# SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

# Cerebral Small-Vessel Disease and Risk of Incidence of Depression: A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Cohort Studies

Yuanyuan Fang, MD\*; Tingting Qin, PhD\*; Wenhua Liu, MD; Lusen Ran, MD; Yuan Yang, MD; Hao Huang, PhD; Dengji Pan, PhD; Minghuan Wang , PhD

**BACKGROUND:** Results of several longitudinal cohort studies suggested an association between cerebral small-vessel disease and depression. Therefore, we performed a meta-analysis to explore whether cerebral small-vessel disease imparts increased risk for incident depression.

**METHODS AND RESULTS:** We searched prospective cohort studies relevant to the relationship between cerebral small-vessel disease and incident depression published through September 6, 2019, which yielded 16 cohort studies for meta-analysis based on the relative odds ratio (OR) calculated with fixed- and random-effect models. Baseline white matter hyperintensities (WMHs) (pooled OR, 1.37; 95% CI, 1.14–1.65), enlarged perivascular spaces (pooled OR, 1.33; 95% CI, 1.03–1.71), and cerebral atrophy (pooled OR, 2.83; 95% CI, 1.54–5.23) were significant risk factors for incident depression. Presence of deep WMHs (pooled OR, 1.47; 95% CI, 1.05–2.06) was a stronger predictor of depression than were periventricular WMHs (pooled OR, 1.31; 95% CI, 0.93–1.86). What's more, the pooled OR increased from 1.20 for the second quartile to 1.96 for the fourth quartile, indicating that higher the WMH severity brings greater risk of incident depression (25th–50th: pooled OR, 1.20; 95% CI, 0.68–2.12; 50th–75th; pooled OR, 1.42; 95% CI, 0.81–2.46; 75th–100th: OR, 1.96; 95% CI, 1.06–3.64). These results were stable to subgroup analysis for age, source of participants, follow-up time, and methods for assessing WMHs and depression.

**CONCLUSIONS:** Cerebral small-vessel disease features such as WMHs, enlarged perivascular spaces, and cerebral atrophy, especially the severity of WMHs and deep WMHs, are risk factors for incident depression.

Key Words: cerebral small-vessel disease ■ cohort studies ■ incident depression ■ meta-analysis

Gerebral small-vessel disease (CSVD) affects small arteries, venules, and capillaries of the brain. The diagnosis of CSVD is based on findings of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of white matter lesions, lacunar infarcts, cerebral microbleeds (CMBs), enlarged perivascular spaces (EPVSs), and cerebral atrophy.<sup>1</sup> Numerous studies have explored the association between imaging markers of CSVD with depressive symptoms or mood disorders.<sup>2,3</sup> The vascular depression hypothesis postulates that CSVD may cause depression in elderly persons.

Studies of cross-sectional design<sup>4</sup> and longitudinal studies<sup>5</sup> concurred in showing an association between markers of CSVD and depression. However, systematic evidence for the causal association between MRI CSVD features and incident depression is limited. Three meta-analyses<sup>6–8</sup> have examined the association of white matter hyperintensities (WMHs) and depression, of which 2 found a positive association. One meta-analysis<sup>9</sup> failed to show a significant association between microbleeds and depression, whereas another confirmed an association between

Correspondence to: Minghuan Wang, PhD, and Dengji Pan, PhD, Tongji Hospital, Tongji Medical College Huazhong University of Science and Technology, 1095 Jiefang Ave, Wuhan 430030, China. E-mail: mhwang@tjh.tjmu.edu.cn; djpan@tjh.tjmu.edu.cn

Supplementary Materials for this article are available at https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/suppl/10.1161/JAHA.120.016512

<sup>\*</sup>Dr Fang and Dr Qin contributed equally to this work.

For Sources of Funding and Disclosures, see page 10.

<sup>© 2020</sup> The Authors. Published on behalf of the American Heart Association, Inc., by Wiley. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

JAHA is available at: www.ahajournals.org/journal/jaha

# CLINICAL PERSPECTIVE

## What Is New?

- We undertook a new meta-analysis showing that certain cerebral small-vessel disease markers may indicate a causal relationship between cerebral small-vessel disease and incidence of depression because we selected only longitudinal cohort studies that excluded participants with prevalent depression at baseline.
- We found that specific cerebral small-vessel disease features, including white matter hyperintensities, enlarged perivascular spaces, and cerebral atrophy indicated a high risk for incident depression—the association was especially evident in the case of white matter hyperintensities, which bring greater risk for incident depression in proportion to severity of the imaging findings; furthermore, we found that deep white matter hyperintensities, but not periventricular white matter hyperintensities, predicted a higher risk for incident depression.

## What Are the Clinical Implications?

• These data may inform the prevention of depression and indicate that location-specific and severity-specific preventative measures may be needed.

## Nonstandard Abbreviations and Acronyms

CMBs	cerebral microbleeds
CSVD	cerebral small-vessel disease
DWMHs	deep white matter hyperintensities
EPVSs	enlarged perivascular spaces
MRI	magnetic resonance imaging
OR	odds ratio
PWMHs	periventricular white matter hyperintensities
WMHs WMLs	white matter hyperintensities white matter lesions

hippocampal atrophy and depression.<sup>10</sup> However, there is no meta-analysis compiling imaging findings for lacunar infarcts, enlarged perivascular spaces, and cerebral atrophy as potential risk factors for depression. Most importantly, since the previously published meta-analyses compiled cross-sectional and longitudinal studies, they were not robust to confounding effects of baseline depression in the study populations.

In view of these considerations, we undertook a new meta-analysis including only longitudinal cohort

studies, with exclusion of cases with baseline depression, thus enabling an exploration of causal effects of CSVD on the incidence of depression. Additionally, we explored effects of WMH location and severity on the risk of incident depression.

## METHODS

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

## Literature Search

We searched online databases (PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, the Cochrane Library, meeting abstracts, and relevant listed references) from January 1, 1947, to September 6, 2019. A combination of several keywords relevant for CSVD were used as the search items (*leukoencephalopathy, stroke lacunar, microbleeds, perivascular spaces, cerebral atrophy*) and for depression (*depression\*, depressive symptom\*, depressive disorder\**). The search was limited to articles published in English that reported human data. The reference lists of eligible articles and relevant reviews were also searched and reviewed. The detailed search strategy is presented in Data S1.

## **Study Selection**

Two researchers independently completed the study selection, and any differences were resolved by consensus. Thus, studies were included if they fulfilled the following criteria: (1) longitudinal and cohort design; (2) baseline CSVD was diagnosed by MRI or computed tomography. The detailed definitions are included in Data S2; (3) participants had neither baseline depressive symptoms nor earlier history of depression: (4) the outcome was incident depression, assessed over a period of at least 2 weeks following the diagnosis of CSVD. Depression rating was defined by standardized criteria (eg, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. Fourth Edition: International Classification of Diseases. Tenth Revision [ICD-10]) or validated clinical rating scales (eg, Geriatric Depression Scale-15, Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale–Depression, Hamilton Depression Scale. Patient Health Questionnaire-9): (5) the raw data or reported effects were measured by odds ratio (OR) and 95% CI; (6) in cases with multiple articles arising from the same study, the publication with more comprehensive reporting of relevant data was selected. Figure 1 presents the detailed selection procedures. All retrospective cohort studies, case-control studies, cross-sectional studies,



**Figure 1.** Study flow diagram summarizing identification and selection of publications in the meta-analysis.

case reports, case series, and animal studies were excluded.

#### **Data Extraction**

For the 16 studies meeting the above criteria, 2 investigators independently extracted the following information from each study: (1) study characteristics, including name of the first author, publication year, country, participants resource, and follow-up duration; (2) participant details including the sample size, sex, mean age, and the sizes of the incident depression and control groups; (3) CSVD markers and their means of assessment, including imaging model, assessment procedures, and scales of quantification; (4) outcome assessment of depression, and means of its diagnosis; (5) statistical analysis, including OR, 95% CI, and adjustment for confounders (age, sex, education level, cognitive function, vascular factors).

If multiple analysis models were presented in an individual article, we extracted the OR value from the most fully adjusted model. When the effect estimate was not directly provided, we calculated OR using 2×2 tables.

#### **Quality Assessment**

The quality of studies was assessed by the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for cohort studies.<sup>11</sup> The quality score ranges from 0 to 9 points. We calculated all percentages of maximum Newcastle-Ottawa Scale scores for each study, and any score equal to or exceeding 7 indicated a study of high quality.

#### **Statistical Analysis**

All studies reported either incident depression or no depression after CSVD as dichotomous outcomes. For the case of WMHs, we made a dichotomous judgment of moderate/severe versus mild/none WMHs, with harmonization of different WMHs rating scales' cutoff criteria according to each scale's own definitions. WMHs were dichotomously classified as moderate/severe versus mild/none on the basis of the following cutoffs: Fazekas scale (2–3 versus 0–1), white matter grade (6–9 versus 0–5), Scheltens score, Gothenburg scale (3-2 versus 0–1). For studies assessing WMH volume and presenting results in quartile (25%), we set a cutoff above the median quartile to define moderate/severe WMHs. For lacunar stroke, cerebral microbleeds, and Virchow-Robin spaces, we scored as 1 versus 0 lesion(s) per region, and for regional brain volume, we scored quartiles 3 to 4 versus quartiles 1 to 2.

Considering that relatively few studies were available for each of the CSVD markers, we pooled the effect sizes of different studies using random-effects meta-analyses with generic inverse variance methods. When the heterogeneity was small, we also conducted a fixed-effects meta-analyses as a sensitivity analysis. Between-study heterogeneity was evaluated with the I<sup>2</sup>, the Cochran Q statistic, and  $\tau^2$ ; the value of I<sup>2</sup> is 0% to 25%, 25% to 50%, and >50%, indicating low, medium, and high heterogeneity, respectively.<sup>12</sup> When we pooled the effect sizes on the basis of the OR,  $\tau^2$  was estimated by the restricted maximum likelihood method. When based on actual incident data, the  $\tau^2$  was estimated by the restricted DerSimonian-Laird method. To consider the source of heterogeneity in WMHs, we performed meta-regression analysis to evaluate by applying a mixed-factor model if there was any effect modification by age, participants, follow-up duration, and WMH assessment methods. Furthermore, we conduced subgroup analyses by age (<65/≥65 years), participants (patients/community population), follow-up duration (<1/1-5/≥5 years), WMH evaluation methods (Fazekas scale, white matter grade, Scheltens score, Gothenburg scale), and depression assessment methods (Geriatric Depression Scale-15; Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale; Geriatric Depression Scale, Korean Version; Hamilton Depression Scale-17; Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders). The likelihood of publication bias was first evaluated by the funnel plot because of small study effects. If there was a conspicuous published bias, we performed the "trim-and-fill" analysis to make an adjustment.<sup>13</sup> Finally, the quality of evidence from pooled results was evaluated by the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation approach.

All statistical analyses were performed with R version 3.5.0 (R Core Team, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2013, Boston, MA). This study protocol followed the standards presented in Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocols Statement and Guidelines.<sup>14</sup>

## RESULTS

#### Literature Search and Study Characteristics

Figure 1 illustrates the study selection process. We initially identified 5586 studies, of which 74 full-text articles were scrutinized. Of these 74 studies, 15 were reported from the same research group; 10 had patients with baseline depression; 7 were not longitudinal cohort studies; and 26 used a general linear regression model, structural equation model, or partial correlation analyses that could not extract the incident data. Thus, we were left with 16 longitudinal cohort studies<sup>5,15-29</sup> for analysis. In total, data from 14 324 participants, including about 3099 individuals (21.6 %) with incident depression, were included in the meta-analysis. The follow-up time ranged from 2 weeks to 10 years. CSVD was assessed solely through MRI in 13 studies (n=11 585), solely through computed tomography in 1 study (n=525), or through either method in 2 studies (n=2214). There were 11 studies (n=8498) focusing on WMHs. Regarding WMHs quantification, 4 studies (n=4601) used volumetry, and 7 studies (n=3897) rated WMHs severity with visual semiguantitative rating scales, including Fazekas scale (2 studies; n=428), white matter grade (2 studies; n=2376), Gothenburg scale (2 studies; n=855) and Scheltens score (1 study; n=238). In addition, there were 4 studies (n=6960) about lacunar infarctions, 4 studies (n=3138) about microbleeds, 3 studies (n=3048) about Virchow-Robin spaces, and 2 studies (n=855) about cerebral atrophy. Detailed characteristics of all 16 selected studies are presented in Table 1. All studies were assessed as high guality, as described in more detail in Table S1. The guality of evidence from pooled results for WMHs (low), lacunar infarcts (very low), CMBs (moderate), EPVSs (moderate), and cerebral atrophy (moderate) are described in Table S2.

## Association of CSVD With Incident Depression

#### WMHs and Incident Depression

Eleven studies were included in the meta-analysis on WMHs, which showed that individuals with baseline WMHs had an increased risk for incident depression (pooled OR, 1.37; 95% CI, 1.14–1.65) (Figure 2A). The between-study heterogeneity here was high and statistically significant (I<sup>2</sup>=67.2%;  $\tau^2$ =0.0392; Q=30.48). The funnel plot indicated conspicuous evidence of publication bias, and we consequently performed the trim-and-fill analysis (Figure S1). Nonetheless,

					Follow-Up	Cohort	Participants	Mean Age		Depression	CSVD	Depression
Ref	Author	Year	Country	Population	(X)	Size (n)	(u)	(y)	F (%)	Cases (n)	Markers	Assessment
-	Liang Y <sup>15</sup>	2018	Hong Kong	Acute ischemic stroke	0.25	4333	725	66	38.3	153	CMBs, EPVSs, Lls	GDS-15 ≥7
N	Zhang X <sup>16</sup>	2017	Chinese	Lacunar stroke	0.25	488	374	61.7	40.9	06	LIs, WMHs, CMB, EPVSs	HAMD-17 ≥7
m	Qiu WQ <sup>17</sup>	2017	USA	The Framingham Heart Study offspring cohort	0.0	1400	1212	60	52.4	110	WMHs, TCBV	CES-D ≥≥16
4	He JR <sup>18</sup>	2017	China	Acute cerebral infarction	2W	238	238	67	31.9	42	WMHs	HAMD-17 ≥7
2	Arba F <sup>19</sup>	2016	Italy; UK; Australia	VISTA	-	5721	2160	64.2	ee	416	LIS	HADS-D ≥8
9	van Sloten TT <sup>5</sup>	2015	Netherlands	AGES-Reykjavik study	5.2	5764	1949	74.6	56.6	197	WMHs, Lls, CMBs, VR	GDS-15 ≥6
2	Park JH <sup>20</sup>	2015	Korean	NaSDEK	m	783	54	72.2	52.7	NA	WMHs	SGDS-K ≥8
ω	Gudmundsson P <sup>21</sup>	2015	Sweden	H70 and PPSW	10	868	330	20	56.8	26	WMHs, atrophy	DSM-5
o	Tang WK <sup>22</sup>	2014	Chinese Hong Kong	Acute ischemic stroke	0.25	4766	229	AN	AA	75	Pons CMBs	GDS ≥7
10	Saavedra Perez HC <sup>23</sup>	2013	Netherlands	Elderly persons	3.6	1077	961	20	52	09	LIs, WMHs	CES-D ≥16
ŧ	White CL <sup>24</sup>	2011	Columbia, Canada	SPS3 study	2.1	2477	2477	63.2	37	478	LIS	PHQ-9
12	Tang WK <sup>25</sup>	2011	Hong Kong	Acute ischemic stroke	0.25	3219	235	AN	39.1	84	CMBs	GDS ≥7
13	Olesen PJ <sup>26</sup>	2010	Sweden	Swedish Population Register	ى س	1495	525	72.7	68.6	83	WMHs, atrophy	ICD-10 codes
14	Godin O <sup>27</sup>	2008	three French cities	Three City (3C)- Dijon study	4	1658	956	72.4	60.6	241	WMHs	CES-D ≥17(m), ≥23(f)
15	Verluis CE <sup>28</sup>	2006	Netherlands	PROSPER cohort	2.75	527	484	74.9	43	31	Total WMHs	GDS-15 ≥4
16	Steffens DC <sup>29</sup>	2002	Pennsylvania, California, and North Carolina	CHS	2	5201	1415	≥65	AN	1033	White-matter grade	CES-D ≥7
Adju Studie: GDS-1. magne Prospe	sted confounders includin s Depression Scale; CHS, 5, Geriatric Depression Sca ctic resonance imaging; NA,	ig age, sex, Health Car ale-15; H70, , not applica	<ul> <li>education level, cc</li> <li>e Financing Adminis Gerontological and ible; NaSDEK, Nation Iv at Risk of Cardiov</li> </ul>	ignitive function and stration Medica; CME Geriatric Population 5 awide Survey on Den ascular Diseases SGM	vascular factor. 3, cerebral micru Studies; HADS-I nentia Epidemiol	. AGES-Reykjan obleed; CSVD, D, Hospital Anx logy of Korea; F	vik indicates Age, cerebral small-ve iety and Depressi PHQ-9, Patient He	Gene/Environn ssel disease; C on Scale-Depre alth Questionnai	nent Susce T, compute ssion; HAN ire-9; PPS/	aptibility-Reykjav ad tomography; MD, Hamilton De M, Prospective P	ik; CES-D, Center EPVSs, enlarged pr pression Scale; LI, li opulation Study of V	or Epidemiological srivascular spaces; acunar infarct; MRI, Vomen; PROSPER, ical Strokas study:
TCBV,	total cerebral brain volume;	; VISTA, Virt	tual International Structure	oke Trials Archive; and	J WMHs, white	matter hyperint	ensities.		50 50 5			

	1										
A	Study	country	total	even	t	(	Odds Ratio	0	R 95%	6-CI	Weight
	Qiu WQ(2017)17	America	1212	110			台	1.1	3 (0.95	1.341	18.5%
	Zhang X(2017)16	Asia	374	90			∏- <u>≖</u> -	2.2	8 [1.40;	3.72]	8.6%
	He JR(2017)18	Asia	238	42				1.5	8 11.04:	2.401	10.3%
	van Sloten TT(2015)	5 Europe	1949	197			「「「「」」	1.0	2 [0.88;	1.19]	19.2%
	Park JH(2015)20	Asia	54					- 8.1	4 [1.37;	48.29]	1.0%
	Gudmundsson P(2015	5)21 Europe	330	26				3.8	4 [1.25;	11.78]	2.4%
	Saavedra Perez HC(201	13) <sup>23</sup> Europe	961	60				1.1	0 [1.00;	1.20]	21.0%
	Olesen PJ(2010) <sup>25</sup>	Europe	525	63				3.2	1 [1.00;	10.28]	2.2%
	Godin O(2008)27	Europe	956	241				2.4	0 [1.28;	4.51]	6.1%
	Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup>	Europe	484	31			-	1.2	0 [0.41;	3.55]	2.5%
	Steffens DC(2002) <sup>2</sup>	America	1415	1033	5			1.2	1 [0.73;	2.00]	8.2%
	Random effects mod	el				_	-	1.3	7 [1.14;	1.65]	100.0%
Heterog Test	peneity: /* = 67%, τ* = 0.039 for overall effect: z = 3.40 (	92, p < 0.01 p < 0.01)				0.1	0.5 1 2 10				
	1										
В	Study	country Tev	ent Ttotal	Cevent	Ctotal		Odds Ratio	OR	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
	una Ciatas TT/201615	lathedanda 2	2 200	105	1640		dat	1.02.1		24.24	24.49
	Liang Y(2018)15	Hong Kong 7	2 309	81	439			1.49 [	1.04; 2.13]	42.4%	41.1%
	Zhang X(2017)16	Chinese 5	6 202	34	172			- 1.56	0.96; 2.53]	23.3%	24.5%
	Eived effect model								1 05- 1 691	100.0%	-
	Random effects model						-	1.33	1.03; 1.71]		100.0%
Hete	progeneity: $I^2 = 13\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0069$ , $\rho$	0 = 0.31					1 1		•		
Test for	overall effect (fixed effect): z = 2.3	6(p = 0.02)				0.5	1 2				
	]									Walaba	Walaht
	Study	country Teve	nt Ttotal	Cevent	Ctotal		Odds Ratio	OR	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
	Olesen PJ(2010) <sup>25</sup> Gudmundsson P(2015)	Sweden 13 Sweden 13	203 96	7 13	322 234			3.08 [	1.21; 7.85] 1.19; 5.98]	42.8% 57.2%	42.8% 57.2%
	Fixed effect model							2.83 [	.54; 5.23]	100.0%	-
	Random effects model	- 0.00				_		2.83 [	1.54; 5.23]	-	100.0%
Test fo	r overall effect (fixed effect): z = 3	= 0.82 3.33 (p < 0.01)				0.2	0.5 1 2 5				
Test for o	overall effect (random effects): z =	= 3.33 (p < 0.01)									
	1										
D	Study	country Te	event Ttota	al Ceven	t Ctota		Odds Ratio	OR	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
	Lines V/2010115	Hone Kees	27 440	100	616		_1.4	1.00	0 78: 2 02	26.24	20.04
	van Sloten TT(2015)5	Netherlands	36 337	161	1612			1.08	0.74: 1.58	40.9%	38.7%
	Tang WK(2014)22	Hong Kong	24 52	51	177			- 2.12	1.12; 4.00	14.8%	15.8%
	Tang WK(2011) <sup>25</sup>	Hong Kong	27 72	57	163			1.12	[0.63; 1.98]	18.0%	18.9%
	Fixed effect model						-	1.25	[0.98; 1.60]	100.0%	-
	Random effects model							1.26	0.97; 1.64	-	100.0%
Test fo	eterogeneity: $I^{*} = 11\%$ , $\tau^{*} = 0.0083$ , or overall effect (fixed effect): $z = 1$	ρ = 0.34 .79 (ρ = 0.07)					0.5 1 2				
Test for	overall effect (random effects): z =	1.72 (p = 0.09)									
	۰										
	1			Tevent	Ttotal	Cevent	Ctotal Odd	s Ratio		OR 95	5%-CI
E	Study	country									Contract of Sector 1
E	Study	country						ala 1			
E	Study White CL(2011)24 van Sloten TT(2015)5	Canada	s	24 22	124 139	454 175	2353 — 1810	*	_ 1	.00 [0.6	4; 1.59] 9: 2.841
E	Study White CL(2011) <sup>24</sup> van Sloten TT(2015) <sup>5</sup> Arba F(2016) <sup>19</sup> Italy	Canada Netherland United Kingdon	is n;Australia	24 22 198	124 139 1127	454 175 218	2353 — 1810 1033 —			1.00 [0.6- 1.76 [1.0 0.80 [0.6-	4; 1.59] 9; 2.84] 4; 0.99]
E	Study White CL(2011) <sup>24</sup> van Sloten TT(2015) <sup>5</sup> Arba F(2016) <sup>19</sup> Italy Zhang X(2017) <sup>16</sup>	Canada Netherland United Kingdon Chinese	is n;Australia	24 22 198 66	124 139 1127 198	454 175 218 24	2353 — 1810 1033 — 176			1.00 [0.6- 1.76 [1.0 0.80 [0.6- 3.17 [1.8	4; 1.59] 9; 2.84] 4; 0.99] 8; 5.34]
	Study White CL(2011) <sup>24</sup> van Sloten TT(2015) <sup>5</sup> Arba F(2016) <sup>19</sup> Zhang X(2017) <sup>16</sup> Random effects model	Canada Netherland United Kingdon Chinese	ls n;Australia	24 22 198 66	124 139 1127 198	454 175 218 24	2353 — 1810 1033 — 176			1.00 [0.6 1.76 [1.0 0.80 [0.6 3.17 [1.8	4; 1.59] 9; 2.84] 4; 0.99] 8; 5.34] 4; 2.32]
Heterog	Study           White CL(2011)24           van Sloten TT(2015)5           Arba F(2016)19           Italy           Zhang X(2017)16           Random effects model           eneity: 1 <sup>2</sup> = 84%, t <sup>2</sup> = 0.2150, p < 0	Canada Netherland ;United Kingdon Chinese	is n;Australia	24 22 198 66	124 139 1127 198	454 175 218 24	2353 — 1810 1033 —			1.00 [0.6 1.76 [1.0 0.80 [0.6 3.17 [1.8 1.40 <b>[0.8</b>	4; 1.59] 9; 2.84] 4; 0.99] 8; 5.34] 4; 2.32]

# Figure 2. Forest plots of the relationship between white matter hyperintensities (WMHs), enlarged perivascular spaces (EPVSs), cerebral atrophy, cerebral microbleeds (CMBs), and lacunar infarcts (LIs) at baseline and incident depression.

**A**, WMHs in adjusted estimates; **B**, EPVSs in crude estimates; **C**, cerebral atrophy in crude estimates; **D**, CMBs in crude estimates; **E**, LIs in crude estimates.  $C_{event}$  indicates the number of incident depression in non-CSVD;  $C_{total}$ , the number of non-CSVD; OR, odds ratio;  $T_{event}$ , the number of incident depression in CSVD; and  $T_{total}$ , the number of CSVD.

the between-study heterogeneity remained very high. We consequently applied the random-effect model, which showed that baseline WMHs was no longer significantly associated with incident depression (pooled OR, 1.10; 95% Cl, 0.90–1.34; l<sup>2</sup>=74.7%;  $\tau^2$ =0.0791; Q=63.13).

Furthermore, in the subgroup analysis of WMH location, we found that presence of deep white matter hyperintensities (DWMHs) was a factor in incident depression (pooled OR, 1.47; 95% Cl, 1.05–2.06), but presence of PWMHs was not (pooled OR, 1.31; 95% Cl, 0.93–1.86) (Figure 3A). Besides, we saw a trend toward a linear relationship between WMH severity and increasing risk of incident depression (25th–50th:

pooled OR, 1.20; 95% Cl, 0.68–2.12; 50th–75th: pooled OR, 1.42; 95% Cl, 0.81–2.46; 75th–100th: OR, 1.96; 95% Cl, 1.06–3.64) (Figure 3B), although without attaining significant *P* value (*P*=0.15).

#### **EPVSs and Incident Depression**

The between-study heterogeneity of the 3 EPVSs studies was low and not significant (I<sup>2</sup>=13.5%;  $\tau^2$ =0.0069; Q=2.31). Therefore, we applied the fixed-effect model to evaluate the pooled effect (pooled OR, 1.33; 95% Cl, 1.05–1.68) and the random-effect model (pooled OR, 1.33; 95% Cl, 1.03–1.71) (Figure 2B). The results from these 2 models and that of the pooled effect

A Study	Odds Ratio	OR	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
Location ="DWMH"					
Tang WK(2014)22		1.34	(0.77: 2.33)	19.3%	19.3%
Tang WK(2011)25		1.20	10.67: 2.151	17.3%	17.3%
Saavedra Perez HC(2013) 23		- 2.10	[1.12: 3.95]	14.8%	14.8%
Fixed effect model		1.47	[1.05: 2.06]	51.3%	
Random effects model	-	1.47	[1.05: 2.06]		51.3%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0$ , $p = 0.41$			[]		
Location ="PVWMH"	1				
Tang WK(2014) 22		1.45	[0.82; 2.57]	18.1%	18.1%
Tang WK(2011) <sup>25</sup>		1.20	[0.69; 2.08]	19.6%	19.6%
Saavedra Perez HC(2013) <sup>23</sup>		1.30	[0.62; 2.71]	11.0%	11.0%
Fixed effect model		1.31	[0.93; 1.86]	48.7%	
Random effects model		1.31	[0.93; 1.86]		48.7%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0$ , $p = 0.90$					
Fixed effect model		1.39	[1.09; 1.77]	100.0%	-
Random effects model	$\diamond$	1.39	[1.09; 1.77]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0$ , $p = 0.82$					
Residual heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$ , $p = 0.73$	0.5 1 2				
Test for overall effect (fixed effect): $z = 2.65$ ( $p < 0.01$ )					
Test for overall effect (random effects): z = 2.65 (p < 0.01	)				
B				Weig	ht Weight
Study	Odds Ratio	0	R 95%-C	l (fixe	d) (random
Degree ="25th-50th"	Odds Ratio	0	R 95%-C	l (fixe	d) (random
Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup>	Odds Ratio	0	R 95%-C	I (fixe	d) (random % 22.9%
Degree ="25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup>	Odds Ratio	0 1.: 1.:	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.89	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8%
Degree ="25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model	Odds Ratio	0 	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.89 12] 31.7	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8% %
Degree ="25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model	Odds Ratio	0 — 1.3 — 1.3 1.3 1.3	<b>R</b> 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8 12] 31.7 12]	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8% % 31.7%
Degree ="25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 0%, τ <sup>2</sup> = 0, p = 1.00	Odds Ratio	0 — 1.3 1.3 1.3	<b>R</b> 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.89 12] 31.7 12]	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8% % 31.7%
Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: J <sup>2</sup> = 0%, τ <sup>2</sup> = 0, ρ = 1.00           Degree = "50-75 th"	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3	R 95%-C	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8 12] 31.7 12]	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8% % 31.7%
Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 0%, τ <sup>2</sup> = 0, ρ = 1.00           Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup>	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 50 [0.79; 2.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9	d) (random 22.9% 8.8%  31.7% % 24.9%
Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 0%, τ <sup>2</sup> = 0, ρ = 1.00           •         Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup>	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 50 [0.79; 2. 20 [0.41; 3.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8% ~- 31.7% % 24.9% % 8.8%
Degree ="25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 0%, τ <sup>2</sup> = 0, p = 1.00 Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model	Odds Ratio	• - 13 13 13 - 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	R 95%-C	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8 46] 33.7	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8% % 31.7% % 24.9% % 8.8%
Degree ="25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 0%, τ <sup>2</sup> = 0, ρ = 1.00 - Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model	Odds Ratio	• - 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.41; 3. 22 [0.81; 2. 22 [0.81; 2.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8' 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8' 46] 33.7 46]	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8% ~- 31.7% % 24.9% % 8.8% ~- 33.7%
Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 1.00$ Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.73$	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.41; 3. 242 [0.81; 2.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8 46] 33.7 46]	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8% % 31.7% % 24.9% % 8.8% 33.7%
Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 1.00$ Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.73$ Degree = "> 75th"	Odds Ratio	0 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 14 14	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 42 [0.81; 2. 42 [0.81; 2.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8 46] 3.7 46]	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8% % 31.7% % 24.9% % 8.8% % 33.7%
Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 1.00$ Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0, p = 0.73$ Degree = ">575th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup>	Odds Ratio	0 - 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 50 [0.79; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 42 [0.81; 2. 42 [0.81; 2. 40 [1.28; 4.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8 46] 33.7 46] 51] 25.9	<ul> <li>(random)</li> <li>22.9%</li> <li>8.8%</li> <li></li> <li>31.7%</li> <li>24.9%</li> <li>8.8%</li> <li></li> <li>33.7%</li> <li>25.9%</li> </ul>
Study Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0, \phi, \tau^2 = 0, \rho = 1.00$ Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0, \phi, \tau^2 = 0, \rho = 0.73$ Degree = "> 75th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup>	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 42 [0.81; 2. 42 [0.81; 2. 40 [1.28; 4. 20 [0.41; 3.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8' 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8' 46] 33.7 46] 55] 8.8' 55] 8.8' 55] 8.8' 55] 8.8'	<ul> <li>(random)</li> <li>22.9%</li> <li>8.8%</li> <li> 31.7%</li> <li>24.9%</li> <li>8.8%</li> <li> 33.7%</li> <li>25.9%</li> <li>8.8%</li> </ul>
Study Degree ="25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 1.00$ Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.73$ Degree = "> 75th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.73$	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.41;	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8 46] 33.7 46] 51] 25.9 55] 8.8 48] 34.7	<ul> <li>(random)</li> <li>22.9%</li> <li>8.8%</li> <li></li></ul>
Study Degree ="25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, \rho = 1.00$ Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, \rho = 0.73$ Degree = ">75th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Bandom effects model	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 42 [0.81; 2. 42 [0.81; 2. 40 [1.28; 4. 20 [0.41; 3. 11 [1.17; 3. 36 [1.06; 36]	I (fixe 35) 22.9 55) 8.8 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8 46] 3.7 46] 51] 25.9 55] 8.8 48] 34.7 64]	<ul> <li>(random)</li> <li>22.9%</li> <li>8.8%</li> <li></li> <li>31.7%</li> <li>24.9%</li> <li>8.8%</li> <li></li> <li>33.7%</li> <li>25.9%</li> <li>8.8%</li> <li></li> <li>34.7%</li> </ul>
Study Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, \rho = 1.00$ Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, \rho = 0.73$ Degree = ">75th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4	R         95%-C           20         [0.61; 2.           20         [0.41; 3.           20         [0.68; 2.           20         [0.68; 2.           50         [0.79; 2.           20         [0.41; 3.           42         [0.81; 2.           42         [0.81; 2.           40         [1.28; 4.           20         [0.41; 3.           21         [1.17; 3.           22         [1.06; 3.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8' 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8' 46] 33.7 46] 51] 25.9 55] 8.8' 46] 34.7 64]	<ul> <li>(random)</li> <li>22.9%</li> <li>8.8%</li> <li></li></ul>
Study Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 1.00$ Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.73$ Degree = ">75th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Random effects model Random effects model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%, \tau^2 = 0.0352, p = 0.28$	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 42 [0.81; 2. 40 [1.28; 4. 20 [0.41; 3. 01 [1.17; 3. 36 [1.06; 3. 59 [1 40; 2.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8' 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8' 46] 33.7 46] 51] 25.9 55] 8.8' 48] 34.7 64]	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8% 31.7% % 24.9% % 8.8% 33.7% % 25.9% % 8.8% 34.7%
Study Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 1.00$ Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.73$ Degree = ">75th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%, \tau^2 = 0.0352, p = 0.28$ Fixed effect model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%, \tau^2 = 0.0352, p = 0.28$	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.79; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 42 [0.81; 2. 42 [0.81; 2. 40 [1.28; 4. 20 [0.41; 3. 36 [1.06; 3. 55 [1.10; 2. 55 [1.10; 2.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8' 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8' 46] 33.7 46] 51] 25.9 55] 8.8' 48] 34.7 64] 09] 100.0	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8% % 31.7% % 24.9% % 8.8% % 33.7% % 25.9% % 8.8% % 34.7%
Study Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, \rho = 1.00$ Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, \rho = 0.73$ Degree = ">75th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%, \tau^2 = 0.0352, \rho = 0.28$ Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%, \tau^2 = 0.0352, \rho = 0.28$	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4	R         95%-C           20         [0.61; 2.           20         [0.64; 3.           20         [0.68; 2.           20         [0.68; 2.           50         [0.79; 2.           20         [0.68; 2.           50         [0.79; 2.           20         [0.68; 2.           40         [1.28; 4.           20         [0.41; 3.           36         [1.06; 3.           52         [1.10; 2.           52         [1.10; 2.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8' 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8' 46] 3.7 46] 51] 25.9 55] 8.8' 48] 34.7 64] 09] 100.0 09]	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8%  31.7% % 24.9% % 8.8%  33.7% % 25.9% % 8.8%  34.7% 0% 100.0%
Study Degree = "25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 1.00$ Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.73$ Degree = ">75th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Verluis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Random effects model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%, \tau^2 = 0.0352, p = 0.28$ Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%, \tau^2 = 0.0352, p = 0.70$ Perior battore areas $T^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0.070$	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4	R         95%-C           20         [0.61; 2.           20         [0.41; 3.           20         [0.68; 2.           20         [0.68; 2.           50         [0.79; 2.           20         [0.41; 3.           42         [0.81; 2.           40         [1.28; 4.           20         [0.41; 3.           301         [1.17; 3.           52         [1.10; 2.           52         [1.10; 2.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8' 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8' 46] 33.7 46] 51] 25.9 55] 8.8' 48] 34.7 64] 09] 100.0 09]	d) (random 22.9% 8.8% 31.7% 24.9% 8.8% 33.7% 25.9% 8.8% 34.7% 0% 100.0%
Study Degree ="25th-50th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 1.00$ Degree = "50-75 th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.73$ Degree = "> 75th" Godin O(2008) <sup>27</sup> Vertuis CE(2006) <sup>28</sup> Fixed effect model Random effects model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%, \tau^2 = 0.0352, p = 0.28$ Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.70$ Residual heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.73$ Test (for overall effect (fixed effect); $z = 0.54$ (for 0 = 0.01)	Odds Ratio	0 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4	R 95%-C 20 [0.61; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.68; 2. 20 [0.41; 3. 42 [0.81; 2. 40 [1.28; 4. 20 [0.41; 3. 01 [1.17; 3. 36 [1.06; 3. 52 [1.10; 2. 52 [1.10; 2.	I (fixe 35] 22.9 55] 8.8' 12] 31.7 12] 86] 24.9 55] 8.8' 46] 33.7 46] 51] 25.9 55] 8.8' 48] 34.7 64] 09] 100.0 09]	d) (random % 22.9% % 8.8% 31.7% % 24.9% % 8.8% 33.7% % 25.9% % 8.8% 34.7% 0% 100.0%

**Figure 3.** Forest plots of white matter hyperintensity (WMH) location and severity at baseline and incident depression.

A, WMH location; B, WMH severity. OR indicates odds ratio.

derived from the OR values (pooled OR, 1.41; 95% Cl, 1.07–1.85) (Figure S2A) were of similar magnitude, and concurred in showing that findings of enlarged perivascular spaces could increase the risk of incident depression. No publication bias was found for EPVS data (Figure S3A).

#### **Cerebral Atrophy and Incident Depression**

Only 2 studies were available for cerebral atrophy. The pooled results from either the original data or the calculated ORs showed a significant association between temporal atrophy and incident depression (Figure 2C and Figure S2B). Because of low heterogeneity (l<sup>2</sup>=0%;  $\tau^2$ =0) and the very few studies, we applied fixed-effect and random-effect models, both of which had good consistency (pooled OR, 2.83; 95% CI, 1.54–5.23). There was no sign of publication bias (Figure S3B).

#### **Cerebral Microbleed and Incident Depression**

Four studies of cerebral microbleed were included. The between-study heterogeneity was low and not statistically significant (l<sup>2</sup>=11%;  $\tau^2$ =0.0083; Q=3.38). Considering the relatively few studies and small heterogeneity, we applied the fixed-effect model (pooled OR, 1.25; 95% Cl, 0.98–1.60) and the random-effect model (pooled OR, 1.26; 95% Cl, 0.97–1.64) to test the pooled effect (Figure 2D), which did not indicate cerebral microbleeds as a significant risk factor for incident depression. The OR data using the random-effect model showed the same result (pooled OR, 1.62; 95% Cl, 0.98–2.66) (Figure S2C). There was no evidence for publication bias for microbleeds (Figure S3C).

#### Lacunar Infarcts and Incident Depression

Four studies of lacunar infarct were included. Both the exact incident data and the ORs could be extracted from the original studies. The between-study heterogeneity was high and statistically significant. Therefore, we applied the random-effect model. Neither exact incident data (pooled OR, 1.40; 95% Cl, 0.84–2.32;  $l^2$ =84%;  $\tau^2$ =0.2150) (Figure 2E) nor OR data (pooled OR, 1.31; 95% Cl, 0.71–2.42) indicated statistical significance (Figure S2D). The corresponding funnel plot is presented in Figure S4.

#### Meta-Regression and Subgroup Analysis

We found high heterogeneity in the analysis comparing moderate/severe WMHs versus mild/none. Therefore, we performed meta-regression analysis, which showed that participants (patients), follow-up duration (1–5 years) and WMHs assessment methods (white matter grade) were the source of heterogeneity and could together entirely explain the overall variation (Table S3). Subgroup analyses of study characteristics suggested that the risk of depression was higher in people aged over 65 years (pooled OR, 1.70; 95% CI, 1.17–2.49) and those with cardiovascular disease (pooled OR, 1.64; 95% CI, 1.16–2.30). Furthermore, the shorter the follow-up time, the higher the risk of depression. WMHs and depression assessment methods have an impact on the risk of depression (Figures S5 and S6).

### DISCUSSION

Our meta-analysis shows that certain CSVD markers are strongly associated with incident depression, especially WMHs, EPVSs, and cerebral atrophy. The data may indicate a causal relationship between CSVD and incidence of depression because we selected only longitudinal studies that excluded participants with prevalent depression at baseline. The association is especially evident in the case of WMHs, which bring greater risk for incident depression in proportion to severity of the imaging findings. Furthermore, we find that DWMHs, but not PWMHs, predict a higher risk for incident depression, suggesting neuroanatomic basis of the risk for depression attributable to WMHs. If these associations are indeed causal, presence of DWMHs may therefore predict for onset of depression in the coming years.

Our meta-analysis has several advantages over earlier reports. First, we based our study on a predefined protocol and followed standard guidelines, thus including numerous studies and individuals, which resulted in high statistical power. Second, all selected studies were of longitudinal cohort design, specifically excluding studies with depression at baseline, which is a necessary condition for establishing causality. Furthermore, this analysis is, to our knowledge, the first attempt to identify the causal association of the location and severity of WMHs with incident depression. Third, most of the included studies were of high quality and were properly adjusted for confounders such as age, sex, education level, cognitive function, and vascular risk factors. Finally, subgroup and meta-regression analysis enabled us to identify sources of data heterogeneity; the observed associations proved to be robust to the sources of heterogeneity, which strengthens the validity of our findings.

The several previous meta-analyses on the correlation between WMHs and depression had somewhat discordant results. Two meta-analyses,<sup>7,8</sup> which included both community-based participants and patients, addressed the association of WMHs with

depression in longitudinal and cross-sectional settings but without evident causal analysis. Present findings agree with and extend the interpretation of those previous meta-analyses focusing on WMHs. A recent meta-analysis<sup>6</sup> included cohort studies in adults that showed a consistent association between various CSVD and depression, but the analysis didn't exclude patients with a history of depression. As noted above, by excluding participants with baseline or historical depression, our new meta-analysis supports evaluation of the causal effect of various individual CSVD features on risk of incident depression in prospective cohort study populations. Indeed, our findings give strong support for the hypothesis that WMHs may be a cause of depression, rather than a comorbidity. However, some previous studies of this type have had inconsistent results, presumably due to confounding factors such as the age of participants, different study design, and methods for diagnosis of depression and evaluation of WMHs. Considering these factors, we performed the subgroup analysis, which proved that participants' age, source of participants recruitment, duration of follow-up, WMH evaluation methods, and depression assessment methods all contributed to the overall associations between imaging results and risk of depression. Individuals with ischemic stroke and WMHs have a higher risk of depression than does the community population, likely because ischemia events can cause structural disruptions of the fiber tracts in the cerebral white matter.<sup>30</sup> If connectivity between brain regions involved in mood regulation is then compromised, this may manifest in higher risk for developing depression.<sup>31</sup> Indeed, WMHs are more common in patients with history of ischemic stroke than in the general population.<sup>32</sup> People aged over 65 years had an elevated incidence of depression, which could be explained by vascular depression hypothesis.<sup>33</sup>

Damage to frontal-subcortical circuits is hypothesized to be a pathological condition predisposing the individuals to depression.<sup>34</sup> Indeed, previous imaging studies have suggested that development of depression is related to WMHs localized in the frontal lobe<sup>34</sup> or in the deep white matter,<sup>35</sup> which may contain projections from the frontal lobe. Another study<sup>36</sup> has suggested that DWMHs are associated with risk for developing depression. Our meta-analysis is consistent with these previous results and further indicates that it is the DWMHs, but not PWMHs, that are an independent predictor for incident depression. We suppose that DWMHs are more indicative of impaired connectivity between the frontal lobe and other regions, whereas PWMHs manifest in disturbance of more local cortical circuits, not manifesting in mood disorder.

Previous studies have shown inconsistent results about the impact of severity of WMHs on depression risk. Nys et al<sup>37</sup> concluded that the severity of

WMHs was not significantly associated with poststroke depression. However, the more recent LADIS (Leukoaraiosis and Disability) studies reported a log-linear relationship between volume of WMHs and risk of developing depression in a 3-year follow-up period.<sup>38</sup> In our meta-analysis, volumetric methods were used to assess WMH severity, which showed that higher WMH volumes at baseline indeed increase the risk of developing depression during follow-up. However, since only 2 such studies were available, there is clearly a need for further quantitative analysis of WMH volume as a risk factor for depression.

EPVSs have recently emerged as a marker of CSVD, given their close association with WMHs, lacunae, and cerebral microbleeds.<sup>39</sup> EPVSs are also a marker of neuroinflammation, which likely plays a role in the pathogenesis of depression.<sup>40</sup> Previous studies suggest that EPVSs were associated with depressive symptoms in the general population<sup>39</sup> and in stroke patients.<sup>41</sup> Results of our meta-analysis agree with those previous studies, confirming that individuals with EPVSs may be at higher risk to develop depression.

Cortical atrophy is a common finding in medical imaging of the aging brain<sup>42</sup> and as an expression of CSVD.<sup>1</sup> Previous cross-sectional studies confirmed that late-life depression was associated with atrophy in the frontal and temporal lobes,<sup>43</sup> but one longitudinal population-based study found no association between cerebral atrophy and occurrence of depression at follow-up.<sup>42</sup> The design of our present analysis, which includes only longitudinal studies without base-line depression, reveals a strong association between temporal lobe atrophy and incident depression. While frontal-subcortical circuits are certainly implicated in depression,<sup>44</sup> the present findings call attention to a possible relationship between temporal lobe atrophy and incident depression.

CMBs are common occurrences in ischemic stroke and may be one of the main factors leading to poststroke depression.<sup>45</sup> However, our meta-analysis found no relationship between CMBs and incident depression. This may relate to the different locations of CMBs, which is a matter for future investigation. Besides, lacunar strokes detected by MRI are one of the common manifestations of CSVD and are a frequent finding in aged depressed patients.<sup>46</sup> However, the present meta-analysis did not indicate a strong association between lacunae and depression. This may be related more to the smaller lesion size (<2.0 cm) than for other stroke subtypes.<sup>47</sup>

#### Limitations

Some limitations should be considered in our meta-analysis. First, the heterogeneity of studies and

potential publication bias of meta-analysis is hard to avoid. Although we have applied strict standards, our included studies differ in some respects, such as subjects' mean age, follow-up duration, target population, and the assessment methods of WMHs and depression. Therefore, we analyzed data by a random-effect model and explored the heterogeneity by meta-regression, which revealed that follow-up duration, target population, and the WMH assessment methods could together explain 100% of the heterogeneity of WMHs in the pathway to depression in CSVD. Subgroup analyses according to age, different follow-up duration, target population, and the WMH and depression assessment methods were also performed, which indicated that the specific sample composition had great impact on the relationship between CSVD and incident depression. Second, we found evidence for publication bias in the WMH studies, which was accommodated by our trim-and-fill analysis. Third, only 3 studies evaluated EPVSs, and only 2 evaluated cerebral atrophy. Therefore, the evidence linking these 2 markers with incident depression remains weak. Fourth, there were only a few cohort studies of small sample size for lacunar infarcts and cerebral microbleeds, such that the lack of significant relationships with incident depression may be a type II error.

Other limitations arising from the original studies might influence the interpretation of our results. First, the included studies are of observational but not experimental design, such that unmeasured cofactors may have contributed to incident depression, even though CSVD was the only recorded manifestation of the biological pathways. Second, we evaluated only baseline measurements of CSVD without screening the incident CSVD during the follow-up period. Furthermore, the incident depression in the control groups might be attributable to incidence of new CSVD during the follow-up period. Therefore, these studies are not fit to perfectly capture the relationship between baseline CSVD and incident depression. However, this ambiguity seems to be a general limitation of the literature. Finally, we could not evaluate the location of CSVD features (other than WMHs) because of a lack of relevant original anatomic studies, although depression development may well associate with the location of lesions.

#### **Implications and Future Directions**

In conclusion, this meta-analysis shows that presence of CSVD to MRI is causally linked to incident depression, which is a finding with important clinical implications. First, CSVD may be a general marker of risk of depression, but specific features of CSVD carry more weight in this association. Therefore, early and effective treatment for CSVD may help prevent the incidence of geriatric depression. Moreover, our meta-analysis indicates that the severity and location of WMHs are closely related to incident depression. This observation not only may help to improve risk prediction of depression but also provides a theoretical anatomic basis for investigating the underlying mechanisms.

#### CONCLUSIONS

This meta-analysis shows that specific CSVD features, including WMHs, EPVSs, and cerebral atrophy indicate a high risk for incident depression. Furthermore, the severity and location of WMHs are strongly associated with a higher incidence of depression. This finding may provide targets for treatment and prevention strategies of depression in this vulnerable population.

#### **ARTICLE INFORMATION**

Received April 2, 2020; accepted June 4, 2020.

#### Affiliations

From the Department of Neurology, Tongji Hospital (Y.F., L.R., Y.Y., H.H., D.P., M.W.), Department of Biliary–Pancreatic Surgery, Affiliated Tongji Hospital (T.Q.); and Clinical Research Center, Tongji Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China (W.L.).

#### Sources of Funding

The study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81571206 and 81873749).

#### **Disclosures**

None.

#### **Supplementary Materials**

Data S1–S2 Tables S1–S3 Figures S1–S6 References 48–55

#### REFERENCES

- Wardlaw JM, Smith EE, Biessels GJ, Cordonnier C, Fazekas F, Frayne R, Lindley RI, O'Brien JT, Barkhof F, Benavente OR, et al. Neuroimaging standards for research into small vessel disease and its contribution to ageing and neurodegeneration. *Lancet Neurol.* 2013;12:822–838.
- de Groot JC, de Leeuw FE, Oudkerk M, Hofman A, Jolles J, Breteler MM. Cerebral white matter lesions and depressive symptoms in elderly adults. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2000;57:1071–1076.
- Krishnan KR, Hays JC, Blazer DG. MRI-defined vascular depression. *Am J Psychiatry*. 1997;154:497–501.
- Direk N, Perez HS, Akoudad S, Verhaaren BF, Niessen WJ, Hofman A, Vernooij MW, Ikram MA, Tiemeier H. Markers of cerebral small vessel disease and severity of depression in the general population. *Psychiatry Res Neuroimaging*. 2016;253:1–6.
- van Sloten TT, Sigurdsson S, van Buchem MA, Phillips CL, Jonsson PV, Ding J, Schram MT, Harris TB, Gudnason V, Launer LJ. Cerebral small vessel disease and association with higher incidence of depressive symptoms in a general elderly population: the AGES-Reykjavik Study. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2015;172:570–578.
- 6. Rensma SP, van Sloten TT, Launer LJ, Stehouwer C. Cerebral small vessel disease and risk of incident stroke, dementia and depression, and

all-cause mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2018;90:164–173.

- van Agtmaal M, Houben A, Pouwer F, Stehouwer C, Schram MT. Association of microvascular dysfunction with late-life depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA Psychiatry. 2017;74:729–739.
- Wang L, Leonards CO, Sterzer P, Ebinger M. White matter lesions and depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Psychiatr Res.* 2014;56:56–64.
- Egeto P, Fischer CE, Ismail Z, Smith EE, Schweizer TA. Lacunar stroke, deep white matter disease and depression: a meta-analysis. *Int Psychogeriatr.* 2014;26:1101–1109.
- Cole J, Costafreda SG, McGuffin P, Fu CH. Hippocampal atrophy in first episode depression: a meta-analysis of magnetic resonance imaging studies. J Affect Disord. 2011;134:483–487.
- Stang A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2010;25:603–605.
- Dinnes J, Deeks J, Kirby J, Roderick P. A methodological review of how heterogeneity has been examined in systematic reviews of diagnostic test accuracy. *Health Technol Assess*. 2005;9:1–113.
- Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: a simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics*. 2000;56:455–463.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ*. 2009;339:b2535.
- Liang Y, Chan YL, Deng M, Chen YK, Mok V, Wang F, Ungvari GS, Chu CW, Tang WK. Enlarged perivascular spaces in the centrum semiovale are associated with poststroke depression: a 3-month prospective study. J Affect Disord. 2018;228:166–172.
- Zhang X, Tang Y, Xie Y, Ding C, Xiao J, Jiang X, Shan H, Lin Y, Li C, Hu D, et al. Total magnetic resonance imaging burden of cerebral small-vessel disease is associated with post-stroke depression in patients with acute lacunar stroke. *Eur J Neurol.* 2017;24:374–380.
- Qiu WQ, Himali JJ, Wolf PA, DeCarli DC, Beiser A, Au R. Effects of white matter integrity and brain volumes on late life depression in the Framingham Heart Study. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2017;32:214–221.
- He JR, Zhang Y, Lu WJ, Liang HB, Tu XQ, Ma FY, Yang GY, Zeng LL. Age-related frontal periventricular white matter hyperintensities and miR-92a-3p are associated with early-onset post-stroke depression. *Front Aging Neurosci.* 2017;9:328.
- Arba F, Ali M, Quinn TJ, Hankey GJ, Lees KR, Inzitari D. Lacunar infarcts, depression, and anxiety symptoms one year after stroke. J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis. 2016;25:831–834.
- Park JH, Lee SB, Lee JJ, Yoon JC, Han JW, Kim TH, Jeong HG, Newhouse PA, Taylor WD, Kim JH, et al. Epidemiology of MRI-defined vascular depression: a longitudinal, community-based study in Korean elders. J Affect Disord. 2015;180:200–206.
- Gudmundsson P, Olesen PJ, Simoni M, Pantoni L, Ostling S, Kern S, Guo X, Skoog I. White matter lesions and temporal lobe atrophy related to incidence of both dementia and major depression in 70-year-olds followed over 10 years. *Eur J Neurol.* 2015;22:781–788, e49–e50.
- Tang WK, Liu XX, Chen YK, Abrigo J, Chu WC, Mok VC, Ungvari GS, Wong KS. Pontine microbleeds and depression in stroke. J Geriatr Psychiatry Neurol. 2014;27:159–164.
- Saavedra PH, Direk N, Hofman A, Vernooij MW, Tiemeier H, Ikram MA. Silent brain infarcts: a cause of depression in the elderly? *Psychiatry Res.* 2013;211:180–182.
- White CL, McClure LA, Wallace PM, Braimah J, Liskay A, Roldan A, Benavente OR. The correlates and course of depression in patients with lacunar stroke: results from the Secondary Prevention of Small Subcortical Strokes (SPS3) study. *Cerebrovasc Dis.* 2011;32:354–360.
- Tang WK, Chen YK, Lu JY, Chu WC, Mok VC, Ungvari GS, Wong KS. Cerebral microbleeds and depression in lacunar stroke. *Stroke*. 2011;42:2443–2446.
- Olesen PJ, Gustafson DR, Simoni M, Pantoni L, Ostling S, Guo X, Skoog I. Temporal lobe atrophy and white matter lesions are related to major depression over 5 years in the elderly. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2010;35:2638–2645.
- Godin O, Dufouil C, Maillard P, Delcroix N, Mazoyer B, Crivello F, Alperovitch A, Tzourio C. White matter lesions as a predictor of depression in the elderly: the 3C-Dijon study. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2008;63:663–669.
- 28. Versluis CE, van der Mast RC, van Buchem MA, Bollen EL, Blauw GJ, Eekhof JA, van der Wee NJ, de Craen AJ. Progression of cerebral white

matter lesions is not associated with development of depressive symptoms in elderly subjects at risk of cardiovascular disease: the PROSPER Study. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2006;21:375–381.

- Steffens DC, Krishnan KR, Crump C, Burke GL. Cerebrovascular disease and evolution of depressive symptoms in the Cardiovascular Health Study. *Stroke*. 2002;33:1636–1644.
- Taylor WD, Aizenstein HJ, Alexopoulos GS. The vascular depression hypothesis: mechanisms linking vascular disease with depression. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2013;18:963–974.
- Santos M, Xekardaki A, Kovari E, Gold G, Bouras C, Giannakopoulos P. Microvascular pathology in late-life depression. J Neurol Sci. 2012;322:46–49.
- Wen W, Sachdev PS. Extent and distribution of white matter hyperintensities in stroke patients: the Sydney Stroke Study. *Stroke*. 2004;35:2813–2819.
- Alexopoulos GS, Meyers BS, Young RC, Campbell S, Silbersweig D, Charlson M. "Vascular depression" hypothesis. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 1997;54:915–922.
- Yang S, Hua P, Shang X, Cui Z, Zhong S, Gong G, Humphreys GW. A significant risk factor for poststroke depression: the depression-related subnetwork. J Psychiatry Neurosci. 2015;40:259–268.
- 35. Powers WJ, Rabinstein AA, Ackerson T, Adeoye OM, Bambakidis NC, Becker K, Biller J, Brown M, Demaerschalk BM, Hoh B, et al. 2018 guidelines for the early management of patients with acute ischemic stroke: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke*. 2018;49:e46–e110.
- van Velzen LS, Kelly S, Isaev D, Aleman A, Aftanas LI, Bauer J, Baune BT, Brak IV, Carballedo A, Connolly CG, et al. White matter disturbances in major depressive disorder: a coordinated analysis across 20 international cohorts in the ENIGMA MDD working group. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2020;25:1511–1525. [epub ahead of print].
- Nys GM, van Zandvoort MJ, van der Worp HB, de Haan EH, de Kort PL, Kappelle LJ. Early depressive symptoms after stroke: neuropsychological correlates and lesion characteristics. J Neurol Sci. 2005;228:27–33.
- Teodorczuk A, Firbank MJ, Pantoni L, Poggesi A, Erkinjuntti T, Wallin A, Wahlund L, Scheltens P, Waldemar G, Schrotter G, et al. Relationship between baseline white-matter changes and development of late-life depressive symptoms: 3-year results from the LADIS study. *Psychol Med.* 2010;40:603–610.
- Yakushiji Y, Charidimou A, Hara M, Noguchi T, Nishihara M, Eriguchi M, Nanri Y, Nishiyama M, Werring DJ, Hara H. Topography and associations of perivascular spaces in healthy adults: the Kashima scan study. *Neurology*. 2014;83:2116–2123.
- Sandu RE, Buga AM, Uzoni A, Petcu EB, Popa-Wagner A. Neuroinflammation and comorbidities are frequently ignored factors in CNS pathology. *Neural Regen Res.* 2015;10:1349–1355.
- Lau KK, Li L, Lovelock CE, Zamboni G, Chan TT, Chiang MF, Lo KT, Kuker W, Mak HK, Rothwell PM. Clinical correlates, ethnic differences, and prognostic implications of perivascular spaces in transient ischemic attack and ischemic stroke. *Stroke*. 2017;48:1470–1477.
- Ikram MA, Luijendijk HJ, Vernooij MW, Hofman A, Niessen WJ, van der Lugt A, Tiemeier H, Breteler MM. Vascular brain disease and depression in the elderly. *Epidemiology*. 2010;21:78–81.
- Schweitzer I, Tuckwell V, Ames D, O'Brien J. Structural neuroimaging studies in late-life depression: a review. World J Biol Psychiatry. 2001;2:83–88.
- Ressler KJ, Mayberg HS. Targeting abnormal neural circuits in mood and anxiety disorders: from the laboratory to the clinic. *Nat Neurosci.* 2007;10:1116–1124.
- Choi-Kwon S, Han K, Choi S, Suh M, Kim YJ, Song H, Cho KH, Nah HW, Kwon SU, Kang DW, et al. Poststroke depression and emotional incontinence: factors related to acute and subacute stages. *Neurology*. 2012;78:1130–1137.
- Vermeer SE, Longstreth WJ, Koudstaal PJ. Silent brain infarcts: a systematic review. *Lancet Neurol.* 2007;6:611–619.
- Norrving B. Long-term prognosis after lacunar infarction. *Lancet Neurol.* 2003;2:238–245.
- Fazekas F, Chawluk JB, Alavi A, Hurtig HI, Zimmerman RA. MR signal abnormalities at 1.5 T in Alzheimer's dementia and normal aging. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1987;149:351–356.
- Wardlaw JM. Prevalence of cerebral white matter lesions in elderly people: a population based magnetic resonance imaging study: the Rotterdam Scan Study. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2001;70:2–3.
- Yue NC, Arnold AM, Longstreth WJ, Elster AD, Jungreis CA, O'Leary DH, Poirier VC, Bryan RN. Sulcal, ventricular, and white matter changes at MR imaging in the aging brain: data from the cardiovascular health study. *Radiology*. 1997;202:33–39.

- Scheltens P, Erkinjunti T, Leys D, Wahlund LO, Inzitari D, Del ST, Pasquier F, Barkhof F, Mantyla R, Bowler J, et al. White matter changes on CT and MRI: an overview of visual rating scales. European Task Force on Age-Related White Matter Changes. *Eur Neurol.* 1998;39:80–89.
- Skoog I, Palmertz B, Andreasson LA. The prevalence of white-matter lesions on computed tomography of the brain in demented and nondemented 85-year-olds. J Geriatr Psychiatry Neurol. 1994;7:169–175.
- 53. Dichgans M, Holtmannspotter M, Herzog J, Peters N, Bergmann M, Yousry TA. Cerebral microbleeds in CADASIL: a gradient-echo

magnetic resonance imaging and autopsy study. *Stroke*. 2002;33:67-71.

- Klarenbeek P, van Oostenbrugge RJ, Lodder J, Rouhl RP, Knottnerus IL, Staals J. Higher ambulatory blood pressure relates to enlarged Virchow-Robin spaces in first-ever lacunar stroke patients. *J Neurol.* 2013;260:115–121.
- Yang J, Wong A, Wang Z, Liu W, Au L, Xiong Y, Chu WW, Leung EY, Chen S, Lau C, et al. Risk factors for incident dementia after stroke and transient ischemic attack. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2015;11:16–23.

# SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

#### **Supplemental Methods**

Data S1

### Search strategy for CSVD and incident depression.

Pubmed: 1283 articles until September 06, 2019 #1 Search "Cerebral Small Vessel Diseases" [Mesh] #2 Search CSVD[Title/Abstract] #3 Search ("Cerebral Small Vessel Diseases" [Mesh]) OR CSVD [Title/Abstract] #4 Search "Leukoencephalopathies" [Mesh] #5 Search ((((white matter lesion\*[Title/Abstract]) OR white matter hyperintensitie\*[Title/Abstract]) OR WMH\*[Title/Abstract]) OR white matter disease\*[Title/Abstract]) OR leukoaraosis[Title/Abstract] #6 Search ("Leukoencephalopathies" [Mesh]) OR (((((white matter lesion\*[Title/Abstract]) OR white matter hyperintensitie\*[Title/Abstract]) OR WMH\*[Title/Abstract]) OR white matter disease\*[Title/Abstract]) OR leukoaraosis[Title/Abstract]) #7 Search "Stroke, Lacunar" [Mesh] #8 Search (((Lacunar Stroke\*[Title/Abstract]) OR lacunar infarction\*[Title/Abstract]) OR Lacunar Infarct\*[Title/Abstract]) OR microinfarction\*[Title/Abstract] #9 Search ("Stroke, Lacunar" [Mesh]) OR ((((Lacunar Stroke\* [Title/Abstract]) OR lacunar infarction\*[Title/Abstract]) OR Lacunar Infarct\*[Title/Abstract]) OR microinfarction\*[Title/Abstract]) #10 Search (microbleeds[Title/Abstract]) OR CMBs[Title/Abstract] #11 Search (perivascular spaces[Title/Abstract]) OR cerebral atrophy[Title/Abstract] #12 Search ((((("Cerebral Small Vessel Diseases"[Mesh]) OR CSVD[Title/Abstract])) OR (("Leukoencephalopathies"[Mesh]) OR (((((white matter lesion\*[Title/Abstract]) OR white matter hyperintensitie\*[Title/Abstract]) OR WMH\*[Title/Abstract]) OR white matter disease\*[Title/Abstract]) OR leukoaraosis[Title/Abstract]))) OR (("Stroke, Lacunar" [Mesh]) OR ((((Lacunar Stroke\* [Title/Abstract]) OR lacunar infarction\*[Title/Abstract]) OR Lacunar Infarct\*[Title/Abstract]) OR microinfarction\*[Title/Abstract]))) OR ((((microbleeds[Title/Abstract]) OR CMBs[Title/Abstract])) OR ((perivascular spaces[Title/Abstract]) OR cerebral atrophy[Title/Abstract])) #13 Search "Depression" [Mesh] #14 Search ((depression\*[Title/Abstract]) OR depressive symptom\*[Title/Abstract]) OR depressive disorder\*[Title/Abstract] #15 Search ("Depression" [Mesh]) OR (((depression\* [Title/Abstract]) OR depressive symptom\*[Title/Abstract]) OR depressive disorder\*[Title/Abstract]) #16 Search ((("Depression"[Mesh]) OR (((depression\*[Title/Abstract]) OR depressive symptom\*[Title/Abstract]) OR depressive disorder\*[Title/Abstract]))) AND (((((("Cerebral Small Vessel Diseases"[Mesh]) OR CSVD[Title/Abstract])) OR (("Leukoencephalopathies"[Mesh]) OR (((((white matter lesion\*[Title/Abstract]) OR

white matter hyperintensitie\*[Title/Abstract]) OR WMH\*[Title/Abstract]) OR white matter disease\*[Title/Abstract]) OR leukoaraosis[Title/Abstract]))) OR (("Stroke, Lacunar"[Mesh]) OR ((((Lacunar Stroke\*[Title/Abstract]) OR lacunar infarction\*[Title/Abstract]) OR Lacunar Infarct\*[Title/Abstract]) OR microinfarction\*[Title/Abstract]))) OR ((((microbleeds[Title/Abstract]) OR CMBs[Title/Abstract])) OR ((perivascular spaces[Title/Abstract]) OR cerebral atrophy[Title/Abstract])))

#### Embase: 1904 articles until September 06, 2019

```
#1 'Cerebral small vessel disease'.ab,ti
#2 'CSVD'.ab.ti
#3 #1 OR#2
#4 'leukoencephalopathy'/exp
#5 'white matter lesion*': ab,ti
#6 'white matter hyperintensities':ab,ti
#7 'WMH*':ab.ti
#8 'white matter disease*':ab,ti
#9 'leukoaraosis':ab.ti
#10 #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9
#11 'lacunar stroke'/exp
#12 'Stroke, Lacunar':ab,ti
#13 'lacunar infarction*':ab.ti
#14 'Lacunar Infarct*':ab,ti
#15 'microinfarction*':ab.ti
#16 #11 OR #12 OR #13 OR #14 OR #15
#17 'microbleeds':ab,ti
#18 'CMBs':ab,ti
#19 'perivascular spaces':ab,ti
#20 'cerebral atrophy':ab,ti
#21 #17 OR #18 OR #19 OR #20
#22 #3 OR #10 OR #16 OR #21
#23 'depression'/exp
#24 'depression*':ab,ti
#25 'depressive symptom*':ab,ti
#26 'depressive disorder*':ab,ti
#27 #23 OR #24 OR #25 OR #26
#28 #22 AND #27
```

#### Web of Science: 160 articles until September 06, 2019

#1 4548 TS= (Cerebral small vessel disease OR CSVD)

#2 35200 (TS= (leukoencephalopathy OR white matter lesion\* OR white matter hyperintensitie\* OR WMH\* OR white matter disease\* OR leukoaraosis)) AND Type: (Article)

#3 3659 (TS= (Stroke, Lacunar OR Lacunar Stroke\* OR lacunar infarction\* OR

Lacunar Infarct\* OR microinfarction\*)) AND Type= (Article) #4 11421 (TS= (microbleeds OR CMBs OR perivascular spaces OR cerebral atrophy)) AND Type = (Article) #5 48251 #4 OR #3 OR #2 OR #1 #6 389637 (TS= (depression OR depression\* OR depressive symptom\* OR depressive disorder\*)) AND Type = (Article) #7 2239 #6 AND #5

### Cochrane Library: 160 articles until September 06, 2019

#1 MeSH descriptor: [Cerebral small vessel disease] explored all trees

#2 (CSVD): ti,ab,kw

#3 #1 OR #2

#4 MeSH descriptor: [leukoencephalopathies] explored all trees

#5 (white matter lesion\*): ti,ab,kw

#6 (white matter hyperintensitie\*): ti,ab,kw

#7 (WMH\*): ti,ab,kw

#8 (white matter disease\*): ti,ab,kw

#9 (leukoaraosis): ti,ab,kw

#10 #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9

#11 MeSH descriptor: [Stroke, Lacunar ] explored all trees

#12 (Lacunar Stroke\*): ti,ab,kw

#13 (lacunar infarction\*): ti,ab,kw

#14 (Lacunar Infarct\*): ti,ab,kw

#15 (microinfarction\*): ti,ab,kw

#16 #11 OR #12 OR #13 OR #14 OR #15

#17 (microbleeds): ti,ab,kw

#18 (CMBs): ti,ab,kw

#19 (perivascular spaces): ti,ab,kw

#20 (cerebral atrophy): ti,ab,kw

#21 #17 OR #18 OR #19 OR #20

#22 #3 OR #10 OR #16 OR #21

#23 MeSH descriptor: [depression ] explored all trees

#24 (depression\*): ti,ab,kw

#25 (depressive symptom\*): ti,ab,kw

#26 (depressive disorder\*): ti,ab,kw

#27 #23 OR #24 OR #25 OR #26

#28 #22 AND #27

### Data S2. The definition of CSVD according to MRI characteristics.

WMHs were defined as subcortical or periventricular focal or confluent areas of hyperintensity on T2-weighted imaging, which were assessed by semiquantitative visual rating methods, including Fazekas scale<sup>48</sup>, white-matter grade<sup>49,50</sup>, Scheltens score<sup>4</sup>, Gothenburg scale<sup>51,52</sup> and by quantitative measurements of WMH volume.
 LIs were defined as subcortical hyperintense lesions of <20 mm on T2-weighted imaging and fluid attenuated inversion recovery.</li>

(3) CMBs were defined as small (2-10 mm) hypointense lesions on a T2-weighted gradient echo sequence<sup>53</sup>.

(4) EPVs were identified as round or linear-shaped lesions with signal intensity equal to the cerebrospinal fluid, which were of high signal on T2 weighted imaging and low signal on fluid-attenuated inversion recovery<sup>54</sup>.

(5) Total brain parenchyma volume (an indicator of cerebral atrophy) were computed automatically with a previously described image analysis pipeline<sup>55</sup> and were expressed as the percentage of total intracranial volume. Therefore, articles reporting on any of the above five markers were identified and included.

Def	Veer	Einst suth an		Sele	ction		Compa	rability		Outcom	e	NOS
Kel	rear	FIrst author	1	2	3	4	5a	5b	6	7	8	Score
1	2018	Liang, Y	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
2	2017	Zhang, X	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
3	2017	Qiu, W. Q	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
4	2017	He, J. R	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
5	2016	Arba, F	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
6	2015	van Sloten, T. T	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
7	2015	Park, J. H	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
8	2015	Gudmundsson, P	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
9	2014	Tang, W. K	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
10	2013	Saavedra Perez, H. C	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
11	2011	White, C. L	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
12	2011	Tang, W. K	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
13	2010	Olesen, P. J	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
14	2008	Godin, O	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
15	2006	Verluis, C. E	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9
16	2002	Steffens, D. C	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/9

Table S1. Quality assessment of the included studies by use of the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) 40\*.

Selection 1= Representativeness of the exposed cohort; Selection 2= Selection of the non-exposed cohort; Selection 3= Ascertaining of exposure; Selection 4= Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study; Comparability 5= Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis; Outcome 6= assessment of outcome; Outcome 7= follow up duration; Outcome 8= adequacy of follow up

#### Table S2. GRADE classification for CSVD at baseline and incident depression.

CSVD or not for depression patients or population: patients with CSVD

intervention: CSVD

CSVD	outcomes	illustrative and (95%)	comparative risk CI)	Relative effect	No. of	quality of
markers	outcomes	assumed risk	corresponding risk	(95%CI)	(studies)	(GRADE)
		control	CSVD		(studies)	(ORIDE)
WMU	doproceion	ΝA	ΝA	OR 1.37	8498	Low
VV 1V1115	depression	INA	INA	(1.14 to 1.65)	11	++
I Ia	doprossion	162 m m = 1000	214 per 1000	OR 1.40	6960	very low
LIS	depression	102 per 1000	130 to 335	(0.84 to 2.32)	4	+
CMR	doproceion	154  por  1000	186 per 1000	OR 1.26	3138	moderate
CIVIDS	depression	134 per 1000	150 to 230	(0.97 to 1.64)	4	+++-
EDVS	doprossion	124  mar 1000	159 per 1000	OR 1.33	3048	moderate
EFVS	depression	124 per 1000	128 to 159	(1.03 to 1.71)	3	+++-
otrophy	doprosion	26 par 1000	96 per 1000	OR 2.83	855	moderate
anophy	depression	50 per 1000	54 to 163	(1.54 to 5.23)	2	+++-

The quality of evidence in WMHs is low, because of high heterogeneity and publication bias. The quality of evidence in LIs is very low, because the heterogeneity is high and publication bias is found, additionally, the pooled OR is lower from OR data than from original data. The quality of evidence in CMBs, EPVS and atrophy are moderate, because the heterogeneity is low and no publication bias is found. What's more, the pooled OR is higher from OR data than from original data.

#### Table S3. Meta regression for WMHs at baseline and incident depression.

A. Heterogeneity estimate in model 1.	
Model1: ~age + follow + participants + WMH	Value
tau^2 (estimated amount of residual heterogeneity)	0 (SE = 0.2558)
tau (square root of estimated tau^2 value)	0
I <sup>2</sup> (residual heterogeneity / unaccounted variability)	0.00%
H <sup>2</sup> (unaccounted variability / sampling variability)	1.00
R^2 (amount of heterogeneity accounted for)	100.00%
Test for Residual Heterogeneity	
QE(df = 2) = 1.2188	p- value = 0.5437
Test of Moderators (coefficients 2:9):	
QM(df = 8) = 29.2660	
p-value = 0.0003	

B. Model Results of model 1.

	Estimate	Se	Z value	P value	Lower	Upper
intrcpt	-0.0518	0.4888	-0.1060	0.9156	-1.0098	0.9062
Age						
≥65	-0.1024	0.1167	-0.8773	0.3803	-0.3312	0.1264
Follow						
≥5y	1.5710	1.0048	1.5635	0.1179	-0.3984	3.5404
1-5y	2.2510	1.0568	2.1300	0.0332	0.1797	4.3224
Participants						
Patients	0.8777	0.4210	2.0847	0.0371	0.0525	1.7029
WMH						
Gothenburg scale	-0.1575	1.0385	-0.1517	0.8794	-2.1929	1.8779
Scheltens score	-0.2667	0.3473	-0.7679	0.4425	-0.9475	0.4140
Volume	-1.3970	0.9502	-1.4702	0.1415	-3.2593	0.4653
white-matter grade	-2.1039	0.9171	-2.2941	0.0218	-3.9013	-0.3065

Considering the heterogeneity is high in our analysis about WMHs and incident depression including 11 studies, we pooled the effect sizes using mixed-effects model. The  $\tau^2$  was estimated by restricted DerSimonian-Laird method. From the result of Table A, we performed meta-regression analysis to evaluate whether age, follow-up duration, participants, and WMH assessment methods and found they could explain the overall variation 100%. There was significant influence in follow-up duration, participants, and WMH assessment methods, but not in age. Therefore, we built model2.

#### Model 2. Remove age

C. Het	erogeneity estimate in model 2.	
Model1:	~age + follow + participants + WMH	Value
tau^2 (esti	mated amount of residual heterogeneity)	0 (SE = 0.0158)

tau (square root of estimated tau^2 value)	0
I^2 (residual heterogeneity / unaccounted variability)	0.00%
H <sup>2</sup> (unaccounted variability / sampling variability)	1.00
R^2 (amount of heterogeneity accounted for)	100.00%
Test for Residual Heterogeneity	
QE(df = 3) = 1.9885	p-value = $0.574$
Test of Moderators (coefficients 2:9):	
QM(df = 7) = 28.4962	
p-value = 0.0002	

D.	Model Results of r	nodel 2.	
		Estimato	Sa

Estimate	Se	Z value	P value	Lower	Upper
0.0951	0.4592	0.2072	0.8358	-0.8048	0.9951
1.3662	0.9773	1.3979	0.1621	-0.5493	3.2817
2.0016	1.0179	1.9665	0.0492	0.0066	3.9967
0.7308	0.3863	1.8919	0.0585	-0.0263	1.4879
-0.2021	1.0372	-0.1948	0.8456	-2.2350	1.8309
-0.3691	0.3271	-1.1284	0.2592	-1.0103	0.2720
-1.3970	0.9502	-1.4702	0.1415	-3.2593	0.4653
-2.0015	0.9096	-2.2004	0.0278	-3.7843	-0.2187
	Estimate 0.0951 1.3662 2.0016 0.7308 -0.2021 -0.3691 -1.3970 -2.0015	EstimateSe0.09510.45921.36620.97732.00161.01790.73080.3863-0.20211.0372-0.36910.3271-1.39700.9502-2.00150.9096	EstimateSeZ value0.09510.45920.20721.36620.97731.39792.00161.01791.96650.73080.38631.8919-0.20211.0372-0.1948-0.36910.3271-1.1284-1.39700.9502-1.4702-2.00150.9096-2.2004	EstimateSeZ valueP value0.09510.45920.20720.83581.36620.97731.39790.16212.00161.01791.96650.04920.73080.38631.89190.0585-0.20211.0372-0.19480.8456-0.36910.3271-1.12840.2592-1.39700.9502-1.47020.1415-2.00150.9096-2.20040.0278	EstimateSeZ valueP valueLower0.09510.45920.20720.8358-0.80481.36620.97731.39790.1621-0.54932.00161.01791.96650.04920.00660.73080.38631.89190.0585-0.0263-0.20211.0372-0.19480.8456-2.2350-0.36910.3271-1.12840.2592-1.0103-1.39700.9502-1.47020.1415-3.2593-2.00150.9096-2.20040.0278-3.7843





A. Funnel plot; B. Funnel plot adjusting with "trim and filled" analysis.

# Figure S2A-D. Forest plots of cerebral small vascular disease (CSVD) and incident depression using the odds ratio data.

Α	Study		country	total	event	Ode	ds Ratio	OR	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random
	van Sloten TT	2015)	Netherlands	1949	197			1.08	[0.70; 1.66]	35.4%	35.2%
	Liang Y(201	8)	Hong Kong	725	153			1.68	[1.10; 2.57]	36.6%	36.2%
	Zhang X(20	17)	Chinese	374	90			1.56	[0.96; 2.53]	28.0%	28.6%
	Fixed effect m Random effects	nodel model						1.41	[1.09; 1.82] [1.07; 1.85]	100.0%	 100.0%
Hete Test for o Test for ov	erogeneity: $I^2 = 12\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0$ overall effect (fixed effer verall effect (random effe	= 0.0073, ; ct): z = 2.6 ects): z = 2	p = 0.32 60 (p < 0.01) 2.44 (p = 0.01	)		0.5	1 :	2			
В	Stuc	ly	country	total	event	Odd	s Ratio	OR	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weigh (randon
	Olesen P.	J(2010)	Sweden	525	20			1.85	[0.70; 4.88]	44.2%	44.2%
	Gudmundsso	on P(201	5) Sweden	330	26			2.52	[1.06; 5.98]	55.8%	55.8%
	Fixed effect Random effe	t model	lel		1200-			2.20	[1.15; 4.19] [1.15; 4.19]	100.0%	 100.0%
		01100107.1									
С	<b>5</b> 444				l ourset	0	ida Datia	0.0	05% 01	Weight	Weight
С	Study	/	country	tota	l event	00	Ids Ratio	OR	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (randon
С	Study van Sloten T	7 (2015)	country Netherland	tota s 1949	I event	00	Ids Ratio	0R	<b>95%-CI</b> 0 [0.73; 1.66	Weight (fixed)	Weight (randon 42.9%
С	Study van Sloten T Tang WK( Tang WK(	/ T(2015) 2014) 2011)	country Netherland Hong Kong Hong Kong	tota s 1949 g 229 g 235	I event 197 75 84	00	Ids Ratio	OR 1.10 2.23 2.09	<b>95%-Cl</b> 0 [0.73; 1.66] 3 [1.13; 4.41] 9 [1.07; 4.11]	Weight (fixed) 57.6% 21.1% 21.3%	Weight (randon 42.9% 28.5% 28.6%
С	Study van Sloten T Tang WK( Tang WK( Fixed effect	/ ⊤(2015) 2014) 2011) <b>model</b>	country Netherland Hong Kong Hong Kong	tota s 1949 g 229 g 235	l event 197 75 84	00	ids Ratio	OR 1.10 2.23 2.09 1.41	95%-Cl 0 [0.73; 1.66 3 [1.13; 4.41] 9 [1.07; 4.11] 7 [1.07; 2.00	Weight (fixed) 57.6% 21.1% 21.3% 100.0%	Weigh (randon 42.9% 28.5% 28.6%
С	Study van Sloten T Tang WK( Tang WK( Fixed effect Random effect eterconstitut <sup>2</sup> = 55%	7 T(2015) 2014) 2011) model ts mode	country Netherland Hong Kong Hong Kong	tota s 1949 g 229 g 235	l event 197 75 84	00	Ids Ratio	OR 1.10 2.23 2.09 1.44 1.65	95%-Cl 0 [0.73; 1.66 3 [1.13; 4.41] 9 [1.07; 4.11] 7 [1.07; 2.00 2 [0.98; 2.66]	Weight (fixed) 57.6% 21.1% 21.3% 100.0% 	Weight (randon 42.9% 28.5% 28.6%
C He Test fo Test for	Study van Sloten T Tang WK( Tang WK( Fixed effect Random effect eterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 55%, or overall effect (fixed ef overall effect (random e	T(2015) 2014) 2011) model ts model ts model fect): z = ; ffects): z = ;	<b>country</b> Netherland Hong Kong Hong Kong 3, <i>p</i> = 0.11 2.40 ( <i>p</i> = 0.02 = 1.90 ( <i>p</i> = 0.02	tota s 1949 g 229 g 235 ) ) 06)	l event 197 75 84	0.5	Ids Ratio	OR 1.1( 2.23 2.09 1.43 1.62	95%-Cl 0 [0.73; 1.66 3 [1.13; 4.41 9 [1.07; 4.11] 7 [1.07; 2.00 2 [0.98; 2.66]	Weight (fixed) 57.6% 21.1% 21.3% 100.0%	Weight (randon 42.9% 28.5% 28.6%
C H Test for Test for	Study van Sloten T Tang WK(; Tang WK(; Fixed effect Random effec eterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 55%, t or overall effect (fixed ef overall effect (random e	T(2015) 2014) 2011) model ts mode fect): z = ; ffects): z =	country Netherland Hong Kong Hong Kong I 3, p = 0.11 2.40 (p = 0.02 = 1.90 (p = 0.02	tota s 1949 g 229 g 235 ) ) ) )	l event 197 75 84	Oc 0.5	dds Ratio	OR 1.1( 2.23 2.05 1.43 1.63	95%-CI 0 [0.73; 1.66 3 [1.13; 4.41] 9 [1.07; 4.11] 7 [1.07; 2.00 2 [0.98; 2.66]	Weight (fixed) 57.6% 21.1% 21.3% 100.0%  95%-Cl	Weight (randon 42.9% 28.5% 28.6%
C He Test for D	Study van Sloten T Tang WK( Tang WK( Fixed effect Random effec eterogeneity: /² = 55%, t r overall effect (fixed ef overall effect (fixed ef vorall effect (fixed ef study	T(2015) 2014) 2011) model ts mode ? = 0.106; ffect): z :	country Netherland Hong Kong Hong Kong 3, p = 0.11 .40 (p = 0.02) = 1.90 (p = 0.0) country	tota s 1949 g 229 g 235 ) )6)	l event 197 75 84 total	0.5 event 479	Ids Ratio	OR 1.10 2.22 2.09 1.47 1.62 Ratio	95%-Cl 0 [0.73; 1.66] 3 [1.13; 4.41] 9 [1.07; 4.11] 7 [1.07; 2.00] 2 [0.98; 2.66] 0R	Weight (fixed) ] 57.6% ] 21.1% ] 21.3% ] 100.0% ] 95%-Cl	Weight (randon 42.9% 28.5%  100.0% Weig
C He Test for Test for	Study van Sloten T Tang WK(; Tang WK(; Fixed effect Random effect eterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 55%, t or overall effect (fixed efforter overall effect (fixed efforter) overall effect (random effect) Study White CL(2011) van Sloten TT/2015)	T(2015) 2014) 2011) model ts model ts model fect): z = ffects): z =	country Netherland Hong Kong Hong Kong 3, p = 0.11 2.40 (p = 0.02) = 1.90 (p = 0.02) country Canada	tota s 1949 g 229 g 235 ) )) )))	l event 197 75 84 total 2477	00 0.5 event 478 197	Ids Ratio	OR 1.10 2.23 1.43 1.62 Ratio	95%-Cl 0 [0.73; 1.66] 3 [1.13; 4.41] 9 [1.07; 4.11] 7 [1.07; 2.00] 2 [0.98; 2.66] 0R	Weight (fixed) ] 57.6% ] 21.1% ] 21.3% ] 100.0% ] 95%-Cl [0.65; 2.2]	Weight (randon 42.9% 28.5% 28.6%  100.0% Weig 2] 19.19
C Het for Test for D	Study van Sloten T Tang WK( Tang WK( Fixed effect Random effec eterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 55%, or overall effect (fixed ef overall effect (fixed ef overall effect (random e Study White CL(2011) van Sloten TT(2015) Arba E(2016)	( T(2015) 2014) 2011) model ts mode <sup>2</sup> = 0.106 fect): z = ffects): z =	country Netherland Hong Kong Hong Kong 3, p = 0.11 2.40 (p = 0.02) = 1.90 (p = 0.02) = 1.90 (p = 0.02) <b>country</b> Canada Netherland	tota s 1949 g 229 g 235 ) ) 06)	l event 197 75 84 total 2477 1949	0.5 event 478 197 416	Ids Ratio	OR 1.1( 2.2: 2.05 1.4: 1.6: Ratio	95%-Cl 0 [0.73; 1.66 3 [1.13; 4.41 9 [1.07; 4.11] 7 [1.07; 2.00 2 [0.98; 2.66] 0R 1.20 1.83 0.71	Weight (fixed) ] 57.6% ] 21.3% ] 21.3% ] 100.0% ] 95%-Cl [0.65; 2.2 [1.10; 3.0 [0.65; 2.2]	Weight (randon 42.9% 28.5% 28.6%  100.0% Weig 2] 19.19 5] 20.49 2] 22.7%
C He Test for Test for	Study van Sloten T Tang WK( Tang WK( Fixed effect Random effect terogeneity, 7 <sup>2</sup> = 55%, or overall effect (fixed ef overall effect (random e Study White CL(2011) van Sloten TT(2015) Arba F(2016) Oiu W0(2017)	T(2015) 2014) 2011) model ts mode fect): z = ; ffects): z = ffects): z =	country Netherland Hong Kong Hong Kong 3, p = 0.11 2.40 (p = 0.02) = 1.90 (p = 0.02) <b>country</b> Canada Netherland Netherland	tota s 1949 g 229 g 235 ) ) )6)	I event 197 75 84 total 2477 1949 2160 1212	0.5 0.5 event 478 197 416 110	Ids Ratio	OR 1.11 2.22 2.03 1.43 1.63 Ratio	95%-Cl 0 [0.73; 1.66 3 [1.13; 4.41 9 [1.07; 4.11] 7 [1.07; 2.00 2 [0.98; 2.66] 0R 1.20 1.83 0.71 0.72	Weight (fixed) 57.6% 21.1% 21.3% 100.0% 100.0% 55%-Cl 0.65; 2.2 1.10; 3.0 0.55; 0.9 0.55; 0.9	Weigh (randon 42.9% 28.5% 28.6%  100.0% Weig 2] 19.19 5] 20.49 2] 22.79 3] 17.6%
C Het for Test for D	Study van Sloten T Tang WK( Tang WK( Fixed effect Random effect eterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 55%, or overall effect (fixed ef overall effect (fixed ef overall effect (random e Study White CL(2011) van Sloten TT(2015) Arba F(2016) Qiu WQ(2017) Zhang X(2017)	r (2015) 2014) 2011) model ts mode <sup>2</sup> = 0.106 fect): z = ffects): z =	country Netherland Hong Kong Hong Kong 3, p = 0.11 2.40 (p = 0.02) = 1.90 (p = 0.02) = 1.90 (p = 0.02) <b>country</b> Canada Netherland Netherland USA Chinese	tota s 1949 g 229 g 235 ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) )	l event 197 75 84 total 2477 1949 2160 1212 374	0.5 event 478 197 416 110 90	Ids Ratio	OR 1.1( 2.23 2.05 1.43 1.63 Ratio	95%-Cl 0 [0.73; 1.66 3 [1.13; 4.41 9 [1.07; 4.11] 7 [1.07; 2.00 2 [0.98; 2.66] 0R 1.20 1.83 0.71 0.78 3.17	Weight (fixed) ] 57.6% ] 21.1% ] 21.3% ] 100.0% ] 95%-Cl [0.65; 2.2 [1.10; 3.0 [0.55; 0.9 [0.55; 0.9 [0.37; 1.6 [1.88; 5.3]	Weigh (randon 42.9% 28.5% 28.6%  100.0% Weig 2] 19.1% 5] 20.4% 2] 22.7% 3] 17.6% 4] 20.2%
C Het Test for D	Study van Sloten T Tang WK( Tang WK( Fixed effect Random effec eterogeneity: /² = 55%, t or overall effect (fixed effect (fixed effect (fixed effect (fixed effect (fixed effect fixed effect))) overall effect (fixed effect) van Sloten TT(2015) Arba F(2016) Qiu WQ(2017) Zhang X(2017) andom effects model	T(2015) 2014) 2011) model ts mode ts mode ffect): z : ffects): z :	country Netherland Hong Kong Hong Kong 3, p = 0.11 2.40 (p = 0.02) = 1.90 (p = 0.02) country Canada Netherland ited Kingdor USA Chinese	tota s 1949 g 229 g 235 ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) )	l event 197 75 84 total 2477 1949 24160 1212 374	0.5 0.5 event 478 197 416 110 90	Ids Ratio	OR 1.10 2.23 1.43 1.62 Ratio	95%-Cl 0 [0.73; 1.66 3 [1.13; 4.41 9 [1.07; 4.11] 7 [1.07; 2.00 2 [0.98; 2.66] 0R 1.20 1.83 0.71 0.78 3.17 1.31	Weight (fixed) ] 57.6% ] 21.1% ] 21.3% ] 100.0% ] 95%-Cl [0.65; 2.2 [0.65; 2.2 [1.10; 3.0 [0.55; 0.9 [0.37; 1.6 [1.88; 5.3 [0.71; 2.4]	Weight (randon 42.9% 28.5% 28.6%  100.0% Weig 2] 19.19 5] 20.49 2] 22.79 3] 17.69 4] 20.29 2] 100.0
C Het Test for Test for V Ra eterogeneit	Study van Sloten T Tang WK(: Tang WK(: Fixed effect Random effect eterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 55%, or overall effect (fixed ef overall effect (fixed ef overall effect (fixed ef overall effect (random e Study White CL(2011) van Sloten TT(2015) Arba F(2016) Qiu WQ(2017) Zhang X(2017) andom effects model ty: I <sup>2</sup> = 87%, τ <sup>2</sup> = 0.4122	r T(2015) 2014) 2011) model ts mode <sup>2</sup> = 0.106 <sup>2</sup> = 0.106 fect): z = ffects): z = ffects): z =	country Netherland Hong Kong Hong Kong 3, $p = 0.11$ 2.40 ( $p = 0.02$ = 1.90 ( $p = 0.02$ = 1.90 ( $p = 0.02$ Country Canada Netherland Netherland Lited Kingdor USA	tota s 1949 g 229 g 235 ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) )	l event 197 75 84 total 2477 1949 1212 374	0.5 0.5 event 478 197 416 110 90	Ids Ratio	OR 1.11 2.22 2.05 1.43 1.62 Ratio	95%-Cl 0 [0.73; 1.66 3 [1.13; 4.41 9 [1.07; 4.11] 7 [1.07; 2.00 2 [0.98; 2.66] 0R 1.20 1.83 0.71 0.78 3.17 1.31	Weight (fixed) ] 57.6% ] 21.3% ] 21.3% ] 100.0% ] 95%-Cl [0.65; 2.2 [1.10; 3.0 [0.55; 0.9 [0.37; 1.6 [1.88; 5.3] [0.71; 2.4]	Weight (randon 42.9% 28.5% 28.6%  100.0% Weig 2] 19.1% 5] 20.4% 2] 22.7% 3] 17.6% 4] 20.2% 2] 100.0

A. enlarged perivascular spaces (EPVs); B. cerebral atrophy; C. cerebral microbleeds (CMBs); D. lacunar infarcts (LIs); total=participants size; event=the number of incident depression; OR=Odds Ratio; CI=confidence interval

Figure S3A-C. Funnel plot of the association between EPVs, cerebral atrophy, cerebral microbleeds and incident depression.



A. enlarged perivascular spaces (EPVs); B. cerebral atrophy; C. cerebral microbleeds (CMBs)

Figure S4. A. Funnel plot of the association between lacunar infarcts and incident depression; B. Funnel plot of the association between lacunar infarcts and incident depression after adjusting by "trim and fill" analysis.



#### Weight Weight А Study **Odds Ratio** OR 95%-CI (fixed) (random) Age < 65 Qiu WQ(2017) 1.13 [0.95; 1.34] 15.6% 18.5% Zhang X(2017) 2.28 [1.40; 3.72] 1.9% 8.6% 21.0% Saavedra Perez HC(2013) 1.10 [1.00; 1.20] 55.4% Fixed effect model 1.13 [1.04: 1.22] 72.9% 48.1% Random effects model 1.24 [0.99; 1.57] Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 76\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0278$ , p = 0.02Age ≥ 65 He JR(2017) 1.58 [1.04; 2.40] 10.3% 2.6% van Sloten TT(2015) 1.02 [0.88; 1.19] 20.2% 19.2% Park JH(2015) 8.14 [1.37; 48.29] 0.1% 1.0% Gudmundsson P(2015) 3.84 [1.25; 11.78] 0.4% 2.4% Olesen PJ(2010) 3.21 [1.00; 10.28] 0.3% 2.2% Godin O(2008) 2.40 [1.28; 4.51] 1.2% 6.1% Verluis CE(2006) 1.20 [0.41; 3.55] 0.4% 2.5% Steffens DC(2002) 1.21 [0.73; 2.00] 1.8% 8.2% Fixed effect model 1.17 [1.03; 1.33] 27.1% Random effects model 1.70 [1.17; 2.49] 51.9% Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 68\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.1551$ , p < 0.011.14 [1.06; 1.22] 100.0% Fixed effect model Random effects model 1.37 [1.14; 1.65] 100.0% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 67\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0392$ , p < 0.01Residual heterogeneity: $l^2 = 70\%$ , p < 0.01Test for overall effect (fixed effect): z = 3.76 (p < 0.01) 0.1 0.51 2 10 Test for overall effect (random effects): z = 3.40 (p < 0.01) Weight Weight В Study **Odds Ratio** OR 95%-CI (fixed) (random) Participants = "Community population" Qiu WQ(2017) 1.13 [0.95; 1.34] 15.6% 18.5% van Sloten TT(2015) 1.02 [0.88; 1.19] 20.2% 19.2% Park JH(2015) 8.14 [1.37; 48.29] 0.1% 1.0% Gudmundsson P(2015) 3.84 [1.25; 11.78] 0.4% 2.4% Saavedra Perez HC(2013) 55.4% 21.0% 1.10 [1.00; 1.20] 3.21 [1.00; 10.28] Olesen PJ(2010) 0.3% 2.2% Godin O(2008) 2.40 [1.28; 4.51] 1.2% 6.1% Verluis CE(2006) 1.20 [0.41; 3.55] 0.4% 2.5% **Fixed effect model** 1.11 [1.04; 1.19] 93.6% Random effects model 1.25 [1.03; 1.51] 72.9% Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 65\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0284$ , p < 0.01Participants = "Patients" 8.6% Zhang X(2017) 2.28 [1.40; 3.72] 1.9% 1.58 [1.04; 2.40] 2.6% He JR(2017) 10.3% Steffens DC(2002) 1.21 [0.73; 2.00] 1.8% 8.2% **Fixed effect model** 1.64 [1.25; 2.14] 6.4% Random effects model 1.64 [1.16; 2.30] 27.1% Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 38\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0345$ , p = 0.20Fixed effect model 1.14 [1.06; 1.22] 100.0% Random effects model 100.0% 1.37 [1.14; 1.65] ---

0.1

0.51 2

10

#### Figure S5A-D. Subgroup analysis about WMHs.

Test for overall effect (fixed effect): z = 3.76 (p < 0.01)Test for overall effect (random effects): z = 3.40 (p < 0.01)

Heterogeneity:  $l^2 = 67\%$ ,  $\tau^2 = 0.0392$ , p < 0.01Residual heterogeneity:  $l^2 = 61\%$ , p < 0.01

C Study	Odds	Ratio	OR	95%	6-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
Follow up ≤ 1y							
Zhang X(2017)			2.28	[1.40;	3.721	1.9%	8.6%
He JR(2017)			1.58	[1.04:	2.401	2.6%	10.3%
Fixed effect model		$\diamond$	1.85	[1.35;	2.53]	4.6%	
Random effects model		$\diamond$	1.86	[1.30;	2.66]		18.9%
leterogeneity: $I^2 = 21\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0146$ , $p = 0.26$							
Follow up = 1-5y							
Park JH(2015)		·	8.14	[1.37:	48.291	0.1%	1.0%
Saavedra Perez HC(2013)			1.10	[1.00;	1.201	55.4%	21.0%
Godin O(2008)		<b>I</b> →→	2.40	[1.28:	4.511	1.2%	6.1%
Verluis CE(2006)			1.20	[0.41:	3,551	0.4%	2.5%
Fixed effect model		¢.	1.12	[1.03:	1.231	57.1%	
Random effects model		0	1.73	[0.90;	3.331		30.6%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 71\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.2727$ , $p = 0.01$							
Follow up ≥ 5y							
Qiu WQ(2017)		÷.	1.13	[0.95;	1.34]	15.6%	18.5%
van Sloten TT(2015)			1.02	[0.88;	1.19]	20.2%	19.2%
Gudmundsson P(2015)		i <u>↓</u>	3.84	[1.25;	11.78]	0.4%	2.4%
Olesen PJ(2010)			3.21	[1.00;	10.28]	0.3%	2.2%
Steffens DC(2002)	-	1	1.21	[0.73;	2.00]	1.8%	8.2%
Fixed effect model		0	1.10	[0.98;	1.22]	38.3%	
Random effects model		$\diamond$	1.20	[0.95;	1.51]		50.6%
leterogeneity: $l^2 = 57\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0295$ , $p = 0.06$							
Fixed effect model		6	1.14	[1.06;	1.22]	100.0%	
Random effects model		\$	1.37	[1.14;	1.65]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 67\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0392$ , $p < 0.01$							
Residual heterogeneity: $I^2 = 62\%$ , $p < 0.01$	0.1 0.5 1	2 10					
for overall effect (fixed effect): $z = 3.76$ ( $p < 0.01$ )							

Test for overall effect (random effects): z = 3.40 (p < 0.01)

D	Study	Odds	Ratio	OR	95	%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random
WM	H evaluation = "Fazekas scale"							
	Zhang X(2017)			2.28	8 [1.40	; 3.721	1.9%	8.6%
	Park JH(2015)			- 8.14	11.37	48.29]	0.1%	1.0%
	Fixed effect model		$\Leftrightarrow$	2.49	[1.56	; 3.99]	2.1%	
	Random effects model			3.19	[1.07	; 9.57]		9.6%
Heteroger	neity: $l^2 = 45\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.3641$ , $p = 0.18$							
WM	H evaluation = "Gothenburg scale"							
	Gudmundsson P(2015)		<b>↓</b> → →	3.84	[1.25	; 11.78]	0.4%	2.4%
	Olesen PJ(2010)		· · · · ·	3.21	[1.00	; 10.28]	0.3%	2.2%
	Fixed effect model		$\diamond$	3.52	[1.57	; 7.90]	0.7%	
	Random effects model		$\langle \rangle$	3.52	[1.57	; 7.90]		4.6%
Hetero	geneity: $l^2 = 0\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0$ , $p = 0.83$							
W	MH evaluation = "Scheltens score"							
	He JR(2017)			1.58	3 [1.04	; 2.40]	2.6%	10.3%
W	MH evaluation ="Volume"				0.50	24 - 37		
	Qiu WQ(2017)			1.13	8 [0.95	: 1.341	15.6%	18.5%
	van Sloten TT(2015)		100 × 100 ×	1.02	88.01	: 1,191	20.2%	19.2%
	Godin O(2008)			2.40	1.28	4.511	1.2%	6.1%
	Verluis CE(2006)	_		1.20	0 0.41	: 3.551	0.4%	2.5%
	Fixed effect model		ó	1.09	86.01	; 1.22]	37.3%	
	Random effects model		\$	1.17	[0.93	; 1.46]		46.3%
Heteroger	neity: $I^2 = 57\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0237$ , $p = 0.07$							
WMH ev	aluation = "white-matter grade"							
S	aavedra Perez HC(2013)	1		1.10	[1.00	; 1.20]	55.4%	21.0%
	Steffens DC(2002)	3 <u>-</u>	<u>+</u>	1.21	[0.73	; 2.00]	1.8%	8.2%
	Fixed effect model		¢.	1.10	[1.01	; 1.21]	57.2%	
	Random effects model		¢.	1.10	[1.01	; 1.21]		29.2%
Hetero	ogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0$ , $p = 0.72$							
	Fixed effect model		6	1.14	[1.06	; 1.22]	100.0%	
	Random effects model	2	\$	1.37	[1.14	; 1.65]		100.0%
Heteroger	neity: $I^2 = 67\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0392$ , $p < 0.01$	F 1 3						
Residua	I heterogeneity: $I^2 = 33\%$ , $p = 0.18$	0.1 0.5	2 10					
st for overa	Il effect (fixed effect); $z = 3.76$ ( $p < 0.01$ )							

Test for overall effect (random effects): z = 3.40 (p < 0.01)

**A.** age group analysis; **B.** participants group analysis; **C.** follow-up duration group analysis; **D.** WMHs evaluation group analysis; OR=Odds Ratio; CI=confidence interval.

## Figure S6. Subgroup analysis about depression assessment methods.

Study	Odds Ratio	OR	95%-CI	Weight (fixed)	Weight (random)
depression.assessment = CES-D					
Qiu WQ(2017)	盖	1.13	[0.95; 1.34]	15.6%	18.5%
Saavedra Perez HC(2013)	* 11:	1.10	[1.00; 1.20]	55.4%	21.0%
Godin O(2008)	1	2.40	[1.28; 4.51]	1.2%	6.1%
Steffens DC(2002)	-11-	1.21	[0.73; 2.00]	1.8%	8.2%
Fixed effect model	0	1.12	[1.04; 1.21]	73.9%	
Random effects model	Y.	1.17	[1.00; 1.38]		53.8%
Heterogeneity: $I^{-} = 49\%$ , $\tau^{-} = 0.0117$ , $p = 0.12$					
depression.assessment = DSM					
Gudmundsson P(2015)	1 <del>1</del>	3.84	[1.25; 11.78]	0.4%	2.4%
Olesen PJ(2010)		3.21	[1.00; 10.28]	0.3%	2.2%
Fixed effect model		3.52	[1.57; 7.90]	0.7%	
Random effects model		3.52	[1.57; 7.90]		4.6%
Heterogeneity: $I^{-} = 0\%$ , $\tau^{-} = 0$ , $\rho = 0.83$					
depression.assessment = GDS-15					
van Sloten TT(2015)	戦	1.02	[0.88; 1.19]	20.2%	19.2%
Verluis CE(2006)		1.20	[0.41; 3.55]	0.4%	2.5%
Fixed effect model	섞	1.02	[0.88; 1.19]	<b>20.6%</b>	
Random effects model	Ŕ	1.02	[0.88; 1.19]		21.7%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0$ , $\rho = 0.77$					
depression.assessment = GDS-K					
Park JH(2015)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	- 8.14	[1.37; 48.29]	0.1%	1.0%
Fixed effect model		- 8.14	[1.37; 48.29]	0.1%	
Random effects model		- 8.14	[1.37; 48.29]		1.0%
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
depression.assessment = HAMD-17					
Zhang X(2017)	<b> </b> }	2.28	[1.40; 3.72]	1.9%	8.6%
He JR(2017)	1	1.58	[1.04; 2.40]	2.6%	10.3%
Fixed effect model		1.85	[1.35; 2.53]	4.6%	
Random effects model		1.86	[1.30; 2.66]		18.9%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 21\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0146$ , $p = 0.26$					
Fixed effect model	¢.	1.14	[1.06; 1.22]	100.0%	
Random effects model	<u> </u>	1.37	[1.14; 1.65]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 67\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0392$ , $p < 0.01$					
Residual heterogeneity: $I^2 = 17\%$ , $p = 0.30$	0.1 0.5 1 2 10				
Test for overall effect (fixed effect): $z = 3.76$ ( $p < 0.01$ )					
Test for overall effect (random effects): $z = 3.40$ ( $p < 0.01$ )					

OR=Odds Ratio; CI=confidence interval.