medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Identification of Nonverbal Communication Tools for Use in Dementia

Zunera Khan[1] I Miguel Vasconcelos Da Silva[1] I Jemuwem Eno-Amooquaye[1] I Steven Nowicki[3] I Kayleigh Nunez[2] I Paul Francis[2] I Clive Ballard[2]

[1]Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK

[2] Exeter University Medical School, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

[3] Emory College of Arts and Science, Atlanta, USA

Correspondence

Zunera Khan, Department of Old Age Psychiatry, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, 16 De Crespigny Park, Denmark Hill Campus, London, UK SE5 8AF Email: zunera.2.khan@kcl.ac.uk

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors have no conflicts of interest to report.

FUNDING

This study represents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Introduction

Non-verbal communication remains a relatively unexplored area in dementia care with a lack of validated assessment tools available to measure non-verbal communication function in dementia.

Methods

This scoping review identifies assessment scales of nonverbal communication in dementia and evaluates the psychometric properties and clinical utility of these instruments. Relevant publications in English, from 1947 to 2017, were identified through an extensive search strategy in Medline, Psychinfo and the Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), EMBASE, Cochrane and generic search engines (Google) and available off-line resources. Quality judgement criteria was formulated and used to evaluate the psychometric aspects of the scales.

Results

Forty-one tools were identified measuring various communication channels including verbal, nonverbal (e.g., facial expressions, gestures, eye contact) and functional, communication means; within various settings and populations, for instance, those assessing cognition and verbal language difficulties secondary to stroke, aphasia and nonverbal cues associated with pain. A number of tools presented psychometrics qualities; only nine of the forty-one tools specifically focussed on nonverbal communication, however, comprehensive assessment of nonverbal communication function was not presented in majority of the identified tools. Two tools provided a detailed assessment of nonverbal communication, the Emory dyssemia Index (EDI) and the Threadgold Communication Tool (TCT).

Conclusion

Based on the psychometric qualities and criteria regarding sensitivity and clinical utility, we concluded that although it is difficult to recommend one particular tool, the EDI and TCT are the most appropriate scales currently available. Further research should focus on improving these scales by further testing their validity, reliability and clinical utility in dementia.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Background

Communication impairment may interrupt various aspects of daily living for people living with Alzheimer's Disease (PlwD) and may be associated with changes in behaviour or distress, such as agitation, hostility and physical aggression, usually reflecting an attempt to communicate [1, 2]. The use of outcome measures has long been held as a gold standard in research and they often undergo a rigorous development procedure [3]. Several tools have been developed to assess different aspects of communication for PlwD, most of which focus on the person's expression in terms of agitation and aggression rather than the ability to communicate [4]. Limited research literature is present on assessing nonverbal communication and to date no overview is available of communication scales developed specifically to assess nonverbal communication in PlwD. There is thus a need to identify manageable, valid and reliable tools for assessing nonverbal communication function/impairment in PlwD. The ideology was to find an assessment tool that could be used readily in daily practice and to assess an effectiveness of an intervention with pre- and post-assessment of nonverbal communication function. This review aimed to identify measures assessing communication function, specifically nonverbal communication and conduct the appraisal of these measures' psychometric properties using data from earlier studies to guide future choice of measures in research and practice within dementia.

Summary of key Objectives

This paper aims to identify feasible research tools for measuring communication function in PlwAD specifically nonverbal communication. Two research questions were addressed to:

- Identify nonverbal communication assessment tools that are available to assess nonverbal communication function in the current literature.
- Assess the psychometric qualities of the identified tools, including validity measures containing content validity, criterion validity and construct validity, test re-test reliability and interrater reliability.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Design

Scoping review of the literature to identify outcome measures used within research for assessing nonverbal communication among people living with dementia.

Methods

The literature search was conducted through electronic databases and hand searches. The review process utilised publications based on an extensive search strategy, involving database searches of Medline, Psychinfo and the Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), EMBASE, Cochrane and generic search engines (Google) and available off-line resources

Two forms of hand-searches were undertaken: the references and bibliographies of key articles retrieved in the literature search from above search engines. The title of papers published from 1946 to 2017 were scrutinised.

Rationale for the scoping review

A scoping review was conducted following established methods [5-8]. Scoping studies can be particularly relevant to disciplines with emerging evidence, in which the paucity of literature makes it difficult for researchers to undertake systematic reviews. Arksey and O'Malley (6) defined a framework of how to conduct a scoping review and outlined a scoping review as a process which focuses on the appraisal of a body of studies examining the extent range, and nature of existing literature.

A scoping review was chosen for the current study because this methodology aligned with the broad research objective and allowed for the inclusion of research papers, studying body of literature to identify research tools available for assessment of nonverbal cues. Utilisation of the scoping review methodology allowed for the collection of literature, which provides an overview of our current understanding of nonverbal communication tools within dementia, AD and learning disabilities (LD) within the research field. Furthermore, by following the established methods as dictated by the scoping review framework enabled the systematic and comprehensive appraisal of literature.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Search strategy and inclusion criteria

The literature search strategy was structured using the relevant concepts of PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome). Setting was not controlled for the purpose of the literature search with the aim to find broad range of tools assessing nonverbal communication across various settings.

Table 1 Inclusion / Exclusion Criteria for the literature search

Parameter	**Inclusion**	**Exclusion**
Population	Alzheimer's disease, Dementia, Aphasia, Learning Disabilities	Not applied
Intervention	Communication Tools	No reporting of communication tools
Comparator	Not Applied	Not Applied
Outcome	Nonverbal, verbal communication, functional communication	No reporting of communication measures

The following search terms were used when running searches through above listed electronic databases:

- nonverbal communication assessment
- nonverbal communication tools
- the nonverbal communication assessment tool
- nonverbal communication questionnaire
- nonverbal communication instrument
- nonverbal communication scale *'nonverbal' was also entered as well as 'non-verbal'
- *'Alzheimer's Disease' and 'aphasia' and 'dementia' and learning disabilities (LD) were added to each of these search terms and the search run again to cover significant supplementary literature in relation to availability of nonverbal communication scales. Limited literature within Alzheimer's Disease and dementia was expected thus the literature search was expanded to include other parallel areas and terms that were likely to contribute to additional information, such as LD and aphasia. Disease severity or form of dementia was not specified to gauge a broader scope of literature covering nonverbal communication.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Inclusion criteria:

1. Inclusion of a tool assessing elements of communication including nonverbal cues within Alzheimer's disease, Dementia, Aphasia, Learning Disabilities.
2. Inclusion of a tool which can be proxy-reported, self-reported or the use of Test Battery
3. Availability of the full text in English.

Exclusion criteria.

1. No reporting of communication measures.
2. Studies published in a language other than English if a translation was not available.
3. Development information for outcome measures was not freely available.
4. Case reports or secondary sources/reviews

Electronic Database Search

Electronic databases were filtered for English only articles, following that, duplicated articles were also filtered out. Initial review of the titles was conducted to extract articles which signposted elements of communication (both verbal and nonverbal). Review of titles was followed by a review of abstracts, which included both verbal and nonverbal communication elements. Papers with full-text availability were reviewed to extract information for individual tools.

Expert consultation

In addition to the above literature search process through relevant databases, an expert consultation was also conducted to ensure coverage of communication tools examining nonverbal communication function. Research experts, who were highlighted through references of key articles, were contacted via an email by the researcher. Five key researchers; Professor Nowicki Steven, Professor Valerie Manusov, Dr Judith Saxton, Dr Carol Magai and Dr Sheila Wirz were contacted for this purpose. These included researchers who had published key papers focusing on communication in addition to cognitive impairment. It was felt that breadth and depth of knowledge of this group regarding the area of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

communication would provide sufficient coverage to identify any papers or assessment being utilised to examine nonverbal communication that had not been identified.

Figure 1. Literature Review Stages



Tools identified through the electronic databases, hand searches and the expert consultation were further taken into the next stage for data extraction and quality assessment (Figure 11).

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Full texts of articles for all of the tools were identified through electronic databases, hand search and expert consultation. Reviewer discrepancy was checked, discussed and moderated by a third reviewer. The data abstraction criteria were partly based on Streiner and Norman's requirements for health measurement scales for the evaluation of identified tools [9]. Pairs of reviewers independently screened titles and abstracts. The following data were extracted (if available) to examine the nature and methodological quality of the assessment scales: the tool name, publication year, type of tool target population, the source of the items (origin), sample size, psychometric properties and methodology including feasibility and time taken to complete. Psychometric qualities were based on validity measures containing content validity, criterion validity and construct validity in addition to test re-test reliability and interrater reliability. Following the Streiner and Norman's criteria, individual tool was rated against each individual extracted data item and sum for psychometrics quality was generated. In addition, an assessment for suitability was also conducted on each tool, examining assessment coverage of nonverbal communication function, i.e., a person’s ability to express and receive nonverbal cues.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2 Extracted Data for each Communication Tool

Extracted data were the following:

(i) Tool Name

(ii) Publication Year

(iii) Target Population

(iv) Type of Tool - Research Methodology (Proxy, Observation, Battery)

(v) Domains/Communication Modalities

(vi) Source of Item (Origin)

(vii) Psychometrics Properties.

(viii) Methodology including Time Taken to Complete

Table 2 Data Abstraction Criteria based on Psychometric properties

Aspect	Score
Origin of items	2 if items were specially collected for use in PlwD 1 if items were modified for use in PlwD 0 if items originated from a scale developed for another population
Number of participants	2 if N => 100 and the number of PlwD included was considerable relative to the number of items/variables or 50 < N < 100 and corrected for multiple testing 1 if 50 < N < 100 and the number of PlwD included was considerable relative to the number of items/variables or N < 50 and corrected for multiple testing 0 if N < 50, not corrected for multiple testing and a small number of PlwD included
Content validity	2 if scale seems to cover all important items/dimensions (in the reviewers' opinion): nonverbal items were collected for the specific population and different sources/methods were used to collect items 1 if the scale seems to cover important items/dimensions to a moderate extent (in the reviewers' opinion): items were adapted to the population and different sources/methods were used to collect items 0 if the scale does not seem to cover the important items/dimensions (in the reviewers' opinion)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Criterion validity Correlation of the identified tool with other tool scores or a benchmark criterion	2 if correlates acceptable to high (r > .60) according to the 'gold standard' or acceptable according to a 'silver standard'. 1 if correlates moderate-acceptable (.40 < r < .60) according to the 'gold standard' or acceptable according to a 'silver standard' 0 if correlates low (r < .40) or no information is provided
Construct validity in relation to other communication tools	2 if correlates with other communication measures acceptable to high (r > .60) 1 if correlates with other communication measures are moderate (r > .40 < .60) 0 if correlations are low (r <.40) or no information is provided
Internal Consistency (To test whether all items of a scale address the same theoretical construct. Thus, a scale is considered to be internally consistent when there is a high intercorrelation among the scores of the items. A Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .90 or higher indicates high internal consistency.) (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994).	2 if .70 < alpha < .90 1 if alpha > .90 or > .60 alpha <.70 0 if alpha < .60 or no information is provided
Inter-rater reliability (agreement between raters),	2 if reliability coefficient >.80 1 if .60 < reliability coefficient < .80 0 if reliability coefficient < .60 or no information is provided
Test-retest reliability (the extent to which a tool achieves the same result on two or more occasions when the condition is stable)	2 if reliability coefficient >.80 1 if .60 < reliability coefficient < .80 0 if reliability coefficient < .60 or no information is provided
Feasibility	Feasibility 2 if the scale is short, manageable with instructions, scoring interpretation 1 if the scale is manageable (one format) 0 if the scale is more complex
Suitability (Coverage of Nonverbal Communication) Definition	Score
No emphasis on Nonverbal communication	0
Study of both Verbal and Nonverbal communication or other areas such as overall aphasia	1
Study of only specific elements of Nonverbal communication e.g., facial expression	2
Comprehensive assessment of Nonverbal communication	3

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Extended literature review of papers published from 2017 to 2019

A narrative literature review was conducted to extend the findings of the scoping review (2017). The aim was to identify any supplementary nonverbal communication tools to date (Oct 2019) post the initial scoping review.

Methods

Searches across EMBASE, MEDLINE and Google scholar were performed for articles published from June 2017 to Oct 2019 using the following key terms: This literature may not fulfil the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the scoping review but were reported in the current chapter because they were likely to represent supplementary literature.

- nonverbal communication tools
- nonverbal communication assessment tool
- nonverbal communication scale
- *'nonverbal' was also entered as well as 'non-verbal'

  *'Alzheimer's' and 'dementia and aphasia.

Results

A total of 1183 titles were identified through database searches, of which 939 titles were excluded based on lack of reference to verbal and nonverbal communication in the title of the paper. In total, 244 titles were screened for the inclusion of papers, 114 abstracts signposted components of both verbal and nonverbal communication and abstracts, covered elements of nonverbal communication and verbal communication tools. The final literature search review included 36 papers, which were obtained from database searches, and provided full-text information on the methodology used. In addition, five tools were identified through consultation with experts and hand searching from the reference lists of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

papers that were already part of the review process. Hand searches led to three tools being identified and two being identified through expert consultation.

Figure 3 PRISMA flowchart of Literature Search Process through Electronic Databases



Expert Consultation

Of the five researchers contacted via an email, four responded. Tools including the Emory Dyssemia Tools (EDI) [10], American Speech Language Hearing Association Functional Assessment Of Communication Skills For Adults (ASHA-FACS) [11], were identified through this process.

Data Extraction

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Types of Tools and Settings

The majority of identified tools (28/41) were observational, conducted by healthcare professionals or trained other professionals. Other tools included neuropsychological batteries for testing aphasia (12/41) with one structured interview.

The tools were assessed in a range of settings and with various populations. Identified tools were examined in targeted population including survivors of paediatric brain tumours, students, individuals with aphasia, people with developmental disorders, PlwD, adults, older adults, nursing home residents, inpatients in ICU, patients with traumatic brain injury, people with stroke and people with autism.

The list of settings where these tools were used included: Class (school), high school, neuro-rehabilitation units, hospital, inpatient dementia special care units, long-term care, long-term care facilities, intensive care unit, care homes, residential aged care homes, nursing homes, independent practice, managed care and academic, clinic, palliative care hospitals, critical care units, aphasic patients' homes, inpatient rehabilitation unit, speech therapy department, stroke unit, rehabilitation department, community, domus units in long-stay mental hospitals, psychiatric facilities, homes for the aged, continuing care hospitals and residential care facilities.

Some of these tools were required to have video recording, proxy questionnaires, checklists with live and static observations. Other methods involved the use of batteries such as the Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy-2 (DANVA-2), Emotion Recognition Task (ERT) and Posture knowledge test to assess specific elements of nonverbal communication. Since the review was quite broad, with the inclusion of both verbal and nonverbal communication, some of the tools associated with stroke and aphasia purely focussed on verbal language batteries.

Table 3 Assessment Tools and their modalities

Assessment Tool	**Modality**
Emory Dyssemia Index (EDI) [10]	Nonverbal Communication
Revised Edinburgh Functional Communication Profile (REFCP) [12]	Functional Communication
Sheffield Screening Test for Acquired Language Disorders (STALS) [13]	Verbal communication

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy 2 (DANVA-2) [14]	Nonverbal Communication
Pain Assessment in Advanced Dementia (PAINAD) [15]	Pain
Face, Legs, Activity, Cry, Consolability) Pain Scale (FLACC) [16]	Pain
Abbey Pain Scale [17]	Pain
Checklist of Nonverbal Pain Indicators (CNPI) [18]	Pain
Nonverbal communication in doctor–elderly patient transactions (NDEPT) [19]	Nonverbal communication
Discomfort Scale - Dementia for Alzheimer Type (DS DAT) [20]	Pain
Critical Care Pain Observation Tool (CPOT) [21]	Pain
Pain Assessment for the Dementing Elderly (PADE) [22]	Pain
Pain Assessment Checklist for Seniors with Limited Ability to Communicate) (PACSLAC) [23]	Pain
Behavioral Pain Scale (BPS) [24]	Pain
Doloplus-2 [25]	Pain
NOPPAIN (Non-Communicative Patient's Assessment Instrument [26]	Pain
NVPS: Nonverbal Pain Scale [27]	Pain
Communication Effectiveness Index (CETI) [28]	Functional Communication
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (BDAE) [29]	Aphasia
The Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test [30]	Aphasia
Porch Index of Communicative Abilities (PICA) [31]	Functional Communication
Communication Activities of Daily Living -2 (CADL-2) [32]	Functional Communication
ASHA Functional Assessment of Communication Skills (ASHA FACS) [11]	Functional Communication
Kovacev Non-Verbal Expression Check List (KNVECL) [33]	Nonverbal Communication

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ADD (Assessment of Discomfort in Dementia) [34]	Pain
Lille Communication Test (LCT) [35]	Verbal and Nonverbal Communication
The Holden Communication Scale (HCS) [36]	Verbal and Nonverbal Communication
Quality of Interaction schedule (QUIS) [37]	Verbal and Nonverbal Communication
The Assessment of Communication and Interaction Skills (ACIS) [38]	Verbal and Nonverbal Communication
Core Linguistic Battery [39]	Overall communication
Communication Problems Scale [40]	Verbal Communication Problems
Emotion Recognition Test (ERT) [41]	Nonverbal communication
Multidimensional Observation Scale for Elderly Subjects (MOSES) [42]	Multimodal functions
Posture Knowledge Test [43]	Nonverbal Communication
Social Competence Scale [44]	Social Competence
The Functional Linguistic Communication (FLCI) Inventory [45]	Functional Communication
Comprehensive Assessment of Spoken Language (CASL) [46]	Verbal communication
Facial Action Coding System (FACS) [47]	Nonverbal communication
Verbal Fluency Benton (FAS) [48]	Aphasia
Interpersonal Communication Inventory [49]	Verbal and Nonverbal Communication
The Adult Behavior Questionnaire (ABQ) [50]	Nonverbal

Psychometric Quality Assessment

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Information on psychometric elements such as content, criterion and construct validity inter-rater reliability and re-test reliability are presented below for individual tools that were found as part of the review process.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Reliability

Seven tools showed limited evidence for reliability (REFCP, STALD, BDAE, Core Linguistic Battery, Posture Knowledge Test, Social Competence Scale and FLCI). The sections below provide further detail on three different elements of reliability.

Interrater reliability

Data extracted for measuring inter-rater reliability using intra-class correlations were recorded as following: ACIS (0.92), ASHA FACS (0.998) Abbey pain scale (0.44-0.63), CETI (0.73), DS-DAT (0.97), PACSLAC (0.77-0.96), Doloplus-2 (0.77), MOSES (0.58 - 0.97), PADE (0.54-0.96). Kappa coefficients were provided for the FLACC (0.404), CNPI (0.63-0.82), QUIS (0.60 - 0.91), NOPAIN (0.87), LCT (0.90) and CPOT (k = 0.52 - 0.88). Correlation coefficients were used to assess agreement for; FACS (0.82-0.92), NVPS (0.80–0.87) and PAINAD (0.72-0.97). In addition, percentage agreement was used to calculate agreement for the FAST with 93% agreement between raters.

No inter-rater reliability data was presented for seventeen tools (EDI, BDAE, STALD, DANVA-2, PICA, CADL, Holden Communication Scale, KNVECL, Core Linguistic Battery Communication Problems Scale, ERT, Posture Knowledge Test, Social Competence Scale, FLCI, CASL, Verbal Fluency FAS, Interpersonal Communication Inventory and the Adult Behaviour Questionnaire).

Overall, reliability measures were carried out on small sample size and raters, so data for all of the tools are limited, thus restricting the generalisability of findings.

Test-retest Reliability

Examination of intra-rater or Test-retest reliability involved percentage agreement, correlation, kappa, and intra-class correlations. Data extracted for examining intra-rater reliability using intra-class correlations reported the following: PADE (0.70-0.98), PACSLAC (0.86), CETI (0.94), ASHA FACS (0.995). In addition, correlation coefficient between test and retest showed the following findings: DS DAT (0.60), NVPS (0.51 - 0.75), PICA (0.96), CADL-2 (0.903), Verbal Fluency FAS (0.74), Interpersonal Communication Inventory (0.86), CASL (0.92-0.93), ERT (0.53-0.71) and FACS (0.88-0.97). Kappa

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

coefficients were calculated for FAST with reliability was found to be excellent (kappa = 1.00), having a perfect agreement between the two test administration times. However, there were no test-retest reliability data reported for ADD, Doloplus-2, REFCP, STALD, PAINAD, FLACC, Abbey Pain Scale, CNPI, NDEPT, CPOT, BDAE, BPS, KNVECL, Lille Communication Test, QUIS, ACIS, Core Linguistic Battery, Communication Problems Scale, MOSES, NOPPAIN Posture Knowledge Test, Social Competence Scale, FLCI, FACS and ABQ.

Internal consistency

Internal consistency was reported for the following CNPI (0.54-0.64), Doloplus-2 (0.668-0.82), PACSLAC (0.74-0.92), PADE (0.24-0.88), PAINAD (0.5-0.74), EDI (α = 0.97), DANVA-2 (α = 0.64-0.77), PAINAD (α = 0.5-0.65), FLACC (α = 0.882), Abbey Pain Scale (α = 0.74–0.81), DS DAT (α = 0.77), CPOT (α = 0.81), PADE (α = 0.77–0.88), PACSLAC (α = 0.82–0.86), KNVECL (α = 0.803), Doloplus-2 (α = 0.668-0.82), NVPS (α = 0.76), CETI (α = 0.94), CADL-2 (α = 0.64 -0 .94), HCS (α = 0.94), Communication Problems Scale (α = 0.88), MOSES (α = 0.79 - 0.82), CASL (α = 0.85 - 0.96), ABQ (α = 0.48), ASHA FACS (α = 0.95) and FAS with the coefficient alpha of r = .83 was sufficiently high to ensure high item homogeneity even though t-tests showed the number of words was significantly different (α = .001) among the three letters (F vs. A: t(1,893) 5 19.0; F vs. S: t(1,893) 5 5.2; A vs. S: t(1,893) 5 23.0). Contrarily, there were a number of tools for which data relating to internal consistency was not available. These included the REFCP, STALD, NDEPT, NOPPAIN, FAST, PICA, ADD, LCT, QUIS, ACIS, FLCI, Core Linguistic Battery, ERT, Posture Knowledge Test, Social Competence Scale, FACS and Interpersonal Communication Inventory.

Validity

The validity of the identified tools was examined using content, construct and criterion validity, these are further detailed in the subsequent sections. Twelve of the 41 tools seemed to have limited evidence for validity assessment. These included: REFCP, NDEPT, NOPPAIN, CADL-2, KNVECL, ADD, LCT, Core Linguistic Battery, Posture Knowledge Test, Social Competence Scale, FLCI and Interpersonal Communication Inventory.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Criterion validity

Criterion validity was evaluated by examining the correlation of scores between tools. Overall, the tools with the highest correlations included EDI correlation with Behavioural Rating Scale (r = - 0.74), STALD with Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test (r = 0.74), PAIN AD with DS DAT (r = 0.76), FLACC with CNPI (r = 0.96), Frenchay Aphasia Screening test with Functional Communication Profile (r = 0.73), PICA with CET (r = 0.63) and western aphasia battery, ASHA FACS with ADAS Cog (r = 0.63) and with MMSE r = 0.72), HCS with MMSE (r = - 0.67) and CASL with Peabody picture vocabulary (r =0.74). Data was not available for review for 18 tools. Other small to moderate associations were reported between DANVA-2 and PONS (r = 0.44), CNPI and VDS (r =.372), self-report VAS (r = - 0.30-0.50), CPOT and patients' self-report ratings (r = 0.49), PADE and CMAI (r = 0.30 - 0.42), PACSLAC and Doloplus 2 (r=0.34), DS DAT and Pittsburgh Agitation Scale (r = 0.51), ERT and Interpersonal Behaviour Checklist (r = 0.53), MOSES Depression Anxiety and Zung Depression Status Inventory (R = 0.49), ABQ Joy and facial expressions (r= 0.61).

Table 4 Criterion Validity of Tools identified

Assessment Tool	**Criterion (correlation with other tools)**
Emory Dyssemia Index (EDI) (Nowicki and Duke, 1992)	r = - 0.74 with Behavioral Rating Scale (BES-2; Mann & Kenowitz, 1985)
Revised Edinburgh Functional Communication Profile (REFCP) (Wirz and Skinner, 1990)	Not Available
Sheffield Screening Test for Acquired Language Disorders (STALD) (Syder, 1993)	r = 0.74 with Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test
Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy 2 (DANVA-2) (Duke and Nowicki, 1993)	r = 0.44 Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity (PONS)
Pain Assessment in Advanced Dementia (PAINAD) (Warden et al., 2003)	r = 0.76 with DS DAT, r =0.75 with Pain VAS
Face, Legs, Activity, Cry, Consolability) Pain Scale (FLACC) (Willis et al., 2003)	r = 0.96 with CNPI (Checklist of Nonverbal Pain Indicators) (Feldt, 2000
Abbey Pain Scale (Abbey et al., 2004)	Not Available

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Checklist of Nonverbal Pain Indicators (CNPI) (Feldt, 2000)	r =.372 with Verbal Descriptor Scale (VDS), r = - 0.30-0.50 with Self report VAS
Nonverbal communication in doctor–elderly patient transactions (NDEPT) (Gorawara-Bhat, 2014)	Not Available
Discomfort Scale - Dementia for Alzheimer Type (DS DAT) (Hurley et al., 1992)	r=0.76 with PAINAD, r = 0.51 with Pittsburgh Agitation Scale
Critical Care Pain Observation Tool (CPOT) (Gelinas et al., 2006)	r = 0.49, between patients' self-reports of pain and the scores on the Critical-Care Pain Observation Tool
Pain Assessment for the Dementing Elderly (PADE) (Villanueva et al., 2003)	r = 0.30 - 0.42 with CMAI
Pain Assessment Checklist for Seniors with Limited Ability to Communicate) (PACSLAC) (Fuchs-Lacelle et al., 2004)	r=0.34 with Doloplus 2
Behavioral Pain Scale (BPS) (Payen et al., 2001)	Not available
Doloplus-2 (Lefebvre-Chapiro, 2001)	r = 0.29-0.38 with PACSLAC
NOPPAIN (Non-Communicative Patient's Assessment Instrument (Snow et al., 2004)	Not Available
NVPS: Nonverbal Pain Scale (Odhner et al., 2003b)	Not Available
Communication Effectiveness Index (CETI) (Lomas et al., 1989)	r = 0.61with Western Aphasia Battery
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (BDAE) (Goodglass and Kaplan, 1982)	Not Available
The Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test (Enderby et al., 1987)	r = 0.73 with Functional Communication Profile
Porch Index of Communicative Abilities (PICA) (Porch, 1971)	r = 0.63 with CET, r = - 7.49 with Western Aphasic Battery WAB
Communication Activities of Daily Living -2 (CADL-2) (Holland, 1998)	Not Available
ASHA Functional Assessment of Communication Skills (ASHA FACS) (Frattali et al 1995)	r = 0.63 with ADAS Cog, r = 0.72 with MMSE
Kovacev Non-Verbal Expression Check List (KNVECL) (Kovacev, 2008)	Not Available

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ADD (Assessment of Discomfort in Dementia) (Kovach et al., 1999)	Not Available
Lille Communication Test (LCT) (Rousseaux, 2001)	Not Available
The Holden Communication Scale (HCS) (Holden, 1995)	r = - 0.67 with MMSE
Quality of Interaction schedule (QUIS) (Dean et al., 1993)	Not Available
The Assessment of Communication and Interaction Skills (ACIS) (Forsyth et al., 1999)	Not Available
Core Linguistic Battery (Bayles et al., 1992)	Not Available
Communication Problems Scale (Powell et al., 1995)	Not Available
Emotion Recognition Test (ERT) (Shimokawa et al 2000)	r = 0.53 (p< 0.004) between Emotion Recognition Score and Interpersonal Behaviour Checklist
Multidimensional Observation Scale for Elderly Subjects (MOSES) (Helmes et al., 1987)	r = 0.49 (p< 0.001) between Moses Depression Anxiety and Zung Depression Status Inventory
Posture Knowledge Test (Mozaz et al., 2002)	Not Available
Social Competence Scale (Westermeyer and Harrow, 1986)	Not Available
The Functional Linguistic Communication (FLCI) Inventory (Bayles., et al 1994)	Not Available
Comprehensive Assessment of Spoken Language (CASL) (Carrow-Woolfolk, 1999)	r =0.74 with Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition
Facial Action Coding System (FACS) (Ekman et al., 1978)	Between pain scale and proxy pain report) n=26 AU (frequency), r=0.62; AU (intensity) r=0.73;
Verbal Fluency Benton (FAS) (Benton et al., 1976)	r =0 .25 with Vocabulary scores (WAIS-R)
Interpersonal Communication Inventory (Bienvenu, 1971)	Not Available
The Adult Behavior Questionnaire (ABQ) (Magai et al., 1996)	r = 0.36 between facial expressions and ABQ caregiver report interest item, r = 0.56 between facial expressions and joy item on ABQ caregiver report. R = 0.61 between ABQ-F anger item and facial expressions

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Construct validity

Construct validity was measured by comparing scores to function and disease severity. Fifteen tools did not exhibit data in relation to construct validity. Table 5 provides a summary of construct validity across tools. Tools including PACSLAC, CETI, Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test, PICA, ASHA FACS, ERT and MOSES scored high for construct validity.

Table 5 Construct Validity of Tools Identified

Assessment Tool	Construct
Emory Dyssemia Index (EDI) (Nowicki and Duke, 1992)	Not Available
Revised Edinburgh Functional Communication Profile (REFCP) (Wirz and Skinner, 1990)	Not Available
Sheffield Screening Test for Acquired Language Disorders (STALD) (Syder, 1993)	Barthel index of activities of daily living, r = 0.63 with Barthel Activities of Daily Living
Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy 2 (DANVA-2) (Duke & Nowicki, 1993)	Not Available
Pain Assessment in Advanced Dementia (PAINAD) (Warden et al., 2003)	Not Available
Face, Legs, Activity, Cry, Consolability) Pain Scale (FLACC) (Willis et al., 2003)	Significant decreases in FLACC scores after analgesia
Abbey Pain Scale (Abbey et al., 2004)	r = 0.59 with nurses holistic assessment/ Abbey scale
Checklist of Nonverbal Pain Indicators (CNPI) (Feldt, 2000)	Not Available
Nonverbal communication in doctor–elderly patient transactions (NDEPT) (Gorawara-Bhat, 2014)	Not Available
Discomfort Scale - Dementia for Alzheimer Type (DS DAT) (Hurley et al., 1992)	(r =0.51) with Pittsburgh Agitation Scale
Critical Care Pain Observation Tool (CPOT) (Gelinas et al., 2006)	CPOT scores were significantly higher during positioning than during the rest P< 0.05
Pain Assessment for the Dementing Elderly (PADE) (Villanueva et al., 2003)	Not Available

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Pain Assessment Checklist for Seniors with Limited Ability to Communicate) (PACSLAC) (Fuchs-Lacelle et al., 2004)	r = 0.72 - 0.80 with proxy pain ratings from nurses and expert rater; r=0.39-0.54 with Global intensity ratings
Behavioral Pain Scale (BPS) (Payen et al., 2001)	Increase with Nociceptive stimulation (p <.01)
Doloplus-2 (Lefebvre-Chapiro, 2001)	r = 0.31-0.65 with Visual Analogue Scale (VAS)
NOPPAIN (Non-Communicative Patient's Assessment Instrument (Snow et al., 2004)	Not Available
NVPS: Nonverbal Pain Scale (Odhner et al., 2003b)	Increase in scores with non-nonniceptive condition (P< 0.001)
Communication Effectiveness Index (CETI) (Lomas et al., 1989)	r = 0.79 with Global ratings
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (BDAE) (Goodglass and Kaplan, 1982)	r = 0.40 with Repeatable Battery for the Assessment of Neuropsychological Status (RBANS)
The Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test (Enderby et al., 1987)	r = 0.91 with Minnesota Test for Differential Diagnosis of Aphasia (MTDDA)
Porch Index of Communicative Abilities (PICA) (Porch, 1971)	r = 0.60 with stroke severity
Communication Activities of Daily Living -2 (CADL-2) (Holland, 1998)	Not Available
ASHA Functional Assessment of Communication Skills (ASHA FACS) (Frattali et al 1995)	r = - 0.74 with Functional Aphasia Questionnaire, r = - 0.69 with AD group
Kovacev Non-Verbal Expression Check List (KNVECL) (Kovacev, 2008)	Not Available
ADD (Assessment of Discomfort in Dementia) (Kovach et al., 1999)	Not Available
Lille Communication Test (LCT) (Rousseaux, 2001)	Not Available
The Holden Communication Scale (HCS) (Holden, 1995)	r = −0.59 between cognitive dysfunction MMSE and speech item on HCS, r = −0.56 between HCS humour item and severe cognition dysfunction
Quality of Interaction schedule (QUIS) (Dean et al., 1993)	k = 0.40 between self and observer ratings
The Assessment of Communication and Interaction Skills (ACIS) (Forsyth et al., 1999)	Not Available
Core Linguistic Battery (Bayles et al., 1992)	Not Available

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Communication Problems Scale (Powell et al., 1995)	r = - 0.52 with MMSE (p<0.001)
Emotion Recognition Test (ERT) (Shimokawa et al 2000)	r = 0.71, p < .001 between task 2 and 3, r = 0.74, p <0.001 between Task 3 and 4, r = 0.42, p< 0.05 between task 2 and 4
Multidimensional Observation Scale for Elderly Subjects (MOSES) (Helmes et al., 1987)	MOSES subscale Disorientation correlated with Kingston Dementia Rating Scale total (r -.87), Orientation (r=0.95), Communication (r = 0.75) subscales
Posture Knowledge Test (Mozaz et al., 2002)	Not Available
Social Competence Scale (Westermeyer and Harrow, 1986)	Not Available
The Functional Linguistic Communication (FLCI) Inventory (Bayles., et al 1994)	Not Available
Comprehensive Assessment of Spoken Language (CASL) (Carrow-Woolfolk, 1999)	r = 0.30 - 0.79 with 6 age groups, the progression of scores with increasing age
Facial Action Coding System (FACS) (Ekman et al., 1978)	With Pain Behaviour Measurement approach 0.02-0.41
Verbal Fluency (FAS) (Benton et al., 1976)	r = 0.52 between FAS score and number of animals named on verbal fluency
Interpersonal Communication Inventory (Bienvenu, 1971)	Not Available
The Adult Behavior Questionnaire (ABQ) (Magai et al., 1996)	Not Available

Content validity

The majority of the tools did not focus on nonverbal communication alone but in conjunction with other aspects of communication including functional and verbal communication. A review of the content validity was undertaken in relation to the ability to assess nonverbal communication for all identified tools. Using the criteria based on a methodology used in previous literature review [51] and Streiner and Norman's requirements Streiner [9] for health measurement scales, the majority of the tools covered important items/dimensions to a moderate extent only; and three tools had essential items and domains of nonverbal communication function. Eleven tools did not appear to cover the important items/dimensions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

All of the measures outlined were developed for use within a diverse range of settings and purposes. The majority of the measures were adapted from measures originally developed for a different patient group, from young children (DANVA, EDI, FLACC, Doloplus-2) to PlwD (PAINAD) and Abbey Pain scale. Furthermore, some tools were developed for specific users (QUIS for professionals; NOPPAIN, for nursing assistants), another for research purposes (DS-DAT) and as decision support tools (the ADD Protocol). During the review process of the communication tools, five distinct areas emerged, in which tools could be grouped together. These tools were categorised into distinct categories, as listed below. See Appendix A and B for detail information on psychometric and feasibility qualities.

Categories of Communication Tool:

- Nonverbal communication
- Stroke and Aphasia testing verbal communication
- Nonverbal Communication tools within the context of Pain
- Functional communication and overall communication function
- Tools assessing multidimensional function

Figure 4 Identified Communication Tools

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Tools assessing Nonverbal Communication

In total, only nine of the 41 tools specifically examined nonverbal communication; a substantial proportion of these tools did not exhibit a comprehensive assessment of nonverbal communication function and specific indices of nonverbal communication indices. These tools often only assessed specific aspects of nonverbal communication, e.g. facial expressions via DANVA-2 [14] and the emotion recognition task [41]. Other key examples included Nonverbal communication in Doctor–Elderly Patient Transactions (NDEPT) [19] which reflected upon interactions between clinicians and their patients. One tool which reflected a detailed study of nonverbal cues was the Emory Dyssemia Index (EDI) [52].

Assessment of Nonverbal Communication within the context of Pain

A substantial proportion of tools investigating elements of nonverbal communication originated from pain related scales (n=12), including the FLACC (Face, Legs, Activity, Cry, Consolability) Pain Scale [16], Pain Assessment in Advanced Dementia [15] and DS-DAT (Discomfort Scale - Dementia for Alzheimer Type) [20]. These nonverbal pain scales evaluated expressions related to pain (i.e., negative or positive facial expression, grimaces, furrowed brow, smile and frown) in comparison to assessing overall communication function or specific nonverbal cues.

Assessment of Functional Communication and Overall Communication Function

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Other tools covered some elements of nonverbal communication which derived from measures examining functional communication (n= 12) where both verbal and nonverbal communication modalities are examined to assess the efficacy of the message being conveyed during daily communication interactions. Two examples of this were the Revised Edinburgh Functional Communication Profile (REFCP) [12] and the ASHA Functional Assessment of Communication Skills (ASHA FACS) [11]. Other tools which formed a multidimensional assessment of function or social competence were also reviewed in the process, these were grouped under the miscellaneous category.

Stroke and Aphasia testing verbal communication

Some measures that were highlighted in the current review were derived from tools examining acquired language disorders such as aphasia, these exhibited tasks items assessing cognitive functioning and verbal reasoning, such as Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (BDAE) [29] and other brief tests e.g. FAS Verbal Fluency. In addition, some tools only focussed purely on verbal aspects, for instance, the Sheffield Screening Test for Acquired Language Disorders [13] that has been widely used in studies with people living with dementia to test receptive and expressive language function via verbal comprehension for single words and word- finding ability. In total, six out of forty-one tools came across as an assessment of aphasia, testing verbal functioning in people with or without dementia. These assessments were reviewed alongside other scales, with the aim to seek tools examining nonverbal communication in PlwAD.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Overall Psychometric Quality Evaluation

Several tools scored high on psychometric properties, for instance, assessment scales for pain including Face, Legs, Activity, Cry, Consolability) Pain Scale (FLACC) [16], Nonverbal Pain Scale (NVPS) [27], Behavioural Pain Scale (BPS) [24] and Discomfort Scale - Dementia for Alzheimer Type (DS DAT) [20]. Other tools scoring good included tests for aphasia and spoken language; Emory Dyssemia Index, ASHA Functional Assessment of Communication Skills (ASHA FACS) [11], Communication Effectiveness Index [28], Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test [30] and Porch Index of Communicative Ability [31]. One tool specifically focussed on nonverbal communication was the Facial Action Coding System for measuring facial expression which also managed to score towards higher end.

In contrast, some tools failed to score high on psychometric qualities. These were Core Linguistic battery [39], The Functional Linguistic Communication [45], Revised Edinburgh Functional Communication Profile [12], Social Competence Scale [44], Checklist of Nonverbal Pain Indicator (CNPI) [18], NOPPAIN (Non-Communicative Patient's Assessment Instrument [26], Lille Communication Test (LCT) [35] and Posture Knowledge Test [43].

Feasibility and Time Taken to Complete

Evidence available for feasibility and clinical utility of tools was scarce and the criteria for scoring and interpreting scores were often not readily available. Twelve tools that scored zero and appeared complex to conduct included the NDEPT, PACSLAC, NVPS, BDAE, The Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test, PICA, CADL-2, LCT, Core Linguistic Battery, Posture Knowledge Test, CASL, FACS. Several tools that were manageable in a set format comprised of STALD, DANVA-2, PAINDAD, Doloplus-2, NOPPAIN, KNVECL, ADD, QUIS, ERT, Verbal Fluency FAS and FLCI. However 18 tools scored two (i.e. the if tool was short, manageable with instructions, scoring interpretation), this list of tools included the EDI, REFCP, FLACC, Abbey Pain Scale, CNPI, DS DAT, CPOT, PADE, BPS, CET, ASHA-FACS, HCS, ACIS, Communication Problem Scale, MOSES, Social Competence Scale, Interpersonal Communication Inventory and ABQ.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Time taken to complete was also recorded, whenever possible. Information in relation to the time needed to complete an assessment was not specified for eight tools. Some tools did not specify the time requirement; however, these tools were present in a set format that seemed brief to conduct. Only two of the tools were suggested to have duration of two hours.

Table 6 Time needed to complete the assessment

Time needed to complete	Number of Tools	Names of Tools
Not specified	8	NDEPT, CETI, ASHA FACS, ADD, Core Linguistic Battery, ERT, Posture Knowledge Test, Social Competence Scale
Not specified but seemed brief to conduct	7	CNPI, NVPS, HCS, COMMUNICATION PROBLEM SCALE, MOSES, Interpersonal Communication Inventory, ABQ
5 min or less	7	Pain AD, FLACC, Abbey Pain Scale, CPOT, PACSLAC, Verbal Fluency Task, BPS
10 min - 20 min	11	EDI, REFCP, DANVA2, STALD, DSDAT, PADE,ACIS, DOLOPLUS2, NOPPAIN, KNVCEL, Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test
30 min to 1 Hour	6	FLCI, CASL,BADE,PICA,CADL2, LCT
2 Hour	2	FACS, QUIS

Suitability to Assess Nonverbal Communication

Suitability assessed coverage of nonverbal communication within tools; 12 of the 41 tools did not offer an assessment of nonverbal communication, for instance, these focussed on assessing verbal communication purely, namely Sheffield Screening Test for Acquired Language Disorders [13] and Comprehensive Assessment of Spoken Language (CASL) [46]. These tools scored zero for assessing nonverbal communication. Several other tools covered elements of both verbal and nonverbal communication (19/41), these included tools with the score of one for the ability to assess nonverbal cues, examples of such tools integrated tools like the Revised Edinburgh Functional Communication Profile (REFCP) [12] and some of the pain assessing scales, namely Pain Assessment for the Dementing Elderly (PADE) [22]. However other tools encompassed the study of a specific nonverbal cue, e.g. facial expressions through the Facial Action Coding System [53], and these tools received a score of two for assessing nonverbal communication (13/41). Only three tools were identified to provide

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

a comprehensive study of different nonverbal communication cues. The Emory Dyssemia Index (EDI) examined impairment in nonverbal communication through a number of nonverbal communication cues including gesture, gaze, facial expressions and space and touch using .

Table 7 Suitability scores for tools: (Coverage of Nonverbal Communication)

Assessment	Score	Number of Tools
No evidence for emphasis on Nonverbal communication	0	12
Study of both Verbal and Nonverbal communication or other areas such as overall aphasia	1	18
Study of only specific elements of Nonverbal communication e.g. facial expression	2	9
Comprehensive assessment of Nonverbal communication	3	2

Findings of Extended Narrative review

The extended narrative review from 2017 to October 2019 identified 272 papers, of which 49 were retained in the search following the titles being screened. Of these 20 papers focussed on the assessment of pain, four focussed on overall communication; 18 focussed on emotion recognition in addition to seven papers that focussed on nonverbal communication (including gestures, touch and overall nonverbal communication). Two tools were found to examine elements nonverbal communication. The Threadgold Communication tool (TCT) [4, 54] focussed on difficulties in the number of communication cues, including speaking, vocal sounds, singing, smell, gestures, interactive touch and posture. The TCT consists of 14-item questionnaire, and each item is graded from zero to four scale, with zero indicating no evidence to four indicating frequent evidence of communication.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Evidence presented on psychometrics properties of this tool reflect a satisfactory level for internal consistency and a high test-retest reliability (r = 0.76). The corrected item-total correlation ranged between 0.50 and 0.87. Despite the modest sample size (n = 51), the TCT is a reliable and valid instrument, suitable for measuring communication among people with moderate to severe dementia pre- and post-intervention. The second tool identified to assess elements of nonverbal communication was the Scenario Test (ST) [55], a battery test which examines the ability to convey a message verbally and/or nonverbally, in every-day life scenarios. The test was designed for persons with severe to moderate limitations of verbal communication for people with severe aphasia testing an individual's ability to communicate in a set scenario. Despite limited evidence of use in clinical practice and research, there is some evidence for validity and reliability of the tool, high internal consistency (α =0.96) and retest reliability (ICC: 0.98) was present. Concurrent validity for ST is reported as good with other tools in aphasia (0.85 - 0.79).

Discussion

Summary of Findings

The objective of the literature review was to identify tools available to assess nonverbal communication that could be potentially used for assessing nonverbal communication in people living with AD. Forty-one tools were identified through the scoping review (1946 - 2017), these tools originated and focussed on different forms of communication and were used with various populations and settings.

The review revealed a limited number of tools available that focussed purely on investigating nonverbal communication (n = 9). Some of the tools developed were specifically for assessing nonverbal communication, this included: EDI, DANVA-2, NDEPT, KNVECL, ERT, Posture Knowledge Test, FACS and ABQ. Pain and functional communication were the two most common focuses for these tools. These tools utilised different methodological approaches to assess nonverbal communication, most were observational and used test batteries and proxy questionnaires. The findings of the scoping review were further confirmed by the recent narrative literature search process reported in this paper,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

which also indicates towards a lack of nonverbal research tools present within the current literature. Limited number scales provided a detailed report of nonverbal communication function,

Findings in Context of Research

The scoping review aimed to identify nonverbal communication tools that can be employed to examine nonverbal communication in PlwD. Limited literature was available on nonverbal communication in dementia, it is likely that this is partly due to the lack of reliable tools. Furthermore, to date there are no research review papers present that focus on ways of assessing nonverbal communication cues, particularly in dementia. As a whole there is limited evidence to support the feasibility and validity of using these tools in PlwD. This is due to a variety of reasons including the method of data collection, duration and the presence of cognitive impairment in this population. Data on feasibility was insufficient across majority of tools, commonly due to limited information provided on feasibility within the original studies. Variation in settings and population may have an influence on psychometric findings of individual measures, for example in an acute setting; ratings might be affected by having limited knowledge of the participants and disease severity.

Unlike verbal language, the innate nature of nonverbal communication is continuous with multiple channels, contexts and meanings, thus making this a challenging form of communication to assess and define. For instance, aspects of nonverbal communication, such as changes in voice tone and body language could take place without a person's explicit awareness [56], and often varying in their frequency and intensity. Verbal and nonverbal communication cues typically occur simultaneously and are interpreted together during face-to-face interactions [57, 58]. These factors add to the complexity to the evaluation of nonverbal cues and their associated context, meaning and relevance.

Very few tools appeared to have any strong theoretical underpinning which supported the development of the tool and there was variation in research methodologies and calculations for determining psychometric properties. Therefore, a direct comparison across the tools should be interpreted with caution. Overall, the current review supports the previous literature indicating a clear gap in research in relation to nonverbal communication within the previous literature [59]. Further research is warranted within this field to fill in the gaps and to identify appropriate research methodologies for assessing nonverbal communication across various populations and settings.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Limitations and Strength

The review was kept broad in terms of study population and setting, and this represents a limitation of this review. The studies identified in this review have considerable heterogeneity, in terms of design (retrospective vs. prospective), method (observational tools vs. batteries), research population (dementia, stroke, aphasia, different levels of cognitive impairment and different settings), making their data difficult to compare.

In addition, assumptions about the psychometric quality of the tools were based on the information provided and methodological details were often omitted from the report. Further elements that make the studies difficult to compare include differences in format/structure and scoring method. For instance, DOLOPLUS2, PADE, BDAE, REFCP ERT, and FACS are very different in these respects. A set of criteria was used to provide an indication of psychometric strengths, which allowed the review to be more objective. However, the quality scores should always be interpreted with caution since the use of some criteria involved a subjective element derived from the reviewer's expertise. The current literature search was kept broad to capture the presence of nonverbal tools and did not specifically target literature reporting on the feasibility for the tools, because of this, the evidence may be more limited on these properties than it might have been otherwise. The findings of this review help to provide insight into the different research approaches that can be used to assess communication function, approaches which could be developed for use in the dementia population.

Implications for Research and Practice

There are various research and practice implications for the findings of this review. This review could be expanded to include distinct categories of nonverbal cues in the literature search process to ensure broader and fuller coverage of nonverbal research literature. There were forty-one tools identified through the scoping review which included elements of nonverbal cues. However, we cannot at present recommend any particular tool for use in any clinical practice, due to the lack of comprehensive evidence on the reliability, validity, feasibility or clinical utility of any one particular tool. Further research

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

should be conducted on the psychometric properties of tools and in clinical practice to assess feasibility, clinical utility and guidance on use of the tools. These are necessary albeit not sufficient pre-requisites for actual use in routine clinical practice.

Furthermore, there is a need to evaluate the nonverbal tools for people living with dementia across various clinical settings, using rigorous methods and larger sample sizes. These studies need to ensure that the definitions and stages of cognitive impairment are clearly defined, to enable comparison of nonverbal communication function across disease severity. Whilst there is a need for rigorous research, assessing the accuracy of tools can be difficult due to the various methodological research approaches being used and there being no clear gold standard approach [60]. Thus, researchers need to either envision new assessment instruments on the basis of different conceptual foundations or concentrate on extending the psychometric evidence for some of the existing tools. It should also be noted that whilst some tools were identified to have high reliability in research this may not be transferable to routine clinical practice because many of these tools (e.g., particularly pain or EDI) were not being employed as intended.

Literature indicates that nonverbal communication plays an important role in conveying emotional and relational information during clinical interactions [61-63]. This review adds to our understanding of the availability of nonverbal communication measures that could be adapted for various settings, Whilst these tools may be adaptable to different setting their applicability to the real life setting in care homes, for the dementia population this remains unknown [64]. Larger sample size studies will be needed to evaluate feasibility and practical use of identified tools across different populations and settings. Finally, a tool must be applicable to “the condition, setting and individuals participating in an interaction” [65]. This understanding also highlights the importance of context features and emphasizes the need to adopt a person-centred approach, to the extent to which a measure captures both the content of the health care user's views and the form or ways in which their views are expressed [66].

Several communication tools assessing nonverbal behaviour (such as FACS, NDEPT, KNVS) are observational tools utilising real time coding and video analysis, which can be intrusive and resource intensive [67]. An assessment of nonverbal function could be conducted using a proxy assessment, using the EDI scale. Such tools can be further evaluated for validity, reliability and feasibility on a wider scale to match the needs of individuals with dementia. This tool should be studied further to assess its

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

feasibility for use with people living with dementia, matching the possible urgency for such a tool, particularly to improve the well-being of people living in the severe stages of dementia who are not able to communicate their needs. In summary, there a limited number of nonverbal communication tools present currently available. The primary objective of this review was to identify tools for evaluation of nonverbal communication function with a view of utilizing the tool pre- and post-intervention to focus on nonverbal cues as essential means of communication for PlwD in care homes. In line with this, future work is needed to develop a tool specifically focussed on nonverbal communication function.

Conclusion

This review highlights the current evidence base of nonverbal communication assessment tools and provides an insight regarding the gaps in our understanding. Forty-one tools were identified through the literature search process. These tools assessed various communication channels embracing verbal, nonverbal and functional, communication means; originating from various settings and populations, for instance, those assessing cognition and verbal language difficulties secondary to stroke, aphasia and nonverbal cues associated with pain. A number of tools presented psychometrics qualities; only nine of the forty-one tools specifically focussed on nonverbal communication and most of these tools did not provide a comprehensive assessment of nonverbal communication function. It is therefore challenging to recommend one particular tool for use in any clinical or care setting, due to the mismatch of suitability, reliability, validity, and feasibility of any one particular tool. However, namely two tools including the EDI scale and the TCT indicated coverage of nonverbal communication across spectrum of different nonverbal cues. The EDI scale indicated a proxy assessment of impairment across different nonverbal communication skills including paralanguage, gestures facial expressions chronemics and use of space and touch with good test re-test reliability and internal consistency, however, requires further testing to validate it's use in dementia. The EDI scale provides extensive study of nonverbal cues, with the advantage of requiring short time and brief minimum instructions and burden for caregivers to complete, the higher the score, the worse the impairment. The Threadgold Communication Tool (TCT) focussed on difficulties in the number of communication cues. TCT provided satisfactory level for internal consistency and a high test-retest reliability for use in dementia (albeit small sample size). Compared to the TCT, the EDI scale covered nonverbal communication in a greater depth. Further research is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

required to evaluate psychometric properties and in clinical or care practice to assess feasibility, clinical utility and guidance for application in dementia for both EDI and TCT.

References:

[1] Acton GJ, Yauk S, Hopkins BA, Mayhew PA. Increasing social communication in persons with dementia. Research and Theory for Nursing Practice: An International Journal. 2007;21:32-44.
[2] Keady J, Jones L. Investigating the causes of behaviours that challenge in people with dementia. Nurs Older People. 2010;22:25-29.
[3] Moniz-Cook E, Elston C, Gardiner E, Agar S, Silver M, Win T, Wang M. Can training community mental health nurses to support family carers reduce behavioural problems in dementia? An exploratory pragmatic randomised controlled trial. International journal of geriatric psychiatry. 2008;23:185-191.
[4] Strøm BS, Engedal K, Grov E-K. A psychometric evaluation of the Threadgold Communication Tool for persons with dementia. Dementia and geriatric cognitive disorders extra. 2016;6:150-160.
[5] Mays N, Roberts E, Poppay J: Synthesising research evidence. Fulop N, Allen P, Clarke A, Black N, editors. London, Routledge; 2001.
[6] Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. International Journal of Social Research Methodology. 2005;8:19-32.
[7] Davis K, Drey N, Gould D. What are scoping studies? A review of the nursing literature. Int J Nurs Stud. 2009;46:1386-1400.
[8] Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. Implement Sci. 2010;5:69.
[9] Streiner DL NG: Health Measurement Scales: A Practical Guide to Their Development and Use. Oxford, Oxford University Press; 2003.
[10] Nowicki S, Duke MP. The association of children's nonverbal decoding abilities with their popularity, locus of control, and academic achievement. The Journal of genetic psychology. 1992;153:385-393.
[11] Frattali C, Thompson CK, Holland AL, Wohl CB, Ferketic M. Functional assessment of communication skills for adult. 1995.
[12] Wirz SL, Skinner C, Dean E: Revised Edinburgh functional communication profile, Communication Skill Builders; 1990.
[13] Syder D, Body R, Parker M, Boddy M. Sheffield screening test for acquired language disorders. Windsor: NFER-Nelson. 1993.
[14] Nowicki S, Duke MP. Individual differences in the nonverbal communication of affect: The diagnostic analysis of nonverbal accuracy scale. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior. 1994;18:9-35.
[15] Warden V, Hurley AC, Volicer L. Development and psychometric evaluation of the Pain Assessment in Advanced Dementia (PAINAD) scale. Journal of the American Medical Directors Association. 2003;4:9-15.
[16] Willis MH, Merkel SI, Voepel-Lewis T, Malviya S. FLACC Behavioral Pain Assessment Scale: a comparison with the child's self-report. Pediatric nursing. 2003;29:195.
[17] Abbey J, Piller N, Bellis AD, Esterman A, Parker D, Giles L, Lowcay B. The Abbey pain scale: a 1-minute numerical indicator for people with end-stage dementia. International Journal of Palliative Nursing. 2004;10:6-13.
[18] Feldt KS. The checklist of nonverbal pain indicators (CNPI). Pain Management Nursing. 2000;1:13-21.
[19] Gorawara-Bhat R, Cook MA, Sachs GA. Nonverbal communication in doctor–elderly patient transactions (NDEPT): Development of a tool. Patient education and counseling. 2007;66:223-234.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[20] Hurley AC, Volicer BJ, Hanrahan PA, Houde S, Volicer L. Assessment of discomfort in advanced Alzheimer patients. Research in Nursing & Health. 1992;15:369-377.
[21] Gélinas C, Fillion L, Puntillo KA, Viens C, Fortier M. Validation of the critical-care pain observation tool in adult patients. American Journal of Critical Care. 2006;15:420-427.
[22] Villanueva MR, Smith TL, Erickson JS, Lee AC, Singer CM. Pain assessment for the dementing elderly (PADE): reliability and validity of a new measure. Journal of the American Medical Directors Association. 2003;4:1-8.
[23] Fuchs-Lacelle S, Hadjistavropoulos T. Development and preliminary validation of the pain assessment checklist for seniors with limited ability to communicate (PACSLAC). Pain Management Nursing. 2004;5:37-49.
[24] Payen JF, Bru O, Bosson JL, Lagrasta A, Novel E, Deschaux I, Lavagne P, Jacquot C. Assessing pain in critically ill sedated patients by using a behavioral pain scale. Crit Care Med. 2001;29:2258-2263.
[25] Lefebvre-Chapiro S. The Doloplus-2 scale: evaluating pain in the elderly. Eur J Palliat Care. 2001;8:191-194.
[26] Snow AL, Weber JB, O'Malley KJ, Cody M, Beck C, Bruera E, Ashton C, Kunik ME. NOPPAIN: a nursing assistant-administered pain assessment instrument for use in dementia. Dementia and geriatric cognitive disorders. 2004;17:240-246.
[27] Odhner M, Wegman D, Freeland N, Steinmetz A, Ingersoll GL. Assessing pain control in nonverbal critically ill adults. Dimensions of Critical Care Nursing. 2003;22:260-267.
[28] Lomas J, Pickard L, Bester S, Elbard H, Finlayson A, Zoghaib C. The communicative effectiveness index: Development and psychometric evaluation of a functional communication measure for adult aphasia. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders. 1989;54:113-124.
[29] Goodglass H, Kaplan E. Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (BDAE) Lea and Febiger. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. 1983.
[30] Enderby P, Wood V, Wade D: Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test:(FAST): Test Manual, Whurr Publishers; 1987.
[31] Porch BE: Porch index of communicative ability: Theory and development, Consulting Psychologists Press; 1971.
[32] Holland AL, Frattali C, Fromm D: Communication activities of daily living: CADL-2, Pro-Ed; 1999.
[33] Kovacev ANZM, . Non-verbal communication check list (KNVECL) – an instrument for observing non-verbal communication between elderly and their caregivers. In Slovenian (Visoka {ola za zdravstvo, Ljubljana)2007.
[34] Kovach CR, Weissman DE, Griffie J, Matson S, Muchka S. Assessment and treatment of discomfort for people with late-stage dementia. Journal of pain and symptom management. 1999;18:412-419.
[35] Rousseaux M, Sève A, Vallet M, Pasquier F, Mackowiak-Cordoliani MA. An analysis of communication in conversation in patients with dementia. Neuropsychologia. 2010;48:3884-3890.
[36] Holden UP, Woods RT: Positive approaches to dementia care, Churchill Livingstone Edinburgh; 1995.
[37] Dean R, Briggs K, Lindesay J. The domus philosophy: A prospective evaluation of two residential units for the elderly mentally ill. International journal of geriatric psychiatry. 1993;8:807-817.
[38] Forsyth K, Lai J-S, Kielhofner G. The assessment of communication and interaction skills (ACIS): Measurement properties. British Journal of Occupational Therapy. 1999;62:69-74.
[39] Bayles KA, Tomoeda CK, Trosset MW. Relation of linguistic communication abilities of Alzheimer's patients to stage of disease. Brain and Language. 1992;42:454-472.
[40] Powell JA, Hale MA, Bayer AJ. Symptoms of communication breakdown in dementia: Carers' perceptions. European Journal of Disorders of Communication. 1995;30:65-75.
[41] Shimokawa A, Yatomi N, Anamizu S, Ashikari I, Kohno M, Maki Y, Torii S, Isono H, Sugai Y, Koyama N, Matsuno Y. Comprehension of emotions: comparison between Alzheimer type and vascular type dementias. Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord. 2000;11:268-274.
[42] Helmes E, Csapo KG, Short J-A. Standardization and validation of the multidimensional observation scale for elderly subjects (MOSES). Journal of Gerontology. 1987;42:395-405.
[43] Mozaz M, Rothi LJ, Anderson JM, Crucian GP, Heilman KM. Postural knowledge of transitive pantomimes and intransitive gestures. J Int Neuropsychol Soc. 2002;8:958-962.
[44] Westermeyer JF, Harrow M. Predicting outcome in schizophrenics and nonschizophrenics of both sexes: The Zigler-Phillips Social Competence Scale. Journal of Abnormal Psychology. 1986;95:406.
[45] Bayles KA, Tomoeda CK: The functional linguistic communication inventory, Pro-ed; 1994.
[46] Carrow-Woolfolk E: CASL: Comprehensive assessment of spoken language, American Guidance Services; 1999.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[47] Ekman P, Friesen WV: Manual for the facial action coding system, Consulting Psychologists Press; 1978.
[48] Benton AL, & Hamsher, K. (1976). Multilingual aphasia examination (2nd ed.). Iowa City: AJA Associates,, Inc.: Multilingual aphasia examination (2nd ed.). I, Iowa City: AJA Associates, Inc.; 1976.
[49] Bienvenu Sr MJ. An interpersonal communication inventory. Journal of communication. 1971;21:381-388.
[50] Magai C, Cohen C, Gomberg D, Malatesta C, Culver C. Emotional expression during mid- to late-stage dementia. Int Psychogeriatr. 1996;8:383-395.
[51] Zwakhalen SM, Hamers JP, Abu-Saad HH, Berger MP. Pain in elderly people with severe dementia: a systematic review of behavioural pain assessment tools. BMC geriatrics. 2006;6:3.
[52] Love EB, Nowicki Jr S, Duke MP. The Emory Dyssemia Index: A brief screening instrument for the identification of nonverbal language deficits in elementary school children. The Journal of psychology. 1994;128:703-705.
[53] Ekman P, Friesen WV. Facial action coding system. 1977.
[54] Strom BS, Benth JS, Engedal K. Impact of the Sonas Programme on Communication over a Period of 24 Weeks in People with Moderate-to-Severe Dementia. Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders Extra. 2018;8:238-247.
[55] van der Meulen I, van de Sandt-Koenderman WME, Duivenvoorden HJ, Ribbers GM. Measuring verbal and non-verbal communication in aphasia: reliability, validity, and sensitivity to change of the Scenario Test. International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders. 2010;45:424-435.
[56] Cappella JN, Schreiber DM. The Interaction Management Function of Nonverbal Cues: Theory and Research About Mutual Behavioral Influence in Face-to-Face Settings. 2006.
[57] Hall JA, Harrigan JA, Rosenthal R. Nonverbal behavior in clinician—patient interaction. Applied and Preventive Psychology. 1995;4:21-37.
[58] Robinson JD: Nonverbal Communication and Physician-Patient Interaction: Review and New Directions. in The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication. Thousand Oaks, CA, US, Sage Publications, Inc; 2006. pp. 437-459.
[59] Denham MA, Onwuegbuzie AJ. Beyond words: Using nonverbal communication data in research to enhance thick description and interpretation. International Journal of Qualitative Methods. 2013;12:670-696.
[60] Del Piccolo L, Goss C. People-centred care: new research needs and methods in doctor–patient communication. Challenges in mental health. Epidemiology and psychiatric sciences. 2012;21:145-149.
[61] Roter DL, Frankel RM, Hall JA, Sluyter D. The expression of emotion through nonverbal behavior in medical visits. Journal of general internal medicine. 2006;21:28-34.
[62] Hall JA, Roter DL, Blanch DC, Frankel RM. Nonverbal sensitivity in medical students: Implications for clinical interactions. Journal of general internal medicine. 2009;24:1217.
[63] Roter DL, Hall JA: Communication and adherence: moving from prediction to understanding. LWW; (2009).
[64] Wear D, Varley JD. Rituals of verification: the role of simulation in developing and evaluating empathic communication. Patient education and counseling. 2008;71:153-156.
[65] Spengler PM, Strohmer DC, Dixon DN, Shivy VA. A scientist-practitioner model of psychological assessment: Implications for training, practice and research. The Counseling Psychologist. 1995;23:506-534.
[66] Greenhalgh T. Narrative based medicine in an evidence based world. Bmj. 1999;318:323-325.
[67] Jones SE, LeBaron CD. Research on the relationship between verbal and nonverbal communication: Emerging integrations. Journal of Communication. 2002;52:499-521.

Appendix A Identified tools and Psychometric Properties

Assessment Tool	Origin of Item - Population	Number of Participants	Content	Construct	Criterion	Homogeneity (internal consistency)	Inter-rater Reliability	Re-test Reliability	Coverage of nonverbal communication	Sum for Psychometric properties
Selected Tools										
Emory Dyssemia Index (EDI) (Nowicki and Duke, 1992)	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	3	8
Revised Edinburgh Functional Communication Profile (REFCP) (Wirz SL, Skinner C, 1990)	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Sheffield Screening Test for Acquired Language Disorders (Syder, 1993)	1	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4

Non-Selected Tools										
DANVA-2 (Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy 2) (Duke & Nowicki, 1993)	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	2	2	6
Pain Assessment in Advanced Dementia (PAINAD) (Warden et al., 2003)	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	0	2	6
FLACC (Face, Legs, Activity, Cry, Consolability) Pain Scale (Willis et al., 2003)	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	0	2	9
Abbey Pain Scale (Abbey et al., 2004)	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	4
CNPI (Checklist of Nonverbal Pain Indicators) (Feldt, 2000)	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	5

Nonverbal communication in doctor–elderly patient transactions (NDEPT) (Gorawara-Bhat, 2014)	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	3
Discomfort Scale - Dementia for Alzheimer Type (DS DAT) (Hurley et al., 1992)	2	2	1	2	**1**	1	2	1	2	8
Critical Care Pain Observation Tool (CPOT) (Gelinas et al., 2006)	0	0	1	**1**	**1**	2	**2**	**0**	1	7
Pain Assessment for the Dementing Elderly (PADE) (Villanueva et al., 2003)	2	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	6

PACSLAC (Pain Assessment Checklist for Seniors with Limited Ability to Communicate) (Fuchs-Lacelle et al., 2004)	2	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	1	6
Behavioral Pain Scale (BPS) (Payen et al., 2001)	0	1	1	2	0	2	1	0	1	6
Doloplus-2 (Lefebvre-Chapiro, 2001)	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	4
NOPPAIN (Non-Communicative Patient's Assessment Instrument (Snow et al., 2004)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
NVPS: Nonverbal Pain Scale (Odhner et al., 2003b)	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	8

Communication Effectiveness Index (CETI) (Lomas et al., 1989)	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	2	0	8
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (BDAE) (Goodglass and Kaplan, 1982)	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	4
The Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test (Enderby et al., 1987)	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	8
Porch Index of Communicative Abilities (PICA) (Porch, 1971)	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	2	1	6
Communication Activities of Daily Living -2 (CADL-2) (Holland, 1998)	1	2	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	5

ASHA Functional Assessment of Communication Skills (ASHA FACS) (Frattali et al 1995)	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	11
Kovacev Non-Verbal Expression Check List (KNVECL) (Kovacev, 2008)	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	3	4
ADD (Assessment of Discomfort in Dementia) (Kovach et al., 1999)	2	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
Lille Communication Test (LCT) (Rousseaux, 2001)	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
The Holden Communication Scale (Holden, 1995)	2	2	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	5

Quality of Interaction schedule (Dean et al., 1993)	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
The Assessment of Communication and InteractionSkills (ACIS) (Forsyth et al., 1999)	1	2	0	2	1	0	2	0	1	5
Core Linguistic Battery (Bayles et al., 1992)	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Communication Problems Scale (Powell et al., 1995)	2	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	4
Emotion Recognition Test (Shimokawa et al 2000)	2	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	4

Multidimensional Observation Scale for Elderly Subjects (MOSES) (Helmes et al., 1987)	1	2	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	6
Posture Knowledge Test (Mozaz et al., 2002)	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Social Competence Scale (Westermeyer and Harrow, 1986, Zigier-Phillips 1961)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
The Functional Linguistic Communication (Bayles., et al 1994)	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Comprehensive Assessment of Spoken Language (CASL) (Carrow-Woolfolk, 1999)	0	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	0	8

Facial Action Coding System (Ekman et al., 1978)	1	2	2	1	2	0	2	0	1	7
Verbal Fluency Benton (Benton et al., 1976)	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3
Interpersonal Communication Inventory (Bienvenu, 1971)	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	5
The Adult Behaviour Questionnaire (ABQ) (Magai et al., 1996)	2	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Appendix B Communication Tools

Assessment Tool	**Feasibility Score (Manageable or complex to conduct)**
Emory Dyssemia Index (EDI)	2
Revised Edinburgh Functional Communication Profile (REFCP)	2
Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy 2 (DANVA-2)	1
Sheffield Screening Test for Acquired Language Disorders (STALD)	1
Pain Assessment in Advanced Dementia (PAINAD)	1
FLACC (Face, Legs, Activity, Cry, Consolability) Pain Scale	2
Abbey Pain Scale	2
CNPI (Checklist of Nonverbal Pain Indicators)	2
Nonverbal communication in doctor–elderly patient transactions (NDEPT)	0
Discomfort Scale - Dementia for Alzheimer Type (DS DAT)	2
Critical- Care Pain Observation Tool (CPOT)	2
Pain Assessment for the Dementing Elderly (PADE)	2
Pain Assessment Checklist for Seniors with Limited Ability to Communicate (PACSLAC)	0
Behavioral Pain Scale (BPS)	2
Doloplus-2	0
NOPPAIN (Non-Communicative Patient's Assessment Instrument)	1
NVPS: Nonverbal Pain Scale	0
Communication Effectiveness Index (CETI)	2
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (BDAE)	0
The Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test (FAST)	0

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The Functional Linguistic Communication Inventory.	1
Porch Index of Communicative Abilities (PICA)	0
Communication Activities of Daily Living -2 (CADL-2)	0
ASHA Functional Assessment of Communication Skills (ASHA FACS)	2
Kovacev Nonverbal Expression Check List (KNVECL)	1
ADD (Assessment of Discomfort in Dementia)	1
Lille Communication Test (LCT)	0
The Holden Communication Scale	2
Quality of Interaction schedule (QUIS)	1
The Assessment of Communication and Interaction Skills (ACIS)	2
Core Linguistic Battery	0
Communication Problems Scale	2
Emotion Recognition Test	1
Multidimensional Observation Scale for Elderly Subjects	2
Posture Knowledge Test	0
Social Competence Scale	2
Facial Action Coding System	0
Interpersonal Communication Inventory	2
Verbal Fluency	1
Comprehensive Assessment of Spoken Language (CASL)	0
The Adult Behavior Questionnaire	2

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.28.21250369; this version posted February 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .