medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

A Scoping Review of Community-Based Geriatric Health Assessment and Screening Tools used in South Asia

Sucharita Panigrahi[1], Trilochan Bhoi[1], Sanghamitra Pati[1], Jaya Singh Kshatri[1]*

[1]ICMR- Regional Medical Research Centre, Chandrasekharpur, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India
***Corresponding author: Dr. Jaya Singh Kshatri**
Email: jsk.icmr@outlook.com
Address: ICMR- Regional Medical Research Centre, Chandrasekharpur, Bhubaneswar, Odisha 751023, India

Abstract

Background

Home-based comprehensive assessment and integrated care of the older people could be a key to relieve the pressure on the already overburdened health system. This review summarises evidence on validated community-based geriatric health assessment tools in South Asia.

Methods

Guided by Arksey and O'Malley's five-stage scoping review framework, a total of 46 studies were included in the scoping review after searching from electronic databases and reference lists using predefined eligibility criteria. Data were extracted on main characteristics of included studies, identified instruments and their psychometric properties of the tools. This review was reported in accordance with PRISMA-ScR guidelines.

Results

Among the 46 included studies, 10 reported on instruments for medical assessment, 12 on tools for psychological conditions, 13 on tools for functional issues, 2 on social wellbeing, and 9 on tools with multiple domains of health. Most studies included participants from both gender and different social classes. Majority used measurements that were both self-reported or measured by the investigator. whereas only two instruments were designed to be used by clinicians. In the existing

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

geriatric health assessment tools, environmental domain was neglected completely, and not a single tool considered in this review covered all 5 domains which influence regular life of elderly.

Conclusion

There are no validated tools available that can be used for comprehensive geriatric assessment in South Asia. There is a need to develop and validate culturally sensitive tools that can be used for assessing all the geriatric health domains.

Keywords: Geriatric health, Health Assessment tool, Validated tools, Screening tools,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Introduction

An increasingly older population is contributing to a majority of disease burden and subsequently revamping healthcare expenditures globally[1][2][3]. This burden is more acute in low-income settings where the need for healthcare in older age groups is greater and coverage of health and social security schemes is inadequate[4]. Projections have shown that an overwhelming proportion of global disease burden will be from age-related disorders in the foreseeable future[5].
In this situation, Comprehensive geriatric assessment (CGA) is recognized as a key intervention to address the health needs of older adults, effectively evaluate comorbid conditions and functional limitation[6][7]. Even though, there is no standardized format for carrying out CGA, using multiple tools to capture comprehensive health status, a consensus on the broad domains that need to be measured[8][6]. Most of the tools available focus on a particular domain of CGA and a majority of these have been validated for use in high-income countries(HIC), where they have been developed[9][10][11]. Concerns on the utility and accuracy of these tools in Low and Middle-income countries (LMIC)remain [12]. Unlike clinical evaluation, CGA involves complex constructs that are influenced strongly by the socio-cultural milieu of the end-users and target population, which are widely diversified across regions, let alone the world. Therefore, tools need contextual adaptation and validation for optimum utility in the targeted settings.

While there still are linguistic and regional differences among regions in South Asia, historically, the subcontinent has had a common socio-cultural thread running through it as well as a common administrative architecture, making generalizability of health interventions easier. This scoping review aims to summarize studies that describe validated tools for assessing geriatric health in community settings in South Asia. We believe there is no single tool validated for CGA and there is no structured evidence synthesis conducted to map empirical evidence for tools specifically for this population. So, this review will provide evidence to researchers and practitioners on available validated tools, their psychometric properties, and validity in order to enable them to make an informed choice on which tools to include in community-based CGA. Findings of this review could also aid in identifying scope for updating of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

existing tools for the South Asia population as well as identify crucial gaps in the domain of CGA where validated tools are missing.

Methods

This scoping review was reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses statement for reporting systematic reviews-extension for scoping reviews[13] presented in Appendix-1 and was prospectively registered with Open Science Framework*(**10.17605/OSF.IO/TFR3H**).*

We followed the Arksey and O'Malley framework [14] for conducting scoping reviews which uses the following steps –

Step1: Identification of Research Question

Step2: Identification of relevant studies

Step3: Study selection

Step4: Data charting

Step5: Data collation, summarize, and reporting the result,

These steps were further refined by Levac et al.[15].

Identification of Research Question

The research question addressed by this review was developed based on PCC- Population=Geriatric, Concept= Community based health assessment and screening tools, and Context =South Asia.

R.Q: What are the validated community-based geriatric health assessment and screening tools available in South Asia?

Identification of relevant studies

We conducted a systematic search of the following electronic databases: MEDLINE, Embase and PsycINFO. We searched articles published in English only without any date restrictions. The pilot searches were carried out with variations of the words "Community-based", "elderly", "Health assessment*" "screening", "Tool*", along with countries and states of south Asia that appeared in Title/ Abstracts. The detailed search string is presented in Appendix 2. Additional relevant papers were identified through reference mining and Google Scholar search using similar keywords.

Study selection

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

After an extensive search, following de-duplication of electronic articles, all eligible articles were screened by two independent review authors (SP1 & TB) based on their Title/Abstract. Discrepancies were discussed and resolved. In case of disagreement, a third author (JSK) made the decision. Full texts were retrieved and reviewed for eligibility. We included studies conducted in any of the South Asian countries that evaluated geriatric health assessment tools based on community setting, or any of the subdomains or reported its development process or validation. Institutional tools which can be implemented in the community were also included. We excluded manuscripts that were in form of comments, editorials, letters, Conference or congress papers, abstracts, and reviews. Full-text review followed the same method as Title/abstract screening in case of disagreement. In this study, we have not considered methodological rigor of the included studies.

Charting the data

Through iterative process, a predefined data extraction sheet was developed to capture all relevant aspects of the included studies. The study characteristics like country of origin, objectives, sample characteristics, setting, sample size, and sampling method were extracted. Detailed description of the health assessment tools and the procedure of its development, composition, validity, reliability, and feasibility of the instruments were extracted from the relevant paper. After completion, the charted tables were examined further within the reviewers to ensure accuracy and consistency. The detailed descriptions of the studies are given in appendix-3.

Collating, Summarising, and reporting the results

A narrative summary of the results was presented. Tables were used to present specific details of the tools and development process. The results section first described the characteristics of the studies, characteristics of the tool, and its psychometric properties. The charted tools were categorized into five broad domains and further subdomains of CGA as follows[16][17].

a. Medical Assessment
b. Functional Assessment

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

c. Social Assessment
d. Environment Assessment
e. Multiple

Similarly, we also summarized the most reported outcome measures of validity and reliability such as sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and receiver operating characteristics area under the curve (ROC-AUC). We have grouped all the available tools with psychometric properties in 3 categories to make our results standardized.

1. High sensitivity/specificity: When the tool reported value is ranging from 67%-100%.
2. Moderate Sensitivity/Specificity: When the tool reported value is ranging from 34%-66%
3. Poor Sensitivity/ Specificity: When the tool reported value is ranging from 0%-33%

Results

We identified 607 records from electronic databases and other sources after de-duplication. 116 were identified for full-text screening and 46 studies were included in the final analysis. The PRISMA flow diagram for the study selection is provided in Figure 1.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 1: PRISMA flowchart of the Geriatric Scoping Review

All studies were cross-sectional and aimed to either develop, validate or test tools for assessment of different health parameters. A considerable number were part of larger studies, but a few were multinational in scope, so we are presenting the components that concerned the tool development/validation in South Asia only. All studies included participants from all genders, different age groups and social classes, except Rathnayake-2020, who included only postmenopausal women[18]. The study characteristics are summarized in Table-1 below.

Table-1: - Characteristic of Included studies

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Author /YYYY	Tool developed/validated/tested	Country of origin	Study setting	Age
Adhikari 2009	Madras Diabetes Research Foundation (MDRF)- Indian Diabetes Risk Score (IDRS)	India	Semi-urban	>20
Bhowmik 2015	Simple- diabetes risk score (DRS)	Ban'esh	Rural	>25
Chatterjee 2019	Integrated care tool (ICT-BRIEF)	India	Hospital, community (Both rural and urban) and old age home	>=6
Chokkanathan 2013	Centre for Epidemiological Studies – Depression scale (CES-D)	India	Urban	>=6
Corsi 2012	Environmental Profile of a Community's Health (EPOCH-2)	Multiple (India in south Asia)	rural and urban	35-7
Dandona 2000	WHO Quality of Life- for vision (WHOQOL-vision)	India	Both rural and urban	16-7
Dasgupta 2020	Alzheimer Questionnaire	India	Urban	>=6
De Silva 2016	Quality of life instrument for the young elderly in Sri Lanka (QLI YES)	Sri Lanka	Urban and rural	60-7
Deepthi 2012	Single question and Shortened Hearing Handicap Inventory for Elderly (HHIE-S)	India	Rural	>60
Ganguli 1995	Hindi Mini-mental state examination (HMSE)	India	Rural	>55
Husain 2006	Personal Health Questionnaire (PHQ) and Self Reporting Questionnaire (SRQ)	Pakistan	Rural	>18
Jotheeswaran 2016	EASY-care Independence Scale (EASY Care)	India	Both rural and urban	>60

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Khan 2015	Questionnaire to Verify Stroke Free Status (QVSFS)	Pakistan	Urban	>40
Marella 2014	Rapid assessment of Disability (RAD)	Bangladesh	Both rural and urban	>18
Misra 2014	Global physical activity questionnaire (GPAQ)	India	Both rural and urban	15-6
Moiz 2017	Activities-specific balance confidence in Hindi (ABC-H scale)	India	Urban	60-8
Nepal, G. M.,2019	Timed up and Go (TUG) test	Nepal	Rural	60-9
Perera, B. P. R.,2020	WHO-5 well-being index	Sri Lanka	Semi-Urban	16-7
Poongothai, S., 2009	Personal health questionnaire (PHQ-9, PHQ-12)	India	Urban	≥ 20
Prince, M.,2003	Community Screening Instrument for Dementia (CSI 'D'), Informant interview about daily functioning (IDF), Consortium to Establish a Registry of Alzheimer's Disease (CERAD)	Multiple (India in south Asia)	Universities	60 and
Qin 2018	General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12)	India	Both rural and urban	>=6
Ramachandran 2005	DRS- Urban Indians	India	Urban	>=2
Rathnayake 2020	Health Promoting Lifestyle Profile-II (HPLP-II)	Sri Lanka	Both rural and urban	>40 post mer
Sarkar 2015	Geriatric depression scale (GDS-15)	India	Rural	>60
Sherpa 2015	St. George respiratory questionnaire (SGRQ)	Nepal	Both rural and urban	40-8
Siriwardhana	Sinhala Instrumental			

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

2018	Activities of Daily Living (IADL)	Sri Lanka	Rural	>60
Stanley 2009	Vellore Screening Instrument for Dementia – Patient and -Informant (VSID-P and VSID-I)	India	Both rural and urban	>65
Stewart 2016	Short schedule of 10/66 tool	India (and others)	Both rural and urban	>65
Tausig 2003	Modified DSM-III-R Criteria Checklist	Nepal	Rural	>18
Vaz, M.,	Semi-pictorial Rural Physical Activity Questionnaire (RPAQ)	India	Rural	35-7
Pati 2016	Multimorbidity assessment in primary care (MAQ-PC)	India	Both urban and rural	>18
Mohan 2005	Indian Diabetes Risk Score (IDRS)	India	Urban	>18
Fillenbaum 1999	Everyday abilities scale for India (EASI)	India	Rural	>55
Rao 2012	National Institute of Mental Health and Neurosciences (NIMHANS) Headache questionnaire	India	Both urban and rural	10-6
Gaiki 2014	Mini nutritional assessment (MNA) scale	India	Rural	>60
Pandav 2002	Functional Ability Scale — EASI and HMSE	India	Rural	>=5
Ghoshal 2015	Enhanced Asian Rome III questionnaire (EAR3Q)	India (among other Asian countries)	Both urban and rural	18-6
Swati 2015	Dementia assessment by Rapid test (DART)	India	Both urban and rural	55-8
Umayal 2010	Modified Bristol and Blessed scale	Sri Lanka	Both urban and rural	>=5
Diwan 2018	Stroke impact scale	India	Both urban and rural	35-7
McIntyre 2020	Personal wellbeing index	India	Both urban	>18

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

	(PWI)		and rural	
Anjana 2015	MDRF- Physical Activity Questionnaire (MPAQ)	India	Both urban and rural	>=2
Cullati 2018	Self-rated health (SRH)	India	Both urban and rural	>=1
Prasad 2018	Modified Barthel index	India	Hospital	18-7
Singh 2007	Activities of daily living (ADL), IADL, modified performance-oriented mobility assessment (POMA)	India	Urban	65-8
Gothwal 2013	Vision and Quality of Life Index (VisQoL)	India	Hospital	18 year

All tools were either self-administered or administered through an investigator or health worker, except two tools, modified DSM-III checklist [19] and EASY-care [20], which were designed to be used by clinicians. The characteristics of the tools are provided in Table-2 below.

Table-2 Characteristics of the Tools

Domain	Sub-domain	Instrument name	No. of Items	Language	Durat (mins
	Diabetes	MDRF-IDRS	4	Not specified	NA
		Simple DRS	5	NA	NA
		DRS- urban Indians	7	NA	NA
		IDRS	4	NA	NA
	CVD	EPOCH-2	13	NA	NA
	Pulmonary disease	SGRQ	76	Nepali	NA
	Stroke	QVSFS	8	Urdu	7

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Medical	Headache	NIMHANS Headache questionnaire	NA	NA	NA
	Nutritional status	MNA	18	Marathi	NA
	Bowel disease	EAR3Q	NA	Chinese Hindi-Telugu Indonesian Korean Thai	35
Psychological Assessment	Depression	PHQ and SRQ	PHQ=16;	Urdu	NA
		CES-D	20	Tamil	NA
		GDS-15	15	Tamil	NA
		PHQ-9,PHQ-12	9 , 12	NA	NA
	Dementia	CSI ‘D’ , IDF, CERAD	CSI "D"= 32, IDF=26, CERAD- 10 word	Multiple Local languages	NA
		DART	4	NA	5
		VSID-P and VSID-I	10	Tamil	05-Ju
		Short schedule of 10/66 tool	12	Multiple Local languages	10–15 (partic
		Modified DSM-III-R Criteria	59	Nepali	47

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

	Psychological disorders	Checklist			
		GHQ-12	12	Multiple Local languages	NA
	Cognitive impairment	HMSE	13	Hindi	NA
		Alzheimer Questionnaire	21	Bengali	NA
Functional Assessment	Physical activity	MDRF-MPAQ	NA	Tamil	10
		Semi-pictorial RPAQ	20	NA	NA
		GPAQ	16	Hindi	NA
	Mobility	TUG test	NA	Nepali	NA
	Falls	ABC-H scale	16	Hindi	NA
	Hearing loss	Single question and HHIE-S	1 and 10 for HHIE-S	Kannada	NA
	Disability	RAD	92	Bangla	45
	Activities of daily living	Sinhala IADL	8	Sinhala	Oct-1!
		EASI	12	NA	NA
		Modified Barthel index	10	NA	NA
		ADL, IADL, POMA	6 for ADL, 8 for IADL, 24 for POMA	NA	NA
		Modified Bristol and Blessed scale	Bristorl=14; Blessed=13	Sinhala	NA
		EASY-care			

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

		Independence scale	18	NA	NA
Social Assessment	Subjective wellbeing	PWI	2 versions- 7 and 8 items	English	NA
	Health-promoting behavior	HPLP-II	52	Sinhala	NA
Multiple	Vision specific quality of life (6 domain of QoL: physical, social, psychological, environmental, level of independence, religion domain)	WHOQOL-vision	NA	Telugu	10-20
	QoL for young elderly (6 domains: physical, mental, social, functional, environmental, and spiritual)	QLI YES	30	Sinhala	NA
	Level of wellbeing, Depression, Anxiety & depressive symptoms	WHO-5 Well-being index	5	Sinhala	NA
	Multimorbidity,				20-25

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

	Functional limitation, QoL, Health care utilisation	MAQ-PC	52	Odia	
	Physical, social, Mental, well-being, Elder abuse	ICT-BRIEF	30	Hindi	15-20
	Physical, mental, functional health, chronic diseases, health behaviours.	SRH	1	NA	NA
	Cognitive impairment, Functional ability, Dementia	Functional Ability Scale—EASI and HMSE	11	Hindi	NA
	Stroke specific QoL (Memory, ADL, Mobility, Social-cognitive)	Stroke impact scale	59	Gujarati	NA
	Quality of life (physical, social, emotional well-being, level of independence, self-actualization, and planning	VisQoL	6	Telugu, Hindi	NA

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

	and organization)				

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Measures of tools

Majority of the tools were compared with a defined "Gold standard" to evaluate the sensitivity, specificity, predictive values, and cut-off optimization, which was reported in some form for 24 tools and summarized in table-3 below. The other common measures of tool design and validation reported were factorial analysis by Bartlett's test of sphericity, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis (EFA/CFA), content, convergent, divergent, criterion and construct validity , inter-item and spearman's correlation, reliability by tests of internal consistency such as Cronbach's α and test-retest reliability by intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs), inter-rater reliability by Cohen's Kappa.

The available tools were categorized into five major domains: -

A. Medical Assessment tools-

The included studies on 10 tools related to medical assessment in older adults. Four tools - MDRF-IDRS[21], Simple DRS[22], DRS-urban Indians[23], IDRS[24] were for risk scoring of diabetes which had showed moderate sensitivity and specificity.

The QVSFS[25]was intended to verify the stroke-free status, NIMHANS Headache questionnaire[26] for headache and EAR3Q[27] for bowel disease, all these tools had high sensitivity and NPV. The EPOCH-2[28] and MNA[29] were assessed cardio-vascular and nutritional status respectively and reported moderate reliability for both. SGRQ[30] used to predict COPD and had high negative correlation between SGRQ scores and lung capacity.

B. Psychological assessment tools-

There were four studies each that assessed tools related to depression (PHQ/SRQ[31],CES-D[32], GDS-15[33], PHQ-9-12[34]) and dementia (CSI ‘D’/IDF/CERAD[35], DART[36], VSID-P/VSID-I[37], Short schedule of 10/66 tool[38]). All of these reported moderates to high sensitivity and specificity as shown in table 3.

The DSM-III[19] checklist had moderate construct validity, variable reliability with poor alpha values for schizophrenia and mania, along

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

with high alpha values for depression and anxiety. Whereas, the GHQ-12[39] tool showed moderate reliability. In case of HMSE[40] had moderate sensitivity and specificity, high NPV but poor PPV. However, Alzheimer's questionnaire[41] showed high sensitivity, specificity and high PPV.

C. Functional assessment tools-

There are five tools (Sinhala version of ADL[42], Modified Barthel index[43], EASI[44], EASY Care[20], modified Bristol and Blessed scales[45]) were validated for ADL assessment. Among them, Sinhala version of ADL[42] and EASY Care[20] independence scale had high reliability, Whereas Modified Barthel index[43], substantial-high sensitivity and specificity, EASI[44] tool had shown moderate sensitivity and high specificity, with a poor PPV and the modified Bristol and Blessed scales[45] had very high sensitivity and moderate specificity.

RAD assesses disability with moderate sensitivity and high specificity. ABCH scale to assess falls had high sensitivity and specificity with a high PPV. Single question hearing handicap and HHIES both used for hearing loss, had poor sensitivity and high specificity with poor NPV.

D. Social assessment tools-

Subjective wellbeing as assessed by PWI[46] and health-promoting behavior assessed by HPLP-II[18]. Both tools had high reliability.

E. Multiple domain assessment tools-

A total of nine tools assessed more than one domain and all had some form of a quality-of-life assessment included in them.
The WHOQOL vision[47], VisQoL[48], The QLI-YES[49] included 6 different domains of quality of life and reported high to moderate reliability.

The WHO-5 well-being index[50] is used to assess and compare depression, anxiety & depressive symptoms. The translated version demonstrated good content and face validity with high reliability.

The MAQ-PC[51] tool assessed multimorbidity, functional limitation,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

depression, health-related quality of life and health care utilization. It had an overall moderate to high reliability and validity. ICT-BRIEF tool[52] and SRH[53] tools to assess different domains of quality of life had high reliability and t moderate validity respectively

Stroke impact scale[54] assessed the stroke-specific QoL and reported moderate positive correlations between constructs of memory, communication, ADL, mobility, and hand function. It showed weak positive correlation with participation and physical domains.

The psychometric properties of the tools described above are summarized in Table-3 and also available in supplementary file (Appendix-3).

Table-3 psychometric properties of the Tools

Domain	Tool name	Cut off	Sensitivity (%) (95% CI)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)
Medical	MDRF-IDRS	≥ 60	62.2	73.7	19.7	94.9
	Simple DRS	>9	75.7 (62.1–85.5)	61.6 (58.1–65.0)	13.1 (9.7–17.2)	97.0 (95.0 98.3)
	QVSFS		77.1 (64.1–86.9)	85.8 (83.5–87.5)	48.7 (40.5–54.9)	95.5 (93.0 97.4)
	DRS-Urban Indians		76.6	59.9	9.4	97.9
	IDRS	≥ 60	72.5	60.1	17.0	95.1
	NIMHANS Headache		88 (83–91)	81 (74–87)	89 (84–92)	80 (73–86)
	EAR3Q		>60	>60		
	PHQ	5/6	69.6	85.2	78.9	77.8

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

	SRQ	5/6	93.1	80.8	77.9	94.1
	PHQ-12	≥4	92.0	90.7	76.7	97.1
	Short schedule of 10/66 tool		94.2	80.2%		
	VSID-P		66.7	77.6	8.3	98.7
Psychological	VSID-I		100	79.2	13.0	100
	DART		95.5	60.0	70.2	93.0
	GDS-15		80.0	47.6		
	HMSE		81.3	60.2	9.8	98.4
	Alzheimer's questionnaire		85.7% (95% CI=74.2-92.6)	96.4% (95% CI=89.9-98.7)	94.1% (95% CI=84.0-97.9%).	
	RAD		62.4	81.2		
	ABC-H scale	>58.13	86.3 (65.1–97.1)	87.3 (79.4–93.1)	59.4 (40.6–76.3)	96.8 (90.8 99.3
	Modified Bristol Scale		100.0	74.2		
	Modified Blessed scale		100.0	71.0		
	Single question hearing	> 25dB	30.9	93.9	92.9	34.6

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Functional	handicap					
	HHIE-S	> 25dB	34.8	95.0	95.9	24.6
	EASI		62.5	89.7	24.4	97.8
	EASI + HMSE		90.6	54.3	9.6	99.1
	Modified Barthel Index	≤ 60 at 3 months and ≥ 20 at 6 months	89.2	95.0		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Discussion

This systematic scoping review aimed to describe available tools to assess geriatric health in community settings in South Asia. We found that there is a paucity of tools that can be used to evaluate elderly health comprehensively. Majority of tools available evaluate specific health outcomes, rather than broader conceptualizations of complete wellbeing and hence are not suitable for use in assessment of multiple domains of health. A large majority(29 instruments) were adopted from pre-existing instruments, mostly developed for the western population. This indicates insufficient research and uptake of health measurements and scales particularly for the South Asian population. While two studies were from before 2000, many studies (32) were published in the past decade. Research aimed at tool development and validation in South Asia is probably a relatively recent phenomenon.

A combination of steady declining birth rate and increasing life expectancy has been seen in South Asia that has resulted in an increasing aging population, along with an increasing burden of morbidity. This amplifies the need for CGA and the tools necessary for its implementation. , This would play an important role to decide individual needs and thus provide person-centered care. This review also reported medical and functional health assessment seems to be the major domains of CGA represented by maximum number of tools rather than the whole spectrum of health. While assessing geriatric QoL, environment plays an essential role, but tools to assess this domain are the least frequently found. Studies conducted on elderly population in China have shown a clear association between environmental factors

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

and survival, where air pollution was shown to have a significant association with elderly health[55]. Similarly, tools assessing financial burden of illness, access to health care or social health were not found.

The priority in the region has traditionally been on addressing infectious diseases, maternal and child health challenges. Elderly health has therefore remained a neglected area of policy, practice and subsequently research in the region. Although few targeted health programs such as the "National Programme for Health Care of the Elderly (NPHCE)" in India [56] have been initiated in recent years, their impact is yet to be evaluated. These programs envision geriatric assessment and screening in their activities but the uptake has been slow due to unavailability of tools for the same that can be used by the community health workers.

Most of the programs in developing countries have attached less importance to home-based elderly care because of the emphasis given to institutional, mostly medical care. This finding is supported by our review where only one tool MAQ-PC[51] included most of the domains (Medical, Psychological, Functional) of CGA but that too considering the institutional-based care needs of the participants.

Health systems need to appreciate and be prepared for the shift from communicable to non-communicable diseases in the coming years. An increasing focus on healthcare for the elderly in the coming decades is inevitable. Tools for the health assessment and screening of this group need to be contextually developed and validated in multiple settings to realize the goals of the national programs.

Limitation of the review

Only peer-reviewed articles published in English language were selected, which may introduce selection bias, however, it is also important to note that the primary language for scientific communication in the whole of South Asia is English. We have not evaluated the quality of the studies included. We have limited our studies to South Asia, this could increase the chance of missing out the studies conducted in other LMICs. However, the compliance of the review with PRISMA guidelines with robust and systematic methodology strengthens the confidence in findings.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Conclusion

This review indicated a significant gap in tools available for CGA in the South Asian population that can be used in community settings. No tool combining all aspects of CGA has been reported from the region. Acknowledging the significance of context-specific robust health assessment tools, there is a need for culturally sensitive and practical tools that can be used to assess geriatric health.

Authors' Contributions

SP1 & TB were equally contributed to the development of search strategy, screening, hand searching, charting, and analysis of the data. SP1 drafted the article. JSK was responsible for conceptualization, manuscript review, and editing.SP2 was responsible for manuscript review and editing. All the authors have read and agreed to the published version of manuscript.

Funding

This review received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest

References

1. Organization world health. The global burden of disease 2004. *Updat World Heal Organ* 2004:146.

2. Prince MJ, Wu F, Guo Y *et al.* The burden of disease in older people and implications for health policy and practice. *Lancet* 2015;**385**:549–62.

3. Alemayehu B, Warner KE. The lifetime distribution of health care costs. *Health Serv Res* 2004;**39**:627–42.

4. Kowal P, Kahn K, Ng N *et al.* Ageing and adult health status in eight

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

lower-income countries: The INDEPTH WHO-SAGE collaboration. *Glob Health Action* 2010;**3**:11–22.

5. Jiang S, Li P. Current development in elderly comprehensive assessment and research methods. *Biomed Res Int* 2016;**2016**, DOI: 10.1155/2016/3528248.

6. Zagonel V. Importance of a comprehensive geriatric assessment in older cancer patients. *Eur J Cancer* 2001;**37**, DOI: 10.1016/s0959-8049(01)80024-1.

7. Nord M, Östgren CJ, Marcusson J *et al.* Staff experiences of a new tool for comprehensive geriatric assessment in primary care (PASTEL): a focus group study : Primary care staff experiences of geriatric assessment. *Scand J Prim Health Care* 2020;**38**:132–45.

8. Solomon D, Brown AS, Brummel-Smith K *et al.* National Institutes of Health Consensus Development Conference Statement: Geriatric assessment methods for clinical decision-making. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1988;**36**:342–7.

9. University of Marylan. GERIATRIC ASSESSMENT TOOLS.

10. Katz S, Akpom CA. A measure of primary sociobiological functions. *Int J Heal Serv* 1976;**6**:493–508.

11. Lawton MP, Moss M, Fulcomer M *et al.* A research and service oriented multilevel assessment instrument. *Journals Gerontol* 1982;**37**:91–9.

12. Thompson T. Immigrant Populations. *Encycl Heal Commun* 2014:1–9.

13. Vrabel M. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *Oncol Nurs Forum* 2015;**42**:552–4.

14. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *Int J Soc Res Methodol Theory Pract* 2005;**8**:19–32.

15. Peters MDJ, Godfrey CM, Khalil H *et al.* Guidance for conducting systematic scoping reviews. *Int J Evid Based Healthc* 2015;**13**:141–6.

16. Dr. Jaya Singh Kshatri. Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment (CGA) – time for knowledge translation.

17. Wieland D, Hirth V. Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment. *Cancer*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Control 2003;**10**:454–62.

18. Rathnayake N, Alwis G, Lenora J *et al.* Applicability of health promoting lifestyle profile-II for postmenopausal women in Sri Lanka; A validation study. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2020;**18**:122.

19. Tausig M, Subedi S, Broughton CL *et al.* Measuring community mental health in developing societies: Evaluation of a checklist format in Nepal. *Int J Soc Psychiatry* 2003;**49**:269–83.

20. Jotheeswaran AT, Dias A, Philp I *et al.* Calibrating EASY-Care independence scale to improve accuracy. *Age Ageing* 2016;**45**:890–3.

21. Adhikari P, Pathak R, Kotian S. Validation of the MDRF - Indian diabetes risk score (IDRS) in another South Indian population through the boloor diabetes study (BDS). *J Assoc Physicians India* 2010;**58**:434–6.

22. Bhowmik B, Akhter A, Ali L *et al.* Simple risk score to detect rural Asian Indian (Bangladeshi) adults at high risk for type 2 diabetes. *J Diabetes Investig* 2015;**6**:670–7.

23. Ramachandran A, Snehalatha C, Vijay V *et al.* Derivation and validation of diabetes risk score for urban Asian Indians. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2005;**70**:63–70.

24. Mohan V, Deepa R, Deepa M *et al.* A simplified Indian Diabetes Risk Score for screening for undiagnosed diabetic subjects. *J Assoc Physicians India* 2005;**53**:759–63.

25. Khan M, Kamal AK, Islam M *et al.* Can Trained Field Community Workers Identify Stroke Using a Stroke Symptom Questionnaire as well as Neurologists? *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis* 2015;**24**:91–9.

26. Rao GN, Kulkarni GB, Gururaj G *et al.* The burden of headache disorders in India: Methodology and questionnaire validation for a community-based survey in Karnataka State. *J Headache Pain* 2012;**13**:543–50.

27. Ghoshal UC, Gwee KA, Chen M *et al.* Development, translation and validation of Enhanced Asian Rome III questionnaires for diagnosis of functional bowel diseases in major Asian languages: A Rome foundation-Asian neurogastroenterology and motility association working team report. *J Neurogastroenterol Motil* 2015;**21**:83–92.

28. Corsi DJ, Subramanian S V., McKee M *et al.* Environmental Profile of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

a Community's Health (EPOCH): An Ecometric Assessment of Measures of the Community Environment Based on Individual Perception. *PLoS One* 2012;**7**:e44410.

29. Gaiki V, Wagh V. Reliability of Mini-Nutritional Assessment Scale in Rural Setup of a Tertiary Health Care Hospital in Central India. 2014;**2**.

30. Sherpa CT, LeClerq SL, Singh S *et al.* Validation of the St. George's Respiratory Questionnaire in Nepal. *Chronic Obstr Pulm Dis J COPD Found* 2015;**2**:281–9.

31. Husain N, Gater R, Tomenson B *et al.* Comparison of the personal health questionnaire and the self reporting questionnaire in rural Pakistan. *J Pak Med Assoc* 2006;**56**:366–70.

32. Chokkanathan S, Mohanty J. Factor structure of the CES-D scale among older adults in Chennai, India. *Aging Ment Heal* 2013;**17**:517–25.

33. Sarkar S, Kattimani S, Roy G *et al.* Validation of the Tamil version of short form Geriatric Depression Scale-15. *J Neurosci Rural Pract* 2015;**6**:442–6.

34. Poongothai S, Pradeepa R, Ganesan A *et al.* Reliability and validity of a modified PHQ-9 item inventory (PHQ-12) as a screening instrument for assessing depression in Asian Indians (CURES-65). *J Assoc Physicians India* 2009;**57**.

35. Prince M, Acosta D, Chiu H *et al.* Dementia diagnosis in developing countries: A cross-cultural validation study. *Lancet* 2003;**361**:909–17.

36. B S, V S. Dementia Assessment by Rapid Test (DART): An Indian Screening T ool for Dementia. *J Alzheimer's Dis Park* 2015;**05**, DOI: 10.4172/2161-0460.1000198.

37. Stanley R, Kuruvilla A, Kumar S *et al.* The Vellore screening instruments and strategies for the diagnosis of dementia in the community. *Int Psychogeriatrics* 2009;**21**:539–47.

38. Stewart R, Guerchet M, Prince M. Development of a brief assessment and algorithm for ascertaining dementia in low-income and middle-income countries: The 10/66 short dementia diagnostic schedule. *BMJ Open* 2016;**6**:e010712.

39. Qin M, Vlachantoni A, Evandrou M *et al.* General Health Questionnaire-12 reliability, factor structure, and external validity among

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

older adults in India. *Indian J Psychiatry* 2018;**60**:56–9.

40. Ganguli M, Ratcliff G, Chandra V *et al.* A hindi version of the MMSE: The development of a cognitive screening instrument for a largely illiterate rural elderly population in india. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 1995;**10**:367–77.

41. Dasgupta A, Biswas A, Paul B *et al.* Comparative Analysis of Alzheimer Questionnaire and Montreal Cognitive Assessment Tool for Cognitive Impairment Screening among the Elderly Population. *J Clin Diagnostic Res* 2020;**14**:5–9.

42. Siriwardhana DD, Walters K, Rait G *et al.* Cross-cultural adaptation and psychometric evaluation of the Sinhala version of lawton instrumental activities of daily living scale. *PLoS One* 2018;**13**:e0199820.

43. Prasad K, Kumar A, Misra S *et al.* Reliability and validity of telephonic Barthel Index: an experience from multi-centric randomized control study. *Acta Neurol Belg* 2018;**118**:53–9.

44. Fillenbaum GG, Chandra V, Ganguli M *et al.* Development of an activities of daily living scale to screen for dementia in an illiterate rural older population in India. *Age Ageing* 1999;**28**:161–8.

45. Umayal S, Kulathunga M, Somaratne S *et al.* Validation of a functional screening instrument for dementia in an elderly sri lankan population: Comparison of modified bristol and blessed activities of daily living scales. *BMC Res Notes* 2010;**3**:0–4.

46. McIntyre E, Saliba A, McKenzie K. Subjective wellbeing in the Indian general population: a validation study of the Personal Wellbeing Index. *Qual Life Res* 2020;**29**:1073–81.

47. Dandona R, Dandona L, McCarty CA *et al.* Adaptation of WHOQOL as health-related quality of life instrument to develop a vision-specific instrument. *Indian J Ophthalmol* 2000;**48**:65–70.

48. Gothwal VK, Bagga DK. Vision and quality of life index: Validation of the Indian version using rasch analysis. *Investig Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2013;**54**:4871–81.

49. De Silva SHP, Jayasuriya AR, Rajapaksa LC *et al.* Development and Validation of a Measure of Quality of Life for the Young Elderly in Sri Lanka. Bland Bowling, Cronin, De Beni, Emery, Fayers, Guyatt, Hattie,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Hodkinson, Huijer, Ingersoll-Dayton, Juniper, Kelley-Gillespie, Ku, Kumarapeli, Ledesma, Mahoney, McDowell, Nilsson, Osborne, Paschoal, Portney, Power, Rockwood, Shrout, Thanakwang, Wands, Yo B (ed.). *Asia-Pacific J Public Heal* 2016;**28**:115S-125S.

50. Perera BPR, Jayasuriya R, Caldera A *et al.* Assessing mental well-being in a Sinhala speaking Sri Lankan population: Validation of the WHO-5 well-being index. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2020;**18**:305.

51. Pati S, Hussain MA, Swain S *et al.* Development and Validation of a Questionnaire to Assess Multimorbidity in Primary Care: An Indian Experience. *Biomed Res Int* 2016;**2016**, DOI: 10.1155/2016/6582487.

52. Chatterjee P, Rebok GW, Dwivedi SN *et al.* Development of integrated care tool - BRIEF for screening the unmet psychosociomedical needs of older Indians. *Indian J Public Health* 2019;**63**:51–7.

53. Cullati S, Mukhopadhyay S, Sieber S *et al.* Is the single self-rated health item reliable in India? A construct validity study. *BMJ Glob Heal* 2018;**3**:1–12.

54. Diwan. 1/22/2021 Article Fulle Text. 2021;**47**:1–8.

55. Zeng Y, Gu D, Purser J *et al.* Associations of environmental factors with elderly health and mortality in china. *Am J Public Health* 2010;**100**:298–305.

56. Verma R, Khanna P. National program of health-care for the elderly in India: A hope for healthy ageing. *Int J Prev Med* 2013;**4**:1103–7.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted May 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .