CNE ARTICLE

Earn 2.1 Contact Hours

Caring for Older Adults with Mild Cognitive Impairment

An Update for Nurses

HOW TO OBTAIN CONTACT HOURS BY READING THIS ARTICLE

Instructions

2.1 contact hours will be awarded for this activity. A contact hour is 60 minutes of instruction. This is a Learner-Paced Program. Vindico Medical Education does not require submission of quiz answers. A contact hour certificate will be awarded 4 to 6 weeks upon receipt of your completed Registration Form, including the Evaluation portion. To obtain contact hours:

1. Read the article "Caring for Older Adults with Mild Cognitive Impairment: An Update for Nurses" by Feng Lin, PhD, RN; David E. Vance, PhD, MGS; Carey E. Gleason, PhD, MS; and Susan M. Heidrich, PhD, RN, on pages 22-35, carefully noting the tables and other illustrative materials that are provided to enhance your knowledge and understanding of the content.
2. Read each question and record your answers. After completing all questions, compare your answers to those provided at the end of the quiz.
3. Type or print your full name, address, and date of birth in the spaces provided on the registration form.
4. Indicate the total time spent on the activity (reading article and completing quiz). Forms and quizzes cannot be processed if this section is incomplete. All participants are required by the accreditation agency to attest to the time spent completing the activity.
5. Forward the completed form with your check or money order for $20 made payable to JGN-CNE. All payments must be made in U.S. dollars and checks must be drawn on U.S. banks. CNE Registration Forms must be received no later than December 31, 2014.

This activity is co-provided by Vindico Medical Education and the JOURNAL OF GERONTOLOGICAL NURSING.

Vindico Medical Education, LLC is accredited as a provider of continuing nursing education by the American Nurses Credentialing Center's Commission on Accreditation.

Activity Objectives

1. Identify the prevalence and progression data related to mild cognitive impairment (MCI).
2. Discuss the diagnostic criteria and clinical diagnosis for MCI.
3. Describe risk factors associated with MCI.
4. Describe the updated information on prevention and treatment of MCI.
5. Discuss the challenges individuals with MCI and their families face.

Author Disclosure Statement

The authors disclose that they have no significant financial interests in any product or class of products discussed directly or indirectly in this activity, including research support.

Commercial Support Statement

All authors and planners have agreed that this activity will be free of commercial bias. There is no commercial support for this activity. There is no non-commercial support for this activity.

ABSTRACT

Mild cognitive impairment (MCI) is a mild decline in single or multiple cognitive domains, while global cognition and basic activities of daily living remain intact. Nurses play an important role in early detection of MCI and providing care to maintain maximum independence for individuals with MCI. This article seeks to provide nurses with a review of the most recent research regarding the etiology and diagnosis of MCI, related risk and protective factors, patient and family experiences, and current interventions. This update provides research evidence to inform nursing practice of MCI care.

Mild cognitive impairment (MCI) is diagnosed when there is a mild decline in either single or multiple cognitive domains—such as memory, executive functioning, attention, or visuospatial abilities—while global cognition and basic activities of daily living (ADLs) remain intact (Albert et al., 2011; Gauthier et al., 2006). According to the most recently developed diagnostic criteria, MCI is considered to be a "symptomatic predementia phase of AD [Alzheimer's disease]" (Albert et al., 2011, p. 271). Individuals with MCI often have more difficulty or may take longer than their counterparts without MCI in performing more cognitively demanding instrumental ADLs (IADLs) such as driving, telephone use, finding belongings, grocery shopping, medication management, food preparation, traveling alone, and handling finances (Aretouli & Brandt, 2010; Wadley, Okonkwo, Crowe, & Ross-Meadows, 2008). In older adults with MCI, even subtle declines in cognitive abilities or everyday functioning are associated with decreased independence and safety, caregiver burden (Gauthier et al.,

Feng Lin, PhD, RN; David E. Vance, PhD, MGS; Carey E. Gleason, PhD, MS; and Susan M. Heidrich, PhD, RN

2006), a reduced chance of reverting to normal cognitive status (Peres et al., 2006), and an increased likelihood of developing dementia (Farias, Mungas, Reed, Harvey, & DeCarli, 2009).

Despite these impairments, older adults with MCI generally live independently in the community. The impairments they report do not interfere with their ability to adequately carry out important social, family, and occupational roles (Aretouli & Brandt, 2010; Wadley et al., 2008). It is important to understand both the challenges these individuals face as well as how to assist them in meeting these challenges in order to assist older adults with MCI maintain their independence.

The most recent National Institutes of Health statement emphasized the importance of understanding and providing better care to individuals diagnosed with MCI (Daviglus et al., 2010). A recent review found that primary care providers have difficulty identifying MCI in their patients and recording the diagnosis in the medical record (A.J. Mitchell, Meader, & Pentzek, 2011). Most individuals with MCI are community dwelling; thus, primary care providers, including nurses, play an important role in early detection and in providing evidence-based care to those with MCI. Since January 2011, Medicare has started reimbursing primary care providers to perform a more complete "Welcome to Medicare" visit with newly eligible members and a complete wellness visit on an annual basis. Both types of visit include detection of cognitive impairment, which further supports the importance of developing expertise in detecting MCI for primary care providers (Alzheimer's Association, 2012).

The purpose of this article is to provide an update of current research on the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of MCI. The goals are to assist nurses in primary care settings to understand the challenges those with MCI face, examine ways to help older adults overcome these challenges, and discuss the relevance for future nursing research. This update was based on published studies using the most recent standardized diagnostic criteria for MCI (Albert et al., 2011; Winblad et al., 2004). Published studies using other diagnostic criteria (e.g., Stage 3 of Reisberg's Global Deterioration Scale, Clinical Dementia Rating score of 0.5) were not used in this review.

CLINICAL DIAGNOSIS OF MCI

Historically, confusion and lack of precision surrounded the diagnosis of MCI. Terms and concepts such as *amnestic MCI*, *aging-associated cognitive decline*, *cognitive impairment no dementia*, and other such designations were used interchangeably (Ganguli, 2006). At the 2004 Stockholm International Workshop on Mild Cognitive Impairment, standard diagnostic criteria for MCI were established (Winblad et al., 2004). In October 2008, a billing code for MCI was established in the *International Classification of Diseases, 9th Revision, Clinical Modification* (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011). In April 2011, the diagnostic criteria of MCI due to Alzheimer's disease (AD) were first added into the diagnostic guidelines for AD dementia as one of the phases of AD, although mainly for research purposes (Albert et al., 2011).

The prevalence of MCI varies depending on the population in which it has been studied. Using Windblad's 2004 diagnostic criteria, the prevalence of MCI was 42% in France (Artero et al., 2008), 28.3% in the United States (Manly et al., 2005), 24.3% in Austria (Fischer et al., 2007), 17.2% in Germany (Busse, Hensel, Gühne, Angermeyer, & Riedel-Heller, 2006), and 12.7% in China (Nie et al., 2011). According to a recent review of population- and community-based studies, the annual incidence rate of MCI ranged from 51 to 77 per 1,000 individuals 60 and older (Luck, Luppa, Briel, & Riedel-Heller, 2010). A review of 41 cohort studies with a maximum follow up of 10 years suggested that, on average, only 32% of people with MCI progress to dementia (A.J. Mitchell & Shiri-Feshki, 2009). In a multiethnic community-based study of 2,364 participants, the investigators specifically examined the reversion rate of MCI and found that 47% remained unchanged and 31% reverted to normal within an average of 4.7 years follow up (Manly et al., 2008). The reasons for these different outcomes remain unknown. The risk of mortality increased by 50% to 150% in individuals with MCI compared to those without MCI (Guehne, Luck, Busse, Angermeyer, & Riedel-Heller, 2007; Hunderfund et al., 2006; Wilson et al., 2009).

A key recommendation arising from the National Institute on Aging and the Alzheimer's Association Workgroup (Albert et al., 2011) was that MCI should be diagnosed based on the following measures: patient/family interview, physical examination (including laboratory tests), and neuropsychological testing. However, in many primary care settings, a diagnosis of MCI is made on fewer criteria because the full range of diagnostic services is not available (Kaduszkiewicz et al., 2010).

In general, a diagnosis of MCI is made if there is an objectively measured decline (1 to 1.5 standard deviation below the population norms) in one or more cognitive domains over time *or* a subjective report of decline by self-report or by an informant (e.g., family member) in conjunction with observed cognitive deficits. Basic ADLs are preserved, and IADLs are either intact or minimally impaired. There are four subtypes of MCI: amnestic single-domain, amnestic multiple-domain, non-amnestic single-domain, and non-amnestic multiple-domain. The subtypes are based on the number of cognitive domains affected and whether memory is one of them (i.e., amnestic) (Winblad et al., 2004).

Patient/Family Interview

It is essential to obtain the person's health history to elicit information regarding the person's impairment in relation to his or her functional and cognitive status. Open-ended questions should address the person's cognition, social life, hobbies and interests, ADLs, IADLs, and family history of cognitive impairment. Some semi-structured interview checklists, such as the Total Box Score (Daly et al., 2000) can also assist in obtaining a comprehensive background of the patient. Structured assessments of daily functioning are useful in determining the status of ADLs and IADLs. Individuals with MCI may or may not have the insight to provide information on their own health history, including cognitive decline and the status of ADLs and IADLs (Roberts, Clare, & Woods, 2009). On the other hand, caregivers' or other family members' emotional state and stress encountered during caregiving may interfere with their judgment of the person's actual function or ability (Bruce, McQuiggan, Williams, Westervelt, & Tremont, 2008). Thus, it is important to obtain the person's health history through interviewing both the person and the caregiver or other family members. The **Table** describes some of the instruments that have been used to assess ADLs and IADLs in those with MCI.

Physical Examination and Laboratory Tests

A thorough physical examination assists in identifying the etiology of symptoms of cognitive impairment to rule out other illnesses or conditions that can mimic MCI. For example, a thiamine deficiency can mimic symptoms of MCI (Sechi & Serra, 2007), as can physical trauma, dehydration, and malnutrition. In addition to a general physical examination and routine laboratory tests (e.g., vitamin B12, folic acid, thyroid-stimulating hormone, electrolytes, blood pressure, rapid plasma reagin), clinicians should particularly assess for neurological changes in gait, balance, sensory function, and motor ability (Scherder et al., 2007), as well as signs of parkinsonism, among other neurological abnormalities. In addition, self-care capacity and adherence with treatment should be assessed.

Neuropsychological Tests

Neuropsychological tests used in the diagnosis of MCI include numerous tests of cognitive function and

TABLE

EXAMPLES OF NEUROPSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS AND TESTS OF DAILY FUNCTIONING COMMONLY USED IN THE ASSESSMENT OF MILD COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENT (MCI)

Domain/Symptom	Test	Required Time (in Minutes)	Scoring or Psychometric Properties Related to MCI
Cognitive function[a]			
Executive function	Stroop Color and Word Test (Jensen & Rohwer, 1966)	5	*t* scores are used, with higher scores indicating better performance.[b]
	Trail Making Test (Reitan, 1958)	3 to 5	Maximum time for each test (A and B) is 300 seconds. Lower scores indicate better performance.
	Clock Drawing Test (Sunderland, Hill, Mellow, & Lawlor, 1989)	5	Uses different ways of scoring: The quickest way to score is to divide the clock into four quadrants and count the numbers in the correct quadrant. Possible total score = 7, with scores >3 indicating impaired performance.
Language	Semantic and Letter Verbal Fluency tests (Butters, Wolfe, Granholm, & Martone, 1986)	3 to 5	Items named within 1 minute are counted. Higher scores indicate better performance.
Memory and learning	CERAD Word List Memory Test (Morris et al., 1989)	15	Items recalled are counted, with higher scores indicating better performance.
	Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (Schmidt, 1996)	15	*t* scores are used, with higher scores indicating better performance.[b]
Multiple domains[c]	ACE-R (Mioshi, Dawson, Mitchell, Arnold, & Hodges, 2006)	12 to 20	Possible total score = 100, with scores <82 indicating possible MCI. Sensitivity = 0.84; specificity = 1.00.
	MoCA (Nasreddine et al., 2005)	10 to 12	Possible total score = 30, with scores <26 indicating possible MCI. Sensitivity = 0.90; specificity = 0.87.
	MMSE (Folstein, Folstein, & McHugh, 1975)	10	Possible total score = 30, with scores ⩾24 indicating possible MCI. Sensitivity = 0.45; specificity = 0.69.
	Mini-Cog (includes the Clock Drawing Test) (Borson, Scanlan, Brush, Vitaliano, & Dokmak, 2000)	3	Possible total score = 3, with scores <3 indicating possible MCI. Sensitivity = 0.58.
	SLUMS (Tariq et al., 2006)	4 to 10	Possible total score = 30. In those with less than a high school education, scores of 19.5 to 23.5 indicate mild neurocognitive disorder. Sensitivity = 0.92; specificity = 1. In those with a high school education or higher, scores of 21.5 to 25.5 indicate mild neurocognitive disorder. Sensitivity = 0.95; specificity = 0.98.
Behavioral and neuropsychiatric symptoms[d]			
Depression	CES-D (Radloff, 1977)	5	Possible total score = 60 of 12 items, with scores ⩾ 16 indicating depression.
	GDS (Yesavage, 1988)	5 to 10	Possible total score = 15 of 15 items, with scores ⩾5 indicating depression.
Apathy	Apathy Inventory (Robert et al., 2002)	n/a	Possible total score = 36 of 3 dimensions, with scores >2 indicating potential cognitive impairment.
Multiple domains	NPI (Cummings et al., 1994)	10 to 15	Possible total score = 12, measuring the frequency of the symptoms, with scores >0 indicating neuropsychiatric symptoms and increased risk of dementia.
	BSRS (Rabins, 1994)	10 to 15	Possible total score = 12, with higher scores indicating more symptoms.
	CBRSD (Tariot, Mack, Patterson, & Edland, 1995)	20 to 30	Five items are rated as present, absent, or having occurred since the illness began but not in the past month. The other 46 items are rated by frequency of occurrence from 0 (*has not occurred since illness began*) to 9 (*unable to rate*). Higher total scores indicate more symptoms.

TABLE (CONTINUED)

EXAMPLES OF NEUROPSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS AND TESTS OF DAILY FUNCTIONING COMMONLY USED IN THE ASSESSMENT OF MILD COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENT (MCI)

Domain/Symptom	Test	Required Time (in Minutes)	Scoring or Psychometric Properties Related to MCI
Daily functioning[e]			
IADLs	TIADL (Owsley, Sloane, McGwin, & Ball, 2002)	10 to 15	Each task includes a required completion time and an error code. Participants with a major error on a given task are scored with the maximum time for that task. Participants with a minor error are scored with their actual completion time plus a "time penalty," defined as 1 standard deviation of the time data of all participants who completed that particular task with no error. Those with no error are scored with their actual completion time. A mean *Z* score for time on five tasks is computed, with higher scores indicating lower performance. Compared with controls, individuals with MCI had similar accuracy but took significantly longer to complete the functional activities.
	SIB-R (Bruininks, Woodcock, Weatherman, & Hill, 1996)	15 to 20 for short form; 45 to 60 for full form	Age and education matched norm data is available.[b] Compared with controls, individuals with MCI had significantly poorer IADL functioning.
	ECog (Farias et al., 2008)	20	Summary scores for each dimension in the ECog are developed. Mean of summary scores is computed ,with higher scores indicating poorer performance. At a specificity value of 0.80, the ECog had a sensitivity of 0.75 in discriminating MCI from dementia, and 0.67 in discriminating normal controls from those with MCI.
Multiple domains (ADLs and IADLs)	Bayer-ADL (Hindmarch, Lehfeld, de Jongh, & Erzigkeit, 1998)	15 to 20	The mean score from 25 items is computed, with higher scores indicating better performance. Distinguishes MCI from mild dementia with a cut-off at 3.3. Sensitivity = 0.81; specificity = 0.72.
	ADCS-ADL (Galasko et al., 1997)	10	The mean score from 23 items is computed, with higher scores indicating better performance. Distinguishes MCI from controls with an optimal cut-off at 52. Sensitivity = 0.89; specificity = 0.97.
	Total Box Score (Daly et al., 2000)	5 to 10	A score summarizes 6 CDR ratings, with higher scores indicating better performance. MCI group with a Total Box Score ⩾1.5 exhibited amyloid-beta levels similar to controls; MCI group with a Total Box Score <1.5 exhibited amyloid-beta levels similar to Alzheimer's disease.[f]

Note. CERAD = Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer's Disease; ACE-R = Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination Revised; MoCA = Montreal Cognitive Assessment;; MMSE = Mini-Mental State Examination; SLUMS = Saint Louis University Mental Status Examination; CES-D = Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale; GDS = Geriatric Depression Scale; n/a = not applicable; NPI = Neuropsychiatric Inventory; CBRSD = Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer's Disease Behavioral Rating Scale for Dementia; BSRS = Behavior Symptom Rating Scale; IADLs = instrumental activities of daily living; TIADL = Timed Instrumental Activities of Daily Living; SIB-R = Scales of Independent Behavior-Revised; ECog = Everyday Cognition; ADCS-ADL = Alzheimer's Disease Cooperative Study-Activities of Daily Living Inventory; CDR = Clinical Dementia Rating.

[a] A standard deviation of 1 or 1.5 below age- and education-matched normative data indicates a deficit in the respective cognitive domain.

[b] Copyright is reserved for algorithms involved.

[c] Information from systematic review (Lonie, Tierney, & Ebmeier, 2009).

[d] Information from systematic reviews (Apostolova & Cummings, 2008; Monastero, Mangialasche, Camarda, Ercolani, & Camarda, 2009); all instruments have been validated in individuals with MCI. Because these are not diagnostic tests, sensitivity and specificity are not available.

[e] Information from systematic review (Gold, 2012).

[f] Information from individual study (Maccioni et al., 2006).

assessments of behavioral or neuropsychiatric symptoms. For cognitive functioning, a comprehensive examination of memory, language, reasoning, executive function, attention, and mental status adjusted for age and education, by a trained neuropsychologist, is ideal. In these assessments, numerous tests are used to evaluate specific domain(s) of cognition and global cognition (**Table**).

Behavioral and neuropsychiatric assessments are not a required component when diagnosing MCI. However, approximately 35% to 75% of individuals with MCI have behavioral or neuropsychiatric abnormalities (e.g., depression, anxiety, apathy), and individuals with such abnormalities are more prone to develop AD (Apostolova & Cummings, 2008). Thus, it is important to assess these domains when MCI is being diagnosed. It is pertinent to note that these assessments are not diagnostic tests per se (i.e., for clinical depression) but rather provide further information about risk factors in those with MCI.

Biomarker and Neuroimaging Tests

Tests for biomarkers and neuroimaging are not yet accepted as standard diagnostic tests; they are still considered experimental and are typically used only in research settings. However, some of these tests/measurements, such as some cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) and neuroimaging tests, have provided a better prediction of the course of MCI and may be adopted in the near future (Albert et al., 2011). Biomarkers can be categorized as three types: biomarkers of amyloid beta (Aβ) deposition, biomarkers of neuronal injury, and biomarkers of associated biochemical change.

Biomarkers for Aβ Deposition. The accumulation of amyloid plaques in the brain is a hallmark indicator of the pathological change in AD. The protein can be directly detected in CSF, such as CSF Aβ42, which reflects the presence and level of amyloid plaques in the brain. In addition, a newly developed positron emission tomography (PET) amyloid imaging test (e.g., Pittsburgh compound B PET) can bind to Aβ and is being studied as a tool for this biomarker from a molecular image approach (Wolk & Klunk, 2009).

Biomarkers Related to Neuronal Injury. Tau deposition in the brain is associated with AD pathology generally known as *neurofibrillary tangles*. Tau (total tau or phosphorylate-tau) can be measured in CSF, and elevated levels indicate neuronal injury.

Neuronal injury in neurogenerative diseases also results in structural and functional change in the brain. These structural changes may be detected by structural magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), the most widely used neuroimaging technique. Some structural changes in the brain are potentially related to neuronal injury in individuals with MCI. Specifically, hippocampal volume loss appears to be associated with MCI (Geuze, Vermetten, & Bremner, 2005). Functional neuroimaging, such as fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG) PET or single-photon emission tomography perfusion imaging, also offers diagnostic clarification, such as in detecting glucose hypometabolism in the hippocampus (Noble & Scarmeas, 2009) or the regional cerebral hypoperfusion (Austin et al., 2011). While still controversial, functional MRI techniques that measure abnormalities in blood oxygenation levels in the active brain indicate different activation in the medial temporal and other regions between healthy older adults and those with MCI (Dickerson & Sperling, 2009).

The combination of low CSF Aβ42 and elevated CSF tau provides a high likelihood of developing AD in individuals with MCI (van Rossum, Vos, Handels, & Visser, 2010). Thus, recently, biomarkers of Aβ and tau have been incorporated into categorizing different levels of MCI to facilitate their use in clinical research. Based on the presence and consistency of the two biomarkers, the diagnosis of MCI can be classified into four categories of diagnostic certainty: MCI–Core clinical criteria (uninformative/conflicting biomarkers), MCI–Unlikely due to AD (negative biomarkers), MCI due to AD–Intermediate likelihood (intermediate biomarkers), and MCI due to AD–High likelihood (positive biomarkers) (Albert et al., 2011). However, this classification is in an early stage and not yet incorporated into the clinical diagnosis.

Biomarkers of Associated Biochemical Change. A number of biomarkers are available that indicate physiological stress or damage in the organism. These include markers of oxidative stress (e.g., malondialdehyde and thiobarbituric acid-reactive substances), pro-inflammatory cytokines (e.g., interleukin-6, tumor necrosis factor alpha), and markers of synaptic damage (e.g., dynamin-related protein 1) (Albert et al., 2011; Mangialasche et al., 2009).

Controversies in the Diagnosis of MCI

Few studies have examined neurologists' and geriatricians' experiences in diagnosing and providing treatments for MCI. Although there is agreement regarding the importance of identifying the stage between normal aging and dementia, disparities exist in how MCI is diagnosed and how it is treated (T. Mitchell, Woodward, & Hirose, 2008; Roberts, Karlawish, Uhlmann, Petersen, & Green, 2010). Admittedly, there are still gaps in operationalizing the recommended diagnostic procedures for MCI, which may explain the discrepant prevalence rates reported in the literature. For example, there has never been a consensus about which or how many neuropsychological tests are needed when diagnosing MCI (Lonie, Tierney, & Ebmeier, 2009) or what cut-off scores (e.g., $SD = 1.5$ versus $SD = 1$) for each test should be used to indicate impairment (Artero, Petersen, Touchon,

& Ritchie, 2006; Busse et al., 2006; Larrieu et al., 2002; Plassman et al., 2008). Some brief screening assessments, for example, the Mini-Cog (Borson, Scanlan, Brush, Vitaliano, & Dokmak, 2000), the Mini-Mental State Examination (Folstein, Folstein, & McHugh, 1975), and the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (Nasreddine et al., 2005), can help nurses differentiate between older adults who have suspected clinically meaningful cognitive impairment and those who do not, and can be easily adopted by nurses without extensive training. However, none of these screening instruments can be used to differentiate between MCI and other cognitive impairment.

Education- and age-matched normative data are not available for some screening assessments (e.g., Mini-Cog) (Lonie et al., 2009). The Saint Louis University Mental Status Examination needs further validation in individuals with MCI, although it provides cut-off scores for mild neurocognitive disorders (Tariq, Tumosa, Chibnall, Perry, & Morley, 2006). Race/ethnicity norms are also needed for existing neuropsychological tests (Gasquoine, 2009). Similarly, no standard, such as a cut-off score, has been set for defining "minimal impairment" in IADLs. This is further complicated by physical comorbidities that may impair IADL function. At the same time, the traditional self-report IADL instruments have been reported to be insensitive in detecting early subtle symptoms of cognitive changes in MCI (Jefferson et al., 2008). New instruments are needed that can capture MCI-related subtle changes in daily functioning (e.g., IADLs) as well as exclude those changes that are due to comorbidities. Finally, neuroimaging techniques are still in their early development. Although these techniques, especially the PET amyloid imaging test, show potential in the evaluation of mildly affected, clinically atypical patients, they should be supplemental to a clinical evaluation, not a replacement.

ETIOLOGICAL, RISK, AND PROTECTIVE FACTORS RELATED TO MCI

Etiological Factors Related to MCI

The course of MCI may depend on its etiology and how the etiology is related to specific brain pathology. Markesbery (2010) reviewed nine longitudinal studies that followed individuals with MCI for 3 to 4 years and provided some evidence about the etiology and course of MCI. Patients with amnestic MCI, who are likely to develop AD, most commonly had neurofibrillary tangles in the amygdala and the entorhinal cortex of the hippocampus and a greater medial temporal lobe atrophy than healthy controls. For non-amnestic MCI patients and some amnestic MCI patients with parkinsonism who are likely to develop dementia with Lewy bodies, argyrophilic grains and Lewy body neuropathology is common. Finally, for amnestic or non-amnestic MCI patients with readily observed small strokes and reduced cerebral blood flow, progression to vascular dementia was more likely.

Historically, the diagnosis of MCI has been more meaningful to the research community than to the lay public. This can make the diagnosis of MCI confusing to older adults and families.

Risk and Protective Factors Related to MCI

A recent National Institutes of Health state-of-the-science conference panel provided a comprehensive review of protective and risk factors related to general cognitive decline, including MCI (Daviglus et al., 2010). Given the overall low quality or lack of evidence from observational studies and randomized controlled trials, no firm conclusion about any risk or protective factors for cognitive decline can be drawn. Only a few factors have been associated consistently with increased or decreased risk of cognitive decline. Decreased risk has been associated with longer-chain omega-3 fatty acids in the diet. Increased risk has been associated with high blood pressure, depression, current smoking, and APOE-ϵ4 allele genotype (Daviglus et al., 2010).

Four systematic reviews have reported on the risk and protective factors specifically related to the incidence of MCI; however, these reviews were based on a small number (≤15) of observational prospective studies (Beaulieu-Bonneau & Hudon, 2009; Luck et al., 2010; Monastero, Mangialasche, Camarda, Ercolani, & Camarda, 2009; Sofi, Abbate, Gensini, & Casini, 2010). A number of non-modifiable risk factors were found: older age, APOE-ϵ4 allele genotype, low education, and Black and Hispanic race/ethnicity. A number of potentially modifiable risk factors were also found: hypertension, history of heart disease, depression, and sleep disturbances. One protective factor identified was following a Mediterranean diet (characterized by consuming fish, vegetables, and red wine). Evidence for other potential risk/protective factors are preliminary or controversial and based on individual prospective observational studies (e.g., Geda et al., 2010; Petersen et al., 2010), not systematic reviews. Preliminary risk factors include cardiovascular risk factors (e.g., diabetes, metabolic

syndrome), alcohol intake, and male sex. Preliminary protective factors include physical exercise, cognitive activities, and social engagement.

Overall, still very little is known about the etiology of MCI or the factors that increase or decrease the risk of MCI (Daviglus et al., 2010). Most of the current data were based on retrospective data and before the current diagnostic criteria for MCI were adopted. The Cardiovascular Health Cognition Study has proposed the "late-life dementia risk index," an effort to stratify older adults into low, moderate, and high risk of developing dementia (Barnes et al., 2009). With ongoing accumulated evidence, this index may provide a diagnostic index for patients at risk for dementia. It may hold potential to help primary care providers and the public detect MCI more easily as well as develop interventions to prevent MCI or predict further decline from MCI.

LIVING WITH MCI

Historically, the diagnosis of MCI has been more meaningful to the research community than to the lay public. This can make the diagnosis of MCI confusing to older adults and families. The diagnosis does not inform the patient in the same way a diagnosis of dementia does. For example, having the diagnosis of MCI neither predicts whether the person will develop dementia, nor what type of dementia this might be. Because the cognitive and functional changes associated with MCI are more subtle than those associated with dementia, the diagnosis is often missed, but patients and families may be left wondering what their "memory problems" might mean. Finally, there is less certainty in making a MCI diagnosis than in making a dementia diagnosis. Indeed, a relatively substantial proportion (31%) of individuals diagnosed with MCI revert to "normal" over 18 to 24 months (Manly et al., 2008). Older adults and their families may be understandably confused about the implications of being diagnosed with MCI.

Given the level of confusion, older adults' reactions to being diagnosed with MCI are not well understood. This issue has rarely been explored from the patient's perspective, even though people in an early stage of cognitive decline, including MCI, are able to express their own views and needs (Aalten, Van Valen, Clare, Kenny, & Verhey, 2005). A few descriptive and qualitative studies have examined the patient's experience of MCI (Frank et al., 2006; Joosten-Weyn Banningh, Vernooij-Dassen, Rikkert, & Teunisse, 2008; Lin, Gleason, & Heidrich, 2012; Lin & Heidrich, 2012; Lingler et al., 2006; Lu, Haase, & Farran, 2007; McIlvane, Popa, Robinson, Houseweart, & Haley, 2008). Individuals with MCI were able to accurately identify their cognitive symptoms, described negative consequences of MCI (e.g., loss of self-confidence), had diverse emotional responses to their diagnosis (e.g., anxiety, relief that it was not AD), and felt uncertain whether they would progress to AD. Only three studies have examined the coping and self-care behaviors or strategies of those with MCI (Joosten-Weyn Banningh, Kessels, Olde Rikkert, Geleijns-Lanting, & Kraaimaat, 2008; Lin & Heidrich, 2012; McIlvane et al., 2008). Individuals with MCI engaged in self-care behaviors, such as use of supportive services (e.g., legal services, support groups), and strategies (e.g., mental exercise, physical exercise) to prevent AD. They also used coping strategies to reduce stress and cope with memory loss.

In terms of physical and psychological health, a number of studies have examined functional, social, and psychological variables in individuals with MCI. In general, those with MCI report more difficulties than healthy older individuals with engaging in social conversation, telephone use, finding belongings, grocery shopping, driving, and medication management (Aretouli & Brandt, 2010; Kim et al., 2009; Muangpaisan, Assantachai, Intalapaporn, & Pisansalakij, 2008; Peres et al., 2006; Ryu, Ha, Park, Yu, & Livingston, 2011; Schmitter-Edgecombe, Woo, & Greeley, 2009; Wadley et al., 2008). Psychological well-being has been examined in four studies of people with MCI and has included measures of life satisfaction, mastery, affect, and social interaction (Ready, Ott, & Grace, 2004). In general, no differences in psychological well-being have been found between individuals with MCI and healthy older adults. (**Table A**, available as supplemental material in the PDF version of this article, contains descriptions of individual studies.)

INTERVENTIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MCI

Interventions for MCI have been proposed to prevent, slow down, and even reverse the progression of AD. Proposed interventions that have been suggested or studied can be grouped into the following categories: pharmacological, physical training/exercise, cognitive, and psychotherapy. In general, recommendations focus on nonpharmacological interventions, such as physical or cognitive training, that rarely produce adverse events (Daviglus et al., 2010).

Pharmacological Interventions

Currently, no U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved pharmacological treatments are available for MCI. Cerebral-enhancing and cerebral-protective agents have been studied for their efficacy in preventing cognitive decline. Cerebral-enhancing (e.g., cholinesterase inhibitors) agents are hypothesized to counteract potential neuropathological changes in the brain. Cerebral protective agents, such as antioxidants and omega-3 fatty acids, might increase neurotransmitters, hormones, or cerebral blood flow and slow or

halt pathological processes. Some agents may also have both cerebral-enhancing and protective properties: B vitamins, ginseng, ginkgo biloba, and acetyl-L-carnitine (Daffner, 2010). However, to date, there is no sufficient evidence that any of these affect either the onset or progression of MCI (Daviglus et al., 2010). Statins, which were considered to be cerebral protective, were recently reported by the FDA to increase the risk of cognitive impairment (Rojas-Fernandez & Cameron, 2012).

Physical Training/Exercise Interventions

Research on physical training/exercise programs targeting individuals with MCI are rare. Two topical reviews summarized five clinical trials of physical training programs targeting individuals with MCI (Lautenschlager, Cox, & Kurz, 2010; Teixeira et al., 2012). They found moderate-intensity physical training programs, such as walking, may improve cognitive functions (e.g., executive function, memory, attention). Women seemed to benefit more from physical exercise than men, and higher attendance and adherence rates in the programs predicted more improvement on cognitive outcomes (Lautenschlager et al., 2010; Teixeira et al., 2012).

There is considerable diversity in the intensity and format of physical exercise interventions. Standardizing physical activity interventions for older adults would help clinicians translate the research findings to community settings (Elsawy & Higgins, 2010). Further research is needed to clarify which cognitive domain(s) benefit from physical exercise, the underlying neuronal- or vascular-protective mechanisms that occur due to physical exercise, the comparability of different types of physical exercise, and whether combining physical exercise with other types of nonpharmacological interventions is more effective than exercise alone in those with MCI.

Cognitive Interventions

Cognitive interventions based on neuroplasticity theory have been widely applied to improve cognitive abilities in a wide range of patient populations and ages. Two distinct approaches have been applied: Processing efficiency training (e.g., speed of processing training, dual tasks) aims to improve the broad capacity for fluid mental processing, whereas teaching cognitive strategies (e.g., teaching reasoning strategies, mnemonics) aims to compensate for the loss of specific higher order cognitive abilities. Both approaches have shown medium to large targeted training effects in older adults without cognitive impairment or with mild cognitive symptoms (Lövden, Bäckman, Lindenberger, Schaefer, & Schmiedek, 2011). However, a truly successful cognitive intervention must also show transferrable (improvements from a particular training domain are generalizable to other untrained domains and daily functions) and sustainable (training effects last beyond the proximal post-training period) effects (Lövden et al., 2011). According to the most recent systematic review of 15 group- or individual-based cognitive interventions targeting patients with amnestic MCI (samples ranged from 1 to 193), 44% of the objective measures of memory and 49% of the subjective measures of memory, quality of life, or mood significantly improved after interventions, while only 19% of objective measures of cognition other than memory improved (Jean, Bergeron, Thivierge, & Simard, 2010).

Other cognitive training studies might benefit from moving to a real-world context, such as managing finances and medication, driving, and grocery shopping. The Advanced Cognitive Training for Independent and Vital Elderly (ACTIVE) study of 2,802 participants (mean age = 74) used this approach. One of the treatment arms in the ACTIVE study, reasoning training, added content such as learning how to identify patterns related to real-life situations, including identifying medication dosing patterns and filling a pill reminder case. The group that received reasoning training reported significantly less difficulty in overall IADL performance than the control group, and the subgroup of MCI participants also benefited from this training (Unverzagt et al., 2009).

Psychotherapy Interventions

Psychotherapy interventions have been tested for their impact on coping with a diagnosis in patients with MCI and caregivers. One single-group study of cognitive-behavioral therapy of 22 participants with MCI and their caregivers found a significant effect on the patients' levels of acceptance of their diagnosis (Joosten-Weyn Banningh, Kessels, et al., 2008). In another study of 93 individuals with MCI that included a wait-list control group, MCI patients who received group psychotherapy had significantly greater acceptance of their diagnosis and better management of memory problems, but overall levels of psychological distress and well-being did not differ between the groups (Joosten-Weyn Banningh et al., 2011).

Approximately 35% to 85% of individuals with MCI have neuropsychiatric symptoms; the most common ones are depression, anxiety, and irritability (Monastero et al., 2009). There are relatively few psychotherapy trials targeting adults with MCI. The role of psychotherapy for MCI symptoms and adaptation should be studied because it has potential to help improve awareness of and confidence in using cognitive strategies and also possibly improve social connections and overall well-being in those with MCI. This approach also holds the potential to help individuals with cognitive decline effectively manage their noncognitive symptoms, such as depression or anxiety, and improve the communication between

patients and their caregivers. Moreover, as found in a previous study of older cancer survivors (Campbell et al., 2009), psychotherapy may also improve motivation in older adults with MCI to engage in healthy lifestyles, which may also have a positive effect on the underlying neurobiology of cognition.

OVERCOMING THE CHALLENGES OF CARING FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MCI

One challenge in the care of individuals with MCI is that they may not be aware of or underestimate their deficits in either memory or IADLs (J.L. Roberts et al., 2009). For example, some individuals with MCI tend to overestimate their driving abilities (Okonkwo et al., 2009). In fact, reduced awareness of cognitive deficits might prevent community-dwelling older adults from seeking early cognitive assessment (Lin et al., 2010). Even spouses and family members may be unaware of patients' subtle changes in cognition or behaviors at the beginning of their cognitive decline (Lu & Haase, 2009). A well-validated informant-based cognitive screening tool, such as the Informant Questionnaire on Cognitive Decline in the Elderly (Jorm & Jacomb, 1989) can help elicit family members' awareness of patients' cognitive impairment. It is important to obtain information regarding the person's health history from both the person with MCI and the caregiver. This will ensure more comprehensive and accurate health information and potentially help identify those with impaired awareness. Subtle cognitive impairment can easily be overlooked or misinterpreted even by primary care providers, especially in individuals with a high level of education or those with several comorbid conditions (Kaduszkiewicz et al., 2010). Thus, it is important for nurses to be able to recognize early signs of cognitive deficits and help family members recognize the importance of early detection of emerging cognitive problems. Education programs on early detection and management of cognitive decline that directly target older adults who may lack insight into their own cognitive decline are needed.

Another challenge is whether, when, and how to disclose a diagnosis of MCI to patients and their families (Duara, Barker, Loewenstein, & Bain, 2009). Although the most recent consensus paper defines MCI as the symptomatic predementia phase of AD (Albert et al., 2011), individuals with MCI should not be labeled as "having MCI of AD" or "prodromal AD." Instead, clinicians should clarify that MCI is a health problem that is characterized by impaired cognitive function but whose outcomes are uncertain (Petersen, 2011). Nurses may encounter patients with suspected cognitive impairment who do not mention a cognitive problem as a purpose for their visit. When these concerns are not raised by a patient during a visit, it may be useful for nurses to use some short screening assessments (e.g., Mini-Cog) to identify individuals who need further assessment and promote a conversation with the primary care provider. In addition, scheduling regular periodical follow up will help monitor any cognitive or functional changes.

From a patient-centered perspective, it is important to tailor a discussion of MCI to the person's values, beliefs, and culture. For older adults in general, there are diverse beliefs about the causes, controllability, and consequences of MCI (**Table A**). For older adults, being diagnosed with MCI does not always result in psychological distress. For example, according to a recent systematic review of patients with dementia, members of some minority groups do not conceptualize dementia as an illness. They may perceive it as a normal consequence of aging or attribute it to spiritual, psychological, or social causes. They may have little faith in strategies to manage cognitive problems suggested by health care providers or may not wish to use health care services (Mukadam, Cooper, & Livingston, 2011). It is important for nurses to explore each individual's beliefs about MCI and address the individual's unique concerns. Some of these concerns may be related to

KEYPOINTS

Lin, F., Vance, D.E., Gleason, C.E., & Heidrich, S.M. (2012). **Caring for Older Adults with Mild Cognitive Impairment: An Update for Nurses**. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing, 38*(12), 22-35.

1. Mild cognitive impairment (MCI) is diagnosed when there is a mild decline in either single or multiple cognitive domains while global cognition and performance of basic activities of daily living (ADLs) remain intact.
2. Individuals with MCI often have more difficulty or may take longer than their counterparts without MCI in performing more cognitively-demanding instrumental ADLs.
3. From a patient-centered perspective, it is important to tailor a discussion of the diagnosis of MCI to the person's values, beliefs, and culture.
4. Although the course of MCI is not clearly understood, in some cases MCI may be a critical stage during which the progression to dementia could be slowed and independence for older adults prolonged.

the potential stigma or uncertainty attached to the diagnosis. Other concerns may be due to unfamiliarity with the diagnostic tests being conducted and the interpretation of the results. To better assist individuals with MCI and their families, nurses need to be familiar with these various neuropsychological, behavioral, and functional assessments and understand the shortcomings inherent in such assessments. Nurses can also provide information about resources, including support groups that are specifically developed for individuals at the very early stage of cognitive impairment, services or programs that teach how to maintain or enhance memory or other cognitive skills, and stress-reduction techniques (e.g., relaxation, meditation) for patients and their families.

Given the preliminary and controversial results on the risks and protective factors related to MCI, it is premature to recommend pharmaceutical or dietary agents to slow cognitive decline. However, smoking cessation; managing hypertension, cholesterol levels, and diabetes; physical exercise, and cognitive activities are healthy lifestyles or behaviors that are associated with overall better health outcomes, pose little risk in old age and for those with MCI, and address potential risk factors that are modifiable. Nurses can play a key role in helping patients adopt these healthy lifestyle changes and supporting their continued engagement in these activities using monitoring tools such as logs or diaries.

Further research is needed to examine the impact of specific lifestyle strategies on cognitive function and MCI. Three important questions for future research are: (a) Although multimodal interventions for protecting cognition are recommended, what are the appropriate combinations that have the greatest effect on patients' cognitive and quality of life outcomes?; (b) What are the minimal amounts of healthy lifestyle interventions, such as physical exercise, cognitively stimulating activities, and diet, that nurses should recommend to patients?; and (c) Are there any factors (e.g., barriers, benefits) that influence the likelihood that patients will sustain the engagement of these activities?

CONCLUSION

In the past 40 years of the Medicare program—given the high out-of-pocket costs for some cognitive screening tests and well-being maintenance programs—if a patient or family member did not raise a specific memory complaint, an older adult might never receive a cognitive screening test or preventive care. In addition, primary care providers are often hesitant about making a diagnosis of cognitive impairment or disclosing the diagnosis to the patient because of the fear and stigma surrounding a diagnosis of dementia. Both situations create barriers to preventive services for older adults with suspected MCI. Changes in Medicare policy now make it possible for primary care providers to provide cognitive screening and patient-centered lifestyle education for older adults with suspected MCI.

Although the course of MCI is not clearly understood, in some cases MCI may be a critical stage during which the progression to dementia could be slowed and independence for older adults prolonged. With the aging of the population and the increase in longevity, the number of older adults being diagnosed with MCI will increase. It is important that nurses understand the controversies and challenges associated with MCI to provide the best nursing care to patients and their families.

REFERENCES

Aalten, P., Van Valen, E., Clare, L., Kenny, G., & Verhey, F. (2005). Awareness in dementia: A review of clinical correlates. *Aging & Mental Health, 9,* 414-422. doi:10.1080/13607860500143075

Albert, M.S., DeKosky, S.T., Dickson, D., Dubois, B., Feldman, H.H., Fox, N.C.,… Phelps, C.H. (2011). The diagnosis of mild cognitive impairment due to Alzheimer's disease: Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia, 7,* 270-279. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2011.03.008

Alzheimer's Association. (2012). *Medical update: Annual wellness visit*. Retrieved from http://www.alz.org/national/documents/2012annualwellnessvisit.pdf

Apostolova, L.G., & Cummings, J.L. (2008). Neuropsychiatric manifestations in mild cognitive impairment: A systematic review of the literature. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders, 25,* 115-126. doi:10.1159/000112509

Aretouli, E., & Brandt, J. (2010). Everyday functioning in mild cognitive impairment and its relationship with executive cognition. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 25,* 224-233. doi:10.1002/gps.2325

Artero, S., Ancelin, M.L., Portet, F., Dupuy, A., Berr, C., Dartigues, J.F.,...Ritchie, K. (2008). Risk profiles for mild cognitive impairment and progression to dementia are gender specific. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry, 79,* 979-984.

Artero, S., Petersen, R., Touchon, J., & Ritchie, K. (2006). Revised criteria for mild cognitive impairment: Validation within a longitudinal population study. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders, 22,* 465-470. doi:10.1159/000096287

Austin, B.P., Nair, V.A., Meier, T.B., Xu, G., Rowley, H.A., Carlsson, C.M.,…Prabhakaran, V. (2011). Effects of hypoperfusion in Alzheimer's disease. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease, 26*(Suppl. 3), 123-133. doi:10.3233/JAD-2011-0010

Barnes, D.E., Covinsky, K.E., Whitmer, R.A., Kuller, L.H., Lopez, O.L., & Yaffe, K. (2009). Predicting risk of dementia in older adults: The late-life dementia risk index. *Neurology, 73,* 173-179. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181a81636

Beaulieu-Bonneau, S., & Hudon, C. (2009). Sleep disturbances in older adults with mild cognitive impairment. *International Psychogeriatrics, 21,* 654-666. doi:10.1017/S1041610209009120

Borson, S., Scanlan, J., Brush, M., Vitaliano, P., & Dokmak, A. (2000). The Mini-Cog: A cognitive 'vital signs' measure for dementia screening in multi-lingual elderly. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 15,* 1021-1027.

Bruce, J.M., McQuiggan, M., Williams, V., Westervelt, H., & Tremont, G. (2008). Burden among spousal and child caregivers of patients with mild cognitive impairment. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders, 25,* 385-390. doi:10.1159/000122587

Bruininks, R.H., Woodcock, R.W., Weatherman, R.F. & Hill, B.K. (1996). *Scales of*

Independent Behavior-Revised (SIB-R). Rolling Meadows, IL: Riverside.

Busse, A., Hensel, A., Gühne, U., Angermeyer, M.C., & Riedel-Heller, S.G. (2006). Mild cognitive impairment: Long-term course of four clinical subtypes. *Neurology, 67,* 2176-2185. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000249117.23318.e1

Butters, N., Wolfe, J., Granholm, E., & Martone, M. (1986). An assessment of verbal recall, recognition and fluency abilities in patients with Huntington's disease. *Cortex, 22*(1), 11-32.

Campbell, M.K., Carr, C., DeVellis, B., Switzer, B., Biddle, A., Amamoo, M.A.,… Sandler, R. (2009). A randomized trial of tailoring and motivational interviewing to promote fruit and vegetable consumption for cancer prevention and control. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 38,* 71-85. doi:10.1007/s12160-009-9140-5

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). *International Classification of Diseases, ninth revision, clinical modification (ICD-9-CM).* Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/icd/icd9cm.htm

Cummings, J.L., Mega, M., Gray, K., Rosenberg-Thompson, S., Carusi, D.A., & Gornbein, J. (1994). The Neuropsychiatric Inventory. *Neurology, 44,* 2308-2308.

Daffner, K.R. (2010). Promoting successful cognitive aging: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease, 19*, 1101-1122. doi:10.3233/JAD-2010-1306

Daly, E., Zaitchik, D., Copeland, M., Schmahmann, J., Gunther, J., & Albert, M. (2000). Predicting conversion to Alzheimer disease using standardized clinical information. *Archives of Neurology, 57*, 675-680.

Daviglus, M.L., Bell, C.C., Berrettini, W., Bowen, P.E., Connolly, E.S., Jr., Cox, N.J.,…Trevisan, M. (2010). NIH State-of-the-Science conference statement: Preventing Alzheimer's disease and cognitive decline. *NIH Consensus and State-of-the-Science Statements, 27*.

Dickerson, B.C., & Sperling, R.A. (2009). Large-scale functional brain network abnormalities in Alzheimer's disease: Insights from functional neuroimaging. *Behavioural Neurology, 21*, 63-75. doi:10.3233/BEN-2009-0227

Duara, R., Barker, W., Loewenstein, D., & Bain, L. (2009). The basis for disease-modifying treatments for Alzheimer's disease: The sixth annual mild cognitive impairment symposium. *Alzheimer's & Dementia, 5*, 66-74. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2008.10.006

Elsawy, B., & Higgins, K.E. (2010). Physical activity guidelines for older adults. *American Family Physician, 81*, 55-59.

Farias, S.T., Mungas, D., Reed, B.R., Cahn-Weiner, D., Jagust, W., Baynes, K., & Decarli, C. (2008). The measurement of everyday cognition (ECog): Scale development and psychometric properties. *Neuropsychology, 22*, 531-544. doi:10.1037/0894-4105.22.4.531

Farias, S.T., Mungas, D., Reed, B.R., Harvey, D., & DeCarli, C. (2009). Progression of mild cognitive impairment to dementia in clinic- vs community-based cohorts. *Archives of Neurology, 66*, 1151-1157. doi:10.1001/archneurol.2009.106

Fischer, P., Jungwirth, S., Zehetmayer, S., Weissgram, S., Hoenigschnabl, S., Gelpi, E.,…Tragl, K.H. (2007). Conversion from subtypes of mild cognitive impairment to Alzheimer dementia. *Neurology, 68*, 288-291. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000252358.03285.9d

Folstein, M.F., Folstein, S.E., & McHugh, P.R. (1975). "Mini-mental state": A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 12*, 189-198.

Frank, L., Lloyd, A., Flynn, J.A., Kleinman, L., Matza, L.S., Margolis, M.K.,… Bullock, R. (2006). Impact of cognitive impairment on mild dementia patients and mild cognitive impairment patients and their informants. *International Psychogeriatrics, 18*, 151-162. doi:10.1017/S1041610205002450

Galasko, D., Bennett, D., Sano, M., Ernesto, C., Thomas, R., Grundman, M., & Ferris, S. (1997). An inventory to assess activities of daily living for clinical trials in Alzheimer's disease. The Alzheimer's Disease Cooperative Study. *Alzheimer Disease and Associated Disorders, 11*(Suppl. 2), S33-S39.

Ganguli, M. (2006). Mild cognitive impairment and the 7 uses of epidemiology. *Alzheimer Disease and Associated Disorders, 20*(Suppl. 2), S52-S57.

Gasquoine, P.G. (2009). Race-norming of neuropsychological tests. *Neuropsychology Review, 19*, 250-262. doi:10.1007/s11065-009-9090-5

Gauthier, S., Reisberg, B., Zaudig, M., Petersen, R.C., Ritchie, K., Broich, K.,… Winblad, B. (2006). Mild cognitive impairment. *Lancet, 367*, 1262-1270. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(06)68542-5

Geda, Y.E., Roberts, R.O., Knopman, D.S., Christianson, T.J., Pankratz, V.S., Ivnik, R.J.,…Rocca, W.A. (2010). Physical exercise, aging, and mild cognitive impairment: A population-based study. *Archives of Neurology, 67*, 80-86. doi:10.1001/archneurol.2009.297

Geuze, E., Vermetten, E., & Bremner, J.D. (2005). MR-based in vivo hippocampal volumetrics: 2. Findings in neuropsychiatric disorders. *Molecular Psychiatry, 10*, 160-184. doi:10.1038/sj.mp.4001579

Gold, D.A. (2012). An examination of instrumental activities of daily living assessment in older adults and mild cognitive impairment. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology, 34*, 11-34. doi:10.1080/13803395.2011.614598

Guehne, U., Luck, T., Busse, A., Angermeyer, M.C., & Riedel-Heller, S.G. (2007). Mortality in individuals with mild cognitive impairment. Results of the Leipzig Longitudinal Study of the Aged (LEILA75+). *Neuroepidemiology, 29*, 226-234. doi:10.1159/000112479

Hindmarch, I., Lehfeld, H., de Jongh, P., & Erzigkeit, H. (1998). The Bayer Activities of Daily Living Scale (B-ADL). *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders, 9*, 20-26. doi:10.1159/000051195

Hunderfund, A.L., Roberts, R.O., Slusser, T.C., Leibson, C.L., Geda, Y.E., Ivnik, R.J.,…Petersen, R.C. (2006). Mortality in amnestic mild cognitive impairment: A prospective community study. *Neurology, 67*, 1764-1768. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000244430.39969.5f

Jean, L., Bergeron, M.E., Thivierge, S., & Simard, M. (2010). Cognitive intervention programs for individuals with mild cognitive impairment: Systematic review of the literature. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 18*, 281-296. doi:10.1097/JGP.0b013e3181c37ce9

Jefferson, A.L., Byerly, L.K., Vanderhill, S., Lambe, S., Wong, S., Ozonoff, A., & Karlawish, J.H. (2008). Characterization of activities of daily living in individuals with mild cognitive impairment. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 16*, 375-383. doi:10.1097/JGP.0b013e318162f197

Jensen, A.R., & Rohwer, W.D., Jr. (1966). The Stroop Color-Word Test: A review. *Acta Psychologica, 25*, 36-93.

Joosten-Weyn Banningh, L., Vernooij-Dassen, M., Rikkert, M.O., & Teunisse, J.P. (2008). Mild cognitive impairment: Coping with an uncertain label. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 23*, 148-154. doi:10.1002/gps.1855

Joosten-Weyn Banningh, L.W., Kessels, R.P., Olde Rikkert, M.G., Geleijns-Lanting, C.E., & Kraaimaat, F.W. (2008). A cognitive behavioural group therapy for patients diagnosed with mild cognitive impairment and their significant others: Feasibility and preliminary results. *Clinical Rehabilitation, 22*, 731-740. doi:10.1177/0269215508090774

Joosten-Weyn Banningh, L.W., Prins, J.B., Vernooij-Dassen, M.J., Wijnen, H.H., Olde Rikkert, M.G., & Kessels, R.P. (2011). Group therapy for patients with mild cognitive impairment and their significant others: Results of a waiting-list controlled trial. *Gerontology, 57*, 444-454. doi:10.1159/000315933

Jorm, A.F., & Jacomb, P.A. (1989). The Informant Questionnaire on Cognitive Decline in the Elderly (IQCODE): Socio-demographic correlates, reliability, validity and some norms. *Psychological Medicine, 19*, 1015-1022.

Kaduszkiewicz, H., Zimmermann, T., Van den Bussche, H., Bachmann, C., Wiese, B., Bickel, H.,…Pentzek, M. (2010). Do general practitioners recognize mild cognitive impairment in their patients? *The Journal of Nutrition, Health & Aging, 14*, 697-702.

Kim, K.R., Lee, K.S., Cheong, H.K., Eom, J.S., Oh, B.H., & Hong, C.H. (2009). Characteristic profiles of instrumental activities of daily living in different subtypes of mild cognitive impairment. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders, 27*, 278-285. doi:10.1159/000204765

Larrieu, S., Letenneur, L., Orgogozo, J.M., Fabrigoule, C., Amieva, H., Le Carret, N.,…Dartigues, J.F. (2002). Incidence and outcome of mild cognitive impairment in a population-based prospective cohort. *Neurology, 59*, 1594-1599.

Lautenschlager, N.T., Cox, K., & Kurz, A.F. (2010). Physical activity and mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. *Current Neurology and Neuroscience Reports, 10*, 352-358. doi:10.1007/s11910-010-0121-7

Lin, F., Gleason, C.E., & Heidrich, S.M. (2012). Illness representations in older adults with mild cognitive impairment. *Research in Gerontological Nursing, 5,* 195-206. doi:10.3928/19404921-20120605-04

Lin, F., & Heidrich, S.M. (2012). Role of older adult's illness schemata in coping with mild cognitive impairment. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 72,* 357-363. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2012.01.008

Lin, F., Wharton, W., Dowling, N.M., Ries, M.L., Johnson, S.C., Carlsson, C.M.,… Gleason, C.E. (2010). Awareness of memory abilities in community-dwelling older adults with suspected dementia and mild cognitive impairment. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders, 30,* 83-92. doi:10.1159/000318752

Lingler, J.H., Nightingale, M.C., Erlen, J.A., Kane, A.L., Reynolds, C.F., 3rd, Schulz, R., & DeKosky, S.T. (2006). Making sense of mild cognitive impairment: A qualitative exploration of the patient's experience. *The Gerontologist, 46,* 791-800.

Lonie, J.A., Tierney, K.M., & Ebmeier, K.P. (2009). Screening for mild cognitive impairment: A systematic review. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 24,* 902-915. doi:10.1002/gps.2208

Lövden, M., Bäckman, L., Lindenberger, U., Schaefer, S., & Schmiedek, F. (2011). A theoretical framework for the study of adult cognitive plasticity. *Psychological Bulletin, 136,* 659-676. doi:2010-12718-009

Lu, Y.F., & Haase, J.E. (2009). Experience and perspectives of caregivers of spouse with mild cognitive impairment. *Current Alzheimer Research, 6,* 384-391.

Lu, Y.F.Y., Haase, J.E., & Farran, C.J. (2007). Perspectives of persons with mild cognitive impairment: Sense of being able. *Alzheimer's Care Today, 8*(1), 75-86.

Luck, T., Luppa, M., Briel, S., & Riedel-Heller, S.G. (2010). Incidence of mild cognitive impairment: A systematic review. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders, 29,* 164-175. doi:10.1159/000272424

Maccioni, R.B., Lavados, M., Guillón, M., Mujica, C., Bosch, R., Farías, G., Fuentes, P. (2006). Anomalously phosphorylated tau and A-beta fragments in the CSF correlates with cognitive impairment in MCI subjects. *Neurobiology of Aging, 27,* 237-244. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2005.01.011

Mangialasche, F., Polidori, M.C., Monastero, R., Ercolani, S., Camarda, C., Cecchetti, R., & Mecocci, P. (2009). Biomarkers of oxidative and nitrosative damage in Alzheimer's disease and mild cognitive impairment. *Ageing Research Reviews, 8*, 285-305. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2009.04.002

Manly, J.J., Bell-McGinty, S., Tang, M.X., Schupf, N., Stern, Y., & Mayeux, R. (2005). Implementing diagnostic criteria and estimating frequency of mild cognitive impairment in an urban community. *Archives of Neurology, 62,* 1739-1746. doi:10.1001/archneur.62.11.1739

Manly, J.J., Tang, M.X., Schupf, N., Stern, Y., Vonsattel, J.P., & Mayeux, R. (2008). Frequency and course of mild cognitive impairment in a multiethnic community. *Annals of Neurology, 63,* 494-506. doi:10.1002/ana.21326

Markesbery, W.R. (2010). Neuropathologic alterations in mild cognitive impairment: A review. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease, 19,* 221-228. doi:10.3233/JAD-2010-1220

McIlvane, J.M., Popa, M.A., Robinson, B., Houseweart, K., & Haley, W.E. (2008). Perceptions of illness, coping, and well-being in persons with mild cognitive impairment and their care partners. *Alzheimer Disease and Associated Disorders, 22,* 284-292. doi:10.1097/WAD.0b013e318169d714

Mioshi, E., Dawson, K., Mitchell, J., Arnold, R., & Hodges, J.R. (2006). The Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination Revised (ACE-R): A brief cognitive test battery for dementia screening. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 21,* 1078-1085. doi:10.1002/gps.1610

Mitchell, A.J., Meader, N., & Pentzek, M. (2011). Clinical recognition of dementia and cognitive impairment in primary care: A meta-analysis of physician accuracy. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 124,* 165-183. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0447.2011.01730.x

Mitchell, A.J., & Shiri-Feshki, M. (2009). Rate of progression of mild cognitive impairment to dementia—Meta-analysis of 41 robust inception cohort studies. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 119,* 252-265. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0447.2008.01326.x

Mitchell, T., Woodward, M., & Hirose, Y. (2008). A survey of attitudes of clinicians towards the diagnosis and treatment of mild cognitive impairment in Australia and New Zealand. *International Psychogeriatrics, 20,* 77-85. doi:10.1017/S1041610207005583

Monastero, R., Mangialasche, F., Camarda, C., Ercolani, S., & Camarda, R. (2009). A systematic review of neuropsychiatric symptoms in mild cognitive impairment. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease, 18,* 11-30. doi:10.3233/JAD-2009-1120

Morris, J.C., Heyman, A., Mohs, R.C., Hughes, J.P., van Belle, G., Fillenbaum, G.,…Clark, C. (1989). The Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer's Disease (CERAD). Part I. Clinical and neuropsychological assessment of Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology, 39,* 1159-1165.

Muangpaisan, W., Assantachai, P., Intalapaporn, S., & Pisansalakij, D. (2008). Quality of life of the community-based patients with mild cognitive impairment. *Geriatrics and Gerontology International,* 8, 80-85. doi:10.1111/j.1447-0594.2008.00452.x

Mukadam, N., Cooper, C., & Livingston, G. (2011). A systematic review of ethnicity and pathways to care in dementia. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 26,* 12-20. doi:10.1002/gps.2484

Nasreddine, Z.S., Phillips, N.A., Bédirian, V., Charbonneau, S., Whitehead, V., Collin, I.,…Chertkow, H. (2005). The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: A brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 53,* 695-699.

Nie, H., Xu, Y., Liu, B., Zhang, Y., Lei, T., Hui, X.,…Wu, Y. (2011). The prevalence of mild cognitive impairment about elderly population in China: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 26,* 558-563. doi:10.1002/gps.2579

Noble, J.M., & Scarmeas, N. (2009). Application of PET imaging to diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and mild cognitive impairment. *International Review of Neurobiology, 84,* 133-149. doi:10.1016/S0074-7742(09)00407-3

Okonkwo, O.C., Griffith, H.R., Vance, D.E., Marson, D.C., Ball, K.K., & Wadley, V.G. (2009). Awareness of functional difficulties in mild cognitive impairment: A multidomain assessment approach. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 57,* 978-984. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2009.02261.x

Owsley, C., Sloane, M., McGwin, G., Jr., & Ball, K. (2002). Timed instrumental activities of daily living tasks: Relationship to cognitive function and everyday performance assessments in older adults. *Gerontology, 48,* 254-265.

Peres, K., Chrysostome, V., Fabrigoule, C., Orgogozo, J.M., Dartigues, J.F., & Barberger-Gateau, P. (2006). Restriction in

complex activities of daily living in MCI: Impact on outcome. *Neurology, 67,* 461-466. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000228228.70065.f1

Petersen, R.C. (2011). Clinical practice. Mild cognitive impairment. *New England Journal of Medicine, 364,* 2227-2234. doi:10.1056/NEJMcp0910237

Petersen, R.C., Roberts, R.O., Knopman, D.S., Geda, Y.E., Cha, R.H., Pankratz, V.S.,…Rocca, W.A. (2010). Prevalence of mild cognitive impairment is higher in men. The Mayo Clinic Study of Aging. *Neurology, 75,* 889-897. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181f11d85

Plassman, B.L., Langa, K.M., Fisher, G.G., Heeringa, S.G., Weir, D.R., Ofstedal, M.B.,… Wallace R.B. (2008). Prevalence of cognitive impairment without dementia in the United States. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 148,* 427-434.

Rabins, P.V. (1994). The validity of a caregiver rated brief Behavior Symptom Rating Scale (BSRS) for use in the cognitively impaired. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 9,* 205-210.

Radloff, L.S. (1977). The CESD-D Scale. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1,* 385-401.

Ready, R.E., Ott, B.R., & Grace, J. (2004). Patient versus informant perspectives of quality of life in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 19,* 256-265. doi:10.1002/gps.1075

Reitan, R.M. (1958). Validity of the trail making test as an indicator of organic brain damage. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 8,* 271-276.

Robert, P.H., Clairet, S., Benoit, M., Koutaich, J., Bertogliati, C., Tible, O.,…Bedoucha, P. (2002). The Apathy Inventory: Assessment of apathy and awareness in Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease and mild cognitive impairment. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 17,* 1099-1105.

Roberts, J.L., Clare, L., & Woods, R.T. (2009). Subjective memory complaints and awareness of memory functioning in mild cognitive impairment: A systematic review. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders, 28,* 95-109. doi:10.1159/000234911

Roberts, J.S., Karlawish, J.H., Uhlmann, W.R., Petersen, R.C., & Green, R.C. (2010). Mild cognitive impairment in clinical care: A survey of American Academy of Neurology members. *Neurology, 75,* 425-431. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181eb5872

Rojas-Fernandez, C.H., & Cameron, J.C. (2012). Is statin-associated cognitive impairment clinically relevant? A narrative review and clinical recommendations. *Annals of Pharmacotherapy, 46,* 549-557. doi:10.1345/aph.1Q620

Ryu, S.H., Ha, J.H., Park, D.H., Yu, J., & Livingston, G. (2011). Persistence of neuropsychiatric symptoms over six months in mild cognitive impairment in community-dwelling Korean elderly. *International Psychogeriatrics, 23,* 214-220. doi:10.1017/S1041610210001766

Scherder, E., Eggermont, L., Swaab, D., van Heuvelen, M., Kamsma, Y., de Greef, M.,… Mulder, T. (2007). Gait in ageing and associated dementias; its relationship with cognition. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 31,* 485-497. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2006.11.007

Schmidt, M. (1996). *Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test: A handbook*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.

Schmitter-Edgecombe, M., Woo, E., & Greeley, D.R. (2009). Characterizing multiple memory deficits and their relation to everyday functioning in individuals with mild cognitive impairment. *Neuropsychology, 23,* 168-177. doi:10.1037/a0014186

Sechi, G., & Serra, A. (2007). Wernicke's encephalopathy: New clinical settings and recent advances in diagnosis and management. *Lancet Neurology, 6,* 442-455. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(07)70104-7

Sofi, F., Abbate, R., Gensini, G.F., & Casini, A. (2010). Accruing evidence on benefits of adherence to the Mediterranean diet on health: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 92,* 1189-1196. doi:10.3945/ajcn.2010.29673

Sunderland, T., Hill, J.L., Mellow, A.M., & Lawlor, B.A. (1989). Clock drawing in Alzheimer's disease: A novel measure of dementia severity. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 37,* 725-729.

Tariot, P.N., Mack, J.L., Patterson, M.B., & Edland, S.D. (1995). The Behavior Rating Scale for Dementia of the Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer's Disease. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 152,* 1349-1357.

Tariq, S.H., Tumosa, N., Chibnall, J.T., Perry, M.H., 3rd, & Morley, J.E. (2006). Comparison of the Saint Louis University Mental Status Examination and the Mini-Mental State Examination for detecting dementia and mild neurocognitive disorder—A pilot study. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 14,* 900-910. doi:10.1097/01.JGP.0000221510.33817.86

Teixeira, C.V., Gobbi, L.T., Corazza, D.I., Stella, F., Costa, J.L., & Gobbi, S. (2012). Non-pharmacological interventions on cognitive functions in older people with mild cognitive impairment (MCI). *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics, 54,* 175-180. doi:10.1016/j.archger.2011.02.014

Unverzagt, F.W., Smith, D.M., Rebok, G.W., Marsiske, M., Morris, J.N., Jones, R.,… Tennstedt, S.L. (2009). The Indiana Alzheimer Disease Center's symposium on mild cognitive impairment. Cognitive training in older adults: Lessons from the active study. *Current Alzheimer Research, 6,* 375-383.

van Rossum, I.A., Vos, S., Handels, R., & Visser, P.J. (2010). Biomarkers as predictors for conversion from mild cognitive impairment to Alzheimer-type dementia: Implications for trial design. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease, 20,* 881-891. doi:10.3233/JAD-2010-091606

Wadley, V.G., Okonkwo, O., Crowe, M., & Ross-Meadows, L.A. (2008). Mild cognitive impairment and everyday function: Evidence of reduced speed in performing instrumental activities of daily living. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 16,* 416-424. doi:10.1097/JGP.0b013e31816b7303

Wilson, R.S., Aggarwal, N.T., Barnes, L.L., Bienias, J.L., Mendes de Leon, C.F., & Evans, D.A. (2009). Biracial population study of mortality in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer disease. *Archives of Neurology, 66,* 767-772. doi:10.1001/archneurol.2009.80

Winblad, B., Palmer, K., Kivipelto, M., Jelic, V., Fratiglioni, L., Wahlund, L.O.,…Petersen, R.C. (2004). Mild cognitive impairment—Beyond controversies, towards a consensus: Report of the international working group on mild cognitive impairment. *Journal of Internal Medicine, 256,* 240-246. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2796.2004.01380.x

Wolk, D.A., & Klunk, W. (2009). Update on amyloid imaging: From healthy aging to Alzheimer's disease. *Current Neurology and Neuroscience Reports, 9,* 345-352.

Yesavage, J.A. (1988). Geriatric depression scale. *Psychopharmacology Bulletin, 24,* 709-711.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dr. Lin is Research Associate, School of Nursing, University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, New York; Dr. Vance is Associate Professor, School of Nursing, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama; Dr. Gleason is Assistant Professor, School of Medicine and Public Health, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Dr. Heidrich is Nurse Scientist, William S. Middleton Memorial Veterans Hospital, Madison, Wisconsin.

The authors disclose that they have no significant financial interests in any product or class of products discussed directly or indirectly in this activity, including research support.

Address correspondence to Feng Lin, PhD, RN, Research Associate, School of Nursing, University of Rochester Medical Center, HWH 2W128, 601 Elmwood Avenue, Rochester, NY 14642; e-mail: vankee_lin@urmc.rochester.edu.

Received: December 19, 2011
Accepted: June 28, 2012
Posted: November 15, 2012
doi:10.3928/00989134-20121106-03

Table A

Individual Studies of Patients' Experience with MCI

Description of the Study	Results of the Study
Understanding MCI	
12 persons with MCI (age range: 65 – 86) (Lingler, et al., 2006)	Participants understood the symptoms of MCI and reacted differently to the diagnosis, in terms of positive (n = 5, e.g., participants felt relief that it was not a diagnosis of AD), negative (n = 2, e.g., participants worried that the diagnosis may progress to dementia), or neutral (n = 4, e.g., participants perceived cognitive decline, but were fine with the diagnosis).
30 persons with MCI (age range: 60 – 87) (Lin et al., 2012)	Participants correctly identified symptoms related to MCI; generally attributed MCI to aging, heredity, and abnormal brain changes; and believed MCI to be chronic, predictable, and controllable, causing little emotional distress. However, there were no consistent beliefs regarding the negative consequences of MCI or whether MCI was understandable.
63 persons with MCI (M_{age} = 81) (Lin & Heidrich, 2012)	Participants endorsed an average of 7 symptoms that they experienced and believed were related to MCI and an average of 7 potential causes of MCI. Participants tended to believe MCI was chronic, not cyclic, and controllable, but they differed in their beliefs about the consequences, understandability and emotional impact of MCI.
8 persons with MCI (age range: 58 – 83) (Joosten-Weyn Banningh et al., 2007)	Participants identified changes related to their cognitive abilities, mobility, affect, vitality and somatic complaints as symptoms caused by MCI. They also considered negative consequences such as anxiety and the loss of self-confidence.
11 persons with MCI (age > 60) (Lu et al. , 2007)	Participants were aware of their cognitive impairment in their daily lives, but they expected to maintain the ability to live independently. However, they also experienced uncertainty about the disease progression.
Persons with MCI (n = 20, M_{age} = 72) and AD patients (n = 20, M_{age} =77) (Frank et al., 2006b)	Participants were aware of cognitive impairment and their changing role in social/family activities, and also felt uncertain about disease progression.
Persons with MCI (n = 46, M_{age} = 77) and caregivers (n = 29, M_{age} = 70) (McIlvane et al., 2008)	Forty percent of participants believed that their disease was unlikely to convert to AD, and 76% of the participants perceived that the disease process was controllable through practical strategies (e.g., staying optimistic, mental and physical exercises).
Coping with MCI	
63 persons with MCI (M_{age} = 81) (Lin & Heidrich, 2012)	Participants used many dementia prevention behaviors and memory aids, some problem-focused and emotion-focused coping strategies, and few dysfunctional coping strategies.
Persons with MCI (n = 46, M_{age} = 77) and caregivers (n = 29, M_{age} = 70) (McIlvane et al., 2008), using the brief COPE scale and a service use checklist.	Participants engaged in a high frequency of coping such as use of support services (e.g., using legal services, financial planning, housekeeping, support groups), and management of daily living (e.g., planning daily tasks, making notes). Although less frequently reported than other strategies, some participants used strategies such as denial and substance use.
Persons with MCI (age = 58 – 83) (Joosten-Weyn Banningh et al., 2007)	Participants utilized several coping strategies, including stress reduction (e.g. "I tell myself: what I can do, I will do; if I can't, I just leave it"), managing daily living (e.g. "I make notes," "I repeat the information I want to remember"), medical care (e.g., "I visited my GP (general practitioner)"), and

seeking information (e.g., asking pharmacists).

Functional Health	
Cross-sectional comparison of the four subtypes of persons with MCI (amnestic single domain: n = 36, M_{age} = 75.08; amnestic multiple domain: n = 45, M_{age} = 78.36; non-amnestic single domain: n = 26, M_{age} = 74.81; non-amnestic multiple domain: n = 17, M_{age} = 75.59) and healthy control (n = 68, M_{age} = 72.41) (Aretouli & Brandt, 2009).	Regardless of subtype of MCI, participants reported more difficulties in instrumental activities of daily lives than healthy elderly.

Functional Health (Continued)	
Two cross-sectional studies of persons with MCI (n = 50, M_{age} = 70.01) and healthy control (n = 59, M_{age} = 67.76) (Wadley et al., 2008) (Wadley et al., 2009)	Participants were slower than healthy elderly in activities such as telephone use, finding belongings, grocery shopping, and medication management and had worse performance on global and discrete driving maneuvers.
Cross-sectional comparison of persons with amnestic MCI (n = 27, M_{age} = 71.33), persons with non-amnestic MCI (n = 15, M_{age} = 72.20), and healthy control (n = 42, M_{age} = 72.45) (Schmitter-Edgecombe et al., 2009)	Participants had significantly more difficulties than healthy elderly in social functioning, general activities, conversations, household activities, taking medications, telephone use, and food preparation.
A 10-year French longitudinal study of healthy control (n = 828) and persons with MCI (n = 285) (The whole sample: M_{age} = 80.8) (Peres et al., 2006)	Participants had more trouble taking medication, using the telephone, travelling alone, and handling finances.
A cross-sectional study of healthy controls (n = 311) and persons with MCI (n = 255) in Korean older adults (age range: 60 – 94) (Kim et al., 2009)	Participants had significantly worse everyday functioning than healthy elderly in using household appliances and the telephone, transportation, and handling finances.

Mental Well-being	
Persons with MCI (n = 46, M_{age} = 77) and caregivers (n = 29, M_{age} = 70) (McIlvane et al., 2008)	Participants reported relatively typical levels of mental well-being using measures of depression, life satisfaction, mastery, and mental quality of life.
In two studies comparing dementia patients (n = 357, M_{age} = 65.77), persons with MCI (n = 36, M_{age} = 82.11), and a healthy control (n = 72, M_{age} = 79.75) (Missotten et al., 2008) or comparing mild AD (n = 26, M_{age} = 78.2), MCI (n = 30, M_{age} = 77.4), and elderly controls	Participants with MCI also reported a similar overall quality of life compared to healthy elderly, and significantly higher levels of quality of life than participants with dementia.

(n = 23, M_{age} = 74.7) (Ready et al., 2004),	
In a study of 255 persons with MCI (M_{age} = 71.98) and 311 healthy controls (M_{age} = 70.66) in Korea, (Ryu et al., 2010).	Participants and their caregivers both reported significantly lower levels of quality of life if the participant had any neuropsychiatric symptoms.
In a study of persons with MCI (n = 85, M_{age} = 66.7) and healthy control (n = 37, M_{age} = 63.9) in a Thai community (Muangpaisan et al., 2008).	Participants were found to have significantly lower psychological well-being than that of the healthy elderly.

Note. AD = Alzheimer's disease; MCI = Mild Cognitive Impairment.