

BMJ Open

Does more education mean less disability in people with dementia? A large cross-sectional study in Taiwan

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-013841
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Aug-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Huang, ShihWei; Shuang Ho Hospital, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Chi, Wen-Chou ; Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Shuang Ho Hospital, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan Yen, Chia-Feng Chang, Kwang-Hwa ; Graduate Institute of Injury Prevention and Control, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan Liao, Hua-Fang; Chinese Association of Early Intervention Profession for Children with Developmental Delays, Hualien City, Taiwan Escorpizo, Reuben Chang, Feng-Hang; Graduate Institute of Injury Prevention and Control, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan Liou, Tsan-Hon; Shuang Ho Hospital, Taipei Medical University, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Rehabilitation medicine, Public health, Mental health
Keywords:	Dementia < NEUROLOGY, education, ICF, Taiwan, World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0)

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Research Paper

4 Does more education mean less disability in people with dementia? A large
5
6 cross-sectional study in Taiwan
7
8

9
10 Shih-Wei Huang^{1,2}, Wen-Chou Chi¹, Chia-Feng Yen³, Kwang-Hwa

11
12 Chang^{4,5}, Hua-Fang Liao^{6,7}, Reuben Escorpizo^{8,9}, Feng-Hang Chang⁴ & Tsan-Hon

13
14
15 Liou^{1,2,4*}
16

17
18 ¹Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Shuang Ho Hospital, Taipei
19
20 Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan
21

22
23 ²Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, School of Medicine, College of
24
25 Medicine, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan
26

27
28 ³Department of Public Health, Tzu Chi University, Hualien, Taiwan

29
30 ⁴Graduate Institute of Injury Prevention and Control, Taipei Medical University,
31
32 Taipei, Taiwan
33

34
35 ⁵Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Wan Fang Hospital, Taipei
36
37 Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan
38

39
40 ⁶Chinese Association of Early Intervention Profession for Children with
41
42 Developmental Delays, Hualien City, Taiwan

43
44 ⁷School and Graduate Institute of Physical Therapy, College of Medicine, National
45
46 Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan

47
48 ⁸Department of Rehabilitation and Movement Science, College of Nursing and Health
49
50 Sciences, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05401, USA

51
52 ⁹Swiss Paraplegic Research, Nottwil 6207, Switzerland
53

54
55
56 Kwang-Hwa Chang and Tsan-Hon Liou contributed equally to this work
57
58

1
2
3 Address for reprints: Tsan-Hon Liou, MD, PhD

4 Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Shuang Ho Hospital, Taipei

5
6
7 Medical University

8
9 Address: 291 Jhongjheng Rd, Jhonghe, New Taipei City 235, Taiwan

10
11
12 Tel: (+886)222490088 ext 1600

13
14
15 Fax: (+886)22480577

16
17
18 E-mail: peter_liou@s.tmu.edu.tw

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

peer review only

Abstract

Background World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0) is a feasible tool for assessing functional disability and analyzing the risk of institutionalization among elderly dementia patients. However, the data for the effect of education on disability status in dementia patients is lacking. The aim of this large-scale, population-based study was to analyze the effect of education on the disability status of elderly Taiwanese dementia patients by using (WHODAS 2.0).

Methods From the Taiwan Data Bank of Persons with Disability, we enrolled 7,698 disabled elderly (older than 65 years) patients diagnosed with dementia between July 2012 and January 2014. According to their education status, we categorized these patients with and without formal education (3,846 patients each). We controlled for the demographic variables through propensity score matching. The standardized scores of these patients in the six domains of WHODAS 2.0 were evaluated by certified interviewers. Student's *t* test was used for comparing the WHODAS 2.0 scores of dementia patients in the two aforementioned groups. Poisson regression was applied for analyzing the association among all the investigated variables.

Results Patients with formal education had low disability status in the domains of getting along and social participation than did patients without formal education. Poisson regression revealed that standardized scores in all domains of WHODAS 2.0—except self-care—were associated with education status.

Conclusions This study revealed lower disability status in the WHODAS 2.0 domains of getting along and social participation for dementia patients with formal education compared with those without formal education.

Keywords

Dementia, education, ICF, Taiwan, World Health Organization Disability Assessment

Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0)

Strengths and limitations of this study

- First large-scale, population-based study using WHODAS 2.0 to analyzing the effect of education on disability status in dementia patients.
- Propensity scores matching was applied for variables of demographic data to minimize the effect of potential confounders
- Stratification of the education levels and the dose effect of education status on disability severity among dementia patients were not presented in this study
- Dementia patients with extreme severity had limited ability to communicate with the interviewer and thus could not respond to the questionnaires; therefore, their assessment was completed by proxies.
- Differences in education system and medical care system as well as the racial and cultural differences among countries, the results of this study could not be generalized to non-Taiwanese populations.

Introduction

The cognitive reserve hypothesis explains how individuals maintain cognitive function and resist pathological processes and clinical impairment of the brain[1]. Individuals with higher education levels are considered to have higher brain reserve and better compensation during progressive brain disease^[2]. Thus, education is an crucial protective factor for dementia^[1]. Studies have reported that the association between direct measures of brain pathology with neuropsychological test performance can be influenced by education level^[3, 4]. Low education level has been reported to be a risk factor for dementia, especially Alzheimer disease^[2, 5]. In a meta-analysis, individuals with low and medium levels of education had a 1.33-fold higher risk of dementia compared with individuals with a high education level^[6]. In addition, a large-scale, population-based study reported the dose effect of education: individuals with a high education level have a low risk of dementia^[7]. Cognitive decline usually accompanies the normal aging process, and a high education level can slow this decline^[8, 9].

Dementia, a major cause of disability and mortality among elderly individuals,^[10] can lead to functional decline and severely affect many activities of daily living. To comprehensively evaluate and quantify the disability status caused by dementia, an

1
2
3
4 objective assessment tool that evaluates activities of daily living, cognition, and social
5
6
7 participation is essential. In 2001, the World Health Organization Disability
8
9
10 Assessment Scale, Second Edition (WHODAS 2.0), was developed in accordance
11
12 with the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF).
13
14 WHODAS 2.0 can be used for evaluating the functional disability caused by chronic
15
16 diseases in elderly patients^[11]. WHODAS 2.0 assesses the domains of self-care, life
17
18 activities, cognition, getting along, and social participation, all of which are domains
19
20 that dementia may compromise; therefore, WHODAS 2.0 is well-suited for evaluating
21
22 disability in dementia patients.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Our previous studies confirmed that WHODAS 2.0 is a feasible tool for assessing
34
35 functional disability and analyzing the risk of institutionalization among elderly
36
37 dementia patients^[12, 13]. However, no large-scale, population-based studies have
38
39 investigated the effect of education on disability status in dementia patients.
40
41
42 Therefore, we investigated the effect of education on disability status in dementia
43
44 patients by analyzing their using WHODAS 2.0 scores.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Methods**

54
55
56 Data collection
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Patients in the Taiwan Data Bank of Persons with Disability (TDPD) diagnosed
5
6
7 with dementia between July 2012 and January 2014 were enrolled in this study.
8
9
10 The TDPD was established in July 2012; around the same time, a new disability
11
12
13 evaluation process, Disability Eligibility Determination Scale (DES-2012), was
14
15
16 developed on the basis of the ICF framework^[14]. In Taiwan, patients with stable
17
18
19 disability after a disease event can apply for social welfare support. The DES-2012
20
21
22 evaluation process entails two stages and two independent and authorized
23
24
25 specialists. In the first stage, the body function and body structure categories of the
26
27
28 ICF are assessed in accordance with the standardized coding criteria of DES-2012
29
30
31 by a clinical physician specialized in the disease afflicting the patient; in addition,
32
33
34 the physician assigns a diagnostic code to the disease in accordance with the
35
36
37 International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification
38
39
40 (ICD-9-CM) codes. In the second stage, the environmental categories of the ICF
41
42
43 framework are assessed by a specialist, such as a physical therapist, occupational
44
45
46 therapist, psychologist, or social worker. In addition, the specialist evaluates the
47
48
49 patient's social participation status and restriction in life activities by using
50
51
52 WHODAS 2.0 (traditional Chinese version). These specialists are authorized for
53
54
55 DES-2012 evaluation only after receiving official training.
56
57
58
59
60

Patients and data collection

From the TDPD database, we included the data of elderly patients (older than 65 years of age) with dementia (ICD-9-CM 290.0–290.1, 294.1) and Alzheimer disease (ICD-9-CM 331.7–331.9). Demographic data—namely age, gender, residence status (community dwelling or institution dwelling), urbanization level (rural, suburban, urban), socioeconomic status (average, middle, and low), and education status (with and without formal education)—and the parameters of body functions and body structures (ICF categories) are recorded in the TDPD database.

Among patients with dementia, disability was primarily caused by cognition-related ICF body function categories such as b110 (consciousness functions), b117 (intellectual functions), b122 (global psychosocial functions), b140 (attention functions), b144 (memory functions), and b164 (higher-level cognitive functions). The severity of impairment caused by each of these categories has clinical or objective definitions and is indicated by the qualifier following *b*:

1 = mild: 5%–24% impairment; 2 = moderate: 25%–49% impairment, 3 = severe: 50%–95% impairment, 4 = extreme: 96%–100% impairment. For example, b110.4 indicates extreme severity in the consciousness functions of the patient. This study was approved by the Joint Institutional Review Board at Taipei Medical University. Because this is a secondary data analysis study and because the data were analyzed

1
2
3
4 anonymously, informed consent was not required.
5
6
7
8

9
10 Outcome measurements

11
12 The WHODAS 2.0 scores recorded in the TDPD database were used as indicators
13
14 of the disability status of the study patients. The scores are assigned by authorized
15
16 specialists after they interview the patients (or their proxies if patients are unable to
17
18 answer the WHODAS 2.0 questionnaire). WHODAS 2.0 has six domains and 36
19
20 items in total: domain 1 has six items on cognition; domain 2 has five items on
21
22 mobility; domain 3 has four items on self-care; domain 4 has five items on getting
23
24 along; domain 5 has four items on life activities and four items on work and school
25
26 activities; domain 6 has eight items on social participation. The patients indicate
27
28 their level of difficulty in performing activities related to each item in the past 30
29
30 days on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = no difficulty, 2 = mild difficulty, 3 = moderate
31
32 difficulty, 4 = severe difficulty, 5 = extreme difficulty). The total score of all six
33
34 domains are transformed to standardized scores ranging from 0 to 100, with higher
35
36 scores indicating a higher severity of disability. Because we only enrolled dementia
37
38 patients older than 65 years, we expected most of them to be retired or unemployed;
39
40 hence, we excluded the four items in domain 5 pertaining to work and school
41
42 activities. Thus, we analyzed the scores in the remaining 32 WHODAS 2.0 items.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The traditional Chinese version of WHODAS 2.0 is used in TDPD database; the
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The traditional Chinese version of WHODAS 2.0 is used in TDPD database; the intraclass correlation coefficient of this version of the questionnaire was found to be 0.80–0.89, and the internal consistency and reliability was found to be 0.73–0.99 (Cronbach's α)^[15, 16]. Regarding missing data, the WHODAS 2.0 guidelines allow up to 30% of the items in each domain to be missing; the missing values can be adjusted using the mean of the available scores in that domain^[17].

Statistical analysis

Demographic variables, namely age (65–74 years, 75–85 years, and >85 years), socioeconomic status (average, middle, and low), residence status (community dwelling and institution dwelling), urbanization level (urban, suburban, and rural), and severity of dementia-related impairment (mild, moderate, severe, and extreme), were represented as numbers and percentages. To determine the effect of education status on dementia patients, we categorized the data into two groups on the basis of the education status of the patients (with and without formal education); the variables were controlled for through propensity scores matching.

Chi-square analysis was used for comparing the categorical variables of dementia-related disability between dementia patients with and without formal education. The standardized scores for both groups in the six domains of WHODAS

1
2
3
4 2.0 were compared using independent *t* tests. Subsequently, the association between
5
6
7 the demographic variables and the standardized scores for all six domains in both
8
9
10 groups were analyzed through a Poisson regression model. All statistical analyses
11
12
13 were performed using SAS software (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC), and $p < 0.05$ was
14
15
16 considered statistically significant.
17
18
19
20

21 **Results**

22
23
24 After propensity score matching of the disabled dementia patients, the without
25
26
27 formal education group comprised 3,849 patients (1,864 females and 1,985 males)
28
29
30 and the with formal education group comprised 3,849 patients (1,879 females and
31
32
33 1,973 males). The distribution of the demographic variables of the two groups did not
34
35
36 differ significantly (table 1).
37

38
39 According to our analysis, the without formal education group had higher
40
41
42 WHODAS 2.0 scores in domain 4 (getting along) and domain 6 (social participation)
43
44
45 compared with the with formal education group. By contrast, the scores in domain 1
46
47
48 (cognition), domain 2 (mobility), domain 3 (self-care), and domain 5 (life activities)
49
50
51 and the standardized (summarized) WHODAS 2.0 scores did not differ significantly
52
53
54 between the groups (table 2).

55
56 Poisson regression analysis revealed that the scores in all domains— except
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 domain 3—and the summarized scores of WHODAS 2.0 were associated with the
5
6 education status. In addition, domains 1, 2, and 6 were found to be associated with the
7
8 socioeconomic status. Moreover, gender, age, residence status, urbanization level, and
9
10 disease severity were found to be associated with the scores of each domain as well as
11
12 the summarized WHODAS 2.0 scores (table 3).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Discussion

22
23
24 Our study demonstrated that disabled dementia patients with formal education had
25
26 higher scores in the domains of getting along and social participation than did those
27
28 without formal education. However, no significant differences were noted in the
29
30 domains of cognition, mobility, self-care, and life activities.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The cognitive reserve hypothesis states that a higher education level indicates a higher
40
41 cognitive reserve and that it delays the onset of dementia^[18, 19]; in other words,
42
43 education has a protective effect on cognitive function in dementia. However, in this
44
45 study, no differences in the disability status of the cognitive domain functions were
46
47 observed between the with and without formal education groups. We hypothesize that
48
49 irrespective of the education status of an individual, the cognitive function declines
50
51 immediately on the onset of dementia. In start contrast to the cognitive reserve
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 hypothesis, a study reported that after cognitive decline, the onset of dementia is more
5
6 rapid in persons with a higher education level^[20]. Pathological changes to the brain
7
8 may be slow during cognitive reservation; however, after the onset of cognitive
9
10 decline, these changes can be rapid in people with a high education level because
11
12 dementia is at an advanced stage when the symptoms manifest^[21]. This pattern has
13
14 been reported in previous studies that have stated that cognitive decline is more rapid
15
16 after Alzheimer disease is diagnosed in highly educated patients^[21, 22]. Our results
17
18 are consistent with the aforementioned results; that is, cognitive decline is not
19
20 influenced by the education status of an individual before the diagnosis of dementia.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 In our study, the education status did not influence the patients' disability in the
34
35 domains of mobility, self-care, and life activities. However, patients in the with formal
36
37 education group exhibited lower disability status in the domains of getting along and
38
39 social participation than did those in the without formal education group. This may be
40
41 because these domains pertain to basic activities of daily life and are therefore not
42
43 related to the education status, whereas the functional aspects of getting along and
44
45 social participation require advanced skills that can be obtained through formal
46
47 education. Social participation can offer and reinforce social roles and can provide a
48
49 sense of belonging and self-esteem in later life^[23]. Formal schooling can impart the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 skills necessary for abstract thinking and socialization. Most elderly individuals in
5
6
7 Taiwan are illiterate because of their lack of a formal education. Reading and
8
9
10 communication skills obtained through education can ingrain in elderly individuals a
11
12
13 stronger sense of social attachment and widen enlarge their social network.

14
15
16
17
18 Our study analyzed the effect of education on the disability status caused by dementia.
19
20
21 The strength of this study lies in its use of a large-scale, population-based database; in
22
23
24 addition, we controlled for possible confounding variables, increasing the validity of
25
26
27 our results. However, the study has the following limitations. First, the education
28
29
30 status was dichotomized solely on the basis of whether the patient received formal
31
32
33 education. Therefore, future studies can explore stratification of the education levels
34
35
36 and the dose effect of education status on disability severity among dementia patients.
37
38
39 Second, the WHODAS 2.0 assessment was performed on the basis of the responses
40
41
42 given by dementia patients or their caregivers, which might have underestimated the
43
44
45 functioning disability for dementia patients with mild severity of disability and poor
46
47
48 insights. Most dementia patients with extreme severity had limited ability to
49
50
51 communicate with the interviewer and thus could not respond to the questionnaires;
52
53
54 therefore, their assessment was completed by proxies. In addition, the WHODAS 2.0
55
56
57 questionnaire only evaluated the disability condition of individuals in the past 30 days.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Only caregivers of severe dementia patients who were unable to communicate to the
5
6
7 interviewers could accurately report the daily functioning of these patients.
8

9
10 Nevertheless, to avoid the bias this may have caused, we controlled for the severity of
11
12 dementia in both the study groups. Third, community environment, family support,
13
14 and marriage status were not controlled for in this study. Nevertheless, we controlled
15
16 for the urbanization level, residence status, and socioeconomic status, and these
17
18 variables can represent the living environment and social resource of the disabled
19
20 dementia patients. Finally, considering the differences in education system and
21
22 medical care system as well as the racial and cultural differences among countries, the
23
24 results of this study cannot be generalized to non-Taiwanese populations.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Conclusions**

37
38 Dementia patients with a formal education had lower disability status in the
39
40 WHODAS 2.0 domains of getting along and social participation compared with those
41
42 without a formal education. Thus, disability status is influenced by the education
43
44 status of the patient before the diagnosis of dementia and therefore formal education
45
46 can help elderly individuals maintain stronger social interaction even after they
47
48 develop dementia.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Acknowledgments: The authors thank Pei-Hsin Chen and Kai-Hsiang Chuang for their
4 help in manuscript preparation.
5
6
7
8

9
10 Contributors: H-SW participated in the study design, conducted the data analysis,
11 drafted the initial manuscript and approved the final manuscript as submitted. C-KH
12 conducted the data analysis, drafted the manuscript and approved the final manuscript
13 as submitted. C-WC contributed to the study design, reviewed and revised the
14 manuscript, and approved the final manuscript as submitted. Y-CF reviewed and
15 revised the manuscript, and approved the final manuscript as submitted. L-HF
16 participated in the study design, reviewed and revised the manuscript, and approved
17 the final manuscript as submitted. RE designed and conceptualised the study, and
18 approved the final manuscript as submitted. C-FH participated in the study design,
19 reviewed and revised the manuscript, and approved the final manuscript as submitted.
20 L-TH participated in the study design, conducted the data analysis, revised manuscript
21 and approved the final manuscript as submitted.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Funding: This study was funded by the Taipei Medical University and Shuang Ho
39 hospital (no. 105TMU-SHH-05) and supported by the Ministry of Health and Welfare,
40 Taiwan (98M8178, 99M4080, 99M4073, 100M4145, 101M4100, 102M4018, and
41 103M03F4037).
42
43
44
45
46

47 Competing interests: None declared.

48
49 Ethics approval: The Institutional Review Board of Taipei Medical University
50 approved this study
51

52 Data sharing statement: The data of this study is taken from the Taiwan Data Bank of
53 Persons with Disability (TDPD) database. Requests for the data may be sent to
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

peter_liou@s.tmu.edu.tw

Provenance and peer review: Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

For peer review only

Reference:

- 1 Jones RN, Manly J, Glymour MM, et al. Conceptual and measurement challenges in research on cognitive reserve. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society* : JINS 2011;**17**:593-601.
- 2 Stern Y, Gurland B, Tatemichi TK, et al. Influence of education and occupation on the incidence of Alzheimer's disease. *Jama* 1994;**271**:1004-10.
- 3 Dufouil C, Alperovitch A, Tzourio C. Influence of education on the relationship between white matter lesions and cognition. *Neurology* 2003;**60**:831-6.
- 4 Bennett DA, Wilson RS, Schneider JA, et al. Education modifies the relation of AD pathology to level of cognitive function in older persons. *Neurology* 2003;**60**:1909-15.
- 5 Qiu C, Backman L, Winblad B, et al. The influence of education on clinically diagnosed dementia incidence and mortality data from the Kungsholmen Project. *Archives of neurology* 2001;**58**:2034-9.
- 6 Caamano-Isorna F, Corral M, Montes-Martinez A, et al. Education and dementia: a meta-analytic study. *Neuroepidemiology* 2006;**26**:226-32.
- 7 Members ECC, Brayne C, Ince PG, et al. Education, the brain and dementia: neuroprotection or compensation? *Brain : a journal of neurology* 2010;**133**:2210-6.
- 8 Evans DA, Beckett LA, Albert MS, et al. Level of education and change in cognitive function in a community population of older persons. *Annals of epidemiology* 1993;**3**:71-7.
- 9 Lyketsos CG, Chen LS, Anthony JC. Cognitive decline in adulthood: an 11.5-year follow-up of the Baltimore Epidemiologic Catchment Area study. *The American journal of psychiatry* 1999;**156**:58-65.
- 10 Ritchie K, Lovestone S. The dementias. *Lancet* 2002;**360**:1759-66.
- 11 Chang KH, Liao HF, Yen CF, et al. Association between muscle power impairment and WHODAS 2.0 in older adults with physical disability in Taiwan. *Disability and rehabilitation* 2015;**37**:712-20.
- 12 Huang SW, Chang KH, Escorpizo R, et al. Functioning and disability analysis by using WHO Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 in older adults Taiwanese patients with dementia. *Disability and rehabilitation* 2015:1-12.
- 13 Huang SW, Chang KH, Escorpizo R, et al. Using the World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0) for Predicting Institutionalization of Patients With Dementia in Taiwan. *Medicine* 2015;**94**:e2155.
- 14 Chiu WT, Yen CF, Teng SW, et al. Implementing disability evaluation and welfare services based on the framework of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health: experiences in Taiwan. *BMC health services research* 2013;**13**:416.

- 1
2
3 15 Chiu TY, Yen CF, Chou CH, et al. Development of traditional Chinese version of
4 World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 36--item (WHODAS
5 2.0) in Taiwan: validity and reliability analyses. *Research in developmental*
6 *disabilities* 2014;**35**:2812-20.
7
8 16 Yen CF, Hwang AW, Liou TH, et al. Validity and reliability of the Functioning
9 *Disability Evaluation Scale-Adult Version based on the WHODAS 2.0--36 items.*
10 *Journal of the Formosan Medical Association = Taiwan yi zhi* 2014;**113**:839-49.
11 17 Ustun TB, Chatterji S, Kostanjsek N, et al. Developing the World Health
12 *Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0. Bulletin of the World Health*
13 *Organization* 2010;**88**:815-23.
14 18 Farfel JM, Nitrini R, Suemoto CK, et al. Very low levels of education and
15 *cognitive reserve: a clinicopathologic study. Neurology* 2013;**81**:650-7.
16 19 Barnes DE, Tager IB, Satiriano WA, et al. The relationship between literacy and
17 *cognition in well-educated elders. The journals of gerontology Series A, Biological*
18 *sciences and medical sciences* 2004;**59**:390-5.
19 20 Hall CB, Derby C, LeValley A, et al. Education delays accelerated decline on a
20 *memory test in persons who develop dementia. Neurology* 2007;**69**:1657-64.
21 21 Stern Y, Albert S, Tang MX, et al. Rate of memory decline in AD is related to
22 *education and occupation: cognitive reserve? Neurology* 1999;**53**:1942-7.
23 22 Wilson RS, Li Y, Aggarwal NT, et al. Education and the course of cognitive
24 *decline in Alzheimer disease. Neurology* 2004;**63**:1198-202.
25 23 Berkman LF, Glass T, Brissette I, et al. From social integration to health:
26 *Durkheim in the new millennium. Social science & medicine* 2000;**51**:843-57.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of elderly Taiwanese dementia patients with and without formal education ($N = 7,698$) after propensity score matching for gender, age, socioeconomic status, residence status, urbanization level, and severity of impairment

Variables	Literacy $n=3,849$		Illiteracy $n=3,849$		p value
	No.	%	No.	%	
Gender					0.784
Male	1985	51.57%	1973	51.26%	
Female	1864	48.43%	1876	48.74%	
Age					0.915
65-74	1035	26.89%	1048	27.23%	
75-84	1798	46.71%	1799	46.74%	
≥ 85	1016	26.40%	1002	26.03%	
Social Economic Status					0.938
Average	3764	97.79%	3765	97.82%	
middle low & low	85	2.21%	84	2.18%	
Residence					0.728
Community Dwelling	2940	76.38%	2927	76.05%	
Institution	909	23.62%	922	23.95%	
Urbanization level					0.859
Rural	556	14.45%	560	14.55%	
Suburban	1356	35.23%	1333	34.63%	
Urban	1937	50.32%	1956	50.82%	
Severity of impairment					0.973
Mild	759	19.72%	745	19.36%	
Moderate	1259	32.71%	1266	32.89%	
Severe	475	12.34%	470	12.21%	
Extreme	1356	35.23%	1368	35.54%	

Table 2 Overall disability (based on WHODAS II scores) in different domains between elderly Taiwanese dementia patients with and without formal education ($N = 7,698$)

Variables	Literacy $n=3,849$		Illiteracy $n=3,849$		P value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Domain 1	71.81	27.066	72.34	26.750	0.389
Domain 2	57.91	33.586	58.65	33.356	0.336
Domain 3	43.80	36.004	43.85	35.835	0.949
Domain 4	72.16	29.441	74.29	28.455	0.001*
Domain 5	79.45	32.437	80.22	32.240	0.297
Domain 6	51.39	26.664	52.63	26.226	0.039*
Summary	61.87	24.054	62.79	23.609	0.089

Domain 1, understanding and communication; Domain 2, Getting around; Domain 3, self-care; Domain 4, getting along with people; Domain 5, life activities; Domain 6, participation in society

*Independent t test $P < 0.05$

Table 3. Poisson regression of WHODAS 2.0 scores for elderly Taiwanese dementia patients for analyzing the association of the WHODAS 2.0 scores for each domain and the summarized scores with various demographic variables

Variables (N=7,778)	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Domain 5	Domain 6	Domain Summary
Intercept	49.009 *	30.552 *	21.622 *	50.036 *	56.539 *	38.320 *	40.869 *
Education Status							
Literacy							
Illiteracy	1.006 *	1.011 *	0.999	1.028 *	1.009 *	1.023 *	1.014 *
Age							
65~74							
75~84	1.050 *	1.132 *	1.102 *	1.042 *	1.068 *	1.015 *	1.059 *
≥ 85	1.110 *	1.253 *	1.183 *	1.090 *	1.123 *	1.046 *	1.121 *
Socioeconomic status							
Average (Reference)							
Middle-low & Low	0.976 *	1.037 *	1.013	0.984	1.002	1.072 *	1.015
Residence							
Community Dwelling (Reference)							
Institution	1.058 *	1.232 *	1.254 *	1.056 *	1.073 *	1.118 *	1.116 *
Urbanization level							
Rural (Reference)							
Suburban	0.985 *	0.999	0.975 *	0.997	0.999	0.970 *	0.987 *
Urban	0.993	0.991 *	0.938 *	1.012 *	1.002	0.953 *	0.983 *
Severity of disability							
Mild (Reference)							
Moderate	1.303 *	1.434 *	1.601 *	1.301 *	1.291 *	1.247 *	1.323 *
Severe	1.477 *	1.840 *	2.165 *	1.484 *	1.428 *	1.478 *	1.562 *
Extreme	1.669 *	2.007 *	2.376 *	1.666 *	1.472 *	1.614 *	1.715 *
Gender							
Male							
Female	0.985 *	0.978 *	0.966 *	0.945 *	0.969 *	0.943 *	0.965 *

Domain 1, understanding and communication; Domain 2, Getting around; Domain 3, self-care; Domain 4, getting along with people; Domain 5, life activities; Domain 6, participation in society

* p value<0.05

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open : first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-013841 on 4 May 2017. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on October 29, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Pages	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found
Introduction		
Background/rationale	5	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
Objectives	6	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses
Methods		
Study design	7	Present key elements of study design early in the paper
Setting	7	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
Participants	7	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
Data sources/ measurement	7*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group
Bias	8	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
Study size	7	Explain how the study size was arrived at
Quantitative variables	8,9	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
Statistical methods	10	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
Results		
Participants	11	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
Descriptive data	11	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
Outcome data	11	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
Main results	11	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
Other analyses	11,12	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses

Discussion		
Key results	12	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
Limitations	15	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
Interpretation	15	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
Generalisability	15	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results
Other information		
Funding	16	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Does more education mean less disability in people with dementia? A large cross-sectional study in Taiwan

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-013841.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Nov-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Huang, ShihWei; Shuang Ho Hospital, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Chi, Wen-Chou ; School of Occupational Therapy, College of Medicine, Chungshan Medical University Yen, Chia-Feng Chang, Kwang-Hwa ; Graduate Institute of Injury Prevention and Control, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan Liao, Hua-Fang; Chinese Association of Early Intervention Profession for Children with Developmental Delays, Hualien City, Taiwan Escorpizo, Reuben Chang, Feng-Hang; Graduate Institute of Injury Prevention and Control, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan Liou, Tsan-Hon; Shuang Ho Hospital, Taipei Medical University, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Rehabilitation medicine, Public health, Mental health
Keywords:	Dementia < NEUROLOGY, education, ICF, Taiwan, World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0)

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Research Paper

4 Does more education mean less disability in people with dementia? A large
5
6 cross-sectional study in Taiwan
7
8

9
10 Shih-Wei Huang^{1,2}, Wen-Chou Chi³, Chia-Feng Yen⁴, Kwang-Hwa

11
12 Chang^{5,6}, Hua-Fang Liao^{7,8}, Reuben Escorpizo^{9,10}, Feng-Hang Chang⁵ & Tsan-Hon

13
14
15 Liou^{1,2*}

16
17
18 ¹Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Shuang Ho Hospital, Taipei
19
20 Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan

21
22 ²Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, School of Medicine, College of
23
24 Medicine, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan

25
26 ³School of Occupational Therapy, College of Medicine, Chungshan Medical
27
28 University, Taichung, Taiwan

29
30 ⁴Department of Public Health, Tzu Chi University, Hualien, Taiwan

31
32 ⁵Graduate Institute of Injury Prevention and Control, Taipei Medical University,
33
34 Taipei, Taiwan

35
36 ⁶Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Wan Fang Hospital, Taipei
37
38 Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan

39
40 ⁷Chinese Association of Early Intervention Profession for Children with
41
42 Developmental Delays, Hualien City, Taiwan

43
44 ⁸School and Graduate Institute of Physical Therapy, College of Medicine, National
45
46 Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan

47
48 ⁹Department of Rehabilitation and Movement Science, College of Nursing and Health
49
50 Sciences, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05401, USA

51
52 ¹⁰Swiss Paraplegic Research, Nottwil 6207, Switzerland
53
54
55

1
2
3
4
5 Kwang-Hwa Chang and Tsan-Hon Liou contributed equally to this work
6

7 Address for reprints: Tsan-Hon Liou, MD, PhD
8

9 Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Shuang Ho Hospital, Taipei
10
11 Medical University
12

13 Address: 291 Jhongjheng Rd, Jhonghe, New Taipei City 235, Taiwan
14

15
16
17 Tel: (+886)222490088 ext 1600
18

19
20 Fax: (+886)22480577
21

22
23 E-mail: peter_liou@s.tmu.edu.tw
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Background World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0

(WHODAS 2.0) is a feasible tool for assessing functional disability and analyzing the risk of institutionalization among elderly dementia patients. However, the data for the effect of education on disability status in dementia patients is lacking. The aim of this large-scale, population-based study was to analyze the effect of education on the disability status of elderly Taiwanese dementia patients by using (WHODAS 2.0).

Methods From the Taiwan Data Bank of Persons with Disability, we enrolled 7,698 disabled elderly (older than 65 years) patients diagnosed with dementia between July 2012 and January 2014. According to their education status, we categorized these patients with and without formal education (3,849 patients each). We controlled for the demographic variables through propensity score matching. The standardized scores of these patients in the six domains of WHODAS 2.0 were evaluated by certified interviewers. Student's *t* test was used for comparing the WHODAS 2.0 scores of dementia patients in the two aforementioned groups. Poisson regression was applied for analyzing the association among all the investigated variables.

Results Patients with formal education had low disability status in the domains of getting along and social participation than did patients without formal education. Poisson regression revealed that standardized scores in all domains of WHODAS 2.0—except self-care—were associated with education status.

Conclusions This study revealed lower disability status in the WHODAS 2.0 domains of getting along and social participation for dementia patients with formal education compared with those without formal education. For disabled dementia patients without formal education, community intervention of social participation should be implemented to maintain better social interaction ability.

Keywords

Dementia, education, ICF, Taiwan, World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0)

Strengths and limitations of this study

- First large-scale, population-based study using WHODAS 2.0 to analyzing the effect of education on disability status in dementia patients.
- Propensity scores matching was applied for variables of demographic data to minimize the effect of potential confounders
- Stratification of the education levels and the dose effect of education status on disability severity among dementia patients were not presented in this study
- Dementia patients with extreme severity had limited ability to communicate with the interviewer and thus could not respond to the questionnaires; therefore, their assessment was completed by proxies.
- Differences in education system and medical care system as well as the racial and cultural differences among countries, the results of this study could not be generalized to non-Taiwanese populations.

Introduction

The cognitive reserve hypothesis explains how individuals maintain cognitive function and resist pathological processes and clinical impairment of the brain^[1]. Individuals with higher education levels are considered to have higher brain reserve and better compensation during progressive brain disease^[2]. Thus, education is an crucial protective factor for dementia^[1]. Studies have reported that the association between direct measures of brain pathology with neuropsychological test performance can be influenced by education level^[3, 4]. Low education level has been reported to be a risk factor for dementia, especially Alzheimer disease^[2, 5]. In a meta-analysis, individuals with low and medium levels of education had a 1.33-fold higher risk of dementia compared with individuals with a high education level^[6]. In addition, a large-scale, population-based study reported the dose effect of education: individuals with a high education level have a low risk of dementia^[7]. Cognitive decline usually accompanies the normal aging process, and a high education level can slow this decline^[8, 9].

Dementia, a major cause of disability and mortality among elderly individuals,^[10] can lead to functional decline and severely affect many activities of daily living. To comprehensively evaluate and quantify the disability status caused by dementia, an

1
2
3
4 objective assessment tool that evaluates activities of daily living, cognition, and social
5
6
7 participation is essential. The WHO (World Health Organization) Disability Action
8
9
10 Plan was proposed to strengthen the collection of data on disability assessment and
11
12 further identifying needs when planning healthcare services, and allocating medical
13
14 resources during 2014 to 2021.[11] In 2001, the International Classification of
15
16 Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF) was developed to comprehensive evaluation
17
18 impairments, activity limitations, participation restrictions, personal and
19
20 environmental factors. Based on the ICF concept, the WHO developed an assessment
21
22 tool named WHO Disability Assessment Schedule (WHODAS) and 2.0 Version
23
24 (WHODAS 2.0) was published in 2010. WHODAS 2.0 can be used for evaluating the
25
26 functional disability caused by chronic diseases in elderly patients^[12]. WHODAS 2.0
27
28 assesses the domains of self-care, life activities, cognition, getting along, and social
29
30 participation, all of which are domains that dementia may compromise; therefore,
31
32 WHODAS 2.0 is well-suited for evaluating disability in dementia patients.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Our previous studies confirmed that WHODAS 2.0 is a feasible tool for assessing
48
49 functional disability and analyzing the risk of institutionalization among elderly
50
51 dementia patients^[13, 14]. However, no large-scale, population-based studies have
52
53 investigated the effect of education on disability status in dementia patients.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Therefore, we investigated the effect of education on disability status in dementia
5
6
7 patients by analyzing their using WHODAS 2.0 scores.
8
9

10 11 12 **Methods**

13 14 15 **Data collection**

16
17
18 Patients in the Taiwan Data Bank of Persons with Disability (TDPD) diagnosed
19
20 with dementia between July 2012 and January 2014 were enrolled in this study.
21
22 The TDPD was established in July 2012; around the same time, a new disability
23
24 evaluation process, Disability Eligibility Determination Scale (DES-2012), was
25
26 developed on the basis of the ICF framework^[15]. In Taiwan, patients with stable
27
28 disability after a disease event can apply for social welfare support. All the disabled
29
30 people have the rights to apply the disability certification and they initiated the
31
32 DES-2012 evaluation process. The DES-2012 evaluation process entails two stages
33
34 and two independent and authorized specialists. In the first stage, the body function
35
36 and body structure categories of the ICF are assessed in accordance with the
37
38 standardized coding criteria of DES-2012 by a clinical physician specialized in the
39
40 disease afflicting the patient; in addition, the physician assigns a diagnostic code to
41
42 the disease in accordance with the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth
43
44 Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) codes. In the second stage, the
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 environmental categories of the ICF framework are assessed by a specialist, such as
5
6
7 a physical therapist, occupational therapist, psychologist, or social worker. In
8
9
10 addition, the specialist evaluates the patient's social participation status and
11
12
13 restriction in life activities by using WHODAS 2.0 (traditional Chinese version).
14
15
16 These specialists are authorized for DES-2012 evaluation only after receiving
17
18
19 official training. After the DES-2012 process completed, the data of each applied
20
21
22 disabled patients were registered in the TDPD database.
23
24
25
26

27 Patients and data collection

28
29
30 From the TDPD database, we included the data of elderly patients (older than
31
32
33 65 years of age) with senile dementia (ICD-9-CM 290.0–290.1, 294.1) and
34
35
36 Alzheimer disease (ICD-9-CM 331.7–331.9). Demographic data— namely age,
37
38
39 gender, residence status (community dwelling or institution dwelling), urbanization
40
41
42 level (rural, suburban, urban), socioeconomic status (average, middle, and low),
43
44
45 and education status (with and without formal education)—and the parameters of
46
47
48 body functions and body structures (ICF categories) are recorded in the TDPD
49
50
51 database. Among patients with dementia, disability was primarily caused by
52
53
54 cognition-related ICF body function categories such as b110 (consciousness
55
56
57 functions), b117 (intellectual functions), b122 (global psychosocial functions),
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 b140 (attention functions), b144 (memory functions), and b164 (higher-level
5
6
7 cognitive functions). The severity of impairment caused by each of these categories
8
9
10 has clinical or objective definitions and is indicated by the qualifier following *b*:
11
12 1 = mild: 5%–24% impairment; 2 = moderate: 25%–49% impairment, 3 = severe:
13
14 50%–95% impairment, 4 = extreme: 96%–100% impairment. For example, b110.4
15
16 indicates extreme severity in the consciousness functions of the patient. This study
17
18 was approved by the Joint Institutional Review Board at Taipei Medical University.
19
20
21 Because this is a secondary data analysis study and because the data were analyzed
22
23
24 anonymously, informed consent was not required.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Outcome measurements

34
35 The WHODAS 2.0 scores recorded in the TDPD database were used as indicators
36
37
38 of the disability status of the study patients. The scores are assigned by authorized
39
40
41 specialists after they interview the patients (or their proxies if patients are unable to
42
43
44 answer the WHODAS 2.0 questionnaire). WHODAS 2.0 has six domains and 36
45
46
47 items in total: domain 1 has six items on cognition; domain 2 has five items on
48
49
50 mobility; domain 3 has four items on self-care; domain 4 has five items on getting
51
52
53 along; domain 5 has four items on life activities and four items on work and school
54
55
56 activities; domain 6 has eight items on social participation. The patients indicate
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 their level of difficulty in performing activities related to each item in the past 30
5
6 days on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = no difficulty, 2 = mild difficulty, 3 = moderate
7
8 difficulty, 4 = severe difficulty, 5 = extreme difficulty). The total score of all six
9
10 domains are transformed to standardized scores ranging from 0 to 100, with higher
11
12 scores indicating a higher severity of disability. Because we only enrolled dementia
13
14 patients older than 65 years, we expected most of them to be retired or unemployed;
15
16 hence, we excluded the four items in domain 5 pertaining to work and school
17
18 activities. Thus, we analyzed the scores in the remaining 32 WHODAS 2.0 items.
19
20
21 The traditional Chinese version of WHODAS 2.0 is used in TDPD database; the
22
23 intraclass correlation coefficient of this version of the questionnaire was found to
24
25 be 0.80–0.89, and the internal consistency and reliability was found to be 0.73–0.99
26
27 (Cronbach's α)^[16, 17]. Regarding missing data, the WHODAS 2.0 guidelines allow
28
29 up to 30% of the items in each domain to be missing; the missing values can be
30
31 adjusted using the mean of the available scores in that domain^[18].
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Statistical analysis

Demographic variables, namely age (65–74 years, 75–85 years, and >85 years),
socioeconomic status (average, middle, and low), residence status (community
dwelling and institution dwelling), urbanization level (urban, suburban, and rural),

1
2
3
4 and severity of dementia-related impairment (mild, moderate, severe, and extreme),
5
6
7 were represented as numbers and percentages. To determine the effect of education
8
9
10 status on dementia patients, we categorized the data into two groups on the basis of
11
12 the education status of the patients (with and without formal education); the variables
13
14 were controlled for through propensity scores matching.
15
16
17
18 Chi-square analysis was used for comparing the categorical variables of
19
20
21 dementia-related disability between dementia patients with and without formal
22
23 education. The standardized scores for both groups in the six domains of WHODAS
24
25 2.0 were compared using independent *t* tests. Subsequently, the association between
26
27 the demographic variables and the standardized scores for all six domains in both
28
29
30 groups were analyzed through a Poisson regression model. All statistical analyses
31
32
33 were performed using SAS software (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC), and $p < 0.05$ was
34
35
36 considered statistically significant.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Results

46
47 After propensity score matching of the disabled dementia patients, the without
48
49 formal education group comprised 3,849 patients (1,864 females and 1,985 males)
50
51 and the with formal education group comprised 3,849 patients (1,879 females and
52
53 1,973 males). The distribution of the demographic variables of the two groups did not
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 differ significantly (table 1).
5
6

7 According to our analysis, the without formal education group had higher
8
9
10 WHODAS 2.0 scores in domain 4 (getting along) and domain 6 (social participation)
11
12 compared with the with formal education group. By contrast, the scores in domain 1
13
14 (cognition), domain 2 (mobility), domain 3 (self-care), and domain 5 (life activities)
15
16 and the standardized (summarized) WHODAS 2.0 scores did not differ significantly
17
18
19 between the groups (table 2).
20
21
22
23

24 Poisson regression analysis revealed that the scores in all domains— except
25
26 domain 3—and the summarized scores of WHODAS 2.0 were associated with the
27
28 education status. In addition, domains 1, 2, and 6 were found to be associated with the
29
30 socioeconomic status. Moreover, gender, age, residence status, urbanization level, and
31
32 disease severity were found to be associated with the scores of each domain as well as
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 the summarized WHODAS 2.0 scores (table 3).
40
41
42
43

44 Discussion

45
46
47 Our study demonstrated that disabled dementia patients with formal education had
48
49
50 higher scores in the domains of getting along and social participation than did those
51
52
53 without formal education. However, no significant differences were noted in the
54
55
56 domains of cognition, mobility, self-care, and life activities.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 The cognitive reserve hypothesis states that a higher education level indicates a higher
8
9
10 cognitive reserve and that it delays the onset of dementia^[19, 20]; in other words,
11
12
13 education has a protective effect on cognitive function in dementia. However, in this
14
15
16 study, no differences in the disability status of the cognitive domain functions were
17
18
19 observed between the with and without formal education groups. We hypothesize that
20
21
22 irrespective of the education status of an individual, the cognitive function declines
23
24
25 immediately on the onset of dementia. In start contrast to the cognitive reserve
26
27
28 hypothesis, a study reported that after cognitive decline, the onset of dementia is more
29
30
31 rapid in persons with a higher education level^[21]. Pathological changes to the brain
32
33
34 may be slow during cognitive reservation; however, after the onset of cognitive
35
36
37 decline, these changes can be rapid in people with a high education level because
38
39
40 dementia is at an advanced stage when the symptoms manifest^[22]. This pattern has
41
42
43 been reported in previous studies that have stated that cognitive decline is more rapid
44
45
46 after Alzheimer disease is diagnosed in highly educated patients^[22, 23]. Our results
47
48
49 are consistent with the aforementioned results; that is, cognitive decline is not
50
51
52 influenced by the education status of an individual before the diagnosis of dementia.
53
54
55 Another possible reason of no cognitive disability influence by education is caused by
56
57
58 statistical method. In order to control the bias caused by different severity of dementia
59
60

1
2
3
4 between both groups, we matched the percentage of severity of both groups. This
5
6
7 process could lead the domain 1 score no different between both groups because the
8
9
10 severity of dementia mostly determined by degree of cognitive impairment.

11
12
13
14
15 In our study, the education status did not influence the patients' disability in the
16
17
18 domains of mobility, self-care, and life activities. However, patients in the with formal
19
20
21 education group exhibited lower disability status in the domains of getting along and
22
23
24 social participation than did those in the without formal education group. This may be
25
26
27 because these domains pertain to basic activities of daily life and are therefore not
28
29
30 related to the education status, whereas the functional aspects of getting along and
31
32
33 social participation require advanced skills that can be obtained through formal
34
35
36 education. Social participation can offer and reinforce social roles and can provide a
37
38
39 sense of belonging and self-esteem in later life^[24]. Formal schooling can impart the
40
41
42 skills necessary for abstract thinking and socialization. Most elderly individuals in
43
44
45 Taiwan are illiterate because of their lack of a formal education. Although there were
46
47
48 statistical less disability score of social participation and getting alone with people in
49
50
51 such large sample sized study, there were only 2 points difference of standardized
52
53
54 score between these two groups. Formal education experience could lead individuals
55
56
57 to learn the items of social participation and getting alone people domains such as
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 joining community activities, dealing with people, maintaining a friendship, etc.
5
6

7 Reading and communication skills obtained through education can ingrain in elderly
8
9 individuals a stronger sense of social attachment and widen enlarge their social
10
11 network.
12
13

14
15
16
17
18 Our study analyzed the effect of education on the disability status caused by dementia.
19

20
21 The strength of this study lies in its use of a large-scale, population-based database; in
22
23 addition, we controlled for possible confounding variables, increasing the validity of
24
25 our results. However, the study has the following limitations. First, the education
26
27 status was dichotomized solely on the basis of whether the patient received formal
28
29 education. Therefore, future studies can explore stratification of the education levels
30
31 and the dose effect of education status on disability severity among dementia patients.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 Second, the WHODAS 2.0 assessment was performed on the basis of the responses
40
41 given by dementia patients or their caregivers, which might have underestimated the
42
43 functioning disability for dementia patients with mild severity of disability and poor
44
45 insights. Most dementia patients with extreme severity had limited ability to
46
47 communicate with the interviewer and thus could not respond to the questionnaires;
48
49 therefore, their assessment was completed by proxies. In addition, the WHODAS 2.0
50
51 questionnaire only evaluated the disability condition of individuals in the past 30 days.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Only caregivers of severe dementia patients who were unable to communicate to the
5
6
7 interviewers could accurately report the daily functioning of these patients.
8

9
10 Nevertheless, to avoid the bias this may have caused, we controlled for the severity of
11
12 dementia in both the study groups. Third, community environment, family support,
13
14 and marriage status were not controlled for in this study. Besides, the cognitive
15
16 demands in life and occupation cannot be obtained of our database. Nevertheless, we
17
18 controlled for the urbanization level, residence status, and socioeconomic status, and
19
20 these variables can represent the living environment and social resource of the
21
22 disabled dementia patients for minimizing these confounding factors. Finally,
23
24 considering the differences in education system and medical care system as well as
25
26 the racial and cultural differences among countries, the results of this study cannot be
27
28 generalized to non-Taiwanese populations.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Conclusions**

42
43 Dementia patients with a formal education had lower disability status in the
44
45 WHODAS 2.0 domains of getting along and social participation compared with those
46
47 without a formal education. Thus, disability status is influenced by the education
48
49 status of the patient before the diagnosis of dementia and therefore formal education
50
51 can help elderly individuals maintain stronger social interaction even after they
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 develop dementia. Regarding public health aspects, community intervention of social
5
6 participation should be implemented for elderly dementia patients especially those
7
8 without formal education experience to maintain better social interaction ability. Our
9
10 study provided the education influence on disability status after the event of dementia
11
12 diagnosis. Detailed investigation of association between education level and social
13
14 participation among dementia patients is recommended in the future.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Acknowledgments: The authors thank Pei-Hsin Chen and Kai-Hsiang Chuang for their
24
25 help in manuscript preparation.
26
27
28
29

30 Contributors: H-SW participated in the study design, conducted the data analysis,
31
32 drafted the initial manuscript and approved the final manuscript as submitted. C-KH
33
34 conducted the data analysis, drafted the manuscript and approved the final manuscript
35
36 as submitted. C-WC contributed to the study design, reviewed and revised the
37
38 manuscript, and approved the final manuscript as submitted. Y-CF reviewed and
39
40 revised the manuscript, and approved the final manuscript as submitted. L-HF
41
42 participated in the study design, reviewed and revised the manuscript, and approved
43
44 the final manuscript as submitted. RE designed and conceptualised the study, and
45
46 approved the final manuscript as submitted. C-FH participated in the study design,
47
48 reviewed and revised the manuscript, and approved the final manuscript as submitted.
49
50 L-TH participated in the study design, conducted the data analysis, revised manuscript
51
52 and approved the final manuscript as submitted.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Funding: This study was funded by the Taipei Medical University and Shuang Ho
4 hospital (no. 105TMU-SHH-05) and supported by the Ministry of Health and Welfare,
5
6
7 Taiwan (98M8178, 99M4080, 99M4073, 100M4145, 101M4100, 102M4018, and
8
9
10 103M03F4037).

11
12 Competing interests: None declared.

13
14 Ethics approval: The Institutional Review Board of Taipei Medical University
15
16 approved this study

17
18 Data sharing statement: The data of this study is taken from the Taiwan Data Bank of
19
20
21 Persons with Disability (TDPD) database. Requests for the data may be sent to
22
23 peter_liou@s.tmu.edu.tw
24
25
26

27 Provenance and peer review: Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reference:

- 1 Jones RN, Manly J, Glymour MM, et al. Conceptual and measurement challenges in research on cognitive reserve. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society* : JINS 2011;**17**:593-601.
- 2 Stern Y, Gurland B, Tatemichi TK, et al. Influence of education and occupation on the incidence of Alzheimer's disease. *Jama* 1994;**271**:1004-10.
- 3 Dufouil C, Alperovitch A, Tzourio C. Influence of education on the relationship between white matter lesions and cognition. *Neurology* 2003;**60**:831-6.
- 4 Bennett DA, Wilson RS, Schneider JA, et al. Education modifies the relation of AD pathology to level of cognitive function in older persons. *Neurology* 2003;**60**:1909-15.
- 5 Qiu C, Backman L, Winblad B, et al. The influence of education on clinically diagnosed dementia incidence and mortality data from the Kungsholmen Project. *Archives of neurology* 2001;**58**:2034-9.
- 6 Caamano-Isorna F, Corral M, Montes-Martinez A, et al. Education and dementia: a meta-analytic study. *Neuroepidemiology* 2006;**26**:226-32.
- 7 Members ECC, Brayne C, Ince PG, et al. Education, the brain and dementia: neuroprotection or compensation? *Brain : a journal of neurology* 2010;**133**:2210-6.
- 8 Evans DA, Beckett LA, Albert MS, et al. Level of education and change in cognitive function in a community population of older persons. *Annals of epidemiology* 1993;**3**:71-7.
- 9 Lyketsos CG, Chen LS, Anthony JC. Cognitive decline in adulthood: an 11.5-year follow-up of the Baltimore Epidemiologic Catchment Area study. *The American journal of psychiatry* 1999;**156**:58-65.
- 10 Ritchie K, Lovestone S. The dementias. *Lancet* 2002;**360**:1759-66.
- 11 Gutenbrunner C, Negrini S, Kiekens C, et al. The Global Disability Action Plan 2014-2021 of the World Health Organisation (WHO): a major step towards better health for all people with disabilities. *Chance and challenge for Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine (PRM)*. *European journal of physical and rehabilitation medicine* 2015;**51**:1-4.
- 12 Chang KH, Liao HF, Yen CF, et al. Association between muscle power impairment and WHODAS 2.0 in older adults with physical disability in Taiwan. *Disability and rehabilitation* 2015;**37**:712-20.
- 13 Huang SW, Chang KH, Escorpizo R, et al. Functioning and disability analysis by using WHO Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 in older adults Taiwanese patients with dementia. *Disability and rehabilitation* 2015:1-12.
- 14 Huang SW, Chang KH, Escorpizo R, et al. Using the World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0) for Predicting Institutionalization

- 1
2
3 of Patients With Dementia in Taiwan. *Medicine* 2015;**94**:e2155.
- 4 15 Chiu WT, Yen CF, Teng SW, et al. Implementing disability evaluation and welfare
5 services based on the framework of the International Classification of Functioning,
6 Disability and Health: experiences in Taiwan. *BMC health services research*
7 2013;**13**:416.
- 8
9 16 Chiu TY, Yen CF, Chou CH, et al. Development of traditional Chinese version of
10 World Health Organization disability assessment schedule 2.0 36--item (WHODAS
11 2.0) in Taiwan: validity and reliability analyses. *Research in developmental*
12 *disabilities* 2014;**35**:2812-20.
- 13
14 17 Yen CF, Hwang AW, Liou TH, et al. Validity and reliability of the Functioning
15 Disability Evaluation Scale-Adult Version based on the WHODAS 2.0--36 items.
16 *Journal of the Formosan Medical Association = Taiwan yi zhi* 2014;**113**:839-49.
- 17
18 18 Ustun TB, Chatterji S, Kostanjsek N, et al. Developing the World Health
19 Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0. *Bulletin of the World Health*
20 *Organization* 2010;**88**:815-23.
- 21
22 19 Farfel JM, Nitrini R, Suemoto CK, et al. Very low levels of education and
23 cognitive reserve: a clinicopathologic study. *Neurology* 2013;**81**:650-7.
- 24
25 20 Barnes DE, Tager IB, Satariano WA, et al. The relationship between literacy and
26 cognition in well-educated elders. *The journals of gerontology Series A, Biological*
27 *sciences and medical sciences* 2004;**59**:390-5.
- 28
29 21 Hall CB, Derby C, LeValley A, et al. Education delays accelerated decline on a
30 memory test in persons who develop dementia. *Neurology* 2007;**69**:1657-64.
- 31
32 22 Stern Y, Albert S, Tang MX, et al. Rate of memory decline in AD is related to
33 education and occupation: cognitive reserve? *Neurology* 1999;**53**:1942-7.
- 34
35 23 Wilson RS, Li Y, Aggarwal NT, et al. Education and the course of cognitive
36 decline in Alzheimer disease. *Neurology* 2004;**63**:1198-202.
- 37
38 24 Berkman LF, Glass T, Brissette I, et al. From social integration to health:
39 Durkheim in the new millennium. *Social science & medicine* 2000;**51**:843-57.
- 40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of elderly Taiwanese dementia patients with and without formal education ($N = 7,698$) after propensity score matching for gender, age, socioeconomic status, residence status, urbanization level, and severity of impairment

Variables	Literacy $n=3,849$		Illiteracy $n=3,849$		p value
	No.	%	No.	%	
Gender					0.784
Male	1985	51.57%	1973	51.26%	
Female	1864	48.43%	1876	48.74%	
Age					0.915
65-74	1035	26.89%	1048	27.23%	
75-84	1798	46.71%	1799	46.74%	
≥ 85	1016	26.40%	1002	26.03%	
Dementia type					0.007
Senile Dementia	3373	87.63%	3448	89.58%	
Alzheimer Disease	476	12.37%	401	10.42%	
Social Economic Status					0.938
Average	3764	97.79%	3765	97.82%	
middle low & low	85	2.21%	84	2.18%	
Residence					0.728
Community Dwelling	2940	76.38%	2927	76.05%	
Institution	909	23.62%	922	23.95%	
Urbanization level					0.859
Rural	556	14.45%	560	14.55%	
Suburban	1356	35.23%	1333	34.63%	
Urban	1937	50.32%	1956	50.82%	
Severity of impairment					0.973
Mild	759	19.72%	745	19.36%	
Moderate	1259	32.71%	1266	32.89%	
Severe	475	12.34%	470	12.21%	
Extreme	1356	35.23%	1368	35.54%	

Table 2 Overall disability (based on WHODAS II scores) in different domains between elderly Taiwanese dementia patients with and without formal education ($N = 7,698$)

Variables	Literacy $n=3,849$		Illiteracy $n=3,849$		P value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Domain 1	71.81	27.066	72.34	26.750	0.389
Domain 2	57.91	33.586	58.65	33.356	0.336
Domain 3	43.80	36.004	43.85	35.835	0.949
Domain 4	72.16	29.441	74.29	28.455	0.001*
Domain 5	79.45	32.437	80.22	32.240	0.297
Domain 6	51.39	26.664	52.63	26.226	0.039*
Summary	61.87	24.054	62.79	23.609	0.089

Domain 1, understanding and communication; Domain 2, Getting around; Domain 3, self-care; Domain 4, getting along with people; Domain 5, life activities; Domain 6, participation in society

*Independent t test $P < 0.05$

Table 3. Poisson regression of WHODAS 2.0 scores for elderly Taiwanese dementia patients for analyzing the association of the WHODAS 2.0 scores for each domain and the summarized scores with various demographic variables

Variables (N=7,778)	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Domain 5	Domain 6	Domain Summary
Intercept	49.009 *	30.552 *	21.622 *	50.036 *	56.539 *	38.320 *	40.869 *
Education Status							
Literacy							
Illiteracy	1.006 *	1.011 *	0.999	1.028 *	1.009 *	1.023 *	1.014 *
Age							
65~74							
75~84	1.050 *	1.132 *	1.102 *	1.042 *	1.068 *	1.015 *	1.059 *
≥ 85	1.110 *	1.253 *	1.183 *	1.090 *	1.123 *	1.046 *	1.121 *
Socioeconomic status							
Average (Reference)							
Middle-low & Low	0.976 *	1.037 *	1.013	0.984	1.002	1.072 *	1.015
Residence							
Community Dwelling (Reference)							
Institution	1.058 *	1.232 *	1.254 *	1.056 *	1.073 *	1.118 *	1.116 *
Urbanization level							
Rural (Reference)							
Suburban	0.985 *	0.999	0.975 *	0.997	0.999	0.970 *	0.987 *
Urban	0.993	0.991 *	0.938 *	1.012 *	1.002	0.953 *	0.983 *
Severity of disability							
Mild (Reference)							
Moderate	1.303 *	1.434 *	1.601 *	1.301 *	1.291 *	1.247 *	1.323 *
Severe	1.477 *	1.840 *	2.165 *	1.484 *	1.428 *	1.478 *	1.562 *
Extreme	1.669 *	2.007 *	2.376 *	1.666 *	1.472 *	1.614 *	1.715 *
Gender							
Male							
Female	0.985 *	0.978 *	0.966 *	0.945 *	0.969 *	0.943 *	0.965 *

Domain 1, understanding and communication; Domain 2, Getting around; Domain 3, self-care; Domain 4, getting along with people; Domain 5, life activities; Domain 6, participation in society

* p value<0.05

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Pages	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found
Introduction		
Background/rationale	5	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
Objectives	6	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses
Methods		
Study design	7	Present key elements of study design early in the paper
Setting	7	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
Participants	7	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
Data sources/ measurement	7*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group
Bias	8	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
Study size	7	Explain how the study size was arrived at
Quantitative variables	8,9	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
Statistical methods	10	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
Results		
Participants	11	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
Descriptive data	11	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
Outcome data	11	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
Main results	11	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
Other analyses	11,12	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses

Discussion		
Key results	12	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
Limitations	15	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
Interpretation	15	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
Generalisability	15	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results
Other information		
Funding	16	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Does more education mean less disability in people with dementia? A large cross-sectional study in Taiwan

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-013841.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Mar-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Huang, ShihWei; Shuang Ho Hospital, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Chi, Wen-Chou ; School of Occupational Therapy, College of Medicine, Chungshan Medical University Yen, Chia-Feng Chang, Kwang-Hwa ; Graduate Institute of Injury Prevention and Control, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan Liao, Hua-Fang; Chinese Association of Early Intervention Profession for Children with Developmental Delays, Hualien City, Taiwan Escorpizo, Reuben Chang, Feng-Hang; Graduate Institute of Injury Prevention and Control, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan Liou, Tsan-Hon; Shuang Ho Hospital, Taipei Medical University, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Rehabilitation medicine, Public health, Mental health
Keywords:	Dementia < NEUROLOGY, education, ICF, Taiwan, World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0)

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Research Paper

4 Does more education mean less disability in people with dementia? A large
5
6 cross-sectional study in Taiwan
7
8

9
10 Shih-Wei Huang^{1,2}, Wen-Chou Chi³, Chia-Feng Yen⁴, Kwang-Hwa

11
12 Chang^{5,6}, Hua-Fang Liao^{7,8}, Reuben Escorpizo^{9,10}, Feng-Hang Chang⁵ & Tsan-Hon

13
14
15 Liou^{1,2*}

16
17
18 ¹Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Shuang Ho Hospital, Taipei
19
20 Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan

21
22 ²Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, School of Medicine, College of
23
24 Medicine, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan

25
26 ³School of Occupational Therapy, College of Medicine, Chungshan Medical
27
28 University, Taichung, Taiwan

29
30 ⁴Department of Public Health, Tzu Chi University, Hualien, Taiwan

31
32 ⁵Graduate Institute of Injury Prevention and Control, Taipei Medical University,
33
34 Taipei, Taiwan

35
36 ⁶Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Wan Fang Hospital, Taipei
37
38 Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan

39
40 ⁷Chinese Association of Early Intervention Profession for Children with
41
42 Developmental Delays, Hualien City, Taiwan

43
44 ⁸School and Graduate Institute of Physical Therapy, College of Medicine, National
45
46 Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan

47
48 ⁹Department of Rehabilitation and Movement Science, College of Nursing and Health
49
50 Sciences, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05401, USA

51
52 ¹⁰Swiss Paraplegic Research, Nottwil 6207, Switzerland
53
54
55

1
2
3
4
5 Kwang-Hwa Chang and Tsan-Hon Liou contributed equally to this work
6

7 Address for reprints: Tsan-Hon Liou, MD, PhD
8

9 Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Shuang Ho Hospital, Taipei
10
11 Medical University
12

13 Address: 291 Jhongjheng Rd, Jhonghe, New Taipei City 235, Taiwan
14

15
16
17 Tel: (+886)222490088 ext 1600
18

19
20 Fax: (+886)22480577
21

22
23 E-mail: peter_liou@s.tmu.edu.tw
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Background World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0) is a feasible tool for assessing functional disability and analyzing the risk of institutionalization among elderly dementia patients. However, the data for the effect of education on disability status in dementia patients is lacking. The aim of this large-scale, population-based study was to analyze the effect of education on the disability status of elderly Taiwanese dementia patients by using (WHODAS 2.0).

Methods From the Taiwan Data Bank of Persons with Disability, we enrolled 7,698 disabled elderly (older than 65 years) patients diagnosed with dementia between July 2012 and January 2014. According to their education status, we categorized these patients with and without formal education (3,849 patients each). We controlled for the demographic variables through propensity score matching. The standardized scores of these patients in the six domains of WHODAS 2.0 were evaluated by certified interviewers. Student's *t* test was used for comparing the WHODAS 2.0 scores of dementia patients in the two aforementioned groups. Poisson regression was applied for analyzing the association among all the investigated variables.

Results Patients with formal education had low disability status in the domains of getting along and social participation than did patients without formal education. Poisson regression revealed that standardized scores in all domains of WHODAS 2.0—except self-care—were associated with education status.

Conclusions This study revealed lower disability status in the WHODAS 2.0 domains of getting along and social participation for dementia patients with formal education compared with those without formal education. For disabled dementia patients without formal education, community intervention of social participation should be implemented to maintain better social interaction ability.

Keywords

Dementia, education, ICF, Taiwan, World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0)

Strengths and limitations of this study

- First large-scale, population-based study using WHODAS 2.0 to analyzing the effect of education on disability status in dementia patients.
- Propensity scores matching was applied for variables of demographic data to minimize the effect of potential confounders
- Stratification of the education levels and the dose effect of education status on disability severity among dementia patients were not presented in this study
- Dementia patients with extreme severity had limited ability to communicate with the interviewer and thus could not respond to the questionnaires; therefore, their assessment was completed by proxies.
- Differences in education system and medical care system as well as the racial and cultural differences among countries, the results of this study could not be generalized to non-Taiwanese populations.

Introduction

The cognitive reserve hypothesis explains how individuals maintain cognitive function and resist pathological processes and clinical impairment of the brain^[1]. Individuals with higher education levels are considered to have higher brain reserve and better compensation during progressive brain disease^[2]. Thus, education is an crucial protective factor for dementia^[1]. Studies have reported that the association between direct measures of brain pathology with neuropsychological test performance can be influenced by education level^[3, 4]. Low education level has been reported to be a risk factor for dementia, especially Alzheimer disease^[2, 5]. In a meta-analysis, individuals with low and medium levels of education had a 1.33-fold higher risk of dementia compared with individuals with a high education level^[6]. In addition, a large-scale, population-based study reported the dose effect of education: individuals with a high education level have a low risk of dementia^[7]. Cognitive decline usually accompanies the normal aging process, and a high education level can slow this decline^[8, 9].

Dementia, a major cause of disability and mortality among elderly individuals,^[10] can lead to functional decline and severely affect many activities of daily living. To comprehensively evaluate and quantify the disability status caused by dementia, an

1
2
3
4 objective assessment tool that evaluates activities of daily living, cognition, and social
5
6
7 participation is essential. The WHO (World Health Organization) Disability Action
8
9
10 Plan was proposed to strengthen the collection of data on disability assessment and
11
12 further identifying needs when planning healthcare services, and allocating medical
13
14 resources during 2014 to 2021.[11] In 2001, the International Classification of
15
16 Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF) was developed to comprehensive evaluation
17
18 impairments, activity limitations, participation restrictions, personal and
19
20 environmental factors. Based on the ICF concept, the WHO developed an assessment
21
22 tool named WHO Disability Assessment Schedule (WHODAS) and 2.0 Version
23
24 (WHODAS 2.0) was published in 2010. WHODAS 2.0 can be used for evaluating the
25
26 functional disability caused by chronic diseases in elderly patients^[12]. WHODAS 2.0
27
28 assesses the domains of self-care, life activities, cognition, getting along, and social
29
30 participation, all of which are domains that dementia may compromise; therefore,
31
32 WHODAS 2.0 is well-suited for evaluating disability in dementia patients.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Our previous studies confirmed that WHODAS 2.0 is a feasible tool for assessing functional disability and analyzing the risk of institutionalization among elderly dementia patients^[13, 14]. However, no large-scale, population-based studies have investigated the effect of education on disability status in dementia patients.

1
2
3
4 Therefore, we investigated the effect of education on disability status in dementia
5
6
7 patients by analyzing their using WHODAS 2.0 scores.
8
9

10 11 12 **Methods**

13 14 15 **Data collection**

16
17
18 Patients in the Taiwan Data Bank of Persons with Disability (TDPD) diagnosed
19
20 with dementia between July 2012 and January 2014 were enrolled in this study.
21
22 The TDPD was established in July 2012; around the same time, a new disability
23
24 evaluation process, Disability Eligibility Determination Scale (DES-2012), was
25
26 developed on the basis of the ICF framework^[15]. In Taiwan, patients with stable
27
28 disability after a disease event can apply for social welfare support. All the disabled
29
30 people have the rights to apply the disability certification and they initiated the
31
32 DES-2012 evaluation process. The DES-2012 evaluation process entails two stages
33
34 and two independent and authorized specialists. In the first stage, the body function
35
36 and body structure categories of the ICF are assessed in accordance with the
37
38 standardized coding criteria of DES-2012 by a clinical physician specialized in the
39
40 disease afflicting the patient; in addition, the physician assigns a diagnostic code to
41
42 the disease in accordance with the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth
43
44 Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) codes. In the second stage, the
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 environmental categories of the ICF framework are assessed by a specialist, such as
5
6
7 a physical therapist, occupational therapist, psychologist, or social worker. In
8
9
10 addition, the specialist evaluates the patient's social participation status and
11
12
13 restriction in life activities by using WHODAS 2.0 (traditional Chinese version).
14
15
16 These specialists are authorized for DES-2012 evaluation only after receiving
17
18
19 official training. After the DES-2012 process completed, the data of each applied
20
21
22 disabled patients were registered in the TDPD database.
23
24
25
26

27 Patients and data collection

28
29
30 From the TDPD database, we included the data of elderly patients (older than
31
32
33 65 years of age) with senile dementia (ICD-9-CM 290.0–290.1, 294.1) and
34
35
36 Alzheimer disease (ICD-9-CM 331.7–331.9). Demographic data— namely age,
37
38
39 gender, residence status (community dwelling or institution dwelling), urbanization
40
41
42 level (rural, suburban, urban), socioeconomic status (average, middle, and low),
43
44
45 and education status (with and without formal education)—and the parameters of
46
47
48 body functions and body structures (ICF categories) are recorded in the TDPD
49
50
51 database. Among patients with dementia, disability was primarily caused by
52
53
54 cognition-related ICF body function categories such as b110 (consciousness
55
56
57 functions), b117 (intellectual functions), b122 (global psychosocial functions),
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 b140 (attention functions), b144 (memory functions), and b164 (higher-level
5
6
7 cognitive functions). The severity of impairment caused by each of these categories
8
9
10 has clinical or objective definitions and is indicated by the qualifier following *b*:
11
12 1 = mild: 5%–24% impairment; 2 = moderate: 25%–49% impairment, 3 = severe:
13
14 50%–95% impairment, 4 = extreme: 96%–100% impairment. For example, b110.4
15
16 indicates extreme severity in the consciousness functions of the patient. This study
17
18 was approved by the Joint Institutional Review Board at Taipei Medical University.
19
20
21 Because this is a secondary data analysis study and because the data were analyzed
22
23
24 anonymously, informed consent was not required.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Outcome measurements

34
35 The WHODAS 2.0 scores recorded in the TDPD database were used as indicators
36
37
38 of the disability status of the study patients. The scores are assigned by authorized
39
40
41 specialists after they interview the patients (or their proxies if patients are unable to
42
43
44 answer the WHODAS 2.0 questionnaire). WHODAS 2.0 has six domains and 36
45
46
47 items in total: domain 1 has six items on cognition; domain 2 has five items on
48
49
50 mobility; domain 3 has four items on self-care; domain 4 has five items on getting
51
52
53 along; domain 5 has four items on life activities and four items on work and school
54
55
56 activities; domain 6 has eight items on social participation. The patients indicate
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 their level of difficulty in performing activities related to each item in the past 30
5
6 days on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = no difficulty, 2 = mild difficulty, 3 = moderate
7
8 difficulty, 4 = severe difficulty, 5 = extreme difficulty). The total score of all six
9
10 domains are transformed to standardized scores ranging from 0 to 100, with higher
11
12 scores indicating a higher severity of disability. Because we only enrolled dementia
13
14 patients older than 65 years, we expected most of them to be retired or unemployed;
15
16 hence, we excluded the four items in domain 5 pertaining to work and school
17
18 activities. Thus, we analyzed the scores in the remaining 32 WHODAS 2.0 items.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 The traditional Chinese version of WHODAS 2.0 is used in TDPD database; the
28
29 intraclass correlation coefficient of this version of the questionnaire was found to
30
31 be 0.80–0.89, and the internal consistency and reliability was found to be 0.73–0.99
32
33 (Cronbach's α)^[16, 17]. Regarding missing data, the WHODAS 2.0 guidelines allow
34
35 up to 30% of the items in each domain to be missing; the missing values can be
36
37 adjusted using the mean of the available scores in that domain^[18].
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Statistical analysis

48
49 Demographic variables, namely age (65–74 years, 75–85 years, and >85 years),
50
51 socioeconomic status (average, middle, and low), residence status (community
52
53 dwelling and institution dwelling), urbanization level (urban, suburban, and rural),
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 and severity of dementia-related impairment (mild, moderate, severe, and extreme),
5
6
7 were represented as numbers and percentages. To determine the effect of education
8
9
10 status on dementia patients, we categorized the data into two groups on the basis of
11
12 the education status of the patients (with and without formal education); the variables
13
14 were controlled for through propensity scores matching.
15
16
17
18 Chi-square analysis was used for comparing the categorical variables of
19
20
21 dementia-related disability between dementia patients with and without formal
22
23 education. The standardized scores for both groups in the six domains of WHODAS
24
25 2.0 were compared using independent *t* tests. Subsequently, the association between
26
27 the demographic variables and the standardized scores for all six domains in both
28
29 groups were analyzed through a Poisson regression model. We adopt the Poisson
30
31 regression model for identifying the association of category variables (demographic
32
33 variables and type of dementia) and the WHODAS 2.0 scores (continuous variables).
34
35
36 All statistical analyses were performed using SAS software (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary,
37
38 NC), and $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Results

51
52
53 After propensity score matching of the disabled dementia patients, the without
54
55 formal education group comprised 3,849 patients (1,864 females and 1,985 males)
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 and the with formal education group comprised 3,849 patients (1,879 females and
5
6 1,973 males). The distribution of the demographic variables of the two groups did not
7
8 differ significantly (table 1).
9
10

11
12 According to our analysis, the without formal education group had higher
13
14 WHODAS 2.0 scores in domain 4 (getting along) and domain 6 (social participation)
15
16 compared with the with formal education group. By contrast, the scores in domain 1
17
18 (cognition), domain 2 (mobility), domain 3 (self-care), and domain 5 (life activities)
19
20 and the standardized (summarized) WHODAS 2.0 scores did not differ significantly
21
22 between the groups (table 2).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Poisson regression analysis revealed that the scores in all domains— except
32
33 domain 3—and the summarized scores of WHODAS 2.0 were associated with the
34
35 education status. In addition, domains 1, 2, and 6 were found to be associated with the
36
37 socioeconomic status. Moreover, gender, age, residence status, urbanization level, and
38
39 disease severity were found to be associated with the scores of each domain as well as
40
41 the summarized WHODAS 2.0 scores (table 3).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Discussion

51
52 Our study demonstrated that disabled dementia patients with formal education had
53
54 higher scores in the domains of getting along and social participation than did those
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 without formal education. However, no significant differences were noted in the
5
6 domains of cognition, mobility, self-care, and life activities.
7
8
9

10
11
12 The cognitive reserve hypothesis states that a higher education level indicates a higher
13
14 cognitive reserve and that it delays the onset of dementia^[19, 20]; in other words,
15
16 education has a protective effect on cognitive function in dementia. However, in this
17
18 study, no differences in the disability status of the cognitive domain functions were
19
20 observed between the with and without formal education groups. We hypothesize that
21
22 irrespective of the education status of an individual, the cognitive function declines
23
24 immediately on the onset of dementia. In start contrast to the cognitive reserve
25
26 hypothesis, a study reported that after cognitive decline, the onset of dementia is more
27
28 rapid in persons with a higher education level^[21]. Pathological changes to the brain
29
30 may be slow during cognitive reservation; however, after the onset of cognitive
31
32 decline, these changes can be rapid in people with a high education level because
33
34 dementia is at an advanced stage when the symptoms manifest^[22]. This pattern has
35
36 been reported in previous studies that have stated that cognitive decline is more rapid
37
38 after Alzheimer disease is diagnosed in highly educated patients^[22, 23]. Our results
39
40 are consistent with the aforementioned results; that is, cognitive decline is not
41
42 influenced by the education status of an individual before the diagnosis of dementia.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Another possible reason of no cognitive disability influence by education is caused by
5
6 statistical method. In order to control the bias caused by different severity of dementia
7
8 between both groups, we matched the percentage of severity of both groups. This
9
10 process could lead the domain 1 score no different between both groups because the
11
12 severity of dementia mostly determined by degree of cognitive impairment.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 In our study, the education status did not influence the patients' disability in the
22
23 domains of mobility, self-care, and life activities. However, patients in the with formal
24
25 education group exhibited lower disability status in the domains of getting along and
26
27 social participation than did those in the without formal education group. This may be
28
29 because these domains pertain to basic activities of daily life and are therefore not
30
31 related to the education status, whereas the functional aspects of getting along and
32
33 social participation require advanced skills that can be obtained through formal
34
35 education. Social participation can offer and reinforce social roles and can provide a
36
37 sense of belonging and self-esteem in later life^[24]. Formal schooling can impart the
38
39 skills necessary for abstract thinking and socialization. Most elderly individuals in
40
41 Taiwan are illiterate because of their lack of a formal education. Although there were
42
43 statistical less disability score of social participation and getting along with people in
44
45 such large sample sized study, there were only 2 points difference of standardized
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 score between these two groups. Formal education experience could lead individuals
5
6
7 to learn the items of social participation and getting alone people domains such as
8
9
10 joining community activities, dealing with people, maintaining a friendship, etc.

11
12 Reading and communication skills obtained through education can ingrain in elderly
13
14 individuals a stronger sense of social attachment and widen enlarge their social
15
16
17 network.
18
19

20
21 Our study analyzed the effect of education on the disability status caused by dementia.
22

23
24 The strength of this study lies in its use of a large-scale, population-based database; in
25
26
27 addition, we controlled for possible confounding variables, increasing the validity of
28
29
30 our results. However, the study has the following limitations. First, the education
31
32
33 status was dichotomized solely on the basis of whether the patient received formal
34
35
36 education. Therefore, future studies can explore stratification of the education levels
37
38
39 and the dose effect of education status on disability severity among dementia patients.
40
41
42

43
44 Second, the WHODAS 2.0 assessment was performed on the basis of the responses
45
46
47 given by dementia patients or their caregivers, which might have underestimated the
48
49
50 functioning disability for dementia patients with mild severity of disability and poor
51
52
53 insights. Most dementia patients with extreme severity had limited ability to
54
55
56 communicate with the interviewer and thus could not respond to the questionnaires;
57
58
59

1
2
3
4 therefore, their assessment was completed by proxies. In addition, the WHODAS 2.0
5
6
7 questionnaire only evaluated the disability condition of individuals in the past 30 days.
8
9
10 Only caregivers of severe dementia patients who were unable to communicate to the
11
12
13 interviewers could accurately report the daily functioning of these patients.
14
15
16 Nevertheless, to avoid the bias this may have caused, we controlled for the severity of
17
18
19 dementia in both the study groups. Third, community environment, family support,
20
21
22 and marriage status were not controlled for in this study. Besides, the cognitive
23
24
25 demands in life and occupation cannot be obtained of our database. Nevertheless, we
26
27
28 controlled for the urbanization level, residence status, and socioeconomic status, and
29
30
31 these variables can represent the living environment and social resource of the
32
33
34 disabled dementia patients for minimizing these confounding factors. Finally,
35
36
37 considering the differences in education system and medical care system as well as
38
39
40 the racial and cultural differences among countries, the results of this study cannot be
41
42
43 generalized to non-Taiwanese populations.
44
45
46

47 **Conclusions**

48
49
50 Dementia patients with a formal education had lower disability status in the
51
52
53 WHODAS 2.0 domains of getting along and social participation compared with those
54
55
56 without a formal education. Thus, disability status is influenced by the education
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 status of the patient before the diagnosis of dementia and therefore formal education
5
6
7 can help elderly individuals maintain stronger social interaction even after they
8
9
10 develop dementia. Regarding public health aspects, community intervention of social
11
12
13 participation should be implemented for elderly dementia patients especially those
14
15
16 without formal education experience to maintain better social interaction ability. Our
17
18
19 study provided the education influence on disability status after the event of dementia
20
21
22 diagnosis. Detailed investigation of association between education level and social
23
24
25 participation among dementia patients is recommended in the future.
26
27
28

29 Acknowledgments: The authors thank Pei-Hsin Chen and Kai-Hsiang Chuang for their
30
31 help in manuscript preparation.
32
33
34

35
36 Contributors: H-SW participated in the study design, conducted the data analysis,
37
38 drafted the initial manuscript and approved the final manuscript as submitted. C-KH
39
40 conducted the data analysis, drafted the manuscript and approved the final manuscript
41
42 as submitted. C-WC contributed to the study design, reviewed and revised the
43
44 manuscript, and approved the final manuscript as submitted. Y-CF reviewed and
45
46 revised the manuscript, and approved the final manuscript as submitted. L-HF
47
48 participated in the study design, reviewed and revised the manuscript, and approved
49
50 the final manuscript as submitted. RE designed and conceptualised the study, and
51
52 approved the final manuscript as submitted. C-FH participated in the study design,
53
54 reviewed and revised the manuscript, and approved the final manuscript as submitted.
55
56
57 L-TH participated in the study design, conducted the data analysis, revised manuscript
58
59
60

1
2
3 and approved the final manuscript as submitted.
4
5
6

7 Funding: This study was funded by the Taipei Medical University and Shuang Ho
8 hospital (no. 105TMU-SHH-05) and supported by the Ministry of Health and Welfare,
9 Taiwan (98M8178, 99M4080, 99M4073, 100M4145, 101M4100, 102M4018, and
10 103M03F4037).
11
12
13
14

15 Competing interests: None declared.
16
17

18 Ethics approval: The Institutional Review Board of Taipei Medical University
19 approved this study
20
21
22

23 Data sharing statement: The data of this study is taken from the Taiwan Data Bank of
24 Persons with Disability (TDPD) database. Requests for the data may be sent to
25 peter_liou@s.tmu.edu.tw
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Provenance and peer review: Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reference:

- 1 Jones RN, Manly J, Glymour MM, et al. Conceptual and measurement challenges in research on cognitive reserve. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society* : JINS 2011;**17**:593-601.
- 2 Stern Y, Gurland B, Tatemichi TK, et al. Influence of education and occupation on the incidence of Alzheimer's disease. *Jama* 1994;**271**:1004-10.
- 3 Dufouil C, Alperovitch A, Tzourio C. Influence of education on the relationship between white matter lesions and cognition. *Neurology* 2003;**60**:831-6.
- 4 Bennett DA, Wilson RS, Schneider JA, et al. Education modifies the relation of AD pathology to level of cognitive function in older persons. *Neurology* 2003;**60**:1909-15.
- 5 Qiu C, Backman L, Winblad B, et al. The influence of education on clinically diagnosed dementia incidence and mortality data from the Kungsholmen Project. *Archives of neurology* 2001;**58**:2034-9.
- 6 Caamano-Isorna F, Corral M, Montes-Martinez A, et al. Education and dementia: a meta-analytic study. *Neuroepidemiology* 2006;**26**:226-32.
- 7 Members ECC, Brayne C, Ince PG, et al. Education, the brain and dementia: neuroprotection or compensation? *Brain : a journal of neurology* 2010;**133**:2210-6.
- 8 Evans DA, Beckett LA, Albert MS, et al. Level of education and change in cognitive function in a community population of older persons. *Annals of epidemiology* 1993;**3**:71-7.
- 9 Lyketsos CG, Chen LS, Anthony JC. Cognitive decline in adulthood: an 11.5-year follow-up of the Baltimore Epidemiologic Catchment Area study. *The American journal of psychiatry* 1999;**156**:58-65.
- 10 Ritchie K, Lovestone S. The dementias. *Lancet* 2002;**360**:1759-66.
- 11 Gutenbrunner C, Negrini S, Kiekens C, et al. The Global Disability Action Plan 2014-2021 of the World Health Organisation (WHO): a major step towards better health for all people with disabilities. *Chance and challenge for Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine (PRM)*. *European journal of physical and rehabilitation medicine* 2015;**51**:1-4.
- 12 Chang KH, Liao HF, Yen CF, et al. Association between muscle power impairment and WHODAS 2.0 in older adults with physical disability in Taiwan. *Disability and rehabilitation* 2015;**37**:712-20.
- 13 Huang SW, Chang KH, Escorpizo R, et al. Functioning and disability analysis by using WHO Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 in older adults Taiwanese patients with dementia. *Disability and rehabilitation* 2015:1-12.
- 14 Huang SW, Chang KH, Escorpizo R, et al. Using the World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0) for Predicting Institutionalization

- 1
2
3 of Patients With Dementia in Taiwan. *Medicine* 2015;**94**:e2155.
- 4 15 Chiu WT, Yen CF, Teng SW, et al. Implementing disability evaluation and welfare
5 services based on the framework of the International Classification of Functioning,
6 Disability and Health: experiences in Taiwan. *BMC health services research*
7 2013;**13**:416.
- 8
9 16 Chiu TY, Yen CF, Chou CH, et al. Development of traditional Chinese version of
10 World Health Organization disability assessment schedule 2.0 36--item (WHODAS
11 2.0) in Taiwan: validity and reliability analyses. *Research in developmental*
12 *disabilities* 2014;**35**:2812-20.
- 13
14 17 Yen CF, Hwang AW, Liou TH, et al. Validity and reliability of the Functioning
15 Disability Evaluation Scale-Adult Version based on the WHODAS 2.0--36 items.
16 *Journal of the Formosan Medical Association = Taiwan yi zhi* 2014;**113**:839-49.
- 17
18 18 Ustun TB, Chatterji S, Kostanjsek N, et al. Developing the World Health
19 Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0. *Bulletin of the World Health*
20 *Organization* 2010;**88**:815-23.
- 21
22 19 Farfel JM, Nitrini R, Suemoto CK, et al. Very low levels of education and
23 cognitive reserve: a clinicopathologic study. *Neurology* 2013;**81**:650-7.
- 24
25 20 Barnes DE, Tager IB, Satariano WA, et al. The relationship between literacy and
26 cognition in well-educated elders. *The journals of gerontology Series A, Biological*
27 *sciences and medical sciences* 2004;**59**:390-5.
- 28
29 21 Hall CB, Derby C, LeValley A, et al. Education delays accelerated decline on a
30 memory test in persons who develop dementia. *Neurology* 2007;**69**:1657-64.
- 31
32 22 Stern Y, Albert S, Tang MX, et al. Rate of memory decline in AD is related to
33 education and occupation: cognitive reserve? *Neurology* 1999;**53**:1942-7.
- 34
35 23 Wilson RS, Li Y, Aggarwal NT, et al. Education and the course of cognitive
36 decline in Alzheimer disease. *Neurology* 2004;**63**:1198-202.
- 37
38 24 Berkman LF, Glass T, Brissette I, et al. From social integration to health:
39 Durkheim in the new millennium. *Social science & medicine* 2000;**51**:843-57.
- 40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of elderly Taiwanese dementia patients with and without formal education ($N = 7,698$) after propensity score matching for gender, age, socioeconomic status, residence status, urbanization level, and severity of impairment

Variables	Literacy $n=3,849$		Illiteracy $n=3,849$		p value
	No.	%	No.	%	
Gender					0.784
Male	1985	51.57%	1973	51.26%	
Female	1864	48.43%	1876	48.74%	
Age					0.915
65-74	1035	26.89%	1048	27.23%	
75-84	1798	46.71%	1799	46.74%	
≥ 85	1016	26.40%	1002	26.03%	
Dementia type					0.007
Senile Dementia	3373	87.63%	3448	89.58%	
Alzheimer Disease	476	12.37%	401	10.42%	
Social Economic Status					0.938
Average	3764	97.79%	3765	97.82%	
middle low & low	85	2.21%	84	2.18%	
Residence					0.728
Community Dwelling	2940	76.38%	2927	76.05%	
Institution	909	23.62%	922	23.95%	
Urbanization level					0.859
Rural	556	14.45%	560	14.55%	
Suburban	1356	35.23%	1333	34.63%	
Urban	1937	50.32%	1956	50.82%	
Severity of impairment					0.973
Mild	759	19.72%	745	19.36%	
Moderate	1259	32.71%	1266	32.89%	
Severe	475	12.34%	470	12.21%	
Extreme	1356	35.23%	1368	35.54%	

Table 2 Overall disability (based on WHODAS II scores) in different domains between elderly Taiwanese dementia patients with and without formal education ($N = 7,698$)

Variables	Literacy $n=3,849$		Illiteracy $n=3,849$		P value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Domain 1	71.81	27.066	72.34	26.750	0.389
Domain 2	57.91	33.586	58.65	33.356	0.336
Domain 3	43.80	36.004	43.85	35.835	0.949
Domain 4	72.16	29.441	74.29	28.455	0.001*
Domain 5	79.45	32.437	80.22	32.240	0.297
Domain 6	51.39	26.664	52.63	26.226	0.039*
Summary	61.87	24.054	62.79	23.609	0.089

Domain 1, understanding and communication; Domain 2, Getting around; Domain 3, self-care; Domain 4, getting along with people; Domain 5, life activities; Domain 6, participation in society

*Independent t test $P < 0.05$

Table 3. Poisson regression of WHODAS 2.0 scores for elderly Taiwanese dementia patients for analyzing the association of the WHODAS 2.0 scores for each domain and the summarized scores with various demographic variables

Variables (N=7,778)	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Domain 5	Domain 6	Domain Summary
Intercept	49.142 *	30.513 *	21.658 *	50.164 *	56.685 *	38.470 *	40.960 *
Education Status							
Literacy							
Illiteracy	1.006 *	1.011 *	0.999	1.028 *	1.009 *	1.022 *	1.013 *
Age							
65~74							
75~84	1.050 *	1.132 *	1.102 *	1.042 *	1.068 *	1.015 *	1.059 *
≥ 85	1.109 *	1.253 *	1.183 *	1.090 *	1.122 *	1.046 *	1.121 *
Socioeconomic status							
Average (Reference)							
Middle-low & Low	0.976 *	1.037 *	1.013	0.983	1.002	1.072 *	1.015
Residence							
Community Dwelling (Reference)							
Institution	1.057 *	1.232 *	1.253 *	1.055 *	1.073 *	1.118 *	1.116 *
Urbanization level							
Rural (Reference)							
Suburban	0.985 *	0.999	0.975 *	0.997	0.999	0.970 *	0.987 *
Urban	0.993	0.991 *	0.938 *	1.011 *	1.001	0.953 *	0.983 *
Severity of disability							
Mild (Reference)							
Moderate	1.302 *	1.434 *	1.601 *	1.300 *	1.290 *	1.246 *	1.322 *
Severe	1.475 *	1.841 *	2.164 *	1.483 *	1.426 *	1.476 *	1.561 *
Extreme	1.668 *	2.008 *	2.375 *	1.665 *	1.471 *	1.613 *	1.714 *
Gender							
Male							
Female	0.985 *	0.978 *	0.966 *	0.945 *	0.969 *	0.943 *	0.965 *
Dementia type							
Senile Dementia							
Alzheimer Disease	0.986 *	1.007	0.991	0.986 *	0.986 *	0.979 *	0.988 *

Domain 1, understanding and communication; Domain 2, Getting around; Domain 3, self-care; Domain 4, getting along with people; Domain 5, life activities; Domain 6, participation in society

* p value<0.05

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Pages	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found
Introduction		
Background/rationale	5	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
Objectives	6	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses
Methods		
Study design	7	Present key elements of study design early in the paper
Setting	7	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
Participants	7	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
Data sources/ measurement	7*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group
Bias	8	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
Study size	7	Explain how the study size was arrived at
Quantitative variables	8,9	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
Statistical methods	10	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
Results		
Participants	11	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
Descriptive data	11	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
Outcome data	11	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
Main results	11	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
Other analyses	11,12	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses

Discussion		
Key results	12	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
Limitations	15	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
Interpretation	15	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
Generalisability	15	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results
Other information		
Funding	16	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.