

PENDING - Lender



40919975

GENERAL RECORD INFORMATION

Request Identifier: 40919975

Status: PENDING 20080318

Request Date: 20080318

Source: FSILLSTF

MAR 19 2008

OCLC Number: 36249364

Borrower: TEU

Need Before: 20080417

Receive Date:

Renewal Request:

Due Date:

New Due Date:

Lenders: *UCH

Request Type: Copy

online

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Call Number:

Title: Dementia and geriatric cognitive disorders.

ISSN: 1420-8008

Imprint: Basel ;, New York : Karger, 1997 9999

Article: Characterizations of everyday functioning...

Volume: ~~44~~ 25:4

Date: 2008

Pages: 359-365

Verified: WorldCat CODEN: DGCDX Desc: v. : Type: Serial, Internet Resource

MY LIBRARY'S HOLDINGS INFORMATION

LHR Summary: v.8-(1997-)

Lending Policies: Unknown / Unknown

Location: UCHH

Note: [Online=v.9:no.1 1998- . Campus use only.]

Format: unspecified

BORROWING INFORMATION

Patron: Giovannetti, Tania

Ship To: Paley Library ILL/Temple University/1210 W. Berks St./Philadelphia, PA 19122

Bill To: Paley Library ILL/Temple University/1210 W. Berks St./Philadelphia, PA 19122

Ship Via: Ariel 155.247.55.82; IDS #218

Electronic Delivery: Ariel (FTP) - 155.247.55.82

Maximum Cost: IFM - 30

Copyright Compliance: CCG

Fax: 215-204-0753 ARIEL: 155.247.55.82

Email: teuill@temple.edu

Affiliation: PALCI SHARES

Interlibrary Loan / University of Connecticut Health Center Library
(860) 679-2940

The top of this sheet has been stamped. After "Bill" is the amount you will be charged for this request. Following that is a series of letters indicating how you will be charged.

E = EFTS I = IFM CC = Credit Card DA = Deposit Account MI = Monthly Invoice

THIS IS NOT AN INVOICE Please wait for invoice to arrive before sending payment

Basic fill = \$11 Fax surcharge = \$11 Rush surcharge = \$5 Courier surcharge = \$11/package

NOTICE: This photocopy may be protected by copyright.

Characterization of Everyday Functioning in Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Direct Assessment Approach

Tania Giovannetti^a Brianne Magouirk Bettcher^a Laura Brennan^a
David J. Libon^b Marykate Burke^a Katia Duey^a Christine Nieves^a
Denene Wambach^a

^aDepartment of Psychology, Temple University, and ^bDepartment of Neurology, Drexel College of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pa., USA

Key Words

Mild cognitive impairment · Activities of daily living ·
Naturalistic action · Alzheimer's disease

Abstract

Aims: To evaluate the degree and pattern of functional difficulties in mild cognitive impairment (MCI) via direct observation of everyday task performance. **Methods:** MCI (n = 25), mild Alzheimer's disease (AD; n = 25), and control (n = 18) participants performed three everyday tasks of increasing complexity. **Results:** Although caregivers reported no functional difficulties in MCI, direct observation measures of overall impairment and total errors showed MCI participants performed worse than controls, but better than AD participants, even on simple tasks. MCI and control participants exhibited significantly more difficulty performing steps accurately (i.e. commission errors) than completing task steps (i.e. omission errors), but AD participants showed an even distribution of commissions and omissions. **Conclusions:** Diagnostic criteria for MCI should specify mild functional deficits due to the inefficient and imprecise execution of task steps. Functional deficits characterized by omission of major task segments may indicate a diagnosis of dementia.

Copyright © 2008 S. Karger AG, Basel

Introduction

The diagnostic criteria for mild cognitive impairment (MCI) have been controversial, particularly regarding whether functional difficulties should be considered a core feature of the syndrome. However, a consensus is gradually emerging on this topic, as most recent studies have concluded that mild difficulties on complex everyday tasks are common in MCI [1–3]. With the exception of one study [4], recent investigations have used self-/informant-reporting instruments to assess everyday functioning in MCI [5–10]. Ratings may be biased by informant characteristics [11–15], patients' specific pattern of action difficulties [16] and variability in individuals' daily routines. Moreover, most ratings simply denote the presence/absence of problems [17, 18]. Thus, direct observation of everyday task performance is necessary to confirm functional difficulties and to characterize the nature of these deficits, if present.

Griffith et al. [4] have reported the only study to directly examine everyday functioning in MCI using a standardized measure of financial abilities. Their findings revealed that (1) specific domains of performance were more impaired than others (e.g. checkbook management vs. transactions), (2) MCI and control participants

differed on only the more complex financial tasks, and (3) MCI participants did not differ from controls in their financial *knowledge* but were not always capable of *applying* this knowledge to the task. The present study builds upon the work of Griffith et al. [4] by evaluating performance on everyday tasks (e.g. preparing toast and coffee) in people with MCI using the Naturalistic Action Test (NAT) [19, 20], a direct-observation measure that includes three tasks of increasing complexity and a comprehensive scoring method for quantifying and classifying errors.

Three hypotheses were tested: (1) MCI participants will demonstrate an intermediate level of impairment on everyday tasks relative to healthy controls and mild AD participants; (2) MCI participants' general performance pattern will suggest difficulties in efficiently applying preserved task knowledge to the smooth execution of everyday tasks, and (3) MCI participants will show functional difficulties relative to controls on only complex everyday tasks.

Methods

Participants

Twenty-five MCI and 25 mild AD participants were recruited from a memory assessment program that included a multidisciplinary clinical evaluation. Patient diagnoses were made at an interdisciplinary team conference based on established criteria [1, 2, 21] and clinical data. All MCI and AD participants underwent the same evaluation procedures, including a comprehensive neuropsychological assessment of language (Boston Naming Test [22] and Animal Fluency [23]), executive functioning (Mental Control [24] and Phonemic Fluency [25]) and episodic memory (Philadelphia Verbal Learning Test-Discriminability Index [26, 27]).

Individuals diagnosed with MCI reported a decline in cognitive functioning, obtained MMSE scores in the normal range (≥ 25) [28], reported preserved activities of daily living (confirmed via informant report) [29], were not depressed (Geriatric Depression Scale ≤ 10) [30], demonstrated impairment in one or more domains of cognitive functioning (i.e. ± 1.5 SD from age/education matched normative M on aforementioned neuropsychological tests¹) and did not meet criteria for dementia [21, 31].

Individuals diagnosed with AD exhibited mild dementia (MMSE = 18–27) and met the criteria for probable AD [21], including impairment in memory [26, 27] and one or more additional domains of cognitive functioning [22–25], progressive worsening of memory and other cognitive functions, and impaired activities of daily living [29].

¹ A cut score of ± 1.5 SD was arbitrarily selected for this study. The currently accepted criteria for MCI [1, 2] do not specify cut scores for determining 'impairment' on neuropsychological tests. The guidelines state only that ± 1.5 SD cut scores have been used frequently by investigators [1].

Eighteen healthy controls were recruited from the community. The controls did not undergo a formal clinical evaluation and were not administered neuropsychological tests. They were screened for dementia and other exclusion criteria via extensive clinical interview. All controls denied cognitive and functional difficulties and were living independently. Exclusion criteria for all participants included evidence of cortical stroke on neuroimaging/neurologic exam/medical record, insufficient attention to tolerate testing, and/or history of neurological illness (other than dementia for AD and MCI participants), long-standing psychiatric illness, or medical/systemic diseases that affect cognitive functioning.

Procedures

This project was approved by the IRB overseeing the outpatient program. All participants gave informed consent to be videotaped while they performed the NAT in the laboratory.

Naturalistic Action Test (NAT)

The NAT includes 3 items: (1) prepare toast with butter and jelly and prepare coffee with cream and sugar; (2) wrap a gift while salient distractor objects (e.g. garden shears, electric tape) are included on the tabletop, and (3) pack a lunchbox with a sandwich, snack, and a drink and pack a schoolbag with supplies for school while several necessary objects (e.g. thermos lids) are stored out of view in a drawer containing potentially distracting objects (spatula, thread, etc.). Item 3 has been shown to be more difficult than both items 1 and 2 for older adults and other populations [19, 20, 32]. The NAT has good psychometric properties [19, 20], even for adults over age 60 [17, 18, 32–36]. Studies have shown that NAT variables are not affected by education, gender, or motor difficulties [19, 20, 34, 35, 37, 38].

For this study, the following variables were collected from videotape of each participant's NAT performance:

NAT Score. Overall level of performance/impairment. This score combines the percentage of task steps completed with the sum of a subset of key errors that reliably distinguish neurological patients from healthy controls. A score ranging from 0 (accomplishment score $< 50\%$ and 0 or more errors) to 6 (accomplishment score = 100% and < 2 errors) is assigned to each NAT item and summed to equal the NAT score (range = 0–18). A cut score of 13 has been shown to reliably discriminate patients with mild dementia from controls [32]. If MCI participants show an intermediate level of everyday action impairment relative to controls and mild AD participants (hypothesis 1), then we predicted that NAT scores for MCI participants should be significantly lower than controls and significantly higher than AD participants.

Comprehensive Error Score. The total number of errors made on the NAT, including omissions and commissions (table 1). The total number of all errors was compared across groups. Additionally, commission errors were combined and analyzed as a separate error category from omissions and action additions, as prior studies have shown that these error types reflect dissociable constructs, with omission errors best predicted by general dementia severity and episodic memory impairment and commission errors predicted by executive dysfunction [16]. To evaluate the distribution of error types independent of error rate across groups, the proportion of each error category was calculated from the total number of errors (e.g. proportion omission = total omissions/total comprehensive error score). If MCI participants experience

Table 1. NAT comprehensive error score categories [19, 20]

Error category	Definitions	Examples from toast and coffee (item 1) and present (item 2) tasks	
Omission	a step or subtask is not performed	does not add sugar to coffee	
Commission*	Substitution	semantically related or perceptually similar alternate object used in place of target object	spreads butter on toast with spoon instead of knife
	Anticipation-omission	anticipation of a step which entails a subsequent omission (anticipation-omission), steps or subtasks are performed in reverse order (reversal)	applies butter on bread, without first toasting bread; applies jelly on bread, then applies butter
	Perseveration	a step or subtask is performed more than once; an action is performed repetitively or for an excessive amount of time	toasts multiple slices of bread
	Quality	task performance is grossly inadequate	pours too much cream into coffee so that the cup overflows
	Gesture substitution	correct object is used, but with an inappropriate gesture	grasps knife incorrectly
	Spatial misorientation	object is misoriented relative to the hand/body or another object	misorients wrapping paper with respect to the gift
	Spatial misestimation	the spatial relationship between objects is incorrect	cuts too small a piece of wrapping paper
	Tool omission	action is performed without a tool/implement	rips wrapping paper (i.e. does not use scissors)
Action-addition	performance of an action not readily interpreted as a task step	eats toast; puts tape on garden shears	

* Commission errors entail task steps that are performed inaccurately. However, in the case of commissions, the steps are easily identified as relevant to the task and necessary to achieve the task objective.

difficulties efficiently applying preserved task knowledge to the smooth execution of everyday tasks (hypothesis 2), then we predicted a Group × Error Type interaction, with MCI participants, unlike mild AD participants, showing a higher proportion of commissions than omissions. This error pattern would suggest that MCI participants possessed sufficient task knowledge to achieve the major task objectives, but failed to apply this knowledge in a direct and efficient manner. By contrast, we expected that mild AD patients would show both degraded task knowledge and inefficient task execution (i.e. a comparable distribution of omissions and commissions).

Finally, to compare error rates across NAT items, Standardized Error Scores were calculated based on the maximum number of errors possible on each item as enumerated in the test manual [19, 20]. If MCI participants experience difficulties on only complex tasks (hypothesis 3), then we predicted a Group × NAT item interaction, with MCI participants showing significantly higher error rates than controls on only item 3.

Data Analyses

The required statistical assumptions of analysis of variance (ANOVA) were not met, because the raw dependent variables were not normally distributed and were not easily transformed.

Therefore, ANOVAs were performed using ranked data [39]. Post-hoc analyses of between-subject effects were performed using Bonferroni tests with the ranked data. Both M raw and M rank scores were reported below. Effect sizes were calculated for all post-hoc analyses. For small samples, the power efficiency of non-parametric analyses is nearly 95 percent of the t test [40]; therefore, effect sizes were estimated using Cohen's d calculations (0.2 = small; 0.5 = medium; 0.8 = large) [41].

Demographic and Neuropsychological Variables

As shown in table 2, the groups did not differ in age or gender distribution. MCI participants did not differ from the other groups on education. Controls had significantly more years of education than AD participants. However, numerous prior studies have shown that the NAT scores are unrelated to education level [19, 20, 34, 35, 37, 38]. Moreover, significant group differences between AD and controls have been documented [32, 34, 42] and are not the focus of this paper. Therefore, the 1- to 2-year difference in education between AD and controls was considered inconsequential for subsequent analyses. As expected, MCI participants did not differ from controls on MMSE, but both MCI and control participants obtained higher MMSE scores than AD participants.




Fig. 1. Mean proportion of each error category from total errors for control, MCI, and AD groups. Error bars reflect +1 SEM. For each participant, proportion scores are calculated by dividing the number of errors from a specific category by the total number of errors across all categories. Note that group differences in mean total errors (i.e. comprehensive error score) showed controls < MCI < mild AD (table 2).




Fig. 2. Standardized error rates for each group (control, MCI, AD) and NAT item are shown. Error bars reflect +1 SEM. For each participant, the standardized error rate is calculated by dividing the total number of errors made on each item by the number of possible errors for each item.

Table 2. Demographic characteristics of the groups and means, standard deviations, and between-group analyses for NAT variables

	Control (n = 18)		MCI (n = 25)		AD (n = 25)		ANOVA		Group differences
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	F	d.f.	
<i>Demographic variables</i>									
Age	73.1	3.2	72.2	6.7	73.6	3.8	0.51	2, 65	n.s.
Education	13.7	3.2	12.4	1.4	12.0	1.4	4.1*	2, 65	control > AD
MMSE	28.5	1	27.6	1.4	22.4	2.8	45.7**	2, 65	(MCI = control) > AD
Sex (% women)	72		64		80		$\chi^2 = 1.7$		n.s.
<i>NAT variables</i>									
NAT Score	17.5	0.7	15.6	2.3	10.4	4.5	37.5**	2, 65	AD < MCI < controls
Comprehensive error score	2.7	2.2	4.5	2.6	15.1	8	53.6**	2, 65	AD < MCI < controls

n.s. = Nonsignificant; * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01.

Hypothesis 1: Overall Impairment

Consistent with our prediction, the NAT Score, which reflects overall impairment, differed significantly across the three groups (M ranks: control = 52.5; MCI = 38.7; AD = 17.3; table 2). Post-hoc analyses showed that the controls performed significantly better than the MCI (p < 0.01, d = 1.2) and AD (p < 0.01, d = 2.7) groups; the MCI group performed significantly better than the AD group (p < 0.01, d = 1.5). None of the controls, 24% of the MCI group, and 76% of the AD group fell within the impaired range according to cut scores established for healthy older adults [32].

Table 2 also shows that controls committed significantly fewer total errors than the MCI (p = 0.01, d = 0.70) and AD (p < 0.01, d = 2.4) groups. MCI participants made significantly fewer errors than AD participants (p < 0.01, d = 2.0; comprehensive error score M ranks: control = 16.9; MCI = 27.7; AD = 53.9).

Hypothesis 2: Error Patterns

A Group (control, MCI, AD) × Error Type (omission, addition, commission) mixed ANOVA showed significant main effects of Group [F (2, 64) = 10.82, p < 0.01] and Error Type [F (2, 64) = 96.47, p < 0.01], as well as a significant Group × Error Type interaction [F (4, 130) = 6.75, p < 0.01]. As shown in figure 1, error type proportions were quite similar between controls and MCI participants, whereas AD participants demonstrated a very different distribution of errors. As predicted, follow-up within group analyses showed MCI participants obtained a significantly higher proportion commission than proportion omission (p < 0.01; d = 2.77); this difference also was observed for controls (p < 0.01, d = 2.63), but not for AD participants (p = 0.79). For controls and MCI participants, proportion commissions was higher than proportion additions (p < 0.01, d > 3.10 for both), but there was no