



ABUEL

Matrix of Instruments

for Measuring Health and Well-being of People between 60 and 84 Years



ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
Questions on socio-demographic variables, care services, nutrition, physical activity, leisure activities											
-	-	Lindert, Soares	Age, sex, income, living conditions, education, profession, household members, migration/nationality/ethnicity, religion	9	-	No formal reliability or validity reports.	Elderly in the general population	-	-	5-7	free
-	-	Soares	Care Services/ Health Care Use	7	-	No formal reliability or validity reports.	Elderly in the general population	-	-	1	free
-	-	Soares	Nutrition	4	-	No formal reliability or validity reports.	Elderly in the general population	-	-	1	free
-	-	Soares	Physical activities	4	-	No formal reliability or validity reports.	Elderly in the general population	-	-	1	free
-	-	Soares	Leisure activities	1	-	No formal reliability or validity reports.	Elderly in the general population	-	-	1	free
Pain											
Faces Pain	FPS-R	Taylor LJ, Harris J, Epps C, et al. Psy-	Pain	6 faces	x	No formal reliability or validity re-	Preferred by African-	High validity	-	1	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
Scale-Revised		chometric evaluation of selected pain intensity scales for use in cognitively impaired and cognitively intact older adults. Rehab Nurs 2005;30(2):55–61.				ports.	Americans Hispanics				
Iowa Pain Thermometer Scale	IPT	Herr K, Spratt KF, Garand L. Evaluation of the Iowa Pain Thermometer and other selected pain intensity scales in younger and older adult cohorts using controlled clinical pain. Pain Med 2007; 8(7):585–600.	Pain	12	x	Herr K, Spratt KF, Garand L. Evaluation of the Iowa Pain Thermometer and Other Selected Pain Intensity Scales in Younger and Older Adult Cohorts Using Controlled Clinical Pain. Pain Med 2007 8(7):585–600.	Excellent for patients whose cognitive deficits are moderate to severe.	Low reliability	Evaluated in Caucasian and African American older adults	1	free
Mc Gill Pain Questionnaire	MPQ	Melzack R. The McGill Pain Questionnaire: Major properties and scoring methods. Pain. 1975;1:277–99.	Pain	-	x	Stein C, Mendl G. The German counterpart to McGill Pain Questionnaire. Pain 1988;32:251–5.	-	High reliability, high sensitivity	Evaluated in Caucasian and African American older adults	3	free
Numeric Rating Scale	NRS	Ware J, Epps C, Herr K, et al. Evaluation of the revised faces pain scale, verbal descriptor scale, numeric rating scale, and Iowa pain ther-	Pain	1	x	Rodriguez C. Pain measurement in the elderly: A review. Pain Man Nurs 2001;2(2):38–46.	Healthy elderly	Less validity among mentally impaired elderly	Evaluated in Caucasian and African American older adults	1	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
		mometer in older minority adults. Pain Man Nurs 2006; 7(3):117–25.									
Visual analogue scale	VAS	LeBel AA. Assessment of pain. In: Ballantyne JC, Fishman SM, Abdi S (eds). The Massachusetts General Hospital Handbook of Pain Management, 2 nd ed. Boston: Little Brown; 2002:58–75.	Pain	-	-	Rodriguez C. Pain measurement in the elderly: A review. Pain Man Nurs 2001;2(2):38–46.	General population	Low reliability	Easy to administer	1	free
Verbal Descriptor Scale	VDS	Taylor LJ, Harris J, Epps C, et al. Psychometric evaluation of selected pain intensity scales for use in cognitively impaired and cognitively intact older adults. Rehab Nurs 2005;30(2):55–61.	Pain	-	x	Rodriguez C. Pain measurement in the elderly: A review. Pain Man Nurs 2001; 2(2):38–46.	Impaired elderly	Low validity	-	1	free
Pain Questionnaire	-	Grossi G, Soares JJ, Angesleva J, et al. Psychosocial correlates of long-term sick-leave among patients with musculoskeletal pain. Pain (Netherlands), Apr 1999, 80(3):607-19. Jablonska B, Soares	Pain	12	x	Jablonska B, Soares JJ, Sundin O, et al. Age and musculoskeletal pain. Int J Behav Med (United States) 2003;10(2):181–90.	General population	-	-	10	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
		JJ, Sundin O. Pain among women: associations with socio-economic and work conditions. Eur J Pain 2006 Jul;10(5):435–47.									
Functional status											
Katz Index of Independence in Activities of Daily Living	ADL	Katz S, Akpom CA. A measure of primary sociobiological functions. Int J Health Serv 1976;6:493–507.	Activities in daily living	6	x	No formal reliability or validity reports.	Non-institutionalized, institutionalized elderly	Activities of daily living	High sensitivity	x	free
Barthel Index	BI	Mahoney FI, Barthel DW. Functional evaluation: The Barthel ADL index. MD State Med J 1965;14:61–5.	Activities and abilities in daily living	10	x	No formal reliability or validity reports.	Clinical settings	Observation of behaviour (generally about 24 h minimum)	Broadly used	Observation of behaviour (generally about 24 h minimum)	free
Gießener Beschwerdebogen	GBB-24	Brähler E, Scheer JW. Der Gießener Beschwerdebogen (GBB) (2. Aufl). Bern: Huber 1995.	Activities and abilities in daily living	24	x	Schneider G, Driesch G, Kruse A, et al. Ageing styles: Subjective wellbeing and somatic complaints in inpatients aged 60 years and over. Psychother Psychosom 2003; 72:324–32.	General population	German	High reliability, high sensitivity	Self-assessment 5-10	free
Instru-	IADL	Lawton MP, Brody	Activities	31	x	-	Elderly	Observation	-	Observation	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
ment-al Activities		EM. Gerontologist 1969; 9:179–86.	and abilities in daily living					of behaviour			
Physical Health											
Case Vignettes	-	Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE)	Physical health	-	x	Dale J, Middleton H. Factors influencing general practitioners' management of psychosocial and physical problems: a study using case vignettes. Br J Gen Pract 1990; 40(336):284–8.	General population	Low reliability	-	10	free
Medical Outcomes Study	SF-36, SF-36v2	Gandek B, Ware JJ. Methods for validating and norming translations of health status questionnaires: the IQ-OLA Project approach. International Quality of Life Assessment. J Clin Epidemiol 1998;51:953–9.	General health status	36	56	Lim LL, Seubsman S-A, Sleigh A. Thai SF-36 health survey: tests of data quality, scaling assumptions, reliability and validity in healthy men and women. H Qual L Outcom 2008;6:52.	General population, validated for the elderly	-	High reliability and sensitivity	5-10	Folder with manual incl. disc and questionnaire €238
Screening für somatoforme Störungen	SOMS-2	Rief W, Hiller W, Heuser J. SOMS - das Screening für somatoforme Störungen. Bern: Huber; 1997.	Physical health	68	-	Rief W, Hiller W, Heuser J. SOMS - das Screening für somatoforme Störungen. Bern: Huber; 1997.	General population	German	High sensitivity	10	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
Cognition											
AB Cognitive Screen	ABCS	Molloy W. Administration & Scoring Guideline: a practical guide to the abcd's short comprehensive screen. Dundas: Newgrange Press Ltd;2003:11-8.	Cognitive abilities	9	x	Molloy DW, IM Stan-dish T, Lewis D L. Screening for Mild Cognitive Impairment: Comparing the SMMSE and the AB-CS. Can J Psychiatr, 2005; 50(1):52-8.	Geriatric patients	Education significantly influenced ABCS scores, except for the ABCS in MCI subjects	-	3-5	-
Abbreviated Mental Test	AMT	Hodkinson HM. Evaluation of a mental test score for assessment of mental impairment in the elderly. Age Aging 1972;1:233-8.	Cognitive abilities/ Mental impairment	10	x	Chu LW, Pei CKW, Ho MH, et al. Validation of the abbreviated Mental Test in the elderly medical patient. HK Med J 1995;1:207-11.	Elderly , according to the DSM-III-R criteria	Medical patients	Compared with the MMSE, AMT was simpler and quicker to use	5	free
Cognitive Capacity Screening Examination	CCSE	Jacobs EA. Psychological/cognitive testing in an ambulatory set-ting. Prim Care 1982;9(1):161-5.	Cognitive abilities	30	x	Meyer JS, Li Y-S, Thornby J. Validating mini-mental status, cognitive capacity screening and Hamilton depression scales utilizing subjects with vascular headaches. Intern J Geriatr Psychiatr 2001;16(4):430-5.	General population	False-negative rate: 53. Scores are effected by education; impaired English language comprehension	Specificity: 92.2, when headache-free; sensitivity: 83.7 during headache intervals	10	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
Mental Status Assessment of Older Adults: Mini-Cog	Mini-Cog	Borson S, Scanlan JM, Brush M, et al. The Mini-Cog: A cognitive 'vital signs' measure for dementia screening in multilingual elderly. <i>In-tern J Geriatr Psychiatr</i> 2000;15(11):1021–27.	Cognitive impairment	3	x	Doerflinger DM. Mental Status Assessment of Older Adults: The Mini-Cog. Try this: Best practice in Nursing Care to older adults 2007; 3.	Elderly and general population	Scoring demented - non-demented	Sensitivity: 76-99%, specificity: 89-93%; high predictive value in multiple settings	3	free
Mini-Mental-Status Test	MMSE	Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. Mini-Mental State. A practical method for grading the state of patients for the clinician. <i>J Psychiatr Res</i> 1975;12:189–98.	Cognitive abilities	30	x	Crum RM, Anthony JC, Bassett SS, et al. Population-based norms for the Mini-Mental State Examination by age and educational level. <i>JAMA</i> 1993; 269:2386–91.	Elderly general population	Age and education related	Normative data on age and educational attainment	3-10	free
Modified Mini-Mental-State	3MS/3MS-R	Teng EL, Chui HC. The Modified Mini-Mental State (3MS) Examination. <i>J Clin Psychiatry</i> 1987;48:314–8.	Cognitive abilities	15/16	x	Bland RC, Newman SC. Mild dementia or cognitive impairment: the Modified Mini-Mental State examination as a screen for dementia. <i>Can J Psychiatry</i> 2001; 46(6):506–10.	Elderly general population	Widely used for screening	Normative data on age and educational attainment	10	free
Orientation Memory Con-	OMC	Katzman R, Brown T, Fuld P, et al. Validation of a short	Cognitive functioning	6	x	Wade DT, Vergis E. The Short Orientation-Memory-	Elderly general population	Observer rating	Pearson's correlation: =.992	10	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
centration Test		orientation-memory-concentration test of cognitive impairment. Am J Psychiatry 1983;140:734–9.				Concentration Test: a study of its reliability and validity. Clin Rehabil 1999;13(2):164–70.					
Standardized Mini Mental-Status Test	SMM SE	Molloy DW. Standardized Mini Mental Examination. New Grange Press, Troy, Ontario. 1999	Cognitive abilities	12 - 20	x	Molloy DW, Stan-dish T, Lewis DL. Screening for Mild Cognitive Impairment: Comparing the SMM-SE and the AB-CS. Can J Psychiatry, 2005; 50(1):52–8.	Elderly general population	-	Normative data on age, educational attainment	12	free
Short Portable Mental status questionnaire	SPMS Q	Pfeiffer E. A short portable mental status questionnaire for the assessment of organic brain deficit in elderly patients. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1975; 23: 433–41.	Cognitive functioning	10	x	Welch DC, West RL, Chodosh J, et al. The Short Portable Mental Status Questionnaire: assessing cognitive ability in nursing home residents. Nurs Res 1999; 48(6):329–32.	Elderly general population	Low sensitivity, adjustments for education level necessary	Quick and easy to administer Many validation studies	<5	free
Kokmen Short Test of Mental Status	STMS	Kokmen E, Naes-sens JM, Offord KP. A short test of mental status. Description and preliminary results. Mayo Clin Proc 1987;62:281–8.	Cognitive functioning	23	26	Kokmen E, Smith GE, Petersen RC, et al. The short test of mental status. Correlations with standardized psychometric testing.	Elderly general population	Results may not be generalisable to elderly individuals with low educational attainment	Sensitivity: 86.4; specificity: 93.5.	5	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
						Arch Neurol 199;48(7): 725–8.					
Quality of Life											
Multidimensional Comprehensive Quality of Life Scale	Com-QOL (15)	Cummins RA, McCabe MP, Romeo Y. The Comprehensive Quality of Life Scale Instrument. Development and Psychometric evaluation on College Staff and Students. Educational and Psychol Meas 1994;54(2):372–82.	Quality of life	35	German	Man DW, Lee EW, Tong EC, et al. Health services needs and quality of life assessment of individuals with brain injuries: a pilot cross-sectional study. Brain Inj 2004; 18(6):577–91.	General population	Validation for elderly: unknown	High validity	45	free
Medical Outcomes Study / HRQOL	MOS Core Functioning and Well-being	Stewart AL, Sherbourne CD, Hays RD, et al. Summary and discussion of MOS measures. In: Stewart AL, Ware JE (eds) Measuring Functioning and Well-being: The Medical Outcomes Study Approach. Durham: Duke University Press; 1992, 345–71.	Core Functioning and Well-being	116	x	Wu AW, Hays RD, Kelly S, et al. Applications of the Medical Outcomes Study health-related quality of life measures in HIV/AIDS. Qual Life Res 1997;6(6): 531–54.	General population	Very long	-	50-62	free
Personal Well-Being Index	PWI	Cummins RA. ComQol: Caveats to using the Comprehensive Quality of Life Scale Welcome:	Quality of life, subjective well-being	8	Italian, Portuguese, Spanish	Cummins RA, Hunter B, Davern M, et al. The Australian Unity Wellbeing Index:	General population	No special design for use with elderly people.	Cronbach alpha: .70 and .85.	Further information is requested	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
		The Personal Well-being Index; 2002.				An Overview. Social Indicators Network News 2003;76:1–4.					
SF-36 Health Survey Questionnaire	SF-36	Gandek B, Ware JJ. Methods for validating and norming translations of health status questionnaires: the IQOLA Project approach. International Quality of Life Assessment. J Clinic Epidemiol 1998;51:953–59.	General health status	36	More than 30	Lim LL, Seubsman S-A, Sleigh A. Thai SF-36 health survey: tests of data quality, scaling assumptions, reliability and validity in healthy men and women. H Qual L Outcom 2008;6:52.	General population	-	Widely used, intercultural validated	5 – 15	free
The World Health Organisation, Quality of Life	WHO-QOL BREF	WHOQOL Group. Development of the World Health Organization WHO-QOLBREF quality of life assessment. Psychol Med 1998;28:551–8.	Subjective life quality	26	x	The WHOQOL Group. The World Health Organization quality of life assessment (WHO-QOL): development and general psychometric properties 1998.	Adults (18-85)	Intercultural validated	Age-graded reference values for age range 18 to 85 years are available.	7	free
WHO-QOL-OLD		Power M, Quinn K, Schmidt S, and WHOQOL-OLD Group. Development of the WHOQOL-Old Module. Qual Life Res 2005;14(10):2197–214.	Quality of life in older adults	24	Involvement of 22/ 23 centres worldwide	Halvorsrud L, Kalfoss M, Diseth A. Reliability and validity of the Norwegian WHOQOL-OLD module. Scand J Caring Sci 2008;22(2):292–305.	older adults >60	-	Cross-cultural	10	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
Social Support											
Family Emotional Involvement and Criticism Scale	FEICS	Shields C, Franks P, Harp J, et al. Development of the Family Emotion Involvement and Criticism Scale (FEICS): A self-report scale to measure expressed emotion. J Mar Fam Ther 1992;18(4):395–407.	Family emotional involvement and criticism.	14	Spanish	Leung KK, Chen CY, Lue BH, et al. Social support and family functioning on psychological symptoms in elderly Chinese. Arch Gerontol Geriatr 2007;44 (2):203–13.	Clinic, general population	-	Many validations	3	free
Lubben Social Network Scale	LSNS	Lubben J, Gironde M. Measuring social networks and assessing their benefits. In Social Networks and Social Exclusion: Sociological and Policy Perspectives; 2004.	Social support	10	x	Chi IC, Yip PS, Chiu HF, et al. Prevalence of depression and its correlates in Hong Kong's Chinese older Adults. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 2005;13(5):409–16.	Elderly and general population	-	-	5-10	free
MOS Social Support Survey	MOS-SSS	Sherbourne CD, Stewart A. The MOS Social Support Survey. Soc Sci Med 1991;32:705–14.	Social support	19	x	Anderson D, Bilodeau B, Deshaies G, et al. French-Canadian validation of the MOS Social Support Survey. Can J Cardiol 2005, 21(10):867–73.	Patients with chronic conditions	The self-administered scale does not include identification of sources of support	High validity for chronically ill persons.	5	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support	MSPSS	Zimet G, Dahlem N, Zimet S, et al. The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. J Personality Assessment 1988;52:30–41.	Social support	12	x	Loughlin A. Depression and social support: effective treatments for homebound elderly adults. J Gerontol Nurs 2004;30(5):11–5.	Elderly general population	Moderate construct validity	Good internal and test-retest reliability, simple to use	5	free
Norbeck Social Support Questionnaire	NSSQ	Norbeck JS, Lindsey AM, Carrieri VL. The development of an instrument to measure social support. Nurs Res 1982;30:264–9.	Social support, subscales Affect, Affirmation, and Aid	8	-	Sung KW. Influencing variables on life satisfaction of Korean elders in institutions. J Korean Acad Nurs 2003; 3(8):1093–100.	Elderly general population	-	-	3	free
Oslo Social Support Scale	OSS-3	Meltzer H. Development of a common instrument for mental health. In Nosikov A, Gudex C (eds.) EUROHIS: Developing common instruments for health surveys. Amsterdam: IOS Press; 2003, 35–60.	Social support	3		Dalgard OS, Thapa SB, Hauff E, et al. Health and Disability Immigration, lack of control and psychological distress: Findings from the Oslo Health Study Scandinavian J Psychol 2006; 47:551–58.	General population	-	-	-	free
Mental Health											
General Health Questionnaire	GHQ30	Goldberg DP. The detection of psychiatric illness by ques-	Non psychotic psychiatric	30	x	Cramer D, Henderson S, Scott R. Mental health	General population, high age	Not possible to separate anxiety	10	-	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
naire (30 item scale)		tionnaire. A technique for the identification and assessment of non-psychotic psychiatric illness. Maudsley Monographs; 1972.	disorders			and adequacy of social support: a four-wave panel study. Br J Soc Psychol 1996;35(2):285-95.	included	from depression factors			
General Health Questionnaire (12 item scale)	GHQ12	Goldberg DP, Williams P. A user's guide to the General Health questionnaire. Windsor, UK: NFER-Nelson; 1988.	Non psychotic psychiatric disorders	12	x	Schmitz N, Kruse J, Tress W. Psychometric properties of the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12) in a German primary care. Act Psychiatr Scand 1999;100:462-8.	General population	-	Validated in many cultures	5	free
Symptom Checklist-90-Revised	SCL-90-R	Derogatis LR. The Symptom Checklist-90-revised. Minneapolis, MN: NCS Assessments; 1992.	Symptoms of psychopathology	90	x	Schmitz N, Hartkamp N, Kiuse J, et al. The Symptom Check-List-90-R (SCL-90-R): A German validation study. Qual Life Res 2000;9:185-93.	Individuals 13 years and older	No special norm group of elderly	High internal consistency, gender specific norms	12-15	German version uses copy right
Depression											
Beck depression inventory	BDI	Beck AT, Steer RA. Beck Depression Inventory - Manual, San Antonio: The Psychological Corporation; 1987.	Depression over the past two weeks	21	x	Hautzinger M, Bailer M, Worall H, et al. Testhandbuch BDI Beck Depressions-Inventar. Hans	Age range: 13-80.	DSM-IV criteria.	Good validity	15	Record forms, Pack of 100: £145

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
						Huber: Bern, 1995					
Beck Depressions-Inventar (BDI-II), Revision	BDI II	Beck Depression Inventory–II (BDI–II). San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Assessment Inc; 1995.	Depression/ depressive disorders	21	x	Segal D, Coolidge F, Cahill BS, et al. Psychometric properties of the Beck Depression Inventory II (BDI-II) among community-dwelling older adults. Behav Modif 2008;32(1):3–20.	Adolescents from 13 years on and adults	TBS-TK	-	10	Pack of 100: £145
Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale	CES-D	Radloff LS. The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. Appl Psychol Meas 1977; 1:385–401.	Depression	20	English, Spanish	Spijker J, van der Wurff FB, Poort EC, et al. Depression in first generation labour migrants in Western Europe: the utility of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D). Int J Geriatr Psychiatr 2004; 19(6):538–44.	General population	Potential important symptoms of depression in the elderly not included	Sensitivity: 74–93; specificity: 70–87	2-3	free
Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale–	CES-D-R	Gallo JJ, Rabins PV. Depression without sadness: alternative presentation of depression in late life, Am Fam Phys 1999; 60:820–26.	Depression	20	German Swedish	Prince M, Reischies F, Beekman ATF, et al. Development of the EURO-D scale - a European Union initia-	General population	Potential important symptoms of depression in the elderly not included	Sensitivity: .63-.94; specificity: .49- .95	5-6	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
Revised Version						tive to compare symptoms of depression in 14 European centres. Br J Psychiatr 1996;174:330-8.					
Center for Epidemiologic Studies Short Depression Scale	CES-D-10	Andresen EM, Malmgren JA, Carter WB, Patrick DL. Screening for depression in well older adults: evaluation of a short form of the CES-D (Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale). Am J Prev Med 1994;10:77-84.	Depression	10	Spanish	Powers JR, Young AF, Russell A, et al. Implications of non response of older women to a short form of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale. Int J Aging 2003;57(1):37-54	General population and elderly	Does not fit the DSM-IV criteria	-	2-3	free
Euro-D scale	Euro-D	Prince M, Reischies F, Beekman AT, et al. Development of the EURO-D scale. A European Union initiative to compare symptoms of depression in 14 European centres. Br J Psychiatr 1999; 174, 330-8.	Depression	12	x	Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE); http://www.share-project.org/t3/share/index.php?id=69 ; Access: 2008-07-30.	Subjects 65+, general population	Psychometric properties not well established	-	5	free
Yesavage Geriatric Depression Scale	GDS	Yesavage JA, Brink TL, Rose TL, et al. Development and validation of a geriatric depression screening scale: a	Geriatric Depression	30	Spanish	Torres RM, Miralles R, Garcia-Caselles MP, et al. Observational scale and geriatric depression	Elderly	-	-	6	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
		preliminary report. J Psychiatr Res 1983;17:37-49.				scale of Yesavage to identify depressive symptoms in older patients. Arch Gerontol Geriatr Suppl 2004;(9):437-42.					
Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS)	GDS-30	Yesavage JA, Brink TL, Rose TL, et al. Development and validation of a geriatric depression screening scale: A preliminary report. J Psychiatr Res 1983;17:37-49.	Depression	30	x	Gauggel S, Birckner B. Diagnostik depressiver Störungen bei älteren Menschen. Eine Übersicht über die Entwicklung und Evaluation der Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS). Zeitschrift für Gerontopsychologie und -psychiatrie 1998;11:159-71.	Elderly	High sensitivity, specificity	Sensitivity: 92% Specificity: 89%	4-6	free
Geriatric Depression scale (GDS) (short version)	GDS-15	Sheikh JI, Yesavage JA. Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS). Recent evidence and development of a shorter version. In Brink TL. Clinical Gerontology: A Guide to Assessment and Intervention. NY: The Haworth Press; 1986:165-73.	Depression	15	x	Salamero M, Marcos T. Factor study of the Geriatric Depression Scale. Act Psychiatr Scand; 86(4):283-6.	Elderly	Information is requested	Sensitivity: 82-100; specificity: 72-82	2-3	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
Geriatric Depression scale (5-item version)	GDS-5	Hoyl MT, Alessi CA, Harker JO, et al. Development and testing of a five-item version of the Geriatric Depression Scale. J Am Geriatr Soc 1999;47(7):873-8.	Depression	5	x	Weeks SK, McGann PE, Michaels TK, et al. Comparing various short-form Geriatric Depression Scales leads to the GDS-5/15. J Nurs Scholars 2003;35(2):133-7	Elderly	2	Sensitivity: 97%; specificity: 85%	2	free
Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale	HADS, HADS-D (sub-scale on depression)	Zigmont AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. Act Psychiatr Scand 1983; 67:361-70. Snaith RP, Zigmont AS. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale: Manual. Windsor: NFER-Nelson;1994.	Depression, Anxiety	14 (7 items on depression: 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13)	x	Bjelland I, Dahl AA, Haug TT, et al. The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. An updated literature review. J Psychosom Res. 2002;52(2):69-77.	General population	-	sensitivity and specificity for both HADS-A and HADS-D of approximately 0.80	2-6	free
The Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression	HRS-D	Hamilton MA. Rating scale for depression. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1960;23:56-62.	Depression	21	x	Shah A, Herbert R, Lewis S, et al. Screening for depression among acutely ill geriatric inpatients with a short Geriatric Depression Scale. Age Ageing 1997;26:217-21.	Patients	Rating by observer	Sensitivity: 86%, specificity: 80%	Ratings by observer	free
The Hopkins	HSCL-25	Derogatis LR, Lipman RS, Rickels K,	Depression, anxiety	25	x	Frojd K, Hakansson A,	General population	-	Used in about 60 popula-	10	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
Symptom Checklist-25		et al. The Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL): A measure of primary symptom dimensions. In Psychological Measurements in Psychopharmacology, Modern Problems in Pharmacopsychiatry (ed. P. Pichot). Basel, Switzerland: Karger; 1974.	ety			Karlsson I. The Hopkins Symptom Checklist-25 is a sensitive case-finder of clinically important depressive states in elderly people in primary care. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry 2004; 19(4):386–90.			tions.		
Montgomery Asperg	MADRS	Montgomery S, Asperg M. A new depression scale designed to be sensitive to change. Brit J Psychiatr 1979; 134, 382–9.	Depression	15	German	-	Psychiatric patients	Patients	-	3	-
Zung Self-rating Depression Scale	SDS	Zung WWK. A self-rating depression scale. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1965;12: 63–70.	Depression	20		Thurber S, Snow M, Honts CR. The Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale: convergent validity and diagnostic discrimination. Assessment 2002; 9(4):401–5.	General population	Validity coefficients have shown greater variability across studies	Sensitivity: 80%; specificity: 85%.	10	free
Anxiety											
Beck-Anxiety	BAI	Beck AT & Steer RA (1990). Manual for	Anxiety	21		Dennis RE, Bodington SJ, Fun-	Standardised on		High validity	5-10	Complete

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
inventory		the Beck Anxiety Inventory. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation.				nell NJ. Self-report measures of anxiety: are they suitable for older adults? Aging Ment Health 2007;11(6):668-77.	clinical and non-clinical samples				kit: £73.50 (£79.50 inc VAT).
Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale	HADS, HADS-A (sub-scale anxiety)	Zigmont AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. Act Psychiatr Scand 1983; 67: 361-70. Snaith RP, Zigmont AS. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale: Manual. Windsor: NFER-Nelson; 1994.	Depression, Anxiety	14 (7 items on anxiety: item 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14)	-	Bjelland I, Dahl AA, Haug TT, et al. The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. An updated literature review. J Psychosom Res. 2002; 52(2):69-77.	General population	-	sensitivity and specificity for both HADS-A and HADS-D of approximately 0.80	2-6	
Hamilton anxiety rating scale	HAM-A / HAM-S	Hamilton M. The assessment of anxiety states by rating. Br J Med Psychol 1959;32:50-5.	Anxiety	14	-	-	Clinical interview	Observer rating	-	-	free
The Hopkins Symptom Checklist-25	HSCL-25	Derogatis LR, Lipman RS, Rickels K, et al. (1974). The Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL): A measure of primary symptom dimensions. In Psychological Measure-	Depression, Anxiety	25	x	Frojd K, Hakansson A, Karlsson I. The Hopkins Symptom Checklist-25 is a sensitive case-finder of clinically important depressive	General population	-	Sensitive, specific	10	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
		ments in Psychopharmacology, Modern Problems in Pharmacopsychiatry (ed. P. Pichot). Basel, Switzerland: Karger.				states in elderly people in primary care. Int J Geriatr Psych 2004; 19(4):386–90.					
Zung self-rating Anxiety Scale	SAS	Zung WWK. A rating instrument for anxiety disorders. Psychosomatics 1971;12:371–9.	Anxiety	20	-	Taylor R, Lovibond P, Nicholas MK, et al. The utility of somatic items in the assessment of depression in patients with chronic pain: a comparison of the Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale and the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales in chronic pain and clinical and community samples. Clin J Pain 2005;21(1):91–100.	-	-	-	10	free
State-Trait Anxiety	STAI	Spielberger CD, Gorsuch RL, Lushene RE. State-Trait Anxiety (STAI) Manual. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press; 1970.	Anxiety	40	-	-	General population	-	-	10-20	Bundle of 500 (\$0.60 each), \$300 for larger quant.

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
Adjustment Disorder, Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD)											
Maercker Adjustment disorder	AJD	Maercker A, Forstmeier S,ENZler A, et al. Adjustment disorders, posttraumatic stress disorder, and depressive disorders in old age: findings from a community survey. Compr Psychiatry 2008;49(2):113–20.	Adjustment disorder	20	-	Developed for the elderly	-	-	-	5	free
Impact of Event Scale	IES	Horowitz M, Wilner N, Alvarez W. Impact of Event Scale: a measure of subjective stress. Psychosom Med 1979; 41(3):209–18.	Trauma Symptoms	22	x	Sundin EC, Horowitz MJ. Horowitz's Impact of Event Scale evaluation of 20 years of use. Psychosom Med. 2003; 65(5): 870–6.	General population	-	-	5	free
PTSD Checklist - Civilian Version	PCL-C	Weathers FL, Herman DS, Huska JA, et al. The PTSD Checklist (PCL): Reliability, validity, and diagnostic utility. Trauma, Coping and Adaptation, San Antonio, Texas: International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies, 1993.	Trauma symptoms	17	x	Blanchard EB, Jones AJ, Buckley TC, et al. Psychometric properties of the PTSD Checklist (PCL). Behav Res Ther 1996; 34:669–73.	General population	-	-	-	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
Posttraumatic symptom scale	PTSS-10	Raphael B, Lundin T, Weisaeth L. A Research Method for the study of psychological and psychiatric Aspects of Disaster. Act Psychiatr Scand, 1989 (Suppl. 353) 80.	Trauma symptoms	10	x	Stoll C, Kapfhammer HP, Rothenhausler HB, et al. Sensitivity and specificity of a screening test to document traumatic experiences and to diagnose post-traumatic stress disorder in ARDS patients after intensive care treatment. Intens Care Med 1999; 25:697–704.	General population	Has been developed before the 1994 DMS-IV- revision.	Sensitivity 77% (95% CI: 54-100%), specificity 98% (CI: 91-100%).	3	free
Short Screening Scale for DSM-IV PTSD	-	Breslau N, Peterson EL, Kessler RC, et al. Short screening scale for DSM-IV posttraumatic stress disorder. Am J Psychiatr 1999; 156:908–11.	Trauma symptoms	7		De Albuquerque A, Soares C, De Jesus PM. Post-traumatic stress disorder. Assessment of its rate of occurrence in the adult population of Portugal, Act Med Port 2003; 16:309–20.	-	-	-	-	
Alcohol / Tobacco Use											
Alcohol use disorder identification	AUDIT	Babor TF, de la Fuente JR, Saunders J, et al. The alcohol use disorder	Alcohol related behaviours	10	x	Babor TF, Higgins-Biddle JC, Saunders JB, et al. AUDIT: The	Normal population	-	Mandated by the World Health Organisation	-	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
test		ders identification test: Guidelines for use in primary health care. Geneva: World Health Organization: Division of Mental Health; 1989.				Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test: Guidelines for Use in Primary Care, 2 nd ed; 1992.					
	CAGE	Ewing JA. Detecting alcoholism: The CAGE Questionnaire. JAMA 1984; 252(14):1905–7.	Alcohol related behaviours	4		Moore AA, Seeman T, Morgestern H, et al. Are there differences between older persons who screen positive on the CAGE questionnaire and the Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test-Geriatric Version? J Am Geriatr Soc 2002; 50(5):858–62.	Geriatric Assessment, general population	-	-	-	free
Michigan Alcoholism Screening Instrument – Geriatric Version	SMAST-G	Blow FC, Brower KJ, Schulenberg JE, et al. The Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test–Geriatric Version (MAST-G): A new elderly-specific screening instrument. Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research 1992;	Alcohol related behaviours	10		Moore AA, Seeman T, Morgestern H, et al. Are there differences between older persons who screen positive on the CAGE questionnaire and the Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening	General population	Sensitivity: 93.9%; specificity: 78.1%; positive predictive value: 87.2%; negative predictive value: 88.9%.	-	-	

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
		16,372.				Test-Geriatric Version? J Am Geriatr Soc 2002; 50(5):858-62.					
Smoking	-	Soares	Smoking	3	-	-	General population	-	Short	1	free
Violence, abuse, neglect											
Conflict-Tactic-Scale	CTS	Straus MA, Gelles RJ, Steinmetz SK. Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family. New York: Anchor Books; 1980.	Violence, abuse	39	x	Straus MA. The conflict tactics scales and its critics: An evaluation and new data on validity and reliability. In: Straus MA & Gelles RJ (Eds.). Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in families (pp. 49-73). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books; 1990.	General population	Restricted to conflict-related violence.	CTS measures the behaviour of both the respondent and the respondent's partner	12-15	\$75 The CTS KIT can be purchased from the publisher for \$75.00.
Exposure to violence in childhood	ETV	Singer MI, Miller DB, Guo S, et al. The mental health consequences of children's exposure to violence; 1998.	Physical violence	2	-	-	General population	-	-	-	free
Hwalek - Seng-	H-S/EAST	Hwalek MA, Sengstock MC. Assess-	Violation of personal	15	x	-	General population	High false negative rate	-	5	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
stock Elder Abuse Screening Test		ing the probability of abuse in the elderly: Toward development of a clinical screening instrument. J Appl Geron 1986; 5(2):153-73.	rights or direct abuse.								
Indicators of abuse screen	IOA	Reis M, Nahmiash D. Validation of the indicators of abuse (IOA) screen. Gerontologist 1998;38:471-80.	Violence, abuse	39	x	Cohen M, Levin S, Gagin R, et al. Development of a screening tool for identifying elderly people at risk of abuse by their care-givers. J Aging Health 2006;18(5):660-85.	General population	-	-	20	free
Index of Spouse Abuse	ISA	Cook SL, Conrad L, Bender M, et al. The internal validity of the index of spouse abuse in African American women. Viol Vict 2003;18(6):641-57.	Violence, abuse	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	free
Revised Conflict tactics Scale	Straus (CTS2)	Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, et al. The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. J Fam Iss 1996; 17:283-316.	Violence, abuse	39	X	Ramirez IL. Acculturation and social integration of Mexican American and Non-Mexican Whites to Assaults on Intimate Partners. Durham, NH: University of New	General population	-	-	10-15	free

ABUEL-Matrix of Instruments

Name of Instrument	Abbreviation	Reference	Variable	Items (no.)	Translations	Validated for the elderly, references	Target group	Disadvantages	Advantages (sensitivity, specificity)	Duration of assessment (min's)	Costs
						Hampshire; 2004.					
Vulnerability to Abuse Screening Scale	VASS	Schofield MJ, Reynolds R, Mishra GD, et al. Screening for vulnerability to abuse among older women: Women's Health Australia study. <i>J Appl Gerontol</i> 2002;21(1):24-39.	Violence, abuse	12	-	Schofield MJ, Mishra GD. Validity of self-report screening scale for elder abuse: Women's Health Australia Study. <i>Gerontologist</i> 2003; 43(1):110-20.	General population	-	-	-	free
-	-	O'Keeffe M, Hills A, Doyle M, et al. UK Study of Abuse and Neglect of Older People: Prevalence Survey Report. London: NatCen, 2007.	Violence, abuse, neglect, financial exploitation	-	no	-	Elderly	Not validated	Provides data which can be compared with other studies on violence against the elderly.	10	free