

Self-report prospective memory problems in people with stroke

Abstract

Background and Purpose: Prospective memory (PM) is a common problem which can limit performance of basic and instrumental activities of daily living in stroke patients. We compared self-report PM failures between older and younger people with stroke, examined differences in perceptions of PM failures between people with stroke and relatives, relationships between these PM failures and functional performance.

Methods: A total of 105 stroke patients, 65 relatives and 112 healthy controls were recruited. Both the stroke patients and controls were further divided into an older (age >55 years) and a younger (age ≤ 55 years) group. Data for stroke patients and relatives were obtained via the Brief Assessment of Prospective Memory (BAPM), **Basic Activity of Daily Living (BADL) related Modified Barthel Index (MBI)** and **Lawton Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (Lawton IADL) Scale**. Healthy controls' data were also collected.

Results: The older stroke group had significantly higher BAPM total scores and BADL and IADL subscale scores than the younger group. Difference in perceptions of the patients' self-report of PM failures and their relatives' report was significant for the IADL subscale. Self-report of PM failure was significantly related to functional BADL and IADL measures.

Conclusions: Results highlight the impact of PM failures in stroke patients and their assessment, management, and rehabilitation of these patients.

Key Words: prospective memory, stroke, functional, age, ADL, IADL

Introduction

According to a recent World Health Organization Global burden report [1], stroke was one of the main causes of death and disability in the world. 15 million people worldwide suffer a stroke 2014. Of these, 5 million died and another 5 millions are left permanently disabled, placing a burden in family and community. Incidence of stroke has been associated with older age and about 75% of stroke occurs over the age of 65 years [2, 3]. Nowadays, significant numbers of people suffer strokes at a younger age [4, 5]. About 12 % of stroke patients report their first stroke between 18 and 50 years [6]. The incidence of stroke in young people in both North America and Western European countries in the 1980s was about 4% [7, 8]. More recently 25 % of stroke patients in the UK were young people [9] and it was estimated that 2 million young people suffer a stroke every year in the world [10]. However, the definition of young stroke can be different from one study to another. Some studies considered persons with stroke who were aged between 18 and 65 years as younger stroke survivors [9, 11]. Other studies defined younger stroke patients as patients up to 45 years or 55 years of age [12]. In the present study, the age range of ‘younger stroke’ patients was operationally defined as between 18 to 55 years old and those over 55 years were considered older stroke patients, as there is an increase in life expectancy and more and more people are retiring late.

As a medical emergency, stroke can cause permanent neurological damage, complications, adult disability, and death [13]. Permanent neurological damage may affect many aspects of functioning including attention, memory, reasoning, perception, vision and motor control [14]. Memory deficits, including prospective memory (PM) impairment [15], can be one of the most obstructive factors that influence the two types of daily living activities: performance of basic (BADL) and instrumental activities of daily living (IADL) [16]. BADL refers to basic daily routine including self-care activities such as bathing, dressing, feeding and using the toilet. IADL

1
2
3 refers to more complex task such as using the telephone, preparing meals, shopping and using
4
5 public transport. PM refers to the ability to “remember to perform an intended action at a
6
7 particular point in the future” [17]. It can be divided into three sub-types, namely, time-based,
8
9 event-based and activity-based [18]. All three types of PM require the execution of an intended
10
11 action in a delayed situation while performing an on-going task at the same time. For time-based
12
13 PM, the intended action should be performed at a specific time, such as an appointment at 10 a.m.
14
15 For event-based PM, the intended action should be performed when a particular cue appears (e.g.,
16
17 call the manager when an invited customer arrives at the office). Finally, activity-based PM is
18
19 similar to event-based PM in that both require a person to carry out an intended action when a cue
20
21 appears. However, the former it does not involve the interruption of the on-going task. An
22
23 everyday example of activity-based PM task is switching off the computer when one finishes
24
25 checking all the e-mails. Most PM researchers contrast PM with retrospective memory (RM).
26
27 According to Cockburn [19], RM and PM are similar in that memory for content is essential to
28
29 both. However the essential differences between these two memory constructs are: (1)
30
31 remembering prospectively also requires memory for intention, and (2) the cue for retrieval has to
32
33 be self-initiated in PM but not in RM. Similarly, Einstein and McDaniel [20] suggested that while
34
35 someone (e.g., an experimenter or a teacher) initiates or requests the act of remember in RM, PM
36
37 requires a person to remember to remember in the first place. PM has a major impact on
38
39 individuals’ quality of life as well as ADL. Impairment of PM can make rehabilitation more
40
41 difficult. Patients might not be able to follow through steps towards any organized meaningful
42
43 activity or remember to initiate strategies or practice activities outside of therapy sessions.
44
45 Assessment and intervention of a patient’s PM impairment should therefore be an important focus
46
47 of any cognitive rehabilitation program.
48
49
50
51
52
53
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

Research in the schizophrenia area has shown that better performance on PM tests predicts higher functional capacity as measured by a standardized **activity of daily living** (ADL) scale [21]. Given the significant effects a stroke can have on the brain, it is logical to assume that stroke patients would have PM problems [22-24]. In addition, given the effect of ageing on both RM and PM, younger and older stroke patients are expected to show different levels of PM impairment [25]. To date, however, few studies have compared the performance between young and old stroke patients as well as with healthy control groups to investigate whether they showed significant differences on different types of PM tasks. Thus, the aims of the current study were to explore whether there was a difference in frequency of PM failure between two stroke patient groups (younger and older) and their corresponding age-similar healthy control groups in their self-report PM, and to explore the differences between stroke patients' self-report of PM failure and their relatives' reports. Finally, we aimed to examine the relationships between PM failure and functional BADL and IADL performance in the two stroke groups as a whole.

Method

Study design and participants

This study used a cross-sectional survey design and a mailed questionnaire to examine stroke patients' self-report PM failures and their functional abilities. Similar questionnaires were sent to their relatives or main caregivers to fill in. The stroke and family participants were recruited from local hospitals, rehabilitation centers, day hospitals, outpatient clinics and self-help groups in Hong Kong. While the younger healthy controls were recruited from The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, the older controls were recruited through three local elderly services centers run by a large NGO called The Neighbourhood Advice-Action Council (NAAC). The convenience

1
2
3 sampling method was used in this study for selecting both stroke patients and health control. The
4
5 inclusion criteria for stroke patients were: (a) age 18 years or above; (b) either gender; (c) a
6
7 diagnosis of suffering from a stroke as confirmed by a CT or MRI scan and had a post stroke
8
9 period over 6 months; (d) willingness to participate. The exclusion criteria were: (a) being
10
11 diagnosed with other neurological conditions such as Parkinson's disease, traumatic brain injury,
12
13 epilepsy etc.; (b) having a recurrent stroke; (c) alcoholism; (e) associated psychiatric and
14
15 behavioural symptoms; (f) dementia or mild cognitive impairment (MCI)
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Instrumentation**

23
24 A similar 4-part questionnaire was put together for both stroke patients and their relatives. The
25
26 first part covered personal demographics including age, gender, marital status, educational level
27
28 and types of hemiplegia. For relatives, the relationship with the patients was also recorded.
29
30
31

32 The second part was a validated Brief Assessment of Prospective Memory (BAPM) [26].
33
34 This self-report instrument consists of 16 questions which are related to PM in both basic
35
36 activities of daily living (8-item BAPM-BADL) and instrumental activities of daily living (8-item
37
38 BAPM-IADL). Previously it has been used for evaluation of PM performance in people with
39
40 traumatic brain injury. Frequency of PM failure in the last month is self-rated on a five-point scale
41
42 where 1 = 'never' and 5 = 'very often'. Items can also be scored as 'not-applicable'. Mean scores
43
44 for the BADL and IADL subscales and total scores are calculated by adding item responses
45
46 together and then dividing by the total number of items rated, with not applicable responses
47
48 excluded from the mean scores. Subscale scores can therefore range from 1 to 5 with higher
49
50 scores indicating more frequent PM failure.
51
52
53
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

The last two parts of the questionnaire aimed to assess the functional level of patients and included the Modified Barthel Index or MBI [27] for evaluating the patients' BADL and the Hong Kong Lawton IADL Scale [28, 29] for assessing IADL. The former is a 10-item index which is targeted at measuring the degree of independence of a patient, covering areas such as feeding, transfer, grooming and toilet use and has a score range of 0-20 [30]. The latter scale, developed by Lawton, defines IADL as complex activities vital to maintaining independent living in the community. In the present study, the Hong Kong version was used and it consists of a total of nine items (including the use of telephone, transportation, shopping, medication management, money management, meal preparation, housework, and laundry work) with scores ranging from 0-27. For healthy controls, a shorter questionnaire consisting of basic personal information and was used, instead of the full version used with the stroke patients and their relatives.

Procedures

Ethical clearance was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee of participating centers, hospitals under Hospital Authority and The Departmental Research Committee of Rehabilitation Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University respectively. Patients with stroke who met the selection criteria were invited to participate in the study. Firstly, the researchers sent the consent forms and questionnaires to the recruiting centers and hospitals. Secondly, written consent from participant was obtained by therapists or center staff, and returned within one week. The questionnaires together with return-mail envelopes were then sent to consenting participants by mail and they were asked to return the completed package within 2 weeks. A reminder was sent after the deadline of reply. Students recruited as younger healthy controls from the Hong Kong Polytechnic University were invited to complete the questionnaire on campus. The elderly

1
2
3 participants were recruited through the NAAC and they were assisted to fill in the questionnaire
4
5
6 by center staff.
7
8
9

10 **Statistical Analysis**

11
12 Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows (Version 20.0) [31]. Descriptive
13
14 statistics were obtained for basic demographic data such age, gender, education level, types of
15
16 hemiplegia, post stroke period, history of illness. Independent samples t-tests or Chi-square tests
17
18 were used to test for homogeneity of the stroke and corresponding age-similar groups in their
19
20 demographics such as age and gender. Comparisons of BAPM scores (BADL, IADL, TOTAL)
21
22 between stroke groups (the younger and older stroke groups); between stroke and the age-similar
23
24 healthy control groups, and between stroke patients and their relatives who also responded to
25
26 questionnaire study. The analyses were conducted using one-way Analysis of Variance and post-
27
28 hoc test using Tukey's test. Associations between BAPM scores and functional BADL and IADL
29
30 were examined using Pearson's correlation coefficients.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Results**

40 **Demographic data**

41
42 Table 1 shows the demographics of the stroke and healthy control groups. A total of 217
43
44 participants were successfully recruited. There were 105 stroke patients and 65 (62%) of their
45
46 relatives also agreed to take part in the study. Their relationships with patients were respectively
47
48 spouses (75.4%), children (13.8%), parents (4.6%), siblings (4.6%) and others (1.5%). Of the
49
50 stroke group, 29 and 46 were classified according to their age range as the younger and older
51
52 stroke group respectively. For the 112 healthy controls, there were 46 younger and 66 older adults
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 respectively. There were no statistically significant differences in age, gender and educational
4 level respectively between young stroke and control group ($t=1.79$, $p=0.07$; $\chi^2 =0.59$, $p=0.44$; χ^2
5 $=3.43$, $p=0.33$); and between older stroke and control group ($t=-1.52$, $p=0.13$; $\chi^2 =0.03$, $p=0.86$;
6 $\chi^2 =7.93$, $p=0.16$). The groups were considered to be age-, gender- and education-similar for other
7 comparison purposes.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14
15
16
17
18 *Insert table 1 about here*
19

20 21 **BAPM in younger and older stroke patients and healthy controls**

22
23 Table 2 presents the scores of the younger and older groups of stroke patients and the
24 corresponding healthy control groups on the three scores of the BAPM. Except for similar
25 BAPM-BADL scores of the younger (mean = 1.14) and older control groups (mean = 1.11), the
26 older groups had higher mean scores (range = 1.11-1.60) on the three scales indicating more
27 frequent PM failure, irrespective of whether they were in the stroke (range = 1.22-1.60) or healthy
28 control group (range=1.10-1.39). Similarly, stroke group had higher mean scores than healthy
29 control group of the same age group. For all comparisons, the older stroke group had higher
30 BAPM-BADL, BAPM-IADL, BAPM-TOTAL mean scores (1.49, 1.60, and 1.46 respectively)
31 indicating more frequent PM failure compared to the individual means of the other three groups
32 as well as the means of the three groups combined (1.15, 1.34, 1.18 respectively).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 *Insert table 2 about here*
56
57
58
59
60

According to the results of one-way ANOVA, there were significant differences ($p<0.001$)
in the BAPM-BADL score ($F=10.57$), BAPM-IADL score ($F=7.14$) and the BAPM-IADL score

1
2
3 (F=8.75) in the four groups (stroke-young and old; healthy control –young and old). Post hoc
4 analysis using Tukey’s test indicates that, for BAPM-BADL, the only significant difference was
5 between the older stroke group and the younger control group ($p<0.001$). For BAPM-IADL, the
6 older stroke group reported more frequent PM failure than the younger stroke ($p=0.029$), younger
7 control ($p<0.001$) and older control ($p<0.001$) groups. The BAPM-TOTAL score of the older
8 stroke group was also significantly different from the younger ($p<0.001$) and older control
9 ($p=0.01$) groups
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 22 **Comparison of PM ratings of stroke patients and relatives**

23
24 Table 3 compared the patients’ score with their relatives for the younger and older stroke patient
25 groups and both groups combined. Relatives’ ratings of patients’ PM failures on the BAPM-
26 BADL scale were not significantly different from the patients’ ratings for both the younger and
27 older stroke group ($t=0.66, p=0.55$; $t= 0.86, p=0.39$ respectively). A significant difference was
28 found for BAPM-IADL score ($t=2.88, p= 0.05$) for the older stroke group only, but not for the
29 younger stroke group ($t=0.93, p=0.38$). The difference in BAPM-total score was not significant
30 for both the older ($t=0.84, p= 0.42$) and the younger stroke ($t=2.04, p=0.43$) groups. When the
31 older and younger stroke groups were combined into one sample there was a significant
32 difference between patient and relatives’ ratings for the BAPM-IADL score ($t=2.56, p=0.01$), with
33 relatives rating the patient’s PM failure as more frequent.
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

Insert table 3 about here

Correlations between PM, ADL and IADL

The correlations between BAPM-BADL and functional BADL, BAPM-IADL and functional IADL and total BAPM and total ADL functional assessments in the patient groups and relatives group are shown in table 4. There were significant negative relationships between BAPM-BADL and MBI scores ($r=-0.40$, $p<0.01$), BAPM-IADL and Lawton IADL scores ($r=-0.27$, $p<0.01$), as well as BAPM-total and Total ADL ($r=-0.36$, $p<0.01$) for the full sample of patients. For the older stroke group, moderate strength of relationship (i.e. value of $r=0.3-0.5$) were found between BAPM-IADL and Lawton IADL scores ($r=-0.24$, $p<0.05$), between BAPM-BADL and MBI scores ($r=-0.48$, $p<0.01$), and between BAPM-total and Total ADL scores ($r=-0.37$, $p<0.01$). The correlation between the BAPM scores and the functional ADL scores was not significant for the younger stroke group. Furthermore, for the relatives' ratings there was no significant relationship between BAPM-IADL and functional IADL ($r=-0.1$, $p>0.05$), although the BAPM-BADL had a significant correlation with MBI score ($r=-0.29$, $p<0.05$), as did BAPM-Total and Total ADL functional score ($r=-0.24$, $p<0.05$).

Insert table 4 about here

Discussion

This research studied the differences in self-report PM failures between older and younger people with stroke and their relatives explore the relationships between these PM failures and functional performance of stroke survivors. For the first aim of the study, we were able to differentiate the self-report PM failures of two stroke groups and with their corresponding age-similar control groups. Stroke patients' PM performance was poorer than controls which is consistent with

1
2
3 previous findings on brain injury [32]. The results also indicated that the older stroke group rated
4 their PM failure as significantly more frequent than the younger stroke group. Literature has
5 shown similar age-related decline in PM [33-35] and greater age-related deficits in event-based
6 PM tasks (such as those items listed in the BAPM) that demand a higher control than automatic
7 processing [36]. Age-related decline in PM may be associated with frontal lobe function [37] and
8 partly explained by the associated lower performance of ongoing task in the older adults [38]. To
9 date, there are a few studies showing PM abilities are reduced in stroke patients [22, 24, 39]. The
10 present study may be another piece of evidence that stroke patients especially the older group face
11 more difficulties performing PM tasks in general, and IADL tasks in particular.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The second aim was to compare self-report PM failures ratings from the perspective of the
27 patient and their relative or caregiver. There were no significant differences between ratings of
28 patients and relatives on the BAPM except for the BAPM-IADL ratings for the old stroke group
29 and for both groups combined. This suggests a similarity in perceptions of PM performance
30 between patients and their caregivers, and that overall patients are accurate in rating their PM
31 performance, at least for PM tasks related to BADL. However, caregivers rated patient's PM
32 failure on IADL tasks as being more frequent than rated by the patients themselves in the older
33 stroke group. This might be due to self-rating bias or diminished self-awareness. Previous
34 research in the traumatic brain injury population has also found that patients underestimate the
35 frequency of their PM failure compared to relatives [40]. It cannot be concluded from the current
36 study however that under-reporting of PM problems only occurs in the older stroke group as the
37 non-significant results for the younger stroke group may reflect the small sample size (n=5) of
38 patient-relative pairs in this group.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 The third aim was to investigate the relationship between PM and ADL functions. In line
58
59
60

1
2
3 with previous findings in schizophrenia patients, it was expected that deficits of PM could
4 possibly lead to disorganized ADL [40]. Evidence of a significant negative correlation between
5 PM and functional ADL in schizophrenia patients has emerged in other studies [41-42]. The
6 hypothesis that the PM of stroke patients on the BAPM would correlate with functional
7 performance was supported. There was a medium negative relationship between PM impairment
8 and BADL functional performance for the combined patient sample. **As a larger PM score**
9 **represents worse performance while larger BADL means more function independence, poor PM is**
10 **found to correlate with a decline in BADL performance.** Similar correlations were found for the
11 older stroke group but not the young stroke group. This might be due to the smaller sample size.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 The early findings of another study reported that PM was associated with IADL
27 performance in an older age group [16]. PM dysfunction in both groups of stroke patients will
28 affect their BADL and IADL performance [43]. In the present study, the relationship between PM
29 performance and IADL performance was weaker, especially for the relative's rating where a very
30 low correlation was found. PM failures on the IADL scale tend to relate to more non-routine PM
31 activities than those on the BADL scale [26]. Possibly due to the non-routine and less frequent
32 nature of these PM tasks, relatives may not have had the opportunity to observe the person with
33 stroke performing the task or it may even be a task that the person is no longer expected to do
34 since having their stroke (e.g., shopping, putting the garbage bin out). This could account for the
35 weaker correlation on these items.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 The findings of the present study may have several clinical implications. First, the results
51 of the current study support that prospective memory deficits are widespread after stroke. **It will**
52 **be a paradigm shift from doing routine clinical practice, which traditionally focuses on training**
53 **retrospective memory or memory for the past events, to pay more attention to PM training. Stroke**
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 patients should also be trained to execute a delayed action which may be time- (e.g. attending a
4
5 medical appointment) or event-based (e.g. shopping when there is a sale). It is suggested that
6
7 possible problem areas in PM can be anticipated according to age range as well as stroke. This
8
9 avoids unrecognized PM difficulties that may restrict individuals' ability to engage in
10
11 rehabilitation strategies, and may shed light on treatment focus and preference for remedial or
12
13 compensatory activities. The treatment goal can be modified according to target PM areas
14
15 perceived by patients to be a problem in everyday life as these areas may be more prevalent and
16
17 demand more attention in rehabilitation. Second, family education is viewed as important as
18
19 differences in perception of were observed between relatives and stroke patients, especially for
20
21 items in the IADL area. Therapists should be aware of this difference in designing community
22
23 skills training while seeking the understanding and support from relatives. It may also be useful
24
25 to perform early screening using handy PM measures in identifying declining cognitive functions
26
27 which may hamper independence in IADL, and then BADL. Thus early education, prevention
28
29 and necessary interventions can be planned.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 One of the limitations of this study is its cross-sectional design. This has restricted
38
39 conclusions about the predictive value of PM to daily functional decline in BADL and IADL. In
40
41 this small sample study, we were not able to employ an additional clinical interview or
42
43 psychometric test of PM that would ensure a clinical diagnosis of PM deficit. As the BAPM is a
44
45 self-report questionnaire, objectivity of findings may be questioned and a performance-based PM
46
47 test may be more objective in ascertaining PM impairments in stroke patients. The Lawton IADL
48
49 has a similar problem because it also uses report from patients and relatives. Nevertheless, this
50
51 instrument has the benefit of asking for patients' own perceptions and those of relatives who are
52
53 familiar with the patients' performance in a real-world environment to rate the performance.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Another limitation of this study is that stroke patients may suffer from different degrees of RM
4 impairment which was not well controlled. The possible heterogeneity across age within the two
5 groups may also be a possible confounding variable, leading to unclear conclusions.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 **Conclusions**

14
15 This study revealed that self-report PM ratings related to BADL and IADL skills is impaired after
16 a stroke in patients of different age ranges. They should be routinely assessed in clinical practice
17 for early screening and monitoring throughout rehabilitation. In addition, the findings suggest that
18 PM impairment is more pronounced for people who experienced strokes after the age of 55 years.
19
20 The relationship between PM impairment and independence in ADL performance suggests that
21 PM impairment is an important area to target in stroke rehabilitation.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Acknowledgements**

38
39 We thank The Self-help Group for the Brain Damaged and The Neighborhood Advice-Action
40 Council in Hong Kong for assistance for data collection. We would like to express our gratitude
41 to all participants for taking part in this study. This research was partly supported by a
42 collaborative research fund (H-ZG66) given by The Griffith University, Australia and The
43 Departmental Research Grant (DRG) of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (G-YK42).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Declaration of interest**

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The authors report no conflicts of interest. The authors alone are responsible for the content and
4 writing of the paper.
5
6
7
8
9

10 References

- 11
12 1. The atlas of heart disease and stroke: Part III, Global burden of stroke. Geneva, World
13 Health Organization, 2014. Available online at
14 http://www.who.int/cardiovascular_diseases/en/cvd_atlas_15_burden_stroke.pdf?ua=1,
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Accessed 2014 Aug 7.
- 23 2. Banks P, Pearson C. Parallel lives: Younger stroke survivors and their partners coping
24 with crisis. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy* 2004; 19: 413-429.
- 25 3. Teasell RW, McRae MP, Finestone HM. Social issues in the rehabilitation of younger
26 stroke patients. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 2000; 81: 205-209.
- 27 4. Daniel K, Wolfe CD, Busch MA, McKeivitt C. What are the social consequences of stroke
28 for working-aged adults? A systematic review. *Stroke* 2009; 40: 431-440.
- 29 5. To know about Acute Stroke. Hong Kong Stroke Society. 2014. Available online at
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
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
9. Morris R. The psychology of stroke in young adults: The roles of service provision and

- 1
2
3 return to work. *Stroke Research and Treatment* 2011; 11: 1-10.
- 4
5
6 10. Rutten-Jacobs LCA, Maaijwee NAM, Arntz AM, Van Alebeek ME, Schaapsmeeders P,
7
8 Schoonderwaldt HC, et al. Risk factors and prognosis of young stroke. The FUTURE
9
10 study: A prospective cohort study. Study rationale and protocol. *BMC Neurology* 2011;
11
12 11:109.
- 13
14
15 11. Varona JF, Bermejo F, Guerra JM, Molina JA. Long-term prognosis of ischemic stroke in
16
17 young adults. Study of 272 cases. *Journal of Neurology* 2004; 251: 1507–1514
- 18
19
20 12. Putaala J, Curtze S, Hiltunen S, Tolppanen H, Kaste M, Tatlisumak T. Causes of death
21
22 and predictors of 5-year mortality in young adults after first-ever ischemic stroke: the
23
24 Helsinki Young Stroke Registry. *Stroke* 2009; 40: 2698–2703
- 25
26
27 13. Feigin VL. Stroke epidemiology in the developing world. *Lancet* 2005; 365: 2160–2161.
- 28
29
30 14. Roding J, Glader EL, Malm J, Eriksson M. Perceived impaired physical and cognitive
31
32 functions after stroke in men and women between 18 and 55 years of age--a national
33
34 survey. *Disability and Rehabilitation* 2009; 31: 1092-1099.
- 35
36
37 15. Fish J, Wilson BA, Manly T. The assessment and rehabilitation of prospective memory
38
39 problems in people with neurological disorders: A review. *Neuropsychological*
40
41 *rehabilitation* 2010; 20: 161-179.
- 42
43
44 16. Woods SP, Weinborn M, Velnoweth A, Rooney A, Bucks RS. Memory for intentions is
45
46 uniquely associated with instrumental activities of daily living in healthy older adults.
47
48 *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society* 2012; 18: 134–138.
- 49
50
51 17. Martin M, Kliegel M, McDaniel MA. The involvement of executive functions in
52
53 prospective memory performance of adults. *International Journal of Psychology* 2003; 38:
54
55 195 - 206.
- 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
18. Shum D, Valentine M, Cutmore T. Performance of individuals with severe long-term traumatic brain injury on time-, event-, and activity-based prospective memory tasks. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology* 1999; 21: 49 – 58.
19. Cockburn J. Task interruption on prospective memory: A frontal lobe function? *Cortex* 1995; 31: 87-97.
20. Einstein GO, McDaniel MA. Normal aging and prospective memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 1990; 16: 717-726.
21. Ungvari GS, Xiang YT, Tang WK, Shum D. Prospective memory and its correlates and predictors in schizophrenia: an extension of previous findings. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology* 2008; 23: 613-622.
22. Brooks BM, Rose FD, Potter J, Jayawardena S, Morling A. Assessing stroke patients' prospective memory using virtual reality. *Brain Injury* 2004; 18: 391-401.
23. Kim HJ, Luo L, Lim JE, Ween JE, Craik FIM. (2009). Prospective memory function in stroke patients. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences* 2009; 283: 319.
24. Kim HJ, Craik FI, Luo L, Ween JE. Impairments in prospective and retrospective memory following stroke. *Neurocase: The Neural Basis of Cognition* 2009; 15: 145-156.
25. Kvavilashvil L, Kornbrot DE, Mash V, Cockburn J, Milne A. Differential effects of age on prospective and retrospective memory tasks in young, young-old, and old-old adults. *Memory* 2009; 17: 180-196.
26. Man D, Fleming J, Hohaus L, Shum D. Development of a Brief Assessment of Prospective Memory (BAPM) for use with traumatic brain injury populations. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation* 2011; 21: 884-898.
27. Shah S, Vanclay F, Cooper B. Improving the sensitivity of the Barthel Index for stroke

- 1
2
3 rehabilitation. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1989; 42: 703-709.
4
5
6 28. Lawton MP, Brody EM. Assessment of older people: self-maintaining and instrumental
7
8 activities of daily living. *Gerontologist* 1969; 9: 179–186
9
10
11 29. Tong AYC, Man DWK. The validation of the Hong Kong Chinese Version of the Lawton
12
13 Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Scale for the Institutionalized Elderly Persons.
14
15 *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research* 2002; 22: 132-142.
16
17
18 30. McDowell I, Nowell I. (1996). *Measuring health: a guide to rating scales and*
19
20 questionnaires. New York: Oxford University Press; 1996: 56-63.
21
22
23 31. IBM Corp. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 20.0 Released 2011. Armonk, NY:
24
25 IBM Corp; 2011.
26
27
28 32. Groot YCT, Wilson BA, Evan J, Watson P. Prospective memory functioning in people
29
30 with and without brain injury. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*
31
32 2002; 8: 645-654.
33
34
35 33. Gao JL, Cheung RTF, Chan YS, Chu LW, Lee TMC. Increased prospective memory
36
37 interference in normal and pathological aging: different roles of motor and verbal
38
39 processing speed. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition* 2013; 20: 80-100.
40
41
42 34. Maylor EA. Changes in event-based prospective memory across adulthood. *Aging,*
43
44 *Neuropsychology and Cognition* 1998; 5: 107-128
45
46
47 35. West R, Jakubeck K, Wymbs N. Age-related declines in prospective memory: behavioural
48
49 and electrophysiological evidence. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 2002; 26:
50
51 827-833.
52
53
54 36. Henry JD, MacLeod MS, Phillips LH, Crawford JR. A meta-analytic review of
55
56 prospective memory and aging. *Psychology and Aging* 2004; 19: 27-39.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 37. McFarland CP, Glisky EL. Frontal lobe involvement in a task of time-based prospective
4 memory. *Neuropsychologia* 2009; 47: 1660–1669.
5
6
7
8 38. Smith RE, Horn SS, Bayen UT. Prospective memory in younger and older adults: the
9 effects of ongoing-task load. *Ageing, Neuropsychology, and Cognition* 2012; 19: 495-514.
10
11
12 39. Cheng H, Tian Y, Hu P, Wang J, Wang K. Time-based prospective memory impairment in
13 patients with thalamic stroke. *Behavioral Neuroscience* 2010; 124: 152-158.
14
15
16
17 40. Roche NL, Fleming JM, Shum DK. Self-awareness of prospective memory failure in
18 adults with traumatic brain injury. *Brain Injury* 2002; 16: 931-945.
19
20
21
22 41. Ritch J L, Velligan DI, Tucker D, Dicocco M, Maples NJ. Prospective memory in
23 schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia research* 2003; 60: 180.
24
25
26
27 42. Twamley EW, Woods SP, Zurhellen CH, Vertinski M, Narvaez JM, Mausbach BT, et al.
28 Neuropsychological substrates and everyday functioning implications of prospective
29 memory impairment in schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research* 2008; 106: 42-49.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 43. Spíndola L, Bruck SMD. Prospective memory in Alzheimer's disease and Mild Cognitive
38 Impairment. *Dementia e Neuropsychology* 2011; 5: 64-68.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table I. Descriptive statistics for younger and older stroke and control groups

Characteristics	Younger stroke (n=29)	Younger control (n=46)	Older stroke (n=76)	Older control (n= 66)
Gender				
Male	17 (58.60%)	15 (32.60%)	54 (71.70%)	46 (69.70%)
Female	12 (41.40%)	31(67.40%)	22 (28.90%)	20 (30.30%)
Age (years)				
Mean (SD)	49.28 (5.11)	45.48 (3.37)	67.07(6.92)	68.68 (5.24)
Range	36-55	28-55	56-94	60-81
Marital status				
Single	8 (27.60%)	32 (69.56%)	7 (9.20%)	9 (13.36%)
Married	18 (62.10%)	14 (30.44%)	56 (73.68%)	46 (69.69%)
Divorced	3 (10.30%)		5 (6.57%)	6 (9.09%)
Separated	0 (%)		2 (3.98%)	1 (1.52%)
Widowed	0 (%)		5 (6.57%)	4 (6.34%)
Educational level				
No formal education	0 (%)	0 (%)	4 (5.26%)	1 (7.57%)
Primary school	6 (20.70%)	13 (28.26%)	27 (35.52%)	19 (30.30%)
Secondary school	22 (75.90%)	31 (67.40%)	42 (55.28%)	44 (59.09%)
College	1 (3.40%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.63%)	1 (1.52%)
University or above	0 (0%)	2 (4.34%)	1 (1.31%)	1 (1.52%)
Post stroke period				
1 to 3 months	0 (%)		1 (1.33%)	
4-6 months	0 (%)		2 (2.63%)	
7 to 12 months	0 (%)		2 (2.63%)	
1 year to 2 years	2 (6.90%)		4 (5.26%)	
More than 2 years	27 (93.10%)		67 (88.15%)	
Types of hemiplegia				
Left side	10 (34.40%)		24 (31.58%)	
Right side	19 (65.50%)		32 (68.42%)	
History of illness				
Heart disease	2 (6.90%)		3 (5.93%)	
Hypertension	6 (20.70%)		26 (34.22%)	
Diabetes	2 (6.90%)		6 (7.89%)	
Others	12 (41.40%)		11 (14.47%)	
Heart disease & Hypertension	2 (6.9%)		12 (15.78%)	
Heart disease & Diabetes	1 (3.4%)		6 (7.89%)	
Hypertension & Diabetes	0 (0%)		3 (5.93%)	
Heart disease, Hypertension & Diabetes	0 (0%)		6 (7.89%)	
Period of received rehabilitation service				
Less than 3 months	5 (17.20%)			
3 to 6 months	5 (17.20%)			
7 to 9 months	6 (20.70%)			
9 months or above	13 (44.80%)			

Table II. Analysis of variance of stroke and control groups (young and old) on BAPM-BADL, BAPM-IADL and BADL- TOTAL

Group		Mean	SD	F	P
BAPM-BADL ^a	young stroke	1.22	0.33	10.57	<0.001
	old stroke	1.49	0.67		
	young control	1.14	0.14		
	old control	1.11	0.197		
BAPM-IADL ^b	young stroke	1.45	0.56	7.14	<0.001
	old stroke	1.60	0.64		
	young control	1.19	0.13		
	old control	1.39	0.30		
BAPM-TOTAL ^c	young stroke	1.27	0.40	8.75	<0.001
	old stroke	1.46	0.60		
	young control	1.10	0.11		
	old control	1.19	0.22		

^a BAPM- BADL=the part of the Brief Assessment of Prospective Memory - relevant to basic activities of daily living.

^b BAPM-IADL=the part of the Brief Assessment of Prospective Memory relevant to instrumental activities of daily living.

^c BAPM-Total =the total score of the Brief Assessment of Prospective Memory

Table III. Comparison of mean scores of patients' and relatives' ratings on BAPM-BADL, BAPM-IADL and BAPM-TOTAL

Stroke age Group	Size	BAPM-BADL ^a			BAPM-IADL ^b			BAPM-TOTAL ^c		
		Mean (SD)	t	p	Mean (SD)	t	p	Mean (SD)	t	p
Younger stroke	5	1.17 (0.16)			1.22 (0.22)			1.20 (1.84)		
Younger stroke's relatives	5	1.30 (0.41)	-0.62	0.55	1.62 (0.93)	-0.93	0.38	1.46 (0.64)	-0.84	0.42
Older stroke	60	1.51 (0.72)			1.88 (0.74)			1.69 (0.68)		
Older stroke's relatives	60	1.39 (0.77)	0.86	0.39	1.46 (0.84)	2.88	0.05	1.43 (0.75)	2.04	0.43
All patient	65	1.38 (0.74)			1.47 (0.84)			1.43 (0.74)		
All relatives	65	1.48 (0.69)	0.78	0.43	1.83 (0.73)	2.56	0.01	1.66 (0.67)	1.83	0.06

^a BAPM- BADL = the part of the Brief Assessment of Prospective Memory - relevant to basic activities of daily living.

^b BAPM-IADL = the part of the Brief Assessment of Prospective Memory relevant to instrumental activities of daily living.

^c BAPM-TOTAL = the total score of the Brief Assessment of Prospective Memory

Table IV. Correlation between BAPM-BADL and functional BADL, BAPM-IADL and functional IADL and total BAPM and total ADL in patients and relatives group

Measure	All Patients (n=105) r	Young Stroke (n=29) r	Old Stroke (n=75) r	Relatives (n=65) r
BAPM-BADL ^a MBI ^b	-0.40**	0.13	-0.48**	-0.29*
BAPM-IADL ^c Lawton IADL ^d	-0.27**	-0.23	-0.24*	-0.10
BAPM-Total ^e Total ADL ^f	-0.36**	-0.16	-0.37**	-0.24*

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01

^a BAPM-BADL = the part in the Brief Assessment of Prospective Memory relevant to basic activities of daily living.

^b MBI = the scores of Modified Barthel Index.

^c BAPM-IADL = the part in the Brief Assessment of Prospective Memory relevant to instrumental activities of daily living.

^d Lawton IADL = the scores of Lawton instrumental activities of daily living Scale.

^e BADL-Total = the total score of the Brief Assessment of Prospective Memory.

^f Total ADL = the average scores of Modified Barthel Index and Lawton instrumental activities of daily living Scale.