

Supplement

Contents

1 Comparison between participants with and without a general deficit in in-person testing	2
2 Descriptive data and correlation between FNAT classification score and in-person memory performance.....	3
3 Regression models including all considered predictors (before reduction)	4
3.1 General Deficit	5
3.2 Attention	6
3.3 Memory	7
3.4 Executive Function	8

1 Comparison between participants with and without a general deficit in in-person testing

Table S1. Participants with a general deficit in the in-person testing did not significantly differ in age, education and GDS from participants without a general deficit. GDS: Geriatric Depression Scale.

	Participants with deficit	Participants without deficit	t-test
age (years)	M = 48.31 (SD = 16.48)	M = 49.16 (SD = 14.58)	T (180) = .332, p = .740
education	< 12 years: N = 13 (27%)	< 12 years: N = 52 (39%)	T (180) = -1.515, p = .133
	12 years+: N = 35 (73%)	12 year+: N = 82 (61%)	
GDS	M = 6.98 (SD = 3.74)	M = 6.84 (SD = 3.50)	T (180) = -.227, p = .821

2 Descriptive data and correlation between FNAT classification score and in-person memory performance

The FNAT and the VLMT/ CERAD are assumed to reflect a similar construct. To test this assumption, we have calculated the correlation coefficient Yules Q for the association between the classification “memory deficit” (in-person testing) and a variable reflecting the FNAT performance. For this FNAT variable, the FNAT results were classified in the same manner as the VLMT/ CERAD results in the in-person testing: If a participant showed a deficit in two or more FNAT variables (learning, delayed recall, recognition), we assigned a “1” (= deficit) in the “FNAT classification”, otherwise we assigned a “0” (= no deficit). There is a strong association (Yules Q = .811) between the classification based on in-person memory tests and on the FNAT (see table 2). This high convergent validity of classification supports the notion that the tests are related to the same construct.

Table S2: Descriptive data and correlation between the classification based on the FNAT performance and the in-person memory test.

		FNAT classification		
		0 (no deficit)	1 (deficit)	sum
memory	0 (no deficit)	138	27	165
	1 (deficit)	8	15	23
sum		146	42	
Yules Q = .811				

	B	SE	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)	CI Exp(B)
age	-.028	.015	3.464	1	.063	.973	[.945. 1.001]
education	.259	.473	.299	1	.584	1.295	[.513. 3.274]
GDS	-.152	.562	.074	1	.786	.859	[.286. 2.581]
CPI	.187	.498	.141	1	.707	1.205	[.455. 3.197]
FNAT learning	1.138	.597	3.641	1	.056	3.122	[.970. 10.052]
FNAT delayed recall	1.698	.541	9.865	1	.002**	5.462	[1.893. 15.758]
FNAT recognition	.432	.513	.707	1	.400	1.540	[.563. 4.210]
A' (F)	1.368	.615	4.952	1	.026*	3.928	[1.177. 13.107]
A' (CF)	.618	.834	.549	1	.459	1.855	[.362. 9.510]
constant	-1.293	.865	2.234	1	.135	.275	

Chi² (9) = 59.836. p <.001***

Nagelkerke Index = .409

	B	SE	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)	CI Exp(B)
age	-.022	.017	1.692	1	.193	.978	[.947. 1.011]
education	.224	.547	.167	1	.683	1.251	[.428. 3.656]
GDS	.359	.575	.391	1	.532	1.433	[.464. 4.422]
CPI	.673	.633	1.129	1	.288	1.961	[.566. 6.786]
FNAT learning	.850	.653	1.690	1	.194	2.339	[.650. 8.417]
FNAT delayed recall	1.434	.600	5.712	1	.017*	4.195	[1.294. 13.596]
FNAT recognition	-.290	.608	.228	1	.633	.748	[.227. 2.463]
A' (F)	1.488	.659	5.094	1	.024*	4.426	[1.216. 16.110]
A' (CF)	-.286	.832	.118	1	.731	.751	[.147. 3.846]
constant	-2.592	.980	6.997	1	.008**	.075	

Chi² (9) = 28.301. p <.001***

Nagelkerke Index = .250

	B	SE	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)	CI Exp(B)
age	-.016	.019	.771	1	.380	.984	[.949. 1.020]
education	.467	.609	.588	1	.443	1.596	[.483. 5.267]
GDS	-.482	.762	.400	1	.527	.618	[.139. 2.750]
CPI	-.656	.648	1.024	1	.312	.519	[.146. 1.848]
FNAT learning	.518	.695	.554	1	.457	1.678	[.429. 6.559]
FNAT delayed recall	1.711	.721	5.626	1	.018*	5.536	[1.346. 22.769]
FNAT recognition	.921	.639	2.077	1	.150	2.511	[.718. 8.784]
A' (F)	.744	.734	1.027	1	.311	2.103	[.499. 8.863]
A' (CF)	1.558	.847	3.386	1	.066	4.750	[.903. 24.977]
constant	-.016	.019	.771	1	.380	.984	

Chi² (9) = 41.511. p <.001***

Nagelkerke Index = .378

3.4 Executive Function

Table S6. A binary logistic regression analyses for an executive deficit in the in-person testing was calculated. The model returned non-significant. Therefore, the model was not reduced any further. significance level: $p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$, $p < .001^{***}$

	B	SE	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)	CI Exp(B)
age	.002	.037	.003	1	.955	1.002	[.931, 1.078]
education	.239	1.272	.035	1	.851	1.270	[.105, 15.349]
GDS	-17.717	5959.416	.000	1	.998	.000	.000
CPI	18.417	4587.088	.000	1	.997	99681111.205	.000
FNAT learning	1.637	1.832	.798	1	.372	5.139	[.142, 186.392]
FNAT delayed recall	-1.317	2.104	.392	1	.531	.268	[.004, 16.570]
FNAT recognition	.543	1.725	.099	1	.753	1.721	[.058, 50.638]
A' (F)	-16.924	7211.637	.000	1	.998	.000	.000
A' (CF)	-16.619	9372.547	.000	1	.999	.000	.000
constant	-21.719	4587.089	.000	1	.996	.000	

Chi² (9) = 8.344, $p = .500$

Nagelkerke Index = .230
