Goodarzi et al, **Health Promotion Perspectives,** 2024, 14(1), 32-S2
doi: 10.34172/hpp.42354
https://hpp.tbzmed.ac.ir

Table 1. Summary of included studies

First author (year of publication-country)	**Age**	**Gender**	**Study design**	**Sample size**	**Determinants**		**Outcome**	**Descriptive measures**	**Analytic measures/conclusion**
					Psychological	**Social**			
Dombrowsky et al. (2017- USA) [2]	>65	men: 24(26%) women: 68(74%)	cross-sectional	92	cognitive status Geriatric Depression Scale–Short Form (GDS-SF),	Engagement with Meaningful Activity Survey (EMAS), social support	Functional Comorbidity Index (FCI) Katz Index of Independence in ADLs (Katz) Lawton–Brody IADL Scale (Lawton–Brody).	Mean (SD), n FCI: 4.07 (2.23), n = 92 Katz: 5.67 (0.56), n = 91 Lawton–Brody: 7.47 (1.06), n = 92	OR (95% CI) Lawton–Brody model FCI score: 0.889 (0.681–1.147) EMAS score: 1.183 (1.037–1.376) GDS score: 1.090 (0.794–1.521) Katz model EMAS score: 0.922 (0.814–1.035) FCI score: 0.837 (0.664–1.040) GDS score: 1.204 (0.883–1.766)
Burman et al (2019-India) [3]	>60	men: 142(57.7) women: 104(42.2)	cross-sectional	246	depression	Marital status, Family type	Functional Status (ADL and IADL)	32.4% and 59.3% were dependent for basic ADL and IADL respectively	**AOR (95% CI)** Widowed/separated 2.3 (1.1-5.2) joint family 2.6(1.1-5.9) depressed 2.8(1.2-6.4) had increased odds of dependency for ADL and IADL
Koc et al (2015- Turkey) [25]		Female: 208 (55.9) Male: 164 (44.1)	Cross sectional	372	-	Social assurance (research made question)	ADL and self-care agency (ESCA)	ADL: n (%) Dependent 54 (14.6) Semidependent 69 (18.5) Independent 249 (66.9)	There was a negative correlation between Social assurance and self-care agency: Adjusted regression coefficient=-0.446
Martin et al (2013-USA) [26]	98	Male: 41(17.5) Female: 193(82.5)	Cross sectional	234	Affect (Bradburn Affect Balance Scale)	Conscientiousness (NEO),	Functional capacity (OARS)	Functional Capacity: Mean (SD): 14.71 (7.50)	Adjusted regression coefficient (SE) Positive affect: 0.46 (0.14) Conscientiousness: 0.01 (0.03) Social Provisions: 0.03 (0.12)

First author (year of publication-country)	**Age**	**Gender**	**Study design**	**Sample size**	**Determinants**		**Outcome**	**Descriptive measures**	**Analytic measures/conclusion**
					Psychological	**Social**			
						Social Provisions (Social Provisions Scale)			
Mattos et al (2014-Brazil) [27]	76.6 ±9.4	Male: 460 (60.5) Female: 539 (70.9)	Cross sectional	760	Cognition (MMSE) Emotional aspects		Functional capacity (ADL and IADL)	Prevalence of dependence ADL: 382 (50.3%) IADL: 617 (81.2%)	**Adjusted OR (95% CI)** **ADL as outcome** cognitive aspects (Temporal orientation; 4 and 5 as reference) 0 and 1: 4.41 (1.46 - 13.38) 2 and 3: 1.21 (0.38 – 3.82) cognitive aspects (reading no vs. yes): 0.22 (0.07-0.63) emotional aspects ((Have you been upset lately? No vs. yes): 0.21(0.06 – 0.70) **IADL as outcome** Emotional aspects (Do you often feel abandoned? Yes vs. no) 1.82 (1.01 – 3.27)
Morala et al (2006-Japan) [28]	65 - 80	Male: 77(38.5) Female: 123(61.5)	cross-sectional	200	Depression (GDS)		functional status (PPT)	Physical Performance Test N (%) 200 (100%) Mean ±SD 19.3 ± 3.9 (95% CI) 18.7 – 19.8 The PPT mean score of this population was 19.3 (SD= 3.9)	GDS (β = -0.20, p = 0.004) was significantly associated with functional level. GDS had a negative significant correlation with PPT (r= - 0.16, p<0.05)
Murat et al (2019-Malaysia) [29]	60-88	Male: 123 (47.7) Female: 135 (52.3)	cross-sectional study	258		Social relations and Social participation (Two self-reported items)	functional status (IADL)	The prevalence of IADL disability 58.1%. mean±SD IADL ability 6.76±1.37	Adjusted OR (95% CI) Visiting friends and/or relatives (No vs. Yes) 5.7 (0.7, 48.0) Taking part in activity/social programs (No vs. Yes) 1.8 (0.3, 5.8)
Nascimento et al (2012-Brazil) [30]	> 60	male: 290 (46.7) Female: 331 (53.3)	cross-sectional	621	history of depression		functional ability (ADLs and IADLs)	The prevalence functional ability 16.2% (95% CI) (13-19%)	**Multivariate model; Prevalence Ratios (95% CI)** history of depression 1.5 (1.0–2.3)

First author (year of publication-country)	Age	Gender	Study design	Sample size	Determinants		Outcome	Descriptive measures	Analytic measures/conclusion
					Psychological	Social			
Ogata et al (2015-Japan) [31]	≥65	Men : 233 (42.8) Women 312 (57.2)	cross-sectional study	545	Depressive state		Functional Capacity	TMIG M (SD) for men: 7.98 (3.67) for women: 9.16 (3.67)	Depressive state was significantly associated with impaired higher-level functional capacity in both men and women. The marginal odds ratios were OR (95% CI) for men 2.17 1.13–4.19) for women 2.57 (1.26–5.26)
Tomita et al (2013-African) [32]	>65	Male: 479(38.0) Female: 950(62.0)	Cross sectional	1,429	Depression		Functional status (ADL, IADL, and PFM)	ADL Dependency 59(3.6%), IADL Dependency 346 (21.4%), PFM Dependency 635 (39.3%).	functional dependence in ADL adjusted OR (95% CI) 2.57 (1.03-6.41) IADL 2.76 (1.89-4.04), PFM 1.66 (1.18-2.33) but the relationship between depression and functional status, particularly PFM, appeared weaker in older age
Uchoa et al (2019-Brazil) [33]	>60	Female: 74 Male: 26	cross-sectional	100	Depression		functional capacity (IADL)	Functional dependency of older adults for performing IADL was estimated at 46%.	a moderate negative correlation was found between the results obtained with the Geriatric Depression Scale (EDG-15) scale and the Lawton and Brody Scale (R^2= -0.4121 p <0.05)
Van der Weele et al (2009- Netherlands) [34]	90	men: 56(27.8) women: 145(72.1)	Cross sectional	201	Depression anxiety		functional status ADL IADL	Disabilities in ADLs (GARS): 36 (17.9%)	Disabilities in ADLs (GARS) depending on the presence of depression: (median, Interquartile range) Depressed subjects and anxiety present: 44 (34–53) Depressed subjects and anxiety absent: 53 (40–60) p-value=0.10 Non-depressed subjects and anxiety present: 34 (30–52) Depressed subjects and anxiety absent: 34 (27–42) p-value=0.25
Wang H et al. (China-2013) [35]	> 60	Male: 719 (46.6) Female:823 (53.3)	Cross-sectional	1542		living arrangements social support emotional support	functional disability (BADL, IADL, and ADL)		unmarried living alone, ß for BADL: -1.262, ß for IADL: -2.112, ß for ADL: -3.388; for all , P< 0.001 Compared with the married living with children only,

First author (year of publication-country)	Age	Gender	Study design	Sample size	Determinants		Outcome	Descriptive measures	Analytic measures/conclusion
					Psychological	Social			
									ß for BADL: -1.166, P<0.01 ß for IADL: -2.723, P< 0.001 ß for ADL: -3.902, P< 0.001 Emotional support (some difficulty vs. severe difficulty) ß for BADL: -1.94 ß for IADL: -2.02 ß for ADL: -3.22 for all P< 0.001 No difficulty vs. severe difficulty ß for BADL: -1.325 ß for IADL: -2.300 ß for ADL: -3.635 for all, P< 0.001
Akosile et al (2018- Nigeria) [36]	60-98	men: 90(43.7) women: 116 (56.3)	Cross-Sectional	206	Depression		Functional Disability (ADL) Functional status Questionnaire	45.5% depression. at least 30% had functional disability in at least one domain	Depression had significant but inverse correlation with FSQ (r= -0.542 - -0.705; p<0.001) domains.
Asim et al (2021-Pakistan) [37]	> 60	men: 214(50.60) women: 209 (49.40)	Cross-sectional	423		Living with family	functional status (IADL, LADL, TD)	Independent in doing their all-routine work: 42.8% The physical functional status decline Partially 35.2%, completely 22.0%	
Bai et al (2020- China) [38]	> 60	men: 770(42.5) women: 1040(57.4)	cross-sectional	1810	-	Social Capital Social participation, social connection social support	functional ability (ADL/IADL)	43% of whom had functional disability	**Adjusted OR (95% CI)** lower social participation 1.60(1.26–2.03) lower social connection 1.74(1.34–2.25) Social support 0.73(0.57–0.94)
Bhamani et al (2015-Pakistan) [39]	≥ 60	men: 506(53.2) women: 447(47.05)	cross-sectional	950	Depression		functional status	Mean ADL score (9.9 ± 0.2 vs. 9.6 ± 0.2) was higher in men than women.	A one unit increase in ADL score showed a 10% decrease in depression after adjusting for other variables **Adjusted OR (95% CI)** 0.9 (0.8-0.9)

First author (year of publication-country)	**Age**	**Gender**	**Study design**	**Sample size**	**Determinants**		**Outcome**	**Descriptive measures**	**Analytic measures/conclusion**
					Psychological	**Social**			
Boga and Saltan (2020-Turkey) [40]	65- ≥75	Men 84 (45.4%) women 101 (54.6%)	cross-sectional	185	Sleep depression mental status	-	ADL		The dependency levels in daily life activities were found to be associated with mental status (r=0.317, p=0.001) and depression (r= -0.297, p=0.003) in older adults living in nursing homes, while it was associated with mental status (r=0.439, p=0.000), sleep (r= -0.349, p=0.001) and depression (r= -0.407, p=0.000) in those living in home.
Cahn-Weiner et al (2000- Rhode Island) [41]	mean age of 81.9 (± 5.5)	men 5(18.5) women 22(81.4)	cross-sectional	27	Depression severity Emotional Status	-	Functional Status IADLs	Based on a median split of the The IADLs Performance Tasks of the Occupational Therapy Assessment of Performance and Support (OTAPS) score, subjects were assigned to a high IADL performance group (mean = 81.7) and a low IADL performance group (mean =73.9)	A total of 49% (Adjusted R2 = .37) of the variance in OTAPS score was accounted for in the final model, and the Executive Composite and GDS–S score were the only significant predictors.
Chiu et al (2005-) Taiwan) [42]	> 65	men 529(52.6) women 476 (47.3)	cross-sectional	1005	Depressive symptoms	-	functional status	Urben: n % (Limitation in ADL: 67 (9.9) Limitation in IADL: 248 (36.6) Rural: [(Limitation in ADL: 34 (10.4) Limitation in IADL: 100 (30.6)	Functioning disability PADL **Total:** 2.99 (1.87, 4.81) **Urban:** 3.10 (1.76–5.49) **Rural:** 3.71 (1.41–9.76) ADL **Total:** 2.97 (2.01, 4.39) times, **Urban:** 2.81 (1.78–4.44) **Rural:** 3.12 (1.34–7.30)
Fillenbaum et al (2010-USA) [43]	≥60	men 2366(33.6) women 4592(65.2)	cross-sectional	7040	Depression	Social ties (Living arrangement : Live with others)	Functional Status ADLs	Mean number of ADL problems was 0.67 (1.08). Nearly 40% needed help with one or more ADLs	**For Depression** **OR (99% CI)** Household tasks: 1.80 (1.54, 2.09) Medication: 2.54 (2.00, 3.21) Mobility: 2.11 (1.64, 2.70), Personal Hygiene: 2.26 (1.69, 3.02) Feeding self: 2.32(1.46, 3.68) **For Living arrangement:** Household tasks

First author (year of publication-country)	**Age**	**Gender**	**Study design**	**Sample size**	**Determinants**		**Outcome**	**Descriptive measures**	**Analytic measures/conclusion**
					Psychological	**Social**			
									1.52 (1.23, 1.89) Medication : 2.41 (1.67, 3.47) Mobility: 1.75 (1.22, 2.51) Personal Hygiene : 2.57 (1.63, 4.05)
Simone et al (2013-USA) [44]	Mean (*SD*) 74 (10.5) range : 51–102	Participants were predominantly female (82%)	cross-sectional	95	Affect	Frailty Status Social, Leisure Engagement, Solitary Leisure Engagement	Functional Status	-	Groningen Frailty Indicator (standardized canonical correlation function coefficient Coef=0.759 structure coefficient rs=0.844, squared structure coefficient r^2_s=0.712) GFI Leisure Engagement (Coef= 0.522, r= -0.663, r^2=0.440), GFI Solitary Leisure Engagement (Coef=0.051, r=-0.274, r^2=0.075).
Suchy et al (2011-USA) [45]	60 to 87	62% female 38% male	cross-sectional	75	Depression		IADLs	35% of the sample reported having one or more difficulties with IADLs. Similarly, 35% of the sample made one or more errors on performance based IADL assessment	The correlations were significant between GDS total with IADL (r=0.385 p<0.001) TIADL performance (r=0.359 p<0.001)
Vankova et al (2008-Czech Republic) [46]	60	-	Baseline data Of randomized controlled trials(Cross-sectional)	308	Depressive symptoms		Functional status	Barthel Index, mean (SD): 89.22 (15.14)	The correlation between GDS 15 and Barthel Index was significant (r= -0.28, p<0.001)
Wong et al (2019-USA) [47]	57–85	-	cross-sectional	953		Social Engagement Social Relationships	Functional Status IADL/ADL	35% of wives and 29% of husbands report difficulties with IADLs or ADLs. Functional status (%) **(Wives, Husbands)** No limitation (64.7, 71.2) Any IADL, but no ADL (20.8, 16.5) Any ADL (14.5, 12.3)	Couples' functional limitations are associated with marital, family relationship, and friendship quality

First author (year of publication-country)	**Age**	**Gender**	**Study design**	**Sample size**	**Determinants**		**Outcome**	**Descriptive measures**	**Analytic measures/conclusion**
					Psychological	**Social**			
Harigane et al (2017-Japan) [48]	>65	men: 8141(47.6) women: 8951(52.3)	cross-sectional	17,092	psychological distress	-	functional independence	Functional independence: High: 16 149 (94.5%) Low: 943 (5.5%) p<.001	AOR (95% CI) 2.32(1.97, 2.73)
Doubova Dubova et al (2010- México) [68]	≥ 60	men: 1587(47.4) women: 1761(52.5)	cross-sectional	3348	depression	Social networks types	functional dependency (BADL and/or IADL)	Dependent: 475 (14.2 %)	Older adults with functional dependency more likely belonged to a widowed network (adjusted prevalence ratio 1.5; (95% CI) (1.1-2.1) Multivariate Adjusted Prevalence Ratio (95% CI) Probable depression 1.9 (1.6 - 2.3) Established depression 2.7(2.1 - 3.3)
Şahin Onat et al (2014-Turkey) [50]	> 65	Female: 93(58) Males: 67(42)	cross-sectional	160	depression		functional status	-	Correlation Between Depression Scores and FAS was significant (r= -0.732, p=0.001) **Linear Regression Analysis** **FAS** **Beta**= -0.503 **r=** 0.783 **%95**= -0.566 **CI**= -0.440 **f=** (1.157) 248.22 **p**<0.001
Hybels et al (2009-USA) [19]	>65	men: 1017 (33.3%) women: 2035	longitudinal study	4162 Base line 3052 first interval	Depressive Symptoms	Perceived social support	Functional Decline	Mean (SD) ADL Limitations at BL: 0.15 (0.61) IADL Limitations at BL: 0.50 (1.11), Mobility Limitations at BL: 0.79 (1.07).	Having 6+ depressive symptoms predicted an increase of 0.12 IADL limitations 3–4 years later (p=0.03)
Kondo et al (2007-Japan) [51]	76.46.94	Female: 280 (48%) Male: 301 (52%)	Baseline data of a cohort study	581	Mental health (Mental Health component of the Medical Outcomes	Engagement status (engagement in the Mujin)	Functional Capacity (TMIG-IC)	-	**Adjusted** OR (95% CI) **TMIG-IC was outcome** Mujin engagement score (Non participation as reference) Low: 1.01 (0.58, 1.77) Middle: 1.03(0.57, 1.86)

First author (year of publication-country)	**Age**	**Gender**	**Study design**	**Sample size**	**Determinants**		**Outcome**	**Descriptive measures**	**Analytic measures/conclusion**
					Psychological	**Social**			
					Study Short Form-36 Health Survey questionnaire)				High: 1.73(0.99, 3.02) **Mental health** No risk 1.00 (reference) Mild: 0.75 (0.36, 1.57) Moderate: 0.67(0.33, 1.37) Severe: 0.35(0.18, 0.69)
McCurry et al (2002-USA) [52]	65	Men: 966(46) Women: 1128(53)	Cohort	2,094	Depression (CESD)		Functional Decline Katz ADL-Branch IADL and decline in physical functioning Rosow-Breslau and Nagi scales	No decline in physical function at 2-year follow-up (81%) and 4-year follow up (75%) no decline in ADL/IADL status at 2-year follow-up (94%) and 4-year follow up (89%)	**Adjusted OR (99% CI)** decline in physical functioning as outcome Depression: 1.19 (1.05, 1.93) Major Limitation in Physical Function (five or more functional limitations) at 4-year follow up as outcome Depression 1.50 (1.17-1.93)
Mendes de Leon et al (1996-USA) [53]	79.65.2	Female (73%)	A Prospective Study	1,103	ADL-related self-efficacy (FES) depression (CES-D)	Social support (two items about emotional support and instrumental support)	functional status (Katz ADL)	Mean (SD) of Baseline ADL Low: 5.41 (0.9), Middle: 5.87 (0.4), High: 5.98 (0.1)	Adjusted model Regression coefficient (SE) ADL-related self-efficacy: 0.180 (.057), P<0.01 Baseline physical Performance 0.051(.007). p<.001 ADL (baseline) 0.593 (.048), p<.001 Emotional support Not available, 0.092 (.082) No need, -0.002 (.061)
Moreira et al (2016-Brazil) [54]	67–92	Men: 43 (41/7) Women 60 (58.2)	A longitudinal study	103	Depression		functional capacity (Katz ADL and IADL)	**ADL(2008)** Mean (±SD) 5.73 (0.82) **ADL(2010)** 5.52 (0.89) p-value 0.0001 **IADL(2008)** 22.74 (2.68) **IADL(2010)** 22.10 (3.46) p-value 0.002	Multiple for IADL decline Depression OR (95% CI) 0.20 (0.04–1.03)

First author (year of publication-country)	Age	Gender	Study design	Sample size	Determinants		Outcome	Descriptive measures	Analytic measures/conclusion
					Psychological	Social			
								Subjects classified as low weight in 2008 (total, 7; IADL, 40% vs. ADL,6.7%) showed in 2010 a more prevalent IADL compared to ADL). It was also verified for overweight older adults IADL 34.2% vs. ADL, 23.7%. For IADL decline (Depression) n (%) Yes: 7 (50%) No: 7 (50%), p=0.03	
Norburn et al (1995-USA) [55]	> 65		Longitudinal study	3485		Self-Care Social support	Functional status (BADL) (MADL) (IADL)	-	**Multivariable analysis** **(Model 5)** **b (SE)** (Social support: MADL): -.01 (.36) IADL:0.80 (.20) ***p< .01*** BADL:0.54 (.31) **(Model 6)** MADL: 0.07 (.42) IADL: .76 (.20), p< .01 BADL:0.53 (.32) **(Model 5)** Level of IADL Disability(Slight disability: 0.91 (.21) Mild disability: 1.30 (.39), p< .01 Moderate disability: 1.27 (.33), p< .01 Severe disability: 0.32 (.49) **Model 6** (Slight disability: 1.09 (-25), p< .01 Mild disability: 1.42 (.42), p< .01 Moderate disability:1.23 (.34) p< .01 Severe disability:0.37 (.48) Level of BADL Disability No disability (referent category) **Model 5** Slight disability: 0.59 (.19). p< .01 Mild disability:

First author (year of publication-country)	Age	Gender	Study design	Sample size	Determinants		Outcome	Descriptive measures	Analytic measures/conclusion
					Psychological	Social			
									1.55 (-62), p< .05 Moderate disability:0 .79 (.49) Severe disability:0 .26 (.82) **Model 6** Slight disability: 0.85 (.20), p< .01 Mild disability: 1.59(.65) Moderate disability: 1.16(.54) p< .05 Severe disability: .45(1.10) Level of MADL Disability No disability (referent category) **Model 5** Slight disability: 1.55 (.34), p< .01 Mild disability: 1.35 (.41), p< .01 Moderate disability:0 .88 (.45), p< .05 Severe disability:0 .11 (.65) **Model 6** Slight disability: 1.57 (.33), p< .01 Mild disability: 1.76 (.51), p< .01 Moderate disability:0 .82 (.49) Severe disability: 1.19 (.87)
Patino et al (2021-USA) [56]	> 65	Female: 849 (54.9) Male: 696 (45.1)	longitudinal cohort study	1545	Depressive symptoms		functional dependency	SPPBscore With depressive symptoms mean ± SD 8.6 ± 1.4 without depressive symptoms 9.1 ± 1.4	
Pek et al (2020-Singapore) [57]	mean age 67.22 years	Female: 167(72) Male: 62(27)	prospective cohort study	229		Social Frailty	functional status (BADL) (IADL)	functional status (BADL and IADL had respective median scores of 100 and 23, corresponding to the maximum score	BADL ^, max 100 BADL in social Non-Frailty, social Pre-Frailty, social Frailty were 100 (100-100), 100 (95-100), and 95 (92.5-100), respectively. P=0. 004 SPF significantly associated with poor physical performance measured by SPPB adjusted OR (95% CI) 7.66 (1.43–41.14) low physical activity 3.66 (1.67–8.02)

First author (year of publication-country)	Age	Gender	Study design	Sample size	Determinants		Outcome	Descriptive measures	Analytic measures/conclusion
					Psychological	Social			
									poor physical performance 17.51(2.63–116.58) low physical activity 4.46(1.37–14.54)
Russo et al (2007- Italy) [58]	> 80	Female: 244(67) Male: 120(33)	prospective cohort study	364	Depression		functional status		Adjusted means of physical function measures(dependent variable) according to depression: (IADL scale score No depression 2.84 (0.14) vs. depression 3.72 (0.25) p=0.003 **(ADL scale score)** No depression: 1.35 (0.13) Depression: 1.75 (0.24) *P*-value : .01 Participants with depressed mood presented a higher number of impaired IADLs (3.69; SE, 0.25) compared with participants with less than 3 depressive symptoms (2.85; SE, 0.14; P = .005)
SanchezMartinez et al (2016-Spain) [59]	≥ 65	Female: 309(50.9) Male: 298(49.09)	longitudinal study ''Pen˜agrande cohort	607	Depression		Functional status (FS) (ADL)	Some 43.3% (95% CI: 39.3–47.4) of the study population experienced FS decline. Physical functional status (At baseline, n(%)(95% CI) 69.1% (65.4–73.0) had no disability, 15.2% (12.2–18.1) had mobility disability and 15.7% (12.7–18.6) had ADL disability	Depression at baseline were associated with FS decline OR (95% CI): 2.92 (1.71–5.02).
Shankar et al (2017-London) [60]	> 60	over half were women	Longitudinal Study	3070		social isolation, loneliness	Functional Status	Analytic sample Problems with 1 or more ADLS (%): Baseline: 15.5%, Follow-up: 18.8%	A unit increase in loneliness score was associated with a 1.08 times increase in the incidence rate of number of ADLs. In fully and mutually **adjusted models,** social isolation IRR (95% CI): 0.96 (.88–1.02) And loneliness: 1.06 (.52–2.15) were found to be associated with a decrease in gait speed at follow-up: Depression 1.44 (1.13–1.85)

First author (year of publication-country)	Age	Gender	Study design	Sample size	Determinants		Outcome	Descriptive measures	Analytic measures/conclusion
					Psychological	Social			
									Baseline difficulties with ADLs 1.71 (1.54–1.88)
Storeng et al (2018-Norway) [61]	60–69	Women 2738 (54.2) Men 2312 (45.8)	Prospective cohort study	5050	Depression	Social participation	ADL/ IADL status	More participants reported needing assistance from another person in any of the IADLs (19.9%) ADLs (2.4%). A total of 20.3% needed assistance in any of the ADL/IADLs.	Depression was a risk factor for needing assistance in one or more basic ADLs Adjusted OR(95% CI) 1.58 (0.91, 2.73)
Wang et al (2020-China) [62]	≥ 60	-	Longitudinal Study	4994	Depressive Symptoms		Functional status	Functional status (IADL) N (%) Worse 1108 (22.2) No change 3031 (60.7) Better 855 (17.1) P-value <0.001	Adjusted OR (95% CI) Change in cognitive function (No change vs. better): 0.903 (0.689, 1.184) Worse vs. better: 1.446 (1.279, 1.634) Worsening cognitive function (yes vs. no): 1.467 (1.305, 1.650)
Almeida et al (2017- Australia) [63]	70-87	1148 men	Prospective longitudinal cohort	1148	Depression	-	functional capacity (BADL IADL)	-	Adjusted OR (95% CI) Men with than without history of past depression and impaired IADL as outcome: 58% (15%, 116%) Current depression at the start of follow-up was associated with increased risk of impaired ADL 1.70 (1.23, 2.34) IADL at the follow-up assessment 3.89(1.88, 8.05) The associations between depression and sit-to-stand and step tests remained statistically significant (P=.001 and P = .006, respectively), as did the associations with at least 1 impaired ADL: 1.62(1.24, 2.12) IADL: 2.36(1.53, 3.65)
Béland et al (1999-Canada) [64]	>65	men: 518 women: 766	Longitudinal	1284 1273 (Follow-up)	Depressive symptoms		Functional status	Prevalence of disability based on dependency in any of seven ADL items was 15.5%. 50% of the respondents were disabled in at least one of 10 IADLs	OR (95% CI) Depressive symptoms (≥16 vs. <16) IADL: 1.7(1.0–2.8) ADL: 2.2(1.4–5.5) Deceased: 2.3(1.2–4.3) Depressive symptoms (No data vs <16: ADL: 12 (1.5-100)

First author (year of publication-country)	**Age**	**Gender**	**Study design**	**Sample size**	**Determinants**		**Outcome**	**Descriptive measures**	**Analytic measures/conclusion**
					Psychological	**Social**			
									Deceased: 25.0(: 3.2-200) P<0.05 for all.
Guo et al (2021- China) [65]	>50	men: 2694(52.2) women: 2460(47.7)	Longitudinal	5154	-	Social isolation loneliness	functional disability (ADL and IADL)	New-onset ADL disability at follow-up, 861 (16.7%), New-onset IADL disability at follow-up, 990 (19.2%)	
Hajek et al (2017- Germany) [66]	>75	Follow up (wave 2: men 807(34.3) women 1542(65.6) Follow up wave 4 men 495(33.3) Women 989(66.6)	prospective cohort	Follow up wave 2: 2349 Follow up wave 4: 1484	-	Social support emotional support practical support social integration)	functional impairment (FI)	functional impairment (FI): wave 2: 4.7 ± 0.8, wave 4: 4.3 ± 1.2	**FI** decreased with increasing **social support** in the total sample β = 0.05, P< 0.001 The effect on FI was most pronounced with the dimension **social integration** β = 0.135 P= 0.000 whereas changes in practical support only affected FI in the total sample β = 0.095, P= 0.014 and changes in **emotional support** only affected FI in men β = 0.078, P= 0.047
Iwasa et al (2009- Japan) [67]	≥65	men 283(39.8) women 427(60.1)	prospective cohort	710	Depression	-	functional decline (BADL)	functional decline: BADL: 306 (43.0%) Higher-level competence: 516 (72.6%)	RR (95% CI) Depression status and BADL decline 1.46 (1.13, 1.89) and competence decline 1.56 (1.18, 2.04)