

2 9 9 9 : 9



REVIEW

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?

Tiago C. C. Pinto,  Leonardo Machado, Tatiana M. Bulgacov, Antônio L. Rodrigues-Júnior, Maria L. G. Costa, Rosana C. C. Ximenes, and Everton B. Souquey

Post-graduate program in Neuropsychiatry and Behavioral Science at the Federal University of Pernambuco, Recife, Brazil

ABSTRACT

Objective: To evaluate each area of MMS - Memory, Attention, Language, (MMSE) and functional ability. Cognitive ability (MCA) includes memory, language, and attention (MCI) and AD. Dementia (AD).

Method: A ~~S~~ e a c ~~e~~ e . f e ~~B~~ bMed, Br e, Sce ce D~~c~~ ec, C c rae L~~b~~ ay, a d Pycl f da ab a e a c d ced. U g c . a d e c . c e a a d. a g 1,629 a ce, 34 a ce e e eec ed. T e Q a y. f e eec ed e e a c a e a j a e d. a g eQ a y A. e. e fD a g . c Acc a g S. de 2 .. (QUADAS-2).

Result: The area under the ROC curve for MMSE was 0.780 (CI 95% 0.740-0.820) ($p < 0.001$).

Conclusion: The cognitive profile of MCA is similar to MMSE in defining the clinical picture of MCI, and both are effective for AD.

Introduction

De e a . a . d de j b c ea . be .
Acc d g . e W d Hea Ogr a a ,
2012, 36 . e e ed ar . de e -
a, a a e a e c e a e f 4.7%. F e e e de
a 65, e e a e c e a e ac cay d b e de ey
fi ey ea . I add . e e a e ce, e ac
e ec . y, ea , a d . ca a d f de e a
a . c ea g (A e e A ca , 2011; H d
et al., 2013; P ce et al., 2013; W et al., 2013a;

2013b; Zou et al., 2015). A large-scale study by Eshel et al. (2015) found that the average diet in the United States was responsible for 2.5 Gt CO₂ eq yr⁻¹, which is equivalent to about 45% of the country's total greenhouse gas emissions (Eshel et al., 2015).

Age (Du Bois, 2013; Lee et al., 2011). A decrease in age and education level were associated with lower scores on the MMSE and MoCA tests. The results of the logistic regression analysis showed that older age ($\beta = -0.03$, $p < 0.001$), lower education level ($\beta = -0.01$, $p < 0.001$), and higher MMSE score ($\beta = 0.001$, $p < 0.001$) were significant predictors of MCI status. The results of the ROC curve analysis indicated that the area under the curve was 0.71 (95% CI: 0.67–0.75), which is considered acceptable for a diagnostic test (Liu et al., 2015).

Correspondence should be addressed to: C C t 6, t 6, t
-G N 6 C C 6, 6, -
F, A, E, /N,
-G CC -E, E, C, 6, f - E
50740-600, B : +55 87 988727241; F : +55 81 21268539.
E : 6 @ 02 F. 2018; 6
27 F. 2018; 24 J. 2018; 6 29 J. 2018.

... e a e ; ede e , a a f e , re
c g r e d a a a g e e e a e e c e d
a e g e a g e a d e d c a a f e a e , c -
f i e d a b e c e a e b y a , f e a
a g r a c g e e ; de e d e f c . , re -
e ed , a a e .. c a a d ..
ab e . f e d d a (Abe *et al.*, 2011).

T e c g r e dec e c j d b e f . a a e y
f c g r e d a . , c j d g r e e y , e eq e
f c . , a e .. , a g a g e , a d .. a a a b y .
I a r e d e .. d c e . y , a a r e d c .. e
a b y . e a a d i e a e f i a . , e e -
c a y . e e .. a e .. MCI , c j d a e
a g e .. d e e a f . AD (Abe *et al.*, 2011).
T e a j a c e .. , a e .. f M C I . AD a e f .
6% (F e . a *et al.*, 2010), 10%–15% (Pe e . e
et al., 1999), 31% a y e a (B u . c a d L e .. e,
2004).

T e eff e , de y g M C I . f d a e a f . e
e eq .. f .. e e d e a d e a g c e e ..
e e a y . a g e .. f d e a e (Sc .. e c *et al.*,
2005). H e e e , e d a g .. f M C I . a c .. e
a a a e , c .. d e g a .. e c e a y . f e -
y d .. g .. f .. e a f e a .. f e a y
g .. f .. e d e e a a d e c g r e c a g e
r e a d g r e a j a .. c e .. f a g r g .

T e a c q ; a e a d e a y e d - 1 31.7(f)-201.d 3 e d 7.6¶ be e0TD09c(,)T7[(31Tf0(TD-0.0164Tc5665%)-633

c e a e e e a ce , ca e e . . . a e e
f ca e . . e e . . e ed . . , c d g a ce
c dd . . dea e . . bec a e . . c -
a ed f . a . . ergad g e . . c e . f .

Table 1.

Table 1.

STUDY; COUNTRY	POPULATION (N SAMPLING)	CUT OFF										MMSE CONTROL		MMSE CONTROL		TEST WHICH PRESENTED A HIGHER ACCURACY
		AGE (YEARS)		FEMALE GENDER (%)	EDUCATION (YEARS) – AVERAGE SD		MoCA – CONTROL vs MCI CONTROL vs AD	ACCURACY of MoCA (AUC) – CONTROL vs AD		ACCURACY of MMSE (AUC) – CONTROL vs MCI		MoCA CONTROL vs MCI SENSITIVITY/ SPECIFICITY	MoCA CONTROL vs DEMENTIA SENSITIVITY/ SPECIFICITY	MoCA CONTROL vs MCI SENSITIVITY/ SPECIFICITY		
		AVERAGE	SD		MoCA – CONTROL vs MCI CONTROL vs AD	ACCURACY (AUC) – CONTROL vs AD	MoCA CONTROL vs MCI SENSITIVITY/ SPECIFICITY	ACCURACY (AUC) – CONTROL vs MCI	MoCA CONTROL vs MCI SENSITIVITY/ SPECIFICITY	MoCA CONTROL vs MCI SENSITIVITY/ SPECIFICITY	MoCA CONTROL vs MCI SENSITIVITY/ SPECIFICITY	MoCA CONTROL vs DEMENTIA SENSITIVITY/ SPECIFICITY	MoCA CONTROL vs MCI SENSITIVITY/ SPECIFICITY	MoCA CONTROL vs MCI SENSITIVITY/ SPECIFICITY		
Ta <i>et al.</i> (2016); Ta a	C + (26) MCI (59) AD (57)	76.2 8.5	49.6	E e e ay : 35.9%	23/24 19/20	0.91 0.87	0.88	0.89	88/73	79/80	88/70	84/86	M CA + MCI	–	–	
C + <i>et al.</i> (2015); H g K g	C + (115) MCI (87) H g AD (64)	72.2 6.1	75.7	U e y : 28.9%	6.97 4.69 4.62 5.19 4.56 5.00	22/23 19/20	0.85	0.99	0.78	0.99	78/73	94/92	67/83	94/98	M CA + MCI	
H + <i>et al.</i> (2015); USA	C + (124) MCI (126) AD (67)	69.6 7.9	67	U e y : 19.0%	15.3 2.6 14.5 2.8	25/26 19/20	0.88	0.93	0.79	0.95	–	–	–	–	M CA + MCI	
H + <i>et al.</i> (2015); Ta a	C + (260) AD (16)	67.93 6.06	50.7	U e y : 23/24	11.4 4.0	–	–	0.89	–	0.7	–	78/94	–	38/92	M CA	
Ta <i>et al.</i> (2015); C a	C + (4150) MCI (2311) De e a (984)	80.9 4.6	4.9	U e y : 80-89y ea : 24/25 21/22 ≥90y ea : 23/24 19/20	8.5 5.5 7.5 5.7 6.0 6.0	60-79y ea : 25/26 24/25 21/22 ≥90y ea : 23/24 19/20	0.94	0.91	0.85	0.89	>85/>85	>80/>74	–	–	M CA	
Ceca <i>et al.</i> (2014); B a	C + (39) MCI (45) AD (52)	71.8 6.9	74.4	U e y : 22/23	>9y ea : 58.8	24/25	0.94	0.99	0.83	0.95	82.2/92.3	98.1/100.0	80.0/82.1	92.3/82.1	M CA	
K g a <i>et al.</i> (2014); T g g	C + (246) MCI (114) AD (114)	68.0 10.3	60.1	U e y : H g e c : H g e ed ca : 22/23	–	E e e ay : 17/18 15/16 H g e ed ca : 20/21 18/19 H g e ed ca : 22/23	0.85	0.99	0.84	0.98	E e e ay : 67/83 H g e c : 73/85 H g e ed ca : 81/86	89/90 98/97 99/99	–	–	M CA + MCI	
Ma e - A ad <i>et al.</i> (2014); USA	C + (73) MCI (39) AD (34)	82.59 7.67	45.2	U e y : 19/20	14.55 2.41	–	0.71	0.94	0.76	0.97	–	–	–	–	–	
Y g g <i>et al.</i> (2014); H g K g	C + (49) MCI (93) De e a (130)	73.6 7.6	59.0	U e y : 18/19	5.61 4.27 4.80 4.78 3.26 4.03	21/22	0.85	0.97	0.86	0.99	82.8/73.5	92.3/91.8	78.5/81.6	95.4/89.8	–	

Table 1.

STUDY; COUNTRY	POPULATION (N SAMPLING)	AGE	FEMALE	EDUCATION	CUT OFF	ACCURACY	ACCURACY	ACCURA AV
		(YEARS)	GENDER	(YEARS) – AVERAGE SD	MoCA – CONTROL vs AD	of MoCA (AUC) – CONTROL vs MCI	(AUC) – CONTROL vs AD	

Table 1.

STUDY; COUNTRY	POPULATION (N SAMPLING)	AGE	FEMALE	EDUCATION	CUT OFF	ACCURACY	ACCURACY	ACCURACY
		(YEARS)	(%)	(YEARS) – SD	MoCA – CONTROL vs MCI	of MoCA (AUC) – CONTROL vs AD	of MoCA (AUC) – CONTROL vs MCI	Ro69CAV vs AD

AD, the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke—Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders Association (NINCDS-ADRDA) criteria (McKee et al., 1984) and the Clinical Dementia Rating Scale (CDR) (Gillman et al., 2004) are often used for the diagnosis of MCI.

The area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) can also be used to compare the accuracy of MCA and MMSE. Of the 34 studies included, 31 used the AUC method to compare MCA and MMSE in the diagnosis of MCI. They found a mean (80.6%) AUC for MCA and MMSE discrimination of dementia and MCI. The AUC values are as follows: Ceca et al. (2014); Ce et al. (2016); C et al. (2015); Desgraud et al. (2017); D et al. (2012); F et al. (2013); H et al. (2010); G et al. (2010); H et al. (2015); H et al. (2015); H et al. (2013); J et al. (2017); K et al. (2014); Lee et al. (2008); L et al. (2012); I et al. (2011); I et al. (2009); M et al. (2012); M et al. (2016); M et al. (2013).

... e y e a e . e e . e e c e d a d c e -
T e y , a cab y Pa e Se ec . I
ee . J de , e g d a d a d J ed a J ce a
(S ee ay Tab e 1 a d F gure 3). A e
J de ree ed a . f b a a d J a -
cab y g r a d J e de e f e Q UADAS-
2 .

Discussion

T y e a c e e a e d e a j a e e q r e
a e f e J b e c a d a e . c f e e . a
bee . b e b e a c q a e a c J MCI
a d AD e de y d d a . I e e , 34
a c e c a a y e d e ab y f M CA a d
MMSE d . J MCI a d AD a . J e

e de ec . f d AD. T . e .
e de y d d a . ad e e f a ed -
ca . , a g e c ded a ce e
e a j e e . T e eff e, e ab e ce f e
d e r y f M CA . d & a baby
d e l e co m e ce f effec : c g ex
ea y e de y d d a . ad f a ed -
ca . , ed bad e f a ce e e , a
e de y d d a . MCI a d d AD, c -
e de y a acc a g d g
be ee c . ed d d a f . e e c g -
e a a e .

I . e e g b e e a e a e f e
g - ff . f MCI e e j e .
defi ed de e e AD ; ac cay a e .
a e a a ed e de ec . f MCI a d AD (Ceca
et al., 2014; Cj et al., 2015; Degrad et al., 2017;
Fe a et al., 2013; H . et al., 2015; H . et al.,
2013; Kya et al., 2014; Me . et al., 2016; Me -
a et al., 2013; Ra f et al., 2013, 2017; Sa e et al.,
2018; Ta et al., 2015; Ta et al., 2012, 2016; Ye g
et al., 2014). T . fac . baby d e . a g
g e q - ff . , e . d , c e .
ree . be MCI ca e f . be g c . de ed
a . T j , e g e q - ff . , c ea e e
e . y . f e ; ac g e .

I . a . g g a . ce ; ac g e .
a e be g ed, e . . 0544465(a.)]TJ e
Mb173.5eg

J e . y . MMSE de 9 MCI, a d b
e . a e acq; a e de ec g A e e' D. ea e,
M CA ee g a e de g . a d a g ea e
ab y . ac e e . d a g .. c r a c g , h -
J . a . ca d ffe e ce. T e e a j a . f e

- e e ā e ad . . . a de 60 ā . *Neurologia*. d : 10.1016/. . . 2017.01.013 (E b a ead. f).
- et al. (2012). T e M ea C g eA e. e d e . e - e a. aee a a de ec g a e . a g e . f de e a. *International Psychogeriatrics*, 24, 1749–1755. d : 10.1017/S1041610212001068.
- et al. (2013). C a . f e M ea C g eA e. e ad e - e a. a ee a a de ec g j -d a d c g e a a e a C ee b a e d a f a j a . -ba ed. j & . *International Psychogeriatrics*, 25, 1831–1838. d : 10.1017/S1041610213001129.
- (2015). T ex d g . f A e e ? d ea e: a e a e e . be efi. a d c a ege. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, 49, 617–631. d : 10.3233/JAD-150692.
- “M - e a a e”: a p ac ca e d f g ad g e c g e. a e. f e c ca . *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 12, 189–198. d : 10.1016/0022-3956(75)90026-6.
- et al. (2010). C ca a d b. g ca f ed c. f A e e ? d ea e a e .

Sue ea e US. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 24, 197–201. doi : [10.1002/gp.2101](https://doi.org/10.1002/gp.2101).

