# UCLA UCLA Previously Published Works

# Title

Utility of a short, telephone-administered version of the Montreal Cognitive Assessment.

**Permalink** https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9d22909x

**Journal** Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 69(10)

**ISSN** 0002-8614

# **Authors**

Jennings, Lee A Araujo, Katy LB Meng, Can <u>et al.</u>

**Publication Date** 

2021-10-01

# DOI

10.1111/jgs.17318

Peer reviewed

Journal of the American Geriatrics Society

# Utility of a short, telephone-administered version of the Montreal Cognitive Assessment

Lee A. Jennings MD,  $MSHS^1 \bigcirc \square$  | Katy L. B. Araujo  $MPH^2$  | Can Meng MS,  $MPH^3$  | Peter Peduzzi PhD<sup>3</sup> | Peter Charpentier  $MPH^2$  | David B. Reuben  $MD^4$ 

<sup>1</sup>Reynolds Section of Geriatrics, Department of Medicine, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, USA <sup>2</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut, USA

<sup>3</sup>Department of Biostatistics, Yale Center for Analytical Sciences, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut, USA

<sup>4</sup>Multicampus Program in Geriatric Medicine and Gerontology, David Geffen School of Medicine, Division of Geriatrics, University of California, Los Angeles, California, USA

#### Correspondence

Lee A. Jennings, Reynolds Section of Geriatrics, Department of Medicine, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, 1122 N.E. 13 Street, ORB 1200, Oklahoma City, OK 73117, USA. Email: lee-jennings@ouhsc.edu

David B. Reuben, Multicampus Program in Geriatric Medicine and Gerontology, Division of Geriatrics, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, 10945 Le Conte Ave., Suite 2339, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1687, USA. Email: dreuben@mednet.ucla.edu

#### Funding information

Claude D. Pepper Older Americans Independence Center, Yale Program on Aging, Grant/Award Number: P30AG021342; National Institute on Aging, Grant/Award Number: 1 R01 AG061078-01; Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, Grant/Award Number: PCS-2017C1-6534

#### Abstract

**Background:** Because of the COVID-19 pandemic, the ongoing D-CARE pragmatic trial of two models of dementia care management needed to transition to all data collection by telephone.

**Methods:** For the first 1069 D-CARE participants, we determined the feasibility of administering a short 3-item version of the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) to persons with dementia by telephone and examined the correlation with the full 12-item version.

**Results:** The 3-item version could be administered by telephone in approximately 6 min and was highly correlated with the full MoCA (r = 0.78, p < 0.0001).

**Conclusions:** This brief version of the MoCA was feasible to collect by telephone and could be used as an alternative to the full MoCA, particularly if the purpose of cognitive assessment is characterization of study participants.

#### K E Y W O R D S

cognitive assessment, dementia, telephone administration

# INTRODUCTION

The Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA)<sup>1</sup> is a validated, widely used cognitive test that captures mild cognitive impairment and dementia. Telephone versions of the MoCA have been validated<sup>2,3</sup> as have shorter in-person versions.<sup>4</sup> Early in an ongoing pragmatic trial comparing two dementia care models,<sup>5</sup> we noticed more participants than expected had missing MoCA data. Almost simultaneously, the COVID-19 pandemic forced changes in the study protocol, including telephone collection of all data. These two circumstances prompted us to determine the feasibility of administering a short version of the MoCA to persons with dementia (PWD) by telephone and how well it correlated with the full MoCA administered in person.

**TABLE 1**Comparison of full MoCA, telephone MoCA, andDong MoCA

Cognitive domains and tasks	Full MoCA	Telephone MoCA	Dong MoCA		
Visuospatial/executive (5 points)					
Alternate trail making	Х				
Visuoconstructional skills (copy cube)	Х				
Visuoconstructional skills (clock draw)	Х				
Animal naming (3 points)	Х				
Attention (6 points)					
Forward and backward digit span	Х	Х			
Vigilance (A-test)	Х	Х			
Serial subtraction by 7	Х	Х			
Language (3 points)					
Sentence repetition	Х	Х			
Verbal fluency (F words)	Х	Х	Х		
Abstraction (2 points)	Х	Х			
Delayed recall (5 points)	Х	Х	Х		
Orientation (6 points)	Х	Х	Х		
Total maximum points	30	22	12		

*Note*: Full MoCA: in-person, 12-item, 30-point version.<sup>1</sup> Telephone MoCA: 8-item, 22-point version.<sup>2,8</sup> Dong MoCA: 3-item, 12-point version.<sup>6</sup> Abbreviation: MoCA, Montreal Cognitive Assessment.

#### TABLE 2 Characteristics of participants

#### **Key Points**

In a pragmatic trial, a 3-item version of the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) was feasible to administer by telephone and highly correlated with the full MoCA.

# Why Does this Paper Matter?

This brief version of the MoCA could be used for telephone cognitive assessment, particularly if the purpose is participant characterization.

## **METHODS**

Data were from baseline assessments of the D-CARE study,<sup>5</sup> approved by the UCLA IRB and all four trial sites (Clinicaltrials.gov Identifier NCT03786471). From June 2019 until March 2020, the MoCA was administered in person, and subsequently the study transitioned to telephone data collection of a shortened version validated by Dong et al.<sup>6</sup> We selected this version because it required no visual tasks and the scoring rules matched the original MoCA. The full MoCA is a 12-item, 30-point instrument and the Dong version is a 3-item, 12-point subset

Full sample, N = 1069	Participants with missing MoCA data, N = 267	Participants with Dong version only, N = 535	Participants who completed MoCA in person, N = 267	p-Value
80.5 (8.7)	81.5 (8.8)	79.9 (9.1)	80.8 (7.9)	0.038
641 (60.0)	153 (57.3)	325 (60.8)	163 (61.1)	0.590
812 (76.0)	213 (79.8)	392 (73.3)	207 (77.5)	0.100
87 (8.1)	21 (7.9)	51 (9.5)	15 (5.6)	0.158
				0.007
492 (46.0)	116 (43.5)	227 (42.4)	149 (55.8)	
472 (44.2)	122 (45.7)	252 (47.1)	98 (36.7)	
105 (9.8)	29 (10.9)	56 (10.5)	20 (7.5)	
4.3 (1.9)	3.9 (2.0)	4.3 (2.0)	4.8 (1.6)	< 0.0001
12.2 (5.7)	NA	NA	12.2 (5.7)	
3.6 (2.8)	NA	3.7 (3.1)	3.4 (2.2)	0.177
	Full sample,   N = 1069   80.5 (8.7)   641 (60.0)   812 (76.0)   87 (8.1)   492 (46.0)   472 (44.2)   105 (9.8)   4.3 (1.9)   12.2 (5.7)   3.6 (2.8)	Participants with missing MoCA data, N = 1069Full sample, N = 26780.5 (8.7)81.5 (8.8)641 (60.0)153 (57.3)812 (76.0)213 (79.8)87 (8.1)21 (7.9)492 (46.0)116 (43.5)472 (44.2)122 (45.7)105 (9.8)29 (10.9)4.3 (1.9)3.9 (2.0)12.2 (5.7)NA3.6 (2.8)NA	Participants with missing MoCA data, $N = 1069$ Participants with Dong version only, $N = 267$ Participants with Dong version only, $N = 535$ $80.5 (8.7)$ $81.5 (8.8)$ $79.9 (9.1)$ $641 (60.0)$ $153 (57.3)$ $325 (60.8)$ $812 (76.0)$ $213 (79.8)$ $392 (73.3)$ $87 (8.1)$ $21 (7.9)$ $51 (9.5)$ $492 (46.0)$ $116 (43.5)$ $227 (42.4)$ $472 (44.2)$ $122 (45.7)$ $252 (47.1)$ $105 (9.8)$ $29 (10.9)$ $56 (10.5)$ $4.3 (1.9)$ $3.9 (2.0)$ $4.3 (2.0)$ $12.2 (5.7)$ NANA $3.6 (2.8)$ NA $3.7 (3.1)$	Participants with missing N = 1069Participants with missing MoCA data, N = 267Participants with Dong wersion only, N = 535Participants who completed MoCA in person, N = 26780.5 (8.7)81.5 (8.8)79.9 (9.1)80.8 (7.9)641 (60.0)153 (57.3)325 (60.8)163 (61.1)812 (76.0)213 (79.8)392 (73.3)207 (77.5)87 (8.1)21 (7.9)51 (9.5)15 (5.6)492 (46.0)116 (43.5)227 (42.4)149 (55.8)472 (44.2)122 (45.7)252 (47.1)98 (36.7)105 (9.8)29 (10.9)56 (10.5)20 (7.5)4.3 (1.9)3.9 (2.0)4.3 (2.0)4.8 (1.6)12.2 (5.7)NANA12.2 (5.7)3.6 (2.8)NA3.7 (3.1)3.4 (2.2)

*Note*: Participants who completed the full in-person MoCA will also have a Dong MoCA score as the Dong version is a subset of the full MoCA. Baseline characteristics compared among participants with missing MoCA data, participants with Dong version only, and participants who completed MoCA in person using chi-square test for categorical variables and ANOVA for continuous variables. Scores for those with Dong version only and those who completed MoCA in person were compared using a pooled *t* test.

Abbreviations: ADL, activities of daily living including bathing, dressing, toileting, transferring (getting from bed to chair), continence, and feeding; ANOVA, analysis of variance; MoCA, Montreal Cognitive Assessment.

2

(i.e., verbal fluency, delayed recall, and orientation) (Table 1). Pearson's correlation coefficient and linear regression of the Dong subset score on the full MoCA total score were performed.

# RESULTS

Among the first 1069 D-CARE participants, 267 had missing MoCA data (25%). Table 2 provides characteristics of participants with and without missing data, those who completed the full MoCA in person (N = 267), and those with the shortened Dong version completed by telephone or derived from a partial in-person MoCA (N = 535). Of those participants with missing MoCA data, 235 had all data missing and 32 had partial data missing due to refusal by PWD or caregiver (N = 144), hearing impairment (N = 70), PWD's inability to complete assessment (N = 29), or other (N = 24). Mean scores were 12.2 (SD 5.7) for the full MoCA and 3.6 (SD 2.8) for the Dong version. The correlation between full MoCA and Dong subset scores (N = 267 with both full and Dong scores) was 0.78 (p < 0.0001) and the adjusted  $R^2$  was 0.60.

# DISCUSSION

We found that the 3-item Dong MoCA is highly correlated with the full 12-item MoCA and can be administered by telephone to PWD in approximately 6 min. There are seven shortened, previously validated versions of the MoCA,<sup>4</sup> including the one validated for telephone administration in persons with stroke using different scoring rules.<sup>7</sup> One advantage of the Dong version is that it can be calculated from the full MoCA if individual items have been recorded. Therefore, studies that have previously collected in-person data prior to switching to telephone administration can include both modes of administration. Although the brevity of the Dong version helps reduce missing data, it is not as robust as the 22-point telephone version, or version for persons with visual impairment, which collects all items except those requiring a visual stimulus or use of paper and pencil.<sup>2,8</sup> Accordingly, the purpose of cognitive assessment is important. If it is to characterize study participants, the abbreviated version may suffice. If it is an important outcome measure, then a longer telephone version may be preferable.

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the D-CARE study staff for their assistance with data collection. This work was supported by the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCS-2017C1-6534), the National Institute on Aging (1 R01 AG061078-01), and the Yale Program on Aging/ Claude D. Pepper Older Americans Independence Center (P30AG021342).

#### **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The authors have no conflicts of interest to report.

### **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

Lee A. Jennings: conception and design, analysis and interpretation of data; drafting the article; revising the article critically for important intellectual content; final approval. Katy L. B. Araujo: conception and design, analysis and interpretation of data; revising the article critically for important intellectual content; final approval. Can Meng: analysis and interpretation of data; revising the article critically for important intellectual content; final approval. Peter Peduzzi: interpretation of data; revising the article critically for important intellectual content; final approval. Peter Charpentier: analysis and interpretation of data; revising the article critically for important intellectual content; final approval. David B. Reuben: conception and design; acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; revising the article critically for important intellectual content; final approval.

## SPONSOR'S ROLE

The funders of this work had no role in the design, methods, subject recruitment, data collection, data analysis, or preparation of this manuscript.

#### ORCID

Lee A. Jennings b https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9524-6921

# TWITTER

Lee A. Jennings 💟 @LeeAJennings

#### REFERENCES

- 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(4):695-699.
- Pendlebury ST, Welch SJ, Cuthbertson FC, Mariz J, Mehta Z, Rothwell PM. Telephone assessment of cognition after transient ischemic attack and stroke: modified telephone interview of cognitive status and telephone Montreal Cognitive Assessment versus face-to-face Montreal Cognitive Assessment and neuropsychological battery. *Stroke*. 2013;44(1):227-229.
- Zietemann V, Kopczak A, Müller C, Wollenweber FA, Dichgans M. Validation of the telephone interview of cognitive status and telephone Montreal Cognitive Assessment against detailed cognitive testing and clinical diagnosis of mild cognitive impairment after stroke. *Stroke*. 2017;48(11):2952-2957.
- 4. Liew TM. The optimal short version of Montreal Cognitive Assessment in diagnosing mild cognitive impairment and

4 JAGS

dementia. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2019;20(8):1055.e1-1055.e8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2019.02.004

- 5. Reuben DB, Gill TM, Stevens A, et al. D-CARE: the dementia care study: design of a pragmatic trial of the effectiveness and cost effectiveness of health system-based versus community-based dementia care versus usual dementia care. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2020;68(11):2492-2499.
- 6. Dong Y, Xu J, Chan BP, et al. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment is superior to National Institute of Neurological Disease and Stroke. Canadian Stroke Network 5-minute protocol in predicting vascular cognitive impairment at 1 year. *BMC Neurol.* 2016;16:46.
- Wong A, Nyenhuis D, Black SE, et al. Montreal Cognitive Assessment 5-minute protocol is a brief, valid, reliable, and feasible cognitive screen for telephone administration. *Stroke*. 2015;46(4):1059-1064.

8. Wittich W, Phillips N, Nasreddine ZS, Chertkow H. Sensitivity and specificity of the Montreal Cognitive Assessment modified for individuals who are visually impaired. *J Vis Impair Blind*. 2010;104(6):360-368.

How to cite this article: Jennings LA, Araujo KLB, Meng C, Peduzzi P, Charpentier P, Reuben DB. Utility of a short, telephoneadministered version of the Montreal Cognitive Assessment. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2021;1–4. <u>https://</u> doi.org/10.1111/jgs.17318