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final\_dat <- read.csv("/Users/ccalmasini/Desktop/Camilla KHANDLE/social\_networks\_paper/social\_nets\_dat\_both\_waves.csv")  
int\_score\_coefs <- read.csv("/Users/ccalmasini/Desktop/Camilla KHANDLE/social\_networks\_paper/Tables/w1\_regressions\_int\_score.csv")  
confi\_coefs <- read.csv("/Users/ccalmasini/Desktop/Camilla KHANDLE/social\_networks\_paper/Tables/w1\_regressions\_confi.csv")  
  
khandle1\_tab <- final\_dat %>%  
 mutate(W1\_EDU\_new\_c = W1\_EDU\_new - 12,  
 W1\_D\_GENDER = factor(case\_when(W1\_D\_GENDER == 1 ~ "Male",  
 W1\_D\_GENDER == 2 ~ "Female")),  
 W1\_SMK = ifelse(W1\_SMK == 0, "No", "Yes"),  
 years\_over\_65 = W1\_INTERVIEW\_AGE - 65,   
 int\_score = ifelse(int\_score == 0, 1, int\_score)) %>%  
 drop\_na(W1\_EDU\_new\_c, income\_num, ADL\_IADL, tot\_drinks\_week, retirement\_stat)  
  
n\_sample <- nrow(khandle1\_tab) %>% round(3)  
avg\_age <- mean(khandle1\_tab$W1\_INTERVIEW\_AGE) %>% round(3)  
sd\_age <- sd(khandle1\_tab$W1\_INTERVIEW\_AGE) %>% round(3)  
perc\_male <- (nrow(khandle1\_tab[khandle1\_tab$W1\_D\_GENDER == "Male",])/nrow(khandle1\_tab)\*100) %>% round(3)  
  
int\_score\_summary <- list()  
  
for(i in unique(khandle1\_tab$W1\_D\_RACE\_SUMMARY)){  
 int\_score\_summary[[i]]$avg <- mean(khandle1\_tab[khandle1\_tab$W1\_D\_RACE\_SUMMARY == i, "int\_score"]) %>% round(3)  
 int\_score\_summary[[i]]$sd <- sd(khandle1\_tab[khandle1\_tab$W1\_D\_RACE\_SUMMARY == i, "int\_score"]) %>% round(3)  
}

The sample characteristics for the 1343 KHANDLE participants included in our analysis are shown in table 1. The average age for participants was 75.378, SD = 6.405 and 40.208 of participants were male. Participants with higher integrations scores were slightly younger and more likely to be male. The distribution of integration score did not differ substantially by race/ethnicity and average integration score was similar for Asian 3.627, SD = 1.24, Black (3.351, SD = 1.326), Latino (3.333, SD = 1.177, and White (3.461, SD = 1.341) participants.

Higher social integration score was associated with better cognitive scores in covariate-adjusted models = 0.066 (0.04,0.092); this association attenuated slightly when adjusting for all covariates = 0.047 (0.021,0.073) (table 2). In race-stratified, covariate-adjusted models, higher social integration scores were associated with better cognitive scores among Asian ( = 0.082 (0.019,0.145)), Black ( = 0.076 (0.03,0.122)), Latinx: = 0.064 (0.009,0.12), and White: = 0.05 (0.004,0.097) participants (Table 3). In models adjusted for all covariates, the confidence intervals were wide and the association remained statistically significant only for Black participants (Black: = 0.061 (0.014,0.109). Lastly, the coefficients obtained using multiple imputation were similar to the ones from the complete cases analysis.  
When evaluating the effect of having a confidante that one sees daily, we found that having a confidante results in a higher average cognition score ( = 0.137 (0.064,0.211)). In race-stratified models, we found a significant association for Asian participants only (Asian: = 0.226 (0.065,0.388), Black: = 0.119 (-0.021,0.258)), LatinX: = 0.111 (-0.051,0.272), White: = 0.087 (-0.046,0.22)) (table 3). We found similar results in the all-covariates adjusted models.