

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

1 **Tania Aznielle-Rodríguez¹, Lídice Galán-García², Marlis Ontivero-Ortega^{2,3}, Karen Aguilar-**
2 **Mateu⁴, Ana M. Castro-Laguardia⁴, Ana Fernández-Nin⁴, Daysi García-Agustín⁵, and Mitchell**
3 **Valdés-Sosa^{4*}**

4 ¹Department of Electronics, Cuban Center for Neuroscience, Havana, Cuba

5 ²Department of Neuroinformatics, Cuban Center for Neuroscience, Havana, Cuba

6 ³Department of Data Analysis, Faculty of Psychological and Educational Sciences, Ghent University,
7 Ghent, Belgium

8 ⁴Department of Cognitive Neuroscience, Cuban Center for Neuroscience, Havana, Cuba

9 ⁵Centro de Investigaciones sobre Longevidad, Envejecimiento y Salud, CITED, Havana, Cuba

10

11 *** Correspondence:**

12 mitchell@cneuro.edu.cu

13 **Keywords: Mahalanobis distance, cognitive decline, regression, neuropsychological tests,**
14 **normative data**

15

16 **Abstract**

17 **Purposes:** To select the summary cognitive index that is best predicted from spatio-temporal gait
18 features (STGF) extracted from gait patterns.

19 **Methods:** 125 participants were recruited, including 40 young and 85 elderly adults. Their
20 performances in different cognitive domains were evaluated through 12 cognitive measures obtained
21 from five neuropsychological tests. Four summary cognitive indexes were calculated in each case: 1)
22 the z-score of Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) from a population norm (MMSE z-score); 2)
23 the sum of the absolute z-scores of the patient's neuropsychological measures from a population
24 norm (ZSum); 3) the patient's scores for the first principal component (PC) of the set of
25 neuropsychological test scores (PCCog); and 4) the Mahalanobis distance of each patient's score
26 from a population norm (MDCog). The gait patterns were recorded while they executed four walking
27 tasks (normal, fast, easy- and hard-dual tasks). Sixteen STGF were measured using a body-fixed
28 Inertial Measurement Unit. Dual-task costs were computed. The proportion of variances (R^2) that
29 PCA-STGF scores accounted for the four summary cognitive indexes and for the 12 cognitive
30 variables across individuals were measured in multiple linear regressions. The confidence intervals
31 for each R^2 were estimated by bootstrapping the regression 1000 times.

32 **Results:** The mean values of R^2 for the summary cognitive indexes were: 0.0831 for MMSE z-score,
33 0.0624 for ZSum, 0.0614 for PCCog, and 0.4751 for MDCog. The mean values of R^2 for the 12
34 cognitive values ranged between 0.0566 and 0.1211. The multivariate linear regression was only
35 statistically significant for MDCog, with the highest value of the R^2 estimation.

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

36 **Conclusions:** Individual cognitive variables and most of the summary cognitive indices showed a
37 weak association with gait parameters. However, the MDCog index showed a stronger association,
38 explaining about 50 % of the variance. This suggests that this index can be used to study the
39 relationship between gait patterns and cognition.

40

41 **1 Introduction**

42 The use of wearable sensors, such as Inertial Measurement Units (IMU), makes possible the
43 recording of gait patterns and the extraction of spatio-temporal gait features (STGF) even outside of
44 specialized laboratories (Ancillao et al., 2018). This has facilitated studies of the relationship between
45 gait patterns and cognitive impairment within the community, especially in relation to aging
46 (Montero-Odasso et al., 2012; Cohen, Verghese and Zwerling, 2016; Demnitz et al., 2016). The
47 overall finding is that gait quality deteriorates in direct relationship to aging (Mahlknecht et al.,
48 2013), and even more so when there is cognitive impairment (Montero-Odasso *et al.*, 2012); Cohen,
49 Verghese and Zwerling, 2016; Demnitz *et al.*, 2016). However, the results are not entirely consistent
50 and are difficult to generalize to new samples of subjects (Demnitz *et al.*, 2016). This could be due to
51 several problems.

52 The first problem is which overall summary measure of cognitive status is the most useful. A
53 summary measure is needed to generate a grading of the subject's cognitive deterioration. There are
54 clinical tools that offer a fast global evaluation of cognition -e.g. the Mini-Mental State Examination
55 (MMSE) (Folstein, Folstein and McHugh, 1975) or the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA)
56 (Nasreddine *et al.*, 2005)- potentially producing a single score. However, these instruments are semi-
57 quantitative and have been reported to have low specificity and sensitivity (Demnitz *et al.*, 2016;
58 MacAulay *et al.*, 2017; Carnero-Pardo, 2014). Additionally, the MMSE focuses primarily on the
59 domains of language and memory, without assessing other cognitive domains potentially important
60 to gait quality, such as the processing speed (Demnitz *et al.*, 2016).

61 More quantitative measures can be obtained with many neuropsychological tests. However, each test
62 usually examines a narrow cognitive domain (Schretlen, Bobholz and Brandt, 1996; Rabin, Barr and
63 Burton, 2005; Brandt, 1991; Shum, McFarland and Bain, 1990). The idea of combining several
64 cognitive variables into a single measure has been previously explored (Stijntjes *et al.*, 2015;
65 MacAulay *et al.*, 2017; Byun *et al.*, 2018; Beauchet *et al.*, 2013), but we are left with a collection of
66 (sometimes conflicting) measurements.

67 A second problem is that few studies have used normative data to correct for changes in cognitive
68 test scores due to age, which is needed to assess the real severity of cognitive impairments (see Byun
69 *et al.*, 2018 for an exception). This means that the degree of the deviation of a participant's cognitive
70 functions from the population mean is generally not reported in studies of gait patterns. Thirdly,
71 many studies employ a low number of participants, which may impair the reproducibility of the
72 findings due to the low statistical power used (MacAulay *et al.*, 2017; Montero-Odasso *et al.*, 2009;
73 Beauchet *et al.*, 2017).

74 The present study was designed to try to overcome the above difficulties. We measured 12 cognitive
75 variables obtained from five neuropsychological tests. To address the first problem, we computed
76 four summary indexes from the battery of neuropsychological tests. The selected indexes reduce the
77 dimensionality of the cognitive measures but retain quantitative and specific assessments of different
78 cognitive domains. The indexes were the following: 1) the z-score of the MMSE, calculated from
79 normative data, which has been used in different studies with older adults albeit not related to gait
80 (Kondo *et al.*, 2020; Janke *et al.*, 2001) (MMSE z-score); 2) the sum of the z-scores absolute values

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

81 of the deviation of the neuropsychological measures from normative data, previously used in other
82 studies (Mielke *et al.*, 2013) (ZSum); 3) the scores for the first principal component (PC) of the 12
83 cognitive variables (PCCog); and 4) the Mahalanobis distance of each patient's score from a
84 population norm (MDCog).
85 Principal Components Analysis (PCA) is frequently used for dimensionality reduction (Holtzer,
86 Wang and Verghese, 2012). Moreover, the first PC of a set of psychological tasks is often used to
87 assess Spearman's G factor of (fluid) intelligence (Duncan, Burgess and Emslie, 1995).
88 On the other hand, the Mahalanobis distance has been previously used as a statistical measure of the
89 deviation of a subject's cognitive profile from the population mean profile (Elfadaly, Garthwaite and
90 Crawford, 2016). It has been also used in clinical settings, for example: in assessing the cognitive
91 profile of participants who were recovering from a stroke relative to the non-stroke controls (Tehan *et*
92 *al.*, 2018). This approach allows us to retain the quantitative aspect of neuropsychological tests while
93 combining them into the single index MDCog. It also incorporates the use of deviations from the
94 normative data while taking into consideration the correlations between features (avoiding spurious
95 inflation of the estimated distance).
96 Here we examined the strength of the association, using multiple linear regression, of the four
97 summary cognitive measures with a set of STGF extracted from the gait patterns. We hypothesized
98 that the largest explained variance would correspond to the best cognitive indicator. Our results
99 indicate that MDCog has the strongest association with STGF and thus could be useful for studies of
100 the aging.

101

102 **2 Materials and Methods**

103 **2.1 Participants**

104 Around 200 participants from different health institutions in Havana city and from the Cuban Center
105 for Neuroscience were screened for inclusion in the study, described in detail in Aznielle-Rodríguez
106 *et al.*, 2022a. The inclusion criteria were the participant's agreement, young adults aged between 20
107 and 40 years and older adults ages above 60 years, and a Katz Index of independence ≥ 4 , as
108 evidence of functional independence without the need for supervision or external help in performing
109 basic activities of daily life (Shelkey and Wallace, 2000; Katz *et al.*, 1963). The participants with an
110 inability to walk, major neurological disorders, diseases of the musculoskeletal system, or severe
111 cognitive impairment were excluded. All participants underwent a neurological physical
112 examination, a questionnaire, and a cognitive assessment previously to execute the walking tasks.
113 125 participants completed all the requirements and participated in the study. The sample was
114 divided into 40 young adults (mean age 27.65 ± 4.14 , 50 % women) and 85 older adults (mean age:
115 73.25 ± 6.99 , 62.3 % women). Written informed consent was obtained from the participants or
116 caregivers, and the study was approved by the ethics committee of CNEURO due to its compliance
117 with the Helsinki declaration.

118

119 **2.2 Experiment**

120 Participants covered 40 m (20 m in each direction) in an obstacle-free and flat environment,
121 executing four walking tasks: 1) walking freely at a comfortable self-chosen speed (NormalW); 2)
122 walking at a comfortable self-chosen speed while simultaneously counting their steps, an easy
123 cognitive task (EasyD); 3) walking at a comfortable self-chosen speed while simultaneously counting

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

124 backward from 100, a hard cognitive task (HardD); and 4) walking as fast as possible without
125 running (FastW).

126 Their gait patterns were recorded using an IMU (Bitalino RIoT, Plux Wireless Biosignals, Portugal),
127 attached firmly to a velcro band, and placed near the body's center of mass, on the lower back at the
128 L3 spinal level. Data was processed as it was explained in Aznielle-Rodríguez *et al.*, 2022. After
129 computing the Initial Contact and Final Contact events of the gait cycles, 16 STGF were calculated
130 for each walking task: 1) step time (StpT); 2) step time variability or step time coefficient of variation
131 (StpTCoV); 3) stride time (StrT); 4) stride time variability or stride time coefficient of variation
132 (StrTCoV); 5) cadence (Cd); 6) root mean square amplitude of the vertical acceleration (RMS); 7)
133 double support duration or double support time (DSD); 8) single support duration or single support
134 time (SSD); 9) swing duration feed 1 (SwDurF1); 10) swing duration feed 2 (SwDurF2); 11) stance
135 duration feed 1 (StDurF1); 12) stance duration feed 2 (StDurF2); 13) step duration feed 1
136 (StepDurF1); 14) step duration feed 2 (StepDurF2); 15) step length (StepLg); and 16) speed (GS). All
137 STGF were expressed in seconds (s), except Cd (steps/min), RMS (g), StepLg (m) and GS (m/s).
138 STGF were computed using algorithms described in the literature (Zijlstra, 2004; Del Din, Godfrey
139 and Rochester, 2016; Montero-Odasso *et al.*, 2011; Yang *et al.*, 2012; Jarchi *et al.*, 2018; Bugané *et*
140 *al.*, 2012; Zijlstra and Hof, 2003; Del Din *et al.*, 2016).

141 Additional to the 64 STGF, dual-task costs (DTC) for the STGF in the two dual-tasks were also
142 calculated (32 costs). These costs (expressed as percentages) were calculated using (Montero-Odasso
143 *et al.*, 2017):

$$144 \quad DTC = \left(\frac{\text{single_task_value} - \text{dual_task_value}}{\text{single_task_value}} \right) * 100 \quad (1)$$

145 Finally, 96 measures (STGF and DTC) were obtained for each walking direction.

146

147 2.3 Cognitive assessment

148 The cognitive trait of the participants was assessed through five neuropsychological tests: 1) MMSE,
149 as a global index of cognition (Folstein, Folstein and McHugh, 1975); 2) Attentional Span or Brief
150 Test of Attention (BTA), as a measure of auditory divided attention (Schretlen, Bobholz and Brandt,
151 1996); 3) Trail Making Test (TMT), parts A and B, for assessing the attention, visuospatial abilities,
152 mental flexibility, and executive functions (Rabin, Barr and Burton, 2005); 4) Hopkins Verbal
153 Learning Test (HLVT) for memory evaluation, including immediate recognition and delayed recall
154 (Brandt, 1991); and 5) Digit Symbol Substitution Test (DS), for the focused, selective and sustained
155 attention as well as visual perception (Shum, McFarland and Bain, 1990). Twelve cognitive variables
156 were extracted from the test results, which are shown in Table 1.

157

158 Table 1. Cognitive variables extracted from the neuropsychological tests.

Test	Domain	Cognitive variable
MMSE	Global cognition	MMSE
HLVT	Memory, including immediate recognition and delayed recall	HLVT_T1
		HLVT_T2
		HLVT_T3

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

Test	Domain	Cognitive variable
		HLVT_TR
		HLVT_DRCA
		HLVT_DRFP
BTA	Attentional impairment	AtentL
		AtentN
DS	Focused, selective, and sustained attention and visual perception	DigSim
TMT	Attention, visuospatial abilities, mental flexibility and executive function	TMT_PartA
		TMT_PartB

159 MMSE: MMSE score; HLVT_T1: score in trial 1 in HLVT; HLVT_T2: score in trial 2 in HLVT; HLVT_T3: score in trial 3 in HLVT;
 160 HLVT_TR: total recall, the sum of words recalled correctly in the three trials in HLVT; HLVT_DRCA: delayed recall correct answers
 161 in HLVT; HLVT_DRFP: delayed recall false positives in HLVT; AtentL: total score in Form L in BTA; AtentN: total score in Form N
 162 in BTA; DigSim: subject's score in DS, it means the number of correct substitutions made at an interval of 90 seconds; TMT_PartA:
 163 subject's score in TMT Part A, is the time that an individual takes to finish the task in the test; TMT_PartB: subject's score in TMT Part
 164 B, is the time that an individual takes to complete the task in the trial.

165 The same variables have normative data for the Cuban adult population obtained as part of an
 166 international collaborative study (Rivera *et al.*, 2015; Arango-Lasprilla, Rivera, Aguayo, *et al.*, 2015;
 167 Arango-Lasprilla, Rivera, Garza, *et al.*, 2015; Arango-Lasprilla, Rivera, Rodríguez, *et al.*, 2015).

168

169 2.4 Cognitive indexes

170 The four cognitive indexes were computed as follows:

171 1. MMSE z-score: The MMSE score is a value between 0 and 30, used in clinical practice as a global
 172 index of the cognitive trait. This score was transformed into the MMSE z-score using the Equation 2.

$$173 z_{iMMSE} = (v_{iMMSE} - \mu_{MMSE}) / \sigma_{MMSE} \quad (2)$$

174

175 2. ZSum: This index was defined as the sum of the z-scores for the 12 cognitive variables, and was
 176 calculated using Equation 3.

$$177 ZSum_i = \sum_{j=1}^{12} z_{ij} \quad (3)$$

178

179

180 Where:

181 z_{ij} : is the z-score of the cognitive variable j for the subject i , calculated using the equation:

$$182 z_{ij} = (v_{ij} - \mu_j) / \sigma_j \quad (4)$$

183 μ_j : mean value of the cognitive variable j in the population of normal subjects

184 σ_j : standard deviation of cognitive variable j in the population of normal subjects

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

185 These two population parameters were calculated using the normative regression functions of age and
186 educational level-dependent mean values and standard deviations obtained from 306 normal subjects
187 with an age ranging between 18 and 90 years, corresponding to the normative data for the Cuban
188 adult population used in the collaborative study mentioned before (Rivera *et al.*, 2015; Arango-
189 Lasprilla, Rivera, Aguayo, *et al.*, 2015; Arango-Lasprilla, Rivera, Garza, *et al.*, 2015; Arango-
190 Lasprilla, Rivera, Rodríguez, *et al.*, 2015).

191

192 3. PCCog: PC was applied to the z-scores vector of the 12 cognitive variables, and the scores of the
193 first component (explaining the largest proportion of variance) were retained.

194

195 4. MDCog: To measure the deviations from normative data, taking into consideration the correlations
196 between the variables, this index was calculated using the Mahalanobis distance for each subject i ,
197 through the Equation 5.

198

$$199 \quad MDCog_i^2 = Z_i' \Sigma^{-1} Z_i \quad (5)$$

200

201 Where:

202 Z_i : vector with the scores of the 12 cognitive variables for the subject i

203 Σ^{-1} : represents the covariance matrix of the population norm.

204

205 2.5 Analysis

206 PCA was applied to create a new set of gait features (PCA-STGF) due to the high correlation
207 between the 96 STGF. The components which explained more than 95 % of the variance were
208 retained. The correlations between PCA-STG and the summary cognitive indexes were calculated.
209 The proportion of variance (R^2) that PCA-STGF scores could predict the values of summary
210 cognitive indexes and the z_j scores of the 12 cognitive variables across individuals was measured in
211 multiple linear regression. The confidence intervals for R^2 were estimated by bootstrapping the
212 regression 1000 times.

213 All data analysis was performed offline using MATLAB® (Mathworks Inc.).

214


215 3 Results

216 Descriptive statistics of summary cognitive indexes

217 The histograms of the four summary cognitive indexes are presented in Figure 1.

218

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults




219

220 Figure 1. Histograms of the four summary cognitive indexes.

221

222 Reducing dimensionality and redundancy in STGF

223 The new set of features PCA-STGF was obtained with orthogonal and independent components
224 using a PCA. The first seven components explained over 95 % of the variance (highlighted with red
225 dots in Figure 2), and were retained for further analyses. This result corroborated the high suspected
226 redundancy between the STGF.




227

228 Figure 2. The cumulative sum of the variance accounted for the first 40 PCA-STGF components.

229

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

230 As shown in Figure 3, the contribution of each STGF to the first PCA component is similar in the
231 four tasks. The features related to the description of the gait cycle had coefficients around 0.1, while
232 Cd, RMS value, StepLg, and GS had coefficients around -0.1. The coefficients corresponding to gait
233 variability features had values in the range between 0.07 and 0.1. The behavior of the features in the
234 four tasks joined to the fact that the first PCA component explained the 68.79 % of the variance,
235 suggesting that some walking conditions could be eliminated in the experiment without losing much
236 information, thus shortening the total examination time.
237




238
239 Figure 3. Contribution of the 16 STGF in each task to the first PCA component.

240

241 PCA in cognitive variables

242 PCA was applied to the z-scores vector of the 12 cognitive variables. The cumulative sum of the new
243 12 components (PCA-CogVar) is shown in Figure 4. The first seven components explained over 95
244 % of the variance (highlighted in Figure 4 with red dots), and the first one explained the 40.98 % of
245 variance. The score of the first component was retained as PCCog summary index.



246
247 Figure 4. The cumulative sum of the variance accounted for the 12 PCA components.

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

248

249 Relationship between cognitive variables and PCA-STGF

250 Multivariate linear regression with bootstrapping was applied to compare the predictability of the
251 summary cognitive indexes using the first seven components of the PCA-STGF set. The results are
252 shown in Table 2.

253 Table 2. Prediction of the summary cognitive indexes from PCA-STGF set.

Variable	R ²	F	p-Value	CI
Summary indexes				
MMSE z-score	0.0831	1.5569	0.3098	[0.0273-0.1625]
ZSum	0.0624	1.1389	0.4592	[0.0195-0.1328]
PCCog	0.0614	1.1128	0.4524	[0.0219-0.1102]
MDCog	0.4751	15.7781	0.0000*	[0.3610-0.6028]

254 * Statistically significant

255 The multivariate linear regression was only statistically significant for MDCog, with the highest
256 value of the R² estimation. The confidence intervals for R², estimated by bootstrapping the regression
257 1000 times, are also shown in the table. PCA-STGF reliably predicted much more of the variance for
258 MDCog than the other summary cognitive indexes.

259 A new multivariate linear regression with bootstrapping was applied to compare the predictability of
260 the best summary cognitive index (MDCog) regarding the z-scores of the individual cognitive
261 variables, using the same set of gait variables. The results are shown in Table 3.

262

263 Table 3. Prediction of the z-scores of cognitive variables from PCA-STGF using a multivariate linear
264 prediction with bootstrapping.

Variable	R ²	F	p-Value	CI
HLVT_T1	0.0966	1.8222	0.1970	[0.0408-0.1697]
HLVT_T2	0.1193	2.3133	0.1112	[0.0519-0.2010]
HLVT_T3	0.1168	2.2541	0.1079	[0.0572-0.1970]
HLVT_TR	0.0901	1.6923	0.2422	[0.0356-0.1663]
HLVT_DRCA	0.0903	1.6966	0.2475	[0.0323-0.1602]
HLVT_DRFP	0.0566	1.0157	0.4862	[0.0216-0.1033]
AtentL	0.1031	1.9724	0.1903	[0.0366-0.1874]
AtentN	0.1211	2.3588	0.1141	[0.0510-0.2108]
DigSim	0.0872	1.6347	0.2689	[0.0312-0.1619]
TMT_PartA	0.0733	1.3457	0.3423	[0.0302-0.1362]
TMT_PartB	0.0683	1.2510	0.3982	[0.0229-0.1302]

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

265 HLVT_T1: score in trial 1 in HLVT; HLVT_T2: score in trial 2 in HLVT; HLVT_T3: score in trial 3 in HLVT; HLVT_TR: total
266 recall, the sum of words recalled correctly in the three trials in HLVT; HLVT_DRCA: delayed recall correct answers in HLVT;
267 HLVT_DRFP: delayed recall false positives in HLVT; AtentL: total score in Form L in BTA; AtentN: total score in Form N in BTA;
268 DigSim: subject's score in DS, it means the number of correct substitutions made at an interval of 90 seconds; TMT_PartA: subject's
269 score in TMT Part A, is the time that an individual takes to finish the task in the test; TMT_PartB: subject's score in TMT Part B, is the
270 time that an individual takes to complete the task in the trial.

271
272 Non-cognitive variable was statistically significant, as can be seen in Table 3.

273

274 **4 Discussion**

275 Here we explored four summary cognitive indexes to find which was best predicted by STGF. Since
276 PCA revealed a significant redundancy between the STGF of different tasks, we used the seven
277 components that explained 95 % of the variance. MDCog showed the closest relationship with gait
278 features, since gait parameters explained more variance for MDCog than for the other summary
279 indexes or any individual cognitive scores.

280 There are two possible explanations for this advantage of MDCog. First, combining indicators of
281 ability in multiple areas into a global measure can help compensate for measurement noise in each
282 test and provides an overall index of the subject's cognitive function (Harvey, 2012). Second, it has
283 been long known from factor analysis of multiple psychological tests that a general latent variable
284 (Spearman's G factor) explains a large proportion of the variance between individuals (Kane and
285 Brand, 2003; Hoogendam *et al.*, 2014). This G factor has been related to fluid intelligence (Duncan,
286 Burgess and Emslie, 1995), effectiveness in executive function tasks (Crinella and Jen, 1999), and
287 has been shown to decline with aging (Hoogendam *et al.*, 2014). Our MDCog could use information
288 related to this factor that taps essential processes needed to coordinate specific behaviors and manage
289 multitasking. At the same time, it retains information about specific processes such as memory
290 attention etc.

291 The lower performance of the other summary cognitive indexes could be due to several causes.
292 Although the MMSE is a widely used global cognition index, its use has been criticized since its
293 scores depend on the educational level of the subjects and on whether they are illiterate or not
294 (Carnero-Pardo, 2014). Moreover, its sensitivity in discriminating MCI patients from those with
295 normal cognitive aging is inadequate (MacAulay *et al.*, 2017; Carnero-Pardo, 2014; Baek *et al.*,
296 2016). On the other hand, the sum of the z-scores does not take into account the sign of the score of
297 each variable or the correlation between them. Thus, a large pathological deviation on one variable
298 will be added to a better than average performance, overestimating the real deterioration, and
299 summing the z values of the highly correlated variables will also exaggerate scored anomaly.

300 Related to PCA, we used, as customary in the estimation of fluid intelligence, only the first
301 component. In our case, it explained only 40.98 % of the variance in the cognitive variables, leaving
302 59.02 % unexplained. Thus, it discards much information, what is a disadvantage of this index
303 compared to MDCog. This Spearman's factor G by itself does not have a strong association with gait.
304 MDCog takes into consideration the correlation between the results in each neuropsychological test
305 and the distance of each subject from normative data. These factors, together with those stated above,
306 probably explain the better results obtained with this index.

307 Many of the STGF used in this study describe the gait cycle, so there was a high correlation between
308 them. This fact caused redundancy in the data, which has been pointed out by other authors as a
309 problem in gait analysis (Olney *et al.*, 1995). We used the same solution stated in many studies,
310 which has been based on PCA (Olney *et al.*, 1995; Mansour, Gorce and Rezzoug, 2017; Ren *et al.*,

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

311 2017), for expecting that few components explained a reasonable amount of data. This statistical
312 procedure converts the correlated characteristics into a smaller set of linearly uncorrelated
313 components (Khera and Kumar, 2020). We found that the seven first PCA components explained
314 most of the variance (95 %).

315 The limitations of this study are that the sample of older adults with cognitive impairment is smaller
316 than the healthy one and both samples were not completely paired by sex and age. In future studies, it
317 is recommended to delve into the relationship between the STGF domains and the cognitive domains,
318 perhaps performing canonical correlation.

319

320 **5 Conclusions**

321 The usefulness of MDCog as a summary and quantitative cognitive index status was proved. This
322 new index is based on the Mahalanobis distance from each subject's cognitive measure to the
323 population norm and the interaction among these factors. MDCog can be used as an objective index
324 instead the set of cognitive variables or other summary cognitive indexes explored in this study.

325

326 **Permission to reuse and Copyright**

327 Copyright © 2022 Aznielle-Rodríguez, Galán-García, Ontivero-Ortega, Aguilar-Mateu, Castro-
328 Laguardia, Fernández-Nin, García-Agustín, and Valdés-Sosa. This is an open-access article
329 distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use,
330 distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor
331 are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted
332 academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with
333 these terms.

334

335 **Conflict of Interest**

336 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
337 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

338

339 **Author Contributions**

340 TA: gait recordings, data curation, software, analysis, and writing. LG: methodology, formal
341 analysis, and reviewing. MO: methodology, formal analysis, reviewing, and editing. KA, AMC:
342 methodology, cognitive assessment, AF, DG: methodology, gait recordings. MV: conceptualization,
343 methodology, formal analysis, reviewing, and editing.

344

345 **Funding**

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

346 This study was funded by the Flemish Interuniversity Council (VLIR-UOS) through the
347 CU2017TEA436A103 project, awarded to Ghent University, Vrije Universiteit Brussel and Cuban
348 Center for Neuroscience. Also, it was supported by the PN305LH13-050 project funded by the
349 Oficina de Gestión de Fondos y Proyectos Internacionales, CITMA, Cuba.

350

351 Acknowledgments

352 We thank the participants in this study, as well as the older adult's caregivers who gave their consent.
353 To Neisbet Blasco Fanego, Brenda Peón and José Aníbal Ojeda Núñez for the application and
354 evaluation of the tests. To Jaime Menéndez Álvarez, Leisy Serrano Blanco and Gianna Arencibia for
355 recording the gait patterns of the study participants.

356

357 References

358 Ancillao, A. *et al.* (2018) 'Indirect measurement of ground reaction forces and moments by means of
359 wearable inertial sensors: A systematic review', *Sensors (Switzerland)*, 18(8). doi:
360 10.3390/s18082564.

361 Arango-Lasprilla, J. C., Rivera, D., Garza, M. T., *et al.* (2015) 'Hopkins Verbal Learning Test-
362 Revised: Normative data for the Latin American Spanish speaking adult population',
363 *NeuroRehabilitation*, 37(4), pp. 699–718. doi: 10.3233/NRE-151286.

364 Arango-Lasprilla, J. C., Rivera, D., Rodríguez, G., *et al.* (2015) 'Symbol Digit Modalities Test:
365 Normative data for the Latin American Spanish speaking adult population', *NeuroRehabilitation*,
366 37(4), pp. 625–638. doi: 10.3233/NRE-151282.

367 Arango-Lasprilla, J. C., Rivera, D., Aguayo, A., *et al.* (2015) 'Trail Making Test: Normative data for
368 the Latin American Spanish speaking adult population', *NeuroRehabilitation*, 37(4), pp. 639–661.
369 doi: 10.3233/NRE-151284.

370 Aznielle-Rodríguez, T. *et al.* (2022) 'Stable Sparse Classifiers predict cognitive impairment from gait
371 patterns', *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.894576.

372 Baek, M. J. *et al.* (2016) 'The validity and reliability of the mini-mental state examination-2 for
373 detecting mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease in a Korean population', *PLoS ONE*,
374 11(9), pp. 1–19. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0163792.

375 Beauchet, O. *et al.* (2013) 'Gait variability at fast-pace walking speed: A biomarker of mild cognitive
376 impairment?', *Journal of Nutrition, Health and Aging*, 17(3), pp. 235–239. doi: 10.1007/s12603-012-
377 0394-4.

378 Beauchet, O. *et al.* (2017) 'Association of increased gait variability while dual tasking and cognitive
379 decline: results from a prospective longitudinal cohort pilot study', *GeroScience*, 39(4), pp. 439–445.
380 doi: 10.1007/s11357-017-9992-8.

381 Brandt, J. (1991) 'The Hopkins Verbal Learning Test: Development of a new memory test with six

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

- 382 equivalent forms’, *Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 5(2), pp. 125–142. doi:
383 10.1080/13854049108403297.
- 384 Bugané, F. *et al.* (2012) ‘Estimation of spatial-temporal gait parameters in level walking based on a
385 single accelerometer: Validation on normal subjects by standard gait analysis’, *Computer Methods
386 and Programs in Biomedicine*, 108(1), pp. 129–137. doi: 10.1016/j.cmpb.2012.02.003.
- 387 Byun, S. *et al.* (2018) ‘Gait Variability Can Predict the Risk of Cognitive Decline in Cognitively
388 Normal Older People’, *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders*, 45(5–6), pp. 251–261. doi:
389 10.1159/000489927.
- 390 Carnero-Pardo, C. (2014) ‘Should the Mini-Mental State Examination be retired?’, *Neurología
391 (English Edition)*, 29(8), pp. 473–481. doi: 10.1016/j.nrleng.2013.07.005.
- 392 Cohen, J. A., Verghese, J. and Zwerling, J. L. (2016) ‘Cognition and gait in older people’, *Maturitas*,
393 93, pp. 73–77. doi: 10.1016/j.maturitas.2016.05.005.
- 394 Crinella, F. M. and Jen, Y. (1999) ‘Brain mechanisms and intelligence. Psychometric g and executive
395 function’, *Intelligence*, 27(4), pp. 299–327. doi: 10.1016/S0160-2896(99)00021-5.
- 396 Demnitz, N. *et al.* (2016) ‘A systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-sectional studies
397 examining the relationship between mobility and cognition in healthy older adults’, *Gait and
398 Posture*, 50, pp. 164–174. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2016.08.028.
- 399 Del Din, S. *et al.* (2016) ‘Instrumented gait assessment with a single wearable: An introductory
400 tutorial’, *F1000Research*, 5(0), pp. 1–17. doi: 10.12688/F1000RESEARCH.9591.1.
- 401 Del Din, S., Godfrey, A. and Rochester, L. (2016) ‘Validation of an Accelerometer to Quantify a
402 Comprehensive Battery of Gait Characteristics in Healthy Older Adults and Parkinson’s Disease:
403 Toward Clinical and at Home Use’, *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 20(3), pp.
404 838–847. doi: 10.1109/JBHI.2015.2419317.
- 405 Duncan, J., Burgess, P. and Emslie, H. (1995) ‘Fluid intelligence after frontal lobe lesions’,
406 *Neuropsychologia*, 33(3), pp. 261–268. doi: 10.1016/0028-3932(94)00124-8.
- 407 Elfadaly, F. G., Garthwaite, P. H. and Crawford, J. R. (2016) ‘On point estimation of the abnormality
408 of a Mahalanobis index’, *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 99, pp. 115–130. doi:
409 10.1016/j.csda.2016.01.014.
- 410 Folstein, M. F., Folstein, S. E. and McHugh, P. R. (1975) ““MINI-MENTAL STATE” A practical
411 method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician’, *J. Psychiat. Res.*, 12, pp. 189–
412 198.
- 413 Harvey, P. D. (2012) ‘Clinical applications of neuropsychological assessment’, *Dialogues in Clinical
414 Neuroscience*, 14(1), pp. 91–99. doi: 10.31887/dens.2012.14.1/pharvey.
- 415 Hoogendam, Y. Y. *et al.* (2014) ‘Patterns of cognitive function in aging: The Rotterdam Study’,
416 *European Journal of Epidemiology*, 29(2), pp. 133–140. doi: 10.1007/s10654-014-9885-4.
- 417 Janke, A. L. *et al.* (2001) ‘4D deformation modeling of cortical disease progression in Alzheimer’s

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

- 418 dementia', *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*, 46(4), pp. 661–666. doi: 10.1002/mrm.1243.
- 419 Jarchi, D. *et al.* (2018) 'A Review on Accelerometry-Based Gait Analysis and Emerging Clinical
420 Applications', *IEEE Reviews in Biomedical Engineering*, 11(c), pp. 177–194. doi:
421 10.1109/RBME.2018.2807182.
- 422 Kane, H. and Brand, C. (2003) 'The Importance of Spearman's ρ as a Psychometric, Social and
423 Educational Construct', *The Occidental Quarterly*, 3(1), pp. 7–30. Available at:
424 [https://courseresources.derby.ac.uk/bbcswebdav/pid-1404135-dt-content-rid-](https://courseresources.derby.ac.uk/bbcswebdav/pid-1404135-dt-content-rid-11501238_1/courses/2014-SPR-5ED506/spearman%20and%20ed.pdf)
425 [11501238_1/courses/2014-SPR-5ED506/spearman and ed.pdf](https://courseresources.derby.ac.uk/bbcswebdav/pid-1404135-dt-content-rid-11501238_1/courses/2014-SPR-5ED506/spearman%20and%20ed.pdf).
- 426 Katz, S. *et al.* (1963) 'Studies of Illness in the Aged The Index of ADL: A Standardized Measure of
427 Biological and Psychosocial Function', *Jama*, 185(12), pp. 94–99.
- 428 Khera, P. and Kumar, N. (2020) 'Role of machine learning in gait analysis: a review', *Journal of*
429 *Medical Engineering and Technology*, 44(8), pp. 441–467. doi: 10.1080/03091902.2020.1822940.
- 430 Kondo, R. *et al.* (2020) 'Association between self-reported night sleep duration and cognitive
431 function', *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 36, pp. 766–774. doi: 10.1002/gps.5476.
- 432 MacAulay, R. K. *et al.* (2017) 'Improving Sensitivity to Detect Mild Cognitive Impairment:
433 Cognitive Load Dual-Task Gait Speed Assessment', *Journal of the International Neuropsychological*
434 *Society*, 23(6), pp. 493–501. doi: 10.1017/S1355617717000261.
- 435 Mahlknecht, P. *et al.* (2013) 'Prevalence and Burden of Gait Disorders in Elderly Men and Women
436 Aged 60-97 Years: A Population-Based Study', *PLoS ONE*, 8(7), pp. 1–7. doi:
437 10.1371/journal.pone.0069627.
- 438 Mansour, K. Ben, Gorce, P. and Rezzoug, N. (2017) 'The multifeature gait score: An accurate way to
439 assess gait quality', *PLoS ONE*, 12(10), pp. 1–12. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0185741.
- 440 Mielke, M. M. *et al.* (2013) 'Assessing the temporal relationship between cognition and gait: Slow
441 gait predicts cognitive decline in the mayo clinic study of aging', *Journals of Gerontology - Series A*
442 *Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 68(8), pp. 929–937. doi: 10.1093/gerona/gls256.
- 443 Montero-Odasso, M. *et al.* (2009) 'Quantitative gait analysis under dual-task in older people with
444 mild cognitive impairment: A reliability study', *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*,
445 6(1), pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1186/1743-0003-6-35.
- 446 Montero-Odasso, M. *et al.* (2011) 'Gait variability is associated with frailty in community-dwelling
447 older adults', *Journals of Gerontology - Series A Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 66 A(5),
448 pp. 568–576. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glr007.
- 449 Montero-Odasso, M. *et al.* (2012) 'Gait and cognition: A complementary approach to understanding
450 brain function and the risk of falling', *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 60(11), pp. 2127–
451 2136. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2012.04209.x.
- 452 Montero-Odasso, M. M. *et al.* (2017) 'Association of dual-task gait with incident dementia in mild
453 cognitive impairment: Results from the gait and brain study', *JAMA Neurology*, 74(7), pp. 857–865.
454 doi: 10.1001/jamaneurol.2017.0643.

Relationship between gait parameters and cognitive indexes in elderly adults

- 455 Nasreddine, Z. S. *et al.* (2005) ‘The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: A brief screening tool
456 for mild cognitive impairment’, *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 53(4), pp. 695–699. doi:
457 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53221.x.
- 458 Olney, S. J. *et al.* (1995) ‘Multivariate examination of data from gait analysis of stroke subjects’,
459 78(8), pp. 698–699.
- 460 Rabin, L. A., Barr, W. B. and Burton, L. A. (2005) ‘Assessment practices of clinical
461 neuropsychologists in the United States and Canada: A survey of INS, NAN, and APA Division 40
462 members’, *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 20(1), pp. 33–65. doi: 10.1016/j.acn.2004.02.005.
- 463 Ren, P. *et al.* (2017) ‘Gait Rhythm Fluctuation Analysis for Neurodegenerative Diseases by
464 Empirical Mode Decomposition’, *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 64(1), pp. 52–60.
465 doi: 10.1109/TBME.2016.2536438.
- 466 Rivera, D. *et al.* (2015) ‘Brief Test of Attention: Normative data for the Latin American Spanish
467 speaking adult population’, *NeuroRehabilitation*, 37(4), pp. 663–676. doi: 10.3233/NRE-151283.
- 468 Schretlen, D., Bobholz, J. H. and Brandt, J. (1996) ‘Development and psychometric properties of the
469 brief test of attention’, *Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 10(1), pp. 80–89. doi:
470 10.1080/13854049608406666.
- 471 Shelkey, M. and Wallace, M. (2000) ‘Katz Index of Independence in Activities of Daily Living
472 (ADL).’, *Director (Cincinnati, Ohio)*, 8(2), pp. 72–73. doi: 10.1097/00004045-200105000-00020.
- 473 Shum, D. H. K., McFarland, K. A. and Bain, J. D. (1990) ‘Construct validity of eight tests of
474 attention: Comparison of normal and closed head injured samples’, *Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 4(2),
475 pp. 151–162. doi: 10.1080/13854049008401508.
- 476 Stijntjes, M. *et al.* (2015) ‘Low cognitive status is associated with a lower ability to maintain
477 standing balance in elderly outpatients’, *Gerontology*, 61(2), pp. 124–130. doi: 10.1159/000364916.
- 478 Tehan, H. *et al.* (2018) ‘Using mahalanobis distance to evaluate recovery in acute stroke’, *Archives of*
479 *Clinical Neuropsychology*, 33(5), pp. 577–582. doi: 10.1093/arclin/acx107.
- 480 Yang, M. *et al.* (2012) ‘IGAITS: An interactive accelerometer based gait analysis system’, *Computer*
481 *Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 108(2), pp. 715–723. doi: 10.1016/j.cmpb.2012.04.004.
- 482 Zijlstra, W. (2004) ‘Assessment of spatio-temporal parameters during unconstrained walking’,
483 *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 92(1–2), pp. 39–44. doi: 10.1007/s00421-004-1041-5.
- 484 Zijlstra, W. and Hof, A. L. (2003) ‘Assessment of spatio-temporal gait parameters from trunk
485 accelerations during human walking’, *Gait and Posture*, 18(2), pp. 1–10. doi: 10.1016/S0966-
486 6362(02)00190-X.
- 487