. Whilst promising, this is
48
49 375 far removed from the goal of slowing progression to or preventing dementia in MCI patients. There
50
51
52 376 was a lack of follow-up data, with only three studies^{50 53 63} including long-term outcome measures,
53
54 377 so no conclusions can be drawn regarding the longevity of the small to moderate effects or the
55
56 378 transfer of immediate effects. In addition, benefits on neuropsychological testing may not translate
57
58 379 to clinically meaningful benefits in everyday function. Barnett and Ceci⁶⁴ describe the immediate
59
60

1
2
3 380 outcomes measured here as 'near transfer' and the long-term transfer to untrained cognitive
4
5 381 abilities as 'far transfer'. If there is any possibility of dementia being prevented or delayed using CCT
6
7 382 then 'far transfer' of some sort is likely necessary. A review by Zelinski ⁶⁵ outlines how 'far transfer'
8
9
10 383 from cognitive training has been observed in aging population, though this is not specific to CCT or
11
12 384 MCI. Demonstration of 'far transfer' as a result of cognitive training in healthy adults is very rare and
13
14 385 there is increasing evidence that even 'near transfer' is difficult to demonstrate convincingly. ⁶⁶ More
15
16 386 research into long-term transfer effects of CCT in patients with MCI is vital in determining its
17
18
19 387 potential to reduce the dementia burden.

20 21 22 388 **Suggestions for future research**

23
24 389 The discussion highlights factors limiting the reliability and transferability of the results of the
25
26 390 meta-analysis. These limitations may be potentially overcome by more RCTs examining long-term
27
28 391 cognitive outcomes to assess transfer of CCT to everyday life and provide more insight on whether
29
30 392 CCT can influence progression to dementia. It is feasible to conduct large and longitudinal studies of
31
32 393 CCT, as it can be delivered online and therefore be easily and widely available. The standardization
33
34 394 of outcome measures between RCTs would also avoid problems associated with heterogeneity and
35
36 395 overall higher methodological quality of RCTs would reduce bias.

37 38 39 40 41 396 **Conclusion**

42
43
44 397 This meta-analysis has demonstrated support for the hypothesis that CCT improves cognitive
45
46 398 function in older people with MCI. However, the long-term transfer of these improvements and
47
48 399 relevance to reducing dementia prevalence remains unknown. Various methodological issues such
49
50 400 as heterogeneity in outcome measures, interventions and MCI symptoms and lack of ITT analyses
51
52 401 are significant limitations of the literature. Long-term outcomes are the next priority for CCT in MCI
53
54 402 patients to further explore its efficacy with respect to influencing dementia progression.

55
56
57
58 403

1
2
3 404 **Contributors**
4
5

6 405 HZ, RB, JDH, RG, HW, XY and RJH all contributed to the conception and design of the review. HZ, BH,
7
8 406 CJT, JDH read and screened abstracts and titles of potentially relevant studies. HZ, RB, and JDH read
9
10 407 the retained papers and were responsible for extracting data and rating their quality independently.
11
12 408 HZ drafted the paper with all the authors critically reviewing it and suggesting amendments prior to
13
14 409 submission. All the authors had access to all the data in the study and can take responsibility for the
15
16 410 integrity of the reported findings.
17
18
19

20 411 **Funding**
21
22

23 412 We acknowledge the funding provided by Beijing Municipal Science & Technology Commission (No.
24
25 413 Z161100000516001, D171100008217007). Haifeng Zhang is supported by the China Scholarship
26
27 414 Council (CSC) (No. 201706010329) to be a visiting Ph.D. student at University College London, UK. RB
28
29 415 is supported by a NIHR Academic Clinical Fellowship. JH, RG and RH are supported by the NIHR UCLH
30
31 416 BRC.
32
33
34

35 417 **Competing interests**
36
37

38 418 None declared.
39
40

41 419 **Patient consent**
42
43

44 420 Not required.
45
46

47 421 **Provenance and peer review**
48
49

50 422 Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
51
52

53 423 **Data sharing statement**
54
55

56 424 Details of excluded papers are available from the first author on request.
57
58
59
60

426

427

428 **REFERENCES**

- 429 1. Alzheimer's Disease International. World Alzheimer Report 2015. 2015
- 430 2. Huckans M, Hutson L, Twamley E, et al. Efficacy of cognitive rehabilitation therapies for mild
431 cognitive impairment (MCI) in older adults: working toward a theoretical model and
432 evidence-based interventions. *Neuropsychol Rev* 2013;23(1):63-80. doi:
433 10.1007/s11065-013-9230-9
- 434 3. Brookmeyer R, Johnson E, Ziegler-Graham K, et al. Forecasting the global burden of Alzheimer's
435 disease. *Alzheimer's & dementia : the journal of the Alzheimer's Association* 2007;3(3):186-91.
436 doi: 10.1016/j.jalz.2007.04.381
- 437 4. Petersen RC, Smith GE, Waring SC, et al. Mild cognitive impairment: clinical characterization and
438 outcome. *Archives of neurology* 1999;56(3):303-8.
- 439 5. Gauthier S, Reisberg B, Zaudig M, et al. Mild cognitive impairment. *Lancet*
440 2006;367(9518):1262-70. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(06)68542-5
- 441 6. Petersen RC. Mild Cognitive Impairment. *Continuum (Minneap Minn)* 2016;22(2 Dementia):404-18.
442 doi: 10.1212/CON.0000000000000313
- 443 7. Karakaya T, Fusser F, Schroder J, et al. Pharmacological Treatment of Mild Cognitive Impairment
444 as a Prodromal Syndrome of Alzheimer s Disease. *Curr Neuropharmacol* 2013;11(1):102-8.
445 doi: 10.2174/157015913804999487
- 446 8. Gates N, Valenzuela M. Cognitive Exercise and Its Role in Cognitive Function in Older Adults.
447 *Current Psychiatry Reports* 2010;12(1):20-27. doi: 10.1007/s11920-009-0085-y
- 448 9. Ball K, Berch DB, Helmers KF, et al. Effects of cognitive training interventions with older adults: a
449 randomized controlled trial. *Jama* 2002;288(18):2271-81.
- 450 10. Kueider AM, Parisi JM, Gross AL, et al. Computerized cognitive training with older adults: a
451 systematic review. *PloS one* 2012;7(7):e40588. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0040588
- 452 11. Jak AJ, Seelye AM, Jurick SM. Crosswords to computers: a critical review of popular approaches
453 to cognitive enhancement. *Neuropsychology review* 2013;23(1):13-26.
- 454 12. Owen AM, Hampshire A, Grahn JA, et al. Putting brain training to the test. *Nature*
455 2010;465(7299):775-78. doi: 10.1038/nature09042
- 456 13. Hughes TF, Flatt JD, Fu B, et al. Interactive video gaming compared with health education in older
457 adults with mild cognitive impairment: a feasibility study. *International journal of geriatric*
458 *psychiatry* 2014;29(9):890-8. doi: 10.1002/gps.4075
- 459 14. Gates NJ, Sachdev PS, Singh MAF, et al. Cognitive and memory training in adults at risk of
460 dementia: A Systematic Review. *BMC geriatrics* 2011;11 doi: Artn 55
461 10.1186/1471-2318-11-55

- 1
2
3 462 15. Huntley JD, Gould RL, Liu K, et al. Do cognitive interventions improve general cognition in
4 463 dementia? A meta-analysis and meta-regression. *Bmj Open* 2015;5(4) doi: ARTN e005247
5
6 464 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005247
7
8 465 16. Wilson RS, Mendes De Leon CF, Barnes LL, et al. Participation in cognitively stimulating activities
9 466 and risk of incident Alzheimer disease. *Jama* 2002;287(6):742-8.
10
11 467 17. Belleville S. Cognitive training for persons with mild cognitive impairment. *International*
12 468 *Psychogeriatrics* 2008;20(01) doi: 10.1017/s104161020700631x
13
14 469 18. Mowszowski L, Hermens DF, Diamond K, et al. Cognitive training enhances pre-attentive
15 470 neurophysiological responses in older adults 'at risk' of dementia. *Journal of Alzheimer's*
16 471 *disease : JAD* 2014;41(4):1095-108. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.3233/JAD-131985>
17
18 472 19. Reijnders J, van Heugten C, van Boxtel M. Cognitive interventions in healthy older adults and
19 473 people with mild cognitive impairment: a systematic review. *Ageing Res Rev*
20 474 2013;12(1):263-75. doi: 10.1016/j.arr.2012.07.003
21
22 475 20. Gunther VK, Schafer P, Holzner BJ, et al. Long-term improvements in cognitive performance
23 476 through computer-assisted cognitive training: a pilot study in a residential home for older
24 477 people. *Ageing Ment Health* 2003;7(3):200-06. doi: 10.1080/1360786031000101175
25
26 478 21. Cipriani G, Bianchetti A, Trabucchi M. Outcomes of a computer-based cognitive rehabilitation
27 479 program on Alzheimer's disease patients compared with those on patients affected by mild
28 480 cognitive impairment. *Archives of gerontology and geriatrics* 2006;43(3):327-35. doi:
29 481 10.1016/j.archger.2005.12.003
30
31 482 22. Gonzalez-Palau F, Franco M, Bamidis P, et al. The effects of a computer-based cognitive and
32 483 physical training program in a healthy and mildly cognitive impaired aging sample. *Ageing Ment*
33 484 *Health* 2014;18(7):838-46. doi: 10.1080/13607863.2014.899972
34
35 485 23. Rosen AC, Sugiura L, Kramer JH, et al. Cognitive training changes hippocampal function in mild
36 486 cognitive impairment: a pilot study. *Journal of Alzheimer's disease : JAD* 2011;26 Suppl
37 487 3:349-57. doi: 10.3233/jad-2011-0009
38
39 488 24. Eckroth-Bucher M, Siberski J. Preserving cognition through an integrated cognitive stimulation
40 489 and training program. *Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Demen* 2009;24(3):234-45. doi:
41 490 10.1177/1533317509332624
42
43 491 25. Galante E, Venturini G, Fiaccadori C. Computer-based cognitive intervention for dementia:
44 492 preliminary results of a randomized clinical trial. *G Ital Med Lav Ergon* 2007;29(3 Suppl
45 493 B):B26-32.
46
47 494 26. Gaitan A, Garolera M, Cerulla N, et al. Efficacy of an adjunctive computer-based cognitive training
48 495 program in amnesic mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease: a single-blind,
49 496 randomized clinical trial. *International journal of geriatric psychiatry* 2013;28(1):91-9. doi:
50 497 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/gps.3794>
51
52 498 27. Zhuang JP, Fang R, Feng X, et al. The impact of human-computer interaction-based
53 499 comprehensive training on the cognitive functions of cognitive impairment elderly individuals
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 500 in a nursing home. *Journal of Alzheimer's disease : JAD* 2013;36(2):245-51. doi:
4 501 10.3233/jad-130158
- 6 502 28. Bavelier D, Green CS, Han DH, et al. Brains on video games. *Nat Rev Neurosci*
7 503 2011;12(12):763-8. doi: 10.1038/nrn3135
- 9 504 29. Li H, Li J, Li N, et al. Cognitive intervention for persons with mild cognitive impairment: A
10 505 meta-analysis. *Ageing Res Rev* 2011;10(2):285-96. doi: 10.1016/j.arr.2010.11.003
- 12 506 30. Martin M, Clare L, Altgassen AM, et al. Cognition-based interventions for healthy older people and
13 507 people with mild cognitive impairment. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*
14 508 2011(1):CD006220. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006220.pub2
- 16 509 31. Simon SS, Yokomizo JE, Bottino CM. Cognitive intervention in amnesic Mild Cognitive
17 510 Impairment: a systematic review. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2012;36(4):1163-78. doi:
18 511 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2012.01.007
- 21 512 32. Hill NT, Mowszowski L, Naismith SL, et al. Computerized Cognitive Training in Older Adults With
22 513 Mild Cognitive Impairment or Dementia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Am J*
23 514 *Psychiatry* 2017;174(4):329-40. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2016.16030360
- 25 515 33. Sherman DS, Mauser J, Nuno M, et al. The Efficacy of Cognitive Intervention in Mild Cognitive
26 516 Impairment (MCI): a Meta-Analysis of Outcomes on Neuropsychological Measures.
27 517 *Neuropsychol Rev* 2017;27(4):440-84. doi: 10.1007/s11065-017-9363-3
- 29 518 34. Coyle H, Traynor V, Solowij N. Computerized and virtual reality cognitive training for individuals at
30 519 high risk of cognitive decline: systematic review of the literature. *The American journal of*
31 520 *geriatric psychiatry : official journal of the American Association for Geriatric Psychiatry*
32 521 2015;23(4):335-59. doi: 10.1016/j.jagp.2014.04.009
- 34 522 35. Ge S, Zhu Z, Wu B, et al. Technology-based cognitive training and rehabilitation interventions for
35 523 individuals with mild cognitive impairment: a systematic review. *BMC geriatrics*
36 524 2018;18(1):213. doi: 10.1186/s12877-018-0893-1
- 38 525 36. Djabelkhir L, Wu YH, Vidal JS, et al. Computerized cognitive stimulation and engagement
39 526 programs in older adults with mild cognitive impairment: comparing feasibility, acceptability,
40 527 and cognitive and psychosocial effects. *Clinical interventions in aging* 2017;12:1967-75. doi:
41 528 10.2147/cia.s145769
- 43 529 37. Han JW, Son KL, Byun HJ, et al. Efficacy of the Ubiquitous Spaced Retrieval-based Memory
44 530 Advancement and Rehabilitation Training (USMART) program among patients with mild
45 531 cognitive impairment: a randomized controlled crossover trial. *Alzheimers Res Ther* 2017;9:8.
46 532 doi: 10.1186/s13195-017-0264-8
- 48 533 38. Savulich G, Piercy T, Fox C, et al. Cognitive Training Using a Novel Memory Game on an iPad in
49 534 Patients with Amnesic Mild Cognitive Impairment (aMCI). *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol* 2017
50 535 doi: 10.1093/ijnp/pyx040
- 52 536 39. Gates NJ, Vernooij RW, Di Nisio M, et al. Computerised cognitive training for preventing dementia
53 537 in people with mild cognitive impairment. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*
54 538 2019;3(3):CD012279. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD012279.pub2 [published Online First:
55 539 2019/03/14]

- 1
2
3 540 40. Petersen RC, Doody R, Kurz A, et al. Current concepts in mild cognitive impairment. *Archives of*
4 541 *neurology* 2001;58(12):1985-92. [published Online First: 2001/12/26]
5
6 542 41. Higgins JPT GS, (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version
7 543 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. : The Cochrane Collaboration 2011.
8
9 544 42. Hedges LV OI. Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis: New York: Academic Press 1985.
10
11 545 43. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*
12 546 2003;327(7414):557-60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557
13
14 547 44. Borenstein M. Introduction to meta-analysis 2009.
15 548 45. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and
16 549 meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009;339:b2535. doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2535
17
18 550 46. Optale G, Urgesi C, Busato V, et al. Controlling memory impairment in elderly adults using virtual
19 551 reality memory training: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Neurorehabilitation and neural*
20 552 *repair* 2010;24(4):348-57. doi: 10.1177/1545968309353328
21
22 553 47. Barnes DE, Yaffe K, Belfor N, et al. Computer-based cognitive training for mild cognitive
23 554 impairment: results from a pilot randomized, controlled trial. *Alzheimer disease and*
24 555 *associated disorders* 2009;23(3):205-10. doi: 10.1097/WAD.0b013e31819c6137
25
26 556 48. Chandler MJ, Locke DEC, Duncan NL, et al. Computer versus Compensatory Calendar Training
27 557 in Individuals with Mild Cognitive Impairment: Functional Impact in a Pilot Study. *Brain*
28 558 *sciences* 2017;7(9):10. doi: 10.3390/brainsci7090112
29
30 559 49. Han JW, Lee H, Hong JW, et al. Multimodal cognitive enhancement therapy for patients with mild
31 560 cognitive impairment and mild dementia: A multi- center, randomized, controlled, double-blind,
32 561 crossover trial. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease* 2017;55(2):787-96. doi:
33 562 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3233/JAD-160619>
34
35 563 50. Fiatarone Singh MA, Gates N, Saigal N, et al. The Study of Mental and Resistance Training
36 564 (SMART) study-resistance training and/or cognitive training in mild cognitive impairment: a
37 565 randomized, double-blind, double-sham controlled trial. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*
38 566 2014;15(12):873-80. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2014.09.010
39
40 567 51. Gagnon LG, Belleville S. Training of attentional control in mild cognitive impairment with executive
41 568 deficits: results from a double-blind randomised controlled study. *Neuropsychological*
42 569 *rehabilitation* 2012;22(6):809-35. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09602011.2012.691044>
43
44 570 52. Ciarmiello A, Gaeta MC, Benso F, et al. FDG-PET in the Evaluation of Brain Metabolic Changes
45 571 Induced by Cognitive Stimulation in aMCI Subjects. *Curr Radiopharm* 2015;8(1):69-75. doi:
46 572 10.2174/1874471008666150428122924
47
48 573 53. Hyer L, Scott C, Atkinson MM, et al. Cognitive Training Program to Improve Working Memory in
49 574 Older Adults with MCI. *Clin Gerontologist* 2016;39(5):410-27. doi:
50 575 10.1080/07317115.2015.1120257
51
52 576 54. Lin F, Heffner KL, Ren P, et al. Cognitive and Neural Effects of Vision-Based
53 577 Speed-of-Processing Training in Older Adults with Amnesic Mild Cognitive Impairment: A
54 578 Pilot Study. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 2016;64(6):1293-8. doi:
55 579 10.1111/jgs.14132

- 1
2
3 580 55. Kwok T, Wong A, Chan G, et al. Effectiveness of cognitive training for Chinese elderly in Hong
4 581 Kong. *Clinical interventions in aging* 2013;8:213-9. doi: 10.2147/CIA.S38070 [published
5 582 Online First: 2013/02/27]
6
7 583 56. Papp KV WS, Snyder PJ. Immediate and delayed effects of cognitive interventions in healthy
8 584 elderly: a review of current literature and future directions. . 2009
9
10 585 57. Martin M CL, Altgassen AM, Cameron MH, Zehnder F. Cognition-based interventions for healthy
11 586 older people and people with mild cognitive impairment. . 2011
12
13 587 58. Vidovich MR, Lautenschlager NT, Flicker L, et al. The PACE study: A randomized clinical trial of
14 588 cognitive activity strategy training for older people with mild cognitive impairment. *American*
15 589 *Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 2015;23(4):360-72. doi:
16 590 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jagp.2014.04.002>
17
18 591 59. Petersen RC. Mild cognitive impairment clinical trials. 2003
19
20 592 60. Libon DJ XS, Eppig J, Wicas G, Lamar M, Lippa C, Bettcher BM, Price CC, Giovannetti T,
21 593 Swenson R, Wambach DM. The heterogeneity of mild cognitive impairment: a
22 594 neuropsychological analysis. 2009
23
24 595 61. Booth A, Clarke M, Dooley G, et al. The nuts and bolts of PROSPERO: an international
25 596 prospective register of systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2012;1:2. doi: 10.1186/2046-4053-1-2
26 597 [published Online First: 2012/05/17]
27
28 598 62. V. Solfrizzi FP, A.M. Colacicco, A. D'Introno, C. Capurso, F. Torres, F. Grigoletto, S. Maggi, A. Del
29 599 Parigi, E.M. Reiman, R.J. Caselli, E. Scafato, G. Farchi, A. Capurso. Vascular risk factors,
30 600 incidence of MCI, and rates of progression to dementia. 2004
31
32 601 63. Herrera C, Chambon C, Michel BF, et al. Positive effects of computer-based cognitive training in
33 602 adults with mild cognitive impairment. *Neuropsychologia* 2012;50(8):1871-81. doi:
34 603 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.04.012
35
36 604 64. Barnett SM CS. When and where do we apply what we learn? A taxonomy for far transfer. 2002
37
38 605 65. Meta-Analysis CCTiOAWMCIoDASRa. Far transfer in cognitive training of older adults. 2014
39
40 606 66. Stojanoski B, Lyons KM, Pearce AAA, et al. Targeted training: Converging evidence against the
41 607 transferable benefits of online brain training on cognitive function. *Neuropsychologia* 2018 doi:
42 608 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.07.013
43
44 609 67. Barban F, Annicchiarico R, Pantelopoulos S, et al. Protecting cognition from aging and
45 610 Alzheimer's disease: a computerized cognitive training combined with reminiscence therapy.
46 611 *International journal of geriatric psychiatry* 2016;31(4):340-8. doi:
47 612 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/gps.4328>
48
49 613 68. Finn M, McDonald S. Computerised Cognitive Training for Older Persons With Mild Cognitive
50 614 Impairment: A Pilot Study Using a Randomised Controlled Trial Design. *Brain Impair*
51 615 2011;12(3):187-99.
52
53 616 69. Finn M, McDonald S. Repetition-lag training to improve recollection memory in older people with
54 617 amnesic mild cognitive impairment. A randomized controlled trial. *Aging Neuropsychol C*
55 618 2015;22(2):244-58. doi: 10.1080/13825585.2014.915918
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 619 70. Gooding AL, Choi J, Fiszdon JM, et al. Comparing three methods of computerised cognitive
4 620 training for older adults with subclinical cognitive decline. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*
5 621 2016;26(5-6):810-21. doi: 10.1080/09602011.2015.1118389
6
7 622 71. Hagovska M, Olekszyova Z. Impact of the combination of cognitive and balance training on gait,
8 623 fear and risk of falling and quality of life in seniors with mild cognitive impairment. *Geriatrics &*
9 624 *Gerontology International* 2016;16(9):1043-50. doi: 10.1111/ggi.12593
10
11 625 72. Rozzini L, Costardi D, Chilovi BV, et al. Efficacy of cognitive rehabilitation in patients with mild
12 626 cognitive impairment treated with cholinesterase inhibitors. *International journal of geriatric*
13 627 *psychiatry* 2007;22(4):356-60. doi: 10.1002/gps.1681
14
15
16
17 628

For peer review only

629

630

Table 1. Characteristics of studies using computerised cognitive training in persons with MCI

Author and Year	CCT Group N, age, education	Control Group N, age, education	CCT type	Total hours
Barban et al 2016 ⁶⁷	N = 46, Age = 74.4 (5.7), Edu = 9 (4.3)	N = 60, Age = 72.9 (6.0), Edu = 11 (4.7)	Multi domain	24
Ciarmiello et al 2015 ⁵²	N = 15, Age = 71.2 (7.7), Edu = 9.3 (3.0)	N = 15, Age = 72.0 (7.1), Edu = 7.8 (2.6)	Multi domain	24
Djabelkhjr et al 2017 ³⁶	N = 10, Age = 75.2 (6.4), Edu = 60.0% of college level	N = 10, Age = 78.2 (7.0), Edu = 44.4% of college level	Multi domain	18
Fiatarone et al 2014 ⁵⁰	N = 24, Age = >55, Edu = n/s	N = 27, Age = >55, Edu = n/s	Multi domain	80
Finn & McDonald 2011 ⁶⁸	N = 8, Age = 69.0 (7.7), Edu = 13.3 (2.2)	N = 8, Age = 76.4 (6.5), Edu = 12.0 (2.8)	Multi domain	25
Finn & McDonald 2015 ⁶⁹	N = 12, Age = 72.8 (5.7), Edu = 13.8 (3.0)	N = 12, Age = 75.1 (7.5), Edu = 13.7 (2.8)	Memory	n/s
Gagnon & Belleville 2012 ⁵¹	N = 12, Age = 67.0 (7.8), Edu = 15.0 (4.6)	N = 12, Age = 68.4 (6.0), Edu = 13.1 (5.7)	Attentional control	6
Gooding et al 2016 study 1 ⁷⁰	N = 31, Age = 75.6 (8.8), Edu = 15.1 (2.6)	N = 10, Age = 75.6 (8.8), Edu = 15.1 (2.6)	Multi domain	30
Gooding et al 2016 study 2 ⁷⁰	N = 23, Age = 75.6 (8.8), Edu = 15.1 (2.6)	N = 10, Age = 75.6 (8.8), Edu = 15.1 (2.6)	Multi domain	30
Hagovska et al 2016 ⁷¹	N = 40, Age = 68.0 (4.4), Edu = 75% of secondary education	N = 40, Age = 65.9 (6.2), Edu = 70% of secondary education	Multi domain	10
Han et al 2017 ³⁷	N = 23, Age = 73.7 (4.8), Edu = 13.5 (3.2)	N = 20, Age = 74.5 (6.4), Edu = 12.7 (3.7)	Memory	4

Author and Year	CCT Group N, age, education	Control Group N, age, education	CCT type	Total hours
Herrera et al 2012 ⁶³	N = 11, Age = 75.1 (2.0), Edu = 46% of secondary school or more	N = 11, Age = 78.2 (1.4), Edu = 63% of secondary school or more	Multi domain	24
Hughes et al 2014 ¹³	N = 10, Age = 78.5 (7.1), Edu = 13.8 (2.4)	N = 10, Age = 76.2 (4.3), Edu = 13.1 (1.9)	Multi domain	36
Hyer et al 2016 ⁵³	N = 34, Age = 75.1 (7.4), Edu = 70% secondary	N = 34, Age = 75.2 (7.8), Edu = 66% secondary	Working memory	16.7
Lin et al 2016 ⁵⁴	N = 10, Age = 72.9 (8.2), Edu = 90.0% of college level	N = 11, Age = 73.1 (9.6), Edu = 54.5% of college level	Processing speed	24
Rosen et al 2011 ²³	N = 6, Age = 70.7 (10.6), Edu = 16.7 (0.8)	N = 6, Age = 78.0 (7.9), Edu = 18.3 (1.5)	Processing speed	36
Rozzini et al 2007 ⁷²	N = 15, Age = 63-78, Edu = n/s	N = 22, Age = 63-78, Edu = n/s	Multi domain	60
Savulich et al 2017 ³⁸	N = 21, Age = 75.2 (7.4), Edu = 15.9 (1.3) (Age left school)	N = 21, Age = 76.9 (8.3) Edu = 16.0 (2.1) (Age left school)	Memory	8

631 Notes: MMSE: Mini Mental State Examination, n/s: not stated

632

633

Table 2 Results of Meta-analysis of computerised cognitive training (CCT) on cognitive domains

Analysis of CCT	No. of studies	N Tx*/control	Pooled Effect size g (95% CI)	Overall effect: Z (P value)	Heterogeneity: I ² % (P value)
Global Cognition	11	258/245	0.23 (0.03, 0.44)	z= 2.22, p = 0.03	6% p = 0.39
Memory	13	245/232	0.30 (0.11, 0.50)	z = 3.03, p = 0.002	46% p = 0.04
Working Memory	5	82/83	0.39 (0.12, 0.66)	z = 2.85, p = 0.004	0% p = 0.81
Executive Function	11	171/182	0.20 (-0.03, 0.43)	z= 1.74, p = 0.08	51% p = 0.03

634

*Tx = training group.

635

1
2
3 636 Figure 1 Flow chart of the study selection process
4

5 637 Figure 2 Forest plot demonstrating the efficacy of CCT on global cognition function
6

7 638 Figure 3 Forest plot demonstrating the efficacy of CCT on memory, working memory and executive function
8

9 639
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Flow chart of the study selection process

221x188mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 2 Forest plot demonstrating the efficacy of CCT on global cognitive function

195x62mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 3 Forest plot demonstrating the efficacy of CCT on memory, working memory and executive function

195x173mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3 Supplement to: Zhang H, Huntley J, et al. The efficacy of Computerized Cognitive Training on
4 cognitive outcomes in Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.
5
6

7
8 Supplementary Figure 1 summary of risk of bias for included studies
9

10
11 Supplementary Figure 2 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on global cognitive function
12

13
14 Supplementary Figure 3 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on global cognition stratified by
15 the type of control group
16

17
18 Supplementary Figure 4 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on global cognition stratified by the
19 type of control group
20

21
22 Supplementary Figure 5 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on memory, working memory and
23 executive function
24

25
26 Supplementary Figure 6 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on memory stratified by the type
27 of control group
28

29
30 Supplementary Figure 7 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on memory stratified by the type of
31 control group
32

33
34 Supplementary Figure 8 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on executive function stratified by
35 the type of control group
36

37
38 Supplementary Figure 9 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on executive cognition stratified by
39 the type of control group
40


41
42 Supplementary Figure 10 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on memory stratified by single
43 memory domain or multi-domain intervention
44

45
46 Supplementary Figure 11 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on memory stratified by single
47 memory domain or multi-domain intervention
48


49
50 Supplementary Figure 12 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on global cognition stratified by
51 dose of the intervention
52

53
54 Supplementary Figure 13 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on global cognition stratified by
55 dose of the intervention
56
57
58
59
60


A.




B.




Supplementary Figure 1 (A-B). Summary of risk of bias for included studies. (A). Risk of bias graph: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item presented as percentages across all included studies. (B). Risk of bias summary: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item for each included study.




Supplementary Figure 2. Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on global cognitive function




Supplementary Figure 3. Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on global cognition stratified by the type of control group




Supplementary Figure 4. Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on global cognition stratified by the type of control group




Supplementary Figure 5. Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on memory, working memory and executive function




Supplementary Figure 6. Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on memory stratified by the type of control group




Supplementary Figure 7. Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on memory stratified by the type of control group




Supplementary Figure 8. Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on executive function stratified by the type of control group




Supplementary Figure 9. Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on executive cognition stratified by the type of control group




Supplementary Figure 10 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on memory stratified by single memory domain or multi-domain intervention



Supplementary Figure 11 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on memory stratified by single memory domain or multi-domain intervention



Supplementary Figure 12 Forest plot demonstrating efficacy of CCT on global cognition stratified by dose of the intervention



Supplementary Figure 13 Funnel plot demonstrating bias of CCT on global cognition stratified by dose of the intervention

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Supplement to: Zhang H, Huntley J, et al. The efficacy of Computerized Cognitive Training on cognitive outcomes in Mild Cognitive Impairment:
A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.

Supplementary Table 1 Search terms used for literature search

Supplementary Table 2 Brief description of the specific outcome measures included in the meta-analysis

Supplementary Table 3 Detailed Characteristics of studies using computerised cognitive training in persons with MCI

Supplementary Appendix 1 Statistical methods

Supplementary Table 1. Search terms used for literature search

Intervention Terms	<p>“cognitive stimulation” OR “cognitive rehabilitation” OR “cognitive training” OR “cognitive therapy” OR “cognitive retraining” OR “cognitive support” OR “cognitive intervention” OR “cognitive exercise” OR “cognitive strategy” OR “cognitive aid” OR “memory function” OR “memory rehabilitation” OR “memory therapy” OR “memory aid” OR “memory group” OR “memory training” OR “memory retraining” OR “memory support” OR “memory stimulation” OR “memory strategy” OR “memory management” OR “brain training” OR “brain rehabilitation” OR “brain stimulation” OR “brain retraining” OR “brain exercise” OR “neuropsychological training” OR “neuropsychological therapy” OR “neuropsychological strategy” OR “neuropsychological aid” OR “neuropsychological stimulation” OR “neuropsychological rehabilitation” OR “neuropsychological exercise” OR “neuropsychological intervention” OR “neuropsychological retraining” OR “neuropsychological support” OR “psychostimulation” OR “executive training” OR “executive stimulation” OR “executive rehabilitation” OR “attention training” OR “attentional training” OR “attentional rehabilitation” OR “global stimulation” OR “reality orientation”</p>
Study Terms	<p>“RCT” OR “controlled trial” OR random*</p>
Subject Terms	<p>“Mild cognitive impairment” OR “memory impairment” OR “cognitive impairment” OR “memory disorder” OR “cognitive disorder” OR “memory dysfunction” OR “cognitive dysfunction” OR “MCI” OR “AAMI” OR “MCD” OR “mild cognitive disorder”</p>

Supplementary Table 2. Brief description of the specific outcome measures included in the meta-analysis

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE)	GEN COG	A 30-point questionnaire used to estimate severity of cognitive impairment including orientation and memory functions	Barben et al, 2016 Ciarmiello et al. 2015 Djabelkhir et al 2017 Han et al 2017 Hagovska et al. 2015 Rozzini et al 2007 Savulich et al 2017
Modified Mini Mental State Examination (mMMSE)	GEN COG	This instrument included all items from the standard MMSE, plus the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale–Revised Digit Span subtest and additional attention/calculation and general knowledge, language, and construction items.	Gooding et al 2016 study 1&2
Alzheimer’s Disease Assessment Scale-Cognitive (ADAS-Cog)	GEN COG	Measuring severity of cognitive dysfunction associated with Alzheimer’s disease, and is widely used in pharmacological studies of dementia and MCI. Higher scores indicate more dysfunction.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014
Computerised Assessment of Mild Cognitive Impairment (CAMCI)	GEN COG	A battery of tests to assess cognitive performance including domains of attention, executive functioning, memory and processing speed	Hughes et al 2014
Milan Overall Dementia Assessment (MODA)	GEN COG	The MODA is a paper and pencil test, composed of three sections: an autonomy scale, a section testing orientation and a section testing a wide range of cognitive domains.	Ciarmiello et al. 2015
16-item free and cued reminding test	MEM	Participants search a card containing four pictures of items with matched category cues before subjected to tests of free and cued recall	Herrera et al 2012 Djabelkhir et al 2017
BEM-144 recall test	MEM	A 12-word immediate recall test from BEM-144 memory battery	Herrera et al 2012
Description of the visual recognition memory task (DMS48)	MEM	Participants asked to remember a sample before making a delayed forced-choice match to original sample	Herrera et al 2012 Ciarmiello et al. 2015

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
Doors Recognition subtest	MEM	Participants are shown a variety of different coloured doors which they must remember and later recognise from a selection of similar doors	Herrera et al 2012
MMSE - Recall Test	MEM	Participants presented with stimuli before being asked to recall as many as possible	Herrera et al 2012
Paired-associates learning (PAL)	MEM	Visual patterns revealed in different boxes before participant tested on where pattern originally located	Finn & McDonald 2011 Finn & McDonald 2015 Savulich et al 2017
Pattern Recognition Memory (PRM)	MEM	Test of visual pattern recognition in a forced discrimination paradigm	Finn & McDonald 2011
Recall of Rey's Complex Figure	MEM	Subjects shown complex figure and then tested on their delayed recall of the figure	Herrera et al 2012 Rozzini et al 2007
Rey's figure copy	MEM	Participants are to reproduce a drawing by i) copying (reproduction) and ii) memory (recall) using a 18-point scoring system	Rozzini et al 2007
List Learning Memory Sum from ADAS-Cog	MEM	List learning assessed across the three memory recall trials of the ADAS-Cog. Higher scores indicate better memory.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014
Benton Visual Retention Test-Revised (BVRT-R)	MEM	BVRT-R is a visual memory test which assesses visual perception and visual constructional abilities as participants are required to draw from memory simple designs. Higher scores indicate better function.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014 Savulich et al 2017
The Logical Memory subtest of the Wechsler Memory Scale 3rd edition (immediately and delayed)	MEM	The logic memory is used to measure both immediate (I) and delayed (II) memory for verbal information. Participants are presented with a simple narrative and are required to recall as many details of the story as they can immediately after presentation. Higher scores indicate better memory.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014
Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (RAVLT)	MEM	RAVLT includes a list of 15 words to be recalled immediately after each of the 5 verbal presentations and after a 30-min delay	Barben et al, 2016 Ciarmiello et al. 2015
Prose memory	MEM	A subset of The Memory Assessment Scales, is an auditory verbal prose recall task which requires the subject to recall a short story. Subjects are asked to recall the story from memory and are then asked nine questions about details of the story.	Ciarmiello et al. 2015

1
2
3

4 Outcome measure	5 Domain	6 Brief Description	7 Study
8 visuospatial memory test 9 (VST)	MEM	From the Cognitive Efficiency Profile	Djabelkhir et al 2017
10 Buschke Selective Reminding Test 11 (BSRT)	MEM	The test provides 12 words which are selectively rehearsed by the subject until they are memorized. That is, only those words not recalled on the immediately preceding trial are presented. The subject then attends to an interference task or verbal list. Subsequently, after a delay, the subject is asked to recall the words.	Gooding et al 2016 study 1&2
12 13 14 WMS-R Visual Reproductions 15 (VR) I and II subtests	MEM	VR assesses visual memory. Cards with printed designs is shown to the participants. Following each exposure and a 30 minutes delay, subjects draw what they remember of the design.	Gooding et al 2016 study 1&2
16 17 WMS-R Logical Memory 18 (LM)Subtests I and II subtests	MEM	LM. The examiner reads two stories, stopping after each reading for an immediate free recall. And a 30 minutes delayed recall.	Gooding et al 2016 study 1&2
19 20 Short Story	MEM	Participants are asked to recall a short story	Rozzini et al 2007
21 22 23 24 25 The Word List Memory Test (WLMT)	MEM	Word list task that contains 10 semantically unrelated words The words are presented to the subject one at a time and are read aloud Three trials are administered in this fashion, with the order of the 10 words being randomized for each trial The examiner records the order of recall and notes any intrusions that might occur The primary Indices of Interest are the number of words recalled on each trial	Han et al 2017
26 27 28 29 The Word List Recall Test (WLRT)	MEM	Words, displayed one at a time for one second each. Participants read each of the words, and try to remember them without taking notes.	Han et al 2017
30 31 32 33 34 35 WLRcT(The Word List Recognition)	MEM	A word list was designed so that half its words would denote targets when any of a number of target classes were defined. After scanning this list for targets, subjects were unexpectedly tested on their ability to recognize the words they had scanned.	Han et al 2017

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
RBANS Memory Score	MEM	It consists of 12 subtests, which yield five Index scores (i.e., Attention, Language, Visuospatial/Constructional, Immediate Memory, and Delayed Memory) and a Total Scale score.	Rosen et al 2011
Dot counting test	WM	The task dot counting requires examinees to count the dots as quickly as possible by the fastest means possible.	Lin et al 2016
1-back test	WM	In the 1-Back task, participants are presented a sequence of stimuli one-by-one. For each stimulus, they need to decide if the current stimulus is the same as the one presented 1 trials ago.	Lin et al 2016
Digit Span Test	WM	Sequence of digits is read aloud. Subjects asked to immediately recall digits in the correct order. If correct, a sequence with an additional digit is presented.	Herrera et al 2012 Ciarmiello et al 2015
LNS (Letter-Number Sequencing)	WM	The task involves listening to and remembering a string of digits and letters read aloud at a speed of one per second, then recalling the information by repeating the numbers in chronological order, followed by the letters in alphabetical order.	Hyer et al 2016
Spatial Span	WM	Participants tested on ability to remember the location of objects on a spatial grid.	Hyer et al 2016
Spatial Span (Corsi test)	WM	Corsi is a short term memory task conceptually similar to the digit span test. the experimenter (the person who carries out the study) shows nine blocks arranged in front of the participant, the experimenter taps a sequence of blocks (for example, the experimenter taps a sequence of 3 different blocks, one after another), the participant needs to tap the blocks that the experimenter showed, in the same order, steps 1-3 are repeated multiple times with different lengths of blocks.	Ciarmiello et al. 2015
Spatial working memory (SWM)	WM	A test that requires retention and manipulation of visuospatial information to collect 'tokens' and fill a column	Finn & McDonald 2011

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
Symbol Span	WM	This subtest assesses visual working memory using novel visual stimuli. Beginning with two symbols, abstract visual symbols are exposed for 5 seconds. In the test phase, the participant has to correctly recall not only the correct symbols from distractor items, but also the order in which they were presented from left to right. The number of symbols presented increases by one at intervals as the test progresses. Higher scores indicate better visual working memory.	Finn & McDonald et al 2015
Word span	WM	Participants tested on ability to remember a list of words in order.	Ciarmiello et al. 2015
Alpha span task	WM	In the alpha span test, short lists of words are presented and the participant's task is to mentally reorder the words and give them back in correct alphabetical order.	Ciarmiello et al. 2015
Intra-/extra-dimensional set shifting (IED)	EXE	A test of rule acquisition and reversal. It is computerised analogue of the Wisconsin Card Sorting test and measured the total errors made	Finn & McDonald 2011
Modified Dual Task	EXE	Participants completed a modified dual task consisting of a visual detection task (responding to an appearance of a stimuli) and alpha-arithmetic task (responding 'true' or 'false' to equations of letters and numbers e.g. 'U-1 = T') simultaneously and were recorded in accuracy of responses in each task	Gagnon & Belleville 2012
Raven's coloured matrices	EXE	60 patterns present in order of difficulty. Subjects asked to identify the missing element that completes a pattern.	Rozzini et al 2007
Telephone Search Dual Task	EXE	Participants complete the telephone search test whilst simultaneously counting audible tones.	Gagnon & Belleville 2012
Telephone Search Test	EXE	Participants circle key stimuli while searching entries in a simulated classified telephone directory.	Gagnon & Belleville 2012
Trial making test	EXE	The task requires participants to 'connect the dots' in two parts, firstly numerically and secondly, alphanumerically.	Gagnon & Belleville 2012, Hughes et al 2014, Djabelkhir et al 2017 Hyer et al 2016

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
Verbal fluency	EXE	Participants generate as many words in one minute from a given letter.	Rozzini et al 2007, Djabelkhir et al 2017
Visual Elevator Test	EXE	Participants count up and down according to visual stimuli in an elevator, the time-per-direction-change score was calculated.	Gagnon & Belleville 2012
Raven's progressive matrices - non-verbal test (PM47)	EXE	The Raven Standard Progressive Matrices (PM47) assess the measure the test taker's reasoning ability.	Ciarmiello et al. 2015
Rey–Osterrieth complex figure test (ROCF)	EXE	ROCF is a neuropsychological assessment in which examinees are asked to reproduce a complicated line drawing, first by copying it freehand (recognition), and then drawing from memory (recall). The test therefore permits the evaluation of different functions, such as such as visuospatial abilities, memory, attention, planning, working memory and executive functions.	Ciarmiello et al. 2015
Categorical verbal fluency (animals)	EXE	Participants generate as many animal names as possible in one minute.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014 Djabelkhir et al 2017
Number sequencing Number-Letter switching	EXE	In Number Sequencing, the participant is asked to draw a line connecting numbers in order from low to high as quickly as possible without making mistakes, and is a measure of attention. In Number-Letter switching, the task is to switch between connecting numbers and letters, in order, from lowest to highest, e.g., 1-A, 2-B, 3-C etc., and is a measure of cognitive flexibility.	Finn & McDonald et al 2015
Tracking A, Tracking B	EXE	Two tracking tasks requiring participants to (1) track numbers (from 24-1) in reverse order (Tracking A), and (2) months forward (January – December) and numbers in reverse (Tracking B).	Hughes et al 2014
Useful field of view (UFOV)	EXE	UFOV is a computerized test assessing visual processing speed and attention.	Lin et al 2016
Verbal fluency	EXE	Phonemic and categorical fluency	Lin et al 2016
Cognitive control	EXE	Set shifting and flanker tasks	Lin et al 2016

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Outcome measure	Domain	Brief Description	Study
Cross-modality dual task (Divided)	EXE	Participants were subjected to a dual-task simultaneously consisting of a visual detection (as above) with a digit span task (orally recalling a list of digits) and recorded span items recalled correctly in %.	Gagnon & Belleville 2012
The CANTAB CRT(speed)	EXE	It is used to assess motor speed and thus acts as a control measure of general alertness to help interpret other cognitive tasks. An arrow will appear on either the left or right side of a computer screen. After the arrow appears, the participant is instructed to press a corresponding left or right button, using a response box, as quickly as possible.	Savulich et al 2017
WAIS-III Similarities	EXE	WAIS Similarities is a subtest from the WAIS-III used to measure verbal conception formation and abstractive thinking. Higher scores indicate better function.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014
WAIS-III Matrices	EXE	WAIS Matrices is a perceptual subtest of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale–III and is used to assess executive functions posing four types of non-verbal reasoning tasks including pattern completion, classification, abstraction and serial reasoning, and all items require visual perception, organization, and synthesis of visual spatial information. Higher scores indicate better function.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014
COWAT	EXE	Combined Oral Word Association Test is a language-based task assessing association fluency, and is often used as a measure of executive functioning. The most commonly used letters are F, A, and S. or C, F, and L, based upon word prevalence rates. Higher scores indicate better function.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014
SDMT (Attention/speed)	EXE	Symbol Digit Modalities Test measures divided attention, visual scanning, tracking, and motor speed. It uses a substitution format presenting symbols with matching numbers, and participants are required to provide name the numbers corresponding to each given symbol. Higher scores indicate better function.	Fiatarone Singh et al 2014

Notes: General cognition (GEN COG), episodic memory (MEM), working memory (WM), executive function (EXE)

Supplementary Table 3. Detailed Characteristics of studies using computerised cognitive training in persons with MCI

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Included for meta-analysis
Barban et al 2016	N = 46 Ratio = 54.3% Age = 74.4 (5.7) Edu = 9 (4.3) MMSE = 27.3 (2.1)	N = 60 Ratio = 51.7% Age = 72.9 (6.0) Edu = 11 (4.7) MMSE = 28.1 (1.4)	EC: multi domain training. CC: passive(rest)	60 minute sessions, 2 sessions per week for 3 months. Total = 24 hours	n/s	Computerised software: 'SOCIALE' using touch screen. Multi-component - CT including Memory, attentional Executive Function, orientation, logical reasoning, constructional Praxis, language.	Before and after training, follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Chandler et al 2017	N = 27 Ratio = 73.3% Age = 77.4 (7.2) Edu = 16.2 (2.6) MMSE = 26.7 (3.0)	N = 30 Ratio = 50.0 % Age = 76.2 (7.0) Edu = 16.0 (2.4) MMSE = 25.8 (3.2)	EC: Auditory memory training CC: Active(Memory Support System (MSS))	Frequency: n/s Duration: n/s Total = 10 hours	EC:4 CC:3 Total:10.94 %	"Auditory Brain Training" software: 6 adaptive modules exercises to recognize and differentiate sounds, match or repeat sounds, remember increasingly difficult directions, and remember details from stories.	n/s	No*

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Included for meta-analysis
Ciarmiello et al 2015	N = 15 Ratio = 35.7% Age = 71.2 (7.7) Edu = 9.3 (3.02) MMSE = 27.9 (1.8)	N = 15 Ratio = 46.7% Age = 72.0 (7.1) Edu = 7.8 (2.6) MMSE = 27.8(1.9)	EC: multi domain CC: semi-active (meeting with psychologist – no computer)	45 minute sessions, 2 days per week for 4 months. Total = 24 hours.	EC: 0 CC: 0 0%	Computerised training with multiple difficulty levels. Includes dual-task training, executive function training, working memory updating, visual exploration, spatial orienting tasks.	Before and after training follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Djabelkhjr et al 2017	N = 10 Ratio = 30.0 % Age = 75.2 (6.4) Edu = 60.0% (6) (of college level) MMSE = 27.7 (1.9)	N = 10 Ratio = 40.0 % Age = 78.2 (7.0) Edu = 44.4% (4) (of college level) MMSE = 27.4 (2.0)	EC: multi-domain CC: Active(multi-component)	90 mins per session 1 sessions/week, 12 weeks. Total = 18 hours.	EC: 1 CC: 0 Total: 5%	'KODRO' (Altera-Group, Paris, France), a web-based platform with several applications (ie, appointment and event reminding, cognitive games, communication, entertainment, videos and a library).	Before and after training. Follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Fiatarone et al. 2014	N = 24 Ratio = n/s Age = >55 Edu = n/s MMSE = 28.0 (2.0)	N = 27 Ratio = n/s Age = >55 Edu = n/s MMSE = 27.0 (2.0)	EC: multi domain CC: active (sham)	75 minute sessions, 2 or 3 days per week for 26 weeks. Total = 80 hours.	EC: 2 CC: 3 Total: 9.8%	COGPACK program: Computer-based multimodal and multi domain exercises targeting memory, executive function, attention, and speed of information processing	At baseline and 6 months and at least 72 hours after the previous training session Follow-up: at	Yes

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Included for meta-analysis
							18 months	
Finn & McDonald 2011	N = 8 ratio = 37.5% age = 69.0 (7.7) Edu = 13.3 (2.2) MMSE = 28.5 (2.3)	N = 8 ratio = 62.5% age = 76.4 (6.5) Edu = 12.0 (2.8) MMSE = 27.5 (2.4)	EC: Multi-domain CC: Waiting list (Passive)	30 minute sessions, 4-5 sessions a week for an average of 11.43 weeks. Total = 25 hours	EC: 4 CC: 5 Total: 32%	Lumosity Inc CCT package. Four broad cognitive domains targeted: attention, processing speed, visual memory and cognitive control	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Finn & McDonald 2015	N = 12 ratio = 66% age = 72.8 (5.7) Edu = 13.8 (3.0) MMSE = 27.8 (1.3)	N = 12 ratio = 75% age = 75.1 (7.5) Edu = 13.7 (2.8) MMSE = 27.8 (1.9)	EC: Single memory domain CC: Passive	2 sessions per week for 4 weeks Total = n/s	EC: 4 CC: 3 Total: 22.6%	Repetition-lag training to improve recollection memory	First and last training session Follow-up (n/s)	Yes

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Included for meta-analysis
Gagnon & Belleville 2012	N = 12 ratio = n/s age = 67.0 (7.8) Edu = 15.0 (4.6) MMSE = 28.1 (1.2)	N = 12 ratio = n/s age = 68.4 (6.0) Edu = 13.1 (5.7) MMSE = 27.8 (1.5)	EC: Single domain (attentional control) CC: Active	60 minute sessions, 3 times a week for 2 weeks. Total = 6 hours	EC: 1 CC: 1 Total: 8%	Programme targeting attentional control using Variable Priority (VP) training in a dual task with selected priorities and feedback.	One week pre and after intervention Follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Gooding et al 2016 study 1	N = 31 ratio = 58.1% age = 75.6 (8.8) Edu = 15.1 (2.6) MMSE = n/s	N = 10 ratio = 58.1% age = 75.6 (8.8) Edu = 15.1 (2.6) MMSE = n/s	EC: Multi-domain CC: Active	60 min sessions, two days per week for 16 weeks Total = approx. 30 hours	EC: 12 CC: 1 Total: 20.3%	Posit Science's BrainFitness – repeated drill-and-practice adaptive exercises involving memory, attention and executive functions.	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Gooding et al 2016 study 2	N = 23 ratio = 58.1% age = 75.6 (8.8) Edu = 15.1 (2.6) MMSE = n/s	N = 10 ratio = 58.1% age = 75.6 (8.8) Edu = 15.1 (2.6) MMSE = n/s	EC: Multi-domain CC: Active	60 min sessions, two days per week for 16 weeks Total = approx. 30 hours	EC: 12 CC: 1 Total: 20.3%	Posit Science's BrainFitness – repeated drill-and-practice adaptive exercises involving memory, attention and executive functions.	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)	Yes

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Included for meta-analysis
Hagovska et al 2016	N = 40 ratio = 55% age = 68.0 (4.4) Edu = 75% of secondary education MMSE = 26.0 (2.6)	N = 40 ratio = 48% age = 65.9 (6.2) Edu = 70% of secondary education MMSE = 26.0 (1.5)	EC: Multi domain + balance training CC: Passive(just balance training)	30 minute sessions, 2 times a week for 10 weeks. Total = 10 hours	EC: 0 CC: 2 Total: 2.5%	CogniPlus training program Battery contains subprograms for attention, Working Memory, long-term memory, executive functions, spatial processing and visuomotor coordination.	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Han et al 2017	N = 23 Ratio = 56.5% Age = 73.7 (4.8) Edu = 13.5 (3.2) MMSE = 25.7 (3.2)	N = 20 Ratio = 50.0% Age = 74.5 (6.4) Edu = 12.7 (3.7) MMSE=24.5 (2.4)	EC: single memory training CC: Passive (Usual Care)	30 min per session 1 hour per day 2 sessions/week, 4 weeks. Total = 4 hours	EC:3 CC:5 Total: 16%	USMART program involving spaced retrieval-based memory training, using a self-administered application on an iPad tablet.	Week 0, 5 Follow-up (n/s)#	Yes
Herrera et al 2012	N = 11 ratio = 54% age = 75.1 (2.0) Edu = 46% of secondary school or more MMSE = 27.4 (0.5)	N = 11 ratio = 45% age = 78.2 (1.4) Edu = 63% of secondary school or more MMSE = 27.2 (0.4)	EC: Multidomain CC: Active	60 minute sessions, 2 days a week for 12 weeks. Total = 24 hours	0%	Several computer-based training exercises designed to improve memory and attention	0, 12 weeks ± 15 days Follow-up: at 24 weeks	Yes

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Included for meta-analysis
Hughes et al 2014	N = 10 ratio = 20% age = 78.5 (7.1) Edu = 13.8 (2.4) MMSE = 27.2 (1.9)	N = 10 ratio = 40% age = 76.2 (4.3) Edu = 13.1 (1.9) MMSE = 27.1 (1.8)	EC: Multidomain CC: Active	90 minute sessions, once a week for 24 weeks. Total = 36 hours	0%	Group-based Nintendo Wii sports package. Group-based Interactive video gaming	0, 24 weeks ± 1 weeks Follow-up: (n/s)	Yes
Hyer et al. 2016	N = 34 ratio = 50% age = 75.1 (7.4) Edu = 70% secondary MMSE = n/s	N = 34 ratio = 44% age = 75.2 (7.8) Edu = 66% secondary MMSE = n/s	EC: Single domain (working memory) CC: Active (Sham)	25 days of 40 min sessions, completed over 5 to 7 weeks. Total = 16.7 hours	EC: 4 CC: 5 Total: 11.7%	Cogmed – adaptive WM training	Before and after training Follow-up: 3 months after intervention	Yes
Lin et al 2016	N = 10 Ratio = 50.0% Age = 72.9 (8.2) Edu = 90.0% of college level MMSE = n/s	N = 11 Ratio = 54.5% Age = 73.1 (9.6) Edu = 54.5% of college level MMSE = n/s	EC: Single domain speed-of-processing CC: active control (mental leisure activities)	1 hour per day 4 days per week for 6 weeks in their homes. Total = 24 hours	EC:2 CC:1 Total: 12.5%	INSIGHT online program: (vision-based speed-of-processing) which included five training tasks: eye for detail, peripheral challenge, visual sweeps, double decision, and target tracker.	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)#	Yes

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Included for meta-analysis
Optale et al 2010	N = 15 ratio = 59.1% age = 78.5 (10.9) Edu = 5.3 (2.4) MMSE = 22.9 (5.0)	N = 16 ratio = 31.25% age = 81.6 (5.0) Edu = 6 (3.5) MMSE = 21.0 (4.8)	EC: Single domain - Memory CC: Active	30 minute sessions, 3 times a week for 3 months. Total = 58.5 hours	EC: 3 CC: 2 Total: 16.1%	A Virtual Reality-based memory training programme	Before and after training Follow-up: 3 months after intervention	No**
Rosen et al 2011	N = 6 ratio = n/s age = 70.7 (10.6) Edu = 16.7 (0.8) MMSE = 29.3 (1.2)	N = 6 ratio = n/s age = 78.0 (7.9) Edu = 18.3 (1.5) MMSE = 27.8 (2.3)	EC: processing speed and accuracy in auditory processing CC: computer-based activities(Active)	100 minute sessions, 5 times a week for 8 weeks. Total = 36 hours	0%	processing speed and accuracy in auditory processing	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)	Yes

Author and Year	Treatment Group N, % male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	Control Group N, ratio of male, mean age, mean education, MMSE (SD)	CCT type for EC and type of CC	Frequency, duration and total hours	Drop-out (%)	Cognitive Training Intervention	Assessment interval (time pre or post intervention)	Included for meta-analysis
Rozzini et al 2007	N = 15 ratio = n/s age = 63 - 78 Edu = n/s MMSE = 26.0 (1.6)	N = 22 ratio = n/s age = 63 - 78 Edu = n/s MMSE = 26.4 (1.9)	EC: Multidomain and medication CC: Medication only (Passive)	60 minute session, 5 days a week for 4 weeks in 3 discrete blocks. Total = 60 hours	0%	Cognitive exercises based on Neuropsychology Training combined with a cholinesterase inhibitor	Before and after training Follow-up (n/s)	Yes
Savulich et al 2017	N = 21 Ratio = 52.4% Age = 75.2 (7.4) Edu = 15.9 (1.3) (Age left school) MMSE = 26.6 (2.9)	N = 21 Ratio = 66.7% Age = 76.9 (8.3) Edu = 16.0 (2.1) (Age left school) MMSE = 26.8 ± 2.2	EC: a novel memory game CC: negative (clinic visits as usual)	1 hour per session, 8 hours within 4 weeks. Total = 8 hours.	0%	Gameshow program: Computer-based episodic memory training.	At a maximum of 4 weeks after the baseline testing session Follow-up (n/s)	Yes

Notes: MMSE: Mini Mental State Examination, SD: Standard deviation, n/s: not stated, EC: Experimental condition, CC: Control condition. *Excluded from meta-analysis due to immediate cognitive outcomes not stated, ** Excluded from meta-analysis due to suspected inclusion of individuals with AD.

Supplementary Appendix 1

Statistical methods

Effect size calculation

Effect sizes were calculated using RevMan software version 5.3. Standardised mean differences were calculated using Hedges' adjusted g^1 . Pre-intervention standard deviations were used as these are most likely to be comparable across studies and therefore provide the most accurate estimate of effect size.³

The Hedges' adjusted g formula used in RevMan is as follows:

$$g = [M_{\text{post intervention}} - M_{\text{post control}} / SD_{\text{pre-pooled}}] * [1 - 3 / (4N - 9)]$$

Where $N = n_{\text{intervention group}} + n_{\text{control group}}$

and

$$SD_{\text{pre-pooled}} = \sqrt{[(n_{\text{intervention-1}}) SD_{\text{pre intervention}}^2 + (n_{\text{control-1}}) SD_{\text{pre control}}^2] / N - 2}$$

Meta-analyses

1
2
3 Meta-analyses were performed using RevMan software version 5.3. A random effects method as described by DeSirmonian and Laird⁴ was
4
5 used, adjusting standard errors of the effect sizes in each study to account for the heterogeneity for intervention effects observed between
6
7 different studies.
8
9

10
11 The pooled effect size of each meta-analysis was calculated by attributing a weight to the average effect size in each study according to sample
12
13 size. The z statistic was used to evaluate whether the pooled effect size was significantly different to no effect.
14
15

16
17 Heterogeneity was quantified using the I² statistic.
18
19

20 **Composite measure calculation**

21
22
23 Composite scores were calculated where a study reported multiple outcomes falling within a particular outcome domain (e.g. objective
24
25 cognitive performance). This approach was pragmatic in allowing one score to represent each intervention in the meta-analysis regardless of
26
27 the number of outcomes reported. In turn this prevents more weight being given to studies with multiple outcomes.²The variance of the sum
28
29 of variables was calculated as described below.
30
31

32
33 Using the example of a study with two relevant outcomes, there will be two effect sizes, namely y_1 and y_2 . The overall mean effect size for the
34
35 composite measure will be:
36
37

$$38 \bar{y} = 1/2(y_1 + y_2)$$

39
40
41
42

1
2
3 The variance of this mean is calculated as follows:
4
5

$$6 \quad V_{\bar{y}} = \frac{1}{4} (V_{y_1} + V_{y_2} + 2r \sqrt{V_{y_1} V_{y_2}}),$$

7
8

9 where r is the correlation coefficient describing to what extent y_1 and y_2 co-vary.
10

11
12 If the correlation is set at 0, the outcomes are essentially treated as independent of each other and if the correlation is set at 1, the variance is
13 an average of each outcome's variance. The former will lead to an underestimate of the variance and overestimate of precision while the latter
14 will have the opposite effect. Consequently, in the absence of existing literature to identify a suitable correlation, we reported composite
15 effect sizes calculated using a correlation of 0.5.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- 26 1. Hedges LV, Olkin I. Statistical methods for meta-analysis. New York, Academic Press 1985.
 - 27 2. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, et al. Introduction to Meta-Analysis. Chichester, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd 2009.
 - 28 3. Morris S. Estimating Effect Sizes From Pretest-Posttest-Control Group Designs. Organ. Res. Meth 2008;11 (2):364-386.
 - 29 4. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials 1986; 7(3):177-188
- 30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

PRISMA checklist

Section/topic	Checklist item	Page number/ Figure/Table
Title		
Title	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
Abstract		
Structured summary	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	2-3
Introduction		
Rationale	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	4-6
Objectives	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	6
Methods		
Protocol and registration	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	n/a
Eligibility criteria	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	8
Information sources	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	8
Search	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Supplementary

Section/topic	Checklist item	Page number/ Figure/Table
Table 1		
Study selection	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	9
Data collection process	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	9
Data items	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	n/a
Risk of bias in individual studies	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	9
Summary measures	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	9
Synthesis of results	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	9
Risk of bias across studies	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	9
Additional analyses	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	10
Results		
Study selection	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	Figure 1

Section/topic	Checklist item	Page number/ Figure/Table
Study characteristics	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	Table 1 11-12
Risk of bias within studies	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	Supplementary Figure 1
Results of individual studies	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	Figs 2-3
Synthesis of results	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	13-14
Risk of bias across studies	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	Supplementary Figure 1
Additional analysis	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	13-14
Discussion		
Summary of evidence	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	16
Limitations	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	16-17
Conclusions	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	19
Funding		
Funding	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the	n/a

Section/topic	Checklist item	Page number/ Figure/Table
	systematic review.	

For peer review only

The PRISMA for Abstracts Checklist

TITLE	CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
1. Title:	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	3
BACKGROUND		
2. Objectives:	The research question including components such as participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes.	3
METHODS		
3. Eligibility criteria:	Study and report characteristics used as criteria for inclusion.	3
4. Information sources:	Key databases searched and search dates.	3
5. Risk of bias:	Methods of assessing risk of bias.	3
RESULTS		
6. Included studies:	Number and type of included studies and participants and relevant characteristics of studies.	3
7. Synthesis of results:	Results for main outcomes (benefits and harms), preferably indicating the number of studies and participants for each. If meta-analysis was done, include summary measures and confidence intervals.	3
8. Description of the effect:	Direction of the effect (i.e. which group is favoured) and size of the effect in terms meaningful to clinicians and patients.	3
DISCUSSION		
9. Strengths and Limitations of evidence:	Brief summary of strengths and limitations of evidence (e.g. inconsistency, imprecision, indirectness, or risk of bias, other supporting or conflicting evidence)	3
10. Interpretation:	General interpretation of the results and important implications	3
OTHER		
11. Funding:	Primary source of funding for the review.	NA
12. Registration:	Registration number and registry name.	NA