

# **HHS Public Access**

Asia Pac J Public Health. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2015 May 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Author manuscript

Asia Pac J Public Health. 2014 May ; 26(3): 310–319. doi:10.1177/1010539512443698.

# Comorbid Visual and Cognitive Impairment: Relationship with Disability Status and Self-Rated Health Among Older Singaporeans

HE. Whitson, MD, MHS<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>, R. Malhotra, MD, MPH<sup>5</sup>, A. Chan, PhD<sup>5,6</sup>, DB. Matchar, MD<sup>1,5</sup>, and T. Østbye, MD, PhD<sup>5,7</sup>

R. Malhotra: rahul.malhotra@duke-nus.edu.sg; A. Chan: socchana@nus.edu.sg; DB. Matchar: david.matchar@dukenus.edu.sg

<sup>1</sup>Department of Medicine, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC

<sup>2</sup>Department of Ophthalmology, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC

<sup>3</sup>Center for the Study of Aging, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC

<sup>4</sup>Durham VA Geriatrics Research Education and Clinical (GRECC), Durham, NC

<sup>5</sup>Duke-National University of Singapore Graduate Medical School, Singapore

<sup>6</sup>Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore, Singapore

<sup>7</sup>Department of Community and Family Medicine, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC

# Abstract

Our objective was to examine the prevalence and consequences of co-existing vision and cognitive impairments in an Asian population. Data were collected from 4508 community-dwelling Singaporeans aged 60 years and over. Cognition was assessed by the Short Portable Mental Status Questionnaire while vision, disability, and self-rated health (SRH) were determined by self-report. Vision impairment was present in 902 (18.5%) participants and cognitive impairment in 835 (13.6%), with 232 (3.5%) participants experiencing both impairments. Persons with the comorbidity experienced higher odds of disability than persons with either single impairment. The association of vision impairment with SRH was stronger among women (odds ratio [OR] 6.79, 95% confidence interval [CI] 4.64 to 9.92) than among men (OR 1.71, 95% CI 1.21 to 2.41). Concurrent cognitive and vision impairment is prevalent in older Singaporeans and associated with high rates of disability. Gender differences in vision-dependent roles may affect the patient-perceived impact of this comorbidity.

## Keywords

older people; visual impairment; comorbidity; cognitive impairment; ADL/IADL disability; mobility disability; self-rated health

Address for correspondence: Heather E. Whitson; Address: DUMC 3003, Durham, NC 27710 Phone: 919-660-7514 Fax: 919-684-8569, heather.whitson@duke.edu. Alternate corresponding author: Truls Østbye; Address: DUMC Box 104006, Durham, NC 27710; Phone: 919-660-0331; Fax 919-668-1785, truls.ostbye@duke.edu.

Declaration of Conflicts of Interest: The authors have no conflicts relevant to this research.

# INTRODUCTION

In older adults, vision impairment is a risk factor for cognitive decline and incident dementia<sup>1–4</sup>, and vision and cognitive deficits frequently co-occur<sup>5</sup>. Many etiologies of cognitive impairment and vision impairment in older adults, such as Alzheimer's Disease and age-related macular degeneration, are progressive and incurable<sup>6, 7</sup>. Often, people with this comorbidity can expect to experience both impairments for the rest of their lives. Qualitative research has revealed unmet needs among patients with this comorbidity and uncertainty among providers about appropriate management <sup>8</sup>. Efforts to promote quality of life for these patients depend, in part, on understanding the impact of this comorbidity on independence and patient-perceived health.

The presence of either vision impairment or cognitive impairment increases an older adult's risk of disability<sup>9, 10</sup>, but relatively less is known about the impact of both impairments on functional status. A previous study involving 3878 community-dwelling American seniors found that the 4% who experienced comorbid vision and cognitive impairments had the highest risk of prevalent and incident disability, although the contributions of each impairment to disability risk were additive rather than synergistic <sup>5</sup>. That study did not model the association of the comorbidity with patient-perceived health. People with vision impairment are more likely to report their health as poor<sup>11, 12</sup>. Although not as well-documented as the association between vision and self-rated health (SRH), worsening cognition also appears to be associated with lower SRH in older adults<sup>13</sup>.

Many factors may influence task performance and SRH including socioeconomic resources and societal support, medical conditions, psychological well-being, and culture<sup>14</sup>. The associations among impairments, disability, and SRH may be partially culturally mediated, and etiologies of vision impairment and cognitive impairment may vary by population; thus, the relationship between these variables may vary across societies.

Many Asian nations have witnessed substantial increases in life expectancy in recent decades, resulting in higher prevalence of age-related diseases of the brain and eye<sup>15, 16</sup>. Yet little is known about the prevalence or the consequences of comorbid vision and cognitive deficits among older Asians. The objective of the current analysis is to examine the relationship between comorbid cognitive and vision impairment with disability status and SRH in a representative sample of community-dwelling, older Singaporeans. Because previous work has reported gender differences in SRH and function in Asian countries<sup>17</sup>, we further explored whether the association between the impairments and the patient-reported outcomes differed between men and women.

## METHODS

#### **Study Population**

Singapore is a multi-ethnic, multi-lingual city state with a population of 5.08 million as of 2010<sup>18</sup>. The Singapore Social Isolation, Health, and Lifestyles Survey is an ongoing cohort study that includes a nationally representative sample of Singaporeans aged 60 years or older at the time of enrollment in 2009. The analyses presented here are restricted to

baseline data, as the second interview wave is currently underway. The survey, which assesses social and medical risks as well as protective and mediating factors for health and quality of life among older Singaporeans, is a collaborative effort between the National University of Singapore and the Ministry of Community Development, Youth, and Sports, designed to aid in policy planning for Singapore's aging population.

A random sample of 8400 older adults, stratified by gender, ethnicity, and 5-year age group, was drawn from the national database of dwellings. The ethnic distribution of the residents (citizens and permanent residents) of Singapore is as follows: 74.1% Chinese, 13.4% Malay, 9.2% Indian, and 3.3% other<sup>19</sup>. In this study, purposeful over-sampling of Malays, Indians, and those aged 75 years or older ensured that these groups were sufficiently represented. In total, 1195 (14.2%) of the sampled addresses were invalid; of the remaining 7205 potential participants, 5000 (69.4%) participated in the baseline survey. Non-responders were more often 70 years old and of "other" ethnicity, but gender distribution was similar to responders. The current analysis excluded participants with 1) proxy respondents (N=450) or severe cognitive impairment (N=28) due to possible inaccuracy of self-reported outcomes or 2) no vision in both eyes (N=14) because most lacked cognitive data. These analyses utilized de-identified survey data and were exempted from full review by the Institutional Review Boards of the National University of Singapore and Duke University.

#### Vision status

Participants rated their vision (with glasses or contact lenses, if worn) as excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor. We defined vision impairment as self-reported "fair" or "poor" vision.

#### **Cognitive status**

Cognitive status was assessed with the 10-item Short Portable Mental Status Questionnaire (SPMSQ) and adjusted for education (one point added for < primary school, one point subtracted for > secondary level)<sup>20</sup>. Cognitive impairment was defined as three errors.

#### **Disability status**

Participants answered whether they find it difficult to independently perform seven IADLs: prepare meals, shop, use the phone, light housework, use public transport, take medication as prescribed, manage financial matters. Participants were similarly asked about difficulty performing seven BADLs (dress, take a bath/shower, sit down and stand up, walk around the house, go outside, use the toilet, eat) and ten mobility tasks (walk 200 to 300 meters, stand without sitting for two hours, climb 10 steps without rest, sit continuously for two hours, stoop, extend arm in front, raise hand over head, grasp with fingers, lift 10 kilograms, lift 5 kilograms). We defined disability in the three domains –BADL, IADL, or mobility - as self-reported difficulty with one or more task in that domain.

#### Self-Rated Health

Participants rated themselves as very healthy, healthier than average, of average health, somewhat unhealthy, or very unhealthy. We defined low SRH as somewhat or very unhealthy.

#### Covariates

Analyses included several covariates likely to correlate with vision or cognition and with disability status or SRH. Age was analyzed as a categorical variable (60 to 69, 70 to 79, and 80 years). Ethnicity was reported as Chinese, Malay, Indian, or Other; education as less than primary (including those with no education), primary, secondary, or beyond secondary. Marital status was dichotomized as married versus widowed, divorced/separated, or never married. Housing type reflects socioeconomic status and was categorized as public housing (further categorized as 1–2 room, 3 room, 4 or more rooms), private condominiums, or bungalow/terrace/other. Participants were asked about adequacy of income to meet monthly expenses ("more than enough," "just enough," "some difficulty," or "much difficulty") and about whether they had ever been diagnosed with the following chronic conditions: heart attack/angina/myocardial infarction, cancer (excluding skin cancer), cerebrovascular disease, high blood pressure, diabetes, chronic back pain. Depressive symptoms were assessed with a modified, 11-item version of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) with a possible score range of 0 to 22 <sup>21</sup>. Depression scores were analyzed as a continuous variable.

#### **Statistical Analysis**

The sample was divided into four mutually exclusive vision/cognitive impairment groups: 1) neither cognitive nor vision impairment, 2) cognitive impairment only, 3) vision impairment only, and 4) both vision and cognitive impairment. Chi-square tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to compare these groups with respect to covariates.

Logistic regression models were constructed to determine the odds of disability or low SRH among participants with one or both impairments compared to the odds among participants with neither vision nor cognitive impairment. Separate unadjusted and adjusted (for the covariates described above) models were constructed for each dependent variable (IADL disability, BADL disability, mobility disability, low SRH). The SRH model was further adjusted for disability status. Due to concerns regarding possible over-correction, we ran the SRH model both with and without the depressive symptoms covariate.

To assess whether vision impairment and cognitive impairment were associated with disability or SRH in a synergistic manner, we re-ran each model to include a multiplicative interaction term (vision impairment × cognitive impairment). A significant difference (p<0.05) in the  $-2 \log$  likelihood (-2LL) value of the model after inclusion of the interaction term was taken to indicate synergism, meaning that the risk of disability/low SRH associated with cognitive or vision impairment was stronger (or weaker) in the presence of the other impairment.

Next, we explored whether the association between vision impairment and cognitive impairment with SRH or disability differed by gender, age group or gender/age group. Logistic regression models were run with and without 2-way and 3-way multiplicative interaction terms (e.g. vision/cognitive status × age group × gender) to assess for a significant difference (p<0.05) in the -2LL values of the models with and without the interaction terms.

# RESULTS

The average age of the 4508 study participants was  $69.2 \pm 7.2$  years and 53.4% were female. Vision impairment was present in 902 (18.5%) and cognitive impairment in 835 (13.6%), with 232 (3.5%) experiencing both vision and cognitive impairment. The weighted prevalence of cognitive impairment among visually impaired persons was 19.1%, while that of vision impairment among cognitively impaired persons was 25.8%. Participants with the comorbidity were older, less educated, more likely to have financial difficulty, and reported more depressive symptoms and higher rates of coronary disease, diabetes, and high blood pressure (Table 1). Consistent with previous reports, women and Malays were overrepresented in the groups with cognitive impairment <sup>22</sup>.

#### Association of Vision, Cognitive Impairment, or Both with Disability

Of 4508 participants, 380 (6.1%) reported BADL disability, 527 (8.6%) reported IADL disability, and 1977 (38.8%) reported mobility disability. Vision impairment and cognitive impairment were significantly associated with disability (Table 2). The point estimate for the odds ratio was consistently highest among participants with co-existing cognitive and vision impairment. Even after adjustment for potential confounders (Table 2), participants with the comorbidity remained at 2.5 to 3.5 greater odds of each type of disability.

Models that included an interaction term (vision impairment  $\times$  cognitive impairment) revealed no significant interaction between vision and cognitive status with respect to IADL or mobility disability. However, when the dependent variable was BADL disability, comparison of the -2LL values of models with and without the interaction term confirmed significant effect modification (p=0.03). The effect modification was negative, meaning that although participants with concurrent vision and cognitive impairment had higher risk of BADL disability, that risk was not as high as would be expected given the independent contributions from single impairments. Analyses did not suggest any effect modification by age or gender, indicating that the association between vision or cognitive impairment and BADL, IADL, and mobility disability did not vary by gender, age group, or gender/age groups.

#### Association of Vision, Cognitive Impairment, or Both with SRH

Gender-stratified results are presented because the inclusion of interaction terms revealed significant effect modification by gender (but not age group). The weighted prevalence of low SRH was 14.1% among men and 10.0% among women. The relationship between vision and cognitive impairment and SRH differed in men and women due to a stronger association between vision impairment and low SRH among women (Table 3).

In adjusted models, men with either single impairment experienced modest odds of low SRH, whereas men with the comorbidity were at 4 times greater odds of low SRH. In women, low SRH was similarly and strongly associated with either vision impairment alone or co-existing vision and cognitive impairment. In the adjusted models, cognitive impairment alone was not significantly associated with low SRH for either men or women.

## DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first study to document the prevalence and consequences of comorbid vision and cognitive impairment among non-Americans and the first to explore the association of this comorbidity with SRH. The prevalence of concurrent vision and cognitive impairment among older Singaporeans reported here (3.5%) was similar to the prevalence of 4.0% found among older Americans<sup>5</sup>. The rate of cognitive impairment was higher among participants with vision impairment than among those with intact vision, and the rate of vision impairment was higher among cognitively impaired than cognitively intact participants. Similar to Americans, Singaporeans with co-existing vision and cognitive impairment had higher odds of disability than their peers with lone vision or cognitive impairment, but there was no evidence that the excess disability reflected a synergistic interaction between these impairments. Whereas the relationship between concurrent vision and cognitive impairment and disability appears consistent across cultures, age groups, and gender, the relationship between the impairments and SRH differed by gender, with a stronger association between vision impairment and low SRH among women. Nevertheless, both men and women with comorbid vision and cognitive impairment, compared to those with normal vision and cognition, had four- to five-fold higher odds of low SRH.

In this population, cognitive impairment alone was not associated with low SRH, but older adults with both vision and cognitive impairment very frequently experienced low SRH. The results highlight the importance of efforts to develop and evaluate community-based programs or clinical interventions that prevent the development of this prevalent comorbidity or mitigate its effects on quality of life. For example, future research might investigate whether correcting reversible vision loss in cognitively impaired seniors is associated with improved independence or quality of life.

We are aware of only a few other studies that have addressed the consequences of this particular pair of impairments (vision and cognition)<sup>5, 8</sup>. However, our results add to mounting evidence that comorbidity is a common pathway to functional decline and adverse outcomes in an aging society<sup>24, 25</sup>. Comorbidity research frequently considers the overall burden of illness, but the current study demonstrates the utility of examining the health-related consequences of particular pairs of conditions that frequently co-occur.

One unexpected finding was the striking gender-based difference in the pattern of association between vision impairment and SRH. Although it is well-known that vision impairment is associated with depression and low SRH <sup>11, 12, 26</sup>, previous studies did not report a modifying effect of gender. Our finding is consistent with a large body of work which suggests that men and women differ in their self-assessments of health<sup>17, 27</sup>. Women's health assessments tend to be sensitive to a wider range of health problems and life circumstances; this so-called "sponge" hypothesis has been offered as an explanation for the lower correlation of SRH to mortality among women compared to men<sup>28</sup>. That is, women may be more likely to lower their SRH based on a troubling - but not life-threatening – condition, such as vision impairment. The finding may also reflect culturally mediated differences in role expectations for older men and women in Asia<sup>29</sup>. If older Singaporean women are typically engaged in more vision-dependent tasks (such as cooking,

Some limitations may impact the interpretation of results. First, most variables, were assessed by self-report which is subject to bias, particularly for variables reflecting adequacy of income or health status. Cognitive impairment could introduce further bias to the reporting of all outcomes, including vision and disability. However, those with severe cognitive impairment (N=28) were excluded, and evidence suggests that people with mild to moderate cognitive impairment provide reliable information about symptoms and basic health parameters<sup>30</sup>. Second, causation cannot be inferred from the associations observed in this cross-sectional data, though it seems less plausible that disability or low SRH would lead to sensory or cognitive impairment.

#### **Conclusion/Recommendation**

This study provides new information about the relationship of a common comorbidity (vision impairment and cognitive impairment) to older adults' functional status and self-perceived health. With increasing recognition of the importance of patient-reported outcomes, the results suggest a promising point of emphasis for efforts aimed at improving independence and quality of life for older adults. In Singapore, approximately 3–4% of community-dwelling elderly had co-existing vision and cognitive impairment. Individuals with this pair of conditions are at high risk of disability and poorly perceived health, and culturally appropriate interventions that accommodate both conditions and strive to lessen their mutual impact are needed.

# Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge Dr. Harvey Cohen for his thoughtful mentorship.

**Funding and Support:** Dr. Whitson is supported by a Paul B. Beeson Career Development Award [K23 AG032867], the Duke Pepper Center [5P30AG028716], the Brookdale Foundation, the John A. Hartford Foundation, and the American Federation for Aging Research, and the Durham VA Medical Center GRECC. The analyses were in part funded by a generous grant from the Tsao Foundation, Singapore, and a five year STaR Investigator Grant awarded by the National Medical Research Council to David Matchar, Director, Program in Health Services and Systems Research, Duke-NUS Graduate Medical School. Data were collected through a project funded by the Ministry of Community Development, Youth and Sports, Singapore.

# References

- Reyes-Ortiz CA, Kuo YF, DiNuzzo AR, et al. Near vision impairment predicts cognitive decline: data from the Hispanic Established Populations for Epidemiologic Studies of the Elderly. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society. 2005; 53:681–686. [PubMed: 15817017]
- Klaver CC, Ott A, Hofman A, et al. Is age-related maculopathy associated with Alzheimer's Disease? The Rotterdam Study. Am J Epidemiol. 1999; 150:963–968. [PubMed: 10547142]
- Wong TY, Klein R, Nieto FJ, et al. Is early age-related maculopathy related to cognitive function? The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study. Am J Ophthalmol. 2002; 134:828–835. [PubMed: 12470750]
- Clemons TE, Rankin MW, McBee WL. Cognitive impairment in the Age-Related Eye Disease Study: AREDS report no. 16. Arch Ophthalmol. 2006; 124:537–543. [PubMed: 16606880]
- Whitson HE, Cousins SW, Burchett BM, et al. The combined effect of visual impairment and cognitive impairment on disability in older people. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2007; 55:885–891. [PubMed: 17537089]

- 6. Facts about Age Related Macular Degeneration. 2011. [cited 2011 November 20]; Available from: http://www.nei.nih.gov/health/maculardegen/armd\_facts.asp
- Alzheimer's Disease. 2012 Feb. 2012]; Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ pubmedhealth/PMH0001767/
- Lawrence V, Murray J, Ffytche D, Banerjee S. "Out of sight, out of mind": a qualitative study of visual impairment and dementia from three perspectives. Int Psychogeriatr. 2009; 21:511–518. [PubMed: 19265571]
- Di Carlo A, Baldereschi M, Amaducci L, et al. Cognitive impairment without dementia in older people: prevalence, vascular risk factors, impact on disability. The Italian Longitudinal Study on Aging. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2000; 48:775–782. [PubMed: 10894316]
- Rubin GS, Roche KB, Prasada-Rao P, Fried LP. Visual impairment and disability in older adults. Optom Vis Sci. 1994; 71:750–760. [PubMed: 7898882]
- Wang JJ, Mitchell P, Smith W. Vision and low self-rated health: the Blue Mountains Eye Study. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2000; 41:49–54. [PubMed: 10634600]
- Damian J, Pastor-Barriuso R, Valderrama-Gama E. Factors associated with self-rated health in older people living in institutions. BMC Geriatr. 2008; 8:5. [PubMed: 18304308]
- Walker JD, Maxwell CJ, Hogan DB, Ebly EM. Does self-rated health predict survival in older persons with cognitive impairment? J Am Geriatr Soc. 2004; 52:1895–1900. [PubMed: 15507068]
- Verbrugge LM, Jette AM. The disablement process. Soc Sci Med. 1994; 38:1–14. [PubMed: 8146699]
- Chong EW, Lamoureux EL, Jenkins MA, et al. Sociodemographic, lifestyle, and medical risk factors for visual impairment in an urban asian population: the singapore malay eye study. Arch Ophthalmol. 2009; 127:1640–1647. [PubMed: 20008720]
- Kalaria RN, Maestre GE, Arizaga R, et al. Alzheimer's disease and vascular dementia in developing countries: prevalence, management, and risk factors. Lancet Neurol. 2008; 7:812–826. [PubMed: 18667359]
- Chan A, Santosh J. Gender differences in health among older Singaporeans. International Sociology. 2007; 22:463–491.
- Census of Population 2010 Advance Census Release. Singapore: Department of Statistics, Ministry of Trade & Industry, Republic of Singapore; 2010.
- Census of Population 2010 Statistical Release 1: Demographic Characteristics, Education, Language, and Religion. 2011. [cited 2011; Available from: http://www.singstat.gov.sg/pubn/ popn/C2010sr1/cop2010sr1.pdf
- Pfeiffer E. A short portable mental status questionnaire for the assessment of organic brain deficit in elderly patients. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society. 1975; 23:433–441. [PubMed: 1159263]
- 21. Radloff L. The CES-D scale: a self-report depression scale for research in the general population. Applied Psychological Measurement. 1977; 1:385–401.
- 22. Sahadevan S, Saw SM, Gao W, et al. Ethnic differences in Singapore's dementia prevalence: the stroke, Parkinson's disease, epilepsy, and dementia in Singapore study. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2008; 56:2061–2068. [PubMed: 19016940]
- Hall TA, McGwin G Jr, Owsley C. Effect of cataract surgery on cognitive function in older adults. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2005; 53:2140–2144. [PubMed: 16398899]
- 24. Yancik R, Ershler W, Satariano W, et al. Report of the national institute on aging task force on comorbidity. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2007; 62:275–280. [PubMed: 17389724]
- 25. Anderson, GHJ. Chronic Conditions: Making the case for ongoing care. September 2004 update. Princeton, NJ: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Partnership for Solutions; 2004.
- Noran NH, Izzuna MG, Bulgiba AM, Mimiwati Z, Ayu SM. Severity of visual impairment and depression among elderly Malaysians. Asia PacJ Public Health. 2009; 21:43–50. [PubMed: 19124335]
- Fillenbaum GG. Social context and self-assessments of health among the elderly. J Health Soc Behav. 1979; 20:45–51. [PubMed: 438494]

- Wolinsky FD, Tierney WM. Self-rated health and adverse health outcomes: an exploration and refinement of the trajectory hypothesis. J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci. 1998; 53:S336–340. [PubMed: 9826975]
- 29. Pho T-L, Mulvey A. Southeast Asian Women in Lowell: Family Relations, Gender Roles, and Community Concerns. Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies. 2003; 24:101–129.
- Gottlieb GL, Gur RE, Gur RC. Reliability of psychiatric scales in patients with dementia of the Alzheimer type. Am J Psychiatry. 1988; 145:857–860. [PubMed: 3381932]

~
⋗
5
=
ō
$\leq$
>
$\leq$
Ma
Mar
ž
nu
ž
nu
nus

~	
±.	
$\neg$	
0	
$\geq$	
$\leq$	
മ	

# TABLE 1

Characteristics of Study Participants, Stratified by Four Mutually Exclusive Categories of Vision and Cognitive Impairment Status

Agenue         Antical and antical antite antite antical antical antite antite antical antical antical	Characteristic	Overall ParticipantsN=4508	Neither Impairment N=3003	Visually Impaired Only N=670	Cognitively Impaired Only N=603	Both Impairments N=232	p-value <sup>*</sup>
64         64         63         81         21           238         278         297         407         21           98         278         297         407         405           98         69         109         212         405           98         69         109         212         405           98         83         861         863         803           91         73         863         875         803           91         73         863         875         819         819           92         61         73         875         819         819           93         61         73         875         819         819           93         93         93         93         93         93           93         93         93         93         93         93           93         93         93         93         93         93           93         93         93         93         93         93           94         93         93         93         93         93           94         94         93	Age group						
298         278         297         407         405 <td>% 60–69 years</td> <td>60.4</td> <td>65.4</td> <td>59.5</td> <td>38.1</td> <td>27.4</td> <td>&lt;0.0001</td>	% 60–69 years	60.4	65.4	59.5	38.1	27.4	<0.0001
98         60         109         212         321           534         489         453         875         809           833         851         853         875         809           833         851         853         853         875         809           833         851         853         853         875         809           91         7.3         66         2.4         910         91           114         116         0.9         4.6         8.7         924         910           374         394         4.0         0.9         7.1         926         91           374         231         233         233         93         93         93           374         394         4.0         93         93         93         93           374         231         102         93         93         93         93           651         669         671         261         93         93         93           651         54         254         93         93         93           651         54         54         53         93 <t< td=""><td>% 70–79 years</td><td>29.8</td><td>27.8</td><td>29.7</td><td>40.7</td><td>40.5</td><td></td></t<>	% 70–79 years	29.8	27.8	29.7	40.7	40.5	
534         489         453         875         809           833         851         885         682         688           91         733         851         885         682         688           91         733         60         22.4         210           62         60         263         63         63         63           14         16         0.9         67         87         20           15         233         238         597         67         12           374         374         394         400         67         12         12           374         271         271         267         109         71         12           93         102         273         267         139         42           651         609         672         43         42           666         264         236         63         64           616         541         236         63         64           616         541         510         63         64           616         543         510         64         64           616 <td>% 75 years</td> <td>9.8</td> <td>6.9</td> <td>10.9</td> <td>21.2</td> <td>32.1</td> <td></td>	% 75 years	9.8	6.9	10.9	21.2	32.1	
33.4         4.9         4.53         87.5         80           83.3         83.1         88.5         68         68         68           91         7.3         6.0         22.4         210         210           62         6.0         7.3         6.0         22.4         210         210           1.4         1.6         0.9         7.3         50         7         20         210           23.6         23.3         23.3         23.8         7         21	Gender						
	% Female	53.4	48.9	45.3	87.5	80.9	<0.0001
	Ethnicity						
91         73         60         224         210           62         60         46         87         90           14         16         09         67         87         90           286         233         233         87         87         90           374         394         400         251         12         90           374         247         271         267         13         12           374         394         400         251         13         12           93         102         271         267         13         12           14         102         102         93         43         12           15         102         261         13         13         12           16         71         661         70         93         36           16         51         260         233         14         14           16         54         53         56         56         56           16         54         53         63         63         66         56         56           16         54         54	% Chinese	83.3	85.1	88.5	68.2	68.8	<0.0001
62         60         46         87         90           1.4         1.6         0.9         0.7         1.2           28.6         23.3         23.8         59.7         67.1           37.4         39.4         400         25.1         10.9           37.4         24.7         26.7         10.9         67.1           24.7         27.1         26.7         10.9         9.1           24.7         27.1         27.1         26.7         10.9         9.1           24.7         27.1         27.1         26.7         10.9         9.1           24.7         27.1         27.1         26.7         10.9         9.1           65.1         65.1         69.9         67.2         38.9         4.3         4.2           bit         7.1         69.9         67.2         38.9         36.6         11.9           bit         7.1         66.1         26.4         29.2         30.6         11.9           bit         51.1         54.7         23.2         51.0         47.4         11.9           bit         51.1         54.7         51.0         51.0         51.0	% Malay	9.1	7.3	6.0	22.4	21.0	
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	% Indian	6.2	6.0	4.6	8.7	9.0	
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	% Other	1.4	1.6	0.9	0.7	1.2	
28.6         23.3         2.3.8         59.7         67.1           37.4         39.4         400         25.1         19.6           24.7         27.1         26.7         10.9         9.1           24.7         27.1         26.7         10.9         9.1           9.3         10.2         9.5         4.3         9.1           9.3         10.2         9.5         4.3         9.1           1         65.1         69.9         67.2         38.9         35.8           65.1         69.9         67.2         38.9         35.8         4.2           blic         7.1         6.6         7.0         9.3         35.8           blic         51.9         6.6         26.6         26.4         29.2         30.6           blic         53.4         53.2         51.0         47.4           1         53.2         51.0         47.4           1         53.2         51.0         51.0           1         7.3         53.2         51.0         51.0           1         1.4         53.2         51.0         51.0           1         53.2         53.0	Education						
	% < Primary	28.6	23.3	23.8	59.7	67.1	<0.0001
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	% Primary	37.4	39.4	40.0	25.1	19.6	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	% Secondary	24.7	27.1	26.7	10.9	9.1	
65.1 $69.9$ $67.2$ $38.9$ $35.8$ blic $7.1$ $6.6$ $7.0$ $9.3$ $11.9$ lic $26.6$ $26.0$ $26.4$ $29.2$ $30.6$ blic $33.4$ $54.1$ $53.2$ $51.0$ $47.4$ $5.1$ $5.4$ $53.2$ $51.0$ $4.3$ $4.7$ $7.8$ $7.9$ $8.6$ $6.3$ $5.6$ lty $2.5$ $1.7$ $4.9$ $5.1$ lty $12.7$ $13.0$ $12.7$ $5.6$ lty $12.7$ $13.0$ $12.7$ $5.6$	% >Secondary	9.3	10.2	9.5	4.3	4.2	
	Marital status						
blic 7.1 $6.6$ 7.0 $9.3$ $11.9$ lic 26.6 $26.0$ $26.4$ $29.2$ $30.6$ blic 53.4 $54.1$ $53.2$ $51.0$ $47.4$ 5.1 $5.4$ $4.8$ $4.3$ $4.57.8$ $7.9$ $8.6$ $6.3$ $5.6lit 2.5 1.7 49 5.6lit 14.5 1.7 49 3.0 7.7$	% Married	65.1	6.69	67.2	38.9	35.8	<0.0001
blic 7.1 $6.6$ 7.0 $9.3$ $11.9$ lic $26.6$ $26.0$ $26.4$ $29.2$ $30.6$ blic $53.4$ $54.1$ $53.2$ $51.0$ $47.4$ 7.8 $7.9$ $8.6$ $6.3$ $5.6lic 1.7 4.8 4.3 4.5lic 1.7 4.9 5.6lic 1.7 4.9 5.6lic 1.7 4.9 3.0 7.7lic 14.8 1.6 7.7$	Housing type						
ic $26.6$ $26.0$ $26.4$ $29.2$ $30.6$ blic $53.4$ $54.1$ $53.2$ $51.0$ $47.4$ $5.1$ $5.4$ $4.8$ $4.3$ $4.5$ $7.8$ $7.9$ $8.6$ $6.3$ $5.6$ lt $7.9$ $8.6$ $6.3$ $5.6$ ult $2.5$ $1.7$ $4.9$ $3.0$ lt $14.5$ $13.0$ $19.2$ $14.8$ $7.7$	% 1–2 rooms public	7.1	6.6	7.0	9.3	11.9	0.1067
blic 53.4 54.1 53.2 51.0 47.4 5.1 5.4 4.8 4.3 4.5 4.5 7.8 7.9 $8.6$ $6.3$ $5.6$ http://difference.org/line.	% 3 rooms public	26.6	26.0	26.4	29.2	30.6	
5.1 $5.4$ $4.8$ $4.3$ $4.5$ $7.8$ $7.9$ $8.6$ $6.3$ $5.6$ $11$ $2.5$ $1.7$ $4.9$ $3.0$ $7.7$ $11$ $14.5$ $13.0$ $19.2$ $14.8$ $24.7$	% 4+ rooms public	53.4	54.1	53.2	51.0	47.4	
7.8         7.9         8.6         6.3         5.6           dly         2.5         1.7         4.9         3.0         7.7           dly         14.5         13.0         19.2         14.8         24.7	% Condo	5.1	5.4	4.8	4.3	4.5	
Ity     2.5     1.7     4.9     3.0     7.7       Ity     14.5     13.0     19.2     14.8     24.7	$\% \ Other^{\dagger}$	7.8	7.9	8.6	6.3	5.6	
2.5     1.7     4.9     3.0     7.7       14.5     13.0     19.2     14.8     24.7	Income adequacy						
14.5 13.0 19.2 14.8	% Much difficulty	2.5	1.7	4.9	3.0	T.T	<0.0001
	% Some difficulty	14.5	13.0	19.2	14.8	24.7	

Asia Pac J Public Health. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2015 May 01.

Page 10

% Just enough62.162.561.862.654.6% More than enough62.162.561.862.654.6% More than enough20.820.814.220.013.0Depressive symptoms*33.45.13.3±3.13.0±2.83.7±3.56.0001Diseases %6.2 $5.6$ $9.0$ $4.5$ 11.30.0001Diseases %6.2 $5.6$ $9.0$ $4.5$ 11.30.0001MtAngins% $1.0$ $2.8$ $3.6$ $3.6$ $2.4$ $0.7087$ MtAngins% $1.0$ $2.9$ $5.6$ $3.1$ $2.9$ $5.3$ $0.0001$ MtAngins% $1.2$ $2.9$ $5.6$ $2.9$ $5.3$ $0.0001$ MtAngins% $1.7$ $2.9$ $5.6$ $2.9$ $5.3$ $0.0001$ MtAngins% $1.7$ $2.9$ $5.6$ $2.9$ $5.3$ $0.0001$ % CtM $2.9$ $2.9$ $5.4$ $5.7$ $5.3$ $0.0001$ % Distens $21.3$ $19.1$ $27.7$ $22.9$ $3.45$ $0.0001$ % Back Pain $10.3$ $9.0$ $13.0$ $14.6$ $15.2$ $0.0001$	ugh         62.1         62.5         61.8         62.6         54.6           an enough         20.8         14.2         20.0         13.0           an enough         20.8         14.2         20.0         13.0           ynponus <sup>4</sup> 3.3±3.1         3.0±2.8         3.7±3.6         4.4±3.2         5.7±5.5           ynponus <sup>4</sup> 5.1         3.0±2.8         3.7±3.6         4.4±3.2         5.7±5.5           ynponus <sup>4</sup> 5.1         3.0±2.8         3.7±3.6         4.5         11.3           s         3.0         2.8         3.7±3.6         4.5         11.3           s         3.0         2.8         3.6         2.9         5.7±5.5           od pessure         51.7         2.2         5.6         2.9         5.3           od pessure         51.7         49.6         5.4         5.3         5.3           s         21.3         9.1         2.77         2.29         5.4           s         10.3         1.4.6         5.74         5.4           s         10.3         1.0.3         1.4.6         5.4           s         1.3.0         1.4.6         5.4         5.5 <th>Characteristic</th> <th>Overall ParticipantsN=4508</th> <th>Neither Impairment N=3003</th> <th>Visually Impaired Only N=670</th> <th>Cognitively Impaired Only Both Impairments N=232 N=603</th> <th>Both Impairments N=232</th> <th>p-value*</th>	Characteristic	Overall ParticipantsN=4508	Neither Impairment N=3003	Visually Impaired Only N=670	Cognitively Impaired Only Both Impairments N=232 N=603	Both Impairments N=232	p-value*
an enough 20.8 22.8 14.2 20.0 13.0 $13.0$ $ymptoms^4$ 3.3 $\pm$ 3.1 3.0 $\pm$ 2.8 3.7 $\pm$ 3.6 4 $\pm$ 3.2 5.1 1.3 5.5 5.6 7.4 5.7 5.5 5.7 5.5 5.7 5.5 5.7 5.5 5.7 5.5 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.3 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.3 5.6 0.0 restrue 51.7 49.6 5.4 5.7 2.9 5.7 5.7 5.6 5.7 5.7 5.3 5.6 5.7 5.3 5.6 5.7 5.3 5.6 5.7 5.3 5.6 5.7 5.3 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.3 5.3 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6	8         22.8         14.2         20.0         13.0           3.1         3.0±2.8         3.7±3.6         4.4±3.2         5.7±3.5           2         5.6         9.0         4.4±3.2         5.7±3.5           2         5.6         9.0         4.5         11.3           2         9.0         3.6         3.1         2.4           3         2.8         3.6         3.1         2.4           3         2.2         5.6         2.9         5.3           49.6         5.4         5.7         5.3         3.45           3         9.0         13.0         14.6         15.2           3         9.0         13.0         14.6         57.4         54.5	% Just enough	62.1	62.5	61.8	62.6	54.6	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	3.1       3.0±2.8       3.7±3.6       4.4±3.2       5.7±3.5         2       5.6       9.0       4.5       11.3         11.3       3.6       3.1       2.4       2.4         2       3.6       3.6       3.1       2.4         3       2.2       5.6       2.9       5.3         49.6       5.4       5.7       5.3         3       19.1       27.7       22.9       34.5         3       9.0       13.0       14.6       5.3         3       3.0       14.6       5.4       5.4       5.4	% More than enough	20.8	22.8	14.2	20.0	13.0	
6.2     5.6     9.0     4.5     11.3       3.0     3.0     2.8     3.6     3.1     2.4       3.0     2.9     2.8     3.6     3.1     2.4       2.9     2.2     5.6     2.9     5.3       ood pressure     51.7     49.6     54.4     57.4     67.6       s     21.3     19.1     27.7     22.9     34.5       ain     10.3     9.0     13.0     14.6     15.2	2         5.6         9.0         4.5         11.3           0         2.8         3.6         3.1         2.4           0         2.2         5.6         2.9         5.3           7         49.6         54.4         57.4         67.6           3         19.1         27.7         22.9         34.5           3         9.0         13.0         14.6         15.2           ical variables) or ANOVA (for continuous variables) comparing the proportions or means across the four vision/cognitive impairment groups	Depressive symptoms $\sharp$	$3.3 \pm 3.1$	$3.0{\pm}2.8$	$3.7 \pm 3.6$	$4.4 \pm 3.2$	5.7±3.5	<0.0001
3.0     2.8     3.6     3.1     2.4       2.9     2.2     5.6     3.9     5.3       ood pressure     51.7     49.6     54.4     57.4     67.6       s     21.3     19.1     27.7     22.9     34.5       ain     10.3     9.0     13.0     14.6     15.2	0         2.8         3.6         3.1         2.4           0         2.2         5.6         3.9         5.3           7         49.6         54.4         57.4         67.6           3         19.1         27.7         22.9         34.5           3         9.0         13.0         14.6         15.2           ical variables) or ANOVA (for continuous variables) comparing the proportions or means across the four vision/cognitive impairment groups	Diseases %	6.2	5.6	9.0	4.5	11.3	0.0001
https://docs/section	0         2.8         3.6         3.1         2.4           0         2.2         5.6         2.9         5.3           7         49.6         54.4         57.4         67.6           3         19.1         27.7         22.9         34.5           3         9.0         13.0         14.6         15.2           ical variables) or ANOVA (for continuous variables) comparing the proportions or means across the four vision/cognitive impairment groups	MI/Angina§						
<ul> <li> <b>1 2.9 2.2 5.6 2.9 5.3 5.3 5.4 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.6 5.3 5.3</b> </li> <li>             bholood pressure             <b>51.7 49.6 54.4 57.4 67.6 34.5</b> </li> <li>             bholood pressure             <b>51.3 19.1 27.7 22.9 34.5</b> </li> <li>             ck Pain             <b>10.3 9.0 13.0 14.6 15.2</b> </li> </ul>	0         2.2         5.6         2.9         5.3           7         49.6         54.4         57.4         67.6           3         19.1         27.7         22.9         34.5           3         9.0         13.0         14.6         15.2           ical variables) or ANOVA (for continuous variables) comparing the proportions or means across the four vision/cognitive impairment groups	% Cancer	3.0	2.8	3.6	3.1	2.4	0.7087
blood pressure     51.7     49.6     54.4     57.4     67.6       tbetes     21.3     19.1     27.7     22.9     34.5       ck Pain     10.3     9.0     13.0     14.6     15.2	7         49.6         54.4         57.4         67.6         34.5         3         3         3         5         3         4.5         3 <th< td=""><td>% CV¶</td><td>2.9</td><td>2.2</td><td>5.6</td><td>2.9</td><td>5.3</td><td>&lt;0.0001</td></th<>	% CV¶	2.9	2.2	5.6	2.9	5.3	<0.0001
51.7         49.6         54.4         57.4         67.6           21.3         19.1         27.7         22.9         34.5           10.3         9.0         13.0         14.6         15.2	7         49.6         54.4         57.4         67.6           3         19.1         27.7         22.9         34.5           3         9.0         13.0         14.6         15.2           ical variables) or ANOVA (for continuous variables) comparing the proportions or means across the four vision/cognitive impairment groups	Disease						
21.3         19.1         27.7         22.9         34.5           10.3         9.0         13.0         14.6         15.2	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	% High blood pressure	51.7	49.6	54.4	57.4	67.6	<0.0001
10.3 9.0 13.0 14.6 15.2	3 9.0 15.2 13.0 14.6 15.2 ical variables) or ANOVA (for continuous variables) comparing the proportions or means across the four vision/cognitive impairment groups	% Diabetes	21.3	19.1	27.7	22.9	34.5	<0.0001
	Veighted values are reported for all variables p values based on chi-square test (for categorical variables) or ANOVA (for continuous variables) comparing the proportions or means across the four vision/cognitive impairment groups Bungalow/terrace/shophouse/Other	% Back Pain	10.3	9.0	13.0	14.6	15.2	<0.0001
	- Bungalow/terrace/shophouse/Other	p values based on chi-sque	re test (for categorical variables) c	r ANOVA (for continuous variable	ss) comparing the proportions of	r means across the four vision/cog	nitive impairment groups	
p values based on chi-square test (for categorical variables) or ANOVA (for continuous variables) comparing the proportions or means across the four vision/cognitive impairment groups		Bungalow/terrace/shophou	ise/Other					

Asia Pac J Public Health. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2015 May 01.

 $t^{\pm}$ Scores (mean estimate  $\pm$  standard deviation) on the 11-item version of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D)

 $^{\&}MI = myocardial infarction$  $^{\&}CV = cerebrovascular disease$ 

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

#### TABLE 2

Occurrence of Disability Among People with Vision Impairment, Cognitive Impairment, or Both

Unadjusted Analyses			
	BADL <sup>*</sup> Disability OR <sup>‡</sup> (95% CI <sup>§</sup> )	IADL <sup>†</sup> Disability OR (95% CI)	Mobility Disability OR (95% CI)
Impairment Category	[Prevalence of BADL Disability <sup>¶</sup> ]	[Prevalence of IADL Disability]	[Prevalence of Mobility Disability]
People with vision impairment only	3.35 (2.44,4.61) [9.7%]	2.49 (1.88,3.30) [11.5%]	1.90 (1.61,2.24) [47.2%]
People with cognitive impairment only	5.67 (4.12,7.79) [15.4%]	5.44 (4.16,7.12) [22.2%]	3.36 (2.76,4.11) [61.3%]
People with comorbid vision and cognitive impairment	10.61 (7.09,15.87) [25.4%]	9.02 (6.25,13.03) [32.1%]	6.66 (4.63,9.59) [75.9%]
People with neither impairment	1.0 [3.1%]	1.0 [5.0%]	1.0 [32.0%]
Adjusted Analyses <sup>#</sup>			
Impairment	BADL Disability OR (95% CI)	IADL Disability OR (95% CI)	Mobility Disability OR (95% CI)
People with vision impairment only	2.40 (1.68,3.44)	1.93 (1.39,2.66)	1.85 (1.53,2.25)
People with cognitive impairment only	2.73 (1.87,3.99)	2.26 (1.63,3.13)	1.50 (1.18,1.90)
People with comorbid vision and cognitive impairment	3.26 (1.99,5.33)	2.50 (1.59,3.93)	2.59 (1.69,3.96)
People with neither impairment	1.0	1.0	1.0

<sup>\*</sup>BADL = basic activities of daily living

 $\dot{\tau}$ IADL = instrumental activities of daily living

 $^{\ddagger}$ OR = odds ratio; compares the odds of disability among people in each impairment category to the odds of disability among people with neither impairment

 $^{\$}$ CI = confidence interval

 $\P$ Weighted prevalence of disability

<sup>#</sup>Adjusted for Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Education, Marital status, Housing type, Perceived income adequacy, Self-reported chronic diseases (Angina/Myocardial infarction, Cancer, Cerebrovascular disease, Hypertension, Diabetes, Chronic back pain) and Depressive symptoms score

#### TABLE 3

Occurrence of Low Self-Rated Health in Men (N=2094) and Women (N=2413) with Vision impairment, Cognitive Impairment, or Both

Unadjusted Analyses		
	Men OR <sup>*</sup> (95% CI <sup>†</sup> )	Women OR (95% CI)
Impairment Category	[Prevalence of Low $SRH^{\ddagger}_{T}$ ]	[Prevalence of Low SRH
People with vision impairment only	2.59 (1.96,3.43) [24.4%]	9.21 (6.60,12.85) [30.8%]
People with cognitive impairment only	1.76 (0.89,3.48) [18.0%]	1.72 (1.12,2.64) [7.7%]
People with comorbid vision and cognitive impairment	7.00 (3.41,14.35) [46.6%]	11.05 (7.22,16.91) [34.8%]
People with neither impairment	1.0 [11.1%]	1.0 [4.6%]
Adjusted Analyses§		
Impairment Category	Men OR (95% CI)	Women OR (95% CI)
People with vision impairment only	1.71 (1.21,2.41)	6.79 (4.64,9.92)
People with cognitive impairment only	1.50 (0.64,3.53)	1.02 (0.62,1.69)
People with comorbid vision and cognitive impairments	4.27 (1.53,11.92)	5.35 (3.12,9.18)
Neither impairment	1.0	1.0

\*OR = odds ratio; compares the odds of low self-rated health among people in each impairment category to the odds of low self-rated health among people with neither impairment

 $^{\dagger}$ CI = confidence interval

 $^{\ddagger}$ Weighted prevalence of low self-rated health

<sup>§</sup>Adjusted for Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Education, Marital status, Housing type, Perceived income adequacy, Self-reported chronic diseases (Angina/Myocardial infarction, Cancer, Cerebrovascular disease, Hypertension, Diabetes, Chronic back pain), Disability in basic activities of daily living (BADLs), Disability in instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs), and Mobility disability. Models that further adjusted for Depression score did not change results significantly and are not shown.