DHA supplementation improved both memory and reaction time in healthy young adults: a randomized controlled trial1–3
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ABSTRACT

Background: Docosahexaenoic acid (DHA) is important for brain function, and its status is dependent on dietary intakes. Therefore, individuals who consume diets low in omega-3 (n-3) polyunsaturated fatty acids may cognitively benefit from DHA supplementation. Sex and apolipoprotein E genotype (APOE) affect cognition and may modulate the response to DHA supplementation.

Objectives: We investigated whether a DHA supplement improves cognitive performance in healthy young adults and whether sex and APOE modulate the response.

Design: Healthy adults (n=176; age range: 18–45 y; nonsmoking and with a low intake of DHA) completed a 6-mo randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind intervention in which they consumed 1.16 g DHA/d or a placebo. Cognitive performance was assessed by using a computerized cognitive test battery. For all tests, z scores were calculated and clustered into cognitive domains as follows: episodic and working memory, attention, reaction time (RT) of episodic and working memory, and attention and processing speed. ANCOVA was conducted with sex and APOE as independent variables.

Results: RTs of episodic and working memory improved with DHA compared with placebo [mean difference (95% CI): −0.18 SD (−0.33, −0.03 SD) (P = 0.02) and −0.36 SD (−0.58, −0.14 SD) (P = 0.002), respectively]. Sex × treatment interactions occurred for episodic memory (P = 0.006) and the RT of working memory (P = 0.03). Compared with the placebo, DHA improved episodic memory in women [0.28 SD (0.08, 0.48 SD); P = 0.006] and RTs of working memory in men [−0.60 SD (−0.95, −0.25 SD); P = 0.001]. APOE did not affect cognitive function, but there were some indications of APOE × sex × treatment interactions.

Conclusions: DHA supplementation improved memory and the RT of memory in healthy, young adults whose habitual diets were low in DHA. The response was modulated by sex. This trial was registered at the New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (http://www.anzctr.org.au/default.aspx) as ACTRN12610000212055. Am J Clin Nutr 2013;97:1134–43.

INTRODUCTION

The long-chain (LC)3 omega (n-3) PUFA DHA is the dominant n-3 PUFA in the brain. DHA performs structural functions and influences numerous neuronal and glial cell processes (1–3). DHA has been shown to accumulate in areas of the brain involved in memory and attention such as the cerebral cortex and hippocampus (4, 5), and animal studies have shown that deficiency in brain DHA has critical effects on neuronal development and behavior, including changes in learning, memory, auditory, and olfactory responses (3). Despite DHA’s critical role in brain function, the capacity to synthesize DHA de novo is limited in mammals, and its consumption through the diet ensures an adequate supply for neuronal function (1). A large proportion of the New Zealand population (~30% (6)) do not, or rarely, consume seafood (ie, the major dietary source of DHA), which could potentially affect cognitive function. Research on the efficacy of DHA, in terms of its effects on cognitive function in humans, by using randomized controlled trials (RCTs) has focused on either end of the life cycle and shown improvements in children with learning disorders (7, 8) and inconsistent effects in older adults during age-related cognitive decline (9–11). There is a lack of robust evidence to assess the effect of DHA supplementation on cognitive performance in younger healthy adults; to our knowledge, only 5 trials have been conducted, each with considerable design limitations, including small sample sizes (12–14), short durations (12–16), and a lack of placebo control (13).

Although the physiologic basis is poorly understood, significant sex differences with regard to cognitive performance have been shown (17, 18). Event-related potential and fMRI studies have shown sex differences in the pattern of brain activation (19, 20). Therefore, it is likely that the response in cognitive performance to DHA supplementation may be modulated by sex. However, to our knowledge, none of the RCTs that investigated the effect of DHA supplementation on cognitive function has examined sex interactions.
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Apolipoprotein E genotype (APOE) is a major genetic risk factor for Alzheimer’s disease with carriers of the APOE4 allelic variant (~25% of whites) at several-fold increased risk (21, 22). Although the evidence is controversial, it is likely that the APOE4 allele also affects cognitive performance in cognitively healthy adults (23). Some studies showed poorer performance on cognitive tasks in healthy adult APOE4-carriers (23), whereas other studies showed no difference (24) or even better performance (25, 26) compared with APOE4 noncarriers. Structural and functional neurologic changes are seen in APOE4 carriers decades before the appearance of any cognitive or clinical symptoms (27–30). Prospective and some intervention studies have shown APOE-modulating effects on the relation between LC n–3 PUFAs and cognitive function, although the results have been controversial (10, 31–34).

The primary aim of the study was to investigate whether a high-DHA supplement for 6 mo would improve memory (episodic and working memory), attention, reaction times (RTs) of memory and attention, and processing speed in young, healthy adults (age range: 18–45 y) whose habitual diets were low in DHA. A secondary aim was to investigate whether sex and APOE would modulate the response to the intervention.

SUBJECTS AND METHODS

This dietary intervention (http://www.anzctr.org.au; ACTRN12610000212055) was conducted at Massey University’s Albany campus (New Zealand) between March and December 2010 according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical approval for the trial was obtained from the Massey University Human Ethics Committee (Southern A; reference 10/07), and written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Participants

A total of 228 adults (83 men and 145 women), aged 18–45 y, were recruited in Auckland, New Zealand. Inclusion criteria for participants were no known major medical condition or disease and not taking medication for any condition or disease, non-smoking, low habitual intake of LC n–3 PUFAs (less than ~200 mg EPA + DHA/wk), no consumption of fish-oil supplements over the past 6 mo, no allergies to seafood, and not pregnant or lactating. LC n–3 PUFA intake was estimated by asking potential participants to record the frequency of habitual consumption of seafood. Seafood was categorized into fatty (greater than ~1 g n–3/100 g), medium-fat (~0.5–1 g n–3/100 g), and low-fat (less than ~0.5 g n–3/100 g) sources (35), and frequency options included never, 1, 2, or 3 times/mo, and 1, 2, or >2×/wk.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fatty acids</th>
<th>DHA capsules</th>
<th>Placebo capsules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmitic acid (16:0)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stearic acid (18:0)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleic acid (18:1n–9)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linoleic acid (18:2n–6)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arachidonic acid (20:4n–6)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA (20:5n–3)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA* (22:5n–3)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHA (22:6n–3)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only fatty acids that were detected at ≥1% of total fatty acids for either active or placebo capsules are shown.

DPA, docosapentaenoic acid.

Blood sample collection and assays

EDTA blood was collected. The EDTA buffy coat (white blood cell–rich layer) was used for the extraction of DNA for APOE analysis. Erythrocytes were washed 3 times with saline (0.9% NaCl) for fatty acid analysis. Fatty acids were washed 3 times with saline (0.9% NaCl) for fatty acid analysis. Fatty acid analysis. Erythrocytes were washed 3 times with saline (0.9% NaCl) for fatty acid analysis. Analysis of APOE were carried out by Canterbury Health Laboratories, which is fully
accredited with International Accreditation New Zealand to International Organization for Standardization 15189, by using polymerase chain reaction as described by Hixson and Vernier (39). Erythrocyte fatty acids were analyzed by using a Shimadzu gas chromatograph 2010 portable to a gas chromatograph mass spectrometer-QT2010 (Shimadzu Corp) as previously described (40). Briefly, a 200-μL solution of 83 μmol/L heptadecanoic acid 17:0 (Σ > 98%) as an internal standard that contained butyalted hydroxytoluene (150 μmol/L) dissolved in methanol was added to 50 μL erythrocytes followed by 1 mL methanolic HCL (3N). Samples were vortexed and incubated for 4 h at 90°C. After cooling to room temperature, fatty acid methyl esters were extracted by adding 2 mL hexane followed by thorough mixing. The hexane phase that contained fatty acid methyl esters was recovered after centrifugation, dried under nitrogen, resuspended with 100 μL hexane, and transferred to a gas chromatography vial of which 1 μL was injected onto the gas chromatography–mass spectrometer via split injection (split ratio of 1:10). The capillary column used was an Rtx-2330 (30 m × 0.25 mm; Restek). Mass spectrometer conditions were as follows: ion source temperature, 235°C; interface temperature, 250°C; and ionization voltage, 70 eV. The injector temperature was 250°C. Helium gas was used as the carrier gas at a flow rate of 0.77 mL/min. An initial oven temperature of 70°C was maintained for 3.0 min, allowed to increase to 155°C at a rate of 25°C/min, held for 6.0 min, increased to 175°C at a rate of 3°C/min, held for 3.0 min, increased to 205°C at a rate of 3°C/min, and finally increased to 220°C at a rate of 8°C/min and held for 2.0 min. The total time for each run was 36 min. The total spectrum of erythrocyte fatty acids in the samples were identified and quantified and are expressed as the weight percentage of total fatty acids. CVs for EPA and DHA assays were 2.7% and 3.6%, respectively. The CV for the DHA assay was 4%.

Analysis of supplements

Oxidation levels of supplements during the 6-mo duration of the study were analyzed by measuring the peroxide and anisidine values by using the American Oil Chemists’ Society Official Method Cd8-53 with modifications and the American Oil Chemists’ Society Official Method Cd18-90, respectively (41). Oxidation levels were below maximum permitted levels. The fatty acid content of the capsules were analyzed by using a Shimadzu GC-17A gas chromatograph equipped with a flame-ionization detector as previously described (42).

Cognitive assessment

Cognitive function was assessed with the Computerized Mental Performance Assessment System (Northumbria University), which has previously been shown to be sensitive to nutritional interventions (43, 44). The following 2 additional tasks were included; the finding As task from the Kit of Factor-Referenced Cognitive Tests (45) and the letter-number sequencing task, which is a subtest of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale III Intelligence test (46). Cognitive tasks used were all standard tasks of cognitive function that have previously been shown to increase activation of the frontal cortex (15), which is the area of the brain associated with the accumulation of DHA, memory, and attention (4, 5). The battery of tests took ~1 h to administer. The following cognitive domains and tasks were assessed: episodic memory (immediate and delayed word recall, delayed word recognition, and delayed picture recognition), working memory (n-back, Corsi blocks, and a letter-number sequencing task), attention [Stroop test, choice reaction time (CRT), and digit vigilance]; and processing speed (finding As task).

The accuracy (percentage of correct responses made) for all tests and RTs in (ms) (only for n-back, word and picture recognition, Stroop, CRT, and digit vigilance) were assessed. See online supplementary material under “Supplemental data” in the online issue for detailed descriptions of tasks.

The cognitive testing was conducted under rigorously controlled conditions (see online supplementary material under “Supplemental data” in the online issue). In brief, assessments at baseline and end were performed at a similar time of day (between 0700 and 1000). On the day before tests, participants were instructed not to consume alcohol, take recreational drugs, or undertake any unusual sporting activities, to have a good night’s sleep, and not be overly stressed. These aspects were confirmed before participants were allowed to commence assessments. Participants arrived at the research unit fasted from food or stimulants (caffeine and alcohol), except for water, for ≥10 h. A standard breakfast was provided before the commencement of cognitive tests. Environmental factors such as noise and temperature were controlled to avoid any distraction during tests. All assessments were carried out on 5 standardized computers, with the same computer used by individual participants at baseline and end assessments. Participants were instructed on the procedure for the administration of the cognitive battery and undertook a training session before administration of the full battery of tests at baseline and end assessments.

Statistical analysis

The sample-size calculation was based on a difference in z score of 0.5 for memory domains and proved a statistical power equal to 0.8 and an α level of 0.05 (2 tailed) (G*Power 3.1.2) (47). The minimum sample size required was 32 participants per treatment and sex group. To test for sex × treatment and APOE × interaction treatments, a total sample size of 179 provided 80% power to detect a medium effect size f of 0.25 (equivalent to a treatment effect of 0.5 SD) at an α level of 0.05 (G*Power 3.1.2) (47).

Descriptive and comparison statistics (independent t test, 2 tailed) of baseline characteristics were based on all participants randomly assigned to treatment groups. Baseline characteristics of dropouts and participants who completed the study were compared, and dropouts did not differ from study completers.

The primary analysis was carried out on all participants for whom baseline and end data were available irrespective of the level of compliance or protocol violations. The analysis was carried out on 7 cognitive domains, including sex (men compared with women) and APOE (APOE4 carriers compared with noncarriers) as independent variables (28 tests). Changes to cognitive domains during the treatment period between DHA and placebo groups were assessed by using ANCOVA models to adjust for baseline cognitive-function test scores and other covariates as follows: education, first language (English compared with other), age, and baseline DHA concentrations. Sex and APOE were added to the model as independent variables to test
for sex × treatment, APOE × treatment, and APOE × sex × treatment interactions.
For all cognitive outcomes, z scores were calculated by pooling baseline and 6-mo data as previously described (9). Z scores were clustered into cognitive domains as follows:

\[
\text{Memory} = (z_{\text{immediate word recall}} + z_{\text{delayed word recall}} + z_{\text{delayed word recognition}} + z_{\text{delayed picture recognition}}) / 4 \quad (1)
\]

\[
\text{Working memory} = (z_{\text{n-back}} + z_{\text{Corsi blocks}} + z_{\text{letter-number sequencing task}}) / 3 \quad (2)
\]

\[
\text{Attention} = (z_{\text{Stroop test}} + z_{\text{CRT}} + z_{\text{digit vigilance}}) / 3 \quad (3)
\]

\[
\text{RT of memory} = (z_{\text{RT delayed-word recognition}} + z_{\text{RT delayed-picture recognition}}) / 2 \quad (4)
\]

\[
\text{RT of working memory} = z_{\text{RT n-back}} \quad (5)
\]

\[
\text{RT of attention} = (z_{\text{RT Stroop test}} + z_{\text{RT choice RT}} + z_{\text{RT digit vigilance}}) / 3 \quad (6)
\]

\[
\text{Processing speed} = z_{\text{finding As}} \quad (7)
\]

Statistical analyses were performed with IBM SPSS statistics software (version 20; IBM Corp).

RESULTS

The flow of participants through the study is summarized in Figure 1. Of 228 participants who were randomly assigned to treatments, 52 subjects were lost to follow-up or discontinued the intervention for various reasons (n = 30 in the DHA group; n = 22 in the placebo group) (Figure 1). The final analysis was conducted in 176 participants [n = 85 in the DHA group (33 men and 52 women); n = 91 in the placebo group (33 men and 58 women)] for whom baseline and end data were available irrespective of the level of compliance or protocol violations.

Baseline characteristics of subjects are summarized in Table 2. Participants were mostly European, had English as their first language, and were highly educated (most having tertiary qualifications). DHA and placebo groups did not differ with regard to baseline characteristics (Table 2) or cognitive tests.
Changes within and between treatments in erythrocyte arachidonic acid, long-chain omega-3 fatty acids, and omega-3 index from baseline to 6 mo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Baseline (n = 83)</th>
<th>6 mo</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Placebo (n = 90)</th>
<th>6 mo</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>DHA compared with placebo</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA (percentage of total fatty acids)</td>
<td>11.2 ± 1.63 ⁴</td>
<td>10.4 ± 1.45</td>
<td>−0.88 ± 1.15</td>
<td>11.2 ± 1.70</td>
<td>11.2 ± 1.73</td>
<td>−0.01 ± 1.29</td>
<td>−0.89 (−1.26, −0.52)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA (percentage of total fatty acids)</td>
<td>0.61 ± 0.34</td>
<td>0.81 ± 0.41</td>
<td>0.20 ± 0.22</td>
<td>0.54 ± 0.31</td>
<td>0.52 ± 0.31</td>
<td>−0.01 ± 0.25</td>
<td>0.21 (0.14, 0.28)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA (percentage of total fatty acids)</td>
<td>2.81 ± 0.77</td>
<td>2.48 ± 0.85</td>
<td>−0.33 ± 0.73</td>
<td>2.71 ± 0.81</td>
<td>2.70 ± 0.88</td>
<td>−0.01 ± 0.60</td>
<td>−0.32 (−0.52, −0.12)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHA (percentage of total fatty acids)</td>
<td>5.28 ± 1.35</td>
<td>7.91 ± 1.65</td>
<td>2.62 ± 1.27</td>
<td>5.06 ± 1.76</td>
<td>4.98 ± 1.60</td>
<td>−0.08 ± 0.88</td>
<td>2.70 (2.37, 3.03)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA:EPA</td>
<td>23.1 ± 12.9</td>
<td>15.2 ± 6.38</td>
<td>−7.84 ± 11.6</td>
<td>23.3 ± 9.59</td>
<td>23.8 ± 9.92</td>
<td>0.53 ± 9.62</td>
<td>−8.37 (−5.06, −11.7)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA:DHA</td>
<td>2.30 ± 0.84</td>
<td>1.37 ± 0.38</td>
<td>−0.93 ± 0.62</td>
<td>2.51 ± 1.0</td>
<td>2.53 ± 1.02</td>
<td>0.02 ± 0.45</td>
<td>−0.95 (−1.11, −0.79)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omega-3 index (%)</td>
<td>5.89 ± 1.42</td>
<td>8.72 ± 1.72</td>
<td>2.82 ± 1.34</td>
<td>5.59 ± 1.90</td>
<td>5.50 ± 1.72</td>
<td>−0.09 ± 0.98</td>
<td>2.92 (2.56, 3.27)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Includes only participants with erythrocyte fatty acid analysis at baseline and 6 mo. Men and women did not differ, and therefore, only results of total treatment groups are presented. P values were derived by using independent t test (2 tailed). AA, arachidonic acid (20:4n−6); DHA, 22:6n−3; DPA, docosapentaenoic acid (22:5n−3); EPA, 20:5n−3; omega-3 index, percentage of EPA + DHA of total erythrocyte fatty acids.

²Baseline and 6-mo values differed significantly within treatment (P < 0.001; dependent t test, 2 tailed).

³All values are means; 95% CIs in parentheses.

⁴Mean ± SD (all such values).
### TABLE 4  
Changes within and between treatments in cognitive-function test z scores from baseline to 6 mo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>DHA (n = 85)</th>
<th>Placebo (n = 91)</th>
<th>DHA compared with placebo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episodic memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>−0.06 ± 0.76</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.63</td>
<td>0.26 (0.14, 0.38)$^{6,6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>−0.21 ± 0.82</td>
<td>−0.002 ± 0.74</td>
<td>0.15 (−0.04, 0.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0.04 ± 0.71</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.52</td>
<td>0.37 (0.23, 0.51)$^{6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT of episodic memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.04 ± 0.95</td>
<td>−0.19 ± 0.72</td>
<td>−0.28 (−0.39, −0.17)$^{6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>−0.07 ± 0.76</td>
<td>0.15 ± 0.62</td>
<td>0.22 (0.11, 0.32)$^{6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT of working memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.10 ± 1.01</td>
<td>−0.33 ± 0.82</td>
<td>−0.51 (−0.66, −0.35)$^{6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>0.06 ± 1.03</td>
<td>−0.50 ± 0.74</td>
<td>−0.66 (−0.90, −0.41)$^{6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0.31 ± 1.01</td>
<td>−0.22 ± 0.85</td>
<td>−0.36 (−0.55, −0.17)$^{6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.57</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.55</td>
<td>0.06 (−0.08, 0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT of attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>−0.09 ± 0.75</td>
<td>−0.03 ± 0.76</td>
<td>0.07 (−0.04, 0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>−0.11 ± 1.03</td>
<td>0.19 ± 1.15</td>
<td>0.27 (0.14, 0.40)$^{6}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes only participants with cognitive-function scores at baseline and 6 mo. The DHA group included 33 men and 52 women. The placebo group included 33 men and 58 women. A decrease in the reaction time of cognitive tasks indicates an improvement. P values were derived by using ANCOVA (adjusted for baseline cognitive function score, baseline DHA concentrations, first language, age, and education). Sex and APOE were added as independent variables to test for sex × treatment and APOE × treatment interactions.

2 Mean ± SD (all such values).

3 Mean; 95% CI in parentheses (all such values). All values were adjusted for baseline cognitive function z score, baseline DHA concentrations, first language, age, and education.

4 Baseline and 6-mo z scores differed significantly within treatment (P < 0.05; dependent t test, 2 tailed).

5 RT, reaction time.
significantly (by 0.28 SDs) in women who consumed DHA compared with women who consumed the placebo. This improvement equated to correctly remembering or recognizing approximately one more word or picture compared with the placebo group.

The RT of episodic memory improved significantly after DHA treatment irrespective of sex, and the DHA group responded faster (by 0.18 SDs) to these tasks than the placebo group did.

DHA did not significantly affect the working memory domain, but the RT of working memory improved significantly (by 0.36 SDs) in the DHA group compared with the placebo group. A significant sex \( \times \) treatment interaction was also seen (\( P = 0.03 \)). Although RTs improved numerically for both sexes after DHA compared with placebo treatment, this improvement was only significant in men (by 0.6 SDs). This result equated to men in the DHA group having completed the working memory task 223 ms (\(-354, -92.4 \) ms) (20%) faster than did men in the placebo group.

No significant effects of DHA were seen on attention or the RT of attention. However, there was limited room for improvement on the accuracy of attention tasks with baseline scores on attention tasks \( >96\% \) (CRT \( >97\% \), digit vigilance \( >96\% \), and Stroop test \( >97\% \)) (see Table 2 under “Supplemental data” in the online issue).

The processing speed did not differ significantly between DHA and placebo groups.

APOE4 carriers and noncarriers did not differ at baseline with regard to cognitive domains. APOE status did not affect treatment responses on any cognitive domains (Table 4). Because no effects of APOE \( \times \) treatment interaction were observed, results stratified by APOE groups are not presented. APOE \( \times \) sex \( \times \) treatment interactions were observed for RTs of working memory (\( P = 0.02 \)) and attention (\( P = 0.005 \)). Both male APOE4 carriers and noncarriers who received DHA showed improvements in the RT of working memory compared with those in the placebo group, but the effect was considerably greater in APOE4 carriers [mean (95% CI) differences between treatments were \(-1.19 \) SD (\(-1.89, -0.50 \) SD) (\( P = 0.001 \)) in APOE4 carriers and \(-0.42 \) SD (\(-0.81, -0.02 \) SD) (\( P = 0.04 \)) in APOE4 noncarriers] (Figure 2A). The large effect in APOE4 carriers was due to both improvements in the DHA group and a worsening of performance in the placebo group. A similar effect was seen in male APOE4 carriers for RTs of attention (Figure 2B) with an improvement in the DHA group and worsening in the placebo group, which resulted in a significant difference between groups [mean (95% CI): \(-0.80 \) SD (\(-1.27, -0.33 \) SD) (\( P = 0.005 \)). The RT of attention was not affected in APOE4 noncarriers.

With regard to side effects, a significantly greater proportion of participants in the DHA-treatment group reported burping and unpleasant breath [burping: 49% compared with 22%, respectively (\( P < 0.001 \)); unpleasant breath: 39% compared with 18%, respectively (\( P = 0.001 \)); chi-square test], but the effects were rated as minor (1 and 2 on a scale from 1 to 10).

**DISCUSSION**

This study showed, for the first time to our knowledge, that DHA supplementation improved memory and RTs of memory in healthy young adults whose habitual diet was low in DHA, and sex modulated the response. DHA supplementation significantly}
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The increased consumption of DHA in the current study resulted in an increase of 2.6% of total fatty acids in erythrocyte DHA levels and also lowered AA:DHA and AA:EPA ratios, which may have contributed to the cognitive improvements shown in the study by altering membrane fluidity and decreased production of proinflammatory eicosanoids (1, 3). DHA is likely to affect brain function by several possible mechanisms as previously reviewed (1–3). Its incorporation into the neuronal membrane lipid bilayer is essential for neuroplasticity, the promotion of neurogenesis, neurite outgrowth and synaptogenesis, and the maintenance of membrane fluidity and membrane protein function, which, in turn, affects the speed of signal transduction, neurotransmission (1–3), and regulation of brain glucose uptake (49). DHA has also been shown to reduce the vascular tone, which is likely to increase cerebral blood flow during cognitive tasks (14). Unesterified DHA, which is released from the sn2 position of phosphoglycerides by phospholipase A2 is likely to influence inflammation via a variety of mechanisms, including the downregulation of inflammatory cytokine production and by acting as a precursor of the docosanoid family of compounds (neuroprotectins and resolvins) that resolve neuroinflammation and inhibit oxidative stress-induced neuronal apoptosis (1, 3).

Memory domains were affected differently by DHA supplementation in men and women. In women, episodic memory improved, whereas in men, RTs of working memory improved compared with the placebo group. Sex differences in cognitive test performance may be explained by the use of different problem-solving strategies by men and women as indicated by differences in the functional organization of the brain when performing memory tasks (19, 20). The APOE4 allele, which was carried by 31% of participants in the current study, is the major common genetic risk factor for Alzheimer’s disease (21, 22) with an ~3- and 15-fold increase in risk in APOE3/E4 and APOE4/E4 individuals relative to the wild-type genotype (21). Although the physiologic basis is unknown, there have been reports that the cognitive response to LC n–3 PUFAs may be APOE dependent. Improvements in attention in >65-y-olds were seen only in APOE4 carriers (10), whereas Quinn et al (32) showed improvements in cognitive function only in APOE4 noncarriers with Alzheimer’s disease. Evidence for the role of APOE4 in the young adult brain is still emerging, but structural and functional neurologic changes are seen in APOE4 carriers decades before the appearance of any cognitive or clinical symptoms (27–30). APOE4 in young adults is associated with abnormally low rates of glucose metabolism that occurs as early as in 20–39-y-olds (30) and regional brain atrophy (50, 51). Surprisingly, young (20–35-y-old) APOE4 carriers have been shown to perform better on cognitive tasks than noncarriers have (25, 26) and showed increased brain activation in the frontal and temporal regions during memory tasks (28).

To our knowledge, the current study is the first to examine the cognitive response to DHA supplementation in younger adults according to APOE. We saw no evidence for a differential cognitive performance with DHA treatment. Although no effect of the APOE4 allele carrier status was observed for the responses in the group as a whole, the data were strongly suggestive of sex dimorphisms. There was some indication that, when stratified by sex, improvements in RTs of working memory and attention with DHA compared with placebo were more pronounced in male APOE4 carriers than in noncarriers. The effects were due to both improved scores in the DHA group and worsening scores in the placebo group. This novel finding of a potentially greater effect of DHA in RTs of memory and attention in male APOE4 carriers requires additional investigation, and the biological basis for the interaction needs to be investigated.

More-robust RCTs that are long enough (≥6 mo) and take into account the habitual intake of LC n–3 PUFAs are needed to confirm the findings of this study and to determine the most effective dosage of DHA for optimal cognitive function. It is important that any future trials of DHA on cognitive function stratify for sex, and this should be planned into the study design from the start so that sex-stratified random assignment and recruitment of sufficient numbers of men and women is ensured. Future trials that investigate the effects of APOE should ensure a sufficient statistical power to investigate the effects of APOE stratified by sex.

In conclusion, DHA supplementation improved memory and RTs of memory in healthy young adults whose habitual diet was low in DHA and sex modulated the response to DHA supplementation. APOE did not modulate the response to treatment in the group as a whole, but there was some indication that, when stratified by sex, APOE may have resulted in greater improvements in RTs in male APOE4 carriers, but this needs to be confirmed in future studies. These memory-related cognitive domains are the building blocks of more-complex cognitive functions or behaviors that are common in everyday life (20, 48). Thus, young healthy adults may cognitively benefit from an increased consumption of DHA.
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