medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC 4.0 International license .

Beyond Traditional Assessments of Cognitive Impairment: Exploring the Potential of Spatial Navigation Tasks

Giorgio Colombo[1,2,*], Karolina Minta[1,*], Tyler Thrash[3], Jascha Grübel[4], Jan Wiener[5], Marios Avraamides[6], Christoph Hölscher[2], Victor R. Schinazi[1,7]

[1] Future Health Technologies, Singapore-ETH Centre, Campus for Research Excellence and Technological Enterprise (CREATE), Singapore 138602, Singapore.
[2] Chair of Cognitive Science, ETH Zürich, Zürich 8092, Switzerland.
[3] Department of Biology, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO, USA.
[4] Laboratory of Geo-information Science and Remote Sensing, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen 6700, The Netherlands.
[5] Department of Psychology, Bournemouth University, Bournemouth, UK.
[6] Department of Psychology, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus, Rise Nicosia, Cyprus.
[7] Department of Psychology, Bond University, Robina 4226, Queensland, Australia.

* These authors equally contributed to this paper

Abstract

INTRODUCTION: Alzheimer's disease affects spatial abilities that are often overlooked in standard cognitive screening tools. We assessed whether the spatial navigation tasks in the Spatial Performance Assessment for Cognitive Evaluation (SPACE) can complement existing tools such as the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA).

METHODS: 348 participants aged 21-76 completed the MoCA, SPACE, and sociodemographic-health questionnaires. Regressions were used to predict MoCA scores with risk factors and SPACE tasks as predictors. We also conducted a factor analysis to investigate the relationships among SPACE tasks and the MoCA.

RESULTS: Regressions revealed significant effects of age, gender, and SPACE tasks. No risk factors for dementia predicted MoCA scores. The factor analysis revealed that MoCA and perspective taking contributed to a separate factor from other navigation tasks in SPACE. Normative data for SPACE are provided.

DISCUSSION: Our findings highlight the importance of navigation tasks for cognitive assessment and the early detection of cognitive impairment.

Keywords: Cognitive impairment, Alzheimer's disease, Ageing, Spatial ability, Navigation, Digital assessments.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

1. INTRODUCTION

Dementia affects 55 million people worldwide [1], and this number is projected to increase to 152 million by 2050, posing a significant global threat to the healthcare system [2]. Alzheimer's Disease (AD) is the most common form of dementia and ranks as the fifth leading cause of death for those aged 65 and older [3]. The total economic burden of AD is projected to reach $3.3 trillion by 2060 [4] and includes the costs of healthcare, long-term care, and informal caregiving [5,6]. The early stage of dementia, known as Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI), often goes undiagnosed due to its mild symptoms and gradual onset and presents an opportunity to reduce economic and societal costs via early detection and prevention. While researchers have identified several risk factors associated with MCI and AD [7], other predictors, such as spatial navigation ability, may complement existing assessments.

In addition to unmodifiable risk factors such as age [8,9], APOE genetic status [10], and family history [6,11], the Lancet Commission has identified 14 modifiable risk factors (e.g., education, depression, physical inactivity) that account for nearly half of the dementia cases globally [12]. Previous research has found that these factors and other related risks are associated with the outcomes of widely used clinical assessments for cognitive status, including the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) [13–20] and the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) [18,21–26]. Specifically, worse performance on clinical assessments is associated with older age [13,17,18], being female [17,18] [but see 13], less education [13,17], worse health status [13], physical inactivity [27], higher depression [13,15,17,28], more anxiety and stress [15,29], history of alcohol consumption [24,25], smoking [18], sleep [16,30], and lower hearing or vision [19]. The MoCA is often preferred to the MMSE because of its greater sensitivity in the detection of MCI and AD [18,31–33] and, in clinical practice, provides a cheaper and less invasive alternative to a full neuropsychological assessment and the measurement of biomarkers of neurodegeneration.

Critically, biomarkers such as tau and β-amyloid (Aβ) are known to accumulate in brain regions that are essential for spatial navigation [34,35], especially the hippocampus and entorhinal cortex [36–40].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Specifically, place cells in the hippocampus and grid cells in the entorhinal cortex have been found to be key components in encoding spatial locations and tracking positional changes during navigation [41–44]. These findings suggest that spatial ability may be an important predictor of future cognitive status. Indeed, previous research has shown that spatial abilities are among the first skills to deteriorate as a consequence of AD [45–50]. Although the MoCA and neuropsychological assessments emphasise working memory and executive functions and include some basic visuospatial tasks, a more comprehensive assessment of spatial and navigation abilities may further improve the sensitivity of these assessments. Notably, visuospatial tasks often focus on the relations among items at the micro-scale and therefore tap only on a subset of the skills required to navigate a large environment. Navigation in large environments requires additional skills such as the apprehension and integration of spatial information from multiple viewpoints and awareness of one's own movement through space [51,52]. Here, researchers have used several spatial tasks to predict MCI and AD with varying degrees of success [47,53–59] but have not systematically investigated the manner in which these spatial tasks can contribute to common cognitive assessments.

In the present study, we address this limitation of the MoCA and other neuropsychological tests by administering the Spatial Performance Assessment for Cognitive Evaluation (SPACE). SPACE is a novel serious game that combines a variety of spatial tasks from previous research and is designed to identify deficits in spatial and navigation abilities indicative of early signs of cognitive impairment [60]. We tested healthy participants with a wide range of ages using SPACE and the MoCA. Apart from age and gender, we found that none of the common risk factors included in our study were significantly associated with MoCA scores. Notably, using factor analysis, we demonstrate that performance on some tasks in SPACE (i.e., pointing and perspective taking) predict MoCA scores. In comparison, worse performance on other tasks in SPACE (e.g., path integration) is distributed among participants with good and bad MoCA scores. Together, these results suggest that SPACE may tap into another dimension of spatial and navigation abilities that is not currently included in standard screenings of cognitive impairment. We also provide norms with respect to age and gender for each task in SPACE.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

2. METHODS

Participants

We collected data from 348 healthy participants between 21 and 76 years of age (M=45, SD=16) who were recruited via social media platforms (e.g., Facebook, LinkedIn, Telegram) and community flyers. Individuals with neurological disorders, severe visual impairment or blindness, deafness, a history of seizures, epilepsy, or recent acute cardiac events were excluded from the study. Due to unforeseen technical issues, such as app crashes or refusal to answer questionnaires, six participants were entirely excluded from all analyses. Additionally, some participants had incomplete data entries, leading to missing values. These incomplete data were omitted from specific analyses, but the participants themselves were not completely excluded. Ultimately, data from 342 participants were included in the final analyses. Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Parkway Independent Ethics Committee (PIEC/2022/010) and the ETH Zurich Ethics Commission (EK 2021-N-193). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to their involvement in the study. All procedures adhered to the Declaration of Helsinki.

Materials

Instruments

Participants completed both the MoCA and SPACE assessments. Before and after these assessments, participants were asked to complete a series of questionnaires, including a digital visual acuity test, a sociodemographic and health questionnaire, the Santa Barbara Sense of Direction scale [61], a series of usability questionnaires, and a debriefing questionnaire. The digital visual acuity test was based on a Snellen chart and was only used to screen participants for extreme visual impairments or blindness. The results from the usability and debriefing questionnaires are detailed in a separate paper [60].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

MoCA. The MoCA is a widely used cognitive screening tool designed to detect cognitive impairment. The MoCA is composed of a 30-point scale administered in person by a qualified examiner to assess various cognitive domains, including memory, executive function, visuospatial skills, language, attention, and orientation. A score of 25 or below typically indicates MCI. The MoCA has a sensitivity of 90% and a specificity of 87% for predicting cognitive impairment [20]. In addition, the MoCA (AUC values ranging from 0.71 to 0.99) has better diagnostic accuracy for MCI compared to the MMSE (AUC values ranging from 0.43 to 0.94) [32]. For detecting AD, the MoCA also outperforms the MMSE, with AUC values ranging from 0.87 to 0.99 for the MoCA and 0.67 to 0.99 for the MMSE.

SPACE. SPACE is a novel serious game designed to detect deficits in spatial navigation performance that may indicate signs of cognitive impairment [60]. SPACE is deployed on iPads and includes visuospatial training and five other spatial and navigation tasks. The visuospatial training is critical to minimise learning effects and ensure that performance does not reflect the ability to control the device [62]. In SPACE, participants navigate from a first-person perspective from one landmark to another to learn their relative positions as part of a path integration task. Participants are later probed on their spatial knowledge via pointing (Figure 1a), mapping, and associative memory tasks. Participants are also asked to complete a perspective taking task in which they are provided with a top-down representation of the landmarks (Figure 1b). These tasks are specifically developed to probe the acquisition of spatial knowledge at the environmental scale (Table 1).

Table 1. The tasks in SPACE

Visuospatial training	Participants learn to rotate, translate, and integrate these movements by following a robot around the planet from a first-person perspective. In the final training phase, participants are introduced to the logic of the path integration task.
Path integration	Participants follow the robot from the rocket to two landmarks, walking along two sides of a triangle from a first-person perspective. At each landmark, the robot scans a different element that will be recalled in a later task. Participants are asked to return unguided to the original position of the rocket, completing the third side of the triangle. Unlike the final training phase, the rocket takes off at the start of each trial and stays invisible until participants signal its landing after completing the trial.
Pointing	Participants stand in front of a landmark or the rocket and are asked to complete a series of pointing trials to other landmarks encountered during the path integration task.
Mapping	Participants are asked to recreate the configuration of landmarks in the environment they

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

	learned by dragging and dropping icons representing the landmarks from a top-down perspective.
Associative memory	Participants are presented with a corrected top-down map of the landmarks and are asked to drag and drop icons representing the corresponding elements scanned by the robot during the path integration task.
Perspective taking	Participants are provided with the correct top-down map of the environment and are asked to imagine standing at a landmark while facing another landmark. Their task is to indicate the correct bearing toward a third landmark from this perspective.

Sociodemographic and health questionnaire. The sociodemographic and health questionnaire gathered information on the age, gender, education, background, handedness, tablet experience, and prior navigation training of participants. This questionnaire also collected data on their health status, including vision impairments, chronic conditions, and history of traumatic brain injury, as well as their psychosocial well-being, focusing on levels of depression, anxiety, and stress over the past six months. Additionally, the questionnaire addressed health habits, such as smoking, alcohol consumption, incidences of falls in the past year, daily hours of sleep, and weekly hours of walking and vigorous physical activity.



Figure 1. Screenshots from the pointing and perspective taking tasks in SPACE. (a) In the pointing task, participants are positioned at a landmark and asked to point toward another landmark encountered during the path integration task. (b) In the perspective taking task, participants imagine standing at one landmark and facing another. They must then adjust the target icon to indicate the correct direction to a third landmark from that perspective.

Hardware and Software

SPACE was deployed on a 10.2-inch iPad with Wi-Fi and 256 GB memory running iOS version 16.6.1. The vision test was conducted using the iPad app MDCalc (https://www.mdcalc.com). All questionnaire data were collected via the Qualtrics XM online survey platform (www.qualtrics.com)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

on the iPad. Gait data was collected using WitMotion sensors (WT901BLECL Bluetooth 5.0 Accelerometer, https://www.wit-motion.com).

Procedure

Before starting the experiment, the experimenter briefed participants on the aim of the study and informed them of their right to take breaks during the session and their ability to withdraw from the experiment at any time without providing a reason. Participants were then asked to read the information sheet and sign the consent form if they agreed to participate. Participants completed the vision test, the MoCA, and the sociodemographic and health questionnaire before playing SPACE. Each task in SPACE was explained verbally, and additional instructions were displayed within the game interface. After playing SPACE, participants filled out the System Usability Scale (SUS), User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ), NASA Task Load Index (NASA-TLX), Presence questionnaire, and a debriefing questionnaire. To collect gait data, participants walked a circuit for three minutes and then walked the circuit again while counting backwards for three minutes. The gait data were collected for future analyses and will not be included in this paper.

Analysis

We extracted the following performance variables from the tasks in SPACE. *Visuospatial training performance* was measured as the time (in seconds) required to complete the rotation, translation, circuit, and homing phases. *Path integration distance error* referred to the average distance between the participant's final position and the target's original position. Greater distances indicated larger errors. *Egocentric pointing error* was calculated as the average angular deviation (in degrees) between the participant's estimate and the target landmark. *Mapping accuracy* was assessed using bidimensional regression [63] to determine the degree of association (R^2) between the real map of the environment and the map created by the participant. The A*ssociative memory score* was computed as the percentage of correct pairings between scanned elements and landmarks. *Perspective taking error* was measured as the average angular deviation (in degrees) between the participant's estimate and the target landmark. In all analyses, we excluded the associative memory task as an outcome variable

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

from our analysis because of ceiling effects, which limited variability and prevented the models from converging.

Before conducting inferential statistics, we verified whether our data violated the assumptions of the linear regression. Since some of the assumptions were violated, we used robust statistics to reduce the influence of outliers on the regression estimates by giving them less weight in the model-fitting process [64]. We conducted three robust regression models with the MoCA score as the outcome variable. The first model included only age as a continuous predictor variable and gender as a dichotomous predictor variable. In addition to age and gender, the second model included the seven risk factors for dementia from the sociodemographic and health questionnaire (i.e., depression, anxiety, stress, alcohol intake, sleep duration, walking duration, and physical activity duration) as continuous predictor variables. The third model also included the tasks in SPACE (visuospatial, path integration, egocentric pointing, mapping, and perspective taking) as continuous predictors. We compared the first to the second model and the second to the third model using robust Wald tests and assessed the differences in fit in terms of changes in R^2.

Next, we conducted a factor analysis with maximum likelihood extraction and varimax rotation on the MoCA and SPACE scores. Following Dwyer [65], we also used factor extension to evaluate the loadings of factors not included in the original analysis (i.e., age and gender). Finally, we generated age group and gender norms for each of the tasks in SPACE and visualised the data using continuous norming [66] across participant ages. All statistical analyses were performed using R Studio Version 2023.06.0+421 (R Studio PBC, Boston, MA, http://www.rstudio.com). Robust regressions and the Wald tests were conducted using the R packages *robustbase* [67,68] and *WRS2 [69]*. We used the *psych* R package for the factor analysis [70]. Continuous norming was conducted using the *cNORM* R package [71]. The threshold for significance for all tests was set at $\alpha = .05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

3. RESULTS

Descriptive statistics for all predictor and outcome variables are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for the dementia risk factors and the tasks in SPACE.

	Descriptive Statistics		
Variable categorical	**Level**		**Percentage**
Gender	Female		56.43
	Male		43.57
Education	High school		27.49
	University		72.51
Variable continuous	**Median**	**Mean**	**SD**
MoCA	27.00	26.68	2.33
Age	43.50	45.13	16.20
Depression	2.00	2.43	1.78
Anxiety	3.00	3.23	2.04
Stress	3.00	3.95	2.23
Alcohol intake	0.00	0.73	2.32
Sleep	7.00	6.75	0.90
Walking	7.00	9.95	9.61
Physical activity	2.00	2.80	2.86
Visuospatial training	241.29	246.14	37.15
Path integration	226.15	246.46	106.80
Pointing	66.45	65.33	20.32
Mapping	0.41	0.46	0.31
Perspective taking	20.64	28.70	23.12

Results of the regression models are presented in Table 3. The first robust regression model, including age and gender, significantly explained 11.2% of the variance in MoCA scores ($\chi^2(2) = 36.819$, $p < 0.001$). The results indicated that age has a significant negative effect on MoCA scores ($\beta = -0.27$, $p < 0.001$), while gender was not significant ($\beta = -0.18$, $p = 0.060$). The second model, including the individual risk factors as predictors in addition to age and gender, explained an additional 2.4% of the variance in MoCA scores. However, the second model did not significantly explain more variance than the first model ($\chi^2(8) = 9.0293$, $p = 0.340$). According to this second model, age remained a significant predictor ($\beta = -0.25$, $p < 0.001$), but gender also became significant ($\beta = -0.21$, $p = 0.032$). None of the individual risk factors significantly affected MoCA scores. The third model, including the scores from the spatial navigation tasks in SPACE, explained an additional 6.3% of the variance, which was a significant improvement over the second model ($\chi^2(5) = 28.129$, $p < 0.001$). According to this third model, age ($\beta = -0.12$, $p = 0.044$) and gender ($\beta = -0.32$, $p < 0.001$) remained significant

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

predictors. Additionally, the pointing (β = -0.12, p = 0.031) and perspective taking (β = -0.17, p = 0.007) tasks significantly predicted MoCA scores.

Table 3. Predictive models of MoCA scores using various risk factors for dementia and tasks from the SPACE assessment.

	MoCA		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	Unstandardised estimates (std. Error)		
(Intercept)	28.874*** (0.293)	29.837*** (1.175)	32.205*** (1.320)
Age	**-0.039*** (0.007)**	**-0.036*** (0.007)**	**-0.017* (0.008)**
Gender [Male]	-0.408 (0.216)	**-0.481* (0.223)**	**-0.742** (0.222)**
Education [University]		0.396 (0.245)	0.201 (0.260)
Depression		0.042 (0.073)	0.034 (0.072)
Anxiety		0.008 (0.089)	0.033 (0.091)
Stress		-0.003 (0.081)	-0.019 (0.081)
Alcohol intake		0.043 (0.069)	0.031 (0.083)
Sleep		-0.222 (0.141)	-0.168 (0.147)
Walking		-0.010 (0.013)	-0.015 (0.014)
Physical activity		0.034 (0.034)	0.032 (0.032)
Visuospatial training			-0.005 (0.003)
Path integration			-0.001 (0.001)
Pointing			**-0.013* (0.006)**
Mapping			-0.687 (0.394)
Perspective taking			**-0.017** (0.006)**
Observations	330	330	330
R^2	0.112	0.136	0.199
Adjusted R^2	0.107	0.109	0.161
Residual Std. Error	1.801 (df = 327)	1.764 (df = 319)	1.711 (df = 314)

Note: **Model 1** (MoCA ~ Age + Gender); **Model 2** (MoCA ~ Age + Gender + Education + Depression + Anxiety + Stress + Alcohol intake + Sleep + Walking + Physical activity); **Model 3** (MoCA ~ Age + Gender + Education + Depression + Anxiety + Stress + Alcohol intake + Sleep + Walking + Physical activity + Visuospatial + Path integration + Pointing + Mapping + Perspective taking). * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

The factor analysis included the variables age, gender, MoCA scores, and the tasks in the SPACE assessment. A correlation analysis revealed several significant relationships, suggesting potential underlying factors that could be extracted from the data (Figure 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. The correlation matrix presents Spearman's correlation coefficients in the lower triangle, density plots along the diagonal illustrating data distributions, and scatterplots in the upper triangle showing the relationships between pairs of variables. Orange indicates positive correlations, and blue represents negative correlations.

Eigenvalues and a parallel analysis indicated the retention of two factors for the factor analysis (Figure 3). The eigenvalue for the first factor was 2.66, and the eigenvalue for the second factor was 1.10, indicating that these two factors together accounted for 23% of the total variance in the data (Figure 4). Specifically, ML1 and ML2 explained 8% and 15% of the total variance, respectively. ML1 had a moderate positive loading on visuospatial training ($\lambda = 0.30$), stronger positive loadings on pointing error ($\lambda = 0.54$) and path integration error ($\lambda = 0.41$) tasks, and a negative loading on the mapping accuracy ($\lambda = -0.67$). This factor appears to capture spatial and navigational abilities. ML2 had a strong positive loading on the perspective taking error ($\lambda = 0.56$) and a negative loading on MoCA scores ($\lambda = -0.63$), suggesting that this factor is related to cognitive and perceptual abilities

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

(Figure 3). The standardised loadings for age and gender on ML1 and ML2 showed that age had moderate loadings on both factors (ML1: $\lambda = 0.41$, ML2: $\lambda = 0.53$), while gender had no impact (ML1: $\lambda = 0.04$, ML2: $\lambda = 0.11$).



Figure 3. The diagram illustrates the results of the factor analysis for the SPACE tasks and MoCA scores, including the impact of age and gender extensions. Negative loadings are highlighted in red.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. A series of scatter plots for ML1 and ML2, with each dot representing an individual participant. (a) The biplot displays loadings of MoCA and SPACE task scores on extracted factors (ML1 and ML2) and illustrates the relationships among variables. The dots are coloured according to the participants' ages. (b) The scatter plot of the factors ML1 and ML2 with dots coloured according to MoCA scores (reversed for visualisation) along a light green (low error) to dark green (high error) gradient. (c) The scatter plot of the factors ML1 and ML2 with dots coloured according to the errors on the perspective taking task along a light yellow (low error) to dark yellow (high error) gradient. (d) The scatter plot of the factors ML1 and ML2 with dots coloured according to errors from the navigation tasks in SPACE along a light orange (low error) to dark orange (high error) gradient. (e) The scatter plot of the factors ML1 and ML2 with dots coloured according to the difference between reversed MoCA scores and errors from the navigation tasks in SPACE along a gradient from green (difference favouring MoCA) to red (difference favouring the navigation tasks in SPACE). The visualisation demonstrates similar patterns for the MoCA and the perspective taking task. In addition, there are regions of the biplot representing participants performing worse on the navigation tasks in SPACE despite performing well on the MoCA. At the same time, some participants performed worse on the MoCA despite performing well on the navigation tasks in SPACE.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

To facilitate the application of SPACE for the detection of cognitive impairment, we computed age (Table 4) and gender (Table S1) norms for each of the tasks in SPACE. Age norms are listed by age group (i.e., 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and older than 60) and visualised using continuous norming in Figure 5.

Table 4. Normative data for age group.

Task	Age group	Mean	SD	10th Percentile	25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile	90th Percentile
Visuospatial	21-29	227.18	26.07	260.41	244.32	224.97	213.39	195.35
	30-39	234.95	22.97	264.13	250.18	236.16	218.43	208.24
	40-49	241.26	31.82	286.21	261.84	242.96	222.35	203.86
	50-59	260.15	35.26	308.13	288.98	260.64	228.42	220.05
	60+	266.33	42.55	324.45	291.53	258.38	239.79	220.07
Path integration	21-29	193.76	64.09	268.19	227.29	192.08	153.20	109.94
	30-39	212.49	82.81	315.49	263.62	212.32	144.91	114.27
	40-49	229.80	100.35	391.42	270.33	201.86	157.00	125.75
	50-59	272.85	105.21	438.03	348.96	247.11	196.61	173.15
	60+	299.25	100.17	427.16	350.42	291.64	232.78	179.26
Pointing	21-29	54.96	19.74	76.97	68.87	52.36	42.67	29.77
	30-39	58.55	19.31	79.29	70.30	61.96	48.51	30.92
	40-49	67.09	18.33	89.78	80.29	66.34	56.43	43.77
	50-59	71.81	17.62	94.07	79.04	72.16	61.81	51.04
	60+	74.14	15.08	96.99	82.43	73.21	64.31	56.69
Mapping	21-29	0.54	0.32	0.14	0.22	0.53	0.87	0.95
	30-39	0.52	0.33	0.11	0.24	0.51	0.86	0.95
	40-49	0.48	0.33	0.11	0.17	0.41	0.83	0.95
	50-59	0.36	0.29	0.08	0.13	0.28	0.51	0.88
	60+	0.38	0.28	0.82	0.56	0.29	0.56	0.82
Perspective taking	21-29	18.16	13.15	33.44	24.02	14.59	8.82	5.65
	30-39	21.93	18.11	51.36	33.76	13.60	8.70	5.56
	40-49	25.76	21.56	56.47	36.34	18.26	10.54	6.61
	50-59	31.58	21.05	61.25	47.41	25.49	14.62	7.43
	60+	39.80	26.21	73.00	60.17	33.07	19.38	11.53

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 5. Age norms for the different tasks in SPACE. In the plots, error measures are used for visuospatial tasks, path integration, egocentric pointing, and perspective taking. The mapping task, however, assesses performance using an accuracy score.

4. DISCUSSION

This study investigates how dementia risk factors and the performance on spatial navigation tasks in SPACE predict MoCA scores as an indicator of cognitive impairment. The results of our regression analysis revealed that the pointing and perspective taking tasks contributed to the prediction of MoCA beyond age and gender. Despite the established relationships between modifiable risk factors and cognitive impairment [12,13,15], none of the modifiable risk factors in our sample were significant predictors of MoCA scores. Our exploratory factor analysis further revealed that MoCA scores and performance on the perspective taking task in SPACE were associated with the same factor that was separate from the four navigation-related tasks in SPACE. In addition, we identified two clusters of participants that either performed well on the MoCA and poorly on the navigation tasks or well on the navigation tasks and poorly on the MoCA, suggesting that cognitive assessments may benefit from the combination of MoCA and navigation tasks. We argue that incorporating spatial navigation assessments into cognitive screening tests may improve their sensitivity and offer a more comprehensive and accurate evaluation of cognitive functioning.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

A hallmark of MCI and AD is damage to the entorhinal cortex and hippocampus caused by the excessive accumulation of the β-amyloid peptides into neuritic plaques and an abnormal form of the protein tau into neurofibrillary tangles. Since the structures in the medial temporal lobe (MTL) are often associated with working memory and long-term declarative memory [72–74], tasks such as the digit span task and delayed recall are typically used to detect cognitive impairment [31]. Indeed, the MoCA includes the digit span task and delayed recall, as well as visuospatial tasks such as trail-making and cube drawing [20,31]. While both visuospatial tasks require patients to reconstruct small-scale spatial relations, these tasks do not involve the same scale and complexity of navigation skills associated with the MTL. Similar to how performance on declarative memory tasks is used to identify declarative memory impairment, performance on navigation tasks can contribute to the detection of the impairment of spatial skills that rely on the MTL but that are not yet assessed by the MoCA.

SPACE includes various navigation tasks such as visuospatial training, path integration, pointing, and mapping. There is now substantial evidence that performance on each of these individual tasks is associated with age [75,76] and can discriminate with varying accuracy between healthy, MCI, and AD patients [46,48,50,55,77]. For example, Howett and colleagues [48] tested healthy and MCI patients in an immersive path integration task and found that path integration error could discriminate between healthy participants and patients with MCI, especially for biomarker-positive patients (CSF amyloid-β and total tau). Notably, the ability of the path integration tasks to discriminate between biomarker-positive and biomarker-negative patients was significantly higher than the Trail Making Test-B and the Four Mountains Test. In addition, deIpolyi and colleagues [46] found that, although MCI and mild AD patients could recognise landmarks along a learned route, these patients could not accurately identify landmark locations from a map or draw a map of the route. Similar to Howett and colleagues [48], performance on a neuropsychological assessment, including the MMSE and measures of working memory and visuospatial memory, did not discriminate between patients with and without spatial impairments [46]. Comparable results were found in a virtual supermarket test in which participants were asked to orient to different goal locations after learning a route [55]. In that study, researchers found that the scores from this spatial orientation task discriminate between control, AD,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

and the Frontotemporal Dementia participants. Together, this research suggests that spatial navigation assessments can substitute, complement, or even outperform traditional screenings for cognitive impairment.

While previous research focuses on patients who had already been clinically diagnosed as cognitively impaired, we tested participants without a diagnosis and with a wide range of ages. Critically, we found that performance on the pointing and perspective taking tasks in SPACE predicted MoCA scores. Similarly, Tinella and colleagues [78] found a significant correlation between MoCA scores and a perspective taking task of the same format [79] for a large sample with a wide range of ages. Interestingly, this relationship was not found in other studies [80,81] with a higher cutoff for MoCA scores (22 instead of 17), suggesting that perspective taking may be useful for discriminating between patients with different levels of cognitive impairment. Indeed, researchers have found that perspective taking tasks can discriminate between healthy and MCI participants [82], healthy and AD participants [58,82], and MCI and AD participants [58]. As part of SPACE, we introduce a variation of the perspective taking task that predicts MoCA scores and may be more scalable for broader deployment and unsupervised early screening.

Furthermore, we explored the factor structure underlying MoCA and the tasks in SPACE, which revealed two distinct factors. The first factor combined MoCA and the perspective taking task, reinforcing the notion that the perspective taking task in SPACE could provide an alternative to the MoCA. The second factor combined the navigation tasks in SPACE (i.e., visuospatial training, path integration, pointing, and mapping) and may represent an overlooked dimension of cognitive functioning not captured by existing cognitive assessments such as the MoCA. Meneghetti and colleagues [52] employed confirmatory factor analysis to derive the structure underlying visuospatial tasks and multiple wayfinding-related questionnaires. After finding that wayfinding inclinations (as derived from the questionnaires) underlie a separate factor from the visuospatial tasks, they showed that both factors predicted performance on navigation tasks in VR. Critically, the authors suggested that wayfinding inclinations predicted navigation recall performance because participants were asked to consider space at a larger scale. In addition, Hegarty and colleagues [51] showed that small-scale

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

spatial tasks, such as mental rotation, are more strongly related to large-scale tasks in visual media than to learning in a real-world environment. However, they also found that a perspective taking task involving four objects was not related to tasks in either visual media or the real environment. Together, these findings suggest that perspective taking and large-scale navigation tasks represent different aspects of cognitive abilities. Indeed, while many of our participants performed either well or poorly on both SPACE and the MoCA, a substantial portion performed well on either SPACE or the MoCA. The present study provides evidence to support the claim that both types of spatial tasks may be used to complement existing screenings for cognitive impairment.

Our factor analysis extension also revealed an effect of age on both factors (but no relationship with gender). According to previous research, spatial memory and abilities tend to decline with age because of altered computations, functional deficits, and navigational impairments [75,83]. As expected, our regression model revealed that older participants scored lower on the MoCA [84–89], and this difference may be more pronounced because of the wide age range in our sample (21 to 76). Our regression analysis also found that men had lower MoCA scores than women, aligning with prior research showing a female advantage in both older [84,85,89] and younger populations [86], but see [87] for no differences and [88] for a male advantage. Notably, none of the modifiable risk factors in our second model significantly predicted MoCA scores. Specifically, we did not observe a significant effect of education in our study, despite education often being associated with higher MoCA scores [84–89]. These conflicting results may be attributable to the high education level of our sample, with only four participants without a high school diploma. The null effects for depression, anxiety, and stress may be attributable to a lack of sensitivity in our single-item scales for these conditions, although previous research suggests that a high correspondence between single items and established measures such as the Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale [90] and the Geriatric Depression Scale [91]. In our study, neither physical activity nor walking was associated with MoCA scores. While sustained physical activity has been found to protect against cognitive impairment [92], the results are mixed [93,94], and cognitive impairment can instead be the cause of a reduction in physical activity. Although previous studies link healthy lifestyles with a lower risk of dementia [95], we found no

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

association between alcohol consumption and MoCA scores in our sample. These results may be partially explained by the extremely low number of drinkers in our study. In more homogeneous and possibly healthier populations, these risk factors may have a reduced sensitivity to predict cognitive impairment.

The present study has at least three notable limitations. First, because of the inclusion of younger participants, we had less than typical variation in several risk factors, including education and smoking. Second, we did not test participants longitudinally and do not know their eventual cognitive status in old age. Third, we focus on the results of a widely used cognitive assessment (i.e., the MoCA), which is not in itself a diagnostic tool. Clinical diagnoses would require a full neuropsychological exam including tests for biomarkers of neurodegeneration. Despite these limitations, future work can benefit from including SPACE in cognitive assessments, along with the normative data provided in the present study for the early discrimination of healthy and pathological trajectories. Future work will also address the limitations of the present study by testing a more targeted age group over a longer period of time. Notably, these tests will include biomarkers as part of a diagnostic tool to further evaluate the utility of SPACE.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Digital assessments are becoming increasingly popular for assessing cognitive impairments [96–99]. SPACE differs from traditional cognitive assessments by providing spatial tasks in large and complex environments rather than small-scale tasks and questionnaires that focus solely on visuospatial skills, attention, and memory. Here, we show that a novel tablet-based serious game, SPACE, has the potential to complement traditional assessments of cognitive impairment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Giorgio Colombo: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Visualization, Software, Project administration, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Karolina Minta:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Visualization, Project administration, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Tyler Thrash:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Formal analysis, Conceptualization. **Jascha Grübel:** Writing – review & editing, Software, Formal analysis. **Jan Wiener:** Writing – review & editing. **Marios Avraamides:** Writing – review & editing. **Christoph Hölscher:** Writing – review & editing. **Victor R. Schinazi:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization.

The research was conducted at the Future Health Technologies programme which was established collaboratively between ETH Zurich and the National Research Foundation Singapore. This research is supported by the National Research Foundation, Prime Minister's Office, Singapore under its Campus for Research Excellence and Technological Enterprise (CREATE) programme and ETH Zürich. We would like to thank Tai Wei Lin Eunice, Martina Neudecker, Simona Margraf, and Sophia Niklaus for assisting with the data collection.

Declarations of interest: none.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

7. REFERENCES

[1] World Health Organization. Dementia 2023. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/dementia.
[2] Patterson C. World Alzheimer Report 2018. Alzheimer's Disease International (ADI); 2018.
[3] National Center for Health Statistics. National Vital Statistics System, Mortality 2018-2021. Mortality 2018-2021 2021.
[4] Nandi A, Counts N, Bröker J, Malik S, Chen S, Han R, et al. Cost of care for Alzheimer's disease and related dementias in the United States: 2016 to 2060. NPJ Aging 2024;10:13.
[5] Rajan KB, Weuve J, Barnes LL, McAninch EA, Wilson RS, Evans DA. Population estimate of people with clinical Alzheimer's disease and mild cognitive impairment in the United States (2020-2060). Alzheimers Dement 2021;17:1966–75.
[6] Alzheimer's Association. 2024 Alzheimer's Disease Facts and Figures. 2024.
[7] Livingston G, Huntley J, Sommerlad A, Ames D, Ballard C, Banerjee S, et al. Dementia prevention, intervention, and care: 2020 report of the Lancet Commission. Lancet 2020;396:413–46.
[8] Hebert LE, Bienias JL, Aggarwal NT, Wilson RS, Bennett DA, Shah RC, et al. Change in risk of Alzheimer disease over time. Neurology 2010;75:786–91.
[9] Alzheimer's Disease Fact Sheet. National Institute on Aging 2023. https://www.nia.nih.gov/health/alzheimers-and-dementia/alzheimers-disease-fact-sheet (accessed April 18, 2024).
[10] Kunz L, Schröder TN, Lee H, Montag C, Lachmann B, Sariyska R, et al. Reduced grid-cell–like representations in adults at genetic risk for Alzheimer's disease. Science 2015;350:430–3.
[11] Hebert LE, Weuve J, Scherr PA, Evans DA. Alzheimer disease in the United States (2010-2050) estimated using the 2010 census. Neurology 2013;80:1778–83.
[12] Livingston G, Huntley J, Liu KY, Costafreda SG, Selbæk G, Alladi S, et al. Dementia prevention, intervention, and care: 2024 report of the Lancet standing Commission. Lancet 2024. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(24)01296-0.
[13] Dale W, Kotwal AA, Shega JW, Schumm LP, Kern DW, Pinto JM, et al. Cognitive Function and its Risk Factors Among Older US Adults Living at Home. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord 2018;32:207–13.
[14] Freire ACC, Pondé MP, Liu A, Caron J. Anxiety and Depression as Longitudinal Predictors of Mild Cognitive Impairment in Older Adults. Can J Psychiatry 2017;62:343–50.
[15] Del Brutto OH, Mera RM, Del Brutto VJ, Maestre GE, Gardener H, Zambrano M, et al. Influence of depression, anxiety and stress on cognitive performance in community□dwelling older adults living in rural Ecuador: Results of the Atahualpa Project. Geriatr Gerontol Int 2015;15:508–14.
[16] Zawar I, Mattos MK, Manning C, Quigg M. Sleep Disturbances, Cognitive Status, and Biomarkers of Dementia. J Alzheimers Dis 2022;89:1367–74.
[17] Bugallo-Carrera C, Dosil-Díaz C, Pereiro AX, Anido-Rifón L, Gandoy-Crego M. Factors that indicate performance on the MoCA 7.3 in healthy adults over 50 years old. BMC Geriatr 2024;24:482.
[18] Jia X, Wang Z, Huang F, Su C, Du W, Jiang H, et al. A comparison of the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) with the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) for mild cognitive impairment screening in Chinese middle-aged and older population: a cross-sectional study. BMC Psychiatry 2021;21:485.
[19] Dupuis K, Pichora-Fuller MK, Chasteen AL, Marchuk V, Singh G, Smith SL. Effects of hearing and vision impairments on the Montreal Cognitive Assessment. Neuropsychol Dev Cogn B Aging Neuropsychol Cogn 2015;22:413–37.
[20] Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bédirian V, Charbonneau S, Whitehead V, Collin I, et al. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: a brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. J Am Geriatr Soc 2005;53:695–9.
[21] Lv Y, Su H, Li R, Yang Z, Chen Q, Zhang D, et al. A cross-sectional study of the major risk factor at different levels of cognitive performance within Chinese-origin middle-aged and elderly individuals. J Affect Disord 2024;349:377–83.
[22] Kim D. Effects of depression on changes in cognitive function in older adults: A fixed-effects model analysis using the Korean Longitudinal Study of Aging (KLoSA). Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord 2022;36:319–26.
[23] Paterniti S, Verdier-Taillefer M-H, Dufouil C, Alpérovitch A. Depressive symptoms and cognitive decline in elderly people. Br J Psychiatry 2002;181:406–10.
[24] Heymann D, Stern Y, Cosentino S, Tatarina-Nulman O, Dorrejo JN, Gu Y. The association between alcohol use and the progression of Alzheimer's disease. Curr Alzheimer Res 2016;13:1356–62.
[25] Xu G, Liu X, Yin Q, Zhu W, Zhang R, Fan X. Alcohol consumption and transition of mild cognitive impairment to dementia. Psychiatry Clin Neurosci 2009;63:43–9.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

[26] Folstein MF. The Mini-Mental State Examination. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1983;40:812.
[27] Iso-Markku P, Aaltonen S, Kujala UM, Halme H-L, Phipps D, Knittle K, et al. Physical activity and cognitive decline among older adults. JAMA Netw Open 2024;7:e2354285.
[28] Byers AL, Yaffe K. Depression and risk of developing dementia. Nat Rev Neurol 2011;7:323–31.
[29] Potvin O, Hudon C, Dion M, Grenier S, Préville M. Anxiety disorders, depressive episodes and cognitive impairment no dementia in community□dwelling older men and women. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry 2011;26:1080–8.
[30] McSorley VE, Bin YS, Lauderdale DS. Associations of sleep characteristics with cognitive function and decline among older adults. Am J Epidemiol 2019;188:1066–75.
[31] Julayanont P, Nasreddine ZS. Montreal cognitive assessment (MoCA): Concept and clinical review. Cognitive Screening Instruments, Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2017, p. 139–95.
[32] Pinto TCC, Machado L, Bulgacov TM, Rodrigues-Júnior AL, Costa MLG, Ximenes RCC, et al. Is the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) screening superior to the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) in the detection of mild cognitive impairment (MCI) and Alzheimer's Disease (AD) in the elderly? Int Psychogeriatr 2019;31:491–504.
[33] Tsai J-C, Chen C-W, Chu H, Yang H-L, Chung M-H, Liao Y-M, et al. Comparing the Sensitivity, Specificity, and Predictive Values of the Montreal Cognitive Assessment and Mini-Mental State Examination When Screening People for Mild Cognitive Impairment and Dementia in Chinese Population. Arch Psychiatr Nurs 2016;30:486–91.
[34] Weisberg SM, Schinazi VR, Newcombe NS, Shipley TF, Epstein RA. Variations in cognitive maps: understanding individual differences in navigation. J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn 2014;40:669–82.
[35] Fyhn M, Molden S, Witter MP, Moser EI, Moser M-B. Spatial Representation in the Entorhinal Cortex. Science 2004;305:1258–64.
[36] Barthélemy NR, Li Y, Joseph-Mathurin N, Gordon BA, Hassenstab J, Benzinger TLS, et al. A soluble phosphorylated tau signature links tau, amyloid and the evolution of stages of dominantly inherited Alzheimer's disease. Nat Med 2020;26:398–407.
[37] Chételat G, Villemagne VL, Bourgeat P, Pike KE, Jones G, Ames D, et al. Relationship between atrophy and β□amyloid deposition in Alzheimer disease. Ann Neurol 2010;67:317–24.
[38] Jack CR Jr, Wiste HJ, Vemuri P, Weigand SD, Senjem ML, Zeng G, et al. Brain beta-amyloid measures and magnetic resonance imaging atrophy both predict time-to-progression from mild cognitive impairment to Alzheimer's disease. Brain 2010;133:3336–48.
[39] Jack CR Jr, Holtzman DM. Biomarker modeling of Alzheimer's disease. Neuron 2013;80:1347–58.
[40] Schmidt-Hieber C, Häusser M. Cellular mechanisms of spatial navigation in the medial entorhinal cortex. Nat Neurosci 2013;16:325–31.
[41] Epstein RA, Patai EZ, Julian JB, Spiers HJ. The cognitive map in humans: spatial navigation and beyond. Nat Neurosci 2017;20:1504–13.
[42] Hafting T, Fyhn M, Molden S, Moser M-B, Moser EI. Microstructure of a spatial map in the entorhinal cortex. Nature 2005;436:801–6.
[43] O'Keefe J, Nadel L. The hippocampus as a cognitive map. Behav Brain Sci 1979;2:487–94.
[44] McNaughton BL, Battaglia FP, Jensen O, Moser EI, Moser M-B. Path integration and the neural basis of the "cognitive map." Nat Rev Neurosci 2006;7:663–78.
[45] Coughlan G, Laczó J, Hort J, Minihane A-M, Hornberger M. Spatial navigation deficits - overlooked cognitive marker for preclinical Alzheimer disease? Nat Rev Neurol 2018;14:496–506.
[46] deIpolyi AR, Rankin KP, Mucke L, Miller BL, Gorno-Tempini ML. Spatial cognition and the human navigation network in AD and MCI. Neurology 2007;69:986–97.
[47] Hort J, Laczó J, Vyhnálek M, Bojar M, Bureš J, Vlček K. Spatial navigation deficit in amnestic mild cognitive impairment. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 2007;104:4042–7.
[48] Howett D, Castegnaro A, Krzywicka K, Hagman J, Marchment D, Henson R, et al. Differentiation of mild cognitive impairment using an entorhinal cortex-based test of virtual reality navigation. Brain 2019;142:1751–66.
[49] Castegnaro A, Ji Z, Rudzka K, Chan D, Burgess N. Overestimation in angular path integration precedes Alzheimer's dementia. Curr Biol 2023. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2023.09.047.
[50] Segen V, Ying J, Morgan E, Brandon M, Wolbers T. Path integration in normal aging and Alzheimer's disease. Trends Cogn Sci 2022;26:142–58.
[51] Hegarty M, Montello DR, Richardson AE, Ishikawa T, Lovelace K. Spatial abilities at different scales: Individual differences in aptitude-test performance and spatial-layout learning. Intelligence 2006;34:151–76.
[52] Meneghetti C, Miola L, Toffalini E, Pastore M, Pazzaglia F. Learning from navigation, and tasks assessing its accuracy: The role of visuospatial abilities and wayfinding inclinations. J Environ Psychol 2021;75:101614.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

[53] van der Ham IJM, Claessen MHG, Evers AWM, van der Kuil MNA. Large-scale assessment of human navigation ability across the lifespan. Sci Rep 2020;10:3299.
[54] Wiener JM, Carroll D, Moeller S, Bibi I, Ivanova D, Allen P, et al. A novel virtual-reality-based route-learning test suite: Assessing the effects of cognitive aging on navigation. Behav Res Methods 2020;52:630–40.
[55] Tu S, Wong S, Hodges JR, Irish M, Piguet O, Hornberger M. Lost in spatial translation - A novel tool to objectively assess spatial disorientation in Alzheimer's disease and frontotemporal dementia. Cortex 2015;67:83–94.
[56] Coughlan G, Coutrot A, Khondoker M, Minihane A-M, Spiers H, Hornberger M. Toward personalized cognitive diagnostics of at-genetic-risk Alzheimer's disease. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2019;116:9285–92.
[57] Berron D, Glanz W, Clark L, Basche K, Grande X, Güsten J, et al. A remote digital memory composite to detect cognitive impairment in memory clinic samples in unsupervised settings using mobile devices. NPJ Digit Med 2024;7:79.
[58] Chan D, Gallaher LM, Moodley K, Minati L, Burgess N, Hartley T. The 4 Mountains Test: A Short Test of Spatial Memory with High Sensitivity for the Diagnosis of Pre-dementia Alzheimer's Disease. J Vis Exp 2016. https://doi.org/10.3791/54454.
[59] Rekers S, Finke C. Translating spatial navigation evaluation from experimental to clinical settings: The virtual environments navigation assessment (VIENNA). Behav Res Methods 2024;56:2033–48.
[60] Colombo G, Minta K, Grübel J, Tai WLE, Hölscher C, Schinazi VR. Detecting cognitive impairment through an age-friendly serious game: The development and usability of the Spatial Performance Assessment for Cognitive Evaluation (SPACE). Comput Human Behav 2024;160:108349.
[61] Hegarty M, Richardson AE, Montello DR, Lovelace K, Subbiah I. Development of a self-report measure of environmental spatial ability. Intelligence 2002;30:425–47.
[62] Grübel J, Thrash T, Hölscher C, Schinazi VR. Evaluation of a conceptual framework for predicting navigation performance in virtual reality. PLoS One 2017;12:e0184682.
[63] Tobler WR. Computation of the correspondence of geographical patterns. Pap Reg Sci 1965;15:131–9.
[64] Field AP, Wilcox RR. Robust statistical methods: A primer for clinical psychology and experimental psychopathology researchers. Behav Res Ther 2017;98:19–38.
[65] Dwyer PS. The determination of the factor loadings of a given test from the known factor loadings of other tests. Psychometrika 1937;2:173–8.
[66] Lenhard A, Lenhard W, Suggate S, Segerer R. A Continuous Solution to the Norming Problem. Assessment 2018;25:112–25.
[67] Maechler M, Rousseeuw P, Croux C, Todorov V, Ruckstuhl A, Salibian-Barrera M, et al. robustbase: Basic Robust Statistics 2023.
[68] Todorov V, Filzmoser P. An Object-Oriented Framework for Robust Multivariate Analysis. Journal of Statistical Software 2009;32:1–47.
[69] Mair P, Wilcox R. Robust statistical methods in R using the WRS2 package. Behav Res Methods 2020;52:464–88.
[70] Revelle W. psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research. CRAN: Contributed Packages 2007. https://doi.org/10.32614/cran.package.psych.
[71] Lenhard A, Lenhard W, Gary S. CNORM - generating continuous test norms. Psychometrica 2018. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.25821.26082.
[72] Bird CM, Burgess N. The hippocampus and memory: insights from spatial processing. Nat Rev Neurosci 2008;9:182–94.
[73] Eichenbaum H. The hippocampus and declarative memory: cognitive mechanisms and neural codes. Behav Brain Res 2001;127:199–207.
[74] Squire LR. Declarative and nondeclarative memory: multiple brain systems supporting learning and memory. J Cogn Neurosci 1992;4:232–43.
[75] Lester AW, Moffat SD, Wiener JM, Barnes CA, Wolbers T. The Aging Navigational System. Neuron 2017;95:1019–35.
[76] Stangl M, Kanitscheider I, Riemer M, Fiete I, Wolbers T. Sources of path integration error in young and aging humans. Nat Commun 2020;11:2626.
[77] Mitolo M, Gardini S, Fasano F, Crisi G, Pelosi A, Pazzaglia F, et al. Visuospatial memory and neuroimaging correlates in mild cognitive impairment. J Alzheimers Dis 2013;35:75–90.
[78] Tinella L, Lopez A, Caffò AO, Nardulli F, Grattagliano I, Bosco A. What these findings tell us. Reply to Kelly et al. What do these findings tell us? Comment on "tinella et al. Cognitive efficiency and fitness-to-drive along the lifespan: The mediation effect of visuospatial transformations. Brain sci. 2021, 11, 1028." Brain Sci 2022;12:178.
[79] Kozhevnikov M, Hegarty M. A dissociation between object manipulation spatial ability and spatial orientation ability. Mem Cognit 7 2001;29:745–56.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

[80] Muffato V, Miola L, Pazzaglia F, Meneghetti C. Map learning in aging individuals: The role of cognitive functioning and visuospatial factors. Brain Sci 2021;11:1033.
[81] Muffato V, De Beni R. Path learning from navigation in aging: The role of cognitive functioning and wayfinding inclinations. Front Hum Neurosci 2020;14:8.
[82] Laczó M, Wiener JM, Kalinova J, Matuskova V, Vyhnalek M, Hort J, et al. Spatial navigation and visuospatial strategies in typical and atypical aging. Brain Sci 2021;11:1421.
[83] Zancada-Menendez C, Sampedro-Piquero P, Lopez L, McNamara TP. Age and gender differences in spatial perspective taking. Aging Clin Exp Res 2016;28:289–96.
[84] Engedal K, Gjøra L, Bredholt T, Thingstad P, Tangen GG, Ernstsen L, et al. Sex differences on Montreal Cognitive Assessment and Mini-Mental State Examination scores and the value of self-report of memory problems among community dwelling people 70 years and above: The HUNT study. Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord 2021;50:74–84.
[85] Borland E, Nägga K, Nilsson PM, Minthon L, Nilsson ED, Palmqvist S. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment: Normative data from a large Swedish population-based cohort. J Alzheimers Dis 2017;59:893–901.
[86] Larouche E, Tremblay M-P, Potvin O, Laforest S, Bergeron D, Laforce R, et al. Normative data for the Montreal Cognitive Assessment in middle-aged and elderly Quebec-French people. Arch Clin Neuropsychol 2016;31:819–26.
[87] Santangelo G, Siciliano M, Pedone R, Vitale C, Falco F, Bisogno R, et al. Normative data for the Montreal Cognitive Assessment in an Italian population sample. Neurol Sci 2015;36:585–91.
[88] Gonçalves J, Gerardo B, Nogueira J, Afonso RM, Freitas S. Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA): An update normative study for the Portuguese population. Appl Neuropsychol Adult 2023:1–7.
[89] Thomann AE, Goettel N, Monsch RJ, Berres M, Jahn T, Steiner LA, et al. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment: Normative data from a German-speaking cohort and comparison with international normative samples. J Alzheimers Dis 2018;64:643–55.
[90] Verster JC, Sandalova E, Garssen J, Bruce G. The use of single-item ratings versus traditional multiple-item questionnaires to assess mood and health. Eur J Investig Health Psychol Educ 2021;11:183–98.
[91] McCormack B, Boldy D, Lewin G, McCormack GR. Screening for depression among older adults referred to home care services: A single-item depression screener versus the Geriatric Depression Scale. Home Health Care Manag Pract 2011;23:13–9.
[92] Iso-Markku P, Kujala UM, Knittle K, Polet J, Vuoksimaa E, Waller K. Physical activity as a protective factor for dementia and Alzheimer's disease: systematic review, meta-analysis and quality assessment of cohort and case–control studies. Br J Sports Med 2022;56:701–9.
[93] Wilson RS, Mendes De Leon CF, Barnes LL, Schneider JA, Bienias JL, Evans DA, et al. Participation in cognitively stimulating activities and risk of incident Alzheimer disease. JAMA 2002;287:742–8.
[94] Greendale GA, Han W, Huang M, Upchurch DM, Karvonen-Gutierrez C, Avis NE, et al. Longitudinal assessment of physical activity and cognitive outcomes among women at midlife. JAMA Netw Open 2021;4:e213227.
[95] Dhana K, Franco OH, Ritz EM, Ford CN, Desai P, Krueger KR, et al. Healthy lifestyle and life expectancy with and without Alzheimer's dementia: population based cohort study. BMJ 2022;377:e068390.
[96] Berron D, Olsson E, Andersson F, Janelidze S, Tideman P, Düzel E, et al. Remote and unsupervised digital memory assessments can reliably detect cognitive impairment in Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimers Dement 2024;20:4775–91.
[97] Liu W, Yu L, Deng Q, Li Y, Lu P, Yang J, et al. Toward digitally screening and profiling AD: A GAMLSS approach of MemTrax in China. Alzheimers Dement 2024;20:399–409.
[98] Thompson LI, Kunicki ZJ, Emrani S, Strenger J, De Vito AN, Britton KJ, et al. Remote and in□clinic digital cognitive screening tools outperform the MoCA to distinguish cerebral amyloid status among cognitively healthy older adults. Alzheimers Dement (Amst) 2023;15. https://doi.org/10.1002/dad2.12500.
[99] Meier IB, Buegler M, Harms R, Seixas A, Çöltekin A, Tarnanas I. Using a Digital Neuro Signature to measure longitudinal individual-level change in Alzheimer's disease: the Altoida large cohort study. Npj Digital Medicine 2021;4.

a.

Items scanned
Point towards the Nest
Badges
Progress
66 %
SPACE
Player Rotation
Destination: Nest

b.


Progress
SPACE
50 %
SPACE
Zoom map
Volcano
Tree
Target
DONE
You are standing at the Tree facing the Volcano point towards the Rocket.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .





medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315402; this version posted October 14, 2024. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

It is made available under a CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.