

24 Email: yuc199@pitt.edu

25 Tel: 412-383-0766

26

27 **Abstract work count: 225**

28 **Manuscript word count: 2,882**

29

30

31

32

33 **Abstract**

34 **Objective:** Due to the long prodromal period for dementia pathology, approaches are needed to
35 detect cases before clinically recognizable symptoms are apparent, by which time it is likely too
36 late to intervene. This study contrasted two theoretically-based algorithms for classifying early
37 cognitive impairment (ECI) in adults aged ≥ 50 enrolled in the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of
38 Aging.

39 **Method:** Two ECI algorithms were defined as poor performance (1 standard deviation [SD]
40 below age-, sex-, race-, and education-specific means) in: (1) Card Rotations or California Verbal
41 Learning Test (CVLT) immediate recall and (2) ≥ 1 (out of 2) memory or ≥ 3 (out of 6) non-
42 memory tests. We evaluated concurrent criterion validity against consensus diagnoses of mild
43 cognitive impairment (MCI) or dementia and global cognitive scores using receiver operating
44 characteristic (ROC) curve analysis. Predictive criterion validity was evaluated using Cox
45 proportional hazards models to examine the associations between algorithmic status and future
46 adjudicated MCI/dementia.

47 **Results:** Among 1,851 participants (mean age= 65.2 ± 11.8 years, 50% women, 74% white), the
48 two ECI algorithms yielded comparably moderate concurrent criterion validity with adjudicated
49 MCI/dementia. For predictive criterion validity, the algorithm based on impairment in Card
50 Rotations or CVLT immediate recall was the better predictor of MCI/dementia (HR=3.53,
51 95%CI: 1.59-7.84) over 12.3 follow-up years.

52 **Conclusions:** Impairment in visuospatial ability or memory may be capable of detecting early
53 cognitive changes in the preclinical phase among cognitively normal individuals.

54 **Keywords:** Alzheimer's Disease; Cognitive Dysfunction; Neuropsychological Tests;
55 Classification; Validation Study; Longitudinal Studies

56 **Introduction**

57 Alzheimer's disease (AD) is a neurodegenerative disease that interferes with daily activities in its
58 later stages. Identification of early progression is critical to identify risk factors and to properly
59 evaluate interventions to delay clinical onset. Progression to AD is hypothesized to begin with a
60 preclinical phase characterized by normal cognitive ability, up to 20 years prior to a dementia
61 diagnosis.¹⁻³ Thus, accurate and stable diagnostic criteria for identifying early cognitive changes
62 prior to clinically recognizable symptoms of dementia are crucial for purposes of targeting
63 preventive interventions most likely to slow pathological progression.

64 A wide range of neuropsychological measures have been leveraged in epidemiologic
65 studies for the classification of dementia and mild cognitive impairment (MCI). There is a
66 plethora of different algorithms developed based on poor performance in cognitive and everyday
67 functional measures to classify MCI or dementia in lieu of clinical judgement, frequently
68 motivated by various psychiatric^{2,3} or neuropsychological traditions⁴⁻⁶. As episodic memory
69 impairment is most seen in MCI patients who progress to AD, conventional Petersen criteria
70 defined MCI is based on performance >1.5 standard deviation (SD) below age-appropriate norms
71 on a single memory test⁷. This approach has been expanded to multiple other cognitive domains
72 (e.g., executive, language) and requires multiple tests, within each cognitive domain >1 SD
73 below age-appropriate norms to balance sensitivity and specificity.⁴ Although
74 neuropsychological criteria have been validated in multiple cohort studies for MCI classification,
75^{5,6} few studies have carefully considered which cognitive tests should be included to detect early
76 cognitive decline in preclinical stages of dementia before the symptomatic phase.⁸ Specifically,
77 visuospatial function has not been considered as a separate domain in these algorithms, however,
78 a recent study reported that visuospatial ability measured using the Card Rotations test showed

79 the earliest changes in rate of decline at 15.5 years before AD diagnosis, followed by episodic
80 memory where changes were detected up to 11.7 years before AD diagnosis⁹. These findings
81 make some biological sense, given that visuospatial ability as measured by Card Rotations are
82 thought to be controlled in the brain's precuneous and retrosplenial cortex, atrophy in which is an
83 early risk factor for ADRD.⁹⁻¹¹ Thus, incorporating visual function tests in algorithms may help
84 identify individuals who are at high risk of developing ADRD in early stages.¹²

85 We leveraged data from the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging (BLSA), which has
86 followed people for up to 33 years prior to dementia diagnosis starting as early as 1986. In the
87 present study, we aim to contrast two psychometrically defined algorithms for classifying early
88 cognitive impairment (ECI) in middle-aged and older adults enrolled in the BLSA. One
89 algorithm was developed based on visual spatial and episodic memory which have showed early
90 decline in progression to ADRD.⁹ Another algorithm used conventional neuropsychological
91 criteria to detect early amnesic or nonamnesic cognitive decline which we hypothesize may
92 predict all-cause dementia. By comparing different algorithmic classification criteria, we aim to
93 identify optimal classification criteria for early identification of older adults with risk of MCI and
94 dementia. We evaluated these algorithms by comparing concurrent and predictive criterion
95 validation against consensus diagnoses and global measures of cognitive and functional
96 impairment.

97

98

99 **Methods**

100 The BLSA is a longitudinal cohort study established in 1958 and conducted by the National
101 Institute on Aging Intramural Research Program. The study aims to explore the interdependence

102 of aging and disease processes and their mutual impact on physical and cognitive function. A
103 detailed description of the study design is available ¹⁵. The study continuously recruits
104 community-dwelling volunteers free of major chronic conditions and cognitive and functional
105 impairment at the time of enrollment. Participants are followed for health characteristics,
106 cognitive assessments, and physical function testing every 1-4 years depending on age (every 4
107 years for age <60, every 2 years for age 60-79, and annually for age ≥80). The present study
108 includes 1,880 participants aged ≥50 years who underwent cognitive testing from 1993 through
109 2019. Informed consent was obtained from all participants. The study protocol was approved by
110 the National Institutes of Health Intramural Institutional Review Board.

111

112 *Neuropsychological tests*

113 A wide variety of cognitive tests are administered in the BLSA. In the current study, attention
114 and executive function were assessed using the Digit Span Forward and Backward subtests in the
115 Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale – Revised (WAIS-R) ¹⁶. Visual memory was measured using
116 the Benton Visual Retention Test (BVRT) ¹⁷. Language was assessed using the 60-item Boston
117 Naming Test (BNT-60) ¹⁸ and Similarities from the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS) ¹⁶.
118 Visuospatial ability was measured using the difference between the number of correctly and
119 incorrectly classified objects on a modified version of the Card Rotations test developed by the
120 Educational Testing Service ¹⁹. Verbal episodic memory was measured using the immediate (total
121 number of items recalled across five trials) and long-delay free recall in the California Verbal
122 Learning Test (CVLT) ²⁰.

123

124 *Algorithmic classification of ECI*

125 The ECI algorithms were determined based on the Preclinical AD Consortium but tailored for the
126 BLSA sample depending on the number of neuropsychological tests administered in each
127 cognitive domain and cutoff points used⁸. Briefly, poor cognitive performance was
128 operationalized as 1 SD below age-, sex-, race- (white vs nonwhite), and education-specific
129 means. The race adjustment in addition to education is based on the consideration that education
130 may not indicate the same level of educational attainment or intellectual exposure for different
131 racial groups in the US particularly for those growing up in the 60's and 70's. According to
132 previous literature using Jak/Bondi comprehensive criteria, ECI classification was determined
133 based on memory and non-memory domains^{5,6}. In this study, we classified CVLT immediate and
134 long-delay free recall as memory tests and other neuropsychological tests as non-memory tests.
135 As previous findings suggesting that visuospatial ability measured by Card Rotations test and
136 CVLT immediate recall showed the earliest changes in cognitive decline during preclinical stage
137 of AD^{9,21}, we explored the algorithms using visuospatial ability and immediate recall for ECI
138 classification. Thus, in this study, two ECI classification algorithms were developed and
139 compared: (1) poor performance in Card Rotations or CVLT immediate recall and (2) poor
140 performance in ≥ 1 (out of 2) memory or ≥ 3 (out of 6) non-memory tests.

141

142 ***Global cognitive and functional scores***

143 Three measures of global cognitive and/or functional status were used. Global mental status was
144 assessed using the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE)²². The Blessed Information
145 Memory Concentration (BIMC) test is a mental status instrument that has been widely used in
146 clinical populations and research studies²³. CDR Sum of Boxes (CDR-SB) is a global cognitive
147 and functional assessment of six domains: memory, orientation, judgement/problem solving,

148 community affairs, home/hobbies, and personal care ^{24,25}.

149

150 *Adjudicated diagnosis of MCI/dementia*

151 Participants with BIMC test score ≥ 4 or CDR score ≥ 0.5 were reviewed at consensus diagnostic

152 conferences. Experienced clinicians diagnosed MCI based on Petersen criteria ⁷ and dementia

153 based on Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, revised third edition criteria

154 ^{26,27}.

155

156 *Covariates*

157 Sociodemographic characteristics including age, sex, race, and years of education were collected

158 from a health interview. Race was categorized into white and non-white (e.g., Black, American

159 Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islanders).

160

161

162 *Statistical Analysis*

163 Sample characteristics including baseline age, sex, race, and years of education were

164 summarized into frequencies and percentages or means and standard deviations.

165 First, we evaluated concurrent validity of the algorithms with concurrent consensus

166 diagnoses of MCI/dementia (**Table 1**). The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve

167 analysis was used to calculate area under the curve (AUC), sensitivity, and specificity. All BLSA

168 visits among all eligible participants with available cognitive data were included in the analysis.

169 We also examined whether each ECI algorithmic classification was concurrently correlated with

170 MMSE score and other global cognitive and functioning scores (BIMC and CDR-SB scores).

171 Dichotomous global scores were used for the analysis, with cutoff points determined as MMSE
172 ≤ 26 ²⁸, BIMC ≥ 4 ²⁹, and CDR-SB ≥ 0.5 ²⁴.

173 Second, we evaluated predictive criterion validity of each algorithm with future
174 progression to adjudicated MCI/dementia (**Table 2**). Cox proportional hazards models were used
175 to model associations between the earliest ECI status determined based on each algorithmic
176 classification and time to adjudicated MCI/dementia during follow up. Participants who had
177 MCI/dementia diagnosis at the first visit with available cognitive data were excluded from this
178 analysis.

179 Third, we additionally examined the association between baseline MMSE, BIMC, and
180 CDR-SB scores and time to first algorithmically defined ECI during follow up, adjusted for age,
181 sex, race, and years of education (**Table 3**). Participants who already had ECI at baseline were
182 excluded from this analysis.

183 Statistical tests were two-tailed and the significance level α was set as 0.05. All analyses
184 were conducted using Stata version 16.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

185

186 **Results**

187 Among 1,851 participants in analyses, the mean age at baseline was 65.2 (SD=11.8) years, about
188 half of participants were female (n=917, 49.5%), and 73.8% (n=1,366) were white
189 (**Supplementary Table 1**). The average education level was 16.8 (SD=2.7) years. At baseline
190 with available cognitive data, over one third of the participants (n=628, 34.0%) were classified as
191 having ECI based on poor performance in Card Rotations or CVLT immediate recall. One third
192 of the participants (n=597, 32.3%) had ECI based on poor performance in memory or
193 nonmemory tests.

194

195 ***Concurrent criterion validation***

196 **Table 1** summarizes evidence for concurrent criterion validity for both algorithmic
197 classifications with respect to consensus diagnoses of MCI/dementia and global cognitive and
198 functional scores. Compared with the consensus diagnoses, the AUC for the ECI algorithm based
199 on poor performance in memory or nonmemory tests had a higher AUC (AUC = 0.703 vs AUC =
200 0.631). The two algorithms had comparable specificity (0.74 and 0.75) but the ECI algorithm
201 based on memory or nonmemory tests had the higher sensitivity (0.65 vs. 0.52). Regarding
202 evidence of concurrent criterion validity with MMSE, CDR-SB, and BIMC scores, the two
203 algorithms had comparable AUCs, sensitivity, and specificity (**Table 1**).

204

205 ***Predictive criterion validation***

206 Among 1,851 participants, n=21 were diagnosed with MCI/dementia at baseline or prior BLSA
207 visits. Among 1,538 participants with at least 2 visits with cognitive data and without
208 MCI/dementia at baseline, 43 participants progressed to MCI/dementia. The average follow-up
209 years between baseline and a consensus diagnosis of MCI/dementia was 12.3 (SD=6.9) years.
210 **Table 2** summarizes the number of cases with consensus diagnoses over follow up and hazard
211 ratios (HRs) for progression to MCI/dementia based on each algorithm. The algorithm based on
212 impaired Card Rotations or CVLT immediate recall outperformed the other in terms of the ability
213 to predict future progression to MCI/dementia. Participants with ECI based on this algorithm at
214 baseline had over triple the risk of developing MCI/dementia (HR=3.53, 95% CI: 1.59-7.84)
215 compared to those without ECI. The algorithm based on poor performance in memory or
216 nonmemory tests also significantly predicted future progression to MCI/dementia (HR=2.24,

217 95% CI: 1.11-4.51).

218

219 *Global cognitive scores with future algorithmic determined ECI*

220 We additionally examined the relationship between baseline MMSE, BIMC, and CDR-SB scores
221 and hazard of early algorithmic diagnoses using Cox proportional hazards models (**Table 3**). The
222 algorithm based on poor performance in memory or nonmemory tended to have higher HRs of
223 being predicted by MMSE or BIMC score. Comparable HRs were observed for the two
224 algorithms when they were predicted by CDR-SB score.

225

226 **Discussion**

227 This study contrasted two psychometrically defined algorithms to classify older adults with ECI
228 in the BLSA. Results suggest that these ECI algorithms yielded comparably moderate concurrent
229 criterion validity with consensus diagnoses of MCI/dementia and global cognitive and functional
230 impairment. However, the algorithm based on poor performance in visuospatial ability (Card
231 Rotations) or immediate memory (CVLT immediate recall) had a stronger relationship with
232 future progression to MCI/dementia among the algorithms we evaluated. This pattern of findings
233 indicates that impairment in visuospatial ability or memory may be capable of detecting early
234 cognitive changes in the preclinical phase among cognitively normal individuals.

235 Our findings are consistent with previous research demonstrating that tests of visuospatial
236 and memory function are among the earliest to show decline prior to onset of Alzheimer's type
237 dementia^{9,21}. Our results suggest that older adults with poor performance in Card Rotations or
238 CVLT immediate recall had over triple the risk of progressing to MCI or dementia. Previous
239 studies found that multiple domain amnesic MCI, defined as impairment in memory and at least

240 one other domain (i.e., executive function, processing speed, language), significantly predicted
241 incident dementia using data from the Framingham Heart Study ⁵. The algorithm based on one
242 test in visuospatial ability and one test in episodic memory may provide novel and simplified
243 neuropsychological criteria to identify ECI. Deficits in visuospatial functioning also have been
244 associated with probable Lewy Body dementia ^{30,31}. Studies also suggested the diagnostic and
245 prognostic potential of visuospatial tasks in AD and non-AD dementias ^{32–34}. The underlying
246 mechanisms that may lead to early impairment in visuospatial ability as an indicator of ECI are
247 related to the precuneus and other parietal regions that support spatial navigation ^{35,36}. The
248 precuneus is also one of the earliest brain regions to show β amyloid accumulation in preclinical
249 AD ^{37,38}. Our study extends previous research by demonstrating the predictive criterion validity
250 of this algorithm with clinical diagnosis of MCI/dementia and highlights the importance of
251 incorporating visuospatial ability into identification of ECI. Our findings may suggest a novel
252 method to detect and diagnose cognitive impairment at an earlier stage. Future studies should
253 investigate whether this algorithm is capable of identifying ECI in other older populations.

254 Great efforts have been made to define different neuropsychological criteria for MCI
255 diagnoses and to derive a common classification algorithm for identification of MCI across
256 several cohort studies ^{4,6,8,39}. These efforts range from a single impaired memory score towards
257 one or two tests in multiple cognitive domains such as memory, language, and speed/executive
258 function ⁶, which enables identifications of MCI subtypes ^{5,6}. The latter approach is consistent
259 with DSM-5 criteria for mild and major neurocognitive disorder, which specifies domains of
260 learning and memory, higher-level executive abilities, language, visuospatial function, and social
261 cognition ⁴⁰. Although, strictly speaking, our approach is not identical to the Jak/Bondi criteria
262 which require at least two impaired scores (1 SD below the means) within a cognitive domain,^{4,6}

263 we took both memory and non-memory tests into account. Future research is needed to validate
264 these algorithms for early identification of cognitive impairment in other large cohort studies.

265 The algorithmic approach we describe may be useful in future clinical trials or
266 observational studies as a validated tool to differentiate cognitively normal older adults who may
267 be in the preclinical stages of AD, which may be an alternative to time-consuming adjudication.
268 As these algorithms were derived based on age-, sex-, race-, and education-specific cut-points,
269 this approach may be utilized in other cohort studies of cognitively intact older adults with
270 diverse characteristics. Although the diagnosis of MCI in clinical settings also relies on other
271 factors such as subject complaints and proxy reports, this study provides evidence for further
272 investigations on application of algorithmic approaches as supplementary information in the
273 clinical decision-making process.

274 Strengths of this study include large sample size, long follow-up period, and a large
275 battery of neuropsychological tests. This study has several limitations. First, the generalizability
276 of our findings to other cohorts needs to be considered in light of heterogeneity in cognitive
277 batteries across studies. Validations of these algorithms using data from other cohort studies are
278 needed. Second, the majority of BLSA participants were white. Although the algorithmic
279 classification is race-adjusted, this approach should be validated in larger, more representative
280 samples of diverse racial groups – especially given that sensitivity and specificity of algorithms
281 varies across racial and other demographic groups⁴¹. Third, we used an age-, sex-, race-, and
282 education-adjusted cutoff of 1 SD to define poor performance on each test. Refinement of this
283 cutoff is a viable future research area. Fourth, the algorithmic classification was determined
284 based on age-specific means at any single time point. Although this approach may enhance
285 clinical utility for providers with single office visit assessments, there is a possibility that an

286 individual who was classified as impaired within their current age group may move to the
287 unimpaired group in a subsequent visit, limiting the application of the algorithm to longitudinal
288 studies aimed to examine changes in cognitive status. A further limitation is that while we are
289 interested in a measure sensitive to cognitive changes in the preclinical phase of AD, our
290 outcome was all-cause dementia as adjudicated by a clinical consensus committee, which is a
291 broader classification than AD as a primary etiology. We did not explore that outcome because of
292 the confluence of small case numbers coupled with misclassification errors in diagnoses of living
293 participants.⁴²

294 In conclusion, this study compared two classification algorithms to detect early cognitive
295 impairment among cognitively normal adults aged 50 years and older enrolled in the BLSA
296 study. The algorithm based on impairment in visuospatial ability or immediate recall had a
297 stronger relationship with future progression to consensus diagnoses of MCI or dementia. These
298 algorithmic approaches may be further utilized to detect early cognitive changes in the
299 preclinical phase before progression to symptomatic phase of dementia. Future studies
300 incorporating motor function impairment into the algorithms may further enhance the ability to
301 capture preclinical changes across the spectrum of various types of dementias. Additional
302 research is needed to relate the algorithmic approaches to AD biomarkers and apolipoprotein E
303 (APOE) genotype.

304

305 **Acknowledgments**

306 This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant R01AG061786. Y.C.
307 and J.A.S. were supported by R01AG061786 and U01AG057545. A.G. was supported by the
308 NIH K01AG050699. This study was also supported in part by the Intramural Research Program,

309 National Institute on Aging, NIH. N.M.A., M.K-T., L.F., E.M.S., S.M.R. were all supported by
310 the Intramural Research Program of the National Institute on Aging, NIH.

311 **Conflict of Interest**

312 The authors have no conflict of interest to disclose.

313 References

- 314 1. Vermunt L, Sikkes SAM, van den Hout A, et al. Duration of preclinical, prodromal, and
315 dementia stages of Alzheimer's disease in relation to age, sex, and APOE genotype.
316 *Alzheimers Dement.* 2019;15(7):888-898. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2019.04.001
- 317 2. Kessler RC, Üstün TB. The World Mental Health (WMH) Survey Initiative version of the
318 World Health Organization (WHO) Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI).
319 *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res.* 2004;13(2):93-121. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.168>
- 320 3. Kessler RC, Abelson J, Demler O, et al. Clinical calibration of DSM-IV diagnoses in the
321 World Mental Health (WMH) version of the World Health Organization (WHO)
322 Composite International Diagnostic Interview (WMH-CIDI). *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res.*
323 2004;13(2):122-139. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.169>
- 324 4. Jak AJ, Bondi MW, Delano-Wood L, et al. Quantification of five neuropsychological
325 approaches to defining mild cognitive impairment. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry.*
326 2009;17(5):368-375. doi:10.1097/JGP.0b013e31819431d5
- 327 5. Jak AJ, Preis SR, Beiser AS, et al. Neuropsychological criteria for mild cognitive
328 impairment and dementia risk in the Framingham Heart Study. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc.*
329 2016;22(9):937-943. doi:10.1017/S1355617716000199
- 330 6. Bondi MW, Edmonds EC, Jak AJ, et al. Neuropsychological criteria for mild cognitive
331 impairment improves diagnostic precision, biomarker associations, and progression rates.
332 *J Alzheimers Dis.* 2014;42(1):275-289. doi:10.3233/JAD-140276
- 333 7. Petersen RC, Smith GE, Waring SC, Ivnik RJ, Tangalos EG, Kokmen E. Mild cognitive
334 impairment: clinical characterization and outcome. *Arch Neurol.* 1999;56(3):303-308.
335 doi:10.1001/archneur.56.3.303
- 336 8. Gross AL, Hassenstab JJ, Johnson SC, et al. A classification algorithm for predicting

- 337 progression from normal cognition to mild cognitive impairment across five cohorts: The
338 preclinical AD consortium. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2017;8:147-155.
339 doi:10.1016/j.dadm.2017.05.003
- 340 9. Williams OA, An Y, Armstrong NM, Kitner-Triolo M, Ferrucci L, Resnick SM. Profiles of
341 cognitive change in preclinical and prodromal Alzheimer's disease using change-point
342 analysis. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2020;75(4):1169-1180. doi:10.3233/JAD-191268
- 343 10. Cavanna AE, Trimble MR. The precuneus: a review of its functional anatomy and
344 behavioural correlates. *Brain*. 2006;129(3):564-583. doi:10.1093/brain/awl004
- 345 11. Burles F, Umiltá A, McFarlane LH, Potocki K, Iaria G. Ventral—Dorsal Functional
346 Contribution of the Posterior Cingulate Cortex in Human Spatial Orientation: A Meta-
347 Analysis. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2018;12. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2018.00190
- 348 12. Petersen RC, Morris JC. Mild cognitive impairment as a clinical entity and treatment
349 target. *Arch Neurol*. 2005;62(7):1160-1163; discussion 1167.
350 doi:10.1001/archneur.62.7.1160
- 351 13. Edmonds EC, Delano-Wood L, Galasko DR, Salmon DP, Bondi MW. Subtle Cognitive
352 Decline and Biomarker Staging in Preclinical Alzheimer's Disease. *Journal of Alzheimer's*
353 *Disease*. 2015;47(1):231-242. doi:10.3233/JAD-150128
- 354 14. Thomas KR, Edmonds EC, Eppig J, Salmon DP, Bondi MW. Using Neuropsychological
355 Process Scores to Identify Subtle Cognitive Decline and Predict Progression to Mild
356 Cognitive Impairment. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*. 2018;64(1):195-204.
357 doi:10.3233/JAD-180229
- 358 15. Kuo PL, Schrack JA, Shardell MD, et al. A roadmap to build a phenotypic metric of
359 ageing: insights from the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging. *J Intern Med*.

- 360 2020;287(4):373-394. doi:10.1111/joim.13024
- 361 16. Wechsler D. *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised*. Psychological Corporation; 1981.
- 362 17. Benton AL. *The Revised Benton Visual Retention Test*. Psychological Corporation; 1974.
- 363 18. Kaplan EF, Goodglass H, Weintraub S. *The Boston Naming Test*. 2nd ed. Lea & Febiger;
- 364 1983.
- 365 19. Wilson JR, de Fries JC, Mc Clearn GE, Vandenberg SG, Johnson RC, Rashad MN.
- 366 Cognitive abilities: use of family data as a control to assess sex and age differences in two
- 367 ethnic groups. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*.
- 368 1975;6(3):261-276. doi:10.2190/BBJP-XKUG-C6EW-KYB7
- 369 20. Delis D, Kramer J, Kaplan E, Ober B. *California Verbal Learning Test*. The Psychological
- 370 Corporation; 1987.
- 371 21. Bilgel M, Kosciak RL, An Y, et al. Temporal order of Alzheimer’s disease-related cognitive
- 372 marker changes in BLSA and WRAP longitudinal studies. *Journal of Alzheimer’s Disease*.
- 373 2017;59:1335-1347. doi:10.3233/JAD-170448
- 374 22. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. “Mini-mental state”: A practical method for
- 375 grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res*. 1975;12(3):189-
- 376 198. doi:10.1016/0022-3956(75)90026-6
- 377 23. Thal LJ, Grundman M, Golden R. Alzheimer’s disease: a correlational analysis of the
- 378 Blessed Information-Memory-Concentration Test and the Mini-Mental State Exam.
- 379 *Neurology*. 1986;36(2):262-264. doi:10.1212/wnl.36.2.262
- 380 24. O’Bryant SE, Waring SC, Cullum CM, et al. Staging dementia using Clinical Dementia
- 381 Rating Scale Sum of Boxes scores: a Texas Alzheimer’s research consortium study. *Arch*
- 382 *Neurol*. 2008;65(8):1091-1095. doi:10.1001/archneur.65.8.1091

- 383 25. Morris JC. The Clinical Dementia Rating (CDR). *Neurology*. 1993;43(11):2412 LP-2412-
384 a. doi:10.1212/WNL.43.11.2412-a
- 385 26. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental*
386 *Disorders, 3rd Ed., Revised (DSM-III-R)*. American Psychiatric Publishing; 1987.
387 doi:10.1176/ajp.145.10.1301
- 388 27. Kawas C, Gray S, Brookmeyer R, Fozard J, Zonderman A. Age-specific incidence rates of
389 Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology*. 2000;54(11):2072-2077. doi:10.1212/WNL.54.11.2072
- 390 28. Kukull WA, Larson EB, Teri L, Bowen J, McCormick W, Pfanschmidt ML. The Mini-
391 Mental State Examination score and the clinical diagnosis of dementia. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
392 1994;47(9):1061-1067. doi:10.1016/0895-4356(94)90122-8
- 393 29. Keller AJ, Sherman EMS, Strauss E. Blessed Dementia Scale BT - Encyclopedia of
394 Clinical Neuropsychology. In: Kreutzer JS, DeLuca J, Caplan B, eds. Springer New York;
395 2011:413-415. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-79948-3_531
- 396 30. Mori E, Shimomura T, Fujimori M, et al. Visuo-perceptual impairment in dementia with
397 Lewy bodies. *Arch Neurol*. 2000;57(4):489-493. doi:10.1001/archneur.57.4.489
- 398 31. Hamilton JM, Salmon DP, Galasko D, et al. Visuospatial deficits predict rate of cognitive
399 decline in autopsy-verified dementia with Lewy bodies. *Neuropsychology*.
400 2008;22(6):729-737. doi:10.1037/a0012949
- 401 32. Salimi S, Irish M, Foxe D, Hodges JR, Piguet O, Burrell JR. Can visuospatial measures
402 improve the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease? *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2017;10:66-74.
403 doi:10.1016/j.dadm.2017.10.004
- 404 33. Herlitz A, Hill RD, Fratiglioni L, Bäckman L. Episodic memory and visuospatial ability in
405 detecting and staging dementia in a community-based sample of very old adults. *J*

- 406 *Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 1995;50(2):M107-13. doi:10.1093/gerona/50a.2.m107
- 407 34. Johnson DK, Storandt M, Morris JC, Galvin JE. Longitudinal study of the transition from
408 healthy aging to Alzheimer disease. *Arch Neurol.* 2009;66(10):1254-1259.
409 doi:10.1001/archneurol.2009.158
- 410 35. Coughlan G, Laczó J, Hort J, Minihane AM, Hornberger M. Spatial navigation deficits -
411 overlooked cognitive marker for preclinical Alzheimer disease? *Nat Rev Neurol.*
412 2018;14(8):496-506. doi:10.1038/s41582-018-0031-x
- 413 36. Cavanna AE, Trimble MR. The precuneus: a review of its functional anatomy and
414 behavioural correlates. *Brain.* 2006;129(Pt 3):564-583. doi:10.1093/brain/awl004
- 415 37. Rodrigue KM, Kennedy KM, Devous MDS, et al. β -Amyloid burden in healthy aging:
416 regional distribution and cognitive consequences. *Neurology.* 2012;78(6):387-395.
417 doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e318245d295
- 418 38. Bilgel M, Prince JL, Wong DF, Resnick SM, Jernigan BM. A multivariate nonlinear mixed
419 effects model for longitudinal image analysis: Application to amyloid imaging.
420 *Neuroimage.* 2016;134:658-670. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.04.001
- 421 39. Thomas KR, Cook SE, Bondi MW, et al. Application of neuropsychological criteria to
422 classify mild cognitive impairment in the ACTIVE study. *Neuropsychology.*
423 2020;34(8):862-873. doi:10.1037/neu0000694
- 424 40. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental*
425 *Disorders.* 5th ed. American Psychiatric Publishing; 2013.
- 426 41. Gianattasio KZ, Wu Q, Glymour MM, Power MC. Comparison of Methods for
427 Algorithmic Classification of Dementia Status in the Health and Retirement Study.
428 *Epidemiology.* 2019;30(2):291-302. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000945

- 429 42. Rothman KJ. No adjustments are needed for multiple comparisons. *Epidemiology*.
430 1990;1(1):43-46.
431 [https://journals.lww.com/epidem/Fulltext/1990/01000/No_Adjustments_Are_Needed_for_
432 Multiple_Comparisons.10.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/epidem/Fulltext/1990/01000/No_Adjustments_Are_Needed_for_Multiple_Comparisons.10.aspx)
433

Table 1. Concurrent criterion validity for each algorithmic classification of early cognitive impairment (ECI) with consensus diagnosis and global cognitive scores.

Algorithmic classification of early cognitive impairment	AUC	Sensitivity	Specificity	Kappa	N*	TP	FP	FN	TN
Consensus diagnosis of MCI/dementia									
impairment in Card Rotation or CVLT immediate recall	0.631	0.52	0.74	0.03	9466	67	2443	61	6895
impairment in 1+ memory or 3+ non-memory tests	0.703	0.65	0.75	0.04	9524	85	2327	45	7067
Global cognitive scores									
MMSE score (≤ 26)									
impairment in Card Rotation or CVLT immediate recall	0.640	0.51	0.77	0.17	7551	416	1563	398	5174
impairment in 1+ memory or 3+ non-memory tests	0.670	0.56	0.78	0.21	7551	457	1492	357	5245
CDR-SB score (≥ 0.5)									
impairment in Card Rotation or CVLT immediate recall	0.586	0.36	0.81	0.18	2073	264	254	466	1089
impairment in 1+ memory or 3+ non-memory tests	0.610	0.40	0.82	0.23	2073	295	248	435	1095
BIMC score (≥ 4)									
impairment in Card Rotation or CVLT immediate recall	0.623	0.48	0.76	0.16	8892	506	1860	543	5983
impairment in 1+ memory or 3+ non-memory tests	0.659	0.54	0.78	0.21	8892	565	1727	484	6116

Note. MCI=mild cognitive impairment. CVLT=California Verbal Learning Test. MMSE=Mini-Mental State Examination. CDR-SB=Clinical Dementia Rating - Sum of Boxes. BIMC=Blessed Information Memory Concentration test. AUC=area under the curve. TP=true positive. FP=false positive. FN=false negative. TN=true negative.

Poor performance in global cognitive score was determined based on MMSE ≤ 26 , BIMC ≥ 4 , and CDR-SB ≥ 0.5 .

*Number of visits among all eligible participants with available cognitive data.

Table 2. Predictive criterion validity for each algorithmic classification of early cognitive impairment (ECI) at baseline predicting progression to consensus diagnosis of MCI/dementia during follow up.

Algorithmic classification of early cognitive impairment (predictor)	N	Number of progressors	Person-years	Hazard ratio	95% CI
impairment in Card Rotation or CVLT immediate recall	1463	35	16453	3.53*	(1.59, 7.84)
impairment in 1+ memory or 3+ non-memory tests	1459	36	16270	2.24*	(1.11, 4.51)

Note. MCI=mild cognitive impairment. CVLT=California Verbal Learning Test. CI=confidence interval.

Participants who had diagnosis of MCI/dementia at baseline were removed from the analysis. The bolded values indicate statistically significant results ($p < 0.05$).

Table 3. Baseline global cognitive scores as predictors of progression to algorithmically defined early cognitive impairment (ECI) during follow up.

Predictor	Time to event outcome	N [†]	Number of progressors	Person-years	Hazard ratio	95% CI
MMSE score *	clinical adjudication of MCI diagnosis	1503	44	18923	1.435	(0.486, 4.235)
	impairment in Card Rotation or CVLT immediate recall	965	370	9342	1.466	(0.981, 2.191)
	impairment in 1+ memory or 3+ non-memory tests	998	381	9741	1.704	(1.099, 2.642)
CDR-SB score *	clinical adjudication of MCI diagnosis	854	44	11665	1.929	(1.037, 3.590)
	impairment in Card Rotation or CVLT immediate recall	510	216	5097	1.928	(1.434, 2.593)
	impairment in 1+ memory or 3+ non-memory tests	530	226	5400	1.829	(1.362, 2.457)
BIMC score *	clinical adjudication of MCI diagnosis	1575	45	19392	1.424	(0.535, 3.790)
	impairment in Card Rotation or CVLT immediate recall	1003	378	9544	1.591	(1.113, 2.275)
	impairment in 1+ memory or 3+ non-memory tests	1039	392	9955	1.947	(1.348, 2.814)

Note. MCI=mild cognitive impairment. CVLT=California Verbal Learning Test. MMSE=Mini-Mental State Examination. CDR-SB=Clinical Dementia Rating - Sum of Boxes. BIMC=Blessed Information Memory Concentration test. CI=confidence interval.

*Binary predictors were used in the Cox proportional hazards models, adjusted for age, sex, race, and years of education. Poor performance in global cognitive score was determined based on MMSE \leq 26, BIMC \geq 4, and CDR-SB \geq 0.5.

[†]Participants who were impaired based on algorithmic definitions at baseline and who only had one visit were removed from the analyses.