Predictor	OR	95% CI	р
Age	0.905	0.891-0.919	<.001
Education	1.038	1.005-1.072	.025
Female	1.969	1.608-2.412	<.001
Black/African American	0.693	0.571-0.840	<.001
SF-36 Physical Functioning	1.014	1.010-1.018	<.001
CES-D	0.981	0.964-0.998	.029
MCI at baseline	0.466	0.372-0.585	<.001
Booster	1.295	1.096-1.530	.002

Supplemental Table 1. Stepwise logistic regression predictors of remaining in the study at Year 10.

Intervention group did not predict whether a participant was present at Year 10. SF-36=36-Item Short-Form Health Survey; CES-D=Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression-12; MCI=mild cognitive impairment

## Additional covariates for everyday functioning trajectories:

Replicate and assignment to booster sessions did not predict IADL Performance or Difficulty. Study site did predict the IADL Performance subscale in that, relative to Pennsylvania State University, Indiana University had poorer IADL performance (b=1.72, s.e.=0.25, p<.001) while Johns Hopkins University (b=-2.30, s.e.=0.25, p<.001) and Wayne State University (b=-0.79, s.e.=0.28, p=.005) sites had better (corresponding to a lower score) IADL performance; none of the sites differed from Pennsylvania State University for IADL Difficulty. For the Performance subscale, there was neither a significant main effect of intervention group nor a significant intervention group by time (linear or quadratic) interaction. For the Difficulty subscale, there was a main effect of intervention group such that the speed-trained group had more IADL difficulty at baseline (b=0.45, s.e.=0.13, p<.001) than the no-contact control group. Additionally, the intervention x linear time interaction effect showed that the speed-trained group had slower rate of IADL decline (less difficulty) over time relative to the no-contact control group (b=-0.16, s.e.=0.06, p=.004). Other interventions groups did not show significant main effects or intervention group (b=-0.16, s.e.=0.06, p=.004). Other interventions groups did not show significant main effects or interactions relative to the no-contact control group. There was no significant intervention group x quadratic time effects for any of the training groups.