

Full Title: DOC screen completion time reflects executive function, speed of processing and fluency in an observational cohort study

Alisia Southwell, HBSc^{1*}, Sajeevan Sujanthan, HBSc^{1*}, Tera Armel, HBSc¹, Elaine Xing, HBSc¹, Arunima Kapoor, MSc¹, Xiao Yu Eileen Liu, MSc¹, Krista L. Lanctot, PhD^{2,3,4}, Nathan Herrmann, MD^{2,3,4}, Brian J. Murray, MD^{1,2,3}, Kevin E. Thorpe, MMath^{4,5}, Megan L. Cayley, BScN¹, Michelle N. Sicard, MSW¹, Karen Lien, MD¹, Demetrios J. Sahlas, MD, MSc^{6,7,8}, Richard H. Swartz, MD, PhD^{1,3,4,9}

*The first two authors contributed equally to this work

¹Department of Medicine (Neurology), Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, Toronto

²Department of Psychiatry, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, Toronto

³Hurvitz Brain Sciences Research Program, Toronto

⁴University of Toronto, Toronto

⁵St Michael's Hospital, Applied Health Research Centre of the Li Sha Shing Knowledge Institute, Toronto

⁶McMaster University, Hamilton

⁷Department of Medicine (Neurology), Hamilton Health Sciences Centre, Hamilton

⁸Hamilton General Hospital, Toronto

⁹Heart and Stroke Foundation Canadian Partnership for Stroke Recovery

Short Title: DOC screen time as a measure of executive function

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Richard H. Swartz

Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre

2075 Bayview Avenue, Toronto, ON, Canada, M4N 3M5

Phone: 416-480-4866 e-mail: rick.swartz@sunnybrook.ca Fax: 416-480-4552

Word Count: 4201

Abstract

Background: The DOC screen was developed to identify Depression, Obstructive sleep apnea, and Cognitive impairment (“DOC” comorbidities) after stroke. Each component has its own score, but additional information may be gained from the time to complete the screen. Cognitive screening completion time is rarely used as an outcome measure. We assessed the added value of using DOC screen completion time as a predictor of impairment on detailed cognitive assessments.

Methods: Consecutive English-speaking new referrals to the stroke prevention clinic were consented to participate in detailed neuropsychological testing (n=437). DOC screen scores and times were compared to cognitive test scores using multiple linear regression and receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis. All linear regression analyses controlled for age, sex, years of education, and functional outcome as assessed by the modified Rankin score.

Results: Average completion time for the DOC screen was 3.8 ± 1.3 minutes. After accounting for age, sex and cognitive screen score, completion time was a significant independent predictor, of speed of processing ($p = .002$, 95% CI: -0.016 to -0.004), verbal fluency ($p < .001$, CI: -0.012 to -0.006) and executive ($p = .004$, CI: -0.006 to -0.001), but not memory, function. Completion time above 5.5 minutes (332.5 seconds) was associated with a high likelihood of impairment on gold standard executive (likelihood ratios 3.9-5.2) and speed of processing (likelihood ratio = 5.2) tasks.

Conclusions: DOC screen completion time is easy to collect in routine care and is independently associated with speed of processing, language and executive dysfunctions after stroke. People who take more than 5.5 minutes to complete the DOC screen are likely to have deficits in executive functioning and speed of processing. These domains can be challenging to screen for

in stroke survivors, and this measure provides a simple, clinically feasible method to screen for these under-appreciated concerns.

Clinical Trials Registration Identifier: NCT02363114

Clinical Trials URL: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02363114>

Non-Standard Abbreviations and Acronyms

CVLT – California Verbal Learning Test

DOC – Depression, Obstructive Sleep Apnea, Cognitive Impairment

MMSE – Mini Mental State Examination

MoCA – Montreal Cognitive Assessment

OSA – Obstructive Sleep Apnea

QCT – Question Completion Time

TMT – Trail Making Test

Introduction

Stroke is the leading cause of neurological disability in adults¹ and survival after stroke is increasing.²⁻⁴ In addition to physical post-stroke deficits,⁵ approximately 30 to 50% of stroke survivors are affected by each of **d**epression, **o**bststructive sleep apnea (OSA), and **c**ognitive impairment (DOC).⁶⁻⁹ These DOC comorbidities are all associated with poorer functional outcomes,¹⁰ and an increased risk of mortality.¹¹

The DOC screen was developed as a feasible and valid tool to screen and stratify stroke patients into high, intermediate, and low risk groups for DOC comorbidities to facilitate detection and management in high-volume stroke clinic settings.¹² The screen is efficient, yet designed to maintain the construct validity of a delayed recall task. Eighty-nine percent of patients in stroke prevention clinics are able to complete the tool in <6 minutes (mean=4.2 minutes, SD=1.5).¹² In validation studies, the cognitive component of the DOC score is helpful to quickly stratify people into “cognitively normal”, “cognitively impaired” and “need more assessment” groups, compared to more detailed cognitive testing.¹² Although the DOC completion time was originally collected as a way to assess feasibility, practitioners can record this measure when administering the DOC screen in clinical settings. Several studies have reported the average time taken to complete other well-known cognitive screens as feasibility demonstrations, including the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA; means ranging from 9.5 minutes – 11 minutes)^{13,14} and the Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE; means ranging from 8 minutes – 13.4 minutes).^{14,15} However, few studies have assessed the utility of using a cognitive screen’s completion time as a metric to evaluate underlying cognitive abilities, such as executive functioning.

Executive dysfunction and delays in speed of processing are the most commonly reported

cognitive impairments after stroke. The DOC screen specifically examines mood symptoms, cognitive (executive, memory and abstraction) dysfunction and OSA/fatigue – all of which could be associated with cognitive or psychomotor slowing.¹⁶ Screen completion time is an immediately available metric, requiring no additional effort from either patients or clinicians, that might reflect executive function. The objective of this study was to determine whether completion time for the DOC screen is a reliable reflection of cognitive dysfunction and whether a single completion time cut-point could indicate impairment.

Methods

All patients were recruited from the DOC feasibility and validity study.¹² This study included English speaking (or English fluent) patients newly referred to stroke prevention clinics over a two-year period (n=1504). We excluded patients with severe aphasia, severe motor dysfunction and patients who were not fluent in English. Each eligible participant was administered the DOC screen (**Figure 1**) as a brief screen of depression, obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) and cognitive impairment. All DOC screens were timed from the beginning of the memory registration (first task) until the end of the 5-word free recall (final task). Chart abstractions by trained research members captured demographic and clinical data on all participants from patient charts using previously published and validated methods.^{17,18}

To reduce sampling bias, all consecutive patients from stroke prevention clinics who completed the DOC screen were asked to complete more detailed neuropsychological assessments, including a cognitive battery and formal mood assessments as outlined in the DOC feasibility study.¹² A complete list of all mood and cognitive assessments completed as part of the DOC study is reported elsewhere.¹² In this analysis, cognition was assessed using the 30-minute neuropsychological battery recommended by the NINDS-CSN.¹⁹ This cognitive battery consists

of the: Controlled Oral Word Association Test (phonemic fluency), Animal Naming task (semantic fluency), California Verbal Learning Test (CVLT), Digit Symbol Coding, and Trail Making Tests (TMT-A and TMT-B). All scores were normalized (z-score or scaled score) for age using age-matched norms from each respective test manual. CVLT and Animal Naming were also education-standardized.^{20,21} The study was approved by the institutional Research Ethics Board.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows version 24. Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were calculated for age, screen completion time, and number of years of education. To assess whether screen time reflects cognitive function, independent linear regression models were used to examine the association between DOC completion time and the scaled or z-scores of all neuropsychological subtests. Data from all participants was used in the regression models. A sensitivity analysis was performed using a complete case approach to assess whether missing variables affected the models. All models controlled for age, education, modified Rankin Score (mRS) and sex. Due to the established relationship between the DOC cognitive sub-scores and detailed cognitive assessments,¹² we also controlled for the DOC-Cognition score in all models. Significance was set at $p < 0.05$ for all analyses. To identify whether a single cut point (in seconds) for screen time could be found with high specificity and likelihood ratios for cognitive impairment, receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were used. ROC analyses were run for each neuropsychological assessment significantly associated with the DOC screen completion time. A logistic regression with screen time completion and the impairment classification on the NINDS-CSN assessments was applied to the ROC curves. The classification of impairment of NINDS-

CSN was defined as scores >2.0 SD from expected norms, on 2 or more cognitive tasks. This required participants to have completed all tests in the detailed cognitive battery, thus a complete case approach was used for all ROC analyses. First, a single, specific cut-point (time in seconds) was defined based on the ROC curve output for patients with an overall classification of impaired on the NINDS-CSN battery. The cut-point was pre-specified to have 95% specificity for impairment. This cut-point was then applied to ROC curves from each individual assessment and evaluated using likelihood ratios (LR).

Results

437 patients completed cognitive and mood gold standard assessments (Supplemental Table 1). 213 (48.7%) participants were male, the mean (\pm standard deviation) age was 62.7 ± 15.6 years, and the mean years of education was 15.6 ± 3.9 years (**Table 1**). The DOC screen completion mean was 3.8 ± 1.3 minutes (range: 1.9-9.6 minutes). One hundred and thirty-four (31%) patients had an ischemic stroke, 138 (32%) had a probable/possible TIA, and the remainder (37%) were diagnosed with other conditions (**Table 1**). Non-stroke/TIA diagnoses included patients referred with possible stroke symptoms, but whose further investigations revealed alternative diagnoses, as well as patients without specific stroke/TIA symptoms referred for either vascular risk reduction or assessment of incidental abnormal imaging findings.

We performed linear regressions with DOC screen completion time (seconds) as a predictor for each neuropsychological assessment score (**Table 2**). In all models we controlled for age, sex, years of education, screening score of cognitive function (DOC-Cognition score), and overall function (mRS). All regression models for screen completion time were significant ($p < .001$) (Supplemental Table 2). Additionally, model summaries showed that screen completion time was a significant predictor ($p < 0.005$) of: verbal fluency semantic score (95% Confidence

Interval (CI) of Beta-coefficient from linear regression: $-.006$ to $-.001$), verbal fluency phonemic Score (95% CI: $-.018$ to $-.006$), Digit Symbol Coding (95% CI: $-.016$ to $-.004$) and the Trail Making Tests (TMT-A 95% CI: $-.017$ to $-.005$; TMT-B 95% CI: $-.016$ to $-.004$). In all cases, these were negative correlations (i.e., longer completion times correlated with poorer cognitive scores). DOC screen completion time was not a significant predictor of memory performance on the CVLT Short Delay Free Recall ($p=.713$, 95% CI: $-.003$ to $.002$) or the CVLT Long Delay Free Recall ($p=.790$, 95% CI: $-.002$ to $.003$). Results did not differ in the sensitivity models requiring complete case data (see Table 2 compared to Supplemental Table 3 with complete case data).

Using the single cut-off point approach on the overall impairment ROC curve (Figure 2, Table 3A), the point with 95% specificity for impairment was 332.5 seconds. When this time was applied to ROC models for each individual cognitive task (Table 3B), the same cut-point had high specificity on all executive and speed of processing tasks. The area under the curve was greater than 0.7 for all executive and speed of processing tasks. Likelihood ratios for predicting abnormal results on executive and speed of processing tasks ranged from four to six – that is, people taking more than 332.5 seconds to complete the DOC screen were 4-6 times more likely to have severe impairment on executive and speed of processing tasks than those with faster completion times (see Table 3).

Discussion

Several studies²² have shown that post-stroke impairments can be separated into independent cognitive factors including language, memory and executive function, with deficits in executive functioning and speed of processing being the most common.²³ Screening tests for executive function and speed of processing are limited in routine clinical care. These results demonstrate

that DOC screen completion time is an independent predictor of executive function (semantic fluency,²⁴ TMT-B²⁵), speed of processing (Digit symbol coding,²⁶ TMT-A and B²⁷) and verbal fluency²⁸ after stroke, even after controlling for age, sex, education, DOC-cognition score and stroke severity. Completion time did not predict CVLT scores, a verbal test primarily affecting verbal memory (learning/registration and recall).²⁹ Verbal fluency, while reflecting language function, is also reflective of executive function.³⁰ Moreover, we have demonstrated that a 332.5 second (roughly 5.5 minutes) cut-off has 95 % specificity and high likelihood ratios for predicting both overall cognitive and executive function impairment. This can be used as a quick and easily obtainable measure to identify people most likely to be impaired on executive and speed of processing tasks.

A few notable neuropsychological measures have used completion time to assess specific cognitive functions. For instance, Trail Making Tests (TMTs) are a set of widely accepted timed neuropsychological measures that provide insight into executive abilities.²⁷ Processing speed is highly associated with performance on TMT Part B, which involves decision-making skills comparable to measures of executive function.^{25,31} Similarly, Woods et al. discovered that a patient's question completion time on self-paced questionnaires could be used as a measure of executive functioning.³² Question completion time measures processing and decision-making speeds, providing insight into motivation, effort, and cognitive ability that is not measured by existing tests.³² These studies support the notion that timed measures may be useful as a measure of executive dysfunction in addition to their use as diagnostic screening instruments. The findings presented in our study correspond well to those reported by Woods et al. Their analysis showed that complex tasks, akin to our DOC-Cognitive tasks, were strongly related to executive function and processing speed. Their neuropsychological tests (including TMT-B and Digit

Span) also correlated significantly with self-paced question completion time. Their research process was similar to ours, wherein completion time was compared to existing screens to validate completion time as a metric; both studies suggest that completion time of self-paced complex assessments may be valid markers of executive function.

Few studies use completion time of a neuropsychological screening tool as a cognitive marker. Most screens (like the MoCA or MMSE) are not routinely timed when applied in clinical settings. Moreover, executive function deficits are not often assessed in stroke patients; these deficits are subtle, challenging to test for, and often go unrecognized.²³ Measures that are quick and easy to administer, such as DOC screen completion time, may aid in detecting executive dysfunction.

The interpretation of our findings is limited by our sample population. Compared to the total number of patients who were asked to volunteer from the stroke prevention clinic (n=1504), consenting participants (n=437) tended to be slightly younger and with slightly milder neuropsychological deficits (healthy participant bias).¹² However, our sample also included a wide range of patients across the full spectrum of severity. As expected from stroke/TIA clinic samples, 62% had a diagnosis of stroke and/or TIA, and the rest had alternative diagnoses common in stroke prevention clinics (mimics, multiple vascular risk factors, abnormal imaging). This heterogeneity reflects the pragmatic nature of the screening and its broad generalizability to the population of patients referred to stroke prevention clinics. TIA patients are well recognized to share similar long-term risk profiles³³ and are also at risk for cognitive impairment,³⁴ compared to those with imaging confirmed strokes. The relationship between timing and gold standard testing was found across a range of severity from normal function to severely impaired. It should also be noted that there is not a single perfect cut-off score for DOC completion time

that indicates executive dysfunction. To facilitate clinical utility, and because this is intended as a screen in high-volume clinics, we chose to explore a cut-off with high specificity so clinicians could be confident there was a high likelihood of true impairment beyond this time; however, this cut-off will have a low sensitivity and will miss some people with impairments. Previous work has already established that the DOC-cog score can also be a sensitive screen, effectively ruling out cognitive impairment in people who score highly.¹² Finally, it is important to note that although screen completion time may be a useful tool to identify people likely to have executive dysfunction, it is still not equivalent to a detailed neuropsychological assessment.

Conclusion

Clinical cognitive screening tools have not commonly used completion time as a metric. We aimed to determine whether the DOC screen completion time could provide clinically relevant information on patients' cognitive function. DOC screen completion time reflects executive function, speed of processing and verbal fluency. When administering the DOC screen, completion time requires no additional time or patient burden to collect. This convenience is vital in busy stroke prevention clinic settings, where there is minimal time for detailed cognitive assessments. Exploring whether screen time can act as a predictor of future outcomes would provide further support the utility of this measure in clinical settings.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge the DOC participants who volunteered their time for the study.

Sources of Funding

This study was supported by CIHR (Grant Ref No. 137038) and HSF (Project No. 000392). RHS received salary support for research from an Ontario Clinician Scientist (Phase II) Award from

the HSF Canada and from the Department of Medicine (Neurology) at Sunnybrook and University of Toronto. In-kind support for data storage was provided by the Ontario Brain Institute and the Ontario Neurodegenerative Disease Research Initiative (ONDRI).

Disclosures

RHS reports ownership shares in FollowMD Inc., a virtual vascular risk reduction clinic. None of the other authors have any conflicts of interest to disclose.

References

1. Feigin VL, Nichols E, Alam T, et al. Global, regional, and national burden of neurological disorders, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet Neurol.* 2019;18(5):459-480. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(18)30499-X
2. Lakshminarayan K, Berger AK, Fuller CC, et al. Trends in 10-Year Survival of Patients With Stroke Hospitalized Between 1980 and 2000. *Stroke.* 2014;45(9):2575-2581. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.114.005512
3. Rodríguez-Castro E, López-Dequit I, Santamaría-Cadavid M, et al. Trends in stroke outcomes in the last ten years in a European tertiary hospital. *BMC Neurol.* 2018;18(1):164. doi:10.1186/s12883-018-1164-7
4. Waziry R, Heshmatollah A, Bos D, et al. Time Trends in Survival Following First Hemorrhagic or Ischemic Stroke Between 1991 and 2015 in the Rotterdam Study. *Stroke.* 2020;51(3):824-829. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.027198
5. Verstraeten S, Mark R, Sitskoorn M. Motor and Cognitive Impairment after Stroke: A Common Bond or a Simultaneous Deficit? *Stroke Res Ther.* 2016;1(1).
6. Herrmann N, Seitz D, Fischer H, et al. Detection and treatment of post stroke depression: results from the registry of the Canadian stroke network. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry.* 2011:n/a-n/a. doi:10.1002/gps.2663
7. Johnson KG, Johnson DC. Frequency of sleep apnea in stroke and TIA patients: a meta-analysis. *J Clin Sleep Med.* 2010;6(2):131-137.
8. Patel MD, Coshall C, Rudd AG, Wolfe CDA. Cognitive Impairment after Stroke: Clinical Determinants and Its Associations with Long-Term Stroke Outcomes. *J Am Geriatr Soc.*

- 2002;50(4):700-706. doi:10.1046/j.1532-5415.2002.50165.x
9. Kapoor A, Lanctôt KL, Bayley M, et al. “Good Outcome” Isn’t Good Enough. *Stroke*. 2017;48(6):1688-1690. doi:10.1161/strokeaha.117.016728
 10. Kapoor A, Lanctot KL, Bayley M, Herrmann N, Murray BJ, Swartz RH. Screening for Post-Stroke Depression and Cognitive Impairment at Baseline Predicts Long-Term Patient-Centered Outcomes After Stroke. *J Geriatr Psychiatry Neurol*. 2019;32(1):40-48. doi:10.1177/0891988718819859
 11. Swartz RH, Bayley M, Lanctôt KL, et al. Post-stroke depression, obstructive sleep apnea, and cognitive impairment: Rationale for, and barriers to, routine screening. *Int J Stroke*. 2016;11(5):509-518. doi:10.1177/1747493016641968
 12. Swartz RH, Cayley ML, Lanctôt KL, et al. The “DOC” screen: Feasible and valid screening for depression, Obstructive Sleep Apnea (OSA) and cognitive impairment in stroke prevention clinics. Romigi A, ed. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(4):e0174451. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0174451
 13. Lees RA, Hendry BA K, Broomfield N, Stott D, Larner AJ, Quinn TJ. Cognitive assessment in stroke: feasibility and test properties using differing approaches to scoring of incomplete items. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2017;32(10):1072-1078. doi:10.1002/gps.4568
 14. Barnay J-L, Wauquiez G, Bonnin-Koang HY, et al. Feasibility of the Cognitive Assessment scale for Stroke Patients (CASP) vs. MMSE and MoCA in aphasic left hemispheric stroke patients. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med*. 2014;57(6-7):422-435. doi:10.1016/j.rehab.2014.05.010
 15. Molloy DW. *Standardised Mini-Mental State Examination (SMMSE): Guidelines for*

- Administration and Scoring Instructions*. Australia; 2014.
16. Schrijvers D, Hulstijn W, Sabbe BGC. Psychomotor symptoms in depression: A diagnostic, pathophysiological and therapeutic tool. *J Affect Disord*. 2008;109(1-2):1-20. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2007.10.019
 17. Hall R, Khan F, O’Callaghan C, et al. *Ontario Stroke Evaluation Report 2013: Spotlight on Secondary Stroke Prevention and Care*. Toronto; 2013. <https://www.ices.on.ca/Publications/Atlases-and-Reports/2013/Ontario-Stroke-Evaluation-Report-2013.aspx>.
 18. Kapral MK, Fang J, Hill MD, et al. Sex Differences in Stroke Care and Outcomes. *Stroke*. 2005;36(4):809-814. doi:10.1161/01.STR.0000157662.09551.e5
 19. Hachinski V, Iadecola C, Petersen RC, et al. National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke–Canadian Stroke Network Vascular Cognitive Impairment Harmonization Standards. *Stroke*. 2006;37(9):2220-2241. doi:10.1161/01.STR.0000237236.88823.47
 20. Tombaugh T. Normative Data Stratified by Age and Education for Two Measures of Verbal Fluency FAS and Animal Naming. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol*. 1999;14(2):167-177. doi:10.1016/S0887-6177(97)00095-4
 21. Delis DC, Kramer JH, Kaplan E, Ober BE. *California Verbal Learning Test | Second Edition*. Second. San Antonio: The Psychological Corporation; 2000.
 22. Swartz RH, Stuss DT, Gao F, Black SE. Independent Cognitive Effects of Atrophy and Diffuse Subcortical and Thalamico-Cortical Cerebrovascular Disease in Dementia. *Stroke*. 2008;39(3):822-830. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.107.491936
 23. Zinn S, Bosworth HB, Hoenig HM, Swartzwelder HS. Executive Function Deficits in Acute Stroke. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2007;88(2):173-180.

- doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2006.11.015
24. Maseda A, Lodeiro-Fernández L, Lorenzo-López L, Núñez-Naveira L, Balo A, Millán-Calenti JC. Verbal fluency, naming and verbal comprehension: three aspects of language as predictors of cognitive impairment. *Aging Ment Health*. 2014;18(8):1037-1045.
doi:10.1080/13607863.2014.908457
 25. Arbuthnott K, Frank J. Trail Making Test, Part B as a Measure of Executive Control: Validation Using a Set-Switching Paradigm. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol*. 2000;22(4):518-528. doi:10.1076/1380-3395(200008)22:4;1-0;FT518
 26. Deloire MS, Bonnet MC, Salort E, et al. How to detect cognitive dysfunction at early stages of multiple sclerosis? *Mult Scler J*. 2006;12(4):445-452.
doi:10.1191/1352458506ms1289oa
 27. Muir RT, Lam B, Honjo K, et al. Trail Making Test Elucidates Neural Substrates of Specific Poststroke Executive Dysfunctions. *Stroke*. 2015;46(10):2755-2761.
doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.115.009936
 28. Whiteside DM, Kealey T, Semla M, et al. Verbal Fluency: Language or Executive Function Measure? *Appl Neuropsychol Adult*. 2016;23(1):29-34.
doi:10.1080/23279095.2015.1004574
 29. JACOBS M, DONDERS J. Criterion validity of the California Verbal Learning Test-Second Edition (CVLT-II) after traumatic brain injury. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol*. 2007;22(2):143-149. doi:10.1016/j.acn.2006.12.002
 30. Aita SL, Beach JD, Taylor SE, Borgogna NC, Harrell MN, Hill BD. Executive, language, or both? An examination of the construct validity of verbal fluency measures. *Appl Neuropsychol Adult*. 2019;26(5):441-451. doi:10.1080/23279095.2018.1439830

31. MacPherson SE, Cox SR, Dickie DA, et al. Processing speed and the relationship between Trail Making Test-B performance, cortical thinning and white matter microstructure in older adults. *Cortex*. 2017;95:92-103. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2017.07.021
32. Woods DL, Yund EW, Wyma JM, Ruff R, Herron TJ. Measuring executive function in control subjects and TBI patients with question completion time (QCT). *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2015;9. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2015.00288
33. Edwards JD, Kapral MK, Fang J, Swartz RH. Long-term morbidity and mortality in patients without early complications after stroke or transient ischemic attack. *Can Med Assoc J*. 2017;189(29):E954-E961. doi:10.1503/cmaj.161142
34. Pendlebury ST, Wadling S, Silver LE, Mehta Z, Rothwell PM. Transient Cognitive Impairment in TIA and Minor Stroke. *Stroke*. 2011;42(11):3116-3121. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.111.621490

Figure 1: The DOC screen (freely available for download at www.docscreen.ca).

DOC SCREEN PART 1

Date: _____
 Patient of: _____

Completed by: Language: RN English 1st language Unable to complete due to: Language Resides at: Home MD ESL, fluent Aphasio/Dysphasic Nursing Home/ LTC/CCC RA ESL, not fluent Unable to translate Inpatient rehab facility Retirement Home Other Residential Facility M Vision Motor No Fixed Address F Too ill Other: _____ UTO

Education: highest grade (1-13) _____ # of undergraduate years _____ # of graduate years _____
 Systolic BP: _____
 Diastolic BP: _____
 Height: _____
 Weight: _____
 Waist/Hip Circumference: _____ / _____
Modified Rankin Scale: _____
 0 – No symptoms
 1 – No significant disability despite symptoms; able to carry out all usual duties and activities
 2 – Slight disability, unable to carry out all previous activities, but able to look after own affairs without assistance
 3 – Moderate disability; requiring some help, but able to walk without assistance (**with or without cane or walker**)
 4 – Moderately severe disability; unable to walk without assistance and unable to attend to own bodily needs without assistance
 5 – Severe disability; bedridden, incontinent and requiring constant nursing care and attention

Clinical Frailty Scale: _____
 1 – Very fit - Robust, active, energetic, well-motivated and fit
 2 – Well - Without active disease, but less fit than those in 1
 3 – Well, with treated comorbid disease - Disease symptoms well controlled
 4 – Apparently vulnerable - Not dependent, but common complaints about being 'slowed up' or having disease symptoms
 5 – Mildly frail - Limited dependence for IADLs
 6 – Moderately frail - Help required for both IADLs/ADLs
 7 – Severely frail - Completely dependent on others for ADLs, or terminally ill

Please see reverse side!
Version Date Mar 13 2014

Please see reverse side!
Version Date Mar 13 2014

DOC SCREEN PART 2

★ Time to complete: ____ min ____ s

Memory (Registration)
 Read list of words, subject must repeat them. Do 2 trials. Do a recall after 5 minutes.

	FACE	VELVET	CHURCH	DAISY	RED
1 st trial					
2 nd trial					

DOC Mood "Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you been bothered by any of the following problems?"

	Not at all (0)	Several days (1)	More than half the days (2)	Nearly every day (3)
Little interest or pleasure doing things				
Feeling down, depressed or hopeless				

Score (D): /6

DOC Apnea

	Yes	No
Do you snore loudly (louder than talking, heard through a door, or bother other people)?		
Do you often feel tired, fatigued or sleepy during the daytime?		
Has anyone observed you stop breathing during your sleep?		
Do you have, or are you being treated for high blood pressure?		

Score (O): /4

Draw a Clock (Ten Past Eleven)

Contour	[]
Numbers	[]
Hands	[]

Score (C): /3

Abstraction "What is the similarity between: (e.g. banana – orange = fruit)"
 A train and a bicycle? [] A watch and a ruler? []

Score (C): /2

Memory (Delayed Recall)

	WITHOUT CLUE	FACE	VELVET	CHURCH	DAISY	RED
What were those 5 words?	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Category cue						
Multiple choice cue						

Score (C): /5

D (DOC-Mood):	/6	O (DOC-Apnea):	/4	C (DOC-Cog ¹):	/10
TOTAL DOC SCORE = D + O + (10 – C) =			/20		

Modified/Combined from: 1. MOG-2: Nagai VE et al. Brief assessment of cognitive impairment in patients with stroke. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 1989 Feb;70(2):116-7. 2. STOP: Chung P et al. STOP questionnaire: A tool to screen patients for obstructive sleep apnea. Anesthesiology. 2008 May;108(5):812-21. 3. MoCA: Nasreddine ZS et al. The montreal cognitive assessment, MoCA: A brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2005 Apr;53(4):693-9. MoCA copyright of the adapted version: 2. Nasreddine MD. Adapted by Swartz et al., 2013.

Table 1: Demographics for participants completing detailed cognitive and neuropsychological assessments (n = 437).

Variables	Mean (SD)
Age (years)	62.7 (15.6)
Education (years)	15.6 (3.9)
DOC screen completion time (s)	227.8 (76.6)
Language	n (%)
English	363 (83.1)
ESL	74 (16.9)
Sex (female)	51.3%
Most Responsible Diagnosis	
Undetermined Diagnosis	4 (.9)
Abnormal CT/MRI Scan	21 (4.8)
Asymptomatic Carotid Artery Disease	4 (0.9)
Definite Ischemic Stroke	121 (27.7)
Definite TIA	54 (12.4)
Hemorrhage ICH	17 (3.9)
Hemorrhage IVH	1 (0.2)
Hemorrhage SAH	4 (0.9)
Hemorrhage SDH	1 (0.2)
Other Non-Vascular	96 (22)
Other Vascular	14 (3.2)
Possible/Query Ischemic	13 (3.0)
Possible/Query TIA	84 (19.2)
Sinovenous Thrombosis	3 (0.7)
Modified Ranking Scale (mRS)	
0	230 (52.6)
1	113 (25.9)
2	69(15.8)
3	19 (4.3)
4	2 (.5)
Missing	4 (.9)

† TIA = transient ischemic attack, ICH = intracerebral hemorrhage, IVH = intraventricular hemorrhage, SAH = subarachnoid hemorrhage, SDH = subdural hemorrhage

Table 2: Linear Regression results showing the effect of DOC screen completion time on individual neuropsychological assessments.

Measure	Test	B-value	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Executive Function	Semantic Fluency (Z-score)	-.004	.004	-.006	-.001
Language (verbal fluency)	Phonemic Fluency (Scaled Score)	-.012	< .001	-.018	-.006
Speed of Processing	Digit Symbol Coding (Scaled Score)	-.010	.002	-.016	-.004
Motor & Speed of processing	TMT-A (Scaled Score)	-.011	< .001	-.017	-.005
Executive function & Speed of processing	TMT-B (Scaled Score)	-.010	.002	-.016	-.004
Memory	CVLT Short Delay Free Recall (Z-score)	.000	.713	-.003	.002
	CVLT Long Delay Free Recall (Z-score)	.000	.790	-.002	.003

*all models controlled for by age, sex, years of education, DOC-Cognition score and mRS

†significant results bolded and set at $p < 0.05$

Table 3 – ROC model outputs comparing DOC screen completion time with full neuropsychological assessments, with a cut off set at 332.5 seconds (95% specificity) obtained from the model for overall impairment.

	Cut-off – Time (seconds)	Specificity	Sensitivity	Area Under the Curve (AUC)	Likelihood Ratio (LR+)
A) Impairment ROC regression (>2 standard deviations from expected norms on 2 or more tasks)					
Impaired/not	332.5	0.95	0.19	0.706	3.7
B) ROC regressions for each task					
Phonemic	332.5	0.93	0.27	0.735	3.7
Semantic	332.5	0.94	0.30	0.763	4.7
Symbol Encoded	332.5	0.92	0.4	0.788	5.1
Trails A	332.5	0.94	0.28	0.737	4.8
Trails B	332.5	0.95	0.30	0.762	5.9