

# Continuous-time mediation analysis for repeatedly measured mediators and outcomes

Le Bourdonnec Kateline<sup>1</sup>, Valeri Linda<sup>2,3</sup>, Proust-Lima Cécile<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Univ. Bordeaux, Inserm, BPH, U1219, F-33000 Bordeaux, France

<sup>2</sup>Department of Biostatistics, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health,  
722 W 168th St, New York, NY, USA

<sup>3</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health,  
677 Huntington Ave, Boston, MA, USA

March 19, 2024

## Abstract

Mediation analysis aims to decipher the underlying causal mechanisms between an exposure, an outcome, and intermediate variables called mediators. Initially developed for fixed-time mediator and outcome, it has been extended to the framework of longitudinal data by discretizing the assessment times of mediator and outcome. Yet, processes in play in longitudinal studies are usually defined in continuous time and measured at irregular and subject-specific visits. This is the case in dementia research when cerebral and cognitive changes measured at planned visits in cohorts are of interest. We thus propose a methodology to estimate the causal mechanisms between a time-fixed exposure ( $X$ ), a mediator process ( $\mathcal{M}_t$ ) and an outcome process ( $\mathcal{Y}_t$ ) both measured repeatedly over time in the presence of a time-dependent

confounding process ( $\mathcal{L}_t$ ). We consider three types of causal estimands, the natural effects, path-specific effects and randomized interventional analogues to natural effects, and provide identifiability assumptions. We employ a dynamic multivariate model based on differential equations for their estimation. The performance of the methods are explored in simulations, and we illustrate the method in two real-world examples motivated by the 3C cerebral aging study to assess: (1) the effect of educational level on functional dependency through depressive symptomatology and cognitive functioning, and (2) the effect of a genetic factor on cognitive functioning potentially mediated by vascular brain lesions and confounded by neurodegeneration.

# 1 Introduction

Mediation analysis is commonly used in public health to assess the causal effect of an exposure on a system of variables. Mediation analysis aims to decipher the underlying mechanism by which an independent variable ( $X$ ) affects a dependent variable ( $Y$ ) via one or more intermediate variables ( $M$ ), also called mediators. The total effect between  $X$  and  $Y$  is split into a direct effect and indirect effects through the intermediate variables  $M$ . Decomposing causal effects enhances our comprehension of the biological processes in play, and helps identify potential targets for therapeutic or prevention research.

The main framework for mediation analysis involves the definition of counterfactual or potential outcomes in a hypothetical world. Counterfactual outcomes are unobserved variables corresponding to the value the outcome  $Y$  would have taken if the exposure variable  $X$  had been modified in a certain way. Causal effects can then be defined as contrasts of counterfactual outcomes according to scenarios of intervention on  $X$ . Depending on the research question, different causal effects have been studied. For instance, the natural effects, introduced by [15], contrast counterfactual outcome values had an individual been exposed at two distinct levels of exposure (i.e. values are set at the individual level). In contrast, the stochastic effects, introduced by [3], contrast counterfactual outcome values had the distribution of the mediator been changed (i.e., intervention at the population level).

Concepts and methods for mediation analysis have been primarily developed for exposure, mediator and outcome measured at a single time point. With the inherent dynamic nature of health processes, extensions to longitudinal data have been recently proposed. For instance, [20] and [8] introduced methods for time-to-event outcomes with both the exposure variable and the mediator measured at a single time-point. Extensions to accommodate multiple mediators have followed ([9]; [6]). More recently, [23] proposed an alternative approach based on the natural effect proportional hazards model for a single-time exposure on a survival-type outcome with mediator and confounders both repeatedly measured over time. Within the stochastic intervention approach, [24] proposed a more flexible approach that handles

exposure repeatedly measured over time and [19] considered time-to-events for both the mediator and outcome.

In cerebral aging studies, the quantities of interest are usually dynamic processes such as cerebral volumes or cognitive functioning that are measured at planned visits. Considering such repeated data structure is crucial to obtain accurate results in mediation analyses but it remains a challenge. [21] defined randomized interventional analogues to natural effects (i.e., a stochastic intervention on the mediator) for a repeated exposure variable, a repeated mediator and a fixed-time outcome. [18] extended the approach to multiple longitudinal mediators. Mediation analysis techniques to repeated outcomes and mediator data are nevertheless still limited. Some authors extended the mediation methods assuming processes evolve in discrete time with regular measures ([10], [4]). Yet, processes in play lie in continuous time and may be observed only sparsely at very irregular timings across individuals. [2] considered a mediator and an outcome both defined in continuous time. They extended the identification assumptions of natural effects to continuous-time processes, and used a working model based on differential equations to estimate them. However, this was achieved under the strong assumption that only the current mediator level affects the outcome when the entire history of the mediator is likely involved. Moreover, the method did not consider time-varying confounders, and the estimation procedure was step-wise rather than simultaneous for all the variables ([16]).

Motivated by applications in cerebral aging to decipher causal mechanisms among the multidimensional spheres involved, we propose in this work a continuous-time mediation analysis framework to estimate causal effects of time-fixed exposure ( $X$ ) in a system of mediator ( $\mathcal{M}_t$ ), time-varying confounders ( $\mathcal{L}_t$ ) and outcome ( $\mathcal{Y}_t$ ), all defined in continuous-time and measured at irregular and sparse visits. We consider natural effects in the absence of time-varying confounders, and path-specific effects to accommodate the presence of time-varying confounding factors, and we define for each case the identifiability assumptions required for their estimation. Under weaker identifiability assumptions, randomized interventional ana-

logues to natural effects can also be estimated under the proposed strategy. Our approach relies on a recently proposed multivariate mixed model ([17]) that quantifies the influences between dynamic processes of a network to estimate the conditional distributions of the mediator, confounder, and outcome processes from which the mediation g-formulas can be applied and the causal contrasts estimated. Two applications in cerebral aging research are considered from the population-based 3C cohort ([1]). We first estimate the pathways through cognitive functioning and depressive symptomatology involved in the association between educational level and functional dependency among elders. We secondly assess the relationship between  $\epsilon_4$  allele of the apolipoprotein  $E$  (APOE4), the main genetic factor for dementia, and cognitive functioning exploring the pathways through vascular cerebral lesions and neuro-degeneration.

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 Notation

We consider the setting described in Figure 1 with a time-fixed exposure  $X$ , time-fixed confounders  $C$ , as well as a time-dependent mediator and a time-dependent outcome, eventually (right panel) in the presence of time-dependent confounders  $L$ . The time-dependent mediator, confounder and outcome are processes defined in continuous time with their values at any time  $t$  ( $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ) denoted  $M(t)$ ,  $Y(t)$ ,  $L(t)$ , and their history up to  $t$  denoted  $\mathcal{M}_t$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}_t$  and  $\mathcal{L}_t$ , respectively. In a cohort study, this setting translates into the collection for each subject  $i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) of the exposure  $X_i$  and the confounder  $C_i$  at baseline, and of prone-to-error measures of the mediator  $\tilde{M}_{ij}$ , the outcome  $\tilde{Y}_{ij}$  and the time-dependent confounders  $\tilde{L}_{ij}$  at discrete visits  $j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n_i$ ). These visits usually occur at subject-specific times  $t_{ij}$ , and eventually with different time schedules across the time-dependent variables.

To define causal effects, we introduce counterfactual variables. The counterfactual outcome  $Y_t(x, \mathcal{L}_t(x''), \mathcal{M}_t(x', l_t))$  is defined as the value of the outcome that would have been

observed if  $X$  were set to  $x$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_t$  were set to the value it would have taken if  $X$  were set to  $x''$ , and  $\mathcal{M}_t$  were set to the value it would have taken had  $X$  been set to  $x'$  and had  $\mathcal{L}_t$  been set to  $l_t$ .

## 2.2 Causal effects definition

Depending on the framework and the objective, different causal effects can be defined using potential outcomes. We primarily consider natural effects, both in the absence of time-varying confounders, and in the presence of time-varying confounders with path-specific effects.

### 2.2.1 Natural effect

The natural effect decomposes the total effect (TE) of the exposure  $X$  on the outcome at time  $t$ ,  $Y(t)$ , into a natural direct effect (NDE) defined as the effect of  $X$  on  $Y(t)$  only, and a natural indirect effect (NIE) defined as the effect of  $X$  on  $Y(t)$  passing through the mediator process up to  $t$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_t$ .

Contrasting two levels  $x$  and  $x'$ , these effects are expressed as follows:

$$TE = \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{M}_t(x))|C) - \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x', \mathcal{M}_t(x'))|C) \quad (1)$$

$$NIE = \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{M}_t(x))|C) - \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{M}_t(x'))|C) \quad (2)$$

$$NDE = \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{M}_t(x'))|C) - \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x', \mathcal{M}_t(x'))|C) \quad (3)$$

where  $TE$  is the difference in outcome had an individual been exposed at level  $x'$  instead of  $x$ ,  $NIE$  is the difference in outcome had an individual been exposed to level  $x$  while the mediator process changed from what observed under level  $x'$  compared to level  $x$ . The  $NDE$  is the difference in outcome had an individual been exposed two different levels  $x$  and  $x'$ , while keeping the mediator process fixed at what would be under exposure level  $x'$ .

Replacing  $\mathcal{M}_t$  with stochastic intervention  $G_{\mathcal{M}_t}$  in equations (1), (2), (3), randomized interventional analogues to natural effects can be identified under weaker assumptions de-

scribed in [21].

### 2.2.2 Path-specific effect

In the presence of time-dependent confounders, the path-specific effect approach decomposes the effect of the exposure  $X$  on the outcome at time  $t$ ,  $Y(t)$ , into the direct effect of  $X$  on  $Y(t)$  only (noted  $PSE_{XY}$ ), the effect passing only through the mediator process up to  $t$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_t$  (noted  $PSE_{XMY}$ ), and the effect passing first through the time-dependent confounder process up to  $t$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_t$  (noted  $PSE_{XL(M)Y}$ ).

Contrasting two levels  $x$  and  $x'$ , these effects are expressed as follows:

$$PSE_{XY} = \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{L}_t(x'), \mathcal{M}_t(x', \mathcal{L}_t(x')) | C) - \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x', \mathcal{L}_t(x'), \mathcal{M}_t(x', \mathcal{L}_t(x')) | C) \quad (4)$$

$$PSE_{XMY} = \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{L}_t(x'), \mathcal{M}_t(x, \mathcal{L}_t(x')) | C) - \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{L}_t(x'), \mathcal{M}_t(x', \mathcal{L}_t(x')) | C) \quad (5)$$

$$PSE_{XL(M)Y} = \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{L}_t(x), \mathcal{M}_t(x, \mathcal{L}_t(x)) | C) - \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{L}_t(x'), \mathcal{M}_t(x, \mathcal{L}_t(x')) | C) \quad (6)$$

For example,  $PSE_{XMY}$  (equation (5)) is the expected difference in outcome had the mediator process only changed due to an exposure change from  $x'$  to  $x$ , while keeping fixed the exposure and the time-dependent confounders.

## 2.3 Assumptions

The causal contrasts and expectations defined above rely on potential outcomes that are not observable. To identify these effects from the observations, it is mandatory to comply to four sets of fundamental assumptions: **consistency**, **positivity**, **sequential ignorability** and **cross-world independence**. These assumptions vary depending on the presence or absence of time-varying confounders. In the following, we make the distinction between the two cases with  $\overline{TVC}$  and  $TVC$  specifying the absence and the presence of time-varying confounding factors, respectively.

- (i) **consistency**: The consistency assumption establishes the connection between coun-

terfactual variables and observed variables ([12]). The value of the observed outcome  $Y(t)$  is equal to the value of the corresponding counterfactual outcome, i.e. for  $\overline{TVC}$ :  $Y(t)=Y_t(x, m_t)$  if  $X=x, \mathcal{M}_t = m_t$ ; and for TVC:  $Y(t) = Y_t(x, m_t, l_t)$  if  $X=x, \mathcal{M}_t = m_t$  and  $\mathcal{L}_t = l_t$ .

(ii) **positivity** : The positivity assumption stipulates that each individual, given their values of  $C$ , has a positive probability of receiving any exposure value, and a positive probability to have any mediator and time-varying confounder history ([12]). It means that for  $\overline{TVC}$ :  $P(X = x|C) > 0$  and  $P(\mathcal{M}_t(x) = m_t|X = x, C) > 0$ , and for TVC:  $P(X = x|C) > 0$ ,  $P(\mathcal{L}_t(x) = l_t|X = x, C) > 0$  and  $P(\mathcal{M}_t(x, l_t) = m_t|X = x, C, \mathcal{L}_t = l_t) > 0$ .

(iii) **sequential ignorability**: this assumption defines the absence of unobserved confounding in the system through 3 to 5 sub-assumptions:

(a) There is no unobserved confounding of the effect of  $X$  on  $Y_t$  given other variables, i.e.:  $Y_t(x, m_t) \perp\!\!\!\perp X|C$ , for  $\overline{TVC}$ , and  $Y_t(x, l_t, m_t) \perp\!\!\!\perp X|C$  for TVC.

(b) There is no unobserved confounding of the effect of intermediate processes on  $Y_t$  given  $C$  and  $X$ , i.e.,  $Y_t(x, m_t) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{M}_t|C, X$  for  $\overline{TVC}$ , and  $Y_t(x, l_t, m_t) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{L}_t, \mathcal{M}_t|C, X$  for TVC.

(c) There is no unobserved confounding of the effect of  $X$  on intermediate processes given  $C$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{M}_t(x) \perp\!\!\!\perp X|C$  for  $\overline{TVC}$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_t, \mathcal{M}_t(x) \perp\!\!\!\perp X|C$  for TVC.

(d) For TVC only, there is no unobserved confounding between the mediator process  $\mathcal{M}_t$  and  $(X, \mathcal{L}_t)$  given  $C$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{M}_t(x, l_t) \perp\!\!\!\perp X, \mathcal{L}_t|C$ .

(e) For TVC only, there is no unobserved confounding between the counfounder process  $\mathcal{L}_t$  and the mediator process  $\mathcal{M}_t$  affected by  $X$  given  $C$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{M}_t(x, l_t) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{L}_t(x')|X, C$ .

(iv) **Cross-world independence assumption**: this assumption stipulates the absence of



unobserved confounding in the counterfactual world:

- (a) There is no unobserved confounding between the potential outcome and intermediates variables, i.e.,  $Y_t(x, m_t) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{M}_t(x') | X, C$  for  $\overline{TVC}$ , and  $Y_t(x, l_t, m_t) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{L}_t(x'), \mathcal{M}_t(x') | X, C$  for TVC.
- (b) For TVC only, there is no unobserved confounding between the potential outcome and different potential intermediate processes, i.e.,  $Y_t(x, l_t, m_t) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{L}_t(x'), \mathcal{M}_t(x, l_t) | X, C$ .

## 2.4 Identification

### 2.4.1 Natural Effects

The natural effects are systematically defined as a comparison of two expectations  $v = \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{M}_t(x')) | C)$  where  $x$  and  $x'$  can take various values depending on the effect (NE, NIE, NDE). Using the assumptions ((i), (ii), (iii.a), (iii.b), (iii.c), (iv.a)), this expectation can be written as a function of the observations, and thus becomes identifiable. First, the estimand can be developed according to the mediator history  $\mathcal{M}_t$  :

$$v = \int_{m_t} \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, m_t) | C = c, \mathcal{M}_t(x') = m_t) \times f_{\mathcal{M}_t(x') | C=c}(m_t) d_{\mathcal{M}_t(m_t)}$$

Second, thanks to assumption (iv.a), we can remove the conditioning  $\mathcal{M}_t(x') = m_t$ .

$$v = \int_{m_t} \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, m_t) | C = c) \times f_{\mathcal{M}_t(x') | C=c}(m_t) d_{\mathcal{M}_t(m_t)}$$

Third, in order to use the consistency assumption, we add the conditioning on  $X = x$  in the expectation of  $Y_t$  and  $X = x'$  in the density of  $\mathcal{M}_t$  thanks to assumptions (i) and (iii.c):

$$v = \int_{m_t} \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, m_t) | C = c, X = x) \times f_{\mathcal{M}_t(x') | C=c, X=x'}(m_t) d_{\mathcal{M}_t(m_t)}$$

We also add the conditioning on  $\mathcal{M}_t = m_t$  in the expectation of  $Y_t$  thanks to assumption

(iii.b):

$$v = \int_{m_t} \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, m_t)|C = c, X = x, \mathcal{M}_t = m_t) \times f_{\mathcal{M}_t|C=c, X=x'}(m_t) d_{\mathcal{M}_t(m_t)}$$

Finally, the consistency assumption *i* can be applied to obtain an expression that only involves the observations so that:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{M}_t(x'))|C) = \int_{m_t} \mathbb{E}(Y_t|C = c, X = x, \mathcal{M}_t = m_t) \times f_{\mathcal{M}_t|C=c, X=x'}(m_t) d_{\mathcal{M}_t(m_t)} \quad (7)$$

### 2.4.2 Path-specific effect

In the presence of time-varying confounders  $\mathcal{L}_t$ , assumption *iii.c* is violated and the third step of the identification of the natural effect cannot be applied anymore. Alternatively, path-specific effects are considered. They are systematically defined as a comparison of two expectations  $\xi = \mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{L}_t(x), \mathcal{M}_t(x', l_t))|C)$ , where  $x$  and  $x'$  can take various values.

Using similar developments as for the natural effects (see Web Supplementary Material, section 1 for details), we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{L}_t(x), \mathcal{M}_t(x', l_t))|C) = \int_{l_t} \int_{m_t} \mathbb{E}(Y_t|C = c, X = x, \mathcal{L}_t = l_t, \mathcal{M}_t = m_t) \times f_{\mathcal{L}_t|C=c, X=x'}(l_t), f_{\mathcal{M}_t|(C=c, X=x, \mathcal{L}_t=l_t)}(m_t) d_{m_t} d_{l_t} \quad (8)$$

where a different set of assumptions is used depending on the path: assumptions (*i*)-(iii.c) and (*iv.a*) for the  $PSE_{XY}$  (direct path), assumptions (*i*)-(iii.c), (iii.e), (*iv.b*) for the  $PSE_{XMY}$  (path through  $\mathcal{M}_t$  only), and assumptions (*i*)-(iii.a), (iii.c), (*iv.a*)-(iv.b) for the  $PSE_{X(L)MY}$  (indirect paths through  $\mathcal{L}_t$ ).

## 2.5 Estimation

### 2.5.1 Monte Carlo approximation

The causal contrasts are differences of expectation expressions developed in Equations 7 and 8 for the natural effects and for the path-specific effects, respectively. These expectations are general expressions to be estimated from the data. In some specific modeling cases, an analytical solution can be computed. Otherwise, the integrals can be approximated by the Monte Carlo approach ([5]), with  $B$  indicating the number of Mont-Carlo replicates. For the path-specific effects, this gives:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_t(x, \mathcal{L}_t(x'), \mathcal{M}_t(x', \mathcal{L}_t(x')))) \approx \sum_{k=1}^B \mathbb{E}(Y_t | X = x, \mathcal{L}_t = l_t^{(k)}, \mathcal{M}_t = m_t^{(k)})$$

with random draws from conditional distributions:  $f_{\mathcal{L}_t | X=x', C=c}$  and  $m_t^{(k)} \sim f_{\mathcal{M}_t | C=c, X=x', \mathcal{L}_t=l_{tj}}$ . The same approximation is obtained for the natural effects by removing mention to the time-varying confounder.

The Monte-Carlo approximation highlights that the causal estimands calculation requires:

- the conditional expectation of  $Y_t$  given the intermediate processes and time-fixed factors;
- the conditional distribution of  $\mathcal{M}_t$  given the exposure, and eventually the time-varying confounders;
- in the presence of time-varying confounders  $\mathcal{L}_t$ , their distribution conditional on the exposure and the time-fixed confounders.

These quantities can be obtained from a statistical model, called working model, using the posterior distributions of the different processes in play.

## 2.5.2 Example of working model

Any statistical model can be used to estimate these causal effects as long as (i) the processes are jointly modelled taking into account the interrelations between processes and the effect of the time-fixed exposure, and (ii) the posterior conditional distributions of the processes can be derived. In this work, we opted for a multivariate mixed model based on differential equations ([17]). This model was developed to quantify the temporal influences between a system of latent processes measured by repeated marker data. In our case, the processes are  $\mathcal{L}_t$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_t$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_t$  with values  $L_i(t)$ ,  $M_i(t)$  and  $Y_i(t)$  at time  $t$  for subject  $i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ). Their trajectories are defined by the initial level at time 0 and the instantaneous change over time, both modelled in the mixed modeling framework using random effects ([7]). The temporal dependencies between the processes are modelled by the effect of the current level of one process on the instantaneous change of another. The model can be written as follows:

$$\text{For process } \mathcal{L}_t : \begin{cases} L_i(0) = \mathbf{X}_i^{L(0)} \boldsymbol{\beta}^L + u_i^L \\ \frac{\partial L_i(t)}{\partial t} = \mathbf{X}_i^L(t) \boldsymbol{\gamma}^L + \mathbf{Z}_i^L(t) \mathbf{v}_i^L \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

$$\text{For process } \mathcal{M}_t : \begin{cases} M_i(0) = \mathbf{X}_i^{M(0)} \boldsymbol{\beta}^M + u_i^M \\ \frac{\partial M_i(t)}{\partial t} = \mathbf{X}_i^M(t) \boldsymbol{\gamma}^M + \mathbf{Z}_i^M(t) \mathbf{v}_i^M + \alpha_i^{ML} L_i(t) \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

$$\text{For process } \mathcal{Y}_t : \begin{cases} Y_i(0) = \mathbf{X}_i^{Y(0)} \boldsymbol{\beta}^Y + u_i^Y \\ \frac{\partial Y_i(t)}{\partial t} = \mathbf{X}_i^Y(t) \boldsymbol{\gamma}^Y + \mathbf{Z}_i^Y(t) \mathbf{v}_i^Y + \alpha_i^{YL} L_i(t) + \alpha_i^{YM} M_i(t) \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

$$(12)$$

where  $\mathbf{X}_i^{L(0)}$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_i^{M(0)}$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_i^{Y(0)}$  are the vectors of covariates associated with the initial levels of the three processes through parameters  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^L$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^M$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^Y$ . These vectors include the intercept, the time-fixed exposure  $X$  and confounders  $\mathbf{C}$ . Vectors of covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i^L(t)$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_i^M(t)$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_i^Y(t)$  are associated with the change over time of the processes through parameters  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^L$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^M$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^Y$ . They include the intercept, time functions (allowing for nonlinear change over time), the exposure and confounders as well as their eventual interactions with the time functions.

The vectors  $\mathbf{Z}_i^L(t)$ ,  $\mathbf{Z}_i^M(t)$ ,  $\mathbf{Z}_i^Y(t)$  include the intercept and, eventually time functions, to be associated with the changes over time through the individual random effects  $\mathbf{v}_i^L$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_i^M$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_i^Y$ . The random intercepts on the initial levels  $u_i^L$ ,  $u_i^M$ ,  $u_i^Y$ , and the random effects on the changes over time  $\mathbf{v}_i^L$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_i^M$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_i^Y$  account for the intra-individual correlation and follow a zero-mean multivariate normal distribution with variance-covariance  $G$ . The influences between processes are captured by the  $\alpha_i^{aa'}$  that quantify the effect of process  $a'$  on the instantaneous change over time of process  $a$ . The influences  $\alpha_i^{aa'}$  can be modelled as a linear combination of covariates to account for instance for exposure interaction with intermediate processes:  $\alpha_i^{aa'} = \alpha_0^{aa'} + \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1^{aa'}$  with  $\mathbf{X}_i$  a vector of covariates.

The structural models at the process level are linked to the error-prone observations in equations of observations, assuming in this work additive errors:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{L}_{ij} = L_i(t_{ij}) + \epsilon_{ij}^L & \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n_i^L \\ \tilde{M}_{ij} = M_i(t_{ij}) + \epsilon_{ij}^M & \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n_i^M \\ \tilde{Y}_{ij} = Y_i(t_{ij}) + \epsilon_{ij}^Y & \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n_i^Y \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

with  $\epsilon_{ij}^L$ ,  $\epsilon_{ij}^M$ , and  $\epsilon_{ij}^Y$  independent zero-mean Gaussian variables with variances  $\sigma_L^2$ ,  $\sigma_M^2$ , and  $\sigma_Y^2$ , respectively.

The model is estimated in the maximum likelihood framework in the R package CInLPN (<https://github.com/bachirtadde/CInLPN>) using the iterative Marquardt-Levenberg algorithm of R package marqLevAlg ([13]). To achieve an analytical likelihood calculation, the program approximates the differential equations by difference equations with a fine time grid defined by a step  $\delta$  to be specified by the user.

Since this model is Gaussian and linear, analytical solutions can be found for the expectations  $\nu$  and  $\xi$  without requiring a Monte Carlo approximation.

### 2.5.3 Confidence intervals

Since the model is parametric, the confidence intervals of the causal effects can be computed by a parametric bootstrap procedure.  $R$  random vectors of parameters  $\theta^r$  (for  $r = 1, \dots, R$ ) are repeatedly drawn from the asymptotic distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\widehat{\theta}, \widehat{V}(\widehat{\theta}))$  where  $\widehat{\theta}$  and  $\widehat{V}(\widehat{\theta})$  are the maximum likelihood estimates of the model and their Hessian-based variance estimate, respectively. The causal effects are computed for each draw  $r$  and the 95% confidence interval of the causal effect is given by the 2.5% and 97.5% percentiles of the causal effects over the  $R$  replicates.

## 3 Numerical evaluation by simulations

We conducted a simulation study to assess the properties and behavior of our methodology without and with time-varying confounders, under two potential timescales: time in study (Scenarios 1), and age (Scenarios 2).

### 3.1 Data generating mechanism

For each individual  $i$  in a sample of size  $N$ , we generated an exposure variable  $X_i$  according to a Bernoulli distribution (with probability 0.5). Depending on the presence or absence of a time-varying confounder  $\mathcal{L}_t$ , we generated a system of two or three Gaussian processes using the working model defined in section 2.5.2. We assumed a constant rate of change for all the processes with random intercepts and simple effects of the covariate on both the initial level and instantaneous change of each process. We also assumed, as in Figure 1B, that only process  $\mathcal{L}_t$  impacted the change in  $\mathcal{M}_t$ , and that processes  $\mathcal{L}_t$  and  $\mathcal{M}_t$  impacted the change in  $\mathcal{Y}_t$ . Dropout was generated according to a uniform distribution in the range of measures of each scenario (see below). Data generation process including parameters values considered are fully summarized in Web Supplementary Material Section 2. For all the scenarios, we generated 250 samples.

### 3.1.1 Simulation design

**Scenario 1 - Main simulation design** We assumed the repeated data were collected annually over a period of 5 years and used time in the study as the timescale. In scenario 1A, we considered samples of 500 subjects, a 10% dropout and a discretization step in the model of 0.1 year. In scenarios 1B-1D, we sequentially changed the discretization step, the size of the sample and the dropout rate (see web supplementary Table 2). The generating model parameters (see Web Supplementary Section 2) were randomly chosen.

**Scenario 2 - Secondary simulation design** We mimicked one of the application setting by considering the subjects entered the cohort at different ages (simulated according to Normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(72, 4)$ ), using age at the time-scale, and having some systematic missing values in markers by design. Specifically, following the 3C design, the outcome was collected at 0, 2, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 15 years after entry while mediator and confounder were collected only at 0, 4, and 10 years after entry. The sample included 500 subjects, with a discretization interval of 1 year and a fixed dropout rate of 10%. The generating model parameters, reported in Supplementary Table 4 were chosen to mimic the application.

## 3.2 Estimands

Our estimands were the direct effect of the exposure on the outcome not via the mediator nor via the time-varying confounder eventually ( $NDE$  and  $PSE_{XY}$  in equations (3) and (4)), the indirect effect of the exposure on the outcome via the mediator only ( $NIE$  and  $PSE_{XMY}$  in equations (2), and (5)) and, in presence of time-varying confounder, the indirect effect of the exposure on the outcome via all paths through the time-varying confounder ( $PSE_{XL(M)Y}$  in equation (6)).

### 3.3 True generated contrast values

The true effect values were directly computed from equations (2) and (3), or equations (4), (5) and (6) under different exposure levels. In a general context, this is achieved by averaging the outcome over a large population under each scenario. However, given the linear structure of the specific working model we used, this was not necessary; the calculations were done on a single generated individual under different scenarios:

- Natural effect: value of  $Y(t)$  when  $X = x$  and  $\mathcal{M}_t = \mathcal{M}_t(X = x')$  with  $x$  and  $x' \in \{0, 1\}$
- Path-specific effect: value of  $Y(t)$  when  $X = x$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_t = \mathcal{L}_t(X = x')$ , and  $\mathcal{M}_t = \mathcal{M}_t(X = x'', \mathcal{L}_t)$ , with  $x$ ,  $x'$  and  $x'' \in \{0, 1\}$

### 3.4 Working model

In all the scenarios, the working model was the multivariate mixed model based on differential equations detailed in Section 2.5.2.

### 3.5 Performance measures

We computed the causal effects at 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 years for Scenarios 1A-1D and at age 65,70,75,80,85 years for Scenario 2. The estimation quality of each effect was assessed by the distribution of the relative bias (i.e., the bias standardized by the true value, expressed in percentage) reported in violin plots, and the coverage rate of the 95% confidence interval is given in Web Supplementary Table 3.

### 3.6 Simulation results

The effects depicted in Figures 2 and 3 illustrate the correct estimation of the effects at all times under scenario 1A. With a sample size of 500 individuals, a discretization step of 0.1 year, and a censoring rate of 10%, the estimates show minimal bias and coverage rates close to



the 95% nominal value in the absence and in the presence of a time-dependent confounder. The results are the same when changing the simulation characteristics in scenario 1B-1D (Web supplementary Figures 1,2,3).

When considering scenario 2 in which the mediator and the confounder were measured only two to three times while the outcome was measured at six time points, the favorable results achieved previously were not replicated (Figure 4). Interestingly, this bias seemed to be driven by biased estimates in the working model.

## 4 Application to cerebral aging

We applied the methodology to investigate the underlying mechanisms of cognitive aging through two examples:

**Study 1:** We assessed the impact of the educational level on functional dependency investigating the pathways through verbal fluency and depressive symptomatology.

**Study 2:** We investigated the influence of cerebral vascular lesions in the relationship between the main genetic factor of dementia, Apolipoprotein E4 gene (ApoE4), and cognitive functioning, accounting for the potential confounding due to neurodegeneration.

### 4.1 The Three-City study sample

#### 4.1.1 The cohort

We leveraged the data from the Three-City (3C) study, a prospective population-based cohort designed to investigate the association between vascular diseases and dementia in the elderly. Individuals aged 65 years and older were randomly enrolled in 1999 from the electoral lists of three French cities (Bordeaux, Dijon and Montpellier). A total of 9294 participants underwent a comprehensive health examination and risk factor assessment at baseline, and

at follow-up visits every 2-3 years for a duration of up to 17 years. A Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) assessment was also performed on a subsample at baseline, 4 years and only for Bordeaux center at 10 years of follow-up.

The analytical sample comprised the 2,213 participants from Bordeaux and Dijon who were genotyped using genome-wide genotyping arrays, underwent at least one MRI scan, had at least one measure for each marker considered in both studies, no missing covariate for exposures or potential confounders and were free of dementia at baseline. This sample had on average a follow-up of 9.5 years.

#### 4.1.2 Variables of interest

In Study 1 (Figure 5, top panel), the exposure was the binary educational level (high school and higher *versus* lower in reference). The final outcome was the functional dependency measured by the sum-score (range 0-5) of impairment at 5 Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL) (Using the phone, transportation, medication management, finances management and shopping)(the higher, the more dependent). The mediator was the verbal fluency measured by the Isaacs Set Test (IST). The IST score equals the count of words provided across four semantic categories within a 15-second interval each. The potential confounder was the depressive symptomatology measured by the score at the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CESD). The three processes were evaluated at each follow-up evaluation, although some missing data arised.

In Study 2 (Figure 5, bottom panel), the exposure was the carriership of the ApoE4 and the final outcome was the verbal fluency measured by the IST score. The mediator under investigation was the vascular cerebral lesions measured by the global volume of White Matter Hyperintensities (WMH), and the potential confounder was the global neurodegeneration as measured by the total volume of grey matter (GM). WMH and GM were only collected twice (at 1 and 4 years) in Dijon center, and three times (at 1, 4 and 10 years) in Bordeaux Center.

In both studies, potential confounding factors at baseline were sex, age at baseline and

the center (Bordeaux/Dijon).

### 4.1.3 Description of the analytical sample

Among the 2,213 participants of the analytical sample, 1375 (63.6%) were women, 886 (40.1%) had an educational level higher than secondary school and 417 (20.9%) were APOE4 carriers (Table 1). Participants were 72.3 years old at baseline on average, and they were followed up for 9.5 years on average with a mean of 1.7 (sd=0.7) repeated measures of WMH and GM, a mean of 6 (sd=2.2) repeated measures of IST, and a mean of 5 (sd=1.6) repeated measures of CESD and IADL.

## 4.2 Path-specific effects

### 4.2.1 Working model specification and estimands

Path-specific contrasts were estimated using the working model defined in Equations (12) and (13). In both studies, the timescale was the age and the discretization step was of 1 year. The working model systematically assumed a constant change over age. For each component, both the initial level and the change over time were adjusted for ApoE4, educational level, age at entry in the cohort, sex and center, and included an individual random-effect. In study 2, the Grey matter volume model was further adjusted for the total intra-cranial volume. In both studies, the effect of  $\mathcal{L}$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ , and the effect of  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$  were in interaction with the exposure variable. The specifications of the two working models are detailed in Web Supplementary section 3.

To satisfy the model’s assumptions, WMH volume was log transformed, and CESD and IADL scores were normalized in a preliminary step using integrated splines. In the following, IADL normalized score measuring functional dependency is expressed in Standard Deviation of the population at 65 years old.

The estimates of the working models for the two studies are reported in Web Supplementary Tables 5 and 6.

### 4.2.2 Identifiability assumptions

The path-specific effects can be identified under the assumptions listed in Subsection 2.3. In particular, we assume that there is no remaining confounding between the exposure and the outcome variables, between the intermediate variables and the outcomes, and between the exposure and the intermediate variables after adjustment for considered confounders.

### 4.2.3 Study 1

The path-specific effects of educational level on functional dependency are plotted in Figure 6. Overall, a higher educational level induced a lower functional level at all ages, with a difference increasing with age. This effect was largely mediated by the path through cognitive functioning. It was also slightly due to the path through depressive symptomatology, both in the direction of higher educational level implying lower functional level. The natural direct effect of educational level on functional level was in the opposite direction but not significant.

### 4.2.4 Study 2

The path-specific effects relating the presence of allele  $\epsilon 4$  of the Apolipoprotein  $E$  to cognitive functioning are displayed in Figure 6 (bottom panel). In this example, the total effect of ApoE4 on cognitive functioning was driven by its direct effect and was more pronounced as age increased. The two path-specific effects through the vascular lesions as measured by the White Matter Hyper-intensities, and through the neuro-degeneration confounding factor as measured by the total volume of Grey Matter were negligible. However these results should be interpreted with caution as they are very likely biased. As shown in the simulation scenario 2, in such a context with only a few measures for the intermediate variables (average of 1.6 (sd=0.7) measures per subject), the path-specific effects cannot be correctly retrieved.

## 5 Discussion

In this paper, we have expanded the methodology of mediation analysis by proposing an approach for mediator, confounder and outcome that are processes defined in continuous time and measured at sparse and possibly irregular visits in prospective studies. In addition to the natural indirect and direct effects that only hold in the absence of time-dependent confounders, we developed the path-specific effects to address mediation analyses in the presence of time-dependent confounders. A simulation study underlined that the causal contrasts, derived from a single multivariate longitudinal working model, were correctly estimated provided the repeated information collected on the processes in play was rich enough. This prevented for instance the application of mediation analysis to assess the mediating effect of a genetic factor on cognition through MRI-derived features that were measured only two or three times in a population-based cohort.

We primarily focused in this work on natural effects, defining the estimands and the hypotheses to make these quantities identifiable. However, it is important to note that the same methodology also applies to other types of effects. By replacing the process  $\mathcal{M}_t$  in the contrasts definitions with a stochastic intervention  $G_{\mathcal{M}_t}$ , also called randomized intervention, the methodology also extends the stochastic intervention approach to mediator, confounder and outcomes defined in continuous time. In contrast with natural effects, stochastic effects don't require the cross-world independence assumption, and thus apply more broadly notably in the presence of an exposure-induced confounder ([22]). Their interpretation also differs from natural effects as in general they measure the impact of interventions at the population level, rather than mediating mechanisms. ([11]).

Causal contrasts estimation requires the use of a working model from which conditional distributions of mediator and outcome can be derived. We used in this study a multivariate mixed-effects model based on differential equations ([17]) to estimate the joint distribution of all the processes in play while taking into account the effect of the history of the mediator and confounder processes on the outcome. However any other working model adapted to mul-

tivariate interrelated processes could be considered instead to estimate the causal contrasts we proposed.

In a first application, we observed a mediating effect of cognition on the relationship between education level and functional dependency in the elderly. Although we found a non-significant trend associating higher education levels with increased functional dependency, the overall effect suggests that education may promote greater autonomy. This effect, primarily influenced by the mediation through cognition and to a lesser extent through depression, underscores the importance of considering these factors in understanding the dynamics of functional aging.

The second application exploring the impact of the main genetic factor of Alzheimer’s disease ([14]), ApoE4, on cognitive level in the elderly suggested that the total effect of ApoE4 on cognitive functioning was not mediated by its effect through vascular lesions or overall grey matter atrophy. However, these results should not be interpreted further. We chose to report them in order to emphasize the limits of mediation analyses on longitudinal data. Indeed, the simulation study showed that causal contrasts could not be retrieved correctly when the repeated information was poor as in this case with a couple of repeated measures for the intermediate processes.

Mediation analysis had already been extended to longitudinal data. However, methods were mainly restricted to discrete time when processes in play usually lie in continuous time and are measured in prospective studies at irregular timings across individuals, and possibly across variables. By defining the causal contrasts at the process level and using a working model adapted to irregular longitudinal data, our methodology goes one step further to address mediation questions related to time-fixed exposures in prospective cohorts. We leave to future work extensions to time-dependent exposure variables.

## 5.1 Funding

This work was funded by the French government in the framework of the PIA3 (“Investment for the future”) (project reference 17-EURE-0019). It was also carried out in the framework of the University of Bordeaux’s France 2030 program / RRI PHDS, and of the DyMES project funded by the French National Research Agency (ANR-18-CE36-0004). This work was also supported by an EHESP Doctoral Network Fellowship.

## References


- [1] 3C Study Group (2003). Vascular factors and risk of dementia: design of the Three-City Study and baseline characteristics of the study population. Neuroepidemiology **22**, 316–325.
- [2] Albert, J. M., Li, Y., Sun, J., Woyczynski, W. A., and Nelson, S. (2019). Continuous-time causal mediation analysis. Statistics in Medicine **38**, 4334–4347.
- [3] Avin, C., Shpitser, I., and Pearl, J. (2005). Identifiability of Path-Specific Effects.
- [4] Bind, M.-A. C., Vanderweele, T. J., Coull, B. A., and Schwartz, J. D. (2016). Causal mediation analysis for longitudinal data with exogenous exposure. Biostatistics **17**, 122–134.
- [5] Booth, J. G. and Sarkar, S. (1998). Monte Carlo Approximation of Bootstrap Variances. The American Statistician **52**, 354–357.
- [6] Huang, Y.-T. and Yang, H.-I. (2017). Causal mediation analysis of survival outcome with multiple mediators. Epidemiology **28**, 370–378.
- [7] Laird, N. M. and Ware, J. H. (1982). Random-effects models for longitudinal data. Biometrics **38**, 963–974.
- [8] Lange, T. and Hansen, J. V. (2011). Direct and Indirect Effects in a Survival Context. Epidemiology **22**, 575–581.
- [9] Lange, T., Rasmussen, M., and Thygesen, L. C. (2014). Assessing natural direct and indirect effects through multiple pathways. Am J Epidemiol **179**, 513–518.
- [10] Mittinty, M. N. and Vansteelandt, S. (2020). Longitudinal Mediation Analysis Using Natural Effect Models. Am J Epidemiol **189**, 1427–1435.



- [11] Moreno-Betancur, M. and Carlin, J. B. (2018). Understanding Interventional Effects: A More Natural Approach to Mediation Analysis? Epidemiology **29**, 614.
- [12] Nguyen, T. Q., Schmid, I., Ogburn, E. L., and Stuart, E. A. (2022). Clarifying causal mediation analysis: Effect identification via three assumptions and five potential outcomes. Journal of Causal Inference **10**, 246–279.
- [13] Philipps, V., Hejblum, P., B., Prague, M., Commenges, D., and Proust-Lima, C. (2021). Robust and Efficient Optimization Using a Marquardt-Levenberg Algorithm with R Package `marqLevAlg`. The R Journal **13**, 273.
- [14] Reitz, C., Brayne, C., and Mayeux, R. (2011). Epidemiology of Alzheimer disease. Nat Rev Neurol **7**, 137–152.
- [15] Robins, J. M. and Greenland, S. (1992). Identifiability and Exchangeability for Direct and Indirect Effects. Epidemiology **3**, 143–155.
- [16] Saunders, C. T. and Blume, J. D. (2018). A classical regression framework for mediation analysis: fitting one model to estimate mediation effects. Biostatistics **19**, 514–528.
- [17] Taddé, B. O., Jacqmin-Gadda, H., Dartigues, J.-F., Commenges, D., and Proust-Lima, C. (2020). Dynamic modeling of multivariate dimensions and their temporal relationships using latent processes: Application to Alzheimer’s disease. Biometrics **76**, 886–899.
- [18] Tai, A.-S., Lin, S.-H., Chu, Y.-C., Yu, T., Puhan, M. A., and VanderWeele, T. (2023). Causal Mediation Analysis with Multiple Time-varying Mediators. Epidemiology **34**, 8.
- [19] Valeri, L., Proust-Lima, C., Fan, W., Chen, J. T., and Jacqmin-Gadda, H. (2023). A multistate approach for the study of interventions on an intermediate time-to-event in health disparities research. Stat Methods Med Res **32**, 1445–1460.
- [20] VanderWeele, T. J. (2011). Causal mediation analysis with survival data. Epidemiology **22**, 582–585.

- [21] VanderWeele, T. J. and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J. (2017). Mediation analysis with time varying exposures and mediators. J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol **79**, 917–938.
- [22] Vanderweele, T. J., Vansteelandt, S., and Robins, J. M. (2014). Effect decomposition in the presence of an exposure-induced mediator-outcome confounder. Epidemiology **25**, 300–306.
- [23] Vo, T.-T., Superchi, C., Boutron, I., and Vansteelandt, S. (2020). The conduct and reporting of mediation analysis in recently published randomized controlled trials: results from a methodological systematic review. J Clin Epidemiol **117**, 78–88.
- [24] Zheng, W. and Laan, M. J. (2012). Causal Mediation in a Survival Setting with Time-Dependent Mediators.

(A) Without time-varying confounders



(B) With time-varying confounders





Figure 1: Causal Mediation Path Diagram: Exploring the mechanism between a time-fixed exposure  $X$  and an outcome process  $\mathcal{Y}_t$  through: (A) mediator process  $\mathcal{M}_t$  (B) mediator  $\mathcal{M}_t$  and time-varying confounders  $\mathcal{L}_t$  processes, given baseline confounders  $C$

(A) Natural Direct Effect



(B) Natural Indirect Effect






Figure 2: Violin plot across 250 Replicates of the relative bias for Scenario 1A without time-varying confounders for (A) the natural direct effect and (B) the natural indirect effect.

(A) Direct Effect



(B) Indirect Effect through  $\mathcal{M}$



(C) Natural Indirect Effect through  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$






Figure 3: Violin plot across 250 Replicates of the relative bias for Scenario 1A with time-varying confounders: (A) the direct effect, (B) indirect effect through  $\mathcal{M}$ , and (C) indirect effect through  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$

(A) Direct Effect



(B) Indirect Effect through  $\mathcal{M}$



(C) Indirect Effect through  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$





Figure 4: Violin plot across 250 Replicates of the relative bias for Scenario 2 with time-varying confounders: (A) the direct effect, (B) indirect effect through  $\mathcal{M}$ , and (C) indirect effect through  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$

A. Effect of education level on dependency, mediated by cognition and depression



B. Effect of ApoE4 on cognition, mediated by vascular lesion and neurodegeneration




Figure 5: Directed Acyclic Graph of Studies 1 and 2; (A) effect of education level on dependency, mediated by cognition and depression (B) effect of ApoE4 on cognition, mediated by vascular lesion and global neurodegeneration

Table 1: Characteristics of the 2,213 participants of 3C sample according to their APOE4 status, educational level and overall at baseline

Characteristics	APOE4 (N=417)	No APOE4 (N=1583)	High education (N=886)	Low education (N=1327)	Overall (N = 2213)	
	N (%)	Mean (SD)	N (%)	Mean (SD)	N (%)	Mean (SD)
Sex						
<i>female</i>	60.1		54.3		62.1	
<i>male</i>	39.9		45.7		36.4	
Age at entry	71.9 (3.8)	72.1 (4.0)	72.3 (4.0)	72.0 (4.0)	72.0 (4.0)	
WMH ( $cm^3$ )	2.1 (1.6)	2.3 (2.2)	2.3 (2.2)	2.3 (2.0)	2.3 (2.1)	
Number of WMH measures/subject	1.5 (0.6)	1.5 (0.6)	1.6 (0.6)	1.5 (0.6)	1.5 (0.6)	
GM ( $cm^3$ )	502.6 (51.2)	496.3 (49.1)	507.5 (49)	491.4 (49)	497.6 (49.6)	
Number of GM measures/subject	1.6 (0.7)	1.6 (0.7)	1.7 (0.8)	1.6 (0.7)	1.6 (0.7)	
IST score [0-66]	32.9 (7.1)	33.5 (6.7)	35.0 (6.8)	32.2 (6.5)	33.4 (6.8)	
Number of IST measures/subject	6.4 (2.3)	6.5 (2.1)	6.7 (2.1)	6.4 (2.2)	6.5 (2.2)	
CESD score [0-60]	9.2 (8.3)	9.1 (8.3)	8.3 (7.7)	9.6 (8.6)	9.1 (8.2)	
Number of CESD measures/subject	4.8 (1.6)	5.0 (1.5)	5.1 (1.4)	4.8 (1.6)	5.0 (1.6)	
IADL score [0-5]	0.5 (1.4)	0.4 (1.2)	0.4 (1.2)	0.5 (1.3)	0.4 (1.3)	
Number of IADL measures/subject	5.1 (1.6)	5.2 (1.6)	5.3 (1.4)	5.0 (1.6)	5.1 (1.6)	
Years of follow-up	9.1 (4.2)	9.5 (3.9)	9.8 (3.9)	9.2 (4.0)	9.5 (4.0)	

Abbreviations: N=sample size, WMH=White matter hyper-intensities, GM=grey matter, IST=Isaacs Set Test,

CESD = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (normalized score),

IADL = Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (normalized score), SD=standard deviation






Figure 6: Estimated path-specific effects in the 3C cohort study exploring: A. educational level on functional dependency (IADL score) through cognitive functioning (IST score) and depressive symptomatology (CESD score), and B. APOE4 on cognitive functioning (IST score) through neurodegeneration (GM) and vascular lesions( WMH). Confidence bands are obtained by parametric Bootstrap with 1000 replicates.