

Viewpoint

A Recommended Scale for Cognitive Screening in Clinical Trials of Parkinson's Disease

Kelvin L. Chou, MD,^{1*} Melissa M. Amick, PhD,² Jason Brandt, PhD,³ Richard Camicioli, MD,⁴ Karen Frei, MD,⁵ Darren Gitelman, MD,⁶ Jennifer Goldman, MD,⁷ John Growdon, MD,⁸ Howard I. Hurtig, MD,⁹ Bonnie Levin, PhD,¹⁰ Irene Litvan, MD,¹¹ Laura Marsh, MD,¹² Tanya Simuni, MD,¹³ Alexander I. Tröster, PhD,¹⁴ and Ergun Y. Uc, MD^{15,16}
on behalf of the Parkinson Study Group Cognitive/Psychiatric Working Group

¹*Departments of Neurology and Neurosurgery, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA*

²*VA Boston Healthcare System and Department of Psychiatry, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts, USA*

³*Departments of Psychiatry and Neurology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*

⁴*Division of Neurology, Department of Medicine, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada*

⁵*The Parkinson's and Movement Disorders Institute, Fountain Valley, California, USA*

⁶*Departments of Neurology and Radiology, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois, USA*

⁷*Department of Neurological Sciences, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois, USA*

⁸*Department of Neurology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA*

⁹*Department of Neurology, University of Pennsylvania Health System, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA*

¹⁰*Department of Neurology, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, Miami, Florida, USA*

¹¹*Department of Neurology, University of Louisville School of Medicine, Louisville, Kentucky, USA*

¹²*Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas, USA*

¹³*Parkinson's Disease and Movement Disorders Center and Department of Neurology, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois, USA*

¹⁴*Department of Neurology, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA*

¹⁵*Department of Neurology, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, USA*

¹⁶*Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Iowa City, Iowa, USA*

Abstract: Cognitive impairment is common in Parkinson's disease (PD). There is a critical need for a brief, standard cognitive screening measure for use in PD trials whose primary focus is not on cognition. The Parkinson Study Group (PSG) Cognitive/Psychiatric Working Group formed a Task Force to make recommendations for a cognitive scale that could screen for dementia and mild cognitive impairment in

clinical trials of PD where cognition is not the primary outcome. This Task Force conducted a systematic literature search for cognitive assessments previously used in a PD population. Scales were then evaluated for their appropriateness to screen for cognitive deficits in clinical trials, including brief administration time (<15 minutes), assessment of the major cognitive domains, and potential to detect subtle cognitive impairment in PD. Five scales of global cognition met the predetermined screening criteria and were considered for review. Based on the Task Force's evaluation criteria the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA), appeared to be the most suitable measure. This Task Force recommends consideration of the MoCA as a minimum cognitive screening measure in clinical trials of PD where cognitive performance is not the primary outcome measure. The MoCA still requires further study of its diagnostic utility in PD populations but appears to be the most appropriate measure among the currently available brief cognitive assessments. Widespread adoption of a single instrument such as the MoCA in clinical

*Correspondence to: Dr. Kelvin L. Chou, University of Michigan Medical School, 1500 E. Medical Center Drive, SPC 5316, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-5316. E-mail: klchou@med.umich.edu

Potential conflict of interest: The authors report no disclosures or conflict of interest concerning the research related to the manuscript.

Members of the "Parkinson Study Group Cognitive/Psychiatric Working Group" are listed as an Appendix.

Received 18 September 2009; Revised 23 February 2010; Accepted 28 June 2010

Published online 28 September 2010 in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com). DOI: 10.1002/mds.23362

trials can improve comparability between research studies on PD. © 2010 Movement Disorder Society

Key words: Parkinson's disease; cognitive impairment; cognitive screening

Cognitive impairment is common in Parkinson's disease (PD), and it is estimated that the majority of patients will develop dementia in the later stages of the disease.¹ Considering the high prevalence of cognitive impairment in PD and growing interest in the effects of medical and surgical therapies on cognitive dysfunction and motor symptoms in this population, there is a need for a brief cognitive test that can be consistently administered in clinical trials of PD. Currently, individual researchers have their own preferences for different cognitive tests, making it difficult to compare and cross-validate data between studies.

Kulisevsky and Pagonabarraga² recently conducted a systematic review of cognitive scales used in PD and identified the PD-Cognitive Rating Scale (PD-CRS) as the optimal PD-specific scale for detecting early cognitive deficits in PD and tracking the transition to PD dementia. Although this makes the PD-CRS suitable for clinical trials investigating progression of cognitive dysfunction in PD, its administration time (17 minutes in nondemented patients with PD and 26 minutes in patients with Parkinson's disease and dementia [PDD])² makes it less appropriate for inclusion in clinical trials of PD not focused on cognition. Cognitive instruments used in such trials need to be brief (e.g., <15 minutes) for the purpose of screening large numbers of participants for mild cognitive impairment and dementia, while allowing time for other motor assessments that are the primary focus of the research.

To address the growing challenge of identifying cognitive dysfunction in PD clinical trials, the Parkinson Study Group (PSG) Cognitive/Psychiatric Working Group formed a Task Force to develop recommendations on a cognitive scale that could efficiently screen for both dementia and mild cognitive impairment in treatment trials and other clinical research investigations of PD where cognition is not the primary outcome.

METHODS

The Task Force includes nine movement disorders neurologists, one cognitive neurologist, four neuropsychologists, and one psychiatrist. To guide selection and review of candidate scales, the Task Force developed the following primary criteria (see Table 1): (1) the test must have been previously studied in a PD population; (2) the test should be able to stand alone in clinical tri-

als, yet allow investigators to add additional cognitive assessments if indicated; (3) administration should be completed within 15 minutes to minimize the burden of testing in a patient undergoing a clinical trial; (4) all major cognitive domains (attention, memory, language, visual-perception and construction, and executive functions) should be assessed to screen for other causes of dementia, such as Alzheimer's disease (AD), (5) the spectrum of cognitive impairment in PD, particularly subtle impairments involving executive functions, should be measured by the test or tests. If there were several scales that met these five criteria, the Task Force considered the following secondary criteria to narrow the choices to one scale for recommendation: (1) the tool should have been evaluated in studies beyond those of its original developer and (2) psychometric performance data for PD should be available.

Literature Search Strategy and Review of Tests

A systematic search was conducted of PUBMED (from 1950 to January 2009) using the search terms "Cognitive Assessment" and "Parkinson's disease" or "Parkinson disease" in the English language literature for cognitive tests that had previously been used in a PD population. A total of 353 articles were retrieved and examined. In addition, in press peer reviewed articles or published abstracts known to the task force members were included.

After this critical review and discussion of the scales, a report was prepared by the members of the Task Force and circulated to the Cognitive/Psychiatric Working Group for further evaluation. A final draft, including the Group's recommendations, was written and submitted to the Executive Committee of the PSG for final approval before submission for peer review publication.

RESULTS

The literature search identified 10 scales for consideration: Addenbrooke's Cognitive Evaluation (ACE),³ Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale—cognitive (ADAS-cog),⁴ Cambridge Cognitive Assessment (CAMCOG),⁵ Mattis Dementia Rating Scale (DRS),⁶ Mini-Mental Parkinson (MMP),⁷ Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE),⁸ Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA),⁹ PD-CRS,¹⁰ Parkinson Neuropsych-

metric Dementia Assessment (PANDA),¹¹ and Scales for Outcomes in Parkinson's disease—cognition (SCOPA-cog).¹² Each instrument includes components that assess multiple cognitive domains, but the summary scores provide measures of global cognitive function. Thus, each of these scales could stand alone.

Five of the 10 scales (ACE,³ ADAS-cog,¹³ CAM-COG,^{5,14} DRS,¹⁵ and PD-CRS¹⁰) were excluded because administration time requires >15 minutes, leaving two generic instruments, the MMSE and MoCA, and three PD-specific instruments, the MMP, PANDA, and SCOPA-cog. The advantages and disadvantages of these five rating scales relative to the rest of the evaluation criteria are summarized (Table 1).

Mini-Mental State Examination

The MMSE is the most widely used screening measure for detecting dementia. Although not developed specifically for PD patients, it is used consistently in PD studies and has the most empiric evidence among the rating scales considered. Available in 58 languages, the MMSE measures multiple cognitive domains on a 30-point scale: orientation (10 points), registration and short-term recall (6-points), attention and concentration (5 points), language (both oral and written) (8 points), and visuospatial function (1 point).⁸ It can be administered within 10 minutes. The MMSE test manual and forms are owned and copyrighted by Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc. (PAR). Alternate test versions of the MMSE are available.

The MMSE has good test-retest and inter-rater reliability in the general population.¹⁶ However, it has not been specifically validated in the PD population. Although influenced by age and education, age and education corrected normative data are available.¹⁷ A unique advantage of the MMSE relative to the other scales discussed is that it can measure cognitive change over time in PD, especially in patients with de-

mentia (about 2–2.5 points per annum)¹⁸ and is sensitive to treatment effects in clinical trials.^{19,20}

Despite its strengths, the MMSE does not measure the cognitive functions of reasoning, planning, and set shifting (e.g., executive functions), which are commonly impaired in PD patients early in the course of the disease.^{16,21} Furthermore, the naming task in the MMSE has not been validated against formal naming tests (i.e., Boston Naming Test) and, thus, may not detect a mild language deficit. Finally, the MMSE is relatively insensitive to mild cognitive changes.⁹

Montreal Cognitive Assessment

The MoCA was originally developed to screen for mild cognitive impairment (MCI) in the general population. Twenty-two language versions exist.⁹ It is free and may be used for nonprofit research with prior written permission. A licensing agreement is required if the research is funded by a commercial entity. It is a 30-point test that can be administered in about 10 minutes, but unlike the MMSE, the MoCA also covers a range of executive functions. It has six orientation questions and a five word memory recall task. A clock drawing task and a cube copy test assess visuospatial function. Attention/concentration is assessed using serial 7s, target tapping and digit span forward and backward. Confrontation naming and repetition tasks assess language. Executive functions are evaluated using a shortened version of the Trail Making B test, phonemic fluency, and a verbal abstraction task. In non-PD samples, the MoCA has been shown to have excellent test-retest reliability and good internal consistency in patients with MCI.⁹

Four studies were identified that used the MoCA in PD populations,^{22–25} and all suggest that the MoCA may be particularly sensitive to the mild cognitive changes seen in PD. The MoCA has demonstrated good test-retest, inter-rater reliability, and convergent

TABLE 1. Evaluation criteria met for the reviewed scales

	MMSE	MoCA	MMP	PANDA	SCOPA-cog
Primary criteria ^a					
Used in PD population	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Could stand alone as minimum assessment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Administration in <15 min	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Assesses the major cognitive domains	o	✓	o	o	o
Can identify subtle cognitive impairment in PD	o	✓	✓	✓	✓
Secondary criteria					
Used in studies beyond original developers	✓	✓	✓	o	✓
Psychometric data available in PD	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

✓, met criterion, o, did not meet criterion.

^aThe recommended scale should meet all primary criteria.

validity in 48 subjects with PD.²² A recent study in PD that compared the abilities of the MoCA and MMSE to detect MCI and dementia compared with a neuropsychological battery reported that the MoCA had acceptable sensitivity (0.82) and specificity (0.75) for dementia screening using a cutoff of 24/25.²⁵ For MCI screening in PD, the MoCA had acceptable sensitivity (0.83), but low specificity (0.53) using a cutoff of 26/27 and the positive predictive (PPV) and negative predictive values (NPV) for detecting MCI were not explicitly stated.²⁵ The PPV was poor (PPV 46% and NPV 92%) for the “diagnosis of any cognitive disorder” using a 26/27 cutoff.

The main strengths of the MoCA are its rapid and easy administration, assessment of the broad range of cognitive domains, and its sensitivity to milder cognitive deficits and executive dysfunction in patients with PD. However, the naming task in the MoCA (three animals) has not been properly validated and may not pick up mild language deficits. Cutoff values for dementia and MCI are also not firmly established.

Mini-Mental Parkinson (MMP)

The MMP is a brief screening test derived from the MMSE and developed specifically to assess cognition in PD.⁷ It is a 32-point test that takes approximately 10 minutes to complete.²⁶ Differences between the MMP and the MMSE include a time question on orientation instead of the season, a visual registration task based on picture cards, a fluency task where patients are asked to name three animals beginning with the same letter, visual memory recall instead of verbal memory recall, a set-shifting task where subjects are given a card with four images and asked to identify which image is different from the other three, and a concept processing (similarities) task wherein subjects are given three groups of three words and asked which two words in each group are most closely related.

In its validation study, the MMP was validated against a comprehensive neuropsychological battery in 50 subjects with PD.⁷ The wide range of MMP total scores compared with the MMSE suggests it may be more sensitive to detecting the mild cognitive deficits seen in PD. Content validity and construct validity was assessed and inter-rater reliability was high ($r = 0.84$), but no other psychometric properties were assessed.⁷ Despite being developed specifically for PD, the MMP has been evaluated in only one other study.²⁶

Advantages of the MMP include quick administration time and potential to detect early cognitive changes in PD. However, the MMP is still heavily

weighted toward orientation, does not assess other cortically mediated functions such as language, and has limited data regarding psychometric performance in PD.

Parkinson Neuropsychometric Dementia Assessment

The PANDA was developed to be a brief assessment (~10 minutes) to detect subtle cognitive impairment and dementia in patients with PD in research and clinical care settings.¹¹ Four cognitive domains are tested: memory (verbal paired associate learning), executive functioning (alternating categorical fluency), visuospatial abilities (visual imagery), and working memory/attention (number sequencing). A fifth section screens for depressive symptoms (mood, interest, and drive).

Only two studies have used the PANDA in PD but initial data suggest that it is a reliable tool that is more sensitive than the MMSE for detecting cognitive impairment in patients with PD.^{11,27} Test-retest reliability is high ($r = 0.93$), as is inter-rater reliability ($r = 0.95$).¹¹ Although sensitivity, specificity, and cutoff scores for dementia and MCI have been published, they are not firmly established. Moreover, the PANDA does not assess orientation, language, or visual construction.

Scales for Outcomes in Parkinson's Disease—Cognition

SCOPA-cog is a PD-specific scale that was developed for the purpose of comparing groups in research settings, not as a screening or diagnostic tool.¹² It is available without restrictions for use in research. The instrument consists of 10 items, with a maximum score of 43, and can be administered in approximately 10–15 minutes. Nonverbal and verbal memory and learning are assessed using a cube test (copying the order in which four cubes are pointed), backward digit span, and reading/recalling 10 words. Attention is assessed by saying the months backward and serial three subtractions. Aspects of executive functions measured include complex motor planning, working memory, and verbal fluency. A figure assembly task to assess visuospatial function completes the scale. The SCOPA-cog is available in Dutch, English, and Portuguese (Brazilian) versions.^{12,28,29}

The inclusion of specific tasks of executive function make the SCOPA-cog more likely to be sensitive to early cognitive changes in the PD population than the MMSE.¹² In its validation study, the SCOPA-cog was validated against the CAMCOG and had higher reproducibility than the MMSE (0.78 vs. 0.66) and greater inter-

nal consistency than the MMSE (0.83 vs. 0.62).¹² Although SCOPA-cog was developed specifically for a PD population, it has not been used extensively in PD.² Despite the SCOPA-cog's potential sensitivity to early cognitive changes in PD, it has not been evaluated in PD patients with diagnoses of MCI or dementia to be able to determine sensitivity, specificity, or cutoff values, and it does not measure orientation and language function.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this review was to identify and recommend a brief, standard cognitive measure that could be used to screen PD subjects for dementia and cognitive impairment in research studies where cognitive performance is not the primary outcome measure. Of the five instruments reviewed, only the MoCA fulfilled the primary criteria established by the Task Force. Thus, the Task Force preliminarily recommends the MoCA as a minimum standard cognitive screening instrument in clinical trials of PD. It can be administered rapidly and has the potential to identify subtle executive dysfunction while also covering the major cognitive domains.

All available instruments that can be briefly administered have limitations. The MMSE has been used extensively in studies of patients with PD, can measure progression once patients develop dementia, and is sensitive to change in clinical trials. However, its deficiencies include a distinct ceiling effect and its inability to assess executive functions. Therefore, it is unlikely to detect MCI in PD, a primary concern if the instrument is to serve as a screening measure for mild cognitive dysfunction. Although the MoCA, MMP, PANDA, and SCOPA-cog all appear suitable for detecting early cognitive dysfunction in PD, each has undergone limited cross-validation in PD samples. Some instruments (MoCA and MMSE) include language tasks but do not assess this domain as adequately as longer and more comprehensive assessments. Although all of the scales included in this review can be administered in less than 15 minutes, published administration times are likely based on nondemented populations and may take longer in demented PD participants.

Although preliminary data seems to suggest that the MoCA may be a poor screening measure for MCI in PD based on its reported low specificity (0.53) using a cutoff of 26/27,²⁵ this study had several flaws that limit the strength of the conclusions that can be made regarding its utility to detect MCI. The diagnostic criteria for defining MCI has not been well established in PD, and the requirement of self-reported cognitive

decline in this study²⁵ may require a degree of insight not commonly seen in patients with a neurodegenerative process affecting frontally mediated functions such as meta-cognition. In addition, the study had small numbers of subjects with cognitive impairment (only 12.9% PDD and 17.4% MCI of 132 subjects), and a limited neuropsychological battery was used.²⁵

A brief scale for screening dementia in PD (PDD-Short Screen) was recently published,³⁰ which took 4.8–6.9 minutes to administer and had high sensitivity (0.898) and specificity (0.885) for diagnosing PDD. Unfortunately, it may not be sensitive enough to detect subtle executive dysfunction in PD and, thus, did not meet our Task Force's objectives.

The aim of this Task Force is complementary yet distinguishable from a recent review by Kulisevsky and Pagonabarraga² that evaluated different instruments on their appropriateness to assess cognition throughout the course of PD. That review identified both SCOPA-cog and PD-CRS as the most appropriate for capturing early PD cognitive changes and PD-CRS as the most suitable for monitoring cognitive progression in PD. However, SCOPA-cog does not measure orientation or language function, which would be useful in a screening measure to rule out alternative causes for dementia, such as AD. The lengthier administration time of the PD-CRS precludes its use as a screening instrument in clinical trials of PD not focusing primarily on cognition. Our review is also different from the recent efforts of a Movement Disorders Society (MDS) Task Force on Dementia in PD that established diagnostic criteria for dementia in PD³¹ as well as a practical approach to its diagnosis.³²

Should the MoCA be used in clinical trials going forward, the dilemma of how to compare new data with existing trials that used the MMSE needs to be addressed. A potential strategy would be to transform MMSE and MoCA scores into equivalent *z*-scores,¹⁷ which would allow comparison of cognitive performance between the two groups. However, the absence of age and education normative data for the MoCA limits this practice. For now, the most parsimonious strategy would be to administer both the MoCA and the MMSE until further evidence is available to demonstrate whether it is an appropriate tool. For existing clinical trial databases that have extensive MMSE data only, using age- and education-adjusted MMSE cutoffs for cognitive impairment may be helpful. In a recent study on cognitive impairment in the DATATOP study cohort, Uc et al.³³ found that subjects who developed cognitive impairment by age- and education-adjusted MMSE criteria showed significant decline on neuro-

psychological tests whereas the neuropsychological performance of nonimpaired subjects remained stable.

This task force recommends consideration of the MoCA as a screening instrument for dementia and MCI in PD clinical studies where cognition is not the primary outcome measure. Widespread adoption of such an instrument in clinical trials will improve comparability among research studies on motor and non-motor aspects of PD. The MoCA still requires further study of its validity in PD populations to determine how well it detects MCI and dementia, and it could also benefit from the development of age and education normative data. Despite these flaws, the MoCA shows the most promise of the currently available brief cognitive assessments. Because the MoCA lacks data regarding sensitivity to change over time and to treatment, the Task Force does not recommend use of the MoCA as a stand-alone measure in PD trials investigating progression of cognitive impairment. If future evidence demonstrates that the MoCA is sensitive to longitudinal treatment effects and cognitive decline, then the MoCA may be considered for use as a primary outcome measure.

Acknowledgment: We thank the anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful, detailed and constructive comments of our article.

Financial Disclosures: Dr. Chou receives research support from the NIH (NS44504-08), participates as a site-PI in clinical trials sponsored by the HSG (PHAROS, 2CARE, and CREST-HD), receives royalties from UpToDate, has received honoraria for lectures from Teva Neurosciences, Medtronic, Inc., and Allergan, and has served as a consultant to Medtronic Inc., and Teva Neurosciences. Dr. Amick receives research support from the Michael J. Fox Foundation. She has received funds from Boehringer Ingelheim and Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceutical, Inc for coordination of clinical trials. Dr. Brandt receives royalties from Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc. and occasionally gives expert witness testimony related to clinical cases. Dr. Camicioli has received research support from the NIH via the Parkinson Study Group, operating grant support from the Canadian Institute for Health Research, and a one time unrestricted clinical grant and clinical trials payment from Novartis. Dr. Frei has no financial disclosures to make. Dr. Gitelman is consultant for Abiant Inc. and has received research support from the National Parkinson Foundation and the Michael J. Fox Foundation. Dr. Goldman has received research support from NIH K23060949 and the Parkinson's Disease Foundation and has participated as site-PI in clinical trials by Merz (blepharospasm) and Parkinson's Study Group/Boehringer-Ingelheim (PRAMI-BID). Dr. Growdon serves on the editorial board for Archives of Neurology and Neurodegenerative Diseases. He has received royalties from Elsevier for a book, "The Dementias 2", and serves as an advisor for Neurimmune. Dr. Hurtig has received research support from Teva, Solvay, Boehringer-Ingelheim, Novartis, and GlaxoSmithKline,

receives royalties from UpToDate, and has received honoraria from Teva (visiting lecturer Brown University 6/3/09). Dr. Levin has no financial disclosures to report. Dr. Litvan has received research support from Chiltern, NIH R01 NS36711-05A2, Parkinson Study Group and National Parkinson Foundation, and has served as a consultant for Noscira. Dr. Marsh has received research support from the NIH (Grants #MH069666, P50NS38377, HD39822 M032413, NS037167, NS36630-08), the Michael J. Fox Foundation, Eli Lilly, Forest Research Institute, and Boehringer-Ingelheim, and received honoraria from serving as a consultant to Boehringer-Ingelheim, Ovation Pharmaceuticals, Acadia Pharmaceuticals, and Merck Serono. Dr. Simuni has received research grant support from the NIH, Teva, Boehringer-Ingelheim, GlaxoSmithKline, Novartis and Takeda, and has served as a consultant for Boehringer-Ingelheim, Allergan, Teva, GlaxoSmithKline, Novartis, UCB, Valeant and Vernalis. Dr. Tröster has received research support from the National Parkinson Foundation, GlaxoSmithKline, and Medtronic Inc., performs neuropsychological testing in his clinical practice (75% effort), and serves as a consultant to Medtronic, Inc. and St. Jude Neuromodulation. Dr. Uc receives research support from the National Institutes of Health, Department of Veterans Affairs, Parkinson's Disease Foundation, and has received compensation from the NIH and the Parkinson Study Group as a grant reviewer.

Authors' Roles: 1. Research project: A. Conception, B. Organization, C. Execution; 2. Statistical Analysis: A. Design, B. Execution, C. Review and Critique; 3. Manuscript: A. Writing of the first draft, B. Review and Critique. Chou: 1A, 1B, 1C, 3A, 3B. Amick: 1A, 1B, 1C, 3A, 3B. Brandt: 1C, 3B. Camicioli: 1C, 3B. Frei: 1C, 3B. Gitelman: 1C, 3B. Goldman: 1C, 3B. Growdon: 1A, 1B, 3B. Hurtig: 1C, 3B. Levin: 1C, 3B. Litvan: 1C, 3B. Marsh: 1C, 3B. Simuni: 1C, 3B. Tröster: 1C, 3B. Uc: 1A, 1B, 3B.

APPENDIX

The members of the Parkinson Study Group Cognitive/Psychiatric Working Group are:

Chair: John Growdon, MD, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA

Co-chairs: Ergun Uc, MD, University of Iowa Hospitals, Iowa City, IA; Kelvin Chou, MD, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Members: Charles Adler, MD, PhD, Mayo Clinic Arizona, Scottsdale, AZ; Punit Agrawal, DO, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH; Melissa M. Amick, PhD, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA; Jason Brandt, PhD, Neuropsychologist, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD; Richard Camicioli, MD, University of Alberta, Canada; John Caviness, MD, Mayo Clinic Arizona; Karen Frei, MD, Parkinson & MD Institute, Fountain Valley, CA; Joseph Friedman, MD, Butler Hospital, Providence, RI; Serge Gauthier, MD, Dir Alzheimer's Disease Research Unit, McGill University, Montreal; Melissa Gerstenhaber, RNC, MSN, CCRC, Johns Hopkins; Daniel Gitelman, MD, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL; Jennifer Goldman, MD, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, IL; David Hardesty, MD, Columbia University Medical Center, NY; Johanna Hartlein, Washington University, St. Louis, MO; Neal Hermanowicz, MD, Uni-

versity of California, Irvine; Jennifer Hui, MD, U of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA; Howard Hurtig, MD, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; James Leverenz, MD, University of Washington, Seattle, WA; Bonnie Levin, PhD, University of Miami, Miami, FL; Irene Litvan, MD, University of Louisville SOM, Louisville, KY; Laura Marsh, MD, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX; Melissa Nirenberg, MD, PhD, Weill Medical College of Cornell University, New York, NY; Michel Panisset, MD, Hotel-Dieu du CHUM, Montreal, Canada; Irene H. Richard, MD, University of Rochester, NY; Web Ross, Pacific Health Research Institute, Honolulu, HI; Tanya Simuni, MD, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL; Alexander Tröster, PhD, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC; Daniel Truong, MD, Parkinson & MD Institute, Fountain Valley, CA; Paul Tuite, MD, University of Minnesota, MN.

REFERENCES

- Hely MA, Reid WG, Adena MA, Halliday GM, Morris JG. The Sydney multicenter study of Parkinson's disease: the inevitability of dementia at 20 years. *Mov Disord* 2008;23:837–844.
- Kulisevsky J, Pagonabarraga J. Cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease: tools for diagnosis and assessment. *Mov Disord* 2009;24:1103–1110.
- Reyes MA, Lloret SP, Gerscovich ER, Martin ME, Leiguarda R, Merello M. Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination validation in Parkinson's disease. *Eur J Neurol* 2009;16:142–147.
- Stern RG, Mohs RC, Davidson M, et al. A longitudinal study of Alzheimer's disease: measurement, rate, and predictors of cognitive deterioration. *Am J Psychiatry* 1994;151:390–396.
- Hobson P, Meara J. The detection of dementia and cognitive impairment in a community population of elderly people with Parkinson's disease by use of the CAMCOG neuropsychological test. *Age Ageing* 1999;28:39–43.
- Mattis S. Dementia Rating Scale professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources; 1988.
- Mahieux F, Michelet D, Manificier M-J, Boller F, Fermaian J, Guillard A. Mini-Mental Parkinson: first validation study of a new bedside test constructed for Parkinson's disease. *Behav Neurol* 1995;8:15–22.
- Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. "Mini-mental state". A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res* 1975;12:189–198.
- Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bedirian V, et al. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: a brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2005;53:695–699.
- Pagonabarraga J, Kulisevsky J, Llebaria G, Garcia-Sanchez C, Pascual-Sedano B, Gironell A. Parkinson's disease-cognitive rating scale: a new cognitive scale specific for Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord* 2008;23:998–1005.
- Kalbe E, Calabrese P, Kohn N, et al. Screening for cognitive deficits in Parkinson's disease with the Parkinson neuropsychometric dementia assessment (PANDA) instrument. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord* 2008;14:93–101.
- Marinus J, Visser M, Verwey NA, et al. Assessment of cognition in Parkinson's disease. *Neurology* 2003;61:1222–1228.
- Ferris SH. Cognitive outcome measures. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord* 1999;13(suppl 3):S140–S142.
- Athey RJ, Porter RW, Walker RW. Cognitive assessment of a representative community population with Parkinson's disease (PD) using the Cambridge Cognitive Assessment-Revised (CAMCOG-R). *Age Ageing* 2005;34:268–273.
- Llebaria G, Pagonabarraga J, Kulisevsky J, et al. Cut-off score of the Mattis Dementia Rating Scale for screening dementia in Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord* 2008;23:1546–1550.
- Tombs TN, McIntyre NJ. The Mini-Mental State Examination: a comprehensive review. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1992;40:922–935.
- Crum RM, Anthony JC, Bassett SS, Folstein MF. Population-based norms for the Mini-Mental State Examination by age and educational level. *JAMA* 1993;269:2386–2391.
- Aarsland D, Andersen K, Larsen JP, et al. The rate of cognitive decline in Parkinson disease. *Arch Neurol* 2004;61:1906–1911.
- Aarsland D, Laake K, Larsen JP, Janvin C. Donepezil for cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease: a randomised controlled study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2002;72:708–712.
- Muller T, Welnic J, Fuchs G, Baas H, Ebersbach G, Reichmann H. The DONPAD-study—treatment of dementia in patients with Parkinson's disease with donepezil. *J Neural Transm Suppl* 2006;27–30.
- Wind AW, Schellevis FG, Van Staveren G, Scholten RP, Jonker C, Van Eijk JT. Limitations of the Mini-Mental State Examination in diagnosing dementia in general practice. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 1997;12:101–108.
- Gill DJ, Freshman A, Blender JA, Ravina B. The Montreal cognitive assessment as a screening tool for cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord* 2008;23:1043–1046.
- Zadikoff C, Fox SH, Tang-Wai DF, et al. A comparison of the Mini Mental State Exam to the Montreal cognitive assessment in identifying cognitive deficits in Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord* 2008;23:297–299.
- Nazem S, Siderowf AD, Duda JE, et al. Montreal cognitive assessment performance in patients with Parkinson's disease with "normal" global cognition according to Mini-Mental State Examination score. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2009;57:304–308.
- Hoops S, Nazem S, Siderowf AD, et al. Validity of the MoCA and MMSE in the detection of MCI and dementia in Parkinson disease. *Neurology* 2009;73:1738–1745.
- Di Virgilio G, Leroy A, Cunin P, Mahieux F, Bachoud-Levi A-C, Fenelon G. The Mini Mental Parkinson brief cognitive test: comparison with the Mattis dementia rating scale in 289 patients with Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord* 2007;22(suppl 16):S89–S90.
- Riedel O, Klotsche J, Spottke A, et al. Cognitive impairment in 873 patients with idiopathic Parkinson's disease. Results from the German Study on Epidemiology of Parkinson's Disease with Dementia (GEPAD). *J Neurol* 2008;255:255–264.
- Carod-Artal FJ, Martinez-Martin P, Kummer W, Ribeiro Lda S. Psychometric attributes of the SCOPA-COG Brazilian version. *Mov Disord* 2008;23:81–87.
- Verbaan D, Marinus J, Visser M, et al. Cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2007;78:1182–1187.
- Pagonabarraga J, Kulisevsky J, Llebaria G, et al. PDD-Short Screen: a brief cognitive test for screening dementia in Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord* 2010;25:440–446.
- Emre M, Aarsland D, Brown R, et al. Clinical diagnostic criteria for dementia associated with Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord* 2007;22:1689–1707; quiz 1837.
- Dubois B, Burn D, Goetz C, et al. Diagnostic procedures for Parkinson's disease dementia: recommendations from the movement disorder society task force. *Mov Disord* 2007;22:2314–2324.
- Uc EY, McDermott MP, Marder KS, et al. Incidence of and risk factors for cognitive impairment in an early Parkinson disease clinical trial cohort. *Neurology* 2009;73:1469–1477.