Original Research Article

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20205196

A cross-sectional study on prevalence of cognitive impairment and its associated factors among the elderly in an urban area of Chennai, India

Rajesh J.*, Ramasubramanian R., Santhanam R. S.

Department of Community Medicine, Government Medical College and Hospital, Omandurar Government Estate, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

Received: 17 September 2020 **Accepted:** 30 October 2020

*Correspondence:

Dr. Rajesh J.,

E-mail: rajeshjmails@gmail.com

Copyright: © the author(s), publisher and licensee Medip Academy. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ABSTRACT

Background: Elderly people often experience cognitive decline with aging. Existing longitudinal studies report that older adults with mild cognitive impairment (MCI) have a 10-15% annual risk of converting to probable Alzheimer's disease (AD). Objectives were to determine the prevalence of cognitive impairment among the elderly in an urban area of Chennai and to assess the factors associated with cognitive impairment among the elderly.

Methods: This Community based Cross sectional study was conducted between July and October 2019 among 77 individuals aged 60 years and above from an urban area in Chennai, Pudupet. After the institutional ethics committee approval, subjects were interviewed with a pre-designed semi-structured questionnaire followed by administration of standardized mini mental state examination (SMMSE) tool and scoring. Data was analysed using relevant descriptive and inferential statistics with trial version of SPSS.v.25. and OpenEpi software.

Results: The overall prevalence (95% CI) of cognitive impairment was 35.06 % (25.35%, 46.20%). Its prevalence among males and females were 26.08 % (12.55%, 46.47%) and 38.88 (27.04%, 52.21%) respectively. The mean age (95% CI) of study subjects with cognitive impairment was 66.37 years (64.58, 68.16). Those subjects who led a solitary life, had less than 10 years of schooling, used kerosene as cooking fuel and consumed bore well water had significant association with cognitive impairment.

Conclusions: Usage of cooking fuel like LPG and consumption of filtered and purified water could minimize cognitive impairment. Early detection of cognitive impairment would improve the health care and quality of life of the elderly.

INTRODUCTION

Cognition is the process by which the brain receives and processes information from the outside in order to recognize the world actively. Cognitive functions involve memory, attention, language, execution, reasoning, computation, and orientation. Cognitive impairment is when a person has trouble remembering, learning new things, concentrating, or making decisions that affect their everyday life. Cognitive functioning is typically characterized into 1 of 5 domains: learning and memory, language, visuospatial, executive and psychomotor. These

domains have a rough correspondence with their cerebral localization.³ Cognitive impairment ranges from mild to severe.² Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI) is the term used to describe the condition of individuals whose cognition lies between the cognitive changes of aging and early dementia.⁴ For a diagnosis of MCI, only one of these five areas must be impaired, whereas a diagnosis of dementia requires that more than one domain must be impaired. Evidence for involvement of individual domains can be obtained from the history, a brief mental status examination, or neuropsychological testing.³

Cognitive impairment can affect a patient's social functioning and quality of life to varying degrees, and even lead to death in severe cases. MCI is typically associated with either memory impairments or deficits in cognitive and/or motor performance. MCI is about four-times as prevalent as dementia. Elderly people often experience cognitive decline with aging. The reasons for cognitive dysfunctions can range from physiological mild forgetfulness described by many older individuals to mild cognitive impairment until the severe effects of Alzheimer's Disease (AD). Existing longitudinal studies report that older adults with MCI have a 10%-15% annual risk of converting to probable AD. Long However, a significant number tends to remain stable over-time and some may even return to a "healthy" state.

Considering the characteristics of MCI and dementia and its prevalence worldwide, it is one of the major public health problems which need attention. Hand Many patients with mild cognitive impairment (MCI) and AD do not recognize cognitive, functional or behavioral impairment. But this anosognosia can have serious effects on health, because patients eventually deny adequate treatment due to their unawareness of deficits. Daily functioning may be compromised, because they lack adequate judgement of situations. He-18

Studies show cognitive impairment is a main contributor to institutionalization in the elderly, independently of their socio-demographic status, social network, or functional status.¹⁹ More than half of MCI patients will progress to dementia within 5 years.⁵ Therefore, timely intervention of MCI is very important to delay the occurrence and development of dementia.²⁰ Hence this study was done to determine its burden in the community and to emphasize the need for screening. This would help in early detection of cognitive impairment thereby improving the health care of the elderly and eventually reduces the need for institutionalization in elderly care facilities.

With this background the present study was conducted with the objectives to determine the prevalence of cognitive impairment among the elderly in an urban area of Chennai and to assess the factors associated with cognitive impairment among the elderly.

METHODS

This community based cross sectional study was conducted for a period of four months between July and October 2019 in the urban field practice area of Pudupet, under the urban health training center of our medical college hospital in Chennai. Elderly people aged 60 years of age and above who consent to participate were included as study subjects. Data was collected from the eldest member of the household. Those who were terminally ill; those with visual, hearing or speech impairment and those with mental retardation from childhood were excluded from the study. As per the

dementia India 2010 report, the reported prevalence of dementia from urban areas was 0.9 to 4.8%. So assuming a prevalence of 4.8% at 5% level of significance and 95% Confidence interval (CI), Sample size was calculated as follows:

$$n = Z^2pq \div d^2$$

= $(1.96 \times 1.96 \times 4.8 \times 95.2) \div (5 \times 5)$
= 70.21

By considering 10% as non-responders, a sample size of 77 was obtained. Sample households were selected by simple random sampling technique using random number tables, from the line listing of family folders maintained at the urban primary health center. Data was collected by interview of study subjects using a pre-designed semistructured questionnaire for socio-demographic details like age, sex, educational status, occupation, marital status, life style, food habits, physical exercise, family history, co-morbidities, etc., and a Standardized Mini Mental State Examination (SMMSE) Questionnaire to identify the cognitive impairment. Based on the SMMSE score, cognitive impairment of the study subjects was classified as normal (25-30), mild/early (21-24), moderate (10-20), Severe (0-9).²² Those with a SMMSE score of lesser than 25 were considered to have cognitive impairment. Data was coded and entered in trial version of SPSS v.25.0 and OpenEpi software. Data was analysed using descriptive statistics like mean, median, standard deviation, inter-quartile range and proportion as well as inferential statistics like Pearson Chi-square test, Mann Whitney U test and Kruskall Wallis H test. P value < 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

RESULTS

Among the 77 study subjects, 50 (64.93%) had normal cognitive function, 15 (19.48%) had mild cognitive impairment and 12 (15.58%) had moderate cognitive impairment. Occurrence of cognitive impairment in the total study participants was reported in only 27(35.06%) individuals. The cognition status of the study participants were distributed based on their SMMSE score (Table 1).

The overall prevalence (95% CI) of cognitive impairment was 35.06% (25.35%, 46.20%). The prevalence of cognitive impairment among males and females were 26.08% (12.55%, 46.47%) and 38.88 (27.04%, 52.21%) respectively. Of the 77 study subjects, majority 56 (72.7%) were in the age group of 60-69 years. The mean age (95% CI) of the study subjects who had normal cognitive function, mild and moderate cognitive impairment were 65.48 years (63.84, 67.12), 66.07 years (63.58, 68.56) and 66.75 years (63.73, 69.77) respectively. There were 54 (70.1%) females and 23 (29.9%) males. Of the study participants majority 41 (53.2%) were Hindu. Of the 27 study subjects with cognitive impairment, majority 19 (70.3%) were living without spouse and this association was found to be statistically significant (p=0.04, OR=2.788,

CI=1.030-7.547). Majority 72 (93.5%) of the study subjects belonged to families with more than 5 members. There were 67 (87%) subjects who had an education of 10 years or less of which 27 (40.3%) showed cognitive impairment and this association between duration of education and cognitive impairment

was found to be statistically significant (p=0.012, OR=1.675, 95% CI=1.376-2.039) (Table 2).

Table 1: Distribution of cognitive status of study subjects based on SMMSE score.

Cognitive status	Frequency (%)	Mean SMMSE score (95% CI)	SD	Median SMMSE score	IQR
Normal	50 (64.93)	27.06 (26.61, 27.51)	1.58	27.00	2
Mild cognitive impairment	15 (19.48)	22.73 (22.09, 23.38)	1.16	23.00	2
Moderate cognitive impairment	12 (15.58)	18.17 (16.79, 19.54)	2.16	18.50	4

Table 2: Socio-demographic factors associated with cognitive impairment.

Eastons	Cognition		Total	DV
Factors	Normal	Impaired	Total	P Value
Age category (Year)				
60-64	26 (74.3)	9 (25.7)	35	
65-69	11 (52.4)	10 (47.6)	21	
70-74	7 (50.0)	7 (50.0)	14	0.146
75-80	6 (85.7)	1 (14.3)	7	
>80	0	0	0	
Sex				
Male	17 (73.9)	6 (26.1)	23	0.201
Female	33 (61.1)	21 (38.9)	54	0.281
Religion				
Hindu	25 (61.0)	16 (39.0)	41	
Muslim	23 (69.7)	10 (30.3)	33	0.761
Christian	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	3	
Family members				
Up to 5 members	5 (100.0)	0	5	
More than 5 members	45 (62.5)	27 (37.5)	72	0.107
Marital Status				
With spouse	27 (77.1)	8 (22.9)	35	0.04*
Without spouse	23 (54.8)	19 (45.2)	42	
Education status				
Up to 10 years of schooling	40 (59.7)	27 (40.3)	67	
More than 10 years of schooling	10 (100.0)	0	10	0.012*
Occupation status				
Unemployed	29 (61.7)	18 (38.3)	47	
Employed	9 (69.2)	4 (30.8)	13	0.756
Retired	12 (70.6)	5 (29.4)	17	
Family type		,		
Nuclear	19 (67.9)	9 (32.1)	28	
Joint	5 (83.3)	1 (16.7)	6	0.469
Three Generation	26 (60.5)	17 (39.5)	43	

 $(Note: Figures \ in \ parenthesis \ denotes \ percentages, *Pearson \ Chi-square \ test; P\ value < 0.05 \ is \ considered \ as \ statistically \ significant)$

Of the total study participants majority of them 72 (93.5%) used liquid petroleum gas (LPG) as daily cooking fuel. The median SMMSE score of study participants using kerosene as cooking fuel (21.00) was lesser than those who used LPG as fuel (26.00) and this association between type of cooking fuel daily used and cognitive impairment was found to be statistically

significant by Mann Whitney U test (p value=0.019). On studying the association between source of drinking water and cognitive impairment, among bore well water consumers majority 11 (55.0%) had cognitive impairment and this association was statistically significant. Many other factors like presence of any other illnesses, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, intake of medication for other

illnesses, past history of surgery, past history of head injury and history of vital events in the past did not have any statistically significant association with cognitive status of the study subjects (Table 3).

Table 3: Distribution of certain factors associated with cognitive impairment.

Cooking fue LPG	Factors	Cognition		Total	David
LPG 49 (68.1) 23 (31.9) 72 0.048* Kerosene 1 (20.0) 4 (80.0) 5 Diet category Vegetarian 1 (50.0) 1 (50.0) 2 Mixed diet 49 (65.3) 26 (34.7) 75 1.0 Drinking water Wetro 25 (89.3) 3 (10.7) 28 Bore well 9 (45.0) 11 (55.0) 20 0.001* Packaged water 12 (48.0) 13 (52.0) 25 RO 4 (100.0) 0 4 4 H/o any illness 7 70.0 3 (30.0) 10 0.746 He present 43 (64.2) 24 (35.8) 67 0.746 Absent 7 (70.0) 3 (30.0) 10 0.746 H/o Diabetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 0.267 H/o hypertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 0.582 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 0.905 Absent 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 <t< th=""><th>Normal</th><th>Impaired</th><th>Total</th><th>P value</th></t<>		Normal	Impaired	Total	P value
Kerosene 1 (20.0) 4 (80.0) 5 Diet category Vegetarian 1 (50.0) 2 1.0 Mixed diet 49 (65.3) 26 (34.7) 75 1.0 Drinking water Metro 25 (89.3) 3 (10.7) 28 Bore well 9 (45.0) 11 (55.0) 20 0.001* Packaged water 12 (48.0) 13 (52.0) 25 0.001* RO 4 (100.0) 0 4 4 Hoany illness Present 43 (64.2) 24 (35.8) 67 0.746 Absent 7 (70.0) 3 (30.0) 10 0.746 H/o Diabetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 0.267 Absent 27 (71.0) 11 (28.9) 28 0.267 H/o hypertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 0.582 <td>Cooking fuel</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Cooking fuel				
Diet category Vegetarian 1 (50.0) 1 (50.0) 2 1.0 Mixed diet 49 (65.3) 26 (34.7) 75 1.0 Drinking water Metro 25 (89.3) 3 (10.7) 28 Bore well 9 (45.0) 11 (55.0) 20 0.001* Packaged water 12 (48.0) 13 (52.0) 25 8 RO 4 (100.0) 0 4 4 4 60 4 0.001* 4 4 60 4 0.001* 4 0.001* 4 0.001* 4 0.001* 4 0.001* 4 0.001* 4 0.001* <t< td=""><td>LPG</td><td>49 (68.1)</td><td>23 (31.9)</td><td>72</td><td>0.048*</td></t<>	LPG	49 (68.1)	23 (31.9)	72	0.048*
Vegetarian 1 (50.0) 1 (50.0) 2 Mixed diet 49 (65.3) 26 (34.7) 75 1.0 Drinking water Metro 25 (89.3) 3 (10.7) 28 Bore well 9 (45.0) 11 (55.0) 20 0.001* Packaged water 12 (48.0) 13 (52.0) 25 25 RO 4 (100.0) 0 4 4 4 H/o any illness Present 43 (64.2) 24 (35.8) 67 0.746 Absent 7 (70.0) 3 (30.0) 10 0.746 H/o Diabetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 0.267 H/o bubetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 0.267 H/o hypertension Present 21 (64.0) 15 (32.6) 46 0.582 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 0.905 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68	Kerosene	1 (20.0)	4 (80.0)	5	
Mixed diet 49 (65.3) 26 (34.7) 75 1,0 Drinking water Metro 25 (89.3) 3 (10.7) 28 Bore well 9 (45.0) 11 (55.0) 20 0.001* Packaged water 12 (48.0) 13 (52.0) 25 RO 4 (100.0) 0 4 H/o any illness Present 43 (64.2) 24 (35.8) 67 Absent 7 (70.0) 3 (30.0) 10 H/o Diabetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 Absent 27 (71.0) 11 (28.9) 28 H/o byertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 H/o surgery Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 H/o be	Diet category			·	
Mixed diet 49 (65.3) 26 (34.7) 75 Drinking water	Vegetarian	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	2	1.0
Metro 25 (89.3) 3 (10.7) 28 Bore well 9 (45.0) 11 (55.0) 20 0.001* Packaged water 12 (48.0) 13 (52.0) 25 RO 4 (100.0) 0 4 H/o any illness Present 43 (64.2) 24 (35.8) 67 0.746 Absent 7 (70.0) 3 (30.0) 10 0.746 H/o Diabetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 0.267 Absent 27 (71.0) 11 (28.9) 28 0.267 H/o hypertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 0.582 Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 0.582 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 0.905 Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 0.905 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 <td>Mixed diet</td> <td>49 (65.3)</td> <td>26 (34.7)</td> <td>75</td> <td>1.0</td>	Mixed diet	49 (65.3)	26 (34.7)	75	1.0
Bore well 9 (45.0) 11 (55.0) 20 0.001* Packaged water 12 (48.0) 13 (52.0) 25 RO 4 (100.0) 0 4 H/o any illness Present 43 (64.2) 24 (35.8) 67 Absent 7 (70.0) 3 (30.0) 10 H/o Diabetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 Absent 27 (71.0) 11 (28.9) 28 H/o hypertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 Absent 3 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 <td< td=""><td>Drinking water</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Drinking water				
Packaged water 12 (48.0) 13 (52.0) 25 RO 4 (100.0) 0 4 H/o any illness Present 43 (64.2) 24 (35.8) 67 Absent 7 (70.0) 3 (30.0) 10 H/o Diabetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 Absent 27 (71.0) 11 (28.9) 28 H/o hypertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 Absent 5 (55.6) 4 (44.4) 9 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 <td>Metro</td> <td>25 (89.3)</td> <td>3 (10.7)</td> <td>28</td> <td></td>	Metro	25 (89.3)	3 (10.7)	28	
RO 4 (100.0) 0 4 H/o any illness Present 43 (64.2) 24 (35.8) 67 Absent 7 (70.0) 3 (30.0) 10 H/o Diabetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 Absent 27 (71.0) 11 (28.9) 28 H/o hypertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 0.905 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20	Bore well	9 (45.0)	11 (55.0)	20	0.001*
RO 4 (100.0) 0 4 H/o any illness Present 43 (64.2) 24 (35.8) 67 Absent 7 (70.0) 3 (30.0) 10 H/o Diabetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 Absent 27 (71.0) 11 (28.9) 28 H/o hypertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 0.905 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20	Packaged water	12 (48.0)	13 (52.0)	25	
Present 43 (64.2) 24 (35.8) 67 Absent 7 (70.0) 3 (30.0) 10 H/o Diabetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 0.267 Absent 27 (71.0) 11 (28.9) 28 0.267 H/o hypertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 0.582 Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 0.582 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 0.905 Absent 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 H/o bad injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 0.20 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	RO	` /		4	
Absent 7 (70.0) 3 (30.0) 10 0.746 H/o Diabetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 0.267 Absent 27 (71.0) 11 (28.9) 28 0.267 H/o hypertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 0.582 Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 0.582 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 0.905 Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 0.905 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 0.815 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	H/o any illness				
Absent 7 (70.0) 3 (30.0) 10 0.746 H/o Diabetes mellitus Present 23 (59.0) 16 (41.0) 39 0.267 Absent 27 (71.0) 11 (28.9) 28 0.267 H/o hypertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 0.582 Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 0.582 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 0.905 Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 0.905 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 0.815 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	Present	43 (64.2)	24 (35.8)	67	0.746
H/o Diabetes mellitus	Absent			10	0.746
Absent 27 (71.0) 11 (28.9) 28 H/o hypertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 Absent 5 (55.6) 4 (44.4) 9 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	H/o Diabetes mellitus				
Absent 27 (71.0) 11 (28.9) 28 H/o hypertension Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 Absent 5 (55.6) 4 (44.4) 9 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	Present	23 (59.0)	16 (41.0)	39	0.267
Present 31 (67.4) 15 (32.6) 46 0.582 Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 0.582 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 0.905 Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 0.905 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 Absent 5 (55.6) 4 (44.4) 9 0.712 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 0.815 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 0.20 H/o vital events 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	Absent			28	0.267
Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 0.582 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 0.905 Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 0.905 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 Absent 5 (55.6) 4 (44.4) 9 0.712 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 0.815 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	H/o hypertension				
Absent 19 (61.3) 12 (38.7) 31 H/o both diabetes and hypertension Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 Absent 5 (55.6) 4 (44.4) 9 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39	Present	31 (67.4)	15 (32.6)	46	0.502
Present 16 (64.0) 9 (36.0) 25 0.905 Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 0.905 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 Absent 5 (55.6) 4 (44.4) 9 0.712 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 0.815 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 0.20 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	Absent	19 (61.3)	12 (38.7)	31	0.582
Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 Absent 5 (55.6) 4 (44.4) 9 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39	H/o both diabetes and hypert	tension			
Absent 34 (65.4) 18 (34.6) 52 H/o any medication Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 Absent 5 (55.6) 4 (44.4) 9 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39	Present	16 (64.0)	9 (36.0)	25	0.005
Present 45 (66.2) 23 (33.8) 68 0.712 Absent 5 (55.6) 4 (44.4) 9 0.712 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 0.815 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 0.20 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	Absent	` /	18 (34.6)	52	0.905
Absent 5 (55.6) 4 (44.4) 9 0.712 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 0.815 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 0.815 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	H/o any medication				
Absent 5 (55.6) 4 (44.4) 9 H/o surgery Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39	Present	45 (66.2)	23 (33.8)	68	0.712
Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	Absent	` /	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	9	0.712
Present 32 (64.0) 18 (36.0) 50 Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	H/o surgery				
Absent 28 (66.7) 9 (33.3) 27 0.815 H/o head injury Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 0.20 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	Present	32 (64.0)	18 (36.0)	50	0.015
Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.20	Absent	` /	` /	27	0.815
Present 6 (46.2) 7 (53.8) 13 Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.20	H/o head injury				
Absent 44 (68.8) 20 (31.3) 64 H/o vital events Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	Present	6 (46.2)	7 (53.8)	13	0.20
Present 26 (66.7) 13 (33.3) 39 0.747	Absent	44 (68.8)	20 (31.3)	64	0.20
0.747	H/o vital events				
Absent 24 (63.2) 14 (36.8) 38	Present	26 (66.7)	13 (33.3)	39	0.747
	Absent	24 (63.2)	14 (36.8)	38	0.747

(Note: Figures in parenthesis denotes percentages, *- Pearson Chi-square test; p value<0.05 is considered as statistically significant)

Table 4: Distribution of certain factors associated with cognitive impairment.

Factors	Cogr	Cognition		Davolaro
	Normal	Impaired	Total	P value
No. of siblings				
Up to 5 siblings	36 (62.1)	22 (37.9)	58	0.257
More than 5 siblings	14 (73.7)	5 (26.3)	19	0.357
Birth order				
Up to 3 rd	29 (59.2)	20 (40.8)	49	0.162
Above 3 rd	21 (75.0)	7 (35.1)	28	0.162

No. of children				
Up to 2	15 (71.4)	6 (28.6)	21	0.465
More than 2	35 (62.5)	21 (37.5)	56	0.403
BMI category	•	•		
Underweight	4 (80.0)	1 (20.0)	5	
Normal	11 (64.7)	6 (35.3)	17	
Over weight	10 (55.6)	8 (44.4)	18	0.546
Obese class 1	15 (60.0)	10 (40.0)	25	
Obese class 2	10 (83.3)	2 (16.7)	12	
Smoking status	·	•		
Smoker	1 (100.0)	0	1	1.00
Non-smoker	49 (64.9)	27 (35.5)	76	1.00
H/o alcoholism				
Present	4 (80.0)	1 (20.0)	5	0.652
Absent	46 (63.9)	26 (35.1)	72	0.652

(Note: Figures in parenthesis denotes percentages, *Pearson chi-square test; p value<0.05 is considered as statistically significant)

It is also evident that certain other factors like birth order, number of siblings the study subjects had, number of children the study subjects had, body mass index (BMI), personal habits like smoking and alcoholism did not have a statistically significant association with cognitive impairment (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

Studies done around the world have found significant association of factors like age, gender, educational status, marital status, BMI, co-morbidities, environmental factors like cooking fuel, drinking water with cognitive impairment. Elderly people often experience cognitive decline with aging. The cognitive dysfunctions can range from physiological mild forgetfulness to mild cognitive impairment until the severe effects of Alzheimer's disease.⁹ In our study though the proportion of cognitive impaired was higher among the 70-74 years age group, it was not statistically significant. In our study we found that the proportion of women with cognitive impairment was higher compared to men but the association was not statistically significant. In contrast a study done by Ren et al showed that women were significantly associated with increased risk of cognitive impairment than men.²³

Ren et al study reported that people who led a solitary life (AOR: 3.15, 1.89-5.26), were significantly associated with increased risk of cognitive impairment, compared with those who lead a non-solitary life.²³ Also the Liu H et al study suggested that being divorced or widowed at older ages may be a risk factor for cognitive impairment and progression to dementia for both men and women.²⁴ Similarly in our study we observed that among study subjects with cognitive impairment, majority 19 (70.3%) were leading a solitary life without spouse and this association was found to be statistically significant (p=0.04, OR=2.788, 95% CI=1.030-7.547).

In our study, subjects who have had an education of 10 years or less showed a significant association with cognitive impairment (p=0.012, OR=1.675, 95%

CI=1.376, 2.039). This was similar to many other studies which showed that lower education levels were associated with high risk for dementia and MCI compared with higher levels of education.^{20,25,26} In our study we found the median SMMSE score of study subjects using kerosene as cooking fuel (21.00) was significantly lesser than those who used LPG. as fuel (26.00) (p=0.019) and this association between cooking fuel used and cognitive impairment was statistically significant. Similarly, Krishnamoorthy et al reported that about one-fourth of their participants were exposed to indoor air pollution by using kerosene as cooking fuel, out of which more than one fourth had cognitive impairment which is twice that of the general population.²⁷

The chemical composition of drinking water has been associated with cognitive impairment. Rondeau et al found that the risk of developing AD was twice as high in subjects exposed to an aluminum concentration of 0.1 mg/L in their drinking water. ²⁸ Certain other studies have reported that high silica concentrations and long-term increased exposure to lithium in drinking water may protect against impairment of cognitive function and dementia. ^{29,30} In our study we found that proportion of cognitive impairment was higher among bore well water consumers followed by packaged drinking water consumers and the association between source of drinking water and cognitive impairment was statistically significant.

Several studies done earlier have reported that personal habits like tobacco smoking and alcoholism were significant risk factors associated with MCI and dementia. In contrast in our study we observed that smoking and alcoholism did not have a statistically significant association with cognitive impairment. We also did not observe a statistically significant association between obesity and cognitive impairment while Hou et al study had reported that overweight was associated with a decreased risk of cognitive impairment in the elderly, while abdominal obesity was associated with an increased risk of cognitive impairment. In the elderly,

Xue et al had reported that diabetes conferred a 1.25- to 1.91-fold excess risk for cognitive disorders. Compared with non-diabetes, diabetes was associated with 49% increased risk of MCI (RR=1.49, 95% CI=1.26-1.77). Diabetes nearly the doubled risk of progression from MCI to dementia (RR=1.91, 95% CI=1.54-2.36).35 Ebady et al had observed that diabetes was also associated with increased odds of cognitive decline as determined by MMSE scores (odds ratio=1.9; CI=95%, 1.01-3.6). A significant correlation between duration of disease, quality of diabetes control and cognitive dysfunction was observed (p=0.001).³⁶ Also Zhou et al study showed that for MCI patients, those with T2DM showed poor performance in cognitive functions, including attention, information processing speed and memory.³⁷ In our study such a statistically significant association between Diabetes Mellitus and cognitive impairment was not found probably due to a smaller sample size.

Hypertension is also considered as a significant risk factor for cognitive impairment. Study of Obisesan indicated that in age groups 60 to 64, 65 to 69, and 70 to 74, optimal blood pressure (<120/80 mmHg) was associated with best cognitive performance and severe hypertension was associated with the poorest performance in all age groups.³⁸ In recent years, hypertension has become increasingly recognized as an important risk factor for the development of MCI and dementia.^{39,40} But in our study such a statistically significant association was not found between hypertension and cognitive impairment.

Limitations of our study include smaller sample size, cross-sectional study design and univariate analysis. Probably a larger sample size, a cohort study design and multivariate analysis of data could elicit significant association of various risk factors with cognitive impairment.

CONCLUSION

Assessment of cognitive impairment is an important entity in health care of the elderly, as it is an early indicator for development of dementia. As per the dementia India report 2010 the numbers of persons with dementia double every 5 years of age and so India will have one of the largest numbers of elders with this problem. It mainly affects older people; only 2% of cases start before the age of 65 years. After this, the prevalence doubles with every five year increment in age. The prevalence of dementia increases steadily with age and higher prevalence is seen among older women than men. It is estimated that the prevalence of dementia would increase of twofold by 2030 and threefold by 2050.

Factors like marital status, education status, cooking fuel, drinking water source are having a statistically significant association with cognitive impairment in the elderly. Environmental friendly cooking fuel like LPG could reduce the emission of smoke and thereby could reduce

the indoor air pollution compared to kerosene or charcoal. Consumption of water that is purified by any of the treatment methods is also an important factor to be considered. SMMSE questionnaire is a useful tool for assessing the cognitive function and could be used routinely at the level of primary health care services. Early assessment and detection of cognitive impairment could help in improving the health care of the elderly and thereby could improve their quality of life.

Funding: No funding sources Conflict of interest: None declared

Ethical approval: The study was approved by the

Institutional Ethics Committee

REFERENCES

- 1. Consensus writing group of experts on diagnosis and treatment of cognitive impairment in the elderly, Geriatric neurology group of geriatric medicine branch of Chinese medical association. Expert advice on the diagnosis and treatment process of cognitive impairment in the elderly in China. Chin J Geriatr. 2014;33:817-25.
- CDC. Cognitive Impairment: A call for action, now!
 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
 Centers for disease control and prevention. Atlanta,
 Georgia. 2011.
- 3. Knopman DS, Petersen RC. Mild Cognitive Impairment and Mild Dementia: A Clinical Perspective. Mayo Clin Proc. 2014;89(10):1452-9.
- Petersen RC. Mild cognitive impairment as a diagnostic entity. J Intern Med. 2004;256(3):183-94.
- 5. Gauthier S, Reisberg B, Zaudig M, Petersen RC, Ritchie K, Broich K et al. Mild cognitive impairment. Lancet. 2006;367:1262-70.
- 6. Kluger A, Gianutsos JG, Golomb J, Wagner Jr A, Wagner D, Scheurich S. Clinical features of MCI: motor changes. Int. Psychogeriatr. 2008;20:32-9.
- 7. Petersen RC, Smith GE, Waring SC, Ivnik RJ, Tangalos EG, Kokmen E. Mild cognitive impairment: clinical characterization and outcome. Arch. Neurol. 1999;56:303-8.
- 8. De Carli C. Mild cognitive impairment: prevalence, prognosis, aetiology, and treatment. Lancet Neurol. 2003;2:15-21.
- 9. Saxton J, Morrow L, Eschman A, Archer G, Luther J, Zuccolotto A. Computer assessment of mild cognitive impairment. Postgrad Med. 2009;121(2):177-85.
- 10. Manly JJ, Tang MX, Schupf N, Stern Y, Vonsattel JP, Mayeux R. Frequency and course of mild cognitive impairment in a multiethnic community. Ann. Neurol. 2008;63(4):494-506.
- 11. Petersen RC, Roberts RO, Knopman DS, Boeve BF, Geda YE, Ivnik RJ, et al. Mild cognitive impairment: ten years later. Arch. Neurol. 2009;66(12):1447-55.

- 12. Minhas S, Khanum A, Riaz F, Khan S, Alvi A. Predicting Progression from Mild Cognitive Impairment to Alzheimer's Disease using Autoregressive Modelling of Longitudinal and Multimodal Biomarkers. 2017;22(3):1-1.
- 13. Spasov S, Passamonti L, Duggento A, Lio P, Toschi N. A parameter-efficient deep learning approach to predict conversion from mild cognitive impairment to Alzheimer's disease within three years. Neuro Image. 2019;189:276-87.
- 14. Ashford WJ, Borson S, O'Hara R, Dash P, Frank L, et al. Should older adults be screened for dementia? Alzheimers and dementia. 2006;2:76-85.
- 15. Zamboni G, Wilcock G. Lack of awareness of symptoms in people with dementia: the structural and functional basis. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry. 2011;26(8):783-92.
- 16. Johnson E, Torres I. Unawareness of deficits in Alzheimer's disease and other dementias: operational definitions and empirical findings. Neuropsychol Rev. 2005;15(3):147-66.
- 17. Aalten P, Valen VE, Clare L, Kenny G, Verhey F. Awareness in dementia: a review of clinical correlates. Aging Ment Health. 2005;9(5):414-22.
- 18. Silva MR, Moser D, Pflüger M, Pusswald G, Stögmann E, Dal-Bianco P et al. Self-reported and informant-reported memory functioning and awareness in patients with mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. neuropsychiatrie. 2016;30(2):103-12.
- Torres AH, Strauss VE, Viitanen M, Winblad B, Fratiglioni L. Institutionalization in the elderly: the role of chronic diseases and dementia. Crosssectional and longitudinal data from a populationbased study. J Clin Epidemiol. 2001;54(8):795-801.
- Yang L, Jin X, Yan J, Jin Y, Xu S, Xu Y et al. Comparison of prevalence and associated risk factors of cognitive function status among elderly between nursing homes and common communities of China: A strobe-compliant observational study. Med. 2019;98:49(e18248).
- The Dementia India Report 2010. Prevalence, impact, costs and services for dementia. Alzheimer's and Related Disorders Society of India, New Delhi. 2010:13-15.
- IHPA. Standardised Mini-Mental State Examination (SMMSE) Guidelines for administration and scoring instructions. Independent Hospital Pricing authority. Australia. 2014. Available at: https://www.ihpa.gov.au/what-we-do/standardised-mini-mental-state-examination-smmse. Accessed 10 June 2019.
- 23. Ren L, Zheng Y, Wu L, Gu Y, He Y, Jiang B et al. Investigation of the prevalence of Cognitive Impairment and its risk factors within the elderly population in Shanghai, China. Scientific Reports. 2018;8:3575.
- 24. Liu H, Zhang Y, Burgard SA, Needham BL. Marital status and cognitive impairment in the United States: evidence from the National Health and

- Aging Trends Study. Annals Epidemiol. 2019;38:28-34.
- 25. Cheng ST, Lam LC, Chow PK. Under-recognition of dementia in long-term care homes in Hong Kong. Aging Ment Health. 2012;16:516-20.
- 26. Shadlen MF, Siscovick D, Fitzpatrick AL, Dulberg C, Kuller LH, Jackson S. Education, cognitive test scores, and black-white differences in dementia risk. J Ame Geriatr Soci. 2006;54(6):898-905.
- Krishnamoorthy Y, Sarveswaran G, Sivaranjini K, Sakthivel M, Majella MG, and Ganesh Kumar SG. Association between Indoor Air Pollution and Cognitive Impairment among Adults in Rural Puducherry, South India. J Neurosci Rural Pract. 2018; 9(4):529-34.
- 28. Rondeau V, Commenges D, Jacqmin-Gadda H, Dartigues JF. Relation between aluminum concentrations in drinking water and Alzheimer's disease: an 8-year follow-up study. Am J Epidemiol. 2000;152:59-66.
- Guyonnet SG, Andrieu S, Nourhashemi F, Guéronnière VDL, Grandjean H, Vellas B. Cognitive impairment and composition of drinking water in women: findings of the EPIDOS Study. Am J Clin Nutr. 2005;81:897-902.
- 30. Kessing LV, Gerds TA, Knudsen NN, Jorgensen LF, Kristiansen SM, Voutchkova D, et al. Association of Lithium in Drinking Water with the Incidence of Dementia. JAMA Psychiatry. 2017;74(10):1005-10.
- 31. Sabia S, Fayosse A, Dumurgier J, Dugravot A, Akbaraly T, Britton A, et al. Alcohol consumption and risk of dementia: 23 year follow-up of Whitehall II cohort study. BMJ. 2018;362:k2927.
- 32. Rusanen M, Kivipelto M, Quesenberry CP, Zhou J, Whitmer RA. Heavy smoking in midlife and long-term risk of Alzheimer disease and vascular dementia. Archive Intern Med. 2011;171(4):333-9.
- 33. Srinivasan V, Braidy N, Chan EK, Xu YH, Chan DK. Genetic and environmental factors in vascular dementia: an update of blood brain barrier dysfunction. Clin Exp Pharmacol Physiol. 2016;43(5):515-21.
- 34. Hou Q, Guan Y, Yu W, Liu X, Wu L, Xiao M et al. Associations between obesity and cognitive impairment in the Chinese elderly: an observational study. Clinical Interventions in Aging. 2019;14:367-73.
- 35. Xue M, Xu W, Ou YN, Cao XP, Tan MS, Tan L et al. Diabetes mellitus and risks of cognitive impairment and dementia: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 144 prospective studies. Ageing Res Reviews. 2019;55:1-9.
- 36. Ebady SA, Arami MA, Shafigh MH. Investigation on the relationship between diabetes mellitus type 2 and cognitive impairment. Dia Res Clin Pract. 2008;82:305-9.
- 37. Zhou Y, Fang R, Liu LH, Chen SD, Tang HD. Clinical Characteristics for the Relationship between Type-2 Diabetes Mellitus and Cognitive

- Impairment: A Cross-Sectional Study. Aging and Disease. 2015;6(4):236-44.
- 38. Obisesan TO. Hypertension and Cognitive Function. Clin Geriatr Med. 2009;25:259-88.
- 39. Cherubini A, Lowenthal DT, Paran E, Mecocci P, Williams LS, Senin U. Hypertension and cognitive function in the elderly. Dis Mon. 2010;56:106-47.
- 40. De Carli C. Blood pressure control and cognitive performance: something to think about with aging. JAMA. 2015;313:1963-4.

Cite this article as: Rajesh J, Ramasubramanian R, Santhanam RS. A cross-sectional study on prevalence of cognitive impairment and its associated factors among the elderly in an urban area of Chennai, India. Int J Community Med Public Health 2020;7:5126-33.