Measuring Subjective Cognitive Decline in Older Adults: Harmonization between the Cognitive Change Index and the Measurement of Everyday Cognition Instruments

Lindsey F Wells^a, Shannon L Risacher^{b,c}, Brenna C McDonald^{b,c,d}, Martin R Farlow^{c,d}, Jared Brosch^{c,d}, Sujuan Gao^{c,e}, Liana G Apostolova^{b,c,d}, and Andrew J Saykin^{b,c,d}, for the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative*

Affiliations:

^aIndiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN USA

^bCenter for Neuroimaging, Department of Radiology and Imaging Sciences, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN USA

^cIndiana Alzheimer's Disease Research Center, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN USA

^dDepartment of Neurology, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN USA

^eDepartment of Biostatistics and Health Data Science, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN USA

*Data used in preparation of this article were obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database (adni.loni.usc.edu). As such, the investigators within the ADNI contributed to the design and implementation of ADNI and/or provided data but did not participate in analysis or writing of this report. A complete listing of ADNI investigators can be found at: http://adni.loni.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/how_to_apply/ADNI_Acknowledgement_List.pdf

Corresponding Author: Dr. Andrew J. Saykin, 355 W. 16th St., Suite 4100, Center for Neuroimaging, Department of Radiology and Imaging Sciences, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, Indiana 46202, USA. Tel.: +1 317 963 7501; Fax: +1 317 963 7547; E-mail: asaykin@iupui.edu.

ABSTRACT

Background:

Self and informant (proxy or study partner) reports of everyday cognitive functioning have been shown to be associated with incipient neurodegenerative disease. The 20-item Cognitive Change Index (CCI) and the 39-item Measurement of Everyday Cognition (ECog) were each developed to characterize early subjective changes in cognitive function.

Objective:

We examined the relationship between CCI and ECog self and informant evaluations to determine content overlap and provide a co-calibration for converting between these widely used instruments.

Methods:

950 participants (57.1% female, mean age=71.2yrs) from ADNI and the Indiana ADRC with self evaluations and 279 participants (60.9% female, mean age=71.8yrs) with informant evaluations (Indiana ADRC) were included. Analyzed variables for the CCI and ECog included domain mean scores, memory domain total scores, and total scores for all items. Pearson correlations, regression analyses, and frequency distributions were used to assess the relationship between CCI and ECog. Sex, years of education, race, *APOE* ϵ 4 carrier status, and baseline diagnosis were also analyzed as potentially relevant covariates.

Results:

CCI and ECog total scores were highly correlated for the self ($r=0.790$, $p<0.001$) and informant ($r=0.860$, $p<0.001$) versions. Frequency distributions of total scores were generated and self and informant histograms were plotted separately. Quadratic regressions for self ($r^2=0.682$) and informant ($r^2=0.863$) scores were used to create a translation table between the CCI and ECog total scores.

Conclusion:

Self and informant total scores can be harmonized and translated between the CCI and ECog to facilitate cross-study and longitudinal assessment of perceived cognitive change, an important patient-reported outcome.

Keywords:

Alzheimer's disease, Cognitive Assessment Screening Instrument, Cognitive Decline, Subjective Cognitive Decline, Harmonization, Co-Calibration

INTRODUCTION

Prior to the onset of objective cognitive impairment, individuals with preclinical Alzheimer's disease (AD) often present with self report of cognitive decline or reports of cognitive decline by someone who knows them well [1]. Subjective cognitive decline (SCD) is a term given to the period of preclinical dementia during which some decline in everyday cognitive functioning is subjectively recognized by an individual, but there is no evidence of a deficit on objective cognitive tests [2,3]. The presence of significant subjective cognitive concerns can serve as an additional factor to identify individuals at increased risk of progressing to mild cognitive impairment (MCI) or dementia. In previous studies, SCD has been shown to be associated with relevant AD biomarker abnormalities [4-6] and later a diagnosis of MCI or AD [1]. These concerns are important for early detection of dementia because they have been shown to present as early as 15 years prior to diagnosis of MCI or AD [1].

A variety of cognitive assessment tools are available to screen for the early stages of neurodegenerative disease. The Mini-Mental State Exam [7] and Montreal Cognitive Assessment [8] are objective cognitive assessments commonly used for dementia screening; however, they have limitations in terms of detecting these early stages [9]. The 20-item Cognitive Change Index (CCI) [10] and the 39-item Measurement of Everyday Cognition (ECog) [9] are two tools developed specifically to assess SCD. The 12-item CCI-12 is a shortened version, consisting of only the memory domain, that has also been used to evaluate SCD. Both tools have subject (self) and informant (proxy or study partner) versions to evaluate the extent of cognitive concerns for memory, executive functioning, and language. The ECog has additional items to assess the visual-spatial domain. The CCI and ECog each have a different Likert scale and total number of items. There is currently no method for directly comparing or translating between CCI and ECog scores.

The aim of this study is to define the relationship between these tools to improve longitudinal assessment of cognitive concerns. SCD has been shown to be associated with a higher likelihood of onset of neurodegenerative disease [11, 12], which is important, as it informs clinicians about possible risk factors. This cross-sectional study co-calibrates and provides a means to harmonize and translate data between the CCI and the ECog to promote future cross-study analyses.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

Data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) and the Indiana Alzheimer's Disease Research Center (IADRC) including participants from the Indiana Memory and Aging Studies (IMAS) phase and IADRC phases.

ADNI was launched in 2003 by the National Institute on Aging (NIA), the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering (NIBIB), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and private pharmaceutical companies and non-profit organizations. One of the primary goals of ADNI has been to test whether neuropsychological assessment can be used to measure the progression of mild cognitive impairment (MCI) and early Alzheimer's disease (AD). See the ADNI website (<http://adni.loni.usc.edu>) for more details. The IADRC, including the IMAS and IADRC phases, likewise includes objective and subjective evaluation of cognitive function as part of longitudinal observational studies of older adults at risk for and with clinical AD. Informed consent for all included data was obtained by the respective study protocol according to the Declaration of Helsinki.

Data were acquired between 2012 and 2019, and included 639 participants from ADNI, 326 participants from IADRC, and 20 participants from the initial phase of IMAS. At baseline,

615 participants were classified as cognitively normal (CN), 261 were considered to have MCI, and 109 were diagnosed with AD. Participants were included if they or their informant had completed equal to or more than 75% of the items on both the CCI and the ECog, and if the assessments were completed less than a year apart. In the ADNI protocol, the CCI is obtained during the screening visit, whereas the ECog is administered at baseline visit. On average, the difference in time was less than 2 months. In the IMAS and IADRC protocols, the assessments can be completed beforehand or at the time of visit, but only the visit date was recorded. 950 self reports and 279 informant reports were available for analysis. Sex, years of education, race, *APOE* ϵ 4 carrier status, baseline diagnosis, and time difference between administration of the assessments were analyzed as potentially relevant covariates. This study was approved by the Indiana University (IU) Institutional Review Board for data access and analysis.

Clinical diagnosis of CN, MCI, or AD was determined based on the diagnostic criteria [13]. CN subjects were defined as having no cognitive concerns and preserved functional status [13]. Subjects with MCI were defined as having mild objective cognitive impairment with preserved functional status [13]. Subjects with AD were defined based on moderate to severe cognitive impairment and low functional status [13]. The ADNI database includes participants ages 55 to 90. Participants from IADRC and IMAS phases were included if their age was greater than 50. Participants were not included if they had neurological or psychiatric disease such as major depressive disorder, bipolar disorder or schizophrenia other than AD. Notably, minor depression and anxiety were not excluded.

Cognitive Change Index (CCI) and Measurement of Everyday Cognition (ECog)

The CCI consists of 20 items that ask participants and their informants to rate the participant's cognitive status relative to the previous 5 years [10]. The self and informant evaluation forms are available from the authors (contact Dr. Saykin at asaykin@iupui.edu). Each item is rated on a Likert scale out of 5 possible points (1 = no change or better, 2 =

minimal change or slight/occasional problem, 3 = some change or mild problem, 4 = clearly noticeable change or moderate problem, 5 = much worse or severe problem). There are 12 items in the episodic memory domain, 5 items in the executive functioning domain, and 3 items in the language domain. The CCI-12 consists of the memory domain only and has also been used to define SCD.

The ECog includes 39 items that ask participants and their informants to rate the participant's cognitive status relative to 10 years ago (contact Dr. Tomaszewski Farias at sarah.farias@ucdmc.ucdavis.edu for a copy of the 39 item ECog) [9]. Each item is rated out of 4 possible points (1 = better or no change, 2 = questionable/occasionally worse, 3 = consistently a little worse, 4 = consistently much worse, 9 = don't know). There are 8 items in the memory domain, 9 items in the language domain, 15 items in the executive function domain (in three sub-domains: planning, organization, and divided attention), and 7 items in the visual-spatial domain. Of note, the CCI does not have a visual-spatial domain.

For both the CCI and ECog a mean score for each domain, a total score, and a total memory score were calculated to determine which calculation had the highest correlation between the assessment tools. Domain mean scores were calculated by dividing the sum of each domain by the number of items. Total scores were determined by adding together the points for each item in the assessment. Total memory scores were calculated by adding the points for each item in the memory domain alone.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics of participant characteristics were calculated including frequency for categorical variables and mean and standard deviation for continuous measures. Characteristics including age, sex, years of education, race, *APOE* ϵ 4 carrier status, CCI scores, and ECog scores were compared between ADNI, IADC, and IMAS self and informant

reports. Since participants were included if they had completed at least 75% of both assessments, there was some item level missing data. Linear interpolation was performed using SPSS 27 to impute this missing data. One-way ANOVA was used to compare total scores for each measure between diagnostic subgroups. Associations between CCI and ECog mean domain scores for the memory, executive function, and language domains were assessed using Pearson correlation in the self and informant assessments. Associations between CCI and ECog total scores for the memory domain were also assessed using Pearson correlation in the self and informant assessments. Frequency distributions of self and informant CCI and ECog total scores were plotted using a bin width of 10 and a bin center starting at 20 and 40 for the CCI and ECog respectively. Polynomial regression analyses of CCI versus ECog total scores were determined separately for the self and informant assessments. Quadratic regression provided the greatest adjusted R-square value compared to linear and cubic regressions. Therefore, a quadratic equation was used to generate a crosswalk table [14] between the CCI and ECog. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS 27, and plots were generated using GraphPad Prism 9.

RESULTS

Participant demographic characteristics

There were 639 participants from the ADNI cohort and 311 participants from the IADRC study and IMAS studies in the self-report group. Demographic characteristics are shown in Table 1. The mean age of all participants in the self-report group was 71.2 years (range: 52-93 years), with 57.1% female and 83.6% Non-Hispanic White. The mean education for participants in the self-report group was 16.4 years (range: 7-23). The mean self-report total score using the imputed data was 60.7 +/- 20.2 (39-144) for the ECog and 37.3 +/- 14.5 (20-88) for the CCI.

There were 279 participants from the IADRC and IMAS studies in the informant-report group. 244 of these reports were for individuals for whom self-report data was also included.

The mean age of all participants in the informant-report group was 71.8 years (range: 52-95 years), with 60.9% female and 82.8% Non-Hispanic White. The mean education for participants in the informant-report group was 15.9 years (range: 4-22). The mean informant-based total score for the ECog was 66.5 +/- 30.7 (range: 39-156) and for the CCI was 39.5 +/- 21.0 (range: 20-100).

Mean scores in each diagnostic subgroup

Participants from the self versus informant assessments had significantly different scores when stratified by diagnostic subgroup (Table 2). The CCI and ECog total scores were the lowest in the CN group as anticipated, with intermediate scores in MCI, and the highest scores in AD.

Associations between CCI and ECog scores

Pearson correlations (Table 3) showed that the CCI and ECog were significantly associated (range $r=0.610$ to 0.860 , all $p < 0.001$). The highest correlation for the self and the informant assessments was between the total scores.

We evaluated frequency distributions of the 950 self reports and the 279 informant reports total scores (Figure 1). Based on the histogram of self reports, the highest number of entries fell between a score of 25 to 35 for the CCI and 45 to 55 for the ECog. For the informant, the highest number of entries fell between 20 to 25 for the CCI and 39 to 45 for the ECog. The difference between the CCI and ECog is explained by the 19-point difference in minimum total score. Quadratic regression analysis (Figure 2) showed the best fit between the CCI and ECog total scores. All diagnostic subgroups were included in the analysis. A quadratic regression equation was generated to create a conversion table between the CCI-20 and the ECog-39. Separate tables were made for the self-report (Table 4) and informant-report (Table 5) versions

for the. Similar tables were made to translate between the CCI-12 and the ECog (Table 6 and Table 7).

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the CCI and the ECog to facilitate future harmonized cross-study and longitudinal assessments of perceived cognitive change. We found high correlations between the CCI and ECog in self and informant reports across all overlapping domains, which supported the development of a co-calibrated crosswalk to translate between scores on the two assessments. The highest correlations for self and informant assessments were between the ECog and CCI total scores. Due to the content differences between the instruments, which in the ECog includes visuospatial questions and the CCI does not, the high correlations despite these differences suggest that the visual-spatial items in the ECog do not have a large impact on the total score.

. Histograms of all the self-report CCI and ECog and the informant-report CCI and ECog total scores were plotted to assess frequency distributions (Figure 1). While the highest number of entries in the informant report histogram included the minimum total score, the self report histogram did not. This could suggest that participants more often report mild cognitive concerns compared to informants. However, there are limitations to this conclusion because different participants were included in the self and informant cohorts. Previous research has shown that informant reports are more strongly correlated to biomarkers of neurodegenerative disease [15]. Two tables were made to translate between the ECog and CCI: one for self assessments and one for informant assessments. We were able to map the CCI total score to an equivalent ECog total score using a quadratic equation. In the self-evaluation data, a total score of 20 on the CCI did not map below 43 on the ECog, even though the minimum score is 39. A score of 100 on the CCI did not map above a score of 142 on the ECog, although the maximum score is 156 (Table 4). In the informant-evaluation data, a score of 20 did not map below 42 and a score of

100 mapped to 157. For the purposes of the translation table, the maximum ECog score was capped at 156 (Table 5).

Limitations of this study include generalizability, due to the high mean education and limited portion of the sample from underrepresented groups. Other studies using these instruments are currently working on replication and extension in more diverse and representative community-based samples. Additionally, the CCI and ECog were not given at precisely the same time, which may have impacted our results. Despite these limitations, co-calibration and translation between scales is feasible and of practical value.

In summary, this study contributes analysis and harmonization methodology for two commonly used instruments to assess self-perceived and proxy-based cognitive concerns. This is important to foster additional research on varying AD prodromal stages, in which SCD concerns are among the first reported symptoms. Total scores of the CCI and ECog assessments show strong correlations and validate the harmonization of these tools to assess longitudinal change in cognitive concerns. Future longitudinal research is needed to characterize the relationship between these assessments and long-term clinical outcomes and biomarker trajectories. Self and informant reports should also be analyzed for other neurodegenerative diseases to better understand potential implications for differential diagnosis, longitudinal follow-up, and other clinical applications.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by grants from the Indiana CTSI (UL1 TR002529) and the National Institute on Aging (U01 AG024904, R01 AG19771, P30 AG010133, P30 AG072976, K01 AG049050, R01 AG067188, U01 AG068057 and U01 AG072177).

Data collection and sharing for this project was funded by the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) (National Institutes of Health Grant U01 AG024904) and DOD ADNI (Department of Defense award number W81XWH-12-2-0012). See the ADNI website (<http://adni.loni.usc.edu>) for more details.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST/DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Dr. Farlow receives support from Avanir (AVP-923), Biogen (BIIB037), Cognition Therapeutics (CT1812), Eli Lilly and Company (LY450139), Green Valley, Otsuka (OPC-34712), Neurotrope Biosciences, AZTherapies, Athira, Ionis and Lexeo. He also serves on the Oligomerik Advisory Board and the T3D Advisory Board. Dr. Brosch receives support from the following industry sponsors: AbbVie, Athira, Eisai America, Eli Lilly, Green Valley Pharmaceuticals and Takeda. He also receives support from Washington University, UCSD, Biohaven, USC and Boston University. Dr. Gao receives support from multiple NIH grants to Indiana University (P30 AG010133, P30 AG072976, R01HL131730, R01AG052493, R01AG055391, R01AG057733, R01AG061452, R01AG067631, U01AG057195, R01NR018162) and a grant from Indiana State Department of Health to Indiana University (Project Number: 0000000000000055059). Dr. Apostolova receives support from multiple grants (NIA U01 AG057195; NIA R01 AG057739; NIA P30 AG010133; Alzheimer Association LEADS GENETICS 19-639372; Roche Diagnostics RD005665). She has previously consulted for Eli Lilly, Biogen and Two Labs. She received honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing, or educational events from AAN, Mayo clinic, Purdue university, Biogen, MillerMed, APha, and MJH Holdings LLC. She also receives support from the Data Safety Monitoring Board (NIH R01 grant and IQVIA). Dr. Saykin receives support from multiple NIH grants to Indiana University (P30 AG010133, P30 AG072976, R01 AG019771, R01 AG057739, U01 AG024904, R01 LM013463, R01 AG068193, T32 AG071444, U01 AG068057 and U01 AG072177). IU has also received

support from Avid Radiopharmaceuticals, a subsidiary of Eli Lilly (in kind contribution of PET tracer precursor). Dr. Saykin served on a Bayer Oncology Scientific Advisory Board and Siemens Medical Solutions USA, Inc. Dementia Advisory Board. He reports support from Springer-Nature Publishing (Editorial Office Support as Editor-in-Chief, Brain Imaging and Behavior).

REFERENCES

- [1] Reisberg B, Prichep L, Mosconi L, John ER, Glodzik-Sobanska L, Boksay I, Monteiro I, Torossian C, Vedvyas A, Ashraf N, Jamil IA, de Leon MJ (2008) The pre-mild cognitive impairment, subjective cognitive impairment stage of Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement* **4**, S98-s108.
- [2] Jessen F, Amariglio RE, van Boxtel M, Breteler M, Ceccaldi M, Chetelat G, Dubois B, Dufouil C, Ellis KA, van der Flier WM, Glodzik L, van Harten AC, de Leon MJ, McHugh P, Mielke MM, Molinuevo JL, Mosconi L, Osorio RS, Perrotin A, Petersen RC, Rabin LA, Rami L, Reisberg B, Rentz DM, Sachdev PS, de la Sayette V, Saykin AJ, Scheltens P, Shulman MB, Slavin MJ, Sperling RA, Stewart R, Uspenskaya O, Vellas B, Visser PJ, Wagner M, Subjective Cognitive Decline Initiative Working G (2014) A conceptual framework for research on subjective cognitive decline in preclinical Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement* **10**, 844-852.
- [3] Jessen F, Amariglio RE, Buckley RF, van der Flier WM, Han Y, Molinuevo JL, Rabin L, Rentz DM, Rodriguez-Gomez O, Saykin AJ, Sikkes SAM, Smart CM, Wolfsgruber S, Wagner M (2020) The characterisation of subjective cognitive decline. *The Lancet. Neurology* **19**, 271-278.
- [4] Risacher SL, Kim S, Nho K, Foroud T, Shen L, Petersen RC, Jack CR, Jr., Beckett LA, Aisen PS, Koeppe RA, Jagust WJ, Shaw LM, Trojanowski JQ, Weiner MW, Saykin AJ (2015) APOE effect on Alzheimer's disease biomarkers in older adults with significant memory concern. *Alzheimers Dement* **11**, 1417-1429.
- [5] Jessen F, Wiese B, Bachmann C, Eifflaender-Gorfer S, Haller F, Kolsch H, Luck T, Mosch E, van den Bussche H, Wagner M, Wollny A, Zimmermann T, Pentzek M, Riedel-Heller SG, Romberg HP, Weyerer S, Kaduszkiewicz H, Maier W, Bickel H (2010) Prediction of dementia by subjective memory impairment: effects of severity and temporal association with cognitive impairment. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* **67**, 414-422.
- [6] Saykin AJ, Wishart HA, Rabin LA, Santulli RB, Flashman LA, West JD, McHugh TL, Mamourian AC (2006) Older adults with cognitive complaints show brain atrophy similar to that of amnesic MCI. *Neurology* **67**, 834-842.
- [7] Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR (1975) "Mini-mental state". A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res* **12**, 189-198.
- [8] Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bédirian V, Charbonneau S, Whitehead V, Collin I, Cummings JL, Chertkow H (2005) The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: a brief screening tool
- [9] Tomaszewski Farias S, Mungas D, Harvey DJ, Simmons A, Reed BR, Decarli C (2011) The measurement of everyday cognition: development and validation of a short form of the Everyday Cognition scales. *Alzheimer's & dementia : the journal of the Alzheimer's Association* **7**, 593-601.
- [10] Rattanabannakit C, Risacher SL, Gao S, Lane KA, Brown SA, McDonald BC, Unverzagt FW, Apostolova LG, Saykin AJ, Farlow MR (2016) The Cognitive Change Index as a Measure of Self and Informant Perception of Cognitive Decline: Relation to Neuropsychological Tests. *J Alzheimers Dis* **51**, 1145-1155.
- [11] Reisberg B, Shulman MB, Torossian C, Leng L, Zhu W (2010) Outcome over seven years of healthy adults with and without subjective cognitive impairment. *Alzheimer's & dementia : the journal of the Alzheimer's Association* **6**, 11-24.
- [12] Petersen RC, Morris JC (2005) Mild cognitive impairment as a clinical entity and treatment target. *Arch Neurol* **62**, 1160-1163; discussion 1167.
- [13] McKhann G, Drachman D, Folstein M, Katzman R, Price D, Stadlan EM (1984) Clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: report of the NINCDS-ADRDA Work Group under the

- auspices of Department of Health and Human Services Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease. *Neurology* **34**, 939-944.
- [14] Kolen MJ BR (2006) *Test equating, scaling and linking: Methods and practices*, Springer, New York, NY.
- [15] Rueda AD, Lau KM, Saito N, Harvey D, Risacher SL, Aisen PS, Petersen RC, Saykin AJ, Farias ST, Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging I (2015) Self-rated and informant-rated everyday function in comparison to objective markers of Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement* **11**, 1080-1089.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Cohorts

A) Demographic Characteristics of Self-Assessment Cohort					
	CN (n=612)	MCI (n=255)	AD (n=83)	p-value	Pairwise*
Age (years)	70.6 (6.8)	72.1 (7.6)	73.1 (9.3)	0.001	MCI, AD>CN
Education (years)	16.5 (2.5)	16.2 (2.6)	16.0 (2.3)	0.06	None
Gender (M, F)	228, 384	137, 118	43, 40	<0.001	n/a
Race/Ethnicity (%NHW)	85.1%	80.4%	82.0%	0.53	n/a
APOE Genotype (% ε4+) ¹	34.1%	48.7%	60.0%	<0.001	n/a
CDR-Sum of Boxes ²	0.1 (0.3)	1.5 (1.0)	4.4 (1.9)	<0.001	AD>MCI>CN
NPI-Q Total ³	1.1 (2.6)	4.2 (6.0)	7.9 (8.5)	<0.001	AD>MCI>CN
GDS Total ⁴	1.0 (1.3)	2.1 (2.0)	1.9 (1.8)	<0.001	AD, MCI>CN
MoCA Total Score ⁵	26.0 (2.7)	22.6 (3.2)	17.2 (4.7)	<0.001	CN>MCI>AD
Story Immediate Recall (z) ⁶	0.2 (0.9)	-1.2 (1.1)	-2.6 (0.8)	<0.001	CN>MCI>AD
Story Delayed Recall (z) ⁶	0.2 (0.9)	-1.1 (1.0)	-2.4 (0.7)	<0.001	CN>MCI>AD
List Learning Immediate (z) ⁷	-0.1 (1.0)	-1.1 (1.0)	-2.4 (0.8)	<0.001	CN>MCI>AD
List Learning Delayed (z) ⁷	-0.2 (1.2)	-1.4 (1.3)	-2.5 (0.7)	<0.001	CN>MCI>AD
Naming Score (z) ⁸	-1.0 (3.0)	-0.8 (2.2)	-2.5 (3.4)	<0.001	CN, MCI>AD
¹ Missing 62 participants (23 CN, 31 MCI, 8 AD) ² Missing 3 participants (2 CN, 1 MCI) ³ Missing 22 participants (14 CN, 8 MCI)					
⁴ Missing 1 participant (1 MCI) ⁵ Missing 16 participants (5 CN, 7 MCI, 4 AD) ⁶ Missing 4 participants (3 CN, 1 MCI)					
⁷ Missing 33 participants (20 CN, 10 MCI, 2 AD) ⁸ Missing 7 participants (4 CN, 2 MCI, 1 AD) * Bonferroni corrected p<0.05					
B) Demographic Characteristics of Participants in Informant-Assessment Cohort					
	CN (n=163)	MCI (n=75)	AD (n=41)	p-value	Pairwise*
Age (years)	71.0 (8.3)	73.0 (7.7)	72.6 (11.6)	0.20	None
Education (years)	15.9 (2.7)	16.0 (2.8)	15.3 (3.3)	0.44	None
Gender (M, F)	63, 100	31, 44	15, 26	0.87	n/a
Race/Ethnicity (%NHW)	88.3%	74.7%	75.6%	0.02	n/a
APOE Genotype (% ε4+) ⁹	33.3%	61.3%	61.0%	<0.001	n/a
CDR-Sum of Boxes ¹⁰	0.2 (0.5)	1.4 (1.0)	6.1 (4.6)	<0.001	AD>MCI>CN
NPI-Q Total ¹¹	1.6 (2.5)	3.6 (3.8)	7.2 (6.2)	<0.001	AD>MCI>CN
GDS Total ¹²	1.4 (1.7)	3.0 (2.6)	2.3 (2.5)	<0.001	AD, MCI>CN
MoCA Total Score ¹³	26.0 (2.9)	21.6 (3.3)	14.9 (6.1)	<0.001	CN>MCI>AD
Story Immediate Recall (z) ¹⁴	0.3 (1.0)	-1.2 (1.2)	-2.5 (1.0)	<0.001	CN>MCI>AD
Story Delayed Recall (z) ¹⁴	0.2 (1.0)	-1.0 (1.3)	-2.1 (1.1)	<0.001	CN>MCI>AD
List Learning Immediate (z) ¹⁵	-0.1 (1.0)	-1.4 (0.9)	-2.4 (0.9)	<0.001	CN>MCI>AD
List Learning Delayed (z) ¹⁵	0.1 (1.0)	-1.6 (1.0)	-2.5 (0.8)	<0.001	CN>MCI, AD
Naming Score (z) ¹⁶	-0.4 (2.3)	-1.1 (2.3)	-1.8 (2.7)	0.001	CN, MCI>AD
⁹ Missing 1 participant (1 CN) ¹⁰ Missing 1 participant (1 CN) ¹¹ Missing 4 participants (4 CN)					
¹² Missing 3 participants (3 AD) ¹³ Missing 5 participants (2 MCI, 3 AD) ¹⁴ Missing 5 participants (5 AD)					
¹⁵ Missing 32 participants (10 CN, 7 MCI, 15 AD) ¹⁶ Missing 5 participants (5 AD) * Bonferroni corrected p<0.05					

Table 2

Total scores of ECog (39 items) and CCI (20 items) by diagnostic subgroup

		CN	MCI	AD	p-value
SELF	n	612	255	83	
	ECog	54.1 ± 14.1	71.9 ± 23.3	75.3 ± 24.6	<0.01** between CN-AD and CN-MCI
	CCI-20	31.8 ± 10.4	46.9 ± 15.7	48.4 ± 14.6	<0.01** between CN-AD and CN-MCI
INFORMANT	n	163	75	41	
	ECog	50.5 ± 16.0	76.6 ± 25.9	111.7 ± 30.9	<0.01** between all groups
	CCI-20	27.4 ± 10.2	47.3 ± 15.2	73.7 ± 17.8	<0.01** between all groups

CN=Cognitively Normal; MCI=Mild Cognitive Impairment; AD=Alzheimer's Disease

**p<0.01

Table 3

Pearson correlations between the CCI and ECog paired scores

	Domain	PEARSON CORRELATIONS	
		Self n = 950	Informant n = 279
Mean Domain Score	Memory	0.758**	0.856**
	Language	0.650**	0.774**
	Executive function	0.610**	0.741**
	All domains	0.785**	0.860**
Total Score	Memory	0.759**	0.858**
	All domains	0.790**	0.860**

**p<0.01

Table 4

CCI (20 items) self-assessment mapped to ECog (39 items) self-assessment using Quadratic Regression

CCI-20	ECog	CCI-20	ECog	CCI-20	ECog	CCI-20	ECog
20	43	41	62	62	86	83	115
21	44	42	63	63	88	84	117
22	45	43	64	64	89	85	118
23	46	44	66	65	90	86	120
24	47	45	67	66	91	87	121
25	47	46	68	67	93	88	123
26	48	47	69	68	94	89	124
27	49	48	70	69	95	90	126
28	50	49	71	70	97	91	127
29	51	50	72	71	98	92	129
30	52	51	73	72	99	93	131
31	53	52	74	73	101	94	132
32	54	53	75	74	102	95	134
33	55	54	77	75	104	96	135
34	56	55	78	76	105	97	137
35	56	56	79	77	106	98	139
36	57	57	80	78	108	99	140
37	58	58	81	79	109	100	142
38	59	59	83	80	111		
39	60	60	84	81	112		
40	61	61	85	82	114		

Table 5

CCI informant-assessment (20 items) mapped to ECog informant-assessment (39 items) using Quadratic Regression

CCI-20	ECog	CCI-20	ECog	CCI-20	ECog	CCI-20	ECog
20	42	41	63	62	91	83	125
21	43	42	65	63	93	84	127
22	44	43	66	64	94	85	129
23	45	44	67	65	96	86	131
24	45	45	68	66	97	87	132
25	46	46	70	67	99	88	134
26	47	47	71	68	100	89	136
27	48	48	72	69	102	90	138
28	49	49	73	70	103	91	140
29	50	50	75	71	105	92	142
30	51	51	76	72	107	93	144
31	52	52	77	73	108	94	145
32	53	53	79	74	110	95	147
33	55	54	80	75	112	96	149
34	56	55	81	76	113	97	151
35	57	56	83	77	115	98	153
36	58	57	84	78	117	99	155
37	59	58	85	79	118	100	156
38	60	59	87	80	120		
39	61	60	88	81	122		
40	62	61	90	82	123		

Table 6

CCI-12 (12 items) self-assessment mapped to ECog self-assessment using Quadratic Regression

CCI-12	ECog	CCI-12	ECog	CCI-20	ECog
12	37	33	55	54	77
13	38	34	56	55	78
14	39	35	56	56	79
15	40	36	57	57	80
16	40	37	58	58	81
17	41	38	59	59	83
18	42	39	60	60	84
19	43	40	61		
20	43	41	62		
21	44	42	63		
22	45	43	64		
23	46	44	66		
24	47	45	67		
25	47	46	68		
26	48	47	69		
27	49	48	70		
28	50	49	71		
29	51	50	72		
30	52	51	73		
31	53	52	74		
32	54	53	75		

Table 7

CCI-12 (12 items) informant-assessment mapped to ECog informant-assessment using Quadratic Regression

CCI-12	ECog	CCI-12	ECog	CCI-20	ECog
12	35	33	55	54	80
13	36	34	56	55	81
14	37	35	57	56	83
15	38	36	58	57	84
16	38	37	59	58	85
17	39	38	60	59	87
18	40	39	61	60	88
19	41	40	62		
20	42	41	63		
21	43	42	65		
22	44	43	66		
23	45	44	67		
24	45	45	68		
25	46	46	70		
26	47	47	71		
27	48	48	72		
28	49	49	73		
29	50	50	75		
30	51	51	76		
31	52	52	77		
32	53	53	79		

Figure 1. Frequency distributions showing the patterns between CCI 20-item and ECog 39-item total scores in the self and informant assessments. CCI, Cognitive Change Index; ECog, Measurement of Everyday Cognition

Figure 2. Quadratic regression showing the relationship between CCI 20-item and ECog 39-item total scores in the self and informant assessments. CCI, Cognitive Change Index; ECog, Measurement of Everyday Cognition