**Additional file 1.** CIAC review groups: dossier distribution and primary endpoint event decisions

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total cases assigned**  ***N* (%)** | **Cases not meeting event criteria *n* (%)** | **Cases meeting event criteria  *n* (%)** | |
| **Review group\*** |  |  | **MCI** | **AD** |
| A | 76 (100) | 65 (85.5) | 11 (14.5) | 0 (0.0) |
| B | 94 (100) | 80 (85.1) | 13 (13.8) | 1 (1.1) |
| C | 76 (100) | 69 (90.8) | 7 (9.2) | 0 (0.0) |
| D | 80 (100) | 67 (83.8) | 13 (16.2) | 0 (0.0) |
| E | 78 (100) | 68 (87.2) | 8 (10.3) | 2 (2.5) |
| F | 72 (100) | 55 (76.4) | 17 (23.6) | 0 (0.0) |
| G | 93 (100) | 78 (83.9) | 15 (16.1) | 0 (0.0) |
| H | 79 (100) | 70 (88.6) | 8 (10.1) | 1 (1.3) |
| Total | 648 (100) | 552 (85.2) | 92 (14.2) | 4 (0.6) |

A through H are each of eight possible combinations of six reviewing members. Participants meeting criteria for adjudication had their cases randomly assigned to one of eight review groups. (Note: initially, the first 35 dossiers were alternately assigned to only two groups – B or G – before the random assignment to eight was implemented.) This table lists how the dossiers were distributed and summarizes the results of the event decisions. \*Each group was comprised of three CIAC members: one neurologist, one neuropsychologist, and one psychiatrist. AD, Alzheimer’s disease; CIAC, Cognitive Impairment Adjudication Committee; MCI, mild cognitive impairment