

1 Interplay of physical and cognitive performance using 2 hierarchical continuous-time dynamic modelling and a 3 dual-task training regime in Alzheimer's patients

4 S. Schwarck^{1,2*}, M. C. Voelkle³, A. Becke^{1,2}, N. Busse^{1,2}, W. Glanz^{1,2}, E.
5 Düzel^{1,2**}, G. Ziegler^{1,2**}

6

7 ¹Institute of Cognitive Neurology and Dementia research, Otto-von-Guericke-University
8 Magdeburg, Germany

9

10 ²German Center of Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Magdeburg, Germany

11

12 ³Institute of Psychology, Humboldt University of Berlin, Berlin, Germany

13

14

15 *corresponding author:

16 E-mail: svenja.schwarck@med.ovgu.de

17 ** shared senior authorship

18

19 Abstract

20 **Background:** Training studies typically investigate the cumulative rather than the analytically
21 challenging immediate effect of exercise on cognitive outcomes.

22 **Methods:** We investigated the dynamic interplay between single-session exercise intensity and
23 time-locked cognition in older adults with suspected Alzheimer's dementia (N = 17) undergoing
24 a 24-week dual-task regime. We specified a state of the art hierarchical Bayesian continuous-
25 time dynamic model with fully connected state variables to analyze the bidirectional effects
26 between physical and cognitive performance over time.

27 **Results:** Higher physical performance was dynamically linked to improved memory
28 recognition (-1.335, *SD* = 0.201, 95 BCI [-1.725, -0.954]). The effect was short-term, lasting

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

1 up to five days (-0.368, SD = 0.05, 95 BCI [-0.479, -0.266]). Clinical scores supported the
2 validity of the model and observed temporal dynamics.

3 **Conclusion:** Higher physical performance predicted improved memory recognition in a day-
4 by-day manner, providing a proof-of-concept for the feasibility of linking exercise training and
5 cognition in patients with Alzheimer's dementia.

6
7 **Keywords:** Alzheimer's disease, cardiovascular training, cognitive performance, intervention,
8 continuous-time modelling, longitudinal analysis, dynamic modelling, hierarchical, Bayesian

9 10 **Highlights**

- 11 • Hierarchical Bayesian continuous-time dynamic modelling approach
- 12 • 72 repeated physical exercise (PP) and cognitive (COG) performance measurements
- 13 • PP is dynamically linked to session-to-session variability of COG
- 14 • Higher PP improved COG in subsequent sessions in subjects with Alzheimer's dementia
- 15 • Short-term effect: lasting up to four days after training session

16 17 18 **Research in Context**

- 19 **1. Systematic review:** Training-induced effects on cognitive outcomes in Alzheimer's
20 dementia and/or associated dynamic Bayesian modelling approaches were reviewed.
21 Although studies showed exercise-induced cognitive improvements or maintenance,
22 most of these studies fail to capture the dynamic nature of the change and interplay of
23 physical (PP) and cognitive (COG) performance.
- 24 **2. Interpretation:** Using a sophisticated hierarchical Bayesian continuous-time dynamic
25 modelling approach, a fully connected state variable model was specified. PP is
26 dynamically linked to COG, i.e. higher PP predicted improved COG in subsequent
27 sessions. This effect was rather short term, lasting for up to five days.
- 28 **3. Future direction:** Our results support exercise-induced effects on cognition. The
29 cognitive system was still able to fluctuate and change favourably even in a sample with
30 Alzheimer's dementia. Further studies using dynamic modelling are necessary to
31 replicate findings and examine other contributors to cognitive volatility in dementia.

32

1 **1. Background**

2 Alzheimer's disease is a devastating neurodegenerative disorder encompassing
3 neuropathological changes including accumulation of amyloid plaques, neurofibrillary tangles
4 and neuronal as well as synaptic loss resulting in macrostructural atrophy of the brain (1).
5 Alzheimer's dementia is characterized by a progressive decline of functional independence in
6 everyday life, with memory being the most affected cognitive domain (1,2). It has been shown
7 that a higher physical fitness across the lifespan mitigates age-related cognitive decline and
8 reduces the risk of progression to dementia (3,4). Physical fitness seems to reduce Alzheimer's
9 dementia -risk substantially (5) and mice- and human studies suggest a neuroprotective effect
10 of physical activity by reducing A β plaques, increasing hippocampal plasticity/neurogenesis
11 and improving memory performance (6–8). Therefore, targeted interventions focussing on
12 physical inactivity are under investigation to delay the progression of cognitive decline (9).
13 Several intervention-studies reported positive effects of exercise training on cognitive
14 performance in patients with Alzheimer's dementia or mild cognitive impairment (10).
15 However, there is also contradictory evidence where cognition did not benefit in patients with
16 dementia despite physical fitness improvements (11,12).

17
18 Exercise-interventions in dementia are typically envisioned as prolonged regimes of regular
19 weekly training sessions spanning several months. During this time, the exercise intensity is
20 gradually increased according to individual cardio-vascular and physical fitness parameters.
21 Given the prolonged nature of exercise interventions, it is clinically relevant to understand how
22 each training session and changing parameters of training intensity affect cognition, both during
23 training and shortly after training. These time-locked, immediate effects of training are
24 important for several reasons. First, they can provide mechanistic insights into the training-
25 related day-to-day fluctuations of cognition of a patient to develop more effective approaches

1 and guide care and clinical decision making. Second, they can provide individual guidance for
2 adaptively choosing the optimal training intensity from a cognitive point-of-view.

3
4 To summarize, there is partial support for the hypothesis that physical fitness might positively
5 impact cognition and counteract the cognitive decline in patients with Alzheimer’s dementia
6 (4,5). However, the majority of studies using repeated measurements only report undirected
7 associations rather than analysing the dynamic changes and complex interplay of physical and
8 cognitive states directly (13). Temporal precedence is an important requirement for causality
9 (14). Moreover, time is often treated as a discrete variable and accordingly the regression
10 strength between time points is estimated without integrating information regarding the interval
11 between them (14,15). Previous longitudinal studies therefore faced challenging unequal time
12 interval lengths between and/or within participants, which might lead to biased parameter
13 estimates and conclusions (14–16). In contrast, a hierarchical Bayesian continuous-time
14 dynamic modelling approach overcomes problems of conventional approaches, such as above
15 biases and lack of directionality (13,17). This approach enables the analysis of the dynamic
16 change and mechanistic coupling between states of interest, fully accounting for unequal
17 acquisition time intervals (14,18).

18
19 Here we study the dynamic changes of physical and cognitive performance and their interplay
20 using an extensive longitudinal training study for patients with suspected Alzheimer’s dementia
21 comprised of 72 sessions over 24-weeks including a physical and cognitive dual-task regime.
22 The positive exercise-induced effect of physical fitness on cognition was shown in a previous
23 paper using a conventional linear approach (19). In this study we focus on the dynamic interplay
24 between physical and cognitive performance taking advantage of state of the art hierarchical
25 Bayesian continuous-time dynamical system modelling (14,18,20). We hypothesize that

1 changes in physical performance predict subsequent changes of cognitive performance. In
2 addition, we hypothesize that individual dynamics relate to dementia symptom severity as well
3 as physical health.

4

5 **2. Methods**

6 **2.1 Sample and experimental design**

7 We recruited older adults aged 60-80 years with diagnosed mild to moderate Alzheimer's
8 disease (F00.1; Mini Mental Status Examination (MMSE): 18-26) from the memory clinic of
9 the German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), Magdeburg (see Supplemental
10 Material: Methods). The total sample size included $N = 17$ older adults (age: $M = 73.33 \pm 3.43$;
11 MMSE: $M = 23.50 \pm 3.45$; female = 8) who were free of depressive symptoms (Geriatric
12 Depression Scale: $M = 1.88 \pm 0.93$), pulmonary and cardiovascular diseases. The study
13 contained a 24-week (72 sessions, 15-min each) dual-task regime (for details see also (19)).
14 The training support per week was provided by the relatives, a team member and a senior
15 volunteer. Each participant received personalized training with an individualized cadence (40-
16 80 rotations per minute) and exercise intensity of 65-75% of the maximum heart rate (HR, ~
17 90-115 bpm) using the Karvonen method (21). Simultaneously, each training session included
18 a cognitive task with a memorization of 30 pictures, such as animals or landscapes. The picture
19 recognition memory performance was assessed immediately after training and included 30
20 subsequent test screens (original vs. lure picture). All picture sets were matched regarding
21 difficulty level using LaMem score (22). The MMSE and 12-Item Short Form Survey (SF-12)
22 physical health questionnaire (23) were assessed before and immediately after the regime.

23

24

1 2.2 Dynamical Bayesian modelling and statistical analysis

2 We included up to 72 training sessions per participant in the analysis if completed (90% in
3 sample). The training observations were z-standardized on the group level. Physical
4 performance (PP) was measured as the ratio of power output (unit: Watt) and HR of each
5 training session. Higher values reflect higher PP. Cognitive performance (COG) was
6 operationalized as reaction times corrected for the number of errors. The reaction time (RT, in
7 seconds) within a valid range of ≤ 13 seconds was used and corrected for the proportion of error
8 (PE) using the linear integrated speed-accuracy score (LISAS) (24):

$$9 \quad \text{LISAS}(j) = \text{RT}(j) + \frac{\text{SD}_{\text{RT}}}{\text{SD}_{\text{PE}}} * \text{PE}(j) \quad (1)$$

10
11 with mean reaction time and proportion of errors at the measurement occasion j , and respective
12 standard deviations. Lower scores do reflect higher cognitive performance i.e. faster reaction
13 time corrected for error.

14 All statistical analyses were conducted in R version 4.0.2 using RStudio version 1.3.1056. The
15 modelling approach was previously established and implemented in the R package ctsem (20)
16 relying on the Stan software (25). Results were visualized using ctsem and ggplot2 from
17 tidyverse (26). Model fit was compared using Chi-square tests. The alpha level for additional
18 frequentist statistical tests was defined as $p < .05$.

19 Hierarchical Bayesian continuous-time dynamic modelling was used to simultaneously analyse
20 the temporal dynamics of PP and COG reflected in a 2-dimensional state variable $\boldsymbol{\eta}(t) = [\text{PP}(t),$
21 $\text{COG}(t)]^T$ at time t (20). At the core is a subject-level latent dynamic model using a stochastic
22 differential equation (or state equation):

1

$$d\boldsymbol{\eta}(t) = (\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\eta}(t) + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\chi}(t))dt + \mathbf{G}d\mathbf{W}(t) \quad (2)$$

2

3 with time-varying latent process $\boldsymbol{\eta}(t)$ and its temporal derivative $d\boldsymbol{\eta}(t)$ encoding the systems
4 current state and its change over time, respectively. The DRIFT matrix \mathbf{A} contains free
5 parameters and defines the temporal dynamics of the process with auto-effects (connectivity:
6 main-diagonal) and cross-effects encoding interplay or interactions (coupling: off-diagonal) Eq.
7 (2) contains the continuous time intercept (CINT) \mathbf{b} and the effect \mathbf{M} of time dependent
8 predictors $\boldsymbol{\chi}$ on $\boldsymbol{\eta}(t)$.

9 The continuous-time parameters of \mathbf{A} contain changes of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ over a small time interval in the
10 differential equation and can be transformed better interpretable discrete-time equivalents (\mathbf{A}^*)
11 for any given time interval length (Δt)

12

$$\mathbf{A}_{\Delta t_u}^* = e^{\mathbf{A}(t_u - t_{u-1})} \quad (3)$$

13 where $\mathbf{A}_{\Delta t_u}^*$ includes the associated auto and cross-regression effect for the effect of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ at the
14 measurement occasion $u-1$ on $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ at measurement occasion u (20). The used approach also
15 includes a linear measurement model relating latent states $\boldsymbol{\eta}(t)$ to observables $\mathbf{y}(t)$

$$\mathbf{y}(t) = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\eta}(t) + \boldsymbol{\tau} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(t) \quad (4)$$

16 using factor loadings $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$, the manifest intercepts $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ and residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ with covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ (see
17 Supplemental Material).

18 The dynamic model was specified with two fully connected state variables enabling bi-
19 directional coupling between PP and COG over 72 measurement occasions. The observable
20 indicator Power/HR of each session were loading on PP and reaction times (RT) on COG. All
21 other parameters (except \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{M} which were set to zero) of the state equation and measurement
22 model were left free to be estimated using the data. The latent process means at $t=0$, $\boldsymbol{\tau}$

1 (intercepts) and \mathbf{A} (DRIFT-matrix) were allowed to vary free across participants, resulting in
2 49 parameters. Population and individual level parameters are estimated simultaneously using
3 all data from all subjects. The hierarchical Bayesian model estimation was set to default priors
4 and initial starting values using 4 chains and 8.000 iterations (under Stan's optimizer for
5 maximum a posteriori estimates).

6 Four models were hypothesized and further compared. First, a full 2-CR model including both
7 auto- and cross-effect parameters in drift matrix \mathbf{A} resulting in 13 free population mean
8 parameters. Secondly, two 1-CR models with both auto-effects and the cross-effect PP on COG
9 (PP \rightarrow COG) and COG on PP (COG \rightarrow PP), restricting to uni-directional interaction only. Lastly,
10 a zero-model (0-CR) in which both cross-effects were fixed to zero (without domain interplays).
11 The full 2-CR model was compared against both 1-CR (and 0-CR model with regard to their
12 model fit using a Chi-Square difference test (20).

13 Furthermore, we ran a second-level model with the MMSE and the SF12 baseline score as time-
14 independent covariates for validation with the temporal dynamics. A higher score in both
15 covariates is associated with higher cognitive and physical health status respectively. All other
16 model specifications were the same as the above full 2-CR model.

17 To explore potential changes of the domain interplay over the course of the training, the strength
18 of PP on COG (PP \rightarrow COG) was compared between the baseline (day 1-84) and second half (day
19 85-168) of the training (both free parameters to estimate). By specifying a slightly extended full
20 2-CR model, we included a time dependent predictor χ (named 'secondhalf'), which is zero
21 expect on day 84, when it is 1. Additional, an extra latent process (named 'step2ndhalf') was
22 included, with all parameters and covariances fixed to zero, except the element on the time
23 dependent predictor were set to 1 (step function), i.e. the extra latent process shifts on day 84
24 to 1 and stays there. The cross-effect in question was defined as a function of PP \rightarrow COG on

1 baseline added by PP→COG on the second half of the training multiplied by the extra latent
2 process. A negative value reflects a stronger effect of PP→COG (i.e. when physical
3 performance increases the reaction time decreases) in the second half of the training and vice
4 versa.

5

6 **3. Results**

7 **3.1 Demographic data**

8 Table 1 provides the demographic data and associated neurological characteristics of the
9 participants.


Demographic data	
Age (years)	67-80 ($M = 73.41$, $SD = 3.43$)
Sex	7:10 (ratio female to male)
Neurological characteristics	
ICD-10 diagnosis	Alzheimer's disease (F00.1)
MMSE pre	$M = 23.35$, $SD = 3.50$
MMSE post*	$M = 22.75$, $SD = 4.06$

10 Table 1: Demographic data and neurological characteristics of the sample ($N = 17$). MMSE pre, Mini
11 Mental Status Examination score before the start of the intervention. MMSE post, Mini Mental Status
12 Examination score after the end of the 24-week intervention (assessment within 12 days to 8 weeks after
13 the intervention). * $N = 16$ due to one missing post assessment. M , mean. SD , standard deviation.

14

15 **3.2 Analysis of cross-domain interplay using dynamic modelling**

16 The range of valid measurement occasions of all 17 participants was between 59 – 70 sessions
17 ($M = 64.71 \pm 4.26$) resulting in 1100 manifest observations per latent state (or domain) with 25
18 (~2.3%) missing values for physical performance. The time interval between successive
19 measurement occasions ranged from 1 to 14 days ($M = 2.54 \pm 1.04$). The longitudinal data was
20 analysed using a 2-state dynamical model as illustrated in Figure 1 (for details see methods).



1

2 Fig. 1. Schematic illustration of the 2-state-model with the first three timepoints (t0, t1, t2) reflecting
 3 successive training sessions. The graphical model contains the observed variables (manifest indicators)
 4 power of the bicycle ergometer and HR (as ratio: Power/HR) and reaction time corrected for the
 5 proportion of error (RT) loading on the latent variables (ellipsoids) PP (physical performance)
 6 respectively COG (cognitive performance). The main effect of interest is the cross-effect of PP on COG
 7 (further denoted as drift PP→COG). The model also contains latent error terms (**w**) and the continuous
 8 time intercept (**I**). The model shows regression paths (red lines) and variance and covariance
 9 (orange lines). Manifest intercepts are not shown.

10

11 A Chi-Square difference test for model comparison revealed a significant difference between
 12 the full 2-CR model and the zero-model ($\chi^2(17) = 235.1, p < .001$). In addition, a significant
 13 difference was also observed between the 2-CR model and the PP→COG 1-CR model ($\chi^2(9) =$
 14 $149.8, p < .001$) and COG→PP 1-CR model ($\chi^2(9) = 294.6, p < .001$). Correspondingly, the full
 15 2-CR model (Table 2) containing both cross-effects that enable a bi-directional interplay
 16 between COG and PP fitted the data best and is further reported (see Table S1 for estimated
 17 population parameters for the other models).


18

	<i>parameter</i>	<i>symbol</i>	<i>Est.</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>LL-BCI</i>	<i>UL-BCI</i>
DRIFT	drift _{PP}	A	-0.851	0.146	-1.146	-0.602
	drift _{COG}	A	-1.645	0.188	-2.026	-1.300
	drift _{COG→PP}	A	0.313	0.087	0.154	0.485
	drift _{PP→COG}	A	-1.335	0.201	-1.725	-0.954
T₀MEANS	T ₀ m _{PP}	η ₁	-0.175	0.010	-0.194	-0.154
	T ₀ m _{COG}	η ₂	0.941	0.083	0.766	1.102
DIFFUSION	diff _{PP}	Q	0.045	0.011	0.027	0.070
	diff _{COG}	Q	0.797	0.038	0.722	0.874
	diff _{PP→COG}	Q	-0.687	0.135	-0.884	-0.354
MANIFEST_{VAR}	mVar _{Power/HR}	Θ	0.208	0.006	0.195	0.220
	mVar _{RT}	Θ	0.046	0.029	0.012	0.124
MANIFEST_{MEANS}	mm _{Power/HR}	τ	-0.382	0.078	-0.531	-0.234
	mm _{RT}	τ	0.259	0.079	0.103	0.412

Table 2: Group level results showing estimated population means including Bayesian posterior intervals of the Full 2-CR (cross-effect) model. Sample size $n = 17$ with 1100 observed sessions in total; The model contains two latent variables (physical (PP) and cognitive (COG) performance) with one manifest indicator, each (Power/HR and RT corrected for PE) respectively, $n = 13$ free population mean parameters. Est. mean from mean of the chains; BCI, 95% Bayesian credible interval, LL, lower limit, UL, upper limit; Bayesian model estimation: number of chains = 4, number of iterations = 8000.


Changes in PP predict later changes in COG in the opposite direction as found by a more substantial negative cross-effect drift_{PP→COG} (-1.335, $SD = 0.201$, 95 BCI [-1.725, -0.954]). As such, when physical performance levels are above baseline (suggesting higher PP) COG levels are likely to go downwards (faster reaction times). The cross-effect PP→COG also varies between participants which suggests that some subjects benefit more from the exercise training resulting in cognitive improvements than others (between-person variability in drift_{PP→COG}: 2.44, $SD = 0.29$, 95% BCI[1.86, 3.02]). The high between-person differences in the cross-effect PP→COG comes along with its higher population mean (T₀MEANS, Table 2), i.e. this effect seems more relevant in the sample but its importance also differs more between participants. In contrast, COG do partially predict later changes of PP in the same direction as indicated by a small and positive cross-effect (drift_{COG→PP}). When subject's reaction time increases (i.e. reduced COG) the PP levels did also slightly increase over following time. Furthermore, the

1 temporal changes of PP last longer than the temporal dynamic of COG (higher auto-effect of
 2 PP (drift_{PP})).
 3 Previous states of PP do impact COG negatively (-0.368, *SD* = 0.05, 95 BCI [-0.479, -0.266])
 4 as shown via discrete-time parameters (one day time interval). The expected effect PP→COG
 5 peaks around one and lasts for up to around four days, after which the random-state fluctuations
 6 dominate (Figure 2). The cross-lagged effect COG→PP was observed to be close to zero (0.086,
 7 *SD* = 0.024, 95 BCI [0.041, 0.136]) and accordingly there is practically no substantial effect in
 8 this direction. Furthermore, the small autoregressive (self-connection) effect of COG (0.145,
 9 *SD* = 0.039, 95 BCI [0.072, 0.226]) suggested low stability of the construct over time. PP on one
 10 day had a small effect on PP on another day (0.363, *SD* = 0.05, 95 BCI [0.264, 0.472]).



11
 12 Fig 2. Auto and cross regression over time. Temporal autoregressive effects (upper panel) and cross-
 13 lagged effects (lower panel) over time (x-axis, time interval in days), median and 95% quantiles for a
 14 change of 1 at time zero. The expected autoregressive effect (or self-connection) of PP (drift PP) and
 15 COG (drift COG) peak around approximately one day and decrease with increasing time interval length.
 16 This suggests that the more time passes the less predictive is the performance for consecutive
 17 performance levels. The expected cross-lagged effect (or interplay) of PP on COG (PP→COG) peaks
 18 around one day and seem to improve predictions of COG for up to around four days. This can be

1 understood as rather short-term benefits from physical training on cognitive performance. The cross-
2 lagged effect COG on PP (COG→PP) is very close to zero, suggesting that changes in cognitive
3 performance do not improve predictions of physical performance.
4
5 The temporal dynamics of PP showed more inter-individual differences compared to COG.
6 Some subjects showed relatively persistent PP levels over the entire training time, while the PP
7 fluctuated more in other participants (between-person variability in drift_{PP} : 9.89, $SD = 0.52$,
8 95% BCI[8.89, 10.90]). The measurement error ($\text{MANIFEST}_{\text{VAR}}$) of the manifest indicator
9 Power/HR (0.208) was found to be higher compared to RT (0.046), i.e. measurement limitations
10 and short-term situational influences (e.g. subjective stress or sunny days) are more present in
11 the PP indicator (Table 2)., COG showed higher session-to-session fluctuations within-person
12 (0.188, $SD = 0.014$, 95 BCI [0.163, 0.217]) compared to PP (0.004, $SD = 0.002$, 95 BCI [0.001,
13 0.012]). The model prediction of COG and PP over training time are illustrated in Figure 3 (see
14 also Supplemental Material Fig. S1 for five randomly selected participants).




15
16 Fig. 3. Individual estimates. Individual level analyses for all participants of the sample ($n = 17$) over
17 time interval in days (x-axis). The solid lines presents the model prediction of the smoothed estimates

1 of participant's individual latent states COG (upper panel) and PP (lower panel) within a 95% BCI. Each
2 coloured solid line presents the individual model prediction for one subject each. The temporal dynamics
3 of PP show more individual differences compared to COG.

4

5 3.3 Drift coefficients as a function of clinical baseline scores

6 Participants with higher MMSE baseline scores show lower persistence in the cross-effect
7 COG→PP ($\text{drift}_{\text{COG} \rightarrow \text{PP}}$; -0.215 , $SD = 0.022$, 95% BCI $[-0.259, -0.172]$, Fig 4A). Higher MMSE
8 baseline scores were associated with lower persistence in COG ($\text{drift}_{\text{COG}}$; -0.538 , $SD = 0.174$,
9 95% BCI $[-0.887, -0.209]$). The effect of MMSE on the auto-effect PP and the cross-effect
10 PP→COG is close to zero (-0.02 , $SD = 0.003$, 95% BCI $[-0.03, -0.01]$). Participants with a lower
11 health score show a stronger cross-effect of COG on PP ($\text{drift}_{\text{COG} \rightarrow \text{PP}}$; -0.231 , $SD = 0.035$, 95%
12 BCI $[-0.303, -0.165]$, Fig 4B). Likewise, higher physical health scores seem to be associated
13 with lower persistence in their physical performance (drift_{PP} ; -0.036 , $SD = 0.008$, 95% BCI $[-$
14 $0.052, -0.021]$). The effect on the other auto-effect and cross-effect are close to zero.



15

1 Fig. 4. Estimated effect of subject-level covariate predictors on dynamical parameters. We show (A)
2 MMSE and (B) SF12 physical health baseline score effects on drift parameters (auto-effects and cross-
3 effects) within a 95% BCI. drift_{PP}, auto-effect PP (red solid line); drift_{PP→COG}, cross-effect PP on COG
4 (green solid line); drift_{COG→PP}, cross-effect COG on PP (blue solid line); drift_{COG}, auto-effect COG (purple
5 solid line).

6

7 **3.4 Changes of dynamics over the course of training**

8 An extended model with the drift coefficient PP→COG as a function of time was specified.
9 The model estimated if the strength of the cross-effect PP→COG changed between the baseline
10 (day 1-84) and the second half (day 85-168) of training. Results suggested that the cross-effect
11 PP→COG becomes positive in the second half of the training (2.08), i.e. the strength and
12 associated effect of physical performance on cognitive performance was found to be reduced
13 in the second half of training. This change was estimated as a function of PP→COG on baseline
14 (-0.11, *SD* = 0.63, 95% BCI [-1.34, 1.14]) added PP→COG on the second half of the training
15 (-1.50, *SD* = 0.08, 95% BCI [-1.66, -1.34]) multiplied by the extra latent step process (-1.45,
16 *SD* = 0.38, 95% BCI [-2.21, -0.72]).

17

18 **4. Discussion**

19 Recent longitudinal studies reported promising but also conflicting effects of exercise training
20 on cognitive performance in persons with dementia (10). These studies often fail to capture the
21 dynamic nature of the coupling between fitness and cognition (14). This study assessed the
22 dynamic session-to-session changes and interplay of physical and cognitive performance by
23 taking advantage of a Bayesian hierarchical continuous-time dynamic modelling approach (20).
24 A fully connected model was specified to analyse the connectivity (auto/self-effect) and
25 coupling (cross-domain/interplay) of PP and COG over 72 measurement occasions.

1 Under the assumption of our model, physical performance is dynamically linked to cognitive
2 performance. Thus, increased PP was associated with improved COG (faster reaction time),
3 which is in line with previous training studies (4,5). However, this effect shows between-person
4 variability, suggesting that some participants benefited more from the training than others.
5 While we cannot rule out the possibility of non-responders due to a missing control group (27),
6 the observed cross-effect supports the notion that exercise training has a positive effect on
7 cognition in dementia.

8 In addition, an important question is how long this beneficial exercise-induced effect on
9 cognition lasts (e.g. how many days). Our results suggest rather a short-term effect: A positive
10 change in PP can improve the prediction of increased COG for up to four days with the strongest
11 influence after one day, after which unpredictable random fluctuations dominate. However,
12 unexplained or not modelled causes could act on this effect and might appear even without
13 training. Nevertheless, the coupling-effect appears at least under the condition of training,
14 consistent with recent studies (4,5).

15 Furthermore, we observed random session-to-session cognitive fluctuations within participants
16 over time, while the measurement error was close to zero. In patients with Alzheimer's
17 dementia, intra-individual cognitive fluctuations are generally higher compared to healthy
18 controls (28,29) and may be linked to pathology (30). Considering this fluctuations as
19 measurement error only would oversimplify the true cognitive state (31).

20 The observed short-term effects in patients with dementia suggests that exercise seem to
21 mobilize capacities that would otherwise remain unused. However, the exercise-induced causal
22 underlying mechanism(s) leading to cognitive changes are still discussed (32,33). There is some
23 evidence for neurotrophin-mediated neurogenesis, such as BDNF (brain-derived neurotrophic
24 factor) (34,35). Inhibited BDNF in the hippocampus by blocking tyrosine receptor kinase B

1 also inhibited the action of BDNF and its associated beneficial effects on cognitive function
2 (36). The short-term nature of the effect that we report here suggests that rather than the chronic
3 and slow plasticity related to neurogenesis, more immediate mechanisms may play a role. These
4 include changes in the bodily milieu, improved perfusion and improved clearance, just to name
5 a few (35,37,38).

6 We further support some validity for our observed temporal dynamics by assessing the drift
7 coefficients as a function of clinical baseline scores. Higher physical health (SF-12) and lower
8 cognitive impairment (MMSE) were associated with lower persistence in PP and COG,
9 respectively.

10 PP showed a general increasing trend and COG a decreasing trend (faster reaction times) over
11 training time. This is in line with our previous study using a linear-mixed modelling approach
12 (19). Beyond, we observed changes in the coupling-effect of PP on COG over training time by
13 specifying an additional model. The coupling-effect was stronger in the first half of training
14 (day 1- 84), which is line with training studies (39,40). However, in the second half of training
15 (day 85 – 168) the strength of this coupling-effect is reduced, i.e. the exercise-induced increase
16 of PP positively affecting COG appeared to weaken over time. One explanation might be that
17 the changes may follow a non-linear time course, e.g. increase early or close to the end of the
18 whole training regime. As such, further studies using time-varying analysis of those domains
19 may clarify the temporal patterns of the coupling-effect. However, patients with Alzheimer's
20 dementia show general reduced motivational capacities (41). Animal studies observed positive
21 effects of environmental enrichment (combined physical, cognitive and social stimulation) on
22 brain health, such as increased neurotrophic factor levels, neurogenesis, and improved cognitive
23 performance (42). Although our training was designed as a cognitive motivation, i.e. the
24 participants had to physically exercise for new pictures to stimulate the novelty-exploration, the

1 lower variability in the task itself may have led to reduced motivation and/or increased
2 distraction (e.g., by social or environmental factors) from the middle of the training onwards.
3 Finally, we like to mention several limitations of the current study. Although the model is
4 mechanistic (or causal) it contains many assumptions that might be wrong and/or we may have
5 not included all observable factors mediating the observed effects. Our approach assumed
6 stationary dynamics over the course of the training, i.e. we cannot rule out non-stationary
7 dynamics during the training time. The sample was small (N=17) and potentially biased
8 regarding age and severity of Alzheimer's dementia and did not include a control group. Since
9 there is an absence of a physically inactive control group, future studies might look if cognitive
10 volatility (i.e. also short reaching performance highs) is present without training and whether
11 the coupling of physical on cognitive performance still exist without. With regard to the present
12 literature showing positive due to regular exercise (3,4), the latter one might not be the case.
13 Future longitudinal randomized controlled studies using a more comprehensive
14 neuropsychological assessment to examine transfer effects are necessary to verify our results.
15 Additionally, studies may examine the question how cognitive fluctuations can be used since
16 they are random.

17

18 The present extensive 24-week longitudinal training study examined the temporal connectivity
19 und coupling of physical and cognitive performance in a sample with Alzheimer's dementia
20 using a hierarchical Bayesian continuous-time dynamic modelling approach. Physical
21 performance was dynamically linked to cognitive performance, i.e. higher PP improved time-
22 locked COG in subsequent sessions. The beneficial effect was rather short-term, lasting up for
23 four days after the training. Our observed dynamics were validated by clinical scores, i.e. higher
24 MMSE baseline scores were associated with lower persistence in the temporal dynamics of

1 COG. To summarize, our results provided a proof-of-concept regarding the feasibility of time-
2 resolved linkage of exercise training and cognition even in a sample with suspected Alzheimer’s
3 dementia.

4

5 **List of abbreviations**

6 BDNF – brain-derived neurotrophic factor

7 COG – cognitive performance

8 CR – cross-effect

9 HR – heart rate

10 HRV – heart rate variability

11 LISAS – linear speed-accuracy score

12 MCI – mild cognitive impairment

13 MMSE – Mini Mental Status Examination

14 PE – proportion of error

15 PP – physical performance

16 RT – reaction time

17 SF-12 – 12-Item Short Form Survey

18 SF-36 – 36-Item Short Form Survey

19

20

1 **Declarations**

2 Ethics approval and consent to participate:

3 The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Otto-von-Guericke University,
4 Magdeburg, Germany (approval number: 68/17). All participants and their relatives as
5 representatives signed a written informed consent form for participation.

6 Availability of data and materials:

7 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the
8 corresponding author on reasonable request.

9 Competing interests:

10 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

11 Funding:

12 The project (ID: ZS/2016/05/78611) belongs to the Research Association Autonomy in old Age
13 (AiA) funded by the European Union (ERDF-European Regional Development Fund) and the
14 State of Saxony-Anhalt, Germany.

15 Author's contributions:

16 GZ and SS contributed to the conceptualization and the data curation. SS, GZ, and MV
17 performed the formal analysis. ED contributed to the funding acquisition, resources, and the
18 supervision. The investigation was conducted by NB, WG, AB, and SS. ED, MV, GZ, AB, and
19 SS contributed to the methodology and AB and NB to the project administration. The software
20 and validation was conducted by AB. SS contributed to the visualization and the writing of the
21 original draft preparation. SS, GZ, MV, WG, AB, NB, and ED contributed to the writing of the

1 review and editing. All authors contributed to the article and read and approved the submitted
2 version.

3 Acknowledgements:

4 Not applicable

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1 **References**

- 2
- 3 1. Breijyeh Z, Karaman R. Comprehensive Review on Alzheimer’s Disease: Causes and
4 Treatment. *Molecules* [Internet]. 2020 Dec 8;25(24):5789. Available from:
5 <https://www.mdpi.com/1420-3049/25/24/5789>
- 6 2. De-Paula VJ, Radanovic M, Diniz BS, Forlenza O V. Alzheimer’s Disease. In 2012. p.
7 329–52. Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-94-007-5416-4_14
- 8 3. Colcombe S, Kramer AF. Fitness Effects on the Cognitive Function of Older Adults.
9 *Psychol Sci* [Internet]. 2003 Mar 25;14(2):125–30. Available from:
10 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1111/1467-9280.t01-1-01430>
- 11 4. Erickson KI, Hillman C, Stillman CM, Ballard RM, Bloodgood B, Conroy DE, et al.
12 Physical Activity, Cognition, and Brain Outcomes: A Review of the 2018 Physical
13 Activity Guidelines. *Med Sci Sport Exerc* [Internet]. 2019 Jun;51(6):1242–51.
14 Available from: <https://journals.lww.com/00005768-201906000-00019>
- 15 5. Hamer M, Chida Y. Physical activity and risk of neurodegenerative disease: a
16 systematic review of prospective evidence. *Psychol Med* [Internet]. 2009 Jan
17 23;39(1):3–11. Available from:
18 [https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0033291708003681/type/journal_](https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0033291708003681/type/journal_article)
19 [article](https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0033291708003681/type/journal_article)
- 20 6. Erickson KI, Voss MW, Prakash RS, Basak C, Szabo A, Chaddock L, et al. Exercise
21 training increases size of hippocampus and improves memory. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
22 [Internet]. 2011 Feb 15;108(7):3017–22. Available from:
23 <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1015950108>
- 24 7. van Praag H, Christie BR, Sejnowski TJ, Gage FH. Running enhances neurogenesis,
25 learning, and long-term potentiation in mice. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* [Internet]. 1999 Nov
26 9;96(23):13427–31. Available from:
27 <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.96.23.13427>
- 28 8. van Praag H, Kempermann G, Gage FH. Running increases cell proliferation and
29 neurogenesis in the adult mouse dentate gyrus. *Nat Neurosci* [Internet]. 1999
30 Mar;2(3):266–70. Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/nn0399_266
- 31 9. Meng Q, Lin M-S, Tzeng I-S. Relationship Between Exercise and Alzheimer’s
32 Disease: A Narrative Literature Review. *Front Neurosci* [Internet]. 2020 Mar 26;14.
33 Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnins.2020.00131/full>
- 34 10. Groot C, Hooghiemstra AM, Raijmakers PGHM, van Berckel BNM, Scheltens P,
35 Scherder EJA, et al. The effect of physical activity on cognitive function in patients
36 with dementia: A meta-analysis of randomized control trials. *Ageing Res Rev*
37 [Internet]. 2016 Jan;25:13–23. Available from:
38 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1568163715300349>
- 39 11. Lamb SE, Sheehan B, Atherton N, Nichols V, Collins H, Mistry D, et al. Dementia
40 And Physical Activity (DAPA) trial of moderate to high intensity exercise training for
41 people with dementia: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* [Internet]. 2018 May
42 16;k1675. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.k1675>
- 43 12. Sanders LMJ, Hortobágyi T, Karssemeijer EGA, Van der Zee EA, Scherder EJA, van

- 1 Heuvelen MJG. Effects of low- and high-intensity physical exercise on physical and
2 cognitive function in older persons with dementia: a randomized controlled trial.
3 *Alzheimers Res Ther* [Internet]. 2020 Dec 19;12(1):28. Available from:
4 <https://alzres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13195-020-00597-3>
- 5 13. Hecht M, Voelkle MC. Continuous-time modeling in prevention research: An
6 illustration. *Int J Behav Dev* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 19;45(1):19–27. Available from:
7 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0165025419885026>
- 8 14. Voelkle MC, Gische C, Driver CC, Lindenberger U. The Role of Time in the Quest for
9 Understanding Psychological Mechanisms. *Multivariate Behav Res* [Internet]. 2018
10 Nov 2;53(6):782–805. Available from:
11 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00273171.2018.1496813>
- 12 15. Voelkle MC, Oud JHL. Continuous time modelling with individually varying time
13 intervals for oscillating and non-oscillating processes. *Br J Math Stat Psychol*
14 [Internet]. 2013 Feb;66(1):103–26. Available from:
15 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.2044-8317.2012.02043.x>
- 16 16. Voelkle MC, Oud JHL, Davidov E, Schmidt P. An SEM approach to continuous time
17 modeling of panel data: Relating authoritarianism and anomia. *Psychol Methods*
18 [Internet]. 2012;17(2):176–92. Available from:
19 <http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/a0027543>
- 20 17. Hamaker EL, Asparouhov T, Brose A, Schmiedek F, Muthén B. At the Frontiers of
21 Modeling Intensive Longitudinal Data: Dynamic Structural Equation Models for the
22 Affective Measurements from the COGITO Study. *Multivariate Behav Res* [Internet].
23 2018 Nov 2;53(6):820–41. Available from:
24 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00273171.2018.1446819>
- 25 18. Friston KJ, Preller KH, Mathys C, Cagnan H, Heinzle J, Razi A, et al. Dynamic causal
26 modelling revisited. *Neuroimage* [Internet]. 2019 Oct;199:730–44. Available from:
27 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1053811917301568>
- 28 19. Schwarck S, Busse N, Ziegler G, Glanz W, Becke A, Düzel E. Heart Rate Variability
29 During Physical Exercise Is Associated With Improved Cognitive Performance in
30 Alzheimer’s Dementia Patients—A Longitudinal Feasibility Study. *Front Sport Act*
31 *Living* [Internet]. 2021 Jul 15;3. Available from:
32 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fspor.2021.684089/full>
- 33 20. Driver CC, Voelkle MC. Hierarchical Bayesian continuous time dynamic modeling.
34 *Psychol Methods* [Internet]. 2018 Dec;23(4):774–99. Available from:
35 <http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/met0000168>
- 36 21. Karvonen MJ, Kentala E, Mustala O. The effects of training on heart rate; a
37 longitudinal study. *Ann Med Exp Biol Fenn* [Internet]. 1957;35(3):307–15. Available
38 from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/13470504>
- 39 22. Khosla A, Raju AS, Torralba A, Oliva A. Understanding and Predicting Image
40 Memorability at a Large Scale. In: 2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer
41 Vision (ICCV) [Internet]. IEEE; 2015. p. 2390–8. Available from:
42 <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7410632/>
- 43 23. Ware JE, Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: Construction
44 of Scales and Preliminary Tests of Reliability and Validity. *Med Care* [Internet]. 1996

- 1 Mar;34(3):220–33. Available from: [http://journals.lww.com/00005650-199603000-](http://journals.lww.com/00005650-199603000-00003)
2 00003
- 3 24. Vandierendonck A. A comparison of methods to combine speed and accuracy
4 measures of performance: A rejoinder on the binning procedure. *Behav Res Methods*
5 [Internet]. 2017 Apr 4;49(2):653–73. Available from:
6 <http://link.springer.com/10.3758/s13428-016-0721-5>
- 7 25. Carpenter B, Gelman A, Hoffman MD, Lee D, Goodrich B, Betancourt M, et al. Stan :
8 A Probabilistic Programming Language. *J Stat Softw* [Internet]. 2017;76(1). Available
9 from: <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v76/i01/>
- 10 26. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, et al. Welcome
11 to the Tidyverse. *J Open Source Softw* [Internet]. 2019 Nov 21;4(43):1686. Available
12 from: <https://joss.theoj.org/papers/10.21105/joss.01686>
- 13 27. Bonafiglia JT, Rotundo MP, Whittall JP, Scribbans TD, Graham RB, Gurd BJ. Inter-
14 Individual Variability in the Adaptive Responses to Endurance and Sprint Interval
15 Training: A Randomized Crossover Study. Calbet JAL, editor. *PLoS One* [Internet].
16 2016 Dec 9;11(12):e0167790. Available from:
17 <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0167790>
- 18 28. Salthouse TA, Nesselroade JR, Berish DE. Short-Term Variability in Cognitive
19 Performance and the Calibration of Longitudinal Change. *Journals Gerontol Ser B*
20 *Psychol Sci Soc Sci* [Internet]. 2006 May 1;61(3):P144–51. Available from:
21 [https://academic.oup.com/psychsocgerontology/article-](https://academic.oup.com/psychsocgerontology/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/geronb/61.3.P144)
22 [lookup/doi/10.1093/geronb/61.3.P144](https://academic.oup.com/psychsocgerontology/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/geronb/61.3.P144)
- 23 29. Hultsch DF, MacDonald SWS, Hunter MA, Levy-Bencheton J, Strauss E.
24 Intraindividual variability in cognitive performance in older adults: Comparison of
25 adults with mild dementia, adults with arthritis, and healthy adults. *Neuropsychology*
26 [Internet]. 2000 Oct;14(4):588–98. Available from:
27 <http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/0894-4105.14.4.588>
- 28 30. Bangen KJ, Weigand AJ, Thomas KR, Delano-Wood L, Clark LR, Eppig J, et al.
29 Cognitive dispersion is a sensitive marker for early neurodegenerative changes and
30 functional decline in nondemented older adults. *Neuropsychology* [Internet]. 2019
31 Jul;33(5):599–608. Available from:
32 <http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/neu0000532>
- 33 31. Kievit RA, Brandmaier AM, Ziegler G, van Harmelen A-L, de Mooij SMM,
34 Moutoussis M, et al. Developmental cognitive neuroscience using latent change score
35 models: A tutorial and applications. *Dev Cogn Neurosci* [Internet]. 2018 Oct;33:99–
36 117. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S187892931730021X>
- 37 32. Stillman CM, Cohen J, Lehman ME, Erickson KI. Mediators of Physical Activity on
38 Neurocognitive Function: A Review at Multiple Levels of Analysis. *Front Hum*
39 *Neurosci* [Internet]. 2016 Dec 8;10. Available from:
40 <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnhum.2016.00626/full>
- 41 33. Erickson KI, Donofry SD, Sewell KR, Brown BM, Stillman CM. Cognitive Aging and
42 the Promise of Physical Activity. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol* [Internet]. 2022 May
43 9;18(1):417–42. Available from: [https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-](https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-072720-014213)
44 [clinpsy-072720-014213](https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-072720-014213)

- 1 34. Vivar C, Potter MC, van Praag H. All About Running: Synaptic Plasticity, Growth
2 Factors and Adult Hippocampal Neurogenesis. In 2013. p. 189–210. Available from:
3 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/7854_2012_220
- 4 35. de Sousa Fernandes MS, Ordônio TF, Santos GCJ, Santos LER, Calazans CT, Gomes
5 DA, et al. Effects of Physical Exercise on Neuroplasticity and Brain Function: A
6 Systematic Review in Human and Animal Studies. Hess G, editor. *Neural Plast*
7 [Internet]. 2020 Dec 14;2020:1–21. Available from:
8 <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/np/2020/8856621/>
- 9 36. Vaynman S, Ying Z, Gomez-Pinilla F. Hippocampal BDNF mediates the efficacy of
10 exercise on synaptic plasticity and cognition. *Eur J Neurosci* [Internet]. 2004
11 Nov;20(10):2580–90. Available from:
12 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2004.03720.x>
- 13 37. Maass A, Düzel S, Brigadski T, Goerke M, Becke A, Sobieray U, et al. Relationships
14 of peripheral IGF-1, VEGF and BDNF levels to exercise-related changes in memory,
15 hippocampal perfusion and volumes in older adults. *Neuroimage* [Internet]. 2016
16 May;131:142–54. Available from:
17 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1053811915010150>
- 18 38. Stillman CM, Esteban-Cornejo I, Brown B, Bender CM, Erickson KI. Effects of
19 Exercise on Brain and Cognition Across Age Groups and Health States. *Trends*
20 *Neurosci* [Internet]. 2020 Jul;43(7):533–43. Available from:
21 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0166223620301016>
- 22 39. Rieker JA, Reales JM, Muiños M, Ballesteros S. The Effects of Combined Cognitive-
23 Physical Interventions on Cognitive Functioning in Healthy Older Adults: A
24 Systematic Review and Multilevel Meta-Analysis. *Front Hum Neurosci* [Internet].
25 2022 Mar 24;16. Available from:
26 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2022.838968/full>
- 27 40. Gallardo-Gómez D, del Pozo-Cruz J, Noetel M, Álvarez-Barbosa F, Alfonso-Rosa RM,
28 del Pozo Cruz B. Optimal dose and type of exercise to improve cognitive function in
29 older adults: A systematic review and bayesian model-based network meta-analysis of
30 RCTs. *Ageing Res Rev* [Internet]. 2022 Apr;76:101591. Available from:
31 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1568163722000332>
- 32 41. Forstmeier S, Maercker A. Motivational processes in mild cognitive impairment and
33 Alzheimer’s disease: results from the Motivational Reserve in Alzheimer’s (MoReA)
34 study. *BMC Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2015 Dec 17;15(1):293. Available from:
35 <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-244X/15/293>
- 36 42. Kempermann G, Kuhn HG, Gage FH. More hippocampal neurons in adult mice living
37 in an enriched environment. *Nature* [Internet]. 1997 Apr;386(6624):493–5. Available
38 from: <http://www.nature.com/articles/386493a0>
- 39