



CANADIAN STROKE BEST PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS

MOOD, COGNITION AND FATIGUE FOLLOWING STROKE

Table 1A: Selected Validated Screening and Assessment Tools for Post-Stroke Depression

Update 2019

Lancôt KL, Swartz RH (Writing Group Chairs) on Behalf of the Canadian Stroke Best Practice Recommendations Mood, Cognition and Fatigue following Stroke Writing Group and the Canadian Stroke Best Practice and Quality Advisory Committee, in collaboration with the Canadian Stroke Consortium

© 2019 Heart & Stroke

Table 1A: Selected Validated Screening and Assessment Tools for Post-Stroke Depression

This table provides a summary of the psychometric properties of a selected set of screening and assessment tools that have been validated for use with stroke patients, or frequently reported in the stroke literature. This list is not exhaustive, rather it highlights the more commonly used and validated tools. It is recommended that these tools be considered as first line options for all stroke services. (Table completed by Katherine Salter, PhD candidate with thesis research in Post-Stroke Depression).

Notes:

- It should be emphasized that a score indicating depression on a screening tool is not equivalent to a diagnosis of depression. Rather, a positive score indicates the need for further follow-up and assessment
- A more detailed review of these screening tools may be obtained via the ebrsr.com, strokengine.com or in Salter et al. (2007).

Assessment Tool and Link	# of Items	Response Format	Total Score	Stroke-specific reliability/validity	Interpretation of Scores*	Sensitivity/Specificity for PSD
Recommended First Line Tools						
Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS) http://web.stanford.edu/~ye_savage/GDS.html	30	Self-report Yes/No responses	0-30	Reliability: Though thoroughly evaluated in populations of elderly individuals, relatively little has been done specific to individuals with stroke. Agrell and Dehlin (1989) reported high internal consistency ($\alpha=0.90$) as did Sivrioglu et al. (2009) ($\alpha=0.88$). Concurrent Validity: Agrell and Dehlin (1989) reported good correlations between GDS scores and scores on self-report and observational depression assessment scales. Discriminative Validity: Sivrioglu et al. (2009) demonstrated significant differences in GDS scores between groups of depressed vs. non-depressed participants ($p<0.001$).	Normal = 0 – 10, scores ≥ 11 indicate presence of depression; 11-20 = mild depression, 21-30 = moderate to severe depression (McDowell et al. 1996)	Many studies have examined the relative sensitivity and specificity of the GDS – most have reported sensitivity and specificity values $> 80\%$ (Stiles and McGarrahan (1998). Within the stroke population, Johnson et al. (1995) using a cut-off of 10/11, Johnson et al. (1995) reported sensitivity = 85%, specificity = 66% and a misclassification rate of 29%. More recently, using DSM-IV-TR as the criterion for diagnosis, Sivrioglu et al. (2009) reported sensitivity = 69% & specificity = 75% for using a cutoff point of 10/11, and sensitivity = 66% and specificity = 79% for a cut off of 11/12.
Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) http://www.strokengine.ca/assess/hads/	14 (2 x 7-item sub-scales)	Self-report Multiple choice response options graded on a 4 pt scale	0-42 (0-21 for each subscale)	Reliability: Visser et al (1995) reported test retest reliability (0.87); reported internal consistency reliability for the depression portion of the HADS has been >0.70 (Johnston et al. 2000, Aben et al. 2002); most recently Sagen et al (2009) reported $\alpha=0.83$.	Scale authors recommended either 8/9 (high sensitivity) or 10/11 (high specificity) be used to identify the presence of depression using the depression	Aben et al. (2002) reported sensitivity of 72.5% and specificity of 78.9% for the HADS-D, using a cut-off score of ≥ 7 . For the total scale, using a cut-off of ≥ 11 , sensitivity and specificity were 86.8% and 69.9% respectively. Johnson et al. (1995) used a cut-off of 4/5 for the HADS-D and demonstrated a sensitivity of 93% and specificity of 44%

Assessment Tool and Link	# of Items	Response Format	Total Score	Stroke-specific reliability/validity	Interpretation of Scores*	Sensitivity/Specificity for PSD
				<p>Construct validity: Reported satisfactory on confirmatory factor analysis (Johnston et al. 2000).</p> <p>Discriminative validity: HADS-D and HADS-A scores obtained by stroke patients differed significantly from controls ($p < 0.001$) (Visser et al. 1995).</p>	<p>subscale of the HADS (Zigmond and Snaith 1983). Alternate cut-off points have been evaluated for the post stroke population.</p>	<p>while O'Rourke et al. (1998) reported sensitivity of 80% and specificity of 79% using the same cut-off point as Aben et al.</p> <p>More recently, Sagen et al. (2009) reported sensitivity and specificity for the HADS-total (relative to the DSM-IV) of 90% and 83% (cut off ≥ 11), 79% and 85% (cut off ≥ 12) respectively.</p> <p>For the HADS-D, sensitivity = 79% and specificity = 82% (cut off ≥ 5). AUC for HADS-D was 0.87 (95% CI 0.78-0.96) and for HADS-total 0.91 (95% CI 0.85-0.97) (Sagen et al. 2009)</p>
<p>Patient Health Questionnaire -9 (PHQ-9)</p> <p>http://strokengine.ca/assess/module_phq9_intro-en.html</p> <p>http://www.phqscreeners.com/</p>	9	Multiple choice response options, 4pt scale	0-27	<p>Reliability: Inter-rater reliability = 0.98, test re-test = 0.75 and internal consistency = 0.79 (de Man-van Ginkel et al. 2012).</p> <p>Concurrent validity: PHQ-9 was significantly correlated with GDS-15 scores ($r = 0.8$, $p < 0.01$) (de Man-van Ginkel et al. 2012).</p>	<p>Scores ≥ 10 (sensitivity=80%, specificity=78%) for identification of PSD 6-8 weeks post stroke (deMan van Ginkel et al. 2012)</p>	<p>A single study evaluated the sensitivity and specificity of the PHQ-9 for both major depression and any depression against a structured clinical interview in a subgroup of outpatients with stroke who endorsed either 2 or more symptoms on the PHQ-9 or either of the PHQ-2 items at study baseline (Williams et al. 2005). The authors reported sensitivity of 91% and specificity of 89% for major depression as well as sensitivity of 78% and specificity of 96% for any depression associated with a cut-off score ≥ 10. These numbers may, however, have been influenced by the pre-screening (using items from the PHQ-9) and formal assessment of selected individuals only. De Man-vanGinkel et al. (2012) also reported the results of a validation study that evaluated the PHQ-9 against the results of a composite international diagnostic interview for the DSM-IV conducted with 164 individuals with stroke (outpatients approximately 6-8 weeks post stroke). Similar to Williams et al., the authors reported that the accuracy of the PHQ-9 was best using a cutoff of ≥ 10 with a sensitivity of 80% and specificity of 78%. Using the PHQ-9 in patients pre-screened with the PHQ-2 increased the accuracy of identification (sensitivity = 87%) (de man-van Ginkel et al. 2012).</p>

Assessment Tool and Link	# of Items	Response Format	Total Score	Stroke-specific reliability/validity	Interpretation of Scores*	Sensitivity/Specificity for PSD
Additional Tools for Consideration						
Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-II) http://strokengine.ca/assess/module_bdi_intro-en.html http://www.pearsonassessments.com/HAIWEB/Cultures/en-us/Productdetail.htm?Pid=015-8018-370	21	Self-report Multiple-choice response set graded for severity	0-63	Reliability: Aben et al. (2002) confirmed high internal consistency reliability of the BDI in a population of individuals with stroke. Outside of the stroke population estimates of internal consistency tend to exceed 0.80 (Beck et al. 1988) Predictive validity: BDI scores are predictive of functional recovery and need for institutional care following stroke (Kotila et al. 1999, Desrosiers et al. 2002).	Threshold for presence of depression = 10; 10 – 18 = mild depression, 19 – 29 = moderate depression, 30 – 63 = severe depression (Beck et al. 1988)	ROC analysis completed by Lincoln et al. (2003) suggests that the accepted cut-off point indicative of presence of depression might be too low – recommends 15/16 to optimize sensitivity; however, specificity is reduced relative to the DSM-III-R. Aben et al. (2002) reported the standard cut-off points to be acceptable for used for individuals with stroke.
Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) http://cesd-r.com/	20	Self-report 4-pt scale	0-60	Reliability: Internal consistency reliability has been reported ranging from 0.64-0.86 (Agrell & Dehlin 1989, Toedter et al. 1995). Reported item-to-total correlations ranged from 0.39-0.75 (Shinar et al. 1986). Concurrent validity: Results of the CES-D used to assess individuals with stroke have correlated significantly with results of other standardized self-report and observational depression assessment tools (Agrell and Dehlin 1989, Shinar et al. 1986, Parikh et al. 1988)	Presence of depression = ≥ 16 (Radloff et al. 1977)	Using the suggested cut-off score, Shinar et al. 1986 and Parikh et al. 1988 reported sensitivity of 73% and 86%, and specificity of 100% and 90% respectively (relative to the DSM-III-R)
Depression, Obstructive sleep apnea and Cognitive impairment (DOC) Screen http://www.docscreen.ca/	16	Self-report	20	Feasibility: 89% of patients completed the screen in 5 minutes or less (mean 4.2 minutes; 9% CI: 4.1 to 4.3 mins). (Swartz et al. 2017) Time to complete was significantly higher in patients with stroke compared to those with TIA. Validity: The DOC showed excellent diagnostic characteristics for the Patient Health Questionnaire-2 (PHQ-2), STOP, and Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) components. (Swartz et al. 2017) Area Under the Curve (AUC): Doc-Mood: 0.90 Doc-Apnea: 0.80	Doc-Mood: Score 0 indicated low-risk for depression. Scores ≥ 4 indicated high-risk of depression; Doc-obstructive sleep apnea (OSA): Score 0 indicated low-risk for OSA; scores 1 to 3 indicated intermediate risk for OSA; Score 4 indicated high-risk for OSA	Sensitivity and specificity Doc-Mood: Sensitivity 92%; and specificity: 99% Doc-Apnea: Sensitivity: 91%; specificity: 93% Doc-Cog: Sensitivity 96%; specificity 91% For DOC-Mood, 29% of those scoring in the intermediate-risk were impaired according to the SCID-D; therefore, clinicians may want to use caution for patients scoring at intermediate-risk depression by applying more detailed screening tools or pairing with additional clinical questions. (Swartz et al. 2017) Doc-Cog has a low Positive Predictive Value, suggesting that Doc-Cog is more

Assessment Tool and Link	# of Items	Response Format	Total Score	Stroke-specific reliability/validity	Interpretation of Scores*	Sensitivity/Specificity for PSD
				Cog-Cognitive impairment (Cog): 0.81	DOC-Cog: Score of 10 indicated low-risk of cognitive impairment; scores 6 to 9 indicated intermediate risk for cognitive impairment; scores ≤ 5 were classified as high-risk for cognitive impairment	reliable to rule out moderate-severe impairment than for ruling it in.
Tools to Consider for Aphasic Patients						
Stroke Aphasic Depression Questionnaire-10 (SADQ-10) http://strokengine.ca/assess/module_sadq_intro-en.html http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/medicine/about/rehabilitation/ageing/publishedassessments.aspx	10	Observer rating of observed behaviour 4-point scale	30	Reliability: Using carers of individuals with aphasia to complete follow-up assessments, 4-week test-retest reliability was reported to be 0.69 for the SADQ-10 (Sutcliffe and Lincoln 1998). Internal consistency has been reported as $\alpha = 0.80$ (Sutcliffe and Lincoln 1998, Lincoln and Sutcliffe 2000). Construct validity: Results of factor analysis suggested that the SADQ-10 items may be unidimensional (Sutcliffe and Lincoln 1998) Concurrent validity: SADQ-10 scores have been positively associated with scores on the HADS-D, HADS-A, Wakefield Depression Inventory (Sutcliffe and Lincoln 1998), and the GDS-15 (Leeds et al. 2004), though correlations with healthcare professional ratings have varied (Lincoln and Sutcliffe 2000).	Scores ≥ 15 may represent presence of depression (Leeds et al. 2004).	Using the suggest cut-off score of ≥ 15 , Leeds et al. (2004) reported sensitivity = 70% and specificity = 77% in a group of stroke rehabilitation inpatients. Based around cut-offs used for the HADS, Bennett et al. (2006) identified a cut-off of 17/18 on the SADQ-H (sensitivity= 100% and <u>specificity</u> =81%), and an optimum cut-off of 5/6 on the SADQ-H 10 (sensitivity = 100% and specificity = 78%).
Aphasia Depression Rating Scale (ADRS) http://strokengine.ca/assess/module_adrs_intro-en.html	9	Observer rating based on interview & observation Rating scale varies per item	0-32	Reliability: Test retest reported to be 0.89 by scale authors. Interobserver reliability = 0.89 (Benaim et al. 2004). Concurrent validity: ADRS scores were correlated with CAS ratings and with results of HRSD (Benaim et al. 2004).	Scores of ≥ 9 are used to indicate the presence of depression (Benaim et al. 2004).	Using the cut-off indicated as appropriate by the scale author, sensitivity of 83% and specificity of 71% were reported (relative to a psychiatric diagnosis) (Benaim et al. 2004).

Assessment Tool and Link	# of Items	Response Format	Total Score	Stroke-specific reliability/validity	Interpretation of Scores*	Sensitivity/Specificity for PSD
Tools for Consideration in Children						
Children's Depression Inventory (CDI) http://www.mhs.com/products.aspx?gr=edu&id=overview&prod=cdi2#description (The CDI 2 has been recently released but test details are not available free of charge)	27	Self-report 3 pt scale	0-54	The psychometric properties of this scale have not been investigated within a stroke-specific population.	Scores of ≥ 19 have been identified as representing the 90th percentile within a general population of children in grades 3-9 (Smucker et al. 1986).	n/a
Kidscreen 52 (Generic HRQL measure) http://www.kidscreen.org/	52	Self-report 5 pt scale	Scores for each dimension are calculated as T-values (mean=50 ; SD=10).	The psychometric properties of this scale have not been investigated within a stroke-specific population.	Higher scores indicate higher Health-Related Quality of Life and well-being.	n/a

- It should be emphasized that a score indicating depression on a screening tool is not equivalent to a diagnosis of depression. Rather, a positive score indicates the need for further follow-up and assessment
- **more detailed review of these screening tools may be obtained via the ebsr.com, strokengine.com or in Salter et al. (2007)

References for Tables 1A

Aben I, Verhey F, Lousberg R, Lodder J, Honig A. Validity of the beck depression inventory, hospital anxiety and depression scale, SCL-90, and Hamilton depression rating scale as screening instruments for depression in stroke patients. Psychosomatics. 2002 Sep-Oct;43(5):386-93.

Agrell B, Dehlin O. Comparison of six depression rating scales in geriatric stroke patients. Stroke. 1989 Sep;20(9):1190-4.

Beck AT, Epstein N, Brown G, Steer RA. An inventory for measuring clinical anxiety: psychometric properties. J Consult Clin Psychol. 1988 Dec;56(6):893-7.

Beck AT, Steer RA, Garbin MG. Psychometric properties of the Beck Depression Inventory. Twenty-five years of evaluation. Clinical Psychology Review 1988; 8(1): 77-100.

Beck AT, Steer RA Relationship between the Beck Anxiety Inventory and the Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale with anxious outpatients. Journal of Anxiety Disorders 1991; 5(3): 213-223.

Benaim C, Cailly B, Perennou D, Pelissier J. Validation of the aphasic depression rating scale. Stroke. 2004 Jul;35(7):1692-6.

- Bennett HE, Thomas SA, Austen R, Morris AM, Lincoln NB. Validation of screening measures for assessing mood in stroke patients. *Br J Clin Psychol.* 2006 Sep;45(Pt 3):367-76. Erratum in: *Br J Clin Psychol.* 2007 Jun;46(Pt 2):following 251.
- de Man-van Ginkel JM, Gooskens F, Schepers VP, Schuurmans MJ, Lindeman E, Hafsteinsdóttir TB. Screening for poststroke depression using the patient health questionnaire. *Nurs Res.* 2012 Sep-Oct;61(5):333-41.
- de Man-van Ginkel JM, Hafsteinsdóttir T, Lindeman E, Burger H, Grobbee D, Schuurmans M. An efficient way to detect poststroke depression by subsequent administration of a 9-item and a 2-item Patient Health Questionnaire. *Stroke.* 2012 Mar;43(3):854-6. 22156689.
- Desrosiers J, Noreau L, Rochette A, Bravo G, Boutin C. Predictors of handicap situations following post-stroke rehabilitation. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2002 Oct 15;24(15):774-85.
- Dura JR, Beck SJ. A comparison of family functioning when mothers have chronic pain. *Pain.* 1988 Oct;35(1):79-89.
- Eccles A, Morris R, Kneebone I. Psychometric properties of the Behavioural Outcomes of Anxiety questionnaire in stroke patients with aphasia. *Clin Rehabil.* 2017 Mar;31(3):369-378.
- Gjerris A, Bech P, Bøjholm S, Bolwig TG, Kramp P, Clemmesen L, Andersen J, Jensen E, Rafaelsen OJ. The Hamilton Anxiety Scale: evaluation of homogeneity and inter-observer reliability in patients with depressive disorders. *Journal of Affective Disorders.* 1983 May 1;5(2):163-70.
- Johnson G, Burvill PW, Anderson CS, Jamrozik K, Stewart-Wynne EG, Chakera TM. Screening instruments for depression and anxiety following stroke: experience in the Perth community stroke study. *Acta Psychiatr Scand.* 1995 Apr;91(4):252-7.
- Johnston M, Pollard B, Hennessey P. Construct validation of the hospital anxiety and depression scale with clinical populations. *J Psychosom Res.* 2000 Jun;48(6):579-84.
- Kabacoff RI, Segal DL, Hersen M, Van Hasselt VB. Psychometric properties and diagnostic utility of the Beck Anxiety Inventory and the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory with older adult psychiatric outpatients. *J Anxiety Disord.* 1997 Jan-Feb;11(1):33-47.
- Kneebone II, Fife-Schaw C, Lincoln NB, Harder H. A study of the validity and the reliability of the Geriatric Anxiety Inventory in screening for anxiety after stroke in older inpatients. *Clin Rehabil.* 2016 Dec;30(12):1220-1228.
- Kneebone II, Neffgen LM, Pettyfer SL. Screening for depression and anxiety after stroke: developing protocols for use in the community. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2012;34(13):1114-20.
- Kotila M, Numminen H, Waltimo O, Kaste M. Post-stroke depression and functional recovery in a population-based stroke register. The Finnstroke study. *Eur J Neurol.* 1999 May;6(3):309-12.
- Leeds L, Meara RJ, Hobson JP. The utility of the Stroke Aphasia Depression Questionnaire (SADQ) in a stroke rehabilitation unit. *Clin Rehabil.* 2004 Mar;18(2):228-31.
- Lincoln NB, Nicholl CR, Flannaghan T, Leonard M, Van der Gucht E. The validity of questionnaire measures for assessing depression after stroke. *Clin Rehabil.* 2003 Dec;17(8):840-6.
- Lincoln NB, Sutcliffe LM, Unsworth G. Validation of the Stroke Aphasic Depression Questionnaire (SADQ) for use with patients in hospital. *Clinical*

Neuropsychological Assessment 2000; 1: 88-96.

- Linley-Adams B, Morris R, Kneebone I. The Behavioural Outcomes of Anxiety scale (BOA): a preliminary validation in stroke survivors. *Br J Clin Psychol*. 2014 Nov;53(4):451-67.
- Luyk NH, Beck FM, Weaver JM. A visual analogue scale in the assessment of dental anxiety. *Anesth Prog*. 1988 May-Jun;35(3):121-3.
- Luyk NH, Weaver JM, Beck FM, Loetscher CA, Sacks J. The effectiveness of flurazepam as night sedation prior to the removal of third molars. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 1988 Dec;17(6):347-51.
- McDowell BJ, Engberg SJ, Rodriguez E, Engberg R, Sereika S. Characteristics of urinary incontinence in homebound older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 1996 Aug;44(8):963-8.
- O'Rourke S, MacHale S, Signorini D, Dennis M. Detecting psychiatric morbidity after stroke: comparison of the HQ and the HAD Scale. *Stroke*. 1998 May;29(5):980-5. PubMed.
- Pachana NA, Byrne GJ, Siddle H, Koloski N, Harley E, Arnold E. Development and validation of the Geriatric Anxiety Inventory. *Int Psychogeriatr* 2007; 19(1): 103-14.
- Parikh RM, Eden DT, Price TR, Robinson RG. The sensitivity and specificity of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale in screening for post-stroke depression. *Int J Psychiatry Med*. 1988;18(2):169-81.
- Radloff, L.S. The CED-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1977;1 (3); 385-401.
- Sagen U, Vik TG, Moum T, Mørland T, Finset A, Dammen T. Screening for anxiety and depression after stroke: comparison of the hospital anxiety and depression scale and the Montgomery and Asberg depression rating scale. *J Psychosom Res*. 2009 Oct;67(4):325-32.
- Shinar D, Gross CR, Price TR, Banko M, Bolduc PL, Robinson RG. Screening for depression in stroke patients: the reliability and validity of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale. *Stroke*. 1986 Mar-Apr;17(2):241-5.
- Sivrioglu EY, Sivrioglu K, Ertan T, Ertan FS, Cankurtaran E, Aki O, Uluduz D, Ince B, Kirli S. Reliability and validity of the Geriatric Depression Scale in detection of poststroke minor depression. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol*. 2009 Nov;31(8):999-1006.
- Smucker MR, Craighead WE, Craighead LW, Green BJ. Normative and reliability data for the Children's Depression Inventory. *J Abnorm Child Psychol*. 1986 Mar;14(1):25-39.
- Stiles P, McGarrahan. The geriatric depression scale: a comprehensive review. *Journal of Clinical Geropsychology* 1998; 4(2): 89-100.
- Sutcliffe LM, Lincoln NB. The assessment of depression in aphasic stroke patients: the development of the Stroke Aphasic Depression Questionnaire. *Clin Rehabil*. 1998 Dec;12(6):506-13.
- Toedter LJ, Schall RR, Reese CA, Hyland DT, Berk SN, Dunn DS. Psychological measures: reliability in the assessment of stroke patients. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 1995 Aug;76(8):719-25.
- Visser MC, Koudstaal PJ, Erdman RA, Deckers JW, Passchier J, van Gijn J, Grobbee DE. Measuring quality of life in patients with myocardial infarction or stroke:

a feasibility study of four questionnaires in The Netherlands. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 1995 Oct;49(5):513-7.

Williams LS, Brizendine EJ, Plue L, Bakas T, Tu W, Hendrie H, Kroenke K. Performance of the PHQ-9 as a screening tool for depression after stroke. *Stroke*. 2005 Mar;36(3):635-8. Epub 2005 Jan 27.

Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 1983 Jun;67(6):361-70.