Sensory-motor and cognitive tests predict driving ability of persons with brain disorders
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Abstract

Objective: Brain disorders can lead to a decreased ability to perform the physical and cognitive functions necessary for safe driving. This study aimed to determine how accurately a battery of computerized sensory-motor and cognitive tests (SMCTests™) could predict driving abilities in persons with brain disorders.

Methods: SMCTests and an independent on-road driving assessment were applied to 50 experienced drivers with brain disorders referred to a hospital-based driving assessment service. The patients comprised 36 males and 14 females, a mean age of 71.3 years (range 43–85 years) and diagnoses of 35 stroke, 4 traumatic brain injury, 4 Alzheimer’s disease, and 7 other. Binary logistic regression (BLR) and nonlinear causal resource analysis (NCRA) were used to build model equations for prediction of on-road driving ability based on SMCTests performance.

Results: BLR and NCRA correctly classified 94% and 90% of referrals respectively as on-road pass or fail. Leave-one-out cross-validation estimated that BLR and NCRA would correctly predict the classification of 86% and 76% respectively of an independent referral group as on-road pass or fail.

Conclusions: Compared with other studies, SMCTests have shown the highest predictive accuracy against true on-road driving ability as estimated in an independent data set and in persons with brain disorders. SMCTests also have the advantage of being able to comprehensively and objectively assess both sensory-motor and higher cognitive functions related to driving.

© 2007 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.
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1. Introduction

Ability to drive is highly valued by most adults and personal transport is used daily for all manner of activities. Unfortunately, a wide variety of brain disorders can lead to impairment of sensory-motor and/or cognitive abilities important for safe driving [1–4]. Thus, it is important that appropriate driving assessment is available to identify persons no longer able to drive safely. For the driver, forfeiture of a driver’s licence can have a marked negative effect on the person’s mobility, and has been linked to depression, lowered self-esteem, and reduced overall quality of life [5]. Therefore, any driving assessment must be thorough, objective, and strive to ensure that all those who fail do so because of marked deficits that would unquestionably lead to unsafe driving.
Where possible, the assessment should also provide failed or borderline subjects with specific information on, and potential consequences of, their deficits, in order to obtain as high a level as possible of acceptance of, and compliance with, assessment and rehabilitation recommendations.

In New Zealand, medical practitioners have a legal obligation to consider medical aspects of fitness to drive when conducting a medical examination to determine if an individual is fit to drive [6]. In cases where there is doubt regarding an individual’s fitness to drive, a practitioner can refer a patient to a specialist driving assessment service. Occupational therapists with skills in driver assessment offer services to meet this need in major centres in New Zealand. Approximately 1400 persons (35 per 100,000) with brain lesions or age-related cognitive decline are referred for a driving assessment in New Zealand (population ~ 4 million) each year. Despite a relatively high demand for specialized driving assessment, an accurate, comprehensive, and standardized off-road assessment procedure has yet to be identified.

Internationally, several groups have investigated the relationship between on-road driving and performance on neuropsychological test batteries [7–16], tests specifically designed for driving-related functions [17–23], and driving simulators [9,24–27]. Researchers have also investigated the relationship between off-road test performance and on-road driving as estimated by crash records [28–31], closed-course driving [32,33], or simulated driving [34–38].

Several of these studies have investigated the relationship between off- and on-road assessment outcome (i.e., Pass or Fail) using classification models, in which the test data is the same as the training data. Classification models have proven to be 70–94% accurate in classifying on-road assessment outcome based on performance on off-road tests [7–9,15–17, 22,27] or driving simulators [27]. A more robust determination of the relationship between off-road assessments and on-road driving outcome can be achieved by studies using predictive models, in which models are trained and tested on separate data groups. Predictive models have proven to be 62–89% accurate in predicting on-road assessment outcome in an independent group of subjects [14,19,23,32,39].

In addition to varying success at identifying at-risk drivers, there is a need for a simple, relatively inexpensive, but comprehensive assessment system that covers both the physical and cognitive deficits underlying an inability to drive safely in certain individuals with neurological disorders. Such an assessment system would need to have a high predictive accuracy for on-road driving ability. We have developed a battery of computerized sensory-motor and cognitive tests (SMCTests™) to quantify sensory-motor and cognitive dysfunction as a research and quantitative assessment tool in neurology and neurorehabilitation, with particular application to the assessment of driving abilities in patients with neurological disorders. The sensory-motor tests comprise tests of visuoperception, ballistic movements, and visuomotor tracking which have already been extensively used as a standalone battery [40,41] to assess sensory-motor dysfunc-

tion in off-road driving assessment [42,43], unilateral stroke [44,45], Parkinson’s disease [46–49], stutters [50], and following alcohol consumption [51]. The cognitive tests were newly developed measures of complex attention, visual search, decision-making, impulse control, planning, and divided attention. These cognitive functions were identified following an analysis of the literature describing (a) perceived cognitive deficits observed during on-road assessment of subjects with brain disorders (e.g., [1–4]) and (b) performance on cognitive tests associated with driving in subjects with brain disorders [8–23,28–30,32,35,36]. The tests were designed to be contextually close to the on-road driving task so as to provide higher face validity than readily available standard neuropsychological tests, to increase user compliance, and encourage optimal prediction of on-road performance. The normative range, reliability, validity, and effect of sex and age on performance of the cognitive tests have been determined in a separate study of 60 healthy control subjects (manuscript in preparation). This showed that, compared with standard tests of related cognitive functions, the new cognitive tests achieved good construct reliability, good test–retest reliability, and subjectively higher face validity. There was a trend for age to have a detrimental effect on performance but sex differences were seen on only one test, with males having superior performance on a ‘planning’ test.

The primary objective of this study was to determine the extent to which performance on SMCTests can be used to predict on-road driving ability in subjects with brain disorders. An accurate prediction of on-road driving would in large part minimize the need for on-road driving assessments for referrals who will ultimately fail, thus decreasing the unnecessary cost and risk of accident these entail. Reducing the proportion of referrals needing an on-road assessment will lead to lower costs or a higher throughput of referrals for the same resources and costs. In addition, a comprehensive evaluation of cognitive and sensory-motor functions will help identify physical, perceptual, and cognitive deficits underlying an inability to drive safely and allow focussed rehabilitation where possible.

2. Methods

2.1. Subjects

A consecutive sample of 50 subjects with brain disorders who had been referred to the Driving and Vehicle Assessment Service (DAVAS) at Burwood Hospital, Christchurch, were recruited to the study over a 14 month period. All subjects wished to return to, or continue, driving despite a medical condition that might have affected their driving ability. Subjects had been referred to DAVAS through general practitioners, the New Zealand Accident Compensation Corporation, or District Health Board practitioners. All referrals had a definite or probable brain disorder as follows: 35 stroke, 4 traumatic brain injury, 4 Alzheimer’s disease, 2 age-related cognitive decline, 1 multiple sclerosis, 1 Parkinson’s disease, 1 hypoxia, and 2 other neurological disorders. They were
required to be free from any unrelated diagnosed psychiatric illness and referrals unable to use their lower limbs to drive were excluded from the study. Referrals either held a current driver’s licence or had held one prior to the brain disorder (mean of 50.5 years driving experience, range 12–69 years). Twenty-six referrals were actively driving at the time of assessment, while 24 referrals had not driven for a mean of 6.2 months prior to assessment (range 1–12 months). There were 36 males and 14 females with a mean age of 71.3 years (range 43–85 years). A further 204 referrals were eligible for the study but declined to participate. The 50 referrals that were tested were closely representative of sex, age, and neurological disorders of the overall group.

To provide a comparison group, 12 healthy control subjects were also recruited to the study. This group comprised two females and two males from each of three age-range groups (20–40 years, 41–60 years, and 61–80 years). Controls had a mean of 34 years driving experience (range 12–57 years). None of the controls had suffered any form of brain injury or had any diagnosed psychiatric, neurological, or musculoskeletal disorder.

Ethical approval for the study was obtained through the New Zealand Canterbury Ethics Committee prior to recruitment and testing.

2.2. Apparatus

Subjects were tested in a modified car body interfaced to a Pentium PC (Fig. 1). They used the steering wheel, indicator stick, accelerator, clutch, and brake pedals (or hand controls) to respond to 80×60 cm computer-generated test stimuli displayed by a data projector on to a wall in front with an eye-to-screen distance of 180 cm (giving a visual angle of +/−11.3°). The SMCTests program, run by an assessor on a separate monitor, generated the tests, analysed performance, stored biographical and test data in a database, and printed performance summaries.

2.3. Sensory-Motor tests

The sensory-motor tests are described in detail elsewhere [40,41,44,46,52]. Briefly, they include three visuoperceptual tests (Visual Resolution, Static Perception, and Dynamic Perception), four visuomotor tests (Ballistic Movement, Footbrake Reaction, Footbrake and Clutch Reaction, and Hand Control Reaction), and three eye-arm tracking tests (Sine Tracking, Random Tracking and Step Tracking) which involve the use of a steering wheel and/or foot pedals. Visual Resolution measured the minimum separation at which a subject is able to identify a dot as being off the centre of a vertical line. Static Perception measured the minimum separation at which a subject is able to identify the tip of an arrow as being off a vertical line and a sinusoidal waveform. Dynamic Perception measured the minimum separation between the point of an arrow and a moving random preview target at which a subject is able to perceive the tip of an arrow as being off the target (as in Fig. 2A but without the 4 horizontally pointing arrows which were used in a subsequent test). Ballistic Movement measured the reaction time and maximum speed at which a subject can turn the steering wheel to move an arrow out of a box and across a pass-line in response to an unexpected signal. Footbrake Reaction measured the reaction and movement times at which a subject can respond to an unexpected signal by moving his or her foot from the accelerator to the brake. Footbrake and Clutch Reaction measured the reaction and movement times at which a subject can respond to an unexpected signal by releasing the accelerator and pressing both the clutch and brake pedals. Hand Control Reaction measured the reaction and movement times at which a subject can respond to an unexpected signal by pushing back on a hand control lever. Tracking measured the accuracy with which a subject can track a laterally moving target using the steering wheel to move an on-screen arrow. The tracking target may move in a sine wave (Sine Tracking), random wave (Random Tracking) (as in Fig. 2A but without the 4 horizontally pointing arrows), or jump to the left or right (Step Tracking).

2.4. Cognitive tests

2.4.1. Divided Attention (Fig. 2A)

This test evaluated ability to divide attention between two simultaneously performed visuo-cognitive activities. The test combined a preview random tracking task with a simultaneous visual scanning task (Arrows Perception). While the subject tracked the random target (8.0 s preview) with the steering wheel, 12 consecutive sets of four arrows were displayed on the same screen. The subject aimed to maintain accurate tracking of the target while scanning the arrows and determining whether or not all 4 arrows were pointing in the same direction. Each set of arrows was displayed on screen...
for 4.8 s, with a 1.0 s delay between sets. The subject was tested separately on the tracking and arrow perception tasks in order to obtain baseline performance data.

2.4.2. Complex Attention (Fig. 2B)

This test assessed ability to sustain complex attention. The subject used the steering wheel to maintain an arrow in a
box on the same side of the screen as a green light symbol. This light symbol alternated between the left and right side of the screen, requiring the subject to turn the steering wheel from left to right repeatedly. Each green light was presented for 3.0–5.0 s. Reaction, movement, and total times were measured to give indications of slowed information processing, mental and physical fatigue, and lapses in concentration.

2.4.4. Decision-Making (Fig. 2D)

This test assessed visual scanning and selective attention, including left-right or central-peripheral vision bias, and comprised 20 trials of static images, each containing 70 road-sign stimuli. Each screen was presented for a maximum of 10 s. The subject searched each image for one of two target stimuli — a ‘turn-left arrow’ or a ‘turn-right arrow’. Only one of the two target stimuli was present on any trial. If the ‘turn-left arrow’ was presented, the subject was required to turn the steering wheel towards the left as quickly as possible, and conversely for the ‘turn-right arrow’. Examples of the target stimuli were shown in a box at the top of all images.

2.4.5. Planning (Fig. 2E)

This test assessed ability to use accurate timing and judgement as an indicator of planning ability. The subject was presented with images of a bird’s eye perspective of an intersection involving two or more cars. A blue car near the bottom of the image represented the subject’s car, with all other cars being yellow. Orange indicator lights signalled the driving intention of each car. A blue arrow extended off the front of the subject’s car to indicate intended direction of travel. For each screen, the subject needed to decide as quickly as possible whether it was necessary to give way to another car and press brake, or whether it was safe to proceed and press accelerator. The 26 trials were split into 12 basic trials (subject’s car and one other car) and 14 complex trials (subject’s car and 3–6 other cars).

2.4.6. Impulse Control (Fig. 2F and G)

This test assessed a subject’s ability to exercise appropriate anticipatory and inhibitory control. The subject depressed an accelerator pedal to activate a green light (simulating the bottom light in a set of traffic lights) on a screen. When the green light was extinguished, a red light was presented immediately above and the subject needed to release the accelerator pedal and depress the brake pedal as quickly as possible. This was a standard-stimulus trial. In a minority of trials (10 out of 45), a purple rather than a red light was presented. This was a false stimulus trial for which the subject was asked to keep the accelerator pedal depressed. The presentation of the top light in both the standard and false stimulus trials was cued by a separate signal – a yellow circle on either side of the top light – 500 ms prior to the light change. Incorrect releases in response to false stimulus trials were interpreted as the subject exhibiting a deficit in inhibitory control. Incorrect releases of the accelerator pedal while the bottom green light was still presented (or within 180 ms of the light change) were interpreted as the subject exhibiting a deficit in anticipatory control.

2.5. Procedure

The 50 DAVAS referrals and 12 control subjects were assessed off-road on SMCTests and, in a subsequent session, on-road. The on-road assessment was conducted by a driving occupational therapist and a driving instructor blinded to performance on SMCTests. Both driving instructor and occupational therapist were experienced in driver assessment of persons with disabilities or brain disorders. The driving instructor was seated in the front passenger seat and was responsible for giving directions to the subject and for maintaining the safety of the vehicle, as well as providing an evaluation of performance. All study participants performed the same standardized on-road assessment as DAVAS referrals who declined to participate in the study. The on-road assessment began within the hospital grounds where basic control of the vehicle was assessed, and continued on an open course in a nearby suburb which experienced relatively little traffic but included controlled and uncontrolled intersections. The assessment then continued in increasingly busy and complicated traffic situations. Traffic hazards included dual-lane roads, single-lane roundabouts, dual-lane roundabouts, controlled intersections, uncontrolled intersections, and changes in speed zone. Assessments were approximately 45 min unless the safety of the vehicle, occupants, or other road users was considered at risk at any stage during the assessment. On-road driving performance was independently scored by the experienced occupational therapist and driving instructor as Pass or Fail using the Advanced Driving Assessment System, which is the standard system used by all driving assessment occupational therapists in New Zealand. Advanced Driving Assessment System courses are run through the New Zealand Institute of Driving Instructors. Performance was scored in four main areas: search, hazard...
Identification, controls, and observation of traffic regulations. In addition, on-road performance was also rated on a Driving Scale (0–10) specifically designed for the study (Table 1).

### 2.6. Data analysis

Analysis of the referral subject performance on SMCTests was undertaken to quantify the sensitivity (i.e., correct prediction of on-road assessment fails) and specificity (i.e., correct prediction of on-road assessment passes) of the tests at group and individual levels. As the majority of the data were not normally distributed (Shapiro–Wilk test, *p* < .05), and several measures were ordinal, non-parametric techniques were used to analyse the data.

At group level, Mann–Whitney U analysis (STATISTICA 6.0, StatSoft, Inc.) was undertaken to determine significant differences in off-road test performance between the referrals who passed the on-road assessment and those who failed. The Cohen effect size statistic for rank-transformed variables [53] was used to evaluate the magnitude of differences in off-road performance between the pass and fail referral groups.

Two methods were used to determine the predictive value of performance on SMCTests for on-road driving ability at the individual level for referrals. The first of these, binary logistic regression (BLR), is a non-parametric version of discriminant analysis for the case where the dependent variable is dichotomous (i.e., pass or fail on an on-road assessment). BLR was used to estimate the probability of an on-road assessment fail based on an exponential function of SMCTests variables and weightings. A forward stepwise method was used to select the optimal set of SMCTests variables for predicting on-road assessment outcome. Forward stepwise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Driving Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving score</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>SMCTests measures which showed a significant difference in performance between the on-road assessment pass and fail groups based on Mann–Whitney U analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test measure</td>
<td>Healthy subjects*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Attention — reaction and movement time (ms)</td>
<td>n=40 Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking — sine tracking mean error (mm)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking — step tracking mean error (mm)</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballistic Movement — best reaction and movement time (ms)</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning — number of hazards hit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning — duration of lateral position errors (s)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulse Control — mean reaction time (ms)</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making — total number of correct responses</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking — random tracking mean error (mm)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footbrake — reaction and movement time (ms)</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Control — reaction and movement time (ms)</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divided Attention — dual task random tracking error (mm)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballistic Movement — peak velocity (mm/s)</td>
<td>1128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning — safety margin at intersections (mm)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulse Control — number of commissions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning — number of crashes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Search — correct responses</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning — distance travelled (m)</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * Performance data from a separate study of healthy subjects comprising 20 male and 20 female experienced drivers aged 41–78 years (mean 60.4 years).

** Effect size calculated using a Cohen effect-size statistic for rank-transformed variables [53].
Curve RDF curves were created for key performance function and plotted as a resource demand function (RDF) performance on a high-level task is determined for each test minimum resource level required to achieve a given level of accuracy that would be achieved with a separate test dataset and from sensory-motor tests of Tracking and upper-limb Attention, Planning, Impulse Control, and Decision-Making, highest for measures from cognitive tests of Complex Attention, Planning, Impulse Control, and Decision-Making, and from sensory-motor tests of Tracking and upper-limb Ballistic Movement.

For forward stepwise BLR analysis produced a model with 5 SMCTests measures (Table 3) able to correctly classify 47 of the 50 referrals (i.e., 94% accuracy on training data) as an on-road Pass or Fail. The sensitivity of the model was 97% (31/32 correctly classified as Fail) and the specificity was 89% (16/18 correctly classified as Pass). Based on BLR analysis, 26/32 (81%) of referrals who failed the on-road assessment had a high probability (0.80–1.00) of failing the on-road assessment, 9/18 (50%) referrals who passed the on-road assessment had a low probability (0.00–0.05) of failing the on-road assessment, and the remaining referrals had probabilities which fell between the two extremes (Table 4). The correlation between the BLR estimated probability of failing the on-road assessment and observed on-road Driving Scale scores was $r = -0.77$ (Fig. 3).

Leave-one-out cross-validation analysis estimated that the BLR model would correctly predict 86% of an independent test set to pass or fail an on-road assessment. The sensitivity of the model was 91% (29/32 correctly classified as Fail) and the specificity was 78% (14/18 correctly classified as Pass).

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Planning</td>
<td>Number of hazards hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Complex Attention</td>
<td>Reaction and movement time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Tracking</td>
<td>Sine tracking mean error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ballistic Movement</td>
<td>Best reaction time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Divided Attention</td>
<td>Dual task random tracking error</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLR probability</th>
<th>Outcome of blinded on-road assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00–0.05</td>
<td>9 pass/0 fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.06–0.79</td>
<td>9 pass/6 fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80–1.00</td>
<td>0 pass/26 fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on SMCTests performance, NCRA produced resource demand function curves able to correctly classify 45 of the 50 referrals (i.e., 90% accuracy of training data). The sensitivity of the model was 84% (27/32 correctly classified as Fail) and the specificity was 100% (18/18 correctly classified as Pass). The correlation between the NCRA estimated Driving Scale scores and observed on-road Driving Scale scores was $r=0.87$ (Fig. 4).

Leave-one-out cross-validation analysis estimated that the NCRA model would correctly predict 76% of an independent test set to pass or fail an on-road assessment. The sensitivity of the model was 84% (27/32 correctly classified as Fail) and the specificity was 61% (11/18 correctly classified as Pass).

Neither age nor sex contributed to the accuracy of the BLR or NCRA models.

All 12 control subjects passed the on-road assessment, receiving Driving Scores between 6–9, although the assessor considered one subject marginal. Both the BLR and NCRA models that had been based on data from the 50 referrals predicted on-road passes for 11/12 control subjects (92% specificity for predicting a Pass). Both NCRA and BLR incorrectly predicted a fail for the control who achieved a marginal pass on the on-road assessment. However, both models were marginal in their fail prediction for this subject (NCRA-predicted Driving Scale score 5, BLR probability of 0.53 of failing the on-road assessment). A comparison of the observed driving assessment outcome with NCRA- and BLR-predicted driving assessment outcome is shown in Table 5.

4. Discussion

Our study has shown that, compared with other studies, SMCTests have the highest predictive accuracy as estimated in an independent data set and against true on-road driving ability in persons with brain disorders. Furthermore, SMCTests are unique in being able to comprehensively and objectively assess both sensory-motor and higher cognitive functions related to driving.

Four previous studies have estimated the predictive accuracy of off-road tests for driving ability in an independent group [14,19,23,32]. Prediction based upon logistic regression of our SMCTests data achieved the highest accuracy of 86% with the exception of the NCRA predictive model of Fischer et al. [32] with an accuracy of 89%. However, Fischer et al.’s study was substantially limited by the small number of subjects in their test group ($n=9$) and the on-road assessment being limited to a closed-course circuit. The basic physical and cognitive functions used to build Fischer et al.’s model would likely relate well to the vehicle control aspects assessed on the closed-course driving assessment. Conversely, key higher cognitive function skills needed to respond appropriately to the less predictable and more demanding aspects of true on-road driving, especially relating to intersections, other vehicles, pedestrians, distractions, etc., are not challenged on a closed-course circuit [9,57,58]. Despite these limitations, Fischer et al.’s study provides considerable support for NCRA as a means of predicting performance on a complex high-level task such as driving.
Another study to estimate the predictive accuracy of off-road tests for driving ability in an independent group was based upon the DriveABLE assessment system [21,23]. DriveABLE has a ‘high cut-off score’, above which an on-road pass in indicated, and a ‘low cut-off score’, below which an on-road fail is indicated. An on-road assessment is required for all subjects whose scores fall within the ‘indeterminate range’ between the high and low cut-off scores. A validation study of the predictive accuracy of DriveABLE was undertaken with 431 drivers which included healthy drivers across the age range and patients with a wide variety of medical conditions (e.g., dementia, pulmonary disease, cardiovascular disease, renal disease, head trauma) [39]. The study found that a third of participants received scores in the indeterminate range [23,59], and, of the remaining participants, 94% were correctly predicted to pass or fail the on-road assessment. However, the actual accuracy of pass and fail for all participants was 63% (94% of 67% of subjects correctly classified). Another limitation of DriveABLE is its reliance upon a push-button and touch-screen format which cannot measure or take into account deficits in lower-limb functioning.

Previous studies have also investigated the relationship between off- and on-road tests and determined accuracy in terms of classification models [7–9,15–17,22]. However, these results are based on models which are not validated with separate test data and in which there is a substantial risk of models overfitting the training data. That is, in order to maximize the accuracy of the model, the model becomes too specific to the training data and is unable to generalize well to an independent population. Thus, less weight can be given to the performance of driving assessment systems for which predictive accuracy has been solely determined based on test and training data which are not independent.

Our study has demonstrated that performance on a battery of driving-specific sensory-motor and cognitive tests can be used to accurately predict ability to drive safely and to do so in a range of neurological disorders. Leave-one-out analysis indicated that overall the predictive model based on BLR was more accurate than NCRA at predicting on-road Pass or Fail (BLR 86% vs NCRA 76%). However, NCRA has an important advantage in that it is able to identify which of possibly several deficits a subject may have that most restricts his or her ability to drive safely. This advantage provides an opportunity for focused rehabilitation which might optimally reduce or offset the deficit and enable safe return to the road. The two models provide complementary information, with BLR providing the probability of an on-road assessment pass or fail and NCRA providing information regarding the functional deficit most limiting on-road performance.

While safe driving requires a number of simple component skills, the coordination and organization of these component processes are also important [36]. Thus, driving simulators, which aim to replicate on-road driving, might be considered more useful in determining on-road driving ability than batteries of component function tests. However, driving simulators have, thus far, proven to be less predictive for on-road driving than SMCTests [24–27] and are limited by problems with simulator sickness, especially in older drivers [60]. Although SMCTests are components based, we believe it is successful at predicting on-road driving ability because (1) on-road driving requires that basic sensory-motor and cognitive component functions are intact and (2) SMCTests higher cognitive function tests require integration of the component processes.

Our results (Table 4) show that BLR indicated a high probability (>0.80) of failing the on-road assessment for 81% (26/32) of referrals who did fail the on-road assessment. In contrast, no referrals who passed the on-road assessment had BLR probabilities of 0.80 or higher. Using a BLR probability of 0.80 or higher as the cut-point for determining that an on-road assessment would be too dangerous to undertake, we estimate that up to 80% of potentially dangerous on-road assessments could be avoided each year by DAVAS. The value of this decrease in potentially dangerous on-road assessments should not be underestimated. Despite strong safety measures in place at DAVAS, the use of a true on-road course means that it takes only a few seconds for an unsafe driver to unintentionally drive a vehicle into an oncoming car or hazard. If the new assessment system was established in driving assessment centres throughout New Zealand with its small population (~4 million), we estimate that up to 700 potentially dangerous on-road assessments could be avoided annually.

A limitation of the current study is the relatively small number of referrals and the relatively high proportion of stroke patients. We are working towards obtaining a larger data set to further increase the accuracy and breadth of the predictive models and provide robust verification. Future studies will also increase the number of patients in different diagnostic groups. Despite limitations of the current study, SMCTests is unique in being able to comprehensively assess both sensory-motor and higher cognitive functions related to driving. By contrast, other assessment systems either rely on cognitive functions and lack quantitative assessment of sensory-motor functions [9,14,19–23], or rely on assessment of sensory-motor functions with minimal [18] or no tests of higher cognitive functions [32].

Given the promising results achieved in this study with referrals, two additional developments have been initiated. Firstly, a less expensive version of the assessment apparatus has been developed based on portable components (laptop, screen, steering wheel, and pedals). The portable apparatus will offer the full range of SMCTests and is designed for driving assessment services provided by specialist driving occupational therapists. Secondly, an abbreviated version of SMCTests has also been developed as a screening tool for medical practitioners and is being evaluated through a large group of general practitioners and through a study with healthy older drivers. An accurate screening tool should lead to increased confidence for medical practitioners referring appropriate persons for comprehensive driving assessments.
or ratifying the licences of persons who have objectively demonstrated adequate sensory-motor and cognitive abilities needed for safe driving. This will ensure that all persons who are at a potentially increased risk of traffic accident are appropriately identified and referred for assessment.

Accurate off-road estimation of driving ability can minimize the number of on-road assessments of patients who will almost definitely fail, as well as minimizing on-road assessment of patients who are safe to drive. A decrease in unnecessary on-road tests increases cost-effectiveness, assessment efficiency, and, importantly, the safety of referrals, assessors, and other road users by reducing the risk of on-road accidents during on-road assessments.
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