

Supplementary Material

Diagnosing Mild Cognitive Impairment Among Racially Diverse Older Adults: Comparison of Consensus, Actuarial, and Statistical Methods

Supplementary Table 1. Latent Class Analysis of Cognitive Function at Baseline (N = 354)

Classes	Parameters	AIC	CAIC	BIC	aBIC	Entropy	-2LL	VLMR <i>p</i>	BLRT <i>p</i>
1	12	5846	5905	5893	5855	—	—	—	—
2	19	5414	5506	5487	5427	0.86	446.67	<0.0001	<0.0001
3	26	5309	5436	5410	5327	0.85	118.59	0.0077	<0.0001
4	33	5238	5399	5366	5261	0.85	85.22	0.5452	<0.0001
5	40	5157	5352	5312	5185	0.81	94.71	0.6306	<0.0001
6	47	5106	5335	5288	5139	0.83	64.91	0.0273	<0.0001
7	54	5069	5332	5278	5107	0.85	51.12	0.1908	<0.0001

AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; CAIC, consistent AIC; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; aBIC, sample size-adjusted BIC; -2LL, twice the log-likelihood difference; VLMR, Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test; BLRT, bootstrap likelihood ratio test

Supplementary Table 2. Cross-Tabulation of Latent Classes with Consensus and Actuarial MCI Subtypes at Baseline

	Latent Class				
	High Normal	Low Normal	Memory Only	Memory/ Language	Memory/ Executive
Consensus Diagnosis					
NC	103	84	11	1	0
MCI (Total)	6	17	57	46	29
aMCI-SD	4	3	31	20	4
aMCI-MD	0	6	20	26	24
naMCI	2	8	6	0	1
Actuarial Diagnosis					
NC	103	58	4	0	0
MCI (Total)	6	43	64	47	29
aMCI-SD	2	4	45	25	3
aMCI-MD	0	5	16	22	26
naMCI	4	34	3	0	0

NC, normal cognition; aMCI, amnesic mild cognitive impairment; naMCI, non-amnesic mild cognitive impairment; SD, single domain; MD, multi-domain