

Chapter 3.30

Enhancing Cognitive Screening in Geriatric Care: Use of an Internet-Based System

Peter A. Lichtenberg

Wayne State University, USA

Amanda Schafer Johnson

Wayne State University, USA

David M. Erlanger

Headminder™ Corporation, USA

Tanya Kaushik

Headminder™ Corporation, USA

Michael E. Maddens

William Beaumont Hospital, USA

Khaled Imam

William Beaumont Hospital, USA

Jeffrey Barth

University of Virginia School of Medicine, USA

Frank M. Webbe

Florida Institute of Technology, USA

ABSTRACT

Cognitive screening measures for age-related cognitive impairment have been found to have only fair validity, and the risks of harm even may outweigh the benefits at this time (U.S. Preventative Service Task Force, 2003). A large-scale project designed to assess elder care in Primary Care Physician offices noted that dementia evaluation and treatment was one of the most overlooked aspects of care. Taken together, these studies cited the lack of time and technical expertise in test administration as the most prominent barriers to the accurate detection of dementia in Primary Care Physician offices. It was for these reasons that

the Cognitive Screening Test (CST) was created. The CST requires no physician time or training to administer or interpret it. The current study investigated the clinical utility of this cognitive screening system by comparing the results of 102 patients to those of expert geriatricians, using consensus conference methods for diagnosis. Overall clinical utility demonstrated scores at .80 or above for sensitivity, specificity, and positive and negative predictive power. In contrast, the MMSE had only a .38 sensitivity. A Receiver Operating Curve (ROC) analysis indicated a .863 accuracy rating for the predetermined cut score on the CST.

VALIDATION OF A DEMENTIA SCREENING TEST IN GERIATRIC PRACTICE

The growing prevalence of dementia makes it imperative that Primary Care Physicians become more able and more comfortable to diagnose dementia, particularly in its earlier stages. Early diagnosis gives physicians the opportunity to initiate treatment with acetylcholinesterase inhibitors, which have shown to delay cognitive and functional declines (Mohs et al., 2001) and to delay nursing home placement (Schneider, 2000; Turner, 2003), all the while producing infrequent, temporary side effects (Boise, Morgan, Kaye, & Camicioli, 1999). It allows patients and families to plan for future care needs, financial needs, and legal needs associated with a lengthy, debilitating illness (Boise et al., 1999; Knopman, Donohue, & Guterman, 2000), and families and patients may be given insight into the behavioral and personality changes that may occur and the safety precautions that eventually may be necessary (Knopman, et al., 2000; Sano & Weber, 2003). On the whole, primary care physicians continue to have difficulty detecting the majority of dementia cases among their patients. In previous studies, less than 30% of patients have been correctly identified as cognitively impaired, including even those with poor cognitive performance (Boise, Neal, & Kaye, 2004; Olafsdottir, Skoog, & Marcusson, 2000; Valcour, Masaki, & Blanchette, 2002). In an effort to increase the detection of cognitive impairment and generally to increase the quality of patient care, variables have been identified that impede this process. In a review, Reuben, Roth, Kamberg, and Wenger (2003) identified physician time constraints and a lack of physician technical expertise with cognitive screening administration and interpretation as major factors that impede effective dementia screening. Additionally, compounding the issue is that the standard primary care model of medical practice relies heavily on the patient's symptoms report. However, lack of

awareness of symptoms is a common feature of Alzheimer's disease; thus, even when queried directly, patients often deny or minimize cognitive problems (Zanetti et al., 1999).

Conducting and interpreting brief cognitive screening is problematic in Primary Care Practices, even in practices where screening tests such as the Mini-Mental Status Examination (MMSE) are used. It is well established that the MMSE is sensitive to the effects of education and age (Anthony, LeResche, Niaz, Von Korff, & Folstein, 1982; Crum, Anthony, Bassett, & Folstein, 1993; Monsch et al., 1995; Spreen & Strauss, 1998; Tombaugh & McIntyre, 1992; Tombaugh, McDowell, Krisjansson, & Hubble, 1996; Uhlmann & Larson, 1991). As a result of these findings, normative data have been published that make such considerations (Crum et al., 1993; Tombaugh et al., 1996). However, interpretation that considers age and education rarely occurs in clinical practice. More often than not, single-cut scores are used as a basis to distinguish the impaired from intact patients; for example, a cut score of 23/24 on the MMSE has been suggested to indicate cognitive impairment (Folstein, Folstein, & McHugh, 1975). This cut score also has been found appropriate in population-based studies (Ganguli et al., 1993). However, depending on the age and educational characteristics of the patient, this cut score consistently has demonstrated low sensitivity or specificity (Monsch, et al., 1995; Spreen & Strauss, 1998; Tombaugh & McIntyre, 1996). Due to these test constraints, cognitive screening measures for age-related cognitive impairment have been found to have only fair validity, and the risks of harm even may outweigh the benefits at this time (U.S. Preventative Service Task Force, 2003).

Ideally, a screening device for dementia will contain many memory items, since this is the domain of cognition typically impaired; it will require little in the way of administration and interpretation by those not trained in psychometrics and will be based on normative data

9 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/enhancing-cognitive-screening-geriatric-care/26281

Related Content

Mental Task Classification Using Deep Transfer Learning with Random Forest Classifier

Sapna Singh Kshatri, Deepak Singh, Mukesh Kumar Chandrakar and G. R. Sinha (2022). *International Journal of Biomedical and Clinical Engineering* (pp. 1-17).

www.irma-international.org/article/mental-task-classification-using-deep-transfer-learning-with-random-forest-classifier/301215

Electrical Conductivity of Skin Compared to Skin Perfusion Recordings

Anders Jarløvand Tim Toftgaard Jensen (2017). *International Journal of Biomedical and Clinical Engineering* (pp. 1-17).

www.irma-international.org/article/electrical-conductivity-of-skin-compared-to-skin-perfusion-recordings/189117

Context-Aware Task Distribution for Enhanced M-health Application Performance

Hailiang Mei, Bert-Jan van Beijnum, Ing Widya, Val Jones and Hermie Hermens (2009). *Mobile Health Solutions for Biomedical Applications* (pp. 285-307).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/context-aware-task-distribution-enhanced/26777

Biocompatible Carbon Nanodots for Functional Imaging and Cancer Therapy: Carbon Nanodots for Imaging and Cancer Therapy

Alexandre Roumenov Loukanov, Hristo Stefanov Gagov, Milena Yankova Mishonova and Seiichiro Nakabayashi (2018). *International Journal of Biomedical and Clinical Engineering* (pp. 31-45).

www.irma-international.org/article/biocompatible-carbon-nanodots-for-functional-imaging-and-cancer-therapy/204399

Cuff-Less Non-Invasive Blood Pressure Measurement Using Various Machine Learning Regression Techniques and Analysis

Srinivasa M. G. and Pandian P. S. (2022). *International Journal of Biomedical and Clinical Engineering* (pp. 1-20).

www.irma-international.org/article/cuff-less-non-invasive-blood/290387