

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

SciVerse ScienceDirect



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/psyneuen

Mild depressive symptoms do not influence cognitive functioning in patients with type 2 diabetes

Paula S. Koekkoek^{a,*}, Guy E.H.M. Rutten^a, Carla Ruis^b, Yael D. Reijmer^b, Esther van den Berg^b, Kees J. Gorter^a, Coen D.A. Stehouwer^c, Jacqueline M. Dekker^d, Giel Nijpels^e, L. Jaap Kappelle^b, Geert Jan Biessels^b

^a Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

^b Department of Neurology, Rudolf Magnus Institute of Neurosciences, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands ^c Department of Internal Medicine and Cardiovascular Research Institute Maastricht, Maastricht University Medical Center Maastricht, Maastricht, The Netherlands

^d Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

^e Department of General Practice, and the EMGO Institute for Health and Care Research, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Received 26 February 2012; received in revised form 24 June 2012; accepted 28 June 2012

KEYWORDS

Cognitive performance; Type 2 diabetes; Depressive symptoms **Summary** Type 2 diabetes (T2DM) is associated both with cognitive decrements and depressive symptoms. Since depression in itself has been associated with cognitive decrements we aimed to investigate the influence of depressive symptoms on the relation between T2DM and cognitive functioning.

Data were derived from three independent studies on cognitive functioning in patients with T2DM (n = 366) and controls without diabetes (n = 204), two with longitudinal and one with only cross-sectional assessments. Depressive symptoms were measured with self-report inventories (CES-D or BDI-II). The composite z-score of the domains memory, information-processing speed, and attention and executive function was the primary cognitive outcome measure. Mixed linear regression analyses were used in a stepped approach to compare cognitive functioning between (1) patients with T2DM and controls (cross-sectionally and longitudinally), (2) participants with and without depressive symptoms, separately for patients and controls, and (3) patients and controls after adjustment for depressive symptoms. In addition the mediating effect of depressive sive symptoms was assessed with a bootstrapping technique.

Depressive symptoms were present in 11% of the patients with T2DM and in 7% of controls (p = 0.15). Cognitive performance in patients with T2DM was worse than in controls (overall difference composite z-score -0.13). However, T2DM was not associated with accelerated cognitive decline over three years of follow-up relative to controls. Controls with depressive

0306-4530 © 2012 Elsevier Ltd. Open access under the Elsevier OA license. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2012.06.014

^{*} Corresponding author at: Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, HP Str. 6.131, P.O. Box 85500, 3508 GA Utrecht, The Netherlands. Tel.: +31 88 75 55110; fax: +31 88 75 68099.

E-mail address: p.s.koekkoek-3@umcutrecht.nl (P.S. Koekkoek).

symptoms performed worse than those without depressive symptoms, although not statistically significant. Performance in patients with T2DM with and without depressive symptoms was similar. Adjustment for depressive symptoms and estimation of the mediating effect showed that the difference between patients and controls was not mediated by depressive symptoms.

In conclusion, the modest cognitive decrements that are associated with T2DM are not due to the presence of mild depressive symptoms.

© 2012 Elsevier Ltd. Open access under the Elsevier OA license.

1. Introduction

In patients with type 2 diabetes (T2DM) small decrements in cognitive functioning are consistently found on the domains memory, information-processing speed, and attention and executive functioning (Awad et al., 2004). Diabetes is also an established risk factor for dementia, with an up to twofold increased risk (Ott et al., 1999; Biessels et al., 2006). In addition, depressive symptoms are more common among patients with T2DM (Anderson et al., 2001; Ali et al., 2006; Mezuk et al., 2008; Pan et al., 2010) with depression occurring twice as often in patients with diabetes compared to individuals without diabetes (Anderson et al., 2001).

In the general population, depressive symptoms are associated with lower cognitive performance and an increased risk for dementia (Jorm, 2000; Ownby et al., 2006). In people with depressive symptoms impairments are found in the domains memory and information-processing speed (Alexopoulos et al., 2002; Butters et al., 2004; Airaksinen et al., 2007). Therefore, the question arises whether depressive symptoms play a mediating role in the relation between T2DM and cognitive functioning and cognitive decline. In a meta-analysis of three studies, all with the same detailed standardized neuropsychological assessment, we studied the influence of depressive symptoms on the relation between T2DM and cognitive functioning in a cross-sectional and longitudinal design.

2. Methods

Data were derived from three studies that assessed cognitive functioning in patients with T2DM relative to controls: the ADDITION-Netherlands study (Koekkoek et al., 2012), the UDES (van den Berg et al., 2010) and the Hoorn study (van den Berg et al., 2008).

2.1. Design of the studies

The ADDITION study (Anglo-Danish-Dutch Study of Intensive Treatment in People with Screen-Detected Diabetes in Primary Care) was a cluster-randomised trial in patients with screen-detected T2DM that compared the effectiveness of an intensive multifactorial treatment with routine care on cardiovascular outcome (Griffin et al., 2011). The study started with a population-based screening for diabetes followed by inclusion of newly diagnosed patients with diabetes in the trial. In a subgroup of patients from The Netherlands cognition was assessed through two standardized neuropsychological assessments, in 2006–2007 and again in 2009–2010 (Koekkoek et al., 2012). Control participants without diabetes were recruited among spouses and acquaintances of the patients. The UDES (Utrecht Diabetic Encephalopathy Study) was a longitudinal study on determinants of impaired cognition in patients with T2DM in The Netherlands (van den Berg et al., 2010). Patients were recruited through their general practitioner. Controls were recruited among spouses and acquaintances of the patients. They were first examined between 2002 and 2004 and again four years later (2006–2009).

The Hoorn study was a population-based cohort study on glucose metabolism, which started in 1989 in the middlesized town of Hoorn, The Netherlands (Mooy et al., 1995). A random sample of inhabitants of Hoorn was invited to participate in the study. Over the years three follow-up examinations were performed (Mooy et al., 1995; de Vegt et al., 2001; van den Berg et al., 2008). In the third follow-up examination cognitive functioning was assessed (van den Berg et al., 2008). For the present study participants of the Hoorn study were reclassified based on their fasting glucose of the last follow-up examination in patients with T2DM and control subjects.

The ADDITION study and the UDES were approved by the medical ethics committee of the University Medical Center Utrecht, The Netherlands. The Hoorn study was approved by the medical ethics committee of the VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

2.2. Study populations

Fig. 1 represents a flowchart demonstrating drop-out and follow-up of the three studies. The first neuropsychological assessment in the ADDITION study was performed in 183 patients with screen-detected T2DM, aged between 50 and 70 years. Their diabetes was screen-detected approximately three years before, following a standardized protocol (Janssen et al., 2007). Classification was done according to the WHO-criteria (WHO, 1999). Of these patients 135 were reexamined three years later. During the second examination eight patients did not complete a depressive symptoms questionnaire and were therefore excluded for the longitudinal analyses. In the UDES 122 patients aged between 56 and 80 years, known with T2DM for at least one year, underwent the first neuropsychological assessment. Twentythree patients were excluded from the present analyses as sixteen patients had no baseline depressive symptoms questionnaire and seven had no estimated level of (crystallized) intelligence. Four years later 68 patients completed the second neuropsychological assessment. Participants of the Hoorn study were aged 50-75 years at recruitment. For a diagnosis of diabetes fasting blood glucose was measured and subsequently an oral glucose tolerant test (OGTT) was administered and classified according to the WHO-criteria (WHO, 1999). Participants already known with diabetes and/or using glucose-lowering therapy were categorized as having



Figure 1 Flowchart of study participants. T2DM: type 2 diabetes; con: controls.

diabetes. Eighty-six patients fulfilled the criteria for diabetes at the third examination and received a neuropsychological assessment. One person with a missing baseline depressive symptoms questionnaire and one without estimated level of (crystallized) intelligence measured were excluded.

Sixteen control participants of the UDES were also used as controls in the ADDITION-study. For the present pooled analyses these sixteen controls were only included in the population of the UDES. From all three studies only control participants with a fasting glucose \leq 5.6 mmol/L were included. This left 39, 33 and 132 controls from the ADDITION, UDES and Hoorn study respectively for inclusion in the present pooled analysis.

All participants were functionally independent and Dutch speaking. None of them had a history of neurological or psychiatric disorders that could influence cognitive functioning or a history of alcohol or substance abuse. Individuals with a previous non-disabling stroke (i.e. without interference with usual daily activities) could participate.

2.3. Neuropsychological assessment

The neuropsychological assessments in all three studies included the same nine tests addressing three cognitive domains, that are most consistently affected in T2DM in previous studies (Awad et al., 2004): memory, information-processing speed, and attention and executive functioning. The division in cognitive domains was made a priori, according to neuropsychological practice and cognitive theory (Lezak et al., 2004). The domain 'memory' was subdivided in four domains: working memory, immediate memory and learning rate, forgetting rate, and incidental memory. Working memory was assessed by the forward and backward digit

span of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale - 3rd edition (WAIS-III) (Wechsler, 1997) and the Corsi Block-tapping Task (Kessels et al., 2000). The product scores of both measures (number correct times span length) were used. Immediate memory and learning rate was assessed with the Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (RAVLT) (Van der Elst et al., 2005) and the Location Learning Test (LLT) (Bucks et al., 2000). For the RAVLT the mean of the total number of words remembered in five learning trials was recorded and a learning index was calculated. For the LLT the total number of displacements over five trials and a learning index was calculated. Forgetting rate was calculated in the RAVLT and the LLT by correcting the scores in the delayed recall condition for the score obtained in the fifth learning trial. Incidental memory was measured with the delayed recall of the Rey-Osterrieth Complex Figure Test (Rey, 1941). This score was also corrected for the score obtained in the copy condition. The domain 'information-processing speed' was assessed by the Trail-making Test Part A (TMT-A) (Corrigan and Hinkeldey, 1987), the Stroop Color-Word Test (part 1 and 2) (Stroop, 1935) and the subtest Symbol Digit Substitution of the WAIS-III (SS-WAIS-III). Time to complete the TMT-A task was recorded in seconds; the mean of the total time needed to complete part I and II of the Stroop was calculated and for the SS-WAIS-III the total correct numbers of copied symbols within two minutes was recorded. The domain 'attention and executive functioning' was assessed by the Trail-making Test Part B (ratio score) (Corrigan and Hinkeldey, 1987), the Stroop Color-Word Test (part 3; ratio score), the Brixton Spatial Anticipation Test (Burgess and Shallice, 1997) recording the number of errors, and a letter fluency test using the letters 'N' and 'A' and a category fluency test (animal naming) recording the total number of correct responses (Deelman et al., 1981). The Dutch version of the National Adult Reading Test was used to estimate level of (crystallized) intelligence (Schmand et al., 1992). The tests were administered in a fixed order by neuropsychologists and neuropsychologists in training and took about 90 min to complete.

Raw test scores at first and second neuropsychological assessment were standardized into z-scores per test, using the pooled mean of baseline scores of all control participants of the three studies. The z-scores of each domain were calculated by averaging the test scores comprising that domain. The primary cognitive outcome measure was defined as the mean composite z-score of the domains memory, information-processing speed and attention and executive function.

In the ADDITION and Hoorn study depressive symptoms were assessed with the validated Dutch version of the 20item Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) (Bouma et al., 1995) and in the UDES with the Dutch version of the Beck Depression Inventory 2nd Edition (BDI-II) (Beck et al., 1996). Both are self-report questionnaires to measure the presence of depressive symptoms on a four-point scale. Higher scores indicate more depressive symptoms. A score \geq 16 on the CES-D and a score of >13 on the BDI is generally accepted as the cut off score for the presence of depressive symptoms (Radloff, 1977; Beekman et al., 1997). The accuracy of these depressive screening instruments was examined by Katz et al., who found comparable sensitivities and specificities for the CES-D and the BDI when the cut off scores were respectively \geq 16 and >13 (Katz et al., 2004). Therefore these cut off scores were used to classify depressive symptoms as absent or present.

2.4. Clinical characteristics

At the time of the neuropsychological assessments body weight, height, waist circumference and blood pressure were measured and body mass index (BMI) was calculated. Demographic variables and medical history were recorded in a standardized interview. Venous blood samples were drawn after an overnight fast to determine fasting blood glucose, HbA1c and total cholesterol. The specific protocols are described in the separate studies (van den Berg et al., 2008, 2010; Koekkoek et al., 2012).

2.5. Statistical analyses

Categorical variables are reported as numbers and percentages, continuous variables as means with standard deviations (SD) and not normally distributed variables as median with interquartile range (IQR). Within the studies, differences between the patients with diabetes and control subjects were analyzed with Chi-square tests for categorical variables, independent *t*-tests for normally distributed continuous variables and Mann–Whitney tests for not normally distributed continuous variables.

Mean cognitive domain scores were calculated by averaging the test scores comprising that domain and comparisons

	ADDITION		UDES		Hoorn	
	Type 2 diabetes	Controls	Type 2 diabetes	Controls	Type 2 diabetes	Controls
n	183	39	99	33	84	132
Age (yr)	$\textbf{63.0} \pm \textbf{5.4}$	$\textbf{62.3} \pm \textbf{6.5}$	$\textbf{65.6} \pm \textbf{5.8}$	$\textbf{64.3} \pm \textbf{6.0}$	$\textbf{74.5} \pm \textbf{6.0}$	$\textbf{73.6} \pm \textbf{6.1}$
Sex (% male)	61.2	28.2*	51.2	42.1	51.2	42.4
Estimated level of (crystallized) IQ	$\textbf{96.8} \pm \textbf{19.4}$	$106.4 \pm 16.1^{*}$	$\textbf{97.7} \pm \textbf{14.3}$	$\textbf{101.9} \pm \textbf{14.0}$	$\textbf{96.4} \pm \textbf{13.2}$	$\textbf{100.8} \pm \textbf{12.8}$
BMI (kg/m^2)	$\textbf{30.6} \pm \textbf{4.8}$	$\textbf{26.2} \pm \textbf{3.6}^{*}$	$\textbf{28.4} \pm \textbf{4.3}$	$\textbf{25.8} \pm \textbf{3.6}$	$\textbf{28.1} \pm \textbf{4.2}$	$\textbf{26.1} \pm \textbf{3.4}^{*}$
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	$\textbf{143.7} \pm \textbf{19.6}$	$\textbf{145.1} \pm \textbf{24.9}$	$\textbf{147.7} \pm \textbf{19.8}$	$\textbf{139.0} \pm \textbf{19.5}$	$\textbf{151.9} \pm \textbf{22.4}$	$\textbf{145.5} \pm \textbf{21.6}$
Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)	$\textbf{82.0} \pm \textbf{10.4}$	$\textbf{83.1} \pm \textbf{11.8}$	$\textbf{82.6} \pm \textbf{10.8}$	$\textbf{80.0} \pm \textbf{9.4}$	$\textbf{75.4} \pm \textbf{11.8}$	$\textbf{73.8} \pm \textbf{11.9}$
HbA1c (%)	$\textbf{6.2}\pm\textbf{0.5}$	$\textbf{5.4} \pm \textbf{0.2}^{*}$	6.9 ± 1.2	$\textbf{5.5} \pm \textbf{0.4}^{*}$	$\textbf{6.4} \pm \textbf{0.8}$	$\textbf{5.5} \pm \textbf{0.3}^{*}$
Total cholesterol (mmol/L)	$\textbf{4.1} \pm \textbf{1.0}$	$\textbf{5.7} \pm \textbf{0.8}^{*}$	$\textbf{5.0} \pm \textbf{0.9}$	$\textbf{5.8} \pm \textbf{1.1}^{*}$	$\textbf{4.8} \pm \textbf{1.0}$	$\textbf{5.4} \pm \textbf{1.1}^{*}$
Depressive symptoms present (%)	9.8	10.3	9.5	0	12.9	7.6
CES-D/BDI-score ^a	4 (1-8)	6 (2-11)	6 (3-10)	3 (1-7)*	6 (2-10)	4 (1-8)
Diabetes duration (yr) Hypoglycemic medication (%)	3.6±0.6	NA	8.6±6.1	NĂ	6.2 ± 2.6	NA
Metformin	48.6		61.6		29.8	
Sulfonylurea	18.0		55.6		22.6	
Thiazolidinediones	12.6		6.1		9.5	
Insulin	0		29.3		4.8	

 Table 1
 Patient characteristics per study of patients with T2DM and controls.

 * *p*-Value < 0.01 within a study between patients with T2DM and control subjects.

^a Median with interquartile range. In the ADDITION and Hoorn-study the CES-D was used; in the UDES the BDI.

between groups were made using mixed linear regression analyses adjusted for age, gender and estimated level of (crystallized) intelligence. First, cognitive performance and depressive symptoms were compared between the diabetic and the control groups. Next, cognitive performance was compared between participants with and without depressive symptoms, separately for the diabetic and the control groups. Finally, to examine whether the relation between cognitive performance and diabetes status was mediated by depressive symptoms, we added the presence of depressive symptoms as a covariate in the first comparison. In addition, we estimated the possible mediating effect of depression and corresponding 99%-confidence interval (CI) with a bootstrapping technique (Preacher and Hayes, 2008). During bootstrapping the data set is sampled repeatedly to estimate the mediating effect in each resampled data set and reconstruct a 99%-CI. When the CI does not contain zero a mediating effect is present. We computed bootstrapped confidence intervals (5000 samples) for the size of the specific mediating effects using SPSS macros provided by Preacher and Haves (2008).

In the longitudinal analyses, mean change in cognition per year was compared between the groups with and without diabetes using mixed linear models adjusted for age, gender, estimated level of (crystallized) intelligence. Because these analyses did not show accelerated cognitive decline in the group with diabetes, no further analyses on the possible modulating effects of depression were performed.

Secondary analyses were performed for each of the cognitive domains. In addition, to examine the influence of cardiovascular disease, two post hoc analyses were performed. In the first analyses participants with a history of stroke were excluded. The second additionally adjusted the primary comparisons for hypertension (defined by the use of antihypertensive medication or a blood pressure above 160 mmHg systolic and/or 95 mmHg diastolic) and hypercholesterolemia (defined by the use of cholesterol lowering medication or total cholesterol above 6.5 mmol/L). The analyses were performed per study and then combined in a fixed-effect model (Review Manager 5, Cochrane Collaboration). The *I*-squared (I^2) statistic was calculated to quantify

Composite: Mean Difference Mean Difference Diabetes Controls Study or Subgroup SD SD IV, Fixed, 99% CI IV, Fixed, 99% CI Mean Total Mean Total Weight ADDITION 0.352 183 0.187 0.362 31.6% -0.12 [-0.29, 0.04] 0.063 39 Hoorn -0.289 0.348 84 -0.222 0.437 44 2% -0.07 [-0.21, 0.07] 132 UDES -0.077 0.358 99 0.167 0.362 33 24.2% -0.24 [-0.43, -0.06] Total (99% CI) 366 204 100.0% -0.13 [-0.22, -0.04] Heterogeneity: Chi² = 3.85, df = 2 (P = 0.15); l² = 48% -0.5 0.5 0 Test for overall effect: Z = 3.58 (P = 0.0003) Worse in controls Worse in diabetes Memory: Mean Difference Mean Difference Diabetes Controls SD Total Weight IV, Random, 99% CI IV, Random, 99% CI Study or Subgroup Mean SD **Total Mean** ADDITION 0.392 0.172 0.412 -0.09 [-0.28, 0.09] 0.08 183 39 32.3% Hoorn -0.161 0.431 84 -0 19 0 425 132 36 2% 0.03 [-0.13, 0.18] UDES 0.035 0.368 99 0.24 0.373 33 31.5% -0.20 [-0.40, -0.01] Total (99% CI) 366 204 100.0% -0.08 [-0.26, 0.09] Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.01; Chi² = 6.09, df = 2 (P = 0.05); l² = 67% 0.5 -0.5 0 Test for overall effect: Z = 1.21 (P = 0.23) Worse in diabetes Worse in controls Information-processing speed: Diabetes Controls Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean

Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	lotal	Mean	SD	otal	Weight	IV, Fixed, 99% Cl	IV, Fixed, 99% CI			
ADDITION	0.027	0.621	182	0.164	0.649	39	37.8%	-0.14 [-0.43, 0.16]				
Hoorn	-0.375	0.825	84	-0.24	0.824	131	36.7%	-0.14 [-0.43, 0.16]				
UDES	-0.155	0.687	99	0.168	0.689	33	25.5%	-0.32 [-0.68, 0.03]				
Total (99% CI)	4 00 16	0 (5	365	2 00/		203	100.0%	-0.18 [-0.36, -0.00]	• •			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	1.36, df =		-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1									
l est for overall effect:	Z = 2.63	Worse in diabetes Worse in controls										
Attention and executive function:												



Figure 2 Cognitive scores in T2DM versus controls adjusted for age, gender and IQ.

the percentage of total variation across studies due to heterogeneity (Higgins and Thompson, 2002). In case of an l^2 above 50% a random-effect model was used. To minimize the possibility of type 1 errors, a p-value of less than 0.01 was considered statistically significant; therefore results are reported with a 99%-confidence interval.

3. Results

Table 1 shows the characteristics for the control group and patients with T2DM per study at the first neuropsychological assessment. Participants in the Hoorn study were older and T2DM patients in the UDES had a longer history of diabetes. Depressive symptoms were present in 10–13% of the patients with T2DM compared to 0-10% of the control participants (Table 1). Overall, depressive symptoms were present in 11% of the patients with T2DM and in 7% of controls (p = 0.15).

3.1. Cognitive performance

In all three studies, patients with T2DM showed worse cognitive performance than control participants with an overall difference in composite z-score of -0.13 (99%-CI -0.22 to -0.04; p < 0.001) (Fig. 2). Secondary analyses for the separate cognitive domains showed overall differences of -0.08 (memory), -0.14 (attention and executive function) and -0.18 (information-processing speed).

Because the UDES had no control participants with depressive symptoms, this study could not be included in the metaanalysis for the comparison of controls with and without depressive symptoms. In the other two studies the controls with depressive symptoms performed worse than those without depressive symptoms, although not significantly (overall difference composite z-score -0.25; 99%-CI -0.54 to 0.03; p = 0.02) (Fig. 3). Secondary analyses for the separate domains showed similar results. Also, no difference was found between patients with T2DM with and without depressive symptoms in any of the three studies on any of the domains (overall difference composite z-score 0.01; 99%-CI -0.15 to 0.18; p = 0.82) (Fig. 4).

Adjustment for depressive symptoms did not influence the difference in cognitive performance between patients with diabetes and controls; the difference in overall composite score remained -0.13 (99%-Cl -0.23 to -0.03; p < 0.001) (Fig. 5). These results were confirmed by bootstrapping the mediating effect, with a mediating effect of depressive symptoms below 0.01 for all cognitive domains in all three studies (results not shown).

Composite:



Heterogeneity: Chi² = 1.69, df = 1 (P = 0.19); I² Test for overall effect: Z = 0.31 (P = 0.76)

Figure 3 Cognitive scores in controls: depressive symptoms versus no depressive symptoms, adjusted for age, gender and IQ.

-1

-05

Worse in depressive

Ó

05

Worse in non-depressive

Composite:

	Depressi	ve sympt	oms	No depres	sive symp	toms		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 99% CI	IV, Fixed, 99% Cl
ADDITION	0.083	0.352	18	0.032	0.347	165	56.5%	0.05 [-0.17, 0.28]	
Hoorn	-0.384	0.481	11	-0.354	0.47	73	17.9%	-0.03 [-0.43, 0.37]	·
UDES	-0.133	0.389	10	-0.099	0.387	89	25.6%	-0.03 [-0.37, 0.30]	
Total (99% CI)			39			327	100.0%	0.01 [-0.15, 0.18]	+
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0	.40, df = 2 ((P = 0.82);	² = 0%						
Test for overall effect: Z	: = 0.22 (P	= 0.82)							Worse in depressive Worse in non-depressive

Memory:

	Depress	ive sympt	oms	No depres	ssive symp	otoms		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	1
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 99% C	IV, Fixed, 99% C	1
ADDITION	0.027	0.407	18	0.07	0.398	165	48.0%	-0.04 [-0.30, 0.22]		
Hoorn	-0.212	0.461	11	-0.195	0.452	73	22.0%	-0.02 [-0.40, 0.37]		-
UDES	0.055	0.383	10	0.009	0.377	89	30.0%	0.05 [-0.28, 0.37]		-
Total (99% CI)			39			327	100.0%	-0.01 [-0.19, 0.17]	🔶	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2	.30, df = 2 Z = 0.15 (P	(P = 0.86) = 0.88)	; I² = 0%						-1 -0.5 0 Worse in depressive Worse i	0.5 1 n non-depressive

Information-processing speed:

	Depress	ive sympt	oms	No depres	ssive symp	toms		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 99% Cl	IV, Fixed, 99% CI
ADDITION	0.036	0.615	18	-0.014	0.602	164	59.9%	0.05 [-0.34, 0.44]	
Hoorn	-0.533	0.889	11	-0.474	0.88	73	16.9%	-0.06 [-0.80, 0.68]	
UDES	-0.286	0.734	10	-0.172	0.726	89	23.3%	-0.11 [-0.74, 0.52]	
Total (99% CI)			39			326	100.0%	-0.01 [-0.31, 0.30]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0	.36, df = 2	(P = 0.83)	; l² = 0%						
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.06 (P	= 0.96)							Worse in depressive Worse in non-depressive

Attention and executive function:

	Depress	ive symp	toms	No depres	ssive symp	otoms		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 99% C	IV, Fixed, 99% Cl	
ADDITION	0.186	0.789	18	0.044	0.512	164	31.1%	0.14 [-0.35, 0.63]		
Hoorn	-0.407	0.643	11	-0.394	0.632	73	26.1%	-0.01 [-0.55, 0.52]		
UDES	-0.167	0.487	10	-0.132	0.481	89	42.8%	-0.04 [-0.45, 0.38]		
Total (99% CI)			39			326	100.0%	0.03 [-0.25, 0.30]		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0).55, df = 2	(P = 0.76)	; l² = 0%							-1
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.24 (P	= 0.81)							Worse in depressive Worse in non-depres	sive

Figure 4 Cognitive scores in T2DM: depressive symptoms versus no depressive symptoms, adjusted for age, gender and IQ.

Post hoc analyses, one excluding participants with a history of stroke, another adjusting for hypertension and hypercholesterolemia, did not change the results (results not shown).

3.2. Cognitive decline

Cognitive decline was assessed in a pooled analysis of the ADDITION study and the UDES. Over a period of three to four years patients with T2DM showed no greater decline than control participants (overall difference in decline per year on composite score -0.01; 99%-CI -0.04 to 0.02; p = 0.21) (Fig. 6). We did not perform further longitudinal analyses on the mediating effect of depressive symptoms as no accelerated decline was found.

4. Discussion

The present study demonstrated more cognitive decrements in diabetes patients compared to controls. Controls with depressive symptoms performed worse than those without depressive symptoms, although not statistically significant, but performance in diabetes patients with and without depressive symptoms was similar. The pooled analysis, including over 350 patients and 200 controls, showed that cognitive decrements in patients with T2DM are not influenced by the presence of depressive symptoms.

Previous studies reported similar prevalence rates of comorbid depressive symptoms in patients with T2DM compared to our sample. In a review examining the prevalence of co-morbid depression in diabetes, measured by self-report questionnaires, prevalence rates ranged from 8 to 31% in patients with T2DM with an overall prevalence of 18% (Ali et al., 2006) and between 5 and 24% in people without diabetes, with an average of 10%. A study in The Netherlands that administered the CES-D to a community-based sample of older adults, aged 55-85 years, found an overall prevalence of depressive symptoms (CES-D > 16) of 17% in patients with T2DM (Pouwer et al., 2003). In the three included studies, the prevalence rates of depressive symptoms were in the low range of other studies and were not significantly different between diabetes patients and controls, which might have been influenced by selection bias. People with a depressive disorder often do not participate in research. Besides, they are often excluded from the analyses due to their depressive



Memory:

	Di	abetes		Co	ontrols			Mean Difference	Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 99% CI	IV, Random, 99% CI		
ADDITION	0.08	0.392	183	0.172	0.412	39	32.5%	-0.09 [-0.28, 0.09]			
Hoorn	-0.158	0.431	84	-0.192	0.425	132	36.1%	0.03 [-0.12, 0.19]			
UDES	0.033	0.368	99	0.245	0.379	33	31.5%	-0.21 [-0.41, -0.02]			
Total (99% CI)			366			204	100.0%	-0.08 [-0.27, 0.10]	•		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.01; Chi	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1									

leterogeneity: Tau² = 0.01; Chi² = 6.64, df = 2 (P = 0.04); l² = 70% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.16 (P = 0.25)

Information-processing speed:

	Di	abetes		C	ontrols			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 99% CI	IV, Fixed, 99% CI
ADDITION	0.026	0.634	182	0.164	0.649	39	37.9%	-0.14 [-0.43, 0.16]	
Hoorn	-0.369	0.825	84	-0.244	0.824	131	37.1%	-0.13 [-0.42, 0.17]	
UDES	-0.152	0.687	99	0.161	0.701	33	25.1%	-0.31 [-0.67, 0.05]	
Total (99% CI)			365			203	100.0%	-0.18 [-0.36, 0.00]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	.26, df =	2 (P =	0.53); I	² = 0%					
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.52	(P = 0.0)1)						Worse in diabetes Worse in controls
Attention and av	ocutiv	o fun	otion						Worse in diabetes Worse in controls
Allention and ex	eculiv	eiun	Cuon	•					
	Di	abetes		Co	ontrols			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Chudu on Cubaroun	Maan	CD	Total	Maan	CD	Total	Mainht	IV Eined 00% CI	IV Eined 000/ CI

		apeles			JILLIOIS			mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 99% CI	IV, Fixed, 99% CI
ADDITION	0.088	0.486	182	0.225	0.506	39	34.7%	-0.14 [-0.37, 0.09]	
Hoorn	-0.324	0.642	84	-0.239	0.643	132	33.9%	-0.09 [-0.32, 0.15]	
UDES	-0.11	0.458	99	0.091	0.465	33	31.4%	-0.20 [-0.44, 0.04]	
Total (99% CI)			365			204	100.0%	-0.14 [-0.27, -0.01]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0 Test for overall effect:	0.81, df = Z = 2.67	: 2 (P = (P = 0.0	0.67); l [:])08)	² = 0%					-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Worse in diabetes Worse in controls

Cognitive scores in T2DM versus controls adjusted for age, gender, IQ and depressive symptoms. Figure 5

symptomatology. The latter was also the case in the ADDITION study and the UDES; people with a diagnosis of severe depression were excluded.

Over the three studies, the difference in cognitive functioning between patients with T2DM and controls was at the lower end of the range of differences reported in other studies (Awad et al., 2004; van den Berg et al., 2009). Diabetes-associated decrements are often reported in other studies with effect sizes up to 0.6 (Awad et al., 2004; van den Berg et al., 2009). In accordance with the literature the domains information-processing speed and attention and executive functioning are most affected in the pooled analyses. In contrast, the domain memory showed no significant difference between patients and controls in our study (Awad et al., 2004; van den Berg et al., 2009; Reijmer et al., 2010). Several factors may have attenuated the differences in effect sizes. First of all, in our three cohorts patients with diabetes were well controlled for their diabetes and for vascular risk factors relative to control participants. Controls were not excluded if they had elevated vascular risk factor levels, therefore the contrast between participants with and without diabetes may be attenuated, as also hypertension and elevated lipid levels play a role in cognition (van den Berg et al., 2009). Another explanation might be that patients with modest cognitive decrements were reluctant to participate in research.

Worse in diabetes

Both longitudinal studies found no difference in rate of cognitive decline between diabetes patients and controls which is in agreement with recent publication of a large study (Euser et al., 2010). In this study participants were followed for three years and no accelerated decline was found for both those with diabetes and those with elevated fasting glucose or insulin resistance (Euser et al., 2010). Other studies however found an up to 1.5 to two times increased decline in cognition compared to normal aging (Gregg et al., 2000; Fontbonne et al., 2001; Yaffe et al., 2004).

Little research has been done on the effect of depressive symptoms on cognitive functioning in patients with T2DM (Awad et al., 2004). Most previous studies have adjusted their analyses for the presence of depressive symptoms (Alexopoulos et al., 2002; Airaksinen et al., 2004; Butters et al., 2004) and reported that the association between diabetes

Worse in controls



Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.00$, df = 1 (P = 0.98); l² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.88 (P = 0.38)

Attention and executive function:

	Di	abetes		С	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 99% CI	IV, Fixed, 99% CI
ADDITION	-0.114	0.158	127	-0.1	0.079	32	76.8%	-0.01 [-0.06, 0.04]	
UDES	-0.193	0.139	48	-0.154	0.137	21	23.2%	-0.04 [-0.13, 0.05]	
Total (99% CI)			175			53	100.0%	-0.02 [-0.06, 0.02]	· · · · ·
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	0.37, df = Z = 1.14	-0.5 -0.25 0 0.25 0.5 Worse in diabetes Worse in controls							

Figure 6 Cognitive decline per year in patients with T2DM versus controls adjusted for age, gender and IQ.

and cognitive functioning did not change after this adjustment (Lowe et al., 1994; Gregg et al., 2000). One study compared cognitive functioning between patients with T2DM with and without a major depressive disorder (Watari et al., 2006). Comparable to our study, they found no difference in cognitive performance between the two groups. Probably, diabetes-associated cognitive decrements and depressive symptoms emerge independently from each other and have different risk factors and etiologies.

In this article we included three studies that investigated cognitive functioning in patients with T2DM through an extensive neuropsychological assessment which was similar in all studies. This gave us the opportunity to examine the influence of depressive symptoms in a large group of patients with diabetes. Participants with comorbid conditions associated with type 2 diabetes (e.g. hypertension, dyslipidemia) were included in the analyses to form a representative group of diabetes patients. Nevertheless, our findings remained the same after adjusting for these potential confounders. The mean age of the participants over the three studies varied. This might be a reason for the variation in prevalence rates of depressive symptoms. To minimize the number of statistical tests, we choose to divide the tests into cognitive domains

instead of analyzing the effect of depressive symptoms per test. We cannot exclude the possibility that a different approach might have lead to different results. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that cognitive functioning in the study populations was within the range of normal aging and that we only included people with mild depressive symptoms. The results therefore might not be generalizable to people with major depression or pathological cognitive decline.

-0.5

-0.25

Worse in diabetes

Ò

0.25

Worse in controls

0.5

In conclusion, the cognitive decrements in patients with T2DM compared to people without diabetes are not influenced by the mild depressive symptoms that are known to be present in one out of six of these patients.

Role of the funding source

The present study was supported by Stichting Stoffels-Hornstra. The research of GJB is supported by a high potential grant from Utrecht University.

Contributors

GR was principal investigator of the ADDITION study. GJB and LJK were principal investigators of the UDES. JD, CS and GN

were principal investigators of the Hoorn study. EvdB, CR and YR collected the cognitive data in the three studies. PK performed the statistical analysis and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. PK, GR, KG, LK and GJB participated in the interpretation of data and contributed to the discussion. All authors reviewed/edited the manuscript and have approved the final manuscript.

Conflict of interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

The ADDITION study in The Netherlands was funded by grants from Novo Nordisk Netherlands, GlaxoSmithKline Netherlands and Merck Netherlands. The cognition substudy was financially supported by Stichting Stoffels-Hornstra and by a high potential grant from Utrecht University. The UDES and Cognition part of the Hoorn study were financially supported by grant 2003.01.004 of the Dutch Diabetes Research Foundation.

References

- Airaksinen, E., Larsson, M., Lundberg, I., Forsell, Y., 2004. Cognitive functions in depressive disorders: evidence from a populationbased study. Psychol. Med. 34, 83–91.
- Airaksinen, E., Wahlin, A., Forsell, Y., Larsson, M., 2007. Low episodic memory performance as a premorbid marker of depression: evidence from a 3-year follow-up. Acta Psychiatr. Scand. 115, 458–465.
- Alexopoulos, G.S., Kiosses, D.N., Klimstra, S., Kalayam, B., Bruce, M.L., 2002. Clinical presentation of the "depression-executive dysfunction syndrome" of late life. Am. J. Geriatr. Psychiatry 10, 98–106.
- Ali, S., Stone, M.A., Peters, J.L., Davies, M.J., Khunti, K., 2006. The prevalence of co-morbid depression in adults with Type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Diabet. Med. 23, 1165–1173.
- Anderson, R.J., Freedland, K.E., Clouse, R.E., Lustman, P.J., 2001. The prevalence of comorbid depression in adults with diabetes: a meta-analysis. Diabetes Care 24, 1069–1078.
- Awad, N., Gagnon, M., Messier, C., 2004. The relationship between impaired glucose tolerance, type 2 diabetes, and cognitive function. J. Clin. Exp. Neuropsychol. 26, 1044–1080.
- Beck, A.T., Steer, A.R., Brown, G.K., 1996. Beck Depression Inventory - Second Edition: Manual. Psychological Corporation, San Antonio, TX.
- Beekman, A.T., Deeg, D.J., Van Limbeek, .J., Braam, A.W., De Vries, M.Z., van Tilburg, W., 1997. Criterion validity of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale (CES-D): results from a community-based sample of older subjects in The Netherlands. Psychol. Med. 27, 231–235.
- Biessels, G.J., Staekenborg, S., Brunner, E., Brayne, C., Scheltens, P., 2006. Risk of dementia in diabetes mellitus: a systematic review. Lancet Neurol. 5, 64–74.
- Bouma, J., Ranchor, A.V., Sanderman, R., et al., 1995. Het meten van symptomen van depressie met de CES-D; een handleiding. Noordelijk Centrum voor Gezondheidsvraagstukken, Groningen, The Netherlands.
- Bucks, R., Willison, J., Byrne, L., 2000. Thames Valley Test Company. Bury St. Edmunds, UK.
- Burgess, P., Shallice, T., 1997. The Hayling and Brixton Tests. Thames Valley Test Company, Thurston, UK.

- Butters, M.A., Whyte, E.M., Nebes, R.D., Begley, A.E., Dew, M.A., Mulsant, B.H., Zmuda, M.D., Bhalla, R., Meltzer, C.C., Pollock, B.G., Reynolds III, C.F., Becker, J.T., 2004. The nature and determinants of neuropsychological functioning in late-life depression. Arch. Gen. Psychiatry 61, 587–595.
- Corrigan, J.D., Hinkeldey, N.S., 1987. Relationships between parts A and B of the Trail Making Test. J. Clin. Psychol. 43, 402–409.
- de Vegt, F., Dekker, J.M., Jager, A., Hienkens, E., Kostense, P.J., Stehouwer, C.D., Nijpels, G., Bouter, L.M., Heine, R.J., 2001. Relation of impaired fasting and postload glucose with incident type 2 diabetes in a Dutch population: the Hoorn study. JAMA 285, 2109–2113.
- Deelman, B.G., Koning-Haanstra, M., Liebrand, W.B.G., 1981. SAN test, een afasietest voor auditief en mondeling taalgebruik. Swets & Zeitlinger, Lisse, The Netherlands.
- Euser, S.M., Sattar, N., Witteman, J.C., Bollen, E.L., Sijbrands, E.J., Hofman, A., Perry, I.J., Breteler, M.M., Westendorp, R.G., 2010. A prospective analysis of elevated fasting glucose levels and cognitive function in older people: results from PROSPER and the Rotterdam study. Diabetes 59, 1601–1607.
- Fontbonne, A., Berr, C., Ducimetiere, P., Alperovitch, A., 2001. Changes in cognitive abilities over a 4-year period are unfavorably affected in elderly diabetic subjects: results of the Epidemiology of Vascular Aging Study. Diabetes Care 24, 366–370.
- Gregg, E.W., Yaffe, K., Cauley, J.A., Rolka, D.B., Blackwell, T.L., Narayan, K.M., Cummings, S.R., 2000. Is diabetes associated with cognitive impairment and cognitive decline among older women? Study of Osteoporotic Fractures Research Group. Arch. Intern. Med. 160, 174–180.
- Griffin, S.J., Borch-Johnsen, K., Davies, M.J., Khunti, K., Rutten, G.E., Sandbaek, A., Sharp, S.J., Simmons, R.K., van den, D.M., Wareham, N.J., Lauritzen, T., 2011. Effect of early intensive multifactorial therapy on 5-year cardiovascular outcomes in individuals with type 2 diabetes detected by screening (ADDITION-Europe): a cluster-randomised trial. Lancet 378, 156–167.
- Higgins, J.P., Thompson, S.G., 2002. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat. Med. 21, 1539–1558.
- Janssen, P.G., Gorter, K.J., Stolk, R.P., Rutten, G.E., 2007. Low yield of population-based screening for Type 2 diabetes in The Netherlands: the ADDITION Netherlands study. Fam. Pract. 24, 555–561.
- Jorm, A.F., 2000. Is depression a risk factor for dementia or cognitive decline? A review. Gerontology 46, 219–227.
- Katz, M.R., Kopek, N., Waldron, J., Devins, G.M., Tomlinson, G., 2004. Screening for depression in head and neck cancer. Psychooncology 13, 269–280.
- Kessels, R.P., van Zandvoort, M.J., Postma, A., Kappelle, L.J., de Haan, E.H., 2000. The Corsi Block-Tapping Task: standardization and normative data. Appl. Neuropsychol. 7, 252–258.
- Koekkoek, P.S., Ruis, C., van den Donk, M., Biessels, G.J., Gorter, K.J., Kappelle, L.J., Rutten, G.E., 2012. Intensive multifactorial treatment and cognitive functioning in screen-detected type 2 diabetes – the ADDITION-Netherlands study: a cluster-randomized trial. J. Neurol. Sci. 314, 71–77.
- Lezak, M., Howieson, D., Loring, D., 2004. Neuropsychological Assessment. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Lowe, L.P., Tranel, D., Wallace, R.B., Welty, T.K., 1994. Type II diabetes and cognitive function. A population-based study of Native Americans. Diabetes Care 17, 891–896.
- Mezuk, B., Eaton, W.W., Albrecht, S., Golden, S.H., 2008. Depression and type 2 diabetes over the lifespan: a meta-analysis. Diabetes Care 31, 2383–2390.
- Mooy, J.M., Grootenhuis, P.A., de Vries, H., Valkenburg, H.A., Bouter, L.M., Kostense, P.J., Heine, R.J., 1995. Prevalence and determinants of glucose intolerance in a Dutch Caucasian population. The Hoorn study. Diabetes Care 18, 1270–1273.

- Ott, A., Stolk, R.P., van Harskamp, F., Pols, H.A., Hofman, A., Breteler, M.M., 1999. Diabetes mellitus and the risk of dementia: the Rotterdam study. Neurology 53, 1937–1942.
- Ownby, R.L., Crocco, E., Acevedo, A., John, V., Loewenstein, D., 2006. Depression and risk for Alzheimer disease: systematic review, meta-analysis, and metaregression analysis. Arch. Gen. Psychiatry 63, 530–538.
- Pan, A., Lucas, M., Sun, Q., van Dam, R.M., Franco, O.H., Manson, J.E., Willett, W.C., Ascherio, A., Hu, F.B., 2010. Bidirectional association between depression and type 2 diabetes mellitus in women. Arch. Intern. Med. 170, 1884–1891.
- Pouwer, F., Beekman, A.T., Nijpels, G., Dekker, J.M., Snoek, F.J., Kostense, P.J., Heine, R.J., Deeg, D.J., 2003. Rates and risks for co-morbid depression in patients with Type 2 diabetes mellitus: results from a community-based study. Diabetologia 46, 892–898.
- Preacher, K.J., Hayes, A.F., 2008. Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. Behav. Res. Methods 40, 879–891.
- Radloff, L.S., 1977. The CES-D scale: a self-report depression scale for research in the general population. Appl. Psychol. Meas. 1, 385–401.
- Reijmer, Y.D., van den Berg, E., Ruis, C., Kappelle, L.J., Biessels, G.J., 2010. Cognitive dysfunction in patients with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Metab. Res. Rev. 26, 507–519.
- Rey, A., 1941. L'examen psychologique dans les cas d'encephalopathie traumatique: les problemes. Arch. Psychol. 28, 286–340.
- Schmand, B., Lindeboom, J., van Harskamp, F., 1992. Nederlandse leestest voor volwassenen. ([[nl]Dutch adult reading test).Swets & Zeitlinger, Lisse.
- Stroop, J., 1935. Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. J. Exp. Psychol. 18, 643–662.

- van den Berg, E., Dekker, J.M., Nijpels, G., Kessels, R.P., Kappelle, L.J., de Haan, E.H., Heine, R.J., Stehouwer, C.D., Biessels, G.J., 2008. Cognitive functioning in elderly persons with type 2 diabetes and metabolic syndrome: the Hoorn study. Dement. Geriatr. Cogn. Disord. 26, 261–269.
- van den Berg, E., Kloppenborg, R.P., Kessels, R.P., Kappelle, L.J., Biessels, G.J., 2009. Type 2 diabetes mellitus, hypertension, dyslipidemia and obesity: a systematic comparison of their impact on cognition. Biochim. Biophys. Acta 1792, 470–481.
- van den Berg, E., Reijmer, Y.D., de Bresser, J., Kessels, R.P., Kappelle, L.J., Biessels, G.J., 2010. A 4 year follow-up study of cognitive functioning in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. Diabetologia 53, 58–65.
- Van der Elst, W., van Boxtel, M.P., van Breukelen, G.J., Jolles, J., 2005. Rey's verbal learning test: normative data for 1855 healthy participants aged 24–81 years and the influence of age, sex, education, and mode of presentation. J. Int. Neuropsychol. Soc. 11, 290–302.
- Watari, K., Letamendi, A., Elderkin-Thompson, V., Haroon, E., Miller, J., Darwin, C., Kumar, A., 2006. Cognitive function in adults with type 2 diabetes and major depression. Arch. Clin. Neuropsychol. 21, 787–796.
- Wechsler, D., 1997. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, 3rd ed. Psychological Corporation, San Antonio, TX.
- WHO, 1999. Definition, diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus and its complications: report of a WHO consultation.
- Yaffe, K., Blackwell, T., Kanaya, A.M., Davidowitz, N., Barrett-Connor, E., Krueger, K., 2004. Diabetes, impaired fasting glucose, and development of cognitive impairment in older women. Neurology 63, 658–663.