

Executive functioning

Introduction

Executive functions are a group of cognitive processes including control, mental flexibility, planning, inhibition, decision-making, initiation, abstraction, self-monitoring, and pursuit of goals. Executive functions are important in situations involving error correction and behaviour evaluation in response to environmental feedback.

Method

We have included only systematic reviews (systematic literature search, detailed methodology with inclusion/exclusion criteria) published in full text, in English, from the year 2010 that report results separately for people with PTSD. Reviews were identified by searching the databases MEDLINE, EMBASE, and PsycINFO. When multiple copies of reviews were found, only the most recent version was included. We prioritised reviews with pooled data for inclusion.

Review reporting assessment was guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist that describes a preferred way to present a meta-analysis¹. Reviews with less than 50% of items checked have been excluded from the library. Note that early reviews may have been guided by less stringent reporting checklists than the PRISMA, and that some reviews may have been limited by journal guidelines.

Evidence was graded using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation ([GRADE](#)) Working Group approach where high quality evidence such as that gained from randomised controlled trials (RCTs) may be downgraded to moderate or low if review and study quality is limited, if there is inconsistency in results, indirect comparisons, imprecise or sparse data and high probability of reporting bias. It may also be downgraded if risks associated with the intervention or other matter under review are high. Conversely, low quality evidence such as that gained from

observational studies may be upgraded if effect sizes are large or if there is a dose dependent response. We have also taken into account sample size and whether results are consistent, precise and direct with low associated risks (see end of table for an explanation of these terms)². The resulting table represents an objective summary of the available evidence, although the conclusions are solely the opinion of staff of NeuRA (Neuroscience Research Australia).

Results

We found six systematic reviews that met our inclusion criteria³⁻⁸.

- Moderate to high quality evidence finds medium-sized effects that adults and children with PTSD had poorer executive functioning than trauma-exposed or trauma-unexposed controls. There were no significant associations between symptom severity and executive functioning in patients.



Executive functioning

Malarbi S, Abu-Rayya HM, Muscara F, Stargatt R

Neuropsychological functioning of childhood trauma and post-traumatic stress disorder: A meta-analysis

Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews 2017; 72: 68-86

[View review abstract online](#)

Comparison	Executive functioning in children (< 18 years) exposed to trauma with PTSD vs. controls.
Summary of evidence	Moderate quality evidence (unclear sample size, unable to assess consistency, precise, direct) finds a medium-sized effect showing traumatised children with PTSD had poorer executive functioning than healthy controls.
Executive functioning	
<p><i>A medium-sized effect showed traumatised children with PTSD had poorer executive functioning than healthy controls;</i></p> <p>6 studies, N not reported, $d = -0.52$, 95%CI -0.71 to -0.32, $p = 0.01$, I^2 not reported</p> <p>There was no significant difference in the subanalysis of traumatised children with vs. without PTSD.</p>	
Consistency in results[†]	Unable to assess; no measure of consistency is reported.
Precision in results[§]	Precise
Directness of results	Direct

Masson M, East-Richard C, Cellard C

A meta-analysis on the impact of psychiatric disorders and maltreatment on cognition

Neuropsychology 2016; 30: 143-56

[View review abstract online](#)

Comparison	Executive functioning in children with PTSD vs. controls.
Summary of evidence	Moderate to high quality evidence (small to medium-sized sample, consistent, precise, direct) finds a large effect of poorer executive functioning in children with PTSD aged 7-17 years



Executive functioning

	than controls.
Executive functioning	
<p><i>A large effect showed children with PTSD had poorer executive functioning;</i> 8 studies, N = 270, $g = -0.90$, 95%CI -1.19 to -0.61, $p < 0.0001$, $Q = 9.14$, $p = 0.243$ These results were applicable to ages 7-17 years only.</p>	
Consistency in results	Consistent
Precision in results	Precise
Directness of results	Direct

<p><i>Polak AR, Witteveen AB, Reitsma JB, Olf M</i></p> <p>The role of executive function in posttraumatic stress disorder: a systematic review</p> <p>Journal of Affective Disorders 2012; 141: 11-21</p> <p>View review abstract online</p>	
Comparison	Executive functioning in people with PTSD vs. controls.
Summary of evidence	Moderate quality evidence (large overall, unable to assess consistency or precision, direct) finds a medium-sized effect that people with PTSD had poorer executive functioning than controls.
Executive functioning	
<p>18 studies, N = 1,080</p> <p><i>Medium-sized effects showed poorer executive functioning in people with PTSD;</i> Non-exposed controls: $SMD = -0.50$, $p = 0.002$ Trauma-exposed controls: $SMD = -0.55$, $p < 0.001$ Male gender, older age, war trauma, and higher severity of co-morbid depressive symptoms were related to poorer executive functioning in PTSD.</p>	
Consistency in results	Unable to assess; no measure of consistency is reported.
Precision in results	Unable to assess; no measure of precision is reported.
Directness of results	Direct



Executive functioning

Schuitevoerder S, Rosen JW, Twamley EW, Ayers CR, Sones H, Lohr JB, Goetter EM, Fonzio GA, Holloway KJ, Thorp SR

A meta-analysis of cognitive functioning in older adults with PTSD

Journal of Anxiety Disorders 2013; 27: 550-8

[View review abstract online](#)

Comparison	Executive functioning in older people with PTSD (>65 years) vs. controls.
Summary of evidence	Moderate to low quality evidence (small samples, inconsistent, imprecise, direct) no differences in executive functioning between groups.
Executive functioning	
<p><i>No significant differences between groups;</i></p> <p>Trauma-exposed controls: 2 studies, N = 100, $g = -0.80$, 95%CI -1.79 to 1.04, $p > 0.05$, $I^2 = 83%$</p> <p>Trauma-unexposed controls: 1 study, N = 28, $g = -1.49$, CI not reported</p>	
Consistency in results	Inconsistent where applicable.
Precision in results	Imprecise where CIs reported.
Directness of results	Direct

Scott JC, Matt GE, Wrocklage KM, Crnich C, Jordan J, Southwick SM, Krystal JH, Schweinsburg BC

A quantitative meta-analysis of neurocognitive functioning in posttraumatic stress disorder

Psychological Bulletin 2015; 141: 105-40

[View review abstract online](#)

Comparison	Executive functioning in people with PTSD vs. controls.
Summary of evidence	Moderate quality evidence (unclear sample size, unable to assess consistency, precise, direct) finds a medium-sized effect that people with PTSD had poorer executive functioning than controls.



Executive functioning

Executive functioning	
<p><i>A medium-sized effect showed people with PTSD had poorer performance on executive functioning tasks than controls;</i></p> <p>85 studies, N = unclear, $g = -0.45$, 95%CI -0.55 to -0.35, $p < 0.05$, I^2 not reported</p>	
Consistency in results	Unable to assess; no measure of consistency is reported.
Precision in results	Precise
Directness of results	Direct

<p><i>Woon FL, Farrer TJ, Braman CR, Mabey JK, Hedges DW</i></p> <p>A meta-analysis of the relationship between symptom severity of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and executive function</p> <p>Cognitive Neuropsychiatry 2017; 22: 1-16</p> <p>View review abstract online</p>	
Comparison	Executive functioning in people with PTSD vs. controls.
Summary of evidence	Moderate to high quality evidence (medium to large samples, some inconsistency, precise, direct) finds small to medium-sized effects that people with PTSD had poorer executive functioning than trauma-exposed or trauma-unexposed controls. There were no significant associations between symptom severity and executive functioning in patients.
Executive functioning	
<p><i>Small to medium-sized effects showed people with PTSD had poorer performance on executive functioning tasks than controls;</i></p> <p>Trauma-exposed controls: 7 studies, N = 282, $g = 0.41$, 95%CI 0.17 to 0.66, $p = 0.01$, $Qp < 0.01$</p> <p>Trauma-unexposed controls: 6 studies, N = 399, $g = 0.46$, 95%CI 0.34 to 0.59, $p < 0.01$, $Qp = 0.43$</p> <p>There were no significant relationships between symptom severity and executive functioning.</p>	
Consistency in results	Inconsistent for trauma-exposed controls analysis, consistent for trauma-unexposed controls analysis.
Precision in results	Precise
Directness of results	Direct

Executive functioning

Explanation of acronyms

CI = confidence interval, g = Hedges' g standardised mean difference, I^2 = the percentage of the variability in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (chance), N = number of participants, p = statistical probability of obtaining a result, Q = test for heterogeneity, vs. = versus



Executive functioning

Explanation of technical terms

* Bias has the potential to affect reviews of both RCT and observational studies. Forms of bias include; reporting bias – selective reporting of results; publication bias - trials that are not formally published tend to show less effect than published trials, further if there are statistically significant differences between groups in a trial, these trial results tend to get published before those of trials without significant differences; language bias – only including English language reports; funding bias - source of funding for the primary research with selective reporting of results within primary studies; outcome variable selection bias; database bias - including reports from some databases and not others; citation bias - preferential citation of authors. Trials can also be subject to bias when evaluators are not blind to treatment condition and selection bias of participants if trial samples are small⁹.

† Different effect measures are reported by different reviews.

Prevalence refers to how many existing cases there are at a particular point in time. Incidence refers to how many new cases there are per population in a specified time period. Incidence is usually reported as the number of new cases per 100,000 people per year. Alternatively some studies present the number of new cases that have accumulated over several years against a person-years denominator. This denominator is the sum of individual units of time that the persons in the population are at risk of becoming a case. It takes into account the size of the underlying population sample and its age structure over the duration of observation.

Reliability and validity refers to how accurate the instrument is. Sensitivity is the proportion of actual positives that are correctly identified

(100% sensitivity = correct identification of all actual positives) and specificity is the proportion of negatives that are correctly identified (100% specificity = not identifying anyone as positive if they are truly not).

Weighted mean difference scores refer to mean differences between treatment and comparison groups after treatment (or occasionally pre to post treatment) and in a randomised trial there is an assumption that both groups are comparable on this measure prior to treatment. Standardised mean differences are divided by the pooled standard deviation (or the standard deviation of one group when groups are homogenous) that allows results from different scales to be combined and compared. Each study's mean difference is then given a weighting depending on the size of the sample and the variability in the data. Less than 0.4 represents a small effect, around 0.5 a medium effect, and over 0.8 represents a large effect⁹.

Odds ratio (OR) or relative risk (RR) refers to the probability of a reduction (< 1) or an increase (> 1) in a particular outcome in a treatment group, or a group exposed to a risk factor, relative to the comparison group. For example, a RR of 0.75 translates to a reduction in risk of an outcome of 25% relative to those not receiving the treatment or not exposed to the risk factor. Conversely, a RR of 1.25 translates to an increased risk of 25% relative to those not receiving treatment or not having been exposed to a risk factor. A RR or OR of 1.00 means there is no difference between groups. A medium effect is considered if $RR > 2$ or < 0.5 and a large effect if $RR > 5$ or < 0.2 ¹⁰. InOR stands for logarithmic OR where a InOR of 0 shows no difference between groups. Hazard ratios measure the effect of an explanatory variable on the hazard or risk of an event.

Correlation coefficients (eg, r) indicate the strength of association or relationship



Executive functioning

between variables. They can provide an indirect indication of prediction, but do not confirm causality due to possible and often unforeseen confounding variables. An r of 0.10 represents a weak association, 0.25 a medium association and 0.40 and over represents a strong association. Unstandardised (b) regression coefficients indicate the average change in the dependent variable associated with a 1 unit change in the independent variable, statistically controlling for the other independent variables. Standardised regression coefficients represent the change being in units of standard deviations to allow comparison across different scales.

limit crosses an effect size of 0.5 in either direction, and for binary and correlation data, an effect size of 0.25. GRADE also recommends downgrading the evidence when sample size is smaller than 300 (for binary data) and 400 (for continuous data), although for some topics, these criteria should be relaxed¹¹.

‡ Inconsistency refers to differing estimates of effect across studies (i.e. heterogeneity or variability in results) that is not explained by subgroup analyses and therefore reduces confidence in the effect estimate. I^2 is the percentage of the variability in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (chance) - 0% to 40%: heterogeneity might not be important, 30% to 60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity, 50% to 90%: may represent considerable heterogeneity and over this is considerable heterogeneity. I^2 can be calculated from Q (chi-square) for the test of heterogeneity with the following formula⁹;

$$I^2 = \left(\frac{Q - df}{Q} \right) \times 100\%$$

|| Indirectness of comparison occurs when a comparison of intervention A versus B is not available but A was compared with C and B was compared with C that allows indirect comparisons of the magnitude of effect of A versus B. Indirectness of population, comparator and/or outcome can also occur when the available evidence regarding a particular population, intervention, comparator, or outcome is not available and is therefore inferred from available evidence. These inferred treatment effect sizes are of lower quality than those gained from head-to-head comparisons of A and B.

§ Imprecision refers to wide confidence intervals indicating a lack of confidence in the effect estimate. Based on GRADE recommendations, a result for continuous data (standardised mean differences, not weighted mean differences) is considered imprecise if the upper or lower confidence



Executive functioning

References

1. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group (2009): Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *British Medical Journal* 151: 264-9.
2. GRADE Working Group (2004): Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *British Medical Journal* 328: 1490.
3. Malarbi S, Abu-Rayya HM, Muscara F, Stargatt R (2017): Neuropsychological functioning of childhood trauma and post-traumatic stress disorder: A meta-analysis. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 72: 68-86.
4. Polak AR, Witteveen AB, Reitsma JB, Olf M (2012): The role of executive function in posttraumatic stress disorder: a systematic review. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 141: 11-21.
5. Schuitevoerder S, Rosen JW, Twamley EW, Ayers CR, Sones H, Lohr JB, et al. (2013): A meta-analysis of cognitive functioning in older adults with PTSD. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders* 27: 550-8.
6. Scott JC, Matt GE, Wrocklage KM, Crnich C, Jordan J, Southwick SM, et al. (2015): A quantitative meta-analysis of neurocognitive functioning in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Psychological Bulletin* 141: 105-40.
7. Woon FL, Farrer TJ, Braman CR, Mabey JK, Hedges DW (2017): A meta-analysis of the relationship between symptom severity of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and executive function. *Cognitive Neuropsychiatry* 22: 1-16.
8. Masson M, East-Richard C, Cellard C (2016): A meta-analysis on the impact of psychiatric disorders and maltreatment on cognition. *Neuropsychology* 30: 143-56.
9. Cochrane Collaboration (2008): Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Accessed 24/06/2011.
10. Rosenthal JA (1996): Qualitative Descriptors of Strength of Association and Effect Size. *Journal of Social Service Research* 21: 37-59.
11. GRADEpro (2008): [Computer program]. Jan Brozek, Andrew Oxman, Holger Schünemann. *Version 3.2 for Windows*