medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 Region

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

There have been many geriatric tools developed to assess health status targeting especially for older adults from developed nations but not context specific. Whereas finger count tools are available for LMICs, especially the South Asia population. CGA, as opposed to medical examination, uses multiple tools to capture a holistic health status of the older adults in line with the more comprehensive WHO definition of health. It includes a harmonized evaluation of the clinical, functional, psychological, environmental and social health status of older population. Although there is no standardized format for carrying out CGA, there is broad consensus on the domains that need to be measured. For the better caring of culturally diverse South Asian older population, we need to develop more culturally competent CGHA tools. So, this review summarised studies that describe validated tools for assessing geriatric health in community settings in South Asia. We followed Arksey and O'Malley's five-stage scoping review framework, refined with the Joanna Briggs Institute methodology, to identify the research questions, identify relevant studies, select studies, chart the data, and collate and summarize the data. Using the PRISMA-ScR guidelines, a search of 3 databases (PubMed, Embase and PsychInfo was undertaken. After applying eligibility criteria to 607 articles, only 46 studies met the inclusion criteria. 7 studies reported on medical assessment, 4 studies assessed psychological condition,6 studies assessed functional issue,2 studies assessed social wellbeing and 9 studies reported on different domains. None study measured all domains. 24 tools calibrated with Gold standard measure, were validated and reliable by assessed with psychometric properties such as sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV and ROC-AUC. Meanwhile, 21 tools were validated exclusively for older adults, whereas there are no validated tools available for CGHA in South Asia. This review will guide us for development of CGHA tools or adaptation of existing tools in our context. As well, it will help practitioners to develop tools to measure comprehensive health of the elderly in their context.

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

Introduction

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 an increasingly older population across the world, the older adults contribute to a majority of disease burden and subsequently the healthcare expenditures in these countries. (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)

Comprehensive geriatric assessment (CGA) is recognized as a key tool to address the health needs of older adults. It includes a harmonized evaluation of the clinical, functional, psychological, environmental and social health status of older population. (6) Although there is no standardized format for carrying out CGA, there is broad consensus on the domains that need to be measured.(7) CGA, as opposed to medical examination, uses multiple tools to capture a holistic health status of the older adults in line with the more comprehensive WHO definition of health.(8)

Many tools have been developed and validated for various domains of geriatric health and are used in CGA. Most of the tools are focussed on a particular domain of CGA and a majority of these have been validated for use in high-income countries, where they have been developed(9)(10)(11). Concerns have been raised on the utility and accuracy of these tools in Low and Middle-income countries (LMIC)(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 sub-continent has had a common socio-cultural thread running through it 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 in this population 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 tool to include in community-based CGA. Findings of this review could also aid in identifying scope for further updating of existing tools for the South Asian population as well as identify crucial gaps in the domains of CGA where validated tools are missing.

Methods

This scoping review was conducted in order to map and describe available validated community-based geriatric health assessment tools in South Asia. This study was reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses statement for reporting systematic reviews-extension(13) presented in Appendix-1 and registered with Open Science Framework(**10.17605/OSF.IO/TFR3H**).

We followed the Arksey and O'Malley framework for conducting scoping reviews which used the following steps - Identification of relevant studies, Study selection, Data charting, Data reporting. (14).

Identification of relevant studies

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

We conducted a systematic search of the following relevant electronic databases: MEDLINE (Via PubMed), Embase (via Ovid) and PsychInfo (via Ovid). As English is the preferred scientific communication language in the region, we searched for articles published in English without any date restrictions. The pilot searches were carried out on variations of the word "Community-based", "elderly", "Health assessment*" "screening", "Tool*", South Asia that appeared in Title/ Abstracts. The detailed of search string was presented in Appendix 2. In addition, relevant papers were identified through reference mining and Google scholar database using the keywords.

Study selection

After an extensive search in databases, all the eligible studies meeting our inclusion were downloaded and then imported to citation manager (Mendeley). Following de-duplication of electronic articles, two independent review authors (SP & TB) screened relevant articles based on Title/Abstract. Discrepancies were discussed and resolved. In case no consensus was reached, a third author (JSK) made the decision. Full texts were retrieved and reviewed for eligibility. We included studies conducted in any of the 7 South Asian countries that evaluated geriatric health assessment tools, or any of the sub-domains or reported its development process or validation. We excluded manuscripts that were in form of Comments, editorial, letters, Conference or congress papers, abstracts and reviews. We have included those institutional geriatric health assessment tools which can be implemented in community setting as well. Full-text review followed the same method as Title/abstract screening with disagreements resolved by consensus or by a 3rd author. In this study, we have not considered methodological rigor of the included studies.

Charting the data

A standard data extraction sheet was prepared by review team to capture all relevant aspects. This extraction sheet was developed iteratively and updated as required. The study characteristics like country of origin, objective, sample characteristics, setting, sample size and sampling method were extracted. Detailed description of the health assessment tool and the procedure of its development, composition, validity, reliability, feasibility, mode and duration of administration of the instrument were extracted from the relevant paper. After completion, the charted tables were examined further within reviewer to ensure accuracy and consistency.

Collating, Summarising and reporting the result

Narrative summary of result is presented. Tables were used to present specific details of the tools and development process. The result sections first described the characteristic of the studies, characteristics of the tool described and its clinometric or psychometric properties.

We carried out qualitative thematic analysis of the items or tools included and categorized them into 5 broad domains and further subdomains of CGA as follows(15).

a. Medical Assessment
b. Functional Assessment
c. Social Assessment
d. Environment Assessment
e. Multiple

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

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 curve (ROC-AUC).

Results

A total of 46 studies were included in the final analysis. The PRISMA flow diagram for the study selection is provided in figure 1.



Figure 1: PRISMA flowchart of the Geriatric Scoping Review

All studies were cross-sectional in nature and aimed to either develop, validate or test tools for assessment of different health parameters. A considerable number were part of larger studies or trials with different study designs and a few were multi-national in scope, but we are presenting only the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

components that concerned the tool development/validation in South Asia only. All studies included participants from all genders and social classes Rathnayake-2020 which was done in post-menopausal women(16). Majority of studies did not specify the theory/model/framework used to build the tools while 5 studies(17)(18)(19)(20)(21) used regression models to develop the tools. The studies characteristics are summarized in table-1 below.

Table-1: - Characteristic of Included studies

Author /YYYY	Tool developed/validated/tested	Country of origin	Study setting	Age group	Sample Size & Sampling Method
Adhikari 2009	Madras Diabetes Research Foundation (MDRF)-Indian Diabetes Risk Score (IDRS)	India	Semi-urban	>20 years	551, random
Bhowmik 2015	Simple- diabetes risk score (DRS)	Ban'esh	Rural	>25 years	3129, random
Chatterjee 2019	Integrated care tool (ICT-BRIEF)	India	Hospital, community (Both rural and urban) and old age home	>=60 years	635, random
Chokkanathan 2013	Centre for Epidemiological Studies – Depression scale (CES-D)	India	Urban	>=65 years	400, random
Corsi 2012	Environmental Profile of a Community's Health (EPOCH-2)	Multiple (India in south Asia)	rural and urban	35-70 years	2381, convenient
Dandona 2000	WHO Quality of Life- for vision (WHOQOL-vision)	India	Both rural and urban	16-75 years	172, NA
Dasgupta 2020	Alzheimer Questionnaire	India	Urban	>=60 years	140, random
De Silva 2016	Quality of life instrument for the young elderly in Sri Lanka (QLI YES)	Sri Lanka	Urban and rural	60-74 years	200, random
Deepthi 2012	Single question and Shortened Hearing Handicap Inventory for Elderly (HHIE-S)	India	Rural	>60 years	175, purposive
Ganguli 1995	Hindi Mini-mental state examination (HMSE)	India	Rural	>55 years	100, random
Husain 2006	Personal Health Questionnaire (PHQ) and Self Reporting Questionnaire (SRQ)	Pakistan	Rural	>18 years	258, random
Jotheeswaran 2016	EASY-care Independence Scale (EASY Care)	India	Both rural and urban	>60 years	152, purposive
Khan 2015	Questionnaire to Verify Stroke Free Status (QVSFS)	Pakistan	Urban	>40 years	322, purposive
Marella 2014	Rapid assessment of Disability (RAD)	Bangladesh	Both rural and urban	>18 years	1855, random
Misra 2014	Global physical activity questionnaire (GPAQ)	India	Both rural and urban	15-65 years	234, random
Moiz 2017	Activities-specific balance confidence in Hindi (ABC-H scale)	India	Urban	60-86 years	125, convenient
Nepal, G. M.,2019	Timed up and Go (TUG) test	Nepal	Rural	60-91 years	100, convenient
Perera, B. P. R.,2020	WHO-5 well-being index	Sri Lanka	Semi-Urban	16-75 years	300, convenient
Poongothai, S., 2009	Personal health questionnaire (PHQ-9,PHQ-12)	India	Urban	≥ 20 years	100, random

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

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 years and older	2885 (Indian sample 760)
Qin 2018	General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12)	India	Both rural and urban	>=60 years	9478, random
Ramachandran 2005	DRS- Urban Indians	India	Urban	>=20 years	4993 (score development), 5010 (validation), random
Rathnayake 2020	Health Promoting Lifestyle Profile-II (HPLP-II)	Sri Lanka	Both rural and urban	>40 years, post-menopausal	245, random
Sarkar 2015	Geriatric depression scale (GDS-15)	India	Rural	>60 years	242, purposive
Sherpa 2015	St. George respiratory questionnaire (SGRQ)	Nepal	Both rural and urban	40-80 years	150, consecutive
Siriwardhana 2018	Sinhala Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL)	Sri Lanka	Rural	>60 years	702, random
Stanley 2009	Vellore Screening Instrument for Dementia – Patient and -Informant (VSID-P and VSID-I)	India	Both rural and urban	>65 years	191, purposive
Stewart 2016	Short schedule of 10/66 tool	India (and others)	Both rural and urban	>65 years	2631, random (from all sites)
Tausig 2003	Modified DSM-III-R Criteria Checklist	Nepal	Rural	>18 years	653, random
Vaz, M.,	Semi-pictorial Rural Physical Activity Questionnaire (RPAQ)	India	Rural	35-70 years	77, purposive
Pati 2016	Multimorbidity assessment in primary care (MAQ-PC)	India	Both urban and rural	>18 years	120, random
Mohan 2005	Indian Diabetes Risk Score (IDRS)	India	Urban	>18 years	2350, random
Fillenbaum 1999	Everyday abilities scale for India (EASI)	India	Rural	>55 years	387, random
Rao 2012	National Institute of Mental Health and Neurosciences (NIMHANS) Headache questionnaire	India	Both urban and rural	10-65 years	381, random
Gaiki 2014	Mini nutritional assessment (MNA) scale	India	Rural	>60 years	80, purposive
Pandav 2002	Functional Ability Scale — EASI and HMSE	India	Rural	>=55 years	632, random
Ghoshal 2015	Enhanced Asian Rome III questionnaire (EAR3Q)	India (among other Asian countries)	Both urban and rural	18-66 years	75, purposive
Swati 2015	Dementia assessment by Rapid test (DART)	India	Both urban and rural	55-84 years	150, purposive
Umayal 2010	Modified Bristol and Blessed scale	Sri lanka	Both urban and rural	>=55 years	73, purposive
Diwan 2018	Stroke impact scale	India	Both urban and rural	35-74 years	26, purposive
McIntyre 2020	Personal wellbeing index (PWI)	India	Both urban and rural	>18 years	2004, quota
Anjana 2015	MDRF- Physical Activity Questionnaire (MPAQ)	India	Both urban and rural	>=20	543, random

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

Cullati 2018	Self-rated health (SRH)	India	Both urban and rural	>=18 years	9228, purposive
Prasad 2018	Modified Barthel index	India	Hospital	18-75 years	116, purposive
Singh 2007	Activities of daily living (ADL), IADL, modified performance-oriented mobility assessment (POMA)	India	Urban	65-85 years	30, purposive
Gothwal 2013	Vision and Quality of Life Index (VisQoL)	India	Hospital	18 -84 years	349, purposive

All the tools were either self-administered or administered through an investigator or health worker except 2 tools, modified DSM-III checklist (22) and EASY-care (23) which were designed to be used by clinicians. The characteristics of the tools are provided in table-2 below.

Domain	Sub-domain	Instrument name	No. of Items	Language	Duration (mins)	Origin
Medical	Diabetes	MDRF-IDRS	4	Not specified	NA	Adapted
		Simple DRS	5	NA	NA	Original
		DRS- urban Indians	7	NA	NA	Original
		IDRS	4	NA	NA	Original
	CVD	EPOCH-2	13	NA	NA	Adapted
	Pulmonary disease	SGRQ	76	Nepali	NA	Adapted
	Stroke	QVSFS	8	Urdu	7	Adapted
	Headache	NIMHANS Headache questionnaire	NA	NA	NA	Original
	Nutritional status	MNA	18	Marathi	NA	Adapted
	Bowel disease	EAR3Q	NA	Chinese Hindi-Telugu	35	Adapted

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

				Indonesian Korean Thai		
Psychological Assessment	Depression	PHQ and SRQ	PHQ=16;	Urdu	NA	Adapted
		CES-D	20	Tamil	NA	Adapted
		GDS-15	15	Tamil	NA	Adapted
		PHQ-9,PHQ-12	9 , 12	NA	NA	Adapted
	Dementia	CSI 'D' , IDF, CERAD	CSI "D"= 32, IDF=26, CERAD- 10 word	Multiple Local languages	NA	Original
		DART	4	NA	5	Original
		VSID-P and VSID-I	10	Tamil	05-Jun	Original
		Short schedule of 10/66 tool	12	Multiple Local languages	10–15 (participant)	Adapted
	Psychological disorders	Modified DSM-III-R Criteria Checklist	59	Nepali	47	Adapted
		GHQ-12	12	Multiple Local languages	NA	Adapted
	Cognitive impairment	HMSE	13	Hindi	NA	Adapted
		Alzheimer Questionnaire	21	Bengali	NA	Adapted
Functional Assessment	Physical activity	MDRF-MPAQ	NA	Tamil	10	Original
		Semi-pictorial RPAQ	20	NA	NA	Original
		GPAQ	16	Hindi	NA	Adapted

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

	Mobility	TUG test	NA	Nepali	NA	Adapted
	Falls	ABC-H scale	16	Hindi	NA	Adapted
	Hearing loss	Single question and HHIE-S	1 and 10 for HHIE-S	Kannada	NA	Adapted
	Disability	RAD	92	Bangla	45	Adapted
	Activities of daily living	Sinhala IADL	8	Sinhala	Oct-15	Adapted
		EASI	12	NA	NA	Original
		Modified Barthel index	10	NA	NA	Adapted
		ADL, IADL, POMA	6 for ADL, 8 for IADL, 24 for POMA	NA	NA	Adapted
		Modified Bristol and Blessed scale	Bristorl=14; Blessed=13	Sinhala	NA	Adapted
		EASY-care Independence scale	18	NA	NA	Adapted
Social Assessment	Subjective wellbeing	PWI	2 versions-7 and 8 items	English	NA	Adapted
	Health-promoting behavior	HPLP-II	52	Sinhala	NA	Adapted
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	Original
	QoL for young elderly (6 domains: physical, mental, social, functional, environmental, and spiritual)	QLI YES	30	Sinhala	NA	Original

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

	Level of wellbeing, Depression, Anxiety & depressive symptoms	WHO-5 Well-being index	5	Sinhala	NA	Original
	Multimorbidity, Functional limitation, QoL, Health care utilisation	MAQ-PC	52	Odia	20-25	Original
	Physical, social, Mental, well-being, Elder abuse	ICT-BRIEF	30	Hindi	15-20	Original
	Physical, mental, functional health, chronic diseases, health behaviours.	SRH	1	NA	NA	Adapted
	Cognitive impairment, Functional ability, Dementia	Functional Ability Scale —EASI and HMSE	11	Hindi	NA	Original
	Stroke specific QoL (Memory, ADL, Mobility, Social-cognitive)	Stroke impact scale	59	Gujarati	NA	Original
	Quality of life (physical, social, emotional well-being, level of independence, self-actualization, and planning and organization)	VisQoL	6	Telugu, Hindi	NA	Adapted

Measures of tool

The most common measures of validity 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 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 by 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 Cohen's Kappa.

A. <u>Medical Assessment tools-</u>
The included studies reported on 11 tools related to medical assessment in older adults. Four tools - MDRF-IDRS(24), Simple DRS(17), DRS- urban Indians(20), IDRS(25) were for risk scoring of diabetes by regression models using baseline population data. All tools reported moderate sensitivity (range: 62.2%-76.6%) and specificity (range: 59.9-73.7), excellent PPV of over 95% each but poor NPV of below 20%.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

The QVSFS(26) was intended to verify the stroke-free status and Stroke impact scale to assess the post-stroke quality of life. NIMHANS Headache questionnaire(27) was used for headaches and EAR3Q(28) for bowel diseases.

The EPOCH-2(18) and MNA(29) assessed cardio-vascular and nutritional status respectively and reported reliability of the tools which was good in both cases. EPOCH-2 had Kappa values of over 0.8 for all items (range:0.81-0.96) and MNA had overall kappa of 0.78. Reliability was almost perfect for items on BMI, calf circumference, independence, polypharmacy, morbidities and skin ulcers. SGRQ(30) used linear regression models to predict COPD and found a strong negative correlation between SGRQ scores and lung capacities with a ROC-AUC of 0.78 for a cut-off of 33 points.

B. Psychological assessment tools-

There were 4 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 the tools for depression and dementia reported moderate to good sensitivity and specificity as shown in table 3. The CES-D scale showed good internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha=0.89) and factorial analysis showed significant factor item loadings and correlations between dimensions (r >0.8).

Two studies reported on tools for assessment of psychological disorders (Modified DSM-III-R Criteria Checklist(22), GHQ 12(39)). The DSM-III checklist had good construct validity which was assessed by an output of similar prevalence of common psychiatric conditions as compared to those measured by other standard tools. It had variable reliability with low alpha values for schizophrenia (0.45) and mania (0.59) and high alpha values for depression (0.92) and anxiety (0.98). All constructs had mild correlation (r<0.15) except depression and depressive mood (r=0.48). The GHQ-12 tool showed good internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.90. Factor analysis of the GHQ-12 showed that 2 significant components contributed to 59% of the variance. The correlation with subjective wellbeing index scores was moderate (r=0.58) and the study met the KMO criteria for sampling adequacy and significant Bartlett's test.

Two studies reported on tools assessing cognitive impairment (HMSE(40), Alzheimer Questionnaire(41)). The HMSE had moderate sensitivity and specificity, good NPV but poor PPV as shown in table 3. The Alzheimer's questionnaire showed good agreement (Cohen's kappa=0.83) and a strong negative correlation (Spearman's Rho=-0.709) with the gold standard. It showed moderate to good sensitivity and specificity with a good PPV as shown in table 3.

C. Functional assessment tools-

ADL: A total of 6 studies reported on tools assessing ADL. The Sinhala version of ADL(42) had good internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.92 and the ICC for all the raters were above 0.5 indicating moderate to excellent reliability. Bartlet's test was significant and sampling was adequate with KMO=0.898. Item scale correlation for all the items was greater than 0.7 except for item 1. Values of goodness of fit indices were in acceptable range indicating an excellent model fit. Item 1 (ability to use telephone) consistently demonstrated poor validity. The Spearman's correlation coefficients with Lawton IADL score and the scores of Barthel index were 0.61 and 0.41 respectively.

The EASI(43) tool had moderate sensitivity and high specificity as shown in table 3.

In the Modified Barthel index, substantial agreement was observed between telephonic and face-to-face assessment at 3 and 6 months with weighted Kappa of 0.63 (95% CI 0.61–0.68) and 0.72 (95% CI 0.70–0.77) respectively. Cronbach's alpha was 0.89 at 3 months and 0.94 at 6 months. The sensitivity and specificity values are provided in table 3.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

Singh et.al.,(44) compared the relationship between 3 tools for activities of daily living with age and frequency of falls. All 3 tools- ADL, IADL and POMA showed a low correlation with age (r = -0.25, -0.48 and -0.43 respectively) and moderate to high correlation with frequency of falls (r = -0.49, -0.63 and -0.49 respectively).
EASY Care(23) independence scale had a good reliability with Cronbach's alpha across the 18 items over 0.89. The modified Bristol and Blessed scales(45) had very high sensitivity and moderate specificity as shown in table 3.

Physical activity
Three studies reported tools assessed for physical activity.
MDRF-MPAQ(46) showed an ICC between baseline and 1st month between 0.73 - 0.82 and an ICC between GPAQ and MPAQ of 0.40. Construct validity was assessed by linear association between sitting and Moderate/vigorous physical activity (MVPA) and BMI and waist circumference. Spearman's correlation coefficients against accelerometer for sedentary activity was 0.48 (95%CI-0.32-0.62), MVPA was 0.44 (0.27-0.59) and overall Physical activity for MPAQ was 0.46 (0.29-0.60).

Semi-pictorial RPAQ(47) had moderate reliability with correlations between two questionnaires administered one year apart were moderately high (r = 0.37 to 0.52). Correlations between the first questionnaire and the mean of at least 4 questionnaires administered during the course of one year were generally high (males; r = 0.69, females; r = 0.7).

GPAQ (48)had very good reliability with a Cohen's kappa of 100%, Spearman's Rho between 0.40-0.59 and ICC between 0.37 to 0.81. Concurrent validity was assessed by correlation between different variables and the Spearman's Rho was between 0.89-1.00 while the ICC ranged from 0.76 to 0.91. Criterion validity was assessed by Intra-cluster correlation and kappa values which ranged from 0.68 to 0.72 and 0.51 to 0.58 respectively.

Mobility-
A single study assessed mobility by an adapted version of the TUG test(49). This had a good inter-rater reliability between the student physiotherapist and caregivers with an ICC of 0.87 (95% CI: 0.82–0.91).

A single study each reported tools used to assess disability, hearing loss and falls. Their validity parameters are provided in table 3.

D. <u>Social assessment tools-</u>
2 studies reported on tools related to social constructs.
Subjective wellbeing as assessed by PWI(50) which had good consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.89 for the 7-item scale and 0.88 for the 8-item scale. All factor loadings were greater than 0.50 indicating practical significance.

Health-promoting behavior was assessed by HPLP-II(16). This tool had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.98 and ICC of 0.98 (95% CI = 0.97–0.99). Bartlett's test was significant and the KMO was 0.89. Principal component analysis revealed the presence of seven factors with Eigen value >1, explaining cumulative variance of over 80%. Correlation coefficient with physical health domain was 0.75 and psychological health domain was 0.63.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

E. Multiple domain assessment tools-

A total of 9 tools assessed more than one domain and all had some form of a quality of life assessment included in them.

The WHOQOL vision(51) and VisQoL(52) tools were primarily focused on the vision-related quality of life. The WHOQOL vision included 6 domains of quality of life: physical, social, psychological, environmental, level of independence, religion domain. It reported a Cronbach's alpha for physical domain= 0.71, psychological=0.76, independence=0.70, social relationships=0.47, environment=0.66. For inter-interviewer as well as intra-interviewer reproducibility, the mean percentage agreement was over 90% instrument.

VisQoL assessed the physical, social and emotional well-being, level of independence, self-actualization, and planning and organization of individuals. The tool had good reliability and all item fit the model well. Those with low vision had statistically significant better VisQoL score as compared to those blind.

The QLI-YES(53) assessed the quality of Life for young elderly in 6 domains: physical, mental, social, functional, environmental, and spiritual. A model of 24 items with these 6 domains was found to have good fit indices. Both criterion and predictive validity were proved. The tool had good internal consistency with a Cronbach's α of 0.93. Correlation of the domains of the tool with WHOQOL was moderate with an r-value between 0.41 to 0.71.

The WHO-5 well-being index(19) assessed the levels of well-being and compared with depression, anxiety & depressive symptoms. The translated version demonstrated good content and face validity. Internal consistency was also good with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.85 and test-retest reliability over 2 weeks was satisfactory with r = 0.72 and ICC = 0.82. CFA supported factorial validity and factor loadings were between 0.55 and 0.89. WHO-5 scores were significantly negatively correlated with PHQ-9 (r = − 0.45) scores and the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale scores (r = − 0.56).

The MAQ-PC(54) assessed multimorbidity, functional limitation, depression, health-related quality of life and health care utilization. It had an overall consistency of 0.69 with Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.66 for health-related quality of life to 0.89 for depression. The interobserver reliability was good with a Cohen's kappa of 1 for health problems, 0.78 for depression, >0.85 for health care utilization, >0.78 for HRQOL, and 1 for multimorbidity. The test-retest reliability assessed by ICC for multimorbidity assessment domain was 0.97, quality of life physical component score was 0.91, disease severity was 0.90 and self-rated overall health was 0.74. Concurrent validity was assessed by agreement between self-reported and physician's diagnosis of chronic conditions. This was variable with a Kappa between a low of 0.58 for hearing loss and 0.59 for Diabetes to a high of 0.95 for visual impairment and 1.0 for Tuberculosis.

The ICT-BRIEF tool(55) measured physical, social and mental well-being along with elder abuse. Measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity were found to be satisfactory (KMO >0.7) and the overall internal consistency as measured by Cronbach's alpha was 0.79.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

The SRH(21) measured self-rated physical, mental, functional health, chronic diseases and health behaviors. In bivariate analyses among men, all health status variables were associated with the SRH, except for drinking alcohol and eating vegetables. Among women, all health status variables were associated with the SRH item, with the exception of overweight and obesity status, drinking alcohol, physical activity and eating vegetables. In multivariable analyses among men and women, 18 and 19 health status variables respectively remained associated with the SRH item. Explained variance across health dimensions ranged from 0.176 (health behaviors) to 0.444 (functional health). Convergent validity was established by a moderate correlation between SRH and satisfaction with r=0.51.

Stroke impact scale(56) 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 most common measures of validity 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.

Domain	Tool name	Cut off	Sensitivity (%) (95% CI)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	ROC-AUC (95% CI)
Medical	MDRF-IDRS	≥ 60	62.2	73.7	19.7	94.9	0.668
	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)	0.71
	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	0.696 (0.668-0.731)
	IDRS	≥ 60	72.5	60.1	17.0	95.1	0.698 (0.663-0.733)
	NIMHANS Headache		88 (83–91)	81 (74–87)	89 (84–92)	80 (73–86)	
	EAR3Q		>60	>60			
Psychological	PHQ	5/6	69.6	85.2	78.9	77.8	
	SRQ	5/6	93.1	80.8	77.9	94.1	
	PHQ-12	≥4	92.0	90.7	76.7	97.1	0.979 (0.929 - 0.997)
	Short schedule of 10/66 tool		94.2	80.2%			0.971 (0.961 to 0.981)
	VSID-P		66.7	77.6	8.3	98.7	0.81
	VSID-I		100	79.2	13.0	100	0.90
	DART		95.5	60.0	70.2	93.0	
	GDS-15		80.0	47.6			0.659 (0.516–0.803)
	HMSE		81.3	60.2	9.8	98.4	0.804 (0.712– 0.896)
	Alzheimer's questionnaire		85.7% (95% CI=74.2-92.6)	96.4%	94.1%		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

				(95% CI=89.9-98.7)	(95% CI=84.0-97.9%).		
Functional	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)	0.91 (0.84–0.95)
	Modified Bristol Scale		100.0	74.2			0.933 (0.871-0.995)
	Modified Blessed scale		100.0	71.0			0.892 (0.816-0.967)
	Single question hearing handicap	> 25dB	30.9	93.9	92.9	34.6	0.70 (0.62–0.77) for Mild, 0.75 (0.65–0.85) for Moderate and 0.86 (0.75–0.98) for Marked hearing loss
	HHIE-S	> 25dB	34.8	95.0	95.9	24.6	0.70 (0.62–0.77) for Mild, 0.75 (0.65–0.85) for Moderate and 0.86 (0.75–0.98) for Marked hearing loss.
	EASI		62.5	89.7	24.4	97.8	0.884 (0.824– 0.943)
	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			

Discussion

This review aimed to identify validated tools in south Asia for geriatric health assessment in community settings and describe their psychometric properties. We undertook a scoping review as a suitable approach, as it facilitates a broad review of a topic in order to summarize the literature, identify research gaps, and inform the policymakers to establish treatment plan and program for health and functional status of elderly to increase their quality of life.

Our systematic search and screening returned 46 studies that were finally included in this review. Where 21 of the tools have been validated exclusively in the older adults (>55 years of age). A large majority of studies were from India (34) followed by Sri Lanka (5), Nepal (3), Bangladesh (2) and Pakistan (2). All these studies were conducted in rural, urban or semi-urban settings except 3 studies(55)(52)(57). 32 tools were reported in regional language. While 2 studies(43)(40) were from before 2000, many studies (32) were published in the past decade. This indicates that tool development and validation research in South Asia is a relatively recent phenomenon.

The present review reports the broad domains of CGA in order to understand how this multifaceted and complex construct is being measured by validated, scientific tools. Majority of the studies reported tools/ instruments that were either health worker administered or self-reported in nature, where various items were grouped into different subdomains. Medical and functional health assessment seems to be the major domain of CGA represented by maximum number of tools. Only 2 studies(16)(50) address domains related to social health. While assessing geriatric QoL, environment plays a very important role, but the domain is the least frequent one found. Similarly, tools assessing financial burden of illness or access to health care were not found. Interestingly only 1 tool, the MAQ-PC(54), was available which combined medical, functional, psychological, and quality of life assessment. This tool also was not developed or validated for use in older adults exclusively. This shows there is a significant gap in tools available for CGA in South Asian population and no tools combining all aspects of CGA has been validated in the region.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

We found 4 tools(17)(24)(25)(20) to assess risk of diabetes which had similar questions/items including body mass index and hypertension. We found many tools to assess depression in both rural and urban populations, among older and younger adults age groups. Similarly, for cognitive impairment, HMSE and Alzheimer's questionnaire were used for older population. Functional assessment tools specific to different disorders like dementia (EASI(43) and Modified Bristol & Blessed scale(45)), falls (POMA(44)) and frailty (EASY-care(58)) are available out of which EASI and Modified Bristol & Blessed scales are for population aged >55 years living in rural and care homes respectively while EASY-care was validated for both the rural and urban older adults (>60 years). Quality of life questionnaires included all six domains of health. However, out of these two were specific to vision(59) and one for young elderly(53).

Most of the tools reported the following measures of validity and reliability-internal consistency, inter-rater reliability, specificity, sensitivity and ROC-AUC. Among the reported tools, EPOCH-2(18), MNA(29), PHQ/SRQ(31), CES-D(32), GDS-15(33), PHQ-9-12(34), WHOQOL vision(59) and VisQoL(52) had been shown satisfactory values for validity and reliability in their respective domains. But the variation in intent, constructs and measurements of these tools were high and no meaningful cross-domain comparisons were possible. The sample demography for the tool's development was heterogeneous and the determination of true validity and reproducibility of the existing tools is difficult.

Majority of tools reflect specific results for health outcomes, rather than broader conceptualization of complete wellbeing. A large majority, 29 instruments, were adopted from pre-existing instruments, mostly developed for western population. This indicates insufficient research and uptake of health measurements and scales in the region. This review consolidates the conceptual basis of scales necessary for CGA and points towards areas requiring further work.

Although the identified tools were served the purpose in their respective domain, but we were unable to find a single comprehensive health assessment tool for geriatric population. Therefore, findings of this review highlight the importance of using a multidimensional validated tool in the context of geriatric population.

Limitation of the review

Only peer-reviewed articles published in English language were selected which may introduce selection bias. However, as English is the primary language for scientific communication across the region, we expect this to be minimal if any. We have not evaluated the quality of the studies included. We have limited our studies to South Asia region, 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 search strategy, strengthen the confidence on findings

Conclusion: -

There are 21 tools validated exclusively for older adults. Considerable variation among tools in the context of item type, content, sample, outcome measures were observed. Only 9 tools captured multiple domains of geriatric health but there are no validated tools available for CGA in South Asia. There is a need to develop and validate a contextual tool for use in CGA in South Asian populations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

References

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

2. Prince MJ, Wu F, Guo Y, Gutierrez Robledo LM, O'Donnell M, Sullivan R, et al. The burden of disease in older people and implications for health policy and practice. Lancet. 2015;385(9967):549–62.

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

4. Kowal P, Kahn K, Ng N, Naidoo N, Abdullah S, Bawah A, et al. Ageing and adult health status in eight lower-income countries: The INDEPTH WHO-SAGE collaboration. Glob Health Action. 2010;3(SUPPL. 2):11–22.

5. Jiang S, Li P. Current development in elderly comprehensive assessment and research methods. Biomed Res Int. 2016;2016.

6. Nord M, Östgren CJ, Marcusson J, Johansson M. 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(2):132–45.

7. Solomon D, Brown AS, Brummel-Smith K, Burgess L, D'Agostino RB, Goldschmidt JW, et al. National Institutes of Health Consensus Development Conference Statement: Geriatric assessment methods for clinical decision-making. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1988;36(4):342–7.

8. Zagonel V. Importance of a comprehensive geriatric assessment in older cancer patients. Eur J Cancer. 2001;37(SUPPL. 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(3):493–508.

11. Lawton MP, Moss M, Fulcomer M, Kleban MH. A research and service oriented multilevel assessment instrument. Journals Gerontol. 1982;37(1):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(5):552–4.

14. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. Int J Soc Res Methodol Theory Pract. 2005;8(1):19–32.

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

16. Rathnayake N, Alwis G, Lenora J, Lekamwasam S. Applicability of health promoting lifestyle profile-II for postmenopausal women in Sri Lanka; A validation study. Health Qual Life Outcomes [Internet]. 2020;18(1):122. Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=medl&NEWS=N&AN=32375796

17. Bhowmik B, Akhter A, Ali L, Ahmed T, Pathan F, Mahtab H, et al. Simple risk score to detect rural Asian Indian (Bangladeshi) adults at high risk for type 2 diabetes. J Diabetes Investig [Internet]. 2015;6(6):670–7. Available from:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=prem1&NEWS=N&AN=26543541

18. Corsi DJ, Subramanian S V., McKee M, Li W, Swaminathan S, Lopez-Jaramillo P, et al. Environmental Profile of a Community's Health (EPOCH): An Ecometric Assessment of Measures of the Community Environment Based on Individual Perception. PLoS One [Internet]. 2012;7(9):e44410. Available from: http://www.plosone.org/article/fetchObjectAttachment.action?uri=info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0044410&representation=PDF

19. Perera BPR, Jayasuriya R, Caldera A, Wickremasinghe AR. Assessing mental well-being in a Sinhala speaking Sri Lankan population: Validation of the WHO-5 well-being index. Abdulameer Awata, Barua, Bech, Bonnin, Bonsignore, Brown, Browne, Byrne, Chen, Chen, Christensen, Cohen, Dadfar, de Souza, de Wit, Diener, Dimitrov, Epskamp, Finney, Furuya, Gonzalez-Roma, Gumundsdottir, Hajos, Halliday, Hu, Kim, Kline, Knafl, Koh, Koo, A, editor. Health Qual Life Outcomes [Internet]. 2020;18(1). Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=psyc17&NEWS=N&AN=2020-68918-001

20. Ramachandran A, Snehalatha C, Vijay V, Wareham NJ, Colagiuri S. Derivation and validation of diabetes risk score for urban Asian Indians. Diabetes Res Clin Pract [Internet]. 2005;70(1):63–70. Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=med6&NEWS=N&AN=16126124

21. Cullati S, Mukhopadhyay S, Sieber S, Chakraborty A, Burton-Jeangros C. Is the single self-rated health item reliable in India? A construct validity study. BMJ Glob Heal. 2018;3(6):1–12.

22. Tausig M, Subedi S, Broughton CL, Subedi J, Williams-Blangero S. Measuring community mental health in developing societies: Evaluation of a checklist format in Nepal. Abramson Desjarlais, Helzer, Helzer, Janca, Kessler, Lin, Mirowsky, Mirowsky, Murray, Radloff, Regier, Robins, Ross, Williams, Wittchen, UStUn, UStUn B, editor. Int J Soc Psychiatry [Internet]. 2003;49(4):269–83. Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=psyc4&NEWS=N&AN=2004-10186-005

23. Jotheeswaran AT, Dias A, Philp I, Patel V, Prince M. Calibrating EASY-Care independence scale to improve accuracy. Age Ageing. 2016;45(6):890–3.

24. 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 [Internet]. 2010;58(7):434–6. Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=med8&NEWS=N&AN=21121209

25. Mohan V, Deepa R, Deepa M, Somannavar S, Datta M. A simplified Indian Diabetes Risk Score for screening for undiagnosed diabetic subjects. J Assoc Physicians India. 2005;53(SEPT.):759–63.

26. Khan M, Kamal AK, Islam M, Azam I, Virk A, Nasir A, et al. Can Trained Field Community Workers Identify Stroke Using a Stroke Symptom Questionnaire as well as Neurologists? J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis. 2015;24(1):91–9.

27. Rao GN, Kulkarni GB, Gururaj G, Rajesh K, Subbakrishna DK, Steiner TJ, et al. The burden of headache disorders in India: Methodology and questionnaire validation for a community-based survey in Karnataka State. J Headache Pain [Internet]. 2012;13(7):543–50. Available

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

from:
http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=emed13&NEWS=N&AN=52171568

28. Ghoshal UC, Gwee KA, Chen M, Gong XR, Pratap N, Hou X, 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(1):83–92.

29. Gaiki V, Wagh V. Reliability of Mini-Nutritional Assessment Scale in Rural Setup of a Tertiary Health Care Hospital in Central India. J Acad Ind Res. 2014;2(11).

30. Sherpa CT, LeClerq SL, Singh S, Naithani N, Pangeni R, Karki A, et al. Validation of the St. George's Respiratory Questionnaire in Nepal. Chronic Obstr Pulm Dis J COPD Found. 2015;2(4):281–9.

31. Husain N, Gater R, Tomenson B, Creed F. Comparison of the personal health questionnaire and the self reporting questionnaire in rural Pakistan. J Pak Med Assoc. 2006;56(8):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(4):517–25.

33. Sarkar S, Kattimani S, Roy G, Premarajan KC, Sarkar S. Validation of the Tamil version of short form Geriatric Depression Scale-15. J Neurosci Rural Pract. 2015;6(3):442–6.

34. Poongothai S, Pradeepa R, Ganesan A, Mohan V. 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(2).

35. Prince M, Acosta D, Chiu H, Scazufca M, Varghese M. Dementia diagnosis in developing countries: A cross-cultural validation study. Anzola-Perez Broe, Chandra, Copeland, Copeland, Copeland, Copeland, Fuh, Ganguli, Ganguli, Goodglass, Hall, Hall, Henderson, Hendrie, Hendrie, Jorm, Kral, Law, Montgomery, Morales, Morris, Rajkumar, Ritchie, Roth, Weissman, Welsh B, editor. Lancet [Internet]. 2003;361(9361):909–17. Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=psyc4&NEWS=N&AN=2003-03025-001

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(03).

37. Stanley R, Kuruvilla A, Kumar S, Gayathri K, Mathews P, Abraham V, et al. The Vellore screening instruments and strategies for the diagnosis of dementia in the community. Int Psychogeriatrics. 2009;21(3):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 [Internet]. 2016;6(5):e010712. Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=med13&NEWS=N&AN=27225649

39. Qin M, Vlachantoni A, Evandrou M, Falkingham J. General Health Questionnaire-12 reliability, factor structure, and external validity among older adults in India. Indian J Psychiatry [Internet]. 2018;60(1):56–9. Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=prem2&NEWS=N&AN=29736063

40. Ganguli M, Ratcliff G, Chandra V, Sharma S, Gilby J, Pandav R, et al. A hindi version of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

MMSE: The development of a cognitive screening instrument for a largely illiterate rural elderly population in india. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry. 1995;10(5):367–77.

41. Dasgupta A, Biswas A, Paul B, Roy S, Sarkar D, Ghosh P, 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;5–9.

42. Siriwardhana DD, Walters K, Rait G, Bazo-Alvarez JC, Weerasinghe MC. Cross-cultural adaptation and psychometric evaluation of the Sinhala version of lawton instrumental activities of daily living scale. PLoS One [Internet]. 2018;13(6):e0199820. Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=med15&NEWS=N&AN=29953501

43. Fillenbaum GG, Chandra V, Ganguli M, Pandav R, Gilby JE, Seaberg EC, 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(2):161–8.

44. Singh S, Multani NK, Verma SK. Development and Validation of Geriatric Assessment Tools : A Preliminary Report from Indian Population. J Exerc Sci Physiother. 2007;3(2)(December 2007):103–10.

45. Umayal S, Kulathunga M, Somaratne S, Srikanth S, Kathriarachchi S, De Silva R. 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. Anjana RM, Sudha V, Lakshmipriya N, Subhashini S, Pradeepa R, Geetha L, et al. Reliability and validity of a new physical activity questionnaire for India. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act [Internet]. 2015;12(1). Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12966-015-0196-2

47. Vaz M, Bharathi AV, Thomas T, Yusuf S, Kurpad AV. The repeatability of self reported physical activity patterns in rural South India. Asia Pac J Clin Nutr. 2009;18(1):71–5.

48. Misra P, Upadhyay RP, Krishnan A, Sharma N, Kapoor SK. A community based study to test the reliability and validity of physical activity measurement techniques. Int J Prev Med [Internet]. 2014;5(8):952–9. Available from: http://ijpm.mui.ac.ir/index.php/ijpm/article/download/1263/1652

49. Nepal GM, Basaula M, Sharma S. Inter-rater reliability of Timed Up and Go test in older adults measured by physiotherapist and caregivers. Eur J Physiother [Internet]. 2020;22(6):325–31. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/21679169.2019.1623313

50. McIntyre E, Saliba A, McKenzie K. Subjective wellbeing in the Indian general population: a validation study of the Personal Wellbeing Index. Qual Life Res [Internet]. 2020;29(4):1073–81. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-019-02375-7

51. Dandona R, Dandona L, McCarty CA, Gullapalli NR. Adaptation of WHOQOL as health-related quality of life instrument to develop a vision-specific instrument. Indian J Ophthalmol [Internet]. 2000;48(1):65–70. Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=med4&NEWS=N&AN=11271942

52. Gothwal VK, Bagga DK. Vision and quality of life index: Validation of the Indian version using rasch analysis. Investig Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2013;54(7):4871–81.

53. De Silva SHP, Jayasuriya AR, Rajapaksa LC, De Silva AP, Barraclough SIMON. 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, Hodkinson, Huijer, Ingersoll-Dayton, Juniper,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

Kelley-Gillespie, Ku, Kumarapeli, Ledesma, Mahoney, McDowell, Nilsson, Osborne, Paschoal, Portney, Power, Rockwood, Shrout, Thanakwang, Wands, Yo B, editor. Asia-Pacific J Public Heal [Internet]. 2016;28(1, Suppl):115S-125S. Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=psyc13&NEWS=N&AN=2016-04159-016

54. Pati S, Hussain MA, Swain S, Salisbury C, Metsemakers JFM, Knottnerus JA, et al. Development and Validation of a Questionnaire to Assess Multimorbidity in Primary Care: An Indian Experience. Biomed Res Int. 2016;2016.

55. Chatterjee P, Rebok GW, Dwivedi SN, Kumar DA, Madan R, Dey AB. Development of integrated care tool - BRIEF for screening the unmet psychosociomedical needs of older Indians. Indian J Public Health. 2019;63(1):51–7.

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

57. Prasad K, Kumar A, Misra S, Yadav AK, Johri S, Sarkar RS, et al. Reliability and validity of telephonic Barthel Index: an experience from multi-centric randomized control study. Acta Neurol Belg [Internet]. 2018;118(1):53–9. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s13760-017-0843-2

58. A.T. J, A. D, I. P, V. P. Calibrating EASY-Care independence scale to improve accuracy. Age Ageing [Internet]. 2016;45(6):890–3. Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=emed17&NEWS=N&AN=619648781

59. R. D, L. D, C.A. M. Adaptation of WHOQOL as health-related quality of life instrument to develop a vision-specific instrument. Indian J Ophthalmol [Internet]. 2000;48(1):65–70. Available from: http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=emed7&NEWS=N&AN=33439437

APPENDIX-1

Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	√
ABSTRACT			

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	√
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	√
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	√
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	√
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	√
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	√
Selection of sources of evidence	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	√
Data charting process	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	√
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	√
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	NA
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	√

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	√
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	√

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence.	NA
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	√
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	√
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	√
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	√
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	√
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	√

Appendix-2 Search Strategy

Search terms used in databases MEDLINE (Via PubMed), Embase (via Ovid) and PsychInfo (via Ovid)

1.Community-Based Participatory Research/ or Community participation/ or (Community-Based Participatory Research* or Community-based research* or Community-based or communit* or Community-dwelling* or population-based or Community participation* or Community-directed).ti,ab,kw.

and

2.Aged/ or (Aged or older people or elderly people or Older adult* or Elderly or Aging or Ageing or Geriatric* or Senior* or older person*).ti,ab,kw.

and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.21252051; this version posted February 23, 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 .

3.Health impact assessment/ or (Health impact assessment* or Health assessment* or Assessment*).ti,ab,kw. Or diagnosis/ or "diagnostic techniques and procedures"/ or (Diagnos* or Examination*).ti,ab,kw. Or Geriatric assessment/ or Geriatric assessment*.ti,ab,kw. Or Mass Screening/ or (Mass Screening* or Screening*).ti,ab,kw. Or (Instrument* or Tool* or Scale* or Index* or Questionnair* or Evaluation*).ti,ab,kw.

and

4.Validation study/ or (Validation* or Validity or Reliability or Development*).ti,ab,kw.

and

5.Afghanistan/ or Bangladesh/ or Bhutan/ or India/ or Nepal/ or Pakistan/ or Sri Lanka/ or (Afghanistan or Bangladesh or Bhutan or India or Nepal or Pakistan or Sri Lanka or South Asia or Maldives).ti,ab,kw.