







Predictors of accidents in patients with mild cognitive impairment, mild Alzheimer's disease and healthy controls in simulated driving

A. Economou¹, D. Pavlou², I. Beratis³, G. Yannis², S. G. Papageorgiou³

¹ Department of Psychology, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece, ²Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering, National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece, ³ "Attikon" University General Hospital, Department of Neurology, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

BACKGROUND & AIMS

Older drivers, especially those with mild cognitive impairment (MCI) or mild Alzheimer's disease (AD), make more safety errors than middle-aged drivers and are at higher risk of being involved in accidents. It is therefore important to investigate the variables that predict accident risk. The driving simulator offers a valid way of assessing driving performance and is especially valuable for studying accident risk in different driving scenarios.

The present study investigates the driving variables that are predictors of accidents in middle-aged and older drivers, drivers with MCI, and drivers with mild AD in simulated driving.

METHODS

Participants

- •21 healthy controls over 52 years of age (age of youngest patient)
- •37 Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI) patients
- •16 mild Alzheimer's disease (AD) patients

All participants were regular drivers, who completed all four driving conditions

Driving simulator experiment

- Data from Distract and DriverBrain research projects
- All participants underwent neurological, neuropsychological and ophthalmological assessment
- **Driving simulator assessment**: all drivers drove a quarter-cab FOERST driving simulator (3 LCD wide screens 42", full HD: 1920x1080pixels total field of view 170 degrees, validated against a real world environment) in **4 rural conditions**, counterbalanced across participants. **Two unexpected incidents** occurred per driving condition.



moderate traffic (R1, R3) with & without distraction



high traffic (R2, R4)
with & without distraction

- A practice drive (10-15 minutes) preceded the driving assessment
- The test drive took place in a single carriageway route, zero gradient, with mild horizontal curves



Distraction condition: conversation with passenger (R3, R4)

Measures

- Average speed (in km)
- Headway average (distance from the vehicle ahead in m)
- Lateral position (distance from the right road border in m)
- Average speed variability (SD of average speed)
- **Headway variability** (*SD* of headway average)
- Lateral position variability (SD of lateral position)
- Reaction time (RT) average breaking RT at unexpected incidents
- Accidents at unexpected incidents
- The measures were z-transformed based on the performance of all 90 control participants in each of the four driving conditions (mean age 46±16.04)

RESULTS

R1 (mod. traffic)		Model 1					Model 2						Model 3			
Variable	В	SE B	в	t	<i>p</i> -value	В	SE B	в	t	<i>p</i> -value	В	SE B	в	t	<i>p</i> -value	
(constant)	0.34	0.06		5.62	<0.001	0.22	0.07		3.15	0.002	0.30	0.07		4.08	<0.001	
Average RT	0.32			3.13	0.003	0.10	0.03	0.32	3.13	0.003	0.15	0.04	0.46	4.10	<0.001	
Average speed z	-0.15			-1.31	0.19	0.06			0.46	0.65	-0.21			-1.33	0.19	
Headway avg z	0.15			0.30	0.20	-0.02			-0.13	0.89	0.27			1.84	0.07	
Lateral position z	0.04			0.32	0.75	0.00			-0.00	1.00	-0.07			-0.69	0.49	
SD Avg speed z	80.0			0.72	0.48	0.31			2.62	0.011	0.22	0.08	0.31	2.66	0.011	
SD Headway avg z	0.14			1.24	0.22	-0.06			-0.45	0.66	0.22			1.45	0.15	
SD Lateral pos z	0.30	0.08	0.39	3.54	0.001	0.30	0.08	0.39	3.76	<0.001	0.21	0.08	0.27	2.53	0.014	
MCI	-0.07			-0.63	0.53	-0.02			-0.21	0.84	-0.06			-0.56	0.58	
AD	0.16			1.42	0.16	-0.02			-0.16	0.86	0.05			0.45	0.66	
R^2			0.1	5				0.2	5				0.3	2		
F for change in R^2 12.53				0.001				9.77 0.				6.88 0.011			0.011	
R2 (high traffic)			Mode	el 1				Mode	el 2							
Variable	В	SE B	в	t	<i>p</i> -value	В	SE B	в	t	<i>p</i> -value				of RT (R1	& R2):	
(constant)	0.05	0.06		0.80	0.43	0.10	0.05		1.75	0.09		Aver	age sp	eed		
Average RT	0.23	0.04	0.55	5.56	<0.001	0.30	0.04	0.74	7.56	<0.001						
Average speed z	0.34			3.06	0.003	0.03			0.17	0.87						
Headway avg z	-0.33			-3.08	0.003	-0.12			-0.96	0.34						
Lateral position z	0.09			0.92	0.36	0.08			0.88	0.38						
SD Avg speed z	0.44			4.44	<0.001	0.21	0.05	0.44								
SD Headway avg z	-0.33			-2.90	0.005	-0.05			-0.35							
SD Lateral pos z	0.22			2.23	0.03	0.06			0.57							
MCI																
	0.17			0.17	0.87	-0.03			-0.28							
AD	0.14			0.13	0.89	0.11		0.4	1.11	0.27						
R^2			0.3	O				0.4	5	0.004						
F for change in R ²		30	.91		<0.001		19	0.71		<0.001						
R3 (mod. distractio	•			Model								Drod	— ictor c	f DT /D2	١.	
Variable	В			В		<i>p</i> -value						Head	lway v	of RT (R3 variation		
(constant)	0.22		0.06		3.75	<0.001						Late	al pos	ition va	riation	
Average RT	0.09	9				0.42										
Average speed z	0.17	7			1.41	0.16										
Headway avg z	-0.1	8			-1.58	0.12										
Lateral position z	0.09	Ð			0.74	0.47										
SD Avg speed z	0.23	3			1.96	0.053										
SD Headway avg z	-0.1	2			-1.06	0.29										
SD Lateral pos z	0.16	5 0	.05	0.34	3.04	0.003										
MCI	-0.1	7			-1.57	0.12										
AD	0.08	3			0.70	0.48										
R^2				0.12												
F for change in R ²			9.7	26		0.003										
R4 (high distraction)				Model 1			Model 2									
Variable	В	S	E B	в	t	<i>p</i> -value	В	S	E B	β t	H	o-value	Pre	dictor o	f RT (R4	
(constant)	-0.0	1 0	0.07		0.14	0.89	0.02	2 0	0.07	0	35 (0.73	Ave	rage spo	eed	
Average RT	0.15	5 0	.03	0.55	5.37	<0.001	0.17	, 0	.03	0.63 5.	91 <	<0.001	. at	. 	.	
Average speed z	0.16	5			1.37	0.18	-0.0	0		-0	.01 (0.99				
Headway avg z	-0.2	0			-1.75	0.09	-0.1	0		-0	.71 (0.46				
Lateral position z	0.02				0.22	0.82	0.01					0.91				
SD Avg speed z	0.23				2.14	0.036	0.11		.05			0.036				
SD Headway avg z	-0.1				-1.39	0.17	-0.0		. =			0.74				
	-0.1					0.80	-0.0					0.80				
	٠.٠	J			0.20	5.00	٠.٠	_		-0	(.				
SD Lateral posz		Δ			-1 25	0 10	1	4		1	Δ 2 ′) 16				
SD Lateral posz	-0.1					0.18	-0.1					0.16				
SD Lateral posz				0.30	0.56	0.18 0.58	-0.1 0.10					0.16 0.37				

CONCLUSION

- > Longer RT, larger speed variation (in a negative direction), larger lateral position variation predicted accidents at unexpected incidents but patient status did not.
- > Lower speed was associated with longer RT at unexpected incidents; patient status contributed marginally to RT (in R4) over and above average speed.
- Patient status was hardly associated with either accident rate or RT over and above the driving measures, and is by itself an insufficient indicator for the decision to stop driving at a given point in time. An individualized approach is needed than includes assessing performance in the critical driving variables.