

1 **Title: Natural Language Processing to Identify Patients with Cognitive Impairment**

2 Khalil I Hussein, MD^a; Lili Chan, MD, MS^b; Tielman Van Vleck, PhD^c; Kelly Beers, MD^b; Monica
3 R Mindt, PhD^d; Michael Wolf, PhD, MPH^e; Laura M. Curtis, MS^e; Parul Agarwal, PhD^f; Juan
4 Wisnivesky, MD^a; Girish N. Nadkarni, MD, MPH^{b,c}; Alex Federman, MD^a

5 ^aDivision of General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at
6 Mount Sinai, New York, NY

7 ^bDivision of Nephrology, Department of Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New
8 York, NY

9 ^cThe Charles Bronfman Institute of Personalized Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount
10 Sinai, New York, NY

11 ^dDepartment of Neurology, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai; Department of Psychology,
12 Fordham University, New York, NY

13 ^eInstitute of Public Health and Medicine, Department of Medicine; Feinberg School of Medicine,
14 Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois, USA

15 ^fInstitute for Health Care Delivery Science, Department of Population Health Science and Policy,
16 Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

17 *KIH and LC contributed equally and share first authorship, GNN and AF jointly supervised the
18 work

19 Abstract word count: 145

20 Manuscript word count: 3356

21 Tables: 4

22 Figures: 0

23 Running Head: Hussein et al. NLP for CI Identification

24 Corresponding Author:

25 Lili Chan, MD, MS

26 Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai,

27 One Gustave L Levy Place, Box 1243

28 New York, NY-10029

29 Telephone number: (212) 241-8640

30 Fax number: (212) 849-2643

31 Email Address: Lili.Chan@MountSinai.org

32 **Abstract:**

33 **INTRODUCTION:** Early detection of patients with cognitive impairment may facilitate care for
34 individuals in this population. Natural language processing (NLP) is a potential approach to
35 identifying patients with cognitive impairment from electronic health records (EHR).

36 **METHODS:** We used three machine learning algorithms (logistic regression, multilayer
37 perceptron, and random forest) using clinical terms extracted by NLP to predict cognitive
38 impairment in a cohort of 199 patients. Cognitive impairment was defined as a mini-mental
39 status exams (MMSE) score <24.

40 **RESULTS:** NLP identified 69 (35%) patients with cognitive impairment and ICD codes identified
41 44 (22%). Using MMSE as a reference standard, NLP sensitivity was 35%, specificity 66%,
42 precision 41%, and NPV 61%. The random forest method had the best test parameters;
43 sensitivity 95%, specificity 100%, precision 100%, and NPV 97%

44 **DISCUSSION:** NLP can identify adults with cognitive impairment with moderate test
45 performance that is enhanced with machine learning.

46 **KEYWORDS:** Dementia, Cognition, Early Detection, Machine learning, Cognitive Impairment

47

48 Introduction

49 Cognitive impairment is common among Americans over the age of 65, with an
50 estimated prevalence as high as 9% for dementia and 28% for mild cognitive impairment in
51 some populations.^{1,2} Further, the absolute number of individuals with cognitive difficulties will
52 continue to rise as the U.S. population ages.³ Early detection of patients with cognitive
53 impairment may enable primary care providers to facilitate care and care management and
54 improve outcomes for individuals in this population.⁴ Yet systematically identifying patients with
55 cognitive impairment in clinical settings has proven to be logistically difficult.⁵ For example,
56 validated tools for cognitive impairment screening, like the mini Mental State Exam (MMSE) and
57 the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA), are infrequently used in clinical care, possibly
58 owing to the competing demands of management of multimorbidity in the primary care of older
59 adults.⁶⁻¹¹ Therefore, a method to efficiently and accurately identify mild cognitive impairment
60 that minimizes primary care provider involvement is necessary.

61 The rise of healthcare information technology and big data analytics present potential
62 new opportunities to circumvent the existing challenges of identifying patients with cognitive
63 impairment. Electronic health records (EHR) hold an enormous quantum of data beyond
64 traditionally used discrete data elements, like International Classification of Diseases (ICD)
65 diagnosis codes. Free text documentation by clinicians and other members of the health system
66 may hold information about cognitive abilities for the individual, ranging from the nuanced (e.g.,
67 “the patient forgets”) to the overt (e.g., “family is concerned about dementia”). Such data can be
68 leveraged using advanced informatics approaches for cognitive impairment research.¹² Natural
69 language processing (NLP) is such an approach. NLP can be used to process large volumes of
70 free text in clinical documentation and convert it into discrete data elements suitable for
71 quantitative analysis.¹³ Machine learning can then be applied to the data elements extracted
72 through NLP to create precise prediction models when a standard measure of cognition is
73 available. In this study, we used NLP and machine learning to identify patients with cognitive

74 impairment using EHR data from an academic medical center and a neurocognitive assessment
75 as the reference standard.

76

77 **Methods**

78 *Study Population*

79 Data for this study were obtained from multiple sources. While all patients were part of
80 the BioMe Biobank, patient interview data was obtained from two cohort studies.¹⁴ The data
81 from these sources were used to characterize study patients and provide a reference standard
82 for cognitive impairment. The cohort studies were conducted in primary care and pulmonary
83 practices in New York City and Chicago, included older adults (ages ≥ 50 years) with chronic
84 obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) or asthma, and excluded individuals with dementia
85 based on ICD coding in the electronic record. Patients with diagnosed dementia were excluded
86 since the primary goal of this study was to identify patients with previously undiagnosed
87 cognitive impairment. In both studies, baseline assessments of cognition were conducted by
88 research assistants who were formally trained and supervised in the administration of
89 neuropsychological assessment, including the MMSE, by a research psychologist.^{15, 16}

90 The BioMe Biobank is a prospective registry of patients recruited from primary care and
91 subspecialty clinics in the Mount Sinai Health System. Participants consent to the use of their
92 EHR data for biomedical research and the Mount Sinai Institutional Review Board approved the
93 BioME protocols. For the purpose of the present study, we included patients in the cohort
94 studies who had also consented to BioMe participation, and linked their EHR data with cohort
95 study survey data. We retrieved all clinical notes of participants available from the EHR up to
96 December 31, 2017.

97

98 *Study Design*

99 *Reference Standards for Cognitive Impairment*

100 The primary reference standard was the mini-Mental State Exam, which was
101 administered to subjects in both cohort studies at baseline, 12 months, and 24 months.
102 Research assistants were formally trained and supervised in the administration of
103 neuropsychological assessment by a research psychologist from the Mount Sinai School of
104 Medicine Alzheimer's Disease Research Center. For Spanish-speaking patients, the MMSE was
105 administered in Spanish. We defined cognitive impairment as an unadjusted MMSE score of
106 <24 and used data from the most recent assessment.¹⁷

107 In a set of secondary analyses, we used physician review of the chart to determine
108 whether there was documented evidence of cognitive impairment. We randomly selected 25
109 patients who were positive for cognitive impairment by NLP and 25 who were negative. Chart
110 review was independently performed by 2 physicians who were blinded to the results of the NLP
111 analyses and to the ICD codes. Disagreements between the 2 physicians were adjudicated by a
112 third physician. Each reviewer read through all available notes in the EHR. Patients were
113 considered to have cognitive impairment if reviewers found documentation of patient or patient
114 family member complaints of forgetfulness, difficulty learning new things, concentrating, or
115 making decisions to the point of interfering with their everyday life. This could be intermittent or
116 related to a transient condition, such as delirium. Additionally, if a patient was referred to a
117 specialist for dementia workup, reviewers considered this to be positive for cognitive
118 impairment. However, patients forgetting to take medications or to bring in blood pressure/blood
119 sugar logs were not considered to be cognitively impaired, nor were patients who developed
120 altered mental status or cognitive decline while under inpatient hospice care.

121

122 *Natural Language Processing*

123 NLP was used to parse all available progress notes and discharge summaries. When
124 using MMSE as a reference only notes from a 24-month period, between 12 months prior to and
125 12 months after the most recent MMSE administration was used. Since the MMSE was

126 obtained at a defined time, this time restriction allows for inclusion of only notes that reflect the
127 provider assessment of the patients' cognitive function around the time of the MMSE. This
128 avoids including notes from patients who may have developed cognitive impairment after the
129 MMSE. However, when we compared the NLP algorithm to manual chart review and ICD codes,
130 since the entire chart was reviewed, there were no time restrictions to the notes for NLP
131 querying. We excluded radiology reports and pathology reports as text from these note types
132 are generally devoid of assessments of cognition. The NLP program matched words and
133 phrases in EHR free-text documentation to clinical terms of the Systematized Nomenclature of
134 Medicine – Clinical Terms (SNOMED CT). SNOMED is a comprehensive healthcare
135 terminology consisting of hierarchies of concepts, with parent terms encompassing specific
136 concepts (child terms).¹⁸ Two physicians independently reviewed available SNOMED CT for
137 terms associated with cognitive impairment to be used for NLP querying. The SNOMED CT
138 parent and child terms included in the query are diagrammed in eFigure 1.

139 For each of these terms a query was created to identify instances of the concept
140 documented as present in the clinical record and determined whether it represented the subject
141 of record (the patient vs. a family member) and its temporality (current or past). We defined
142 cognitive impairment by NLP as identification of ≥ 1 term in the medical record linked to cognitive
143 impairment by SNOMED CT. Cognitive impairment was not considered present when negation
144 terms, e.g., not or no, were used in the same sentence or when cognitive impairment was
145 mentioned in the context of family history. NLP was performed using CLiX NLP (Clinithink,
146 London, UK).

147 After first use of NLP to identify patients with cognitive impairment, we conducted a
148 manual review of 50 randomly selected charts to identify and correct inaccuracies in the NLP
149 strategy that could lead to false positive and negative results. For example, NLP labeled one
150 patient as having cognitive impairment when it recognized the “mCi” abbreviation used for
151 “millicurie” (a unit of radioactivity) as indicative of mild cognitive impairment.

152

153 *Identifying Cognitively Impaired Patients by ICD Codes*

154 We also used ICD 9 and 10 codes to identify patients with cognitive impairment (eTable
155 1).^{19, 20} The codes we used included 290.x (dementias, including senile and vascular), 294.x
156 (persistent mental disorders due to conditions classified elsewhere, e.g., amnesic disorder in
157 conditions classified elsewhere, dementia unspecified), F01.x (vascular dementia), and F01.x
158 (unspecified dementia).

159

160 *Machine Learning Strategy*

161 In order to develop a machine learning approach to predicting cognitive impairment from
162 free text data, all SNOMED terms were extracted from every available progress note for all
163 patients for the 24 month period of observation. Each data element matched to a SNOMED
164 clinical term has 4 features (temporality, association, subject relationship, finding or presence of
165 the condition). An example is presented in eFigure 2 for the term “forgetful”. While an asset
166 when trying to describe patient features in great detail, the granularity of textual data parsed by
167 NLP complicates the correlation of patients with similar traits when sample sizes (number of
168 patients) are small. To resolve this complexity, we eliminated parts of the SNOMED expression
169 that were unnecessary for analysis such as redundant modifiers. As the SNOMED expressions
170 alone do not capture the logical hierarchy of SNOMED, we also walked up the SNOMED
171 hierarchy and created additional features for relevant children concepts. Thus, for the parent
172 term “cognitive impairment,” the additional features were created to represent the children
173 concepts of forgetful, memory impairment, memory finding, cognitive function finding, mental
174 state, behavior and/or psychosocial function finding, and impaired cognition. We then trained
175 and tested machine learning classifiers using only the condensed output from our NLP algorithm
176 to predict whether the patient would have MMSE score <24. Classification methods included
177 logistic regression, multilayer perceptron (MLP) a feedforward neural network²¹, and random

178 forest.²² We performed 100-fold cross validation. Models were trained on a varying number of
179 top features, according to K-Means correlation with MMSE <24. All machine learning
180 procedures were performed in Python, using the standard scikit-learn package.

181

182 *Statistical Analysis*

183 We assessed performance of NLP, ICD, and the combination of NLP and/or ICD codes
184 for identification of patients with cognitive impairment by calculating the sensitivity, specificity,
185 precision (also known as positive predictive value), negative predictive value (NPV), and F1
186 scores, using MMSE scores and determination by manual chart review as the primary and
187 secondary reference standards, respectively. We performed comparison of categorical
188 demographic variables by cognitive impairment status using Chi Square and Fisher Exact tests
189 and t-tests for continuous variables. We calculated kappa statistic for inter-rater agreement for
190 manual chart review using SAS Macro MAGREE. All statistics were calculated using SAS
191 version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

192

193 **Results**

194 *Subject Characteristics*

195 We linked EHR and cognitive assessment data for 199 patients. The average age of
196 patients was 68±7. They were predominantly female (75%), Hispanic (53%), and low income
197 (<\$750 per month, 51%); 46% had completed less than 12 years of formal education (Table 1).

198 MMSE score was less than 24 for 79 (40%) patients and was more common with
199 increasing age, lower education, poorer general health, and Spanish language preference.

200

201 *Performance of NLP and ICD Codes with MMSE Assessment as the Reference Standard*

202 NLP identified 69 (35%) patients as having cognitive impairment and ICD codes
203 identified 44 (22%). Sensitivity of NLP for detection of cognitive impairment was low, 0.35 (95%

204 CI 0.25-0.47), while specificity was moderate, 0.66 (95% CI 0.57-0.74) (Table 2). Use of ICD 9
205 and 10 codes to detect cognitive impairment performed similarly (sensitivity, 0.24 (95% CI 0.13-
206 0.59); specificity, 0.79 (95% CI 0.6-0.91). Negative and positive predictive and F1 values were
207 also similar for the two strategies (Table 2). Combining NLP and ICD codes into a single
208 diagnostic strategy did not meaningfully alter test performance compared to either approach
209 alone: sensitivity, 0.41 (95% CI 0.3-0.52); specificity, 0.63 (95% CI 0.54-0.72).

210

211 *Performance of NLP and ICD Codes with Manual Chart Review as the Reference Standard*

212 Agreement between reviewers for chart review was high (kappa 0.78, 95% CI 0.62-
213 0.94). Sensitivity of NLP for cognitive impairment as determined by manual chart review was
214 high, 0.96 (95% CI 0.75-1), specificity was moderate, 0.68 (95% CI 0.5-0.82), and precision was
215 moderate 0.52 (95% CI 0.31-0.72) (Table 3). ICD 9 and 10 codes for cognitive impairment by
216 manual chart review had moderate sensitivity, 0.77 (95% CI 0.46-0.95), high specificity, 0.92
217 (95% CI 0.78-0.98), and moderate precision 0.77 (95% CI 0.46-0.95). NPV and F1 scores were
218 similar for the two strategies (Table 3). The combination of NLP and ICD codes as a single
219 diagnostic strategy did not substantially change test performance: sensitivity 0.96 (95% CI 0.75-
220 1), specificity 0.7 (95% CI 0.5-0.82), precision 0.52 (95% CI 0.31-0.72), NPV 0.98 (95% CI 0.86-
221 1), and F1 score of 0.68.

222

223 *Machine Learning with NLP terms for Identification of Cognitive Impairment*

224 Application of machine learning to NLP-identified terms resulted in substantial
225 improvements in identification of patients with cognitive impairment with respect to the MMSE
226 reference standard (Table 4). Of the three classifiers tested, the Random Forest method
227 performed best, though only slightly better than the MLP neural net. The Random Forest
228 approach yielded a sensitivity of 0.95, specificity 1.00, precision 1.00, NPV 0.97, F1 score of
229 0.98 with overall AUC 0.98. For Supervised Neural Network (MLP Classifier) approach,

230 sensitivity was 0.94, specificity 1.00, precision 1.00, NPV 0.96, F1 score of 0.97 with overall
231 AUC 0.97. Lastly, for the logistic regression approach sensitivity was 0.63, specificity 0.98,
232 precision 0.95, NPV 0.79, F1 score of 0.76 with overall AUC 0.80.

233

234 **Discussion**

235 In this study, we used NLP to identify patients with cognitive impairment from EHR
236 documentation and found that it had modest test performance in relation to the MMSE, a
237 standardized assessment. NLP performed similarly to ICD codes when using MMSE as the
238 reference standard but had better performance when using manual review as the reference
239 standard. However, applying machine learning approaches to the concepts extracted by NLP
240 greatly improved test performance.

241 Our study builds on prior literature aimed at detection of patients with cognitive
242 impairment. Multiple studies have utilized NLP to analyze patient speech patterns to identify
243 cognitive impairment.²³⁻²⁵ However, this approach requires prospective collection of recordings
244 or transcription of patient-physician visits and may be logistically challenging in clinical practice.
245 Only one study has used NLP with EHR data.²⁰ Reuben et al used medications, ICD codes, and
246 NLP to identify patients with dementia and compared it to physician manual chart review. Their
247 NLP algorithm only included terms for “dementia” or “neurodegenerative” without negation terms
248 or family history markers. We used a more complex NLP algorithm that was based on SNOMED
249 terms and hierarchy, therefore including a more extensive list of terms for querying. This may
250 have contributed to the higher sensitivity we found compared to that reported by Reuben et al.
251 Additionally, our main comparison was between NLP and an objective cognitive assessment
252 with the MMSE, rather than chart review.

253 As the proportion of older adults in the US population increases, the number of patients
254 with cognitive impairment is also increasing. Cognitive impairment puts a strain on the US
255 healthcare system as it is a major risk factor for hospital admission and readmissions, and a

256 major contributor of healthcare costs among older adults.²⁶⁻²⁹ Additionally, cognitive impairment
257 negatively impacts an individual's life by affecting their ability to self-manage chronic diseases,
258 as a risk factor for functional status decline, and contributes to the development of depression
259 and other chronic health problems.³⁰⁻³³ Despite this, cognitive impairment is under-recognized
260 with only 8-28% of older adults every being screened and on average 10 years between the
261 appearance of early declines in cognitive function and a clinician diagnosis.

262 While our NLP and machine learning approach requires additional validation, since it is
263 based on existing EHR, it can be easily implemented into EHR systems. One proposed method
264 would be a clinical decision support system, which can notify patient's providers when the
265 algorithm identifies a patient with cognitive impairment and suggest potential actions to take
266 such as referrals to neuropsychological testing or assessment for the need of a home health
267 aide. This EHR-based intervention could most benefit patients who regularly interact with
268 healthcare providers that typically do not screen existing clinical data in the chart for evidence of
269 cognitive impairment. For example, an elderly patient who is frequently admitted to a hospital
270 and regularly follows up with multiple specialists for non-cognitive concerns but rarely sees a
271 primary care physician, geriatrician, psychiatrist, or neurologist could easily avoid formal
272 cognitive screening despite risk factors. Because our proposed cognitive impairment detection
273 tools would only use data already contained within the EHR, would only be visible to the
274 patient's providers, and would only suggest the initiation of the cognitive impairment diagnostic
275 workup rather than attempt to establish the diagnosis itself, this intervention would not raise
276 privacy or other ethical concerns.

277 Early detection of cognitive impairment is advocated by the US Department of Health
278 and Human Services^{34, 35} and the Alzheimer's Foundation.^{34, 35} Early identification can allow for
279 enrollment into programs to exclude reversible causes of dementia, cognitive intervention
280 programs³⁶, pharmacotherapy when appropriate, and identifying care coordination needs.³⁷
281 Additionally, identification will enable care givers to receive support to alleviate the stress and

282 burden associated with caring for people with cognitive impairment. Lastly, effective and
283 efficient methods of identifying patients with cognitive impairment will allow for inclusion of these
284 patients into clinical trials and cohort studies. Our NLP and machine learning approach is a
285 scalable method that can facilitate identification given its high sensitivity, understanding that
286 there is the potential for false positive given the lower specificity. As with any screening test,
287 there can be false negatives and false positives. A false negative will lead to a delay in a patient
288 with cognitive impairment receiving appropriate referrals for care, while a false positive will lead
289 to unnecessary additional testing and can cause patient's unneeded stress. Therefore,
290 validation of our results are necessary before implementation.

291 In this study, patients who had lower MMSE scores were older, had less education, and
292 preferred to communicate in Spanish. It has been well established that age, education, and
293 language are associated with lower MMSE scores.³⁸ Some researchers have performed age
294 and education adjustment, which increases the sensitivity but decreases the specificity of the
295 MMSE.³⁹ Lastly, others have argued against using adjustment for education as there may be a
296 true association between education level and cognitive impairment.⁴⁰ Due to this uncertainty
297 and that our study is a proof of concept that NLP can be used to identify patients with cognitive
298 impairment, we chose to use the unadjusted cutoff of 24 consistent with mild impairment that is
299 a widely accepted threshold for cognitive impairment in our analyses.

300 We chose to not include medications in the NLP or machine learning algorithm. Prior
301 studies did not find that the addition of medications improved performance of their NLP or ICD
302 algorithms for dementia identification.²⁰ Authors cite the use of dementia medications for
303 alternative diagnoses as a possible cause. We found a higher prevalence of cognitive
304 impairment than the 15-25% that is reported in literature, which may be due to the inclusion of
305 only older adults with asthma or COPD, two conditions having established associations with
306 cognitive impairment in older adults.⁴¹ Differences between sensitivity of NLP when using

307 MMSE as a standard and chart review as a standard may be influenced by the under diagnosis
308 of cognitive impairment by providers and therefore not documented in the chart.⁴²

309 This study has several limitations. First, the sample size was relatively small, which
310 could have led to overfitting of the machine learning algorithm. We performed a 100-fold cross
311 validation to reduce the risk of overfitting, but validation with data from a different health system
312 is needed before conclusions can be drawn about the NLP and machine learning strategies we
313 employed. As NLP can only identify cognitive impairment from what is in the EHR, it is
314 dependent on the number of encounters and notes available. While there are many methods of
315 identifying cognitive impairment, we only used the MMSE, which can be biased by a person's
316 education, primary language, and culture. Despite these limitations, this is the first study to use
317 NLP and machine learning to identify patients with cognitive impairment using data from EHR.

318

319 **Conclusion**

320 NLP can be used to identify adults with cognitive impairment with moderate test
321 performance and greatly enhanced with the addition of machine learning. NLP and machine
322 learning out performed ICD codes for identification of cognitive impairment. While additional
323 validation in external datasets is necessary, this method provides for a scalable and high
324 throughput method for identifying patients with cognitive impairment for more appropriate
325 diagnostic testing, early treatment, and enrollment into research studies.

326

327 **Acknowledgements:** Data, analytic methods, and study materials can be made available after
328 review and approval by institutional regulatory bodies. The study was not preregistered in any
329 public registry.

330 **Conflict of Interest:** TVV was part of launching Clinithink and retains a financial interest in the
331 company.

332 **Funding:** This research was funded by a grant from the National Institute on Aging,
333 R01AG066471.

334 Author Contributions: KIH, LC, TVV, KB, PA, JW, GNN, and AF were responsible for the
335 conception, design, and acquisition, design, and interpretation of the data. KIH, LC, GNN, AF,
336 MRM, MW, LMC assisted in the drafting and critical revision of the manuscript. All authors
337 approve of the final version of the manuscript.

338

339 References

- 340 1. Ward A, Arrighi HM, Michels S, Cedarbaum JM. Mild cognitive impairment: Disparity of
341 incidence and prevalence estimates. *Alzheimer's Dement.* 2012.
342 doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2011.01.002
- 343 2. Langa KM, Larson EB, Crimmins EM, et al. A comparison of the prevalence of dementia
344 in the United States in 2000 and 2012. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2017.
345 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.6807
- 346 3. Matthews KA, Xu W, Gaglioti AH, et al. Racial and ethnic estimates of Alzheimer's
347 disease and related dementias in the United States (2015–2060) in adults aged ≥65
348 years. *Alzheimer's Dement.* 2019. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2018.06.3063
- 349 4. Borson S, Frank L, Bayley PJ, et al. Improving dementia care: The role of screening and
350 detection of cognitive impairment. *Alzheimer's Dement.* 2013.
351 doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2012.08.008
- 352 5. Wilkinson T, Ly A, Schnier C, et al. Identifying dementia cases with routinely collected
353 health data: A systematic review. *Alzheimer's Dement.* 2018;14(8):1038-1051.
354 doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2018.02.016
- 355 6. Scott J, Mayo AM. Instruments for detection and screening of cognitive impairment for
356 older adults in primary care settings: A review. *Geriatr Nurs (Minneap).* 2018.
357 doi:10.1016/j.gerinurse.2017.11.001
- 358 7. Kotagal V, Langa KM, Plassman BL, et al. Factors associated with cognitive evaluations
359 in the United States. *Neurology.* 2015. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000001096
- 360 8. Moga DC, Roberts M, Jicha G. Dementia for the Primary Care Provider. *Prim Care - Clin*
361 *Off Pract.* 2017. doi:10.1016/j.pop.2017.04.005
- 362 9. Boustani M. Dementia Screening in Primary Care: Not Too Fast! *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2013.
363 doi:10.1111/jgs.12319_2
- 364 10. Linzer M, Poplau S, Babbott S, et al. Worklife and Wellness in Academic General Internal
365 Medicine: Results from a National Survey. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2016. doi:10.1007/s11606-
366 016-3720-4
- 367 11. Rabatin J, Williams E, Baier Manwell L, Schwartz MD, Brown RL, Linzer M. Predictors
368 and Outcomes of Burnout in Primary Care Physicians. *J Prim Care Community Health.*
369 2016. doi:10.1177/2150131915607799
- 370 12. Zhang R, Simon G, Yu F. Advancing Alzheimer's research: A review of big data
371 promises. *Int J Med Inform.* 2017. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2017.07.002
- 372 13. Nadkarni PM, Ohno-Machado L, Chapman WW. Natural language processing: An
373 introduction. *J Am Med Informatics Assoc.* 2011. doi:10.1136/amiajnl-2011-000464
- 374 14. Levin MA, Joseph TT, Jeff JM, et al. iGAS: A framework for using electronic
375 intraoperative medical records for genomic discovery. *J Biomed Inform.* 2017.
376 doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2017.02.005
- 377 15. Krauskopf K, Federman AD, Kale MS, et al. Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
378 illness and medication beliefs are associated with medication adherence. *COPD J*
379 *Chronic Obstr Pulm Dis.* 2015. doi:10.3109/15412555.2014.922067

- 380 16. Ray M, Sano M, Wisnivesky JP, Wolf MS, Federman AD. Asthma control and cognitive
381 function in a cohort of elderly adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2015. doi:10.1111/jgs.13350
- 382 17. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. "Mini-mental state": A practical method for grading
383 the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res*. 1975;12(3):189-198.
384 doi:10.1016/0022-3956(75)90026-6
- 385 18. Spackman KA, Campbell KE, Côté RA. SNOMED RT: a reference terminology for health
386 care. *Proc a Conf Am Med Informatics Assoc AMIA Fall Symp*. 1997:640-644.
387 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9357704>. Accessed July 25, 2017.
- 388 19. St. Germaine-Smith C, Metcalfe A, Pringsheim T, et al. Recommendations for optimal
389 ICD codes to study neurologic conditions a systematic review. *Neurology*. 2012.
390 doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182684707
- 391 20. Reuben DB, Hackbarth AS, Wenger NS, Tan ZS, Jennings LA. An Automated Approach
392 to Identifying Patients with Dementia Using Electronic Medical Records. *J Am Geriatr*
393 *Soc*. 2017. doi:10.1111/jgs.14744
- 394 21. Pal SK, Mitra S. Multilayer perceptron, fuzzy sets, and classification. *IEEE Trans Neural*
395 *Networks*. 1992;3(5):683-697. doi:10.1109/72.159058
- 396 22. Breiman L. Random Forests. *Mach Learn*. 2001.
- 397 23. Mirheidari B, Blackburn D, Harkness K, et al. An avatar-based system for identifying
398 individuals likely to develop dementia. In: *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the*
399 *International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*. ; 2017.
400 doi:10.21437/Interspeech.2017-690
- 401 24. Thomas C, Kešelj V, Cercone N, Rockwood K, Asp E. Automatic detection and rating of
402 dementia of alzheimer type through lexical analysis of spontaneous speech. In: *IEEE*
403 *International Conference on Mechatronics and Automation, ICMA 2005*. ; 2005.
- 404 25. Orimaye SO, Wong JS-M, Golden KJ, Wong CP, Soyiri IN. Predicting probable
405 Alzheimer's disease using linguistic deficits and biomarkers. *BMC Bioinformatics*.
406 2017;18(1):34. doi:10.1186/s12859-016-1456-0
- 407 26. Greenwald JL, Cronin PR, Carballo V, Danaei G, Choy G. A Novel Model for Predicting
408 Rehospitalization Risk Incorporating Physical Function, Cognitive Status, and
409 Psychosocial Support Using Natural Language Processing. *Med Care*. 2017.
410 doi:10.1097/MLR.0000000000000651
- 411 27. Callahan KE, Lovato JF, Miller ME, Easterling D, Snitz B, Williamson JD. Associations
412 between mild cognitive impairment and hospitalization and readmission. *J Am Geriatr*
413 *Soc*. 2015. doi:10.1111/jgs.13593
- 414 28. Lin PJ, Zhong Y, Fillit HM, Chen E, Neumann PJ. Medicare Expenditures of Individuals
415 with Alzheimer's Disease and Related Dementias or Mild Cognitive Impairment Before
416 and After Diagnosis. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2016. doi:10.1111/jgs.14227
- 417 29. Lin PJ, Neumann PJ. The economics of mild cognitive impairment. *Alzheimer's Dement*.
418 2013. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2012.05.2117
- 419 30. Soones TN, Lin JL, Wolf MS, et al. Pathways linking health literacy, health beliefs, and
420 cognition to medication adherence in older adults with asthma. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*.
421 2017. doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2016.05.043

- 422 31. Stuck AE, Walthert JM, Nikolaus T, Büla CJ, Hohmann C, Beck JC. Risk factors for
423 functional status decline in community-living elderly people: A systematic literature
424 review. *Soc Sci Med*. 1999. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(98)00370-0
- 425 32. Dotson VM, Resnick SM, Zonderman AB. Differential association of concurrent, baseline,
426 and average depressive symptoms with cognitive decline in older adults. *Am J Geriatr
427 Psychiatry*. 2008. doi:10.1097/JGP.0b013e3181662a9c
- 428 33. Sanders JB, Bremmer MA, Comijs HC, Deeg DJH, Lampe IK, Beekman ATF. Cognitive
429 functioning and the natural course of depressive symptoms in late life. *Am J Geriatr
430 Psychiatry*. 2011. doi:10.1097/JGP.0b013e3181f7d8e9
- 431 34. *2019 ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE FACTS AND FIGURES Includes a Special Report on
432 Alzheimer's Detection in the Primary Care Setting: Connecting Patients and Physicians.*
433 <https://www.alz.org/media/Documents/alzheimers-facts-and-figures-2019-r.pdf>. Accessed
434 July 15, 2019.
- 435 35. *National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease: 2018 Update.*
436 <https://aspe.hhs.gov/system/files/pdf/259581/NatPlan2018.pdf>. Accessed July 15, 2019.
- 437 36. Hong Y, Jang E, Hwang J, Roh J, Lee J-H. The Efficacy of Cognitive Intervention
438 Programs for Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Systematic Review. *Curr Alzheimer Res*.
439 2015. doi:10.2174/1567205012666150530201636
- 440 37. Backhouse A, Ukoumunne OC, Richards DA, McCabe R, Watkins R, Dickens C. The
441 effectiveness of community-based coordinating interventions in dementia care: A meta-
442 analysis and subgroup analysis of intervention components. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2017.
443 doi:10.1186/s12913-017-2677-2
- 444 38. Crum RM. Population-Based Norms for the Mini-Mental State Examination by Age and
445 Educational Level. *JAMA J Am Med Assoc*. 1993;269(18):2386.
446 doi:10.1001/jama.1993.03500180078038
- 447 39. Mungas D, Marshall SC, Weldon M, Haan M, Reed BR. Age and education correction of
448 mini-mental state examination for english- and spanish-speaking elderly. *Neurology*.
449 1996. doi:10.1212/WNL.46.3.700
- 450 40. Pedraza O, Clark JH, O'Bryant SE, et al. Diagnostic validity of age and education
451 corrections for the mini-mental state examination in older African Americans. *J Am
452 Geriatr Soc*. 2012. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03766.x
- 453 41. Creavin ST, Wisniewski S, Noel-Storr AH, et al. Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE)
454 for the detection of dementia in clinically unevaluated people aged 65 and over in
455 community and primary care populations. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016;(1).
456 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD011145.pub2
- 457 42. Berkman LF. The association between educational attainment and mental status
458 examinations: Of etiologic significance for senile dementias or not? *J Chronic Dis*. 1986.
459 doi:10.1016/0021-9681(86)90020-2
- 460 43. Roberts R, Knopman DS. Classification and epidemiology of MCI. *Clin Geriatr Med*.
461 2013. doi:10.1016/j.cger.2013.07.003
- 462 44. Bradford A, Kunik ME, Schulz P, Williams SP, Singh H. Missed and delayed diagnosis of
463 dementia in primary care: Prevalence and contributing factors. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc
464 Disord*. 2009. doi:10.1097/WAD.0b013e3181a6bebc

465

466

467 Table 1: Demographics

Characteristic		Total (n=199) n (%)	MMSE<24 (n=79) n (%)	MMSE≥24 (n=120) n (%)	p-value
Age					
	55-64	88 (44.2%)	25 (31.7%)	63 (52.5%)	0.008
	65-70	58 (29.2%)	31 (39.2%)	27 (22.5%)	
	≥71	53 (26.6%)	23 (29.1%)	30 (25.0%)	
Female		149 (74.9%)	56 (70.9%)	93 (77.5%)	0.29
Married/Living with Partner		44 (22.1%)	17 (21.5%)	27 (22.5%)	0.87
Race					
	White	29 (14.6%)	7 (8.9%)	22 (18.3%)	0.27
	Black	56 (28.1%)	22 (27.8%)	34 (28.3%)	
	Hispanic	106 (53.3%)	47 (59.5%)	59 (49.2%)	
	Other	8 (4.0%)	3 (3.8%)	5 (4.2%)	
Monthly Income					
	\$0-\$750	100 (50.8%)	38 (48.1%)	62 (51.7%)	0.63
	\$751-\$1350	62 (31.5%)	28 (35.4%)	34 (28.3%)	
	\$1351-\$3000	23 (11.6%)	8 (10.1%)	15 (12.5%)	
	>\$3000	6 (3.1%)	1 (1.3%)	5 (4.2%)	
	Refused/Don't Know	8 (4.0%)	4 (5.1%)	4 (3.3%)	
Education					
	Less than 12 years	91 (45.7%)	50 (63.3%)	41 (34.2%)	<0.001
	High school graduate	42 (21.1%)	12 (15.2%)	30 (25.0%)	
	Some college	35 (17.6%)	9 (11.4%)	26 (21.7%)	
	College degree or higher	30 (15.1%)	7 (8.9%)	23 (19.2%)	
	Refused/Don't Know	1 (0.5%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	
General Health Rating					
	Excellent/Very Good	29 (14.6%)	6 (7.6%)	23 (19.2%)	0.003
	Good	53 (26.6%)	15 (19.0%)	38 (31.7%)	
	Fair/Poor	117 (58.8%)	58 (73.4%)	59 (49.2%)	
Assistance with ADLs					
	No help	123 (61.8%)	42 (53.1%)	81 (67.5%)	0.08
	Help needed	74 (37.2%)	36 (45.6%)	38 (31.7%)	
	Refused/Don't Know	2 (1.0%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (0.8%)	
Origin Country/Territory					
	United States	103 (51.8%)	33 (41.8%)	70 (58.3%)	0.02
	Puerto Rico	73 (36.7%)	34 (43.0%)	39 (32.5%)	
	Dominican Republic	9 (4.5%)	7 (8.9%)	2 (1.7%)	
	Other	14 (7.0%)	5 (6.3%)	9 (7.5%)	
Preferred Language					
	English	147 (73.9%)	46 (58.3%)	101 (84.2%)	<0.001
	Spanish	52 (26.1%)	33 (41.7%)	19 (15.8%)	

468

469 Table 2: NLP and ICD9/10 compared with MMSE (inclusive of notes +/- 1 year of MMSE)

	NLP	ICD	NLP/ICD
Sensitivity	0.35 (0.25-0.47)	0.24 (0.13-0.59)	0.41 (0.30-0.52)
Specificity	0.66 (0.57-0.74)	0.79 (0.60-0.91)	0.63 (0.54-0.72)
Precision	0.41 (0.29-0.53)	0.43 (0.19-0.75)	0.42 (0.31-0.54)
NPV	0.61 (0.52-0.69)	0.61 (0.50-0.82)	0.62 (0.53-0.70)
F1 Score	0.38	0.31	0.41

470

471

472 Table 3: NLP and ICD9/10 compared with Manual Chart Review (inclusive of all notes)

	NLP	ICD	NLP/ICD
Sensitivity	0.96 (0.75-1.00)	0.77 (0.46-0.95)	0.96 (0.75-1.00)
Specificity	0.68 (0.50-0.82)	0.92 (0.78-0.98)	0.68 (0.50-0.82)
Precision	0.52 (0.31-0.72)	0.77 (0.46-0.95)	0.52 (0.31-0.72)
NPV	0.98 (0.86-1.00)	0.92 (0.78-0.98)	0.98 (0.86-1.00)
F1 Score	0.68	0.77	0.68

473

474

475 Table 4: Machine Learning Applied to NLP extracted terms compared with MMSE

	Logistic Regression	MLP	Random Forest
Sensitivity	0.63	0.94	0.95
Specificity	0.98	1.00	1.00
Precision	0.95	1.00	1.00
NPV	0.79	0.96	0.97
F1 Score	0.76	0.97	0.98
AUC	0.80	0.97	0.98

476

477

478

- 479 1. Ward A, Arrighi HM, Michels S, *et al.* Mild cognitive impairment: Disparity of incidence and
480 prevalence estimates. *Alzheimer's and Dementia* 2012.
- 481
- 482 2. Langa KM, Larson EB, Crimmins EM, *et al.* A comparison of the prevalence of dementia in the
483 United States in 2000 and 2012. *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2017.
- 484
- 485 3. Matthews KA, Xu W, Gaglioti AH, *et al.* Racial and ethnic estimates of Alzheimer's disease and
486 related dementias in the United States (2015–2060) in adults aged ≥65 years. *Alzheimer's and*
487 *Dementia* 2019.
- 488
- 489 4. Borson S, Frank L, Bayley PJ, *et al.*: Improving dementia care: The role of screening and detection
490 of cognitive impairment. In *Alzheimer's and Dementia*, 2013
- 491
- 492 5. Wilkinson T, Ly A, Schnier C, *et al.* Identifying dementia cases with routinely collected health
493 data: A systematic review. *Alzheimers Dement* 2018; **14**: 1038-1051.
- 494
- 495 6. Scott J, Mayo AM. Instruments for detection and screening of cognitive impairment for older
496 adults in primary care settings: A review. *Geriatric Nursing* 2018.
- 497
- 498 7. Kotagal V, Langa KM, Plassman BL, *et al.* Factors associated with cognitive evaluations in the
499 United States. *Neurology* 2015.
- 500
- 501 8. Moga DC, Roberts M, Jicha G: Dementia for the Primary Care Provider. In *Primary Care - Clinics*
502 *in Office Practice*, 2017
- 503
- 504 9. Boustani M. Dementia Screening in Primary Care: Not Too Fast! *Journal of the American*
505 *Geriatrics Society* 2013.
- 506
- 507 10. Linzer M, Poplau S, Babbott S, *et al.* Worklife and Wellness in Academic General Internal
508 Medicine: Results from a National Survey. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2016.
- 509
- 510 11. Rabatin J, Williams E, Baier Manwell L, *et al.*: Predictors and Outcomes of Burnout in Primary
511 Care Physicians. In *Journal of Primary Care & Community Health*, 2016
- 512

- 513 12. Zhang R, Simon G, Yu F: Advancing Alzheimer's research: A review of big data promises. In
514 *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 2017
515
- 516 13. Nadkarni PM, Ohno-Machado L, Chapman WW: Natural language processing: An introduction. In
517 *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 2011
518
- 519 14. Levin MA, Joseph TT, Jeff JM, *et al.* iGAS: A framework for using electronic intraoperative
520 medical records for genomic discovery. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics* 2017.
521
- 522 15. Krauskopf K, Federman AD, Kale MS, *et al.* Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease illness and
523 medication beliefs are associated with medication adherence. *COPD: Journal of Chronic*
524 *Obstructive Pulmonary Disease* 2015.
525
- 526 16. Ray M, Sano M, Wisnivesky JP, *et al.* Asthma control and cognitive function in a cohort of elderly
527 adults. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 2015.
528
- 529 17. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. "Mini-mental state": A practical method for grading the
530 cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *Journal of Psychiatric Research* 1975; **12**: 189-198.
531
- 532 18. Spackman KA, Campbell KE, Côté RA. SNOMED RT: a reference terminology for health care.
533 *Proceedings : a conference of the American Medical Informatics Association AMIA Fall*
534 *Symposium* 1997.
535
- 536 19. St Germaine-Smith C, Metcalfe A, Pringsheim T, *et al.* Recommendations for optimal ICD codes
537 to study neurologic conditions: a systematic review. *Neurology* 2012; **79**: 1049-1055.
538
- 539 20. Reuben DB, Hackbarth AS, Wenger NS, *et al.* An Automated Approach to Identifying Patients
540 with Dementia Using Electronic Medical Records. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*
541 2017; **65**: 658-659.
542
- 543 21. Pal SK, Mitra S. Multilayer perceptron, fuzzy sets, and classification. *IEEE Transactions on Neural*
544 *Networks* 1992; **3**: 683-697.
545
- 546 22. Breiman L. Random Forreests. *Machine learning* 2001.
547
- 548 23. Mirheidari B, Blackburn D, Harkness K, *et al.*: An avatar-based system for identifying individuals
549 likely to develop dementia. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech*
550 *Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, 2017
551
- 552 24. Thomas C, Kešelj V, Cercone N, *et al.*: Automatic detection and rating of dementia of alzheimer
553 type through lexical analysis of spontaneous speech. In *IEEE International Conference on*
554 *Mechatronics and Automation, ICMA 2005*, 2005
555
- 556 25. Orimaye SO, Wong JS-M, Golden KJ, *et al.* Predicting probable Alzheimer's disease using
557 linguistic deficits and biomarkers. *BMC Bioinformatics* 2017; **18**: 34.
558

- 559 26. Greenwald JL, Cronin PR, Carballo V, *et al.* A Novel Model for Predicting Rehospitalization Risk
560 Incorporating Physical Function, Cognitive Status, and Psychosocial Support Using Natural
561 Language Processing. *Medical Care* 2017.
562
- 563 27. Callahan KE, Lovato JF, Miller ME, *et al.* Associations between mild cognitive impairment and
564 hospitalization and readmission. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 2015.
565
- 566 28. Lin PJ, Zhong Y, Fillit HM, *et al.* Medicare Expenditures of Individuals with Alzheimer's Disease
567 and Related Dementias or Mild Cognitive Impairment Before and After Diagnosis. *Journal of the*
568 *American Geriatrics Society* 2016.
569
- 570 29. Lin PJ, Neumann PJ: The economics of mild cognitive impairment. In *Alzheimer's and Dementia*,
571 2013
572
- 573 30. Soones TN, Lin JL, Wolf MS, *et al.* Pathways linking health literacy, health beliefs, and cognition
574 to medication adherence in older adults with asthma. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*
575 2017.
576
- 577 31. Dotson VM, Resnick SM, Zonderman AB. Differential association of concurrent, baseline, and
578 average depressive symptoms with cognitive decline in older adults. *American Journal of*
579 *Geriatric Psychiatry* 2008.
580
- 581 32. Stuck AE, Walthert JM, Nikolaus T, *et al.*: Risk factors for functional status decline in community-
582 living elderly people: A systematic literature review. In *Social Science and Medicine*, 1999
583
- 584 33. Sanders JB, Bremmer MA, Comijs HC, *et al.* Cognitive functioning and the natural course of
585 depressive symptoms in late life. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 2011.
586
- 587 34. 2019 ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE FACTS AND FIGURES Includes a Special Report on Alzheimer's
588 Detection in the Primary Care Setting: Connecting Patients and Physicians. In
589
- 590 35. National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease: 2018 Update. . In
591
- 592 36. Hong Y, Jang E, Hwang J, *et al.* The Efficacy of Cognitive Intervention Programs for Mild Cognitive
593 Impairment: A Systematic Review. *Current Alzheimer Research* 2015.
594
- 595 37. Backhouse A, Ukoumunne OC, Richards DA, *et al.* The effectiveness of community-based
596 coordinating interventions in dementia care: A meta-analysis and subgroup analysis of
597 intervention components. *BMC Health Services Research* 2017.
598
- 599 38. Crum RM. Population-Based Norms for the Mini-Mental State Examination by Age and
600 Educational Level. *JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association* 1993; **269**: 2386.
601
- 602 39. Creavin ST, Wisniewski S, Noel-Storr AH, *et al.* Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) for the
603 detection of dementia in clinically unevaluated people aged 65 and over in community and
604 primary care populations. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2016.
605

- 606 40. Berkman LF. The association between educational attainment and mental status examinations:
607 Of etiologic significance for senile dementias or not? *Journal of Chronic Diseases* 1986.
608
- 609 41. Roberts R, Knopman DS: Classification and epidemiology of MCI. In *Clinics in Geriatric Medicine*,
610 2013
611
- 612 42. Bradford A, Kunik ME, Schulz P, *et al.*: Missed and delayed diagnosis of dementia in primary
613 care: Prevalence and contributing factors. In *Alzheimer Disease and Associated Disorders*, 2009
614
615