


Identifying older adults at risk for Alzheimer's Disease based on smartphone data obtained during wayfinding in the real world

Jonas Marquardt, Priyanka Mohan, Myra Spiliopoulou, Michaela Butryn, Wenzel Glanz,
Stefanie Schreiber, Esther Kühn, Anne Maas & Nadine Diersch

Supplementary Information



Supplementary Figure 1. Movement trajectories of the three participant groups (red: younger adults; blue: healthy older adults; yellow: older adults with subjective cognitive decline) on (a) track 1; (b) track 2; (c) track 3; (d) track 4; (e) track 5 of the mobile wayfinding task.



Supplementary Figure 2. Number of orientation stops on each track in healthy older adults (blue) and older adults with subjective cognitive decline (yellow). The boxplot denotes the lower and upper quartile of the measure; center line the median; whiskers the 1.5x interquartile range; dots the individual data points; diamond shape the mean.



Supplementary Figure 3. Spatial memory test implemented in the familiarity questionnaire to assess the participants' prior knowledge of the campus area in three sub-tests (maximum score: 28). (a) Recognition test: First, participants had to indicate from a list of pictures showing 12 campus buildings (including the 5 Poles of the mobile wayfinding task), which of the buildings they recognize (shown are 4 example buildings). (b) Distance estimation test: Next, they saw 4 triplets of the 12 buildings and were asked to indicate, which of the two buildings in the lower row lies closer to the reference building in the upper row (shown is one example triplet). (c) Map test: Finally, for the buildings they knew, they had to assign the buildings from the recognition test to dots on a map of the campus, in this way identifying their location.

Fixed Effects					
	Est/Beta	SE	95% CI	t-value	p
Intercept	5.368	0.184	5.007 ; 5.729	29.136	< .001
Group YA	-0.127	0.052	-0.230 ; -0.024	-2.427	.018
Group SCD	0.071	0.055	-0.038 ; 0.179	1.273	.208
Familiarity	-0.003	0.003	-0.009 ; 0.002	-1.241	.219
Gender Female	0.102	0.002	0.016 ; 0.188	2.333	.023
Random Effects					
	Variance	SD			
Participant	0.003	0.055			
Track	0.154	0.393			
Model fit					
AIC	Basic Model	Final Model	Delta AIC		
	370.34	361.09	-9.25		
R²	Marginal		Conditional		
	0.033		0.530		

Supplementary Table 1. Results of the linear mixed effect model estimating the fixed effects of group, campus familiarity, and gender on the log-transformed wayfinding distance. Random intercepts were estimated per participant and track. P-values for fixed effects were calculated using the Satterthwaite's approximation for degrees of freedom (bold font indicates significant effects). Confidence intervals were calculated using the Wald method. Model equation: $\log(\text{wayfinding distance}) \sim \text{group} + \text{familiarity} + \text{gender} + (1|\text{participant}) + (1|\text{track})$.

Fixed Effects					
	Est/Beta	SE	95% CI	t-value	p
Intercept	5.120	0.178	4.771 ; 5.468	28.802	< .001
Group YA	-0.283	0.070	-0.420 ; -0.146	-4.042	< .001
Group SCD	0.128	0.074	-0.017 ; 0.273	1.733	<i>.088</i>
Familiarity	-0.008	0.004	-0.015 ; -0.001	-2.114	.038
Gender Female	0.139	0.058	0.025 ; 0.253	2.391	.020
Random Effects					
	Variance	SD			
Participant	0.022	0.148			
Track	0.130	0.361			
Model fit					
AIC	Basic Model	Final Model	Delta AIC		
	483.35	458.01	-25.34		
R²	Marginal		Conditional		
	0.108		0.512		

Supplementary Table 2. Results of the linear mixed effect model estimating the fixed effects of group, campus familiarity, and gender on the log-transformed wayfinding duration. Random intercepts were estimated per participant and track. P-values for fixed effects were calculated using the Satterthwaite's approximation for degrees of freedom (bold font indicates significant effects; italic font indicates statistical trends). Confidence intervals were calculated using the Wald method. Model equation: $\log(\text{wayfinding duration}) \sim \text{group} + \text{familiarity} + \text{gender} + (1|\text{participant}) + (1|\text{track})$.

Fixed Effects					
	Est/Beta	SE	95% CI	t-value	p
Intercept	1.310	0.058	1.196 ; 1.424	22.504	< .001
Group YA	0.223	0.051	0.123 ; 0.323	4.375	< .001
Group SCD	-0.048	0.053	-0.153 ; 0.056	-0.901	.371
Familiarity	0.006	0.003	0.001 ; 0.011	2.206	.031
Gender Female	-0.054	0.042	-0.137 ; 0.029	-1.285	.203

Random Effects		
	Variance	SD
Participant	0.028	0.168
Track	0.002	0.130

Model fit			
AIC	Basic Model	Final Model	Delta AIC
	-229.02	-252.34	-23.32
R²		Marginal	Conditional
		0.277	0.742

Supplementary Table 3. Results of the linear mixed effect model estimating the fixed effects of group, campus familiarity, and gender on the movement speed. Random intercepts were estimated per participant and track. P-values for fixed effects were calculated using the Satterthwaite's approximation for degrees of freedom (bold font indicates significant effects). Confidence intervals were calculated using the Wald method. Model equation: movement speed \sim group + familiarity + gender + (1|participant) + (1|track).

Fixed Effects					
	Est/Beta	SE	95% CI	z-value	p
Intercept	-0.655	0.506	-1.646 ; 0.336	-1.296	.195
Group YA	-1.243	0.514	-2.251 ; -0.236	-2.418	.016
Group SCD	0.820	0.435	-0.033 ; 1.672	1.885	.059
Familiarity	-0.048	0.025	-0.010 ; -0.000	-1.960	.050
Gender Female	0.183	0.367	-0.537 ; 0.903	0.499	.618
Random Effects					
	Variance	SD			
Participant	1.246	1.116			
Track	0.003	0.063			
Model fit					
AIC	Basic Model	Final Model	Delta AIC		
	661.5	647.4	-14.1		
Pseudo R²	0.265				

Supplementary Table 4. Results of the generalized mixed effect model estimating the fixed effects of group, campus familiarity, and gender on the number of map views during walking. Random intercepts were estimated per participant and track. The model was estimated using the maximum likelihood estimation (bold font indicates significant effects; italic font indicates statistical trends). A zero-inflated negative binomial distribution of the data was assessed and a log link function applied. Confidence intervals were calculated using the Wald method. Pseudo R² was calculated by: $1 - e^{(-2/n * \log L(x) - \log L(0))}$, where $\log L(x)$ is the log-likelihood of the final model and $\log L(0)$ the log-likelihood of an intercept only model. Model equation: number of map views \sim group + familiarity + gender + (1|participant) + (1|track).

Fixed Effects					
	Est/Beta	SE	95% CI	z-value	p
Intercept	0.187	0.291	-0.384 ; 0.758	0.641	.521
Group YA	-0.919	0.281	-1.470 ; -0.369	-3.274	.001
Group SCD	0.670	0.248	0.184 ; 1.157	2.702	.006
Familiarity	-0.007	0.013	-0.033 ; 0.019	-0.531	.595
Gender Female	0.301	0.207	-0.105 ; 0.707	1.453	.146

Random Effects		
	Variance	SD
Participant	0.402	0.634
Track	0.000	0.000

Model fit			
AIC	Basic Model	Final Model	Delta AIC
	1020.1	994.1	-25.94
Pseudo R²		0.268	

Supplementary Table 5. Results of the generalized mixed effect model estimating the fixed effects of group, campus familiarity, and gender on the number of orientation stops. Random intercepts were estimated per participant and track. The model was estimated using the maximum likelihood estimation (bold font indicates significant effects). A zero-inflated poisson distribution of the data was assessed and a log link function applied. Confidence intervals were calculated using the Wald method. Pseudo R² was calculated by: $1 - e^{(-2/n * \log L(x) - \log L(0))}$, where $\log L(x)$ is the is the log-likelihood of the final model and $\log L(0)$ the log-likelihood of an intercept only model. Model equation: number of orientation stops \sim group + familiarity + gender + (1|participant) + (1|track).

CERAD Subtest	r	p-value
Verbal Fluency (animals)	-.10	.640
Boston Naming Test	.20	.371
Mini-Mental Status Examination	-.33	.122
Word List Learning	-.26	.228
Word List Recall	-.18	.412
Word List Savings	.03	.901
Word List Discrimination	.14	.524
Constructional Praxis Drawing	.21	.332
Constructional Praxis Recall	-.32	.136
Constructional Praxis Savings	-.31	.144
Verbal Fluency (words) ^a	.16	.494
Trail Making Test A	-.07	.756
Trail Making Test B	-.29	.184
Trail Making Test A/B	-.39	.068

Supplementary Table 6. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (df = 21) between the number of orientation stops and the age-, gender-, and education-corrected z-scores from all available subtests of the CERAD test battery in older adults with subjective cognitive decline (SCD). ^a three missing values for Verbal Fluency (words), df = 18.

	YA	OA	SCD
n	23	20	18
Age	24.4 ± 2.29	66.0 ± 3.79	65.2 ± 6.87
No of female	12	9	10
Campus familiarity (max. score: 28)	12.9 ± 9.30	13.4 ± 8.40	9.2 ± 6.59
Life-Space Assessment (max. score: 120)	81.3 ± 12.3	84.8 ± 16.1	83.4 ± 14.1
Cognitive screening scores	--	MoCA: 28.4 ± 1.09	MMSE: 29.0 ± 1.19 CERAD: 0.24 ± 0.54 min = -0.75

Supplementary Table 7. Sample characteristics (descriptives, mean scores ± SD) of the three participant groups (YA: younger adults; OA: healthy older adults; SCD: older adults with subjective cognitive decline), when only considering those individuals who completed all five tracks in the mobile wayfinding task (N = 61). The CERAD composite score was calculated using the age-, gender-, and education-corrected z-scores from six different subtests (Boston Naming Test, verbal fluency, word list learning, word list recall, word list savings, and constructional praxis, see Chandler et al., 2005). The groups did not differ in the listed attributes, all $p \geq .272$ (age differences were only tested between healthy older adults and older adults with SCD).

References

Chandler, M. J., Lacritz, L. H., Hynan, L. S., Barnard, H. D., Allen, G., Deschner, M., Weiner, M. F., & Cullum, C. M. (2005). A total score for the CERAD neuropsychological battery. *Neurology*, *65*(1), 102–106. <https://doi.org/10.1212/01.wnl.0000167607.63000.38>