



# Going outdoors and cognitive function among community-dwelling older adults: Moderating role of physical function

Harada, Kazuhiro ; Lee, Sangyoon ; Park, Hyuntae ; Shimada, Hiroyuki ; Makizako, Hyuma ; Doi, Takehiko ; Yoshida, Daisuke ; Tsutsumimoto, Kot...

---

**(Citation)**

Geriatrics & Gerontology International, 16(1):65-73

**(Issue Date)**

2016-01

**(Resource Type)**

journal article

**(Version)**

Accepted Manuscript

**(Rights)**

©2016 Japan Geriatrics Society. This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: [Geriatrics & Gerontology International, 16(1):65-73, 2016], which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ggi.12437>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for...

**(URL)**

<https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14094/90003866>



**Title:** Going outdoors and cognitive function among community-dwelling older adults:  
moderating role of physical function

**Running head:** Going outdoors and cognitive function

**Authors' names:** Kazuhiro Harada<sup>1</sup>, Sangyoon Lee<sup>1</sup>, Hyuntae Park<sup>1</sup>, Hiroyuki Shimada<sup>1</sup>,  
Hyuma Makizako<sup>1</sup>, Takehiko Doi<sup>1,2</sup>, Daisuke Yoshida<sup>1</sup>, Kota Tsutsumimoto<sup>1</sup>, Yuya Anan<sup>1</sup>,  
Kazuki Uemura<sup>1</sup>, Takao Suzuki<sup>3</sup>

**Author affiliations:**

1. Department of Functioning Activation, National Center for Geriatrics and Gerontology,  
35 Morioka, Gengo, Obu, Aichi 454-8511, Japan.

2. Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, 5-3-1 Kochi, Chiyoda, Tokyo 102-0083,  
Japan.

3. Research Institute, National Center for Geriatrics and Gerontology, 35 Morioka, Gengo,  
Obu, Aichi 454-8511, Japan.

**Correspondence to:**

Kazuhiro Harada

Section of Motor Function Activation, Department of Functioning Activation, National  
Center for Geriatrics and Gerontology, 35 Morioka, Gengo, Obu, Aichi 454-8511,  
Japan.

Tel: +81-562-44-5651 (ext. 5636); E-mail: haradak@ncgg.go.jp

**Abstract**

**Aims:** Identifying risk factors of cognitive impairment is essential for implementing effective prevention strategies for dementia. Previous studies have indicated that the frequency of going outdoors is inversely associated with cognitive decline. Little research has examined whether the relationship between going outdoors and cognitive decline varies with physical functioning in older adults. The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between going outdoors and cognitive function in older adults with and without physical function limitations.

**Methods:** This study analyzed the data of 4,450 individuals (65 years or older) who participated in the Obu Study of Health Promotion for the Elderly. The measures were the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE), going outdoors (at least once a week or not), self-reported physical function limitations (with or without), and demographic and health-related factors as potential confounders.

**Results:** Analysis of covariance and post-hoc comparisons showed that while going outdoors at least once a week was associated with higher MMSE scores among older adults with limited physical function, it was not significantly associated with the MMSE scores among older adults without limited physical function. Similarly, logistic regression analyses, stratified by physical function, revealed a significant association between going outdoors and MMSE (< 24 points or not) among the older adults with limited physical function.

**Conclusions:** The results indicate that going outdoors less than once a week is associated with decreased cognitive function among older adults with limited physical function, but it is not associated with cognitive function among older adults without limited physical function.

**Key words:** Aged; Cognition Disorders; Effect Modifier; Homebound Persons;

Physical Function; Preventive Medicine

## Introduction

As the world's population ages, dementia has become an important public health problem, particularly in developed countries. Identifying risk and protective factors associated with cognitive decline is essential to create effective prevention strategies for dementia. The possible role of lifestyle-related factors,<sup>6-10</sup> such as smoking habits, excessive alcohol intake, and dietary patterns, has been proposed to help understand cognitive decline due to age-related changes, as well as genetic, sociodemographic and medical factors.<sup>1-5</sup>

Going outdoors daily may help prevent cognitive decline in older people in addition to these factors. Previous studies<sup>11-14</sup> have indicated that the frequency of going outdoors is a predictor of both the psychological and physical health outcomes of older people. The Japan Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare<sup>15</sup> regards going outdoors less than once a week to be a risk of being housebound, a condition of Need for Long-Term Care, and the Ministry instructs each local government to provide community-based programs for supporting these individuals. Some previous studies<sup>16-19</sup> have found that limited life space, which is a similar concept to going outdoors, is also associated with cognitive decline. The interventions designed to aid older adults expand their zones of life experience, such as the Experience Corps, may be effective to protect against cognitive decline.<sup>20</sup> Since going outdoors does not require any special knowledge, motivation, costs, or time, increasing outdoor activity would be easier for older people to incorporate into their daily life, compared with reducing other lifestyle-related risk factors, such as smoking cessation and avoiding excessive alcohol intake.

The effects of going outdoors on cognitive function might differ by the physical function status of older people. Previous studies have indicated that life space

differentiated patients with Alzheimer's disease from healthy older adults, and that it was strongly correlated with physical function.<sup>21</sup> Physical function is reciprocally associated with cognitive decline,<sup>22-24</sup> in that decline in physical function can reduce opportunities to engage in physical and social activities,<sup>17,25</sup> which are important to maintain cognitive functioning.<sup>9,26,27</sup> Additionally, it has been reported that regular physical activity reduces the risk of dementia among older adults with lower levels of physical functioning compared with those with higher levels of physical functioning.<sup>28</sup> Thus, those with limited physical function might gain more cognitive health benefits by going outdoors than those with normal physical function. However, there are no previous studies that have identified the differences between the older adults with and without limitations of physical function on the relationships among going outdoors and cognitive function among community-dwelling older adults.

The purpose of this study was to examine whether the relationships between going outdoors and cognitive function differ according to physical functioning of older people.

## **Methods**

### ***Participants and procedures***

This study analyzed the data of the Obu Study of Health Promotion for the Elderly (OSHPE). The participants in the OSHPE were recruited from all people living in the city of Obu (a residential suburban area in Japan), aged 65 years or older at the time of the study, who had not participated in another study, and who were not certified as needing support or care by the Japanese long-term care insurance system (Care Level  $\geq 3/5$ ). A total of 14,519 people were asked to participate in the OSHPE by postal mail,

and 5,104 (35.2%) participated in this study. The OSHPE was conducted at community centers in Obu.

Participants in the OSHPE were excluded from the current study if they met at least one of the exclusion criteria: (1) a history of Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, stroke, or depressive disorder, (2) a disability in basic activities of daily living, (3) a certification of long-term care or support need from the Japanese insurance system, and (4) missing data for the variables used in this study. In total, 654 individuals were excluded; hence, the data of 4,450 individuals were analyzed in this study.

The OSHPE conducted comprehensive health assessments on all participants. The health assessments we analyzed in this study included data from neuropsychological tests (cognitive function) and survey questionnaires (going outdoors and physical function) collected by trained staff members, and face-to-face interviews (demographic and health-related factors) collected by health professionals. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants of the OSHPE. The OSHPE received prior approval from the Ethics Committee of the National Center for Geriatrics and Gerontology.

## ***Measures***

### *Cognitive function*

Cognitive function was measured by the Japanese-language version of the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE).<sup>29</sup> The MMSE was originally developed for clinical settings, but is now widely used in epidemiological surveys. The MMSE represents general cognitive functioning. MMSE scores range from 0 to 30, with higher scores

representing higher cognitive function.

#### *Going outdoors*

An item from the Frailty Checklist for Care Prevention<sup>15</sup> was used to measure going outdoors. This checklist<sup>15</sup> consists of 25 items, which the Japan Ministry of Health Labour and Welfare developed to briefly screen physical function limitations, depressive symptoms, malnutrition, being homebound, decline in cognitive function, and decline in dental function in community settings. Going outdoors less than once a week has been used to define being homebound in previous studies.<sup>26-28</sup> We used the following question to measure being homebound: “Do you usually go outside the house at least once a week?” The participants answered this question with “Yes” or “No”.

#### *Physical function*

Physical function was measured by five items that are a part of the Frailty Checklist for Care Prevention,<sup>15</sup> which is used for screening limitations in physical functioning. The items are: “Are you able to go upstairs without holding a rail or wall?”; “Are you able to stand up from a chair without any aid?”; “Are you able to keep walking for about 15 minutes?”; “Have you fallen during the past year (reversed item)?”; and “Are you afraid of falling (reversed item)?”. The respondents answered “Yes” or “No” to each question. The numbers of “No” responses were summed for each respondent, and the respondents were categorized into two groups (without limited physical function, with limited physical function) by the cut-off point for screening physical function limitation (the numbers of “No”  $\geq 3$ ).<sup>15</sup>

#### *Demographic and health-related factors*

The study analyzed data on medical condition (histories of hypertension, heart disease, diabetes, and hyperlipidemia), drinking alcohol habits (yes, no), smoking (yes, no), sex



(men, women), age (65–69, 70–74, 74–79, or  $80 \geq$  years old), years of education ( $\leq 9$ , 10–12,  $\geq 13$  years), living with others (yes, no), and depressive mood (scores  $< 6$ , or  $\geq 6$  on the Geriatric Depression Scale, short version<sup>33</sup>). Previous research<sup>34,35</sup> revealed that hypertension, heart disease, diabetes, and hyperlipidemia are risk factors for dementia, and that midlife onset of these diseases is associated with later-life dementia. Thus, the current study analyzed the histories of these diseases.

### *Analyses*

We analyzed the MMSE data in two ways: scores on the MMSE, and the categorization of MMSE ( $< 24$  points, or higher). This cut-off point for the MMSE is widely used in screening for decline in cognitive function among older people.<sup>36</sup>

The associations of demographic and health-related factors with cognitive function were examined by Mann–Whitney tests (age, years of education) or chi-squared tests (other variables) for the MMSE scores, and analysis of variance (age, educational years) or *t*-tests (other variables) for the MMSE categories.

Next, two-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to examine the interactive associations of physical function and going outdoors with the MMSE scores. The covariates included all demographics, such as age, sex, education, and living with others, and health-related factors, such as medical condition, drinking and smoking, and depressive mood. If the interaction of physical function and going outdoors was significant, the Bonferroni correction was used to counteract the problem of multiple comparisons.

Then, multivariate logistic regression was used to examine the association of going outdoors and physical function with the MMSE categories as the dependent

variable. Going outdoors was included as an independent variable by the forced-entry method, and the stepwise method was used to select the demographic and health-rated factors for inclusion as independent variables. Crude and adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated for each variable. Separate logistic regression analyses were subsequently conducted for the groups without and with limited physical function. All analyses were performed using IBM SPSS 21.0 software (IBM, Chicago, IL, USA). The level of significance was set at  $p < 0.05$ .

## **Results**

### ***Characteristics of the participants and associations of demographic and health-related factors with cognitive function***

Table 1 presents the characteristics of the participants. The mean age of the total sample was 71.9 years old (SD 5.4; range 65–97): 72.0 years (SD 5.4; range 65–97) for men and 71.8 years (SD 5.4; range 65–94) for women. Of all the participants (N = 4,450), 220 (4.9%) did not go outdoors at least once a week and 359 (8.1%) had limited physical function. The average MMSE score was 26.3 points, and 24.5% of participants scored fewer than 24 points on the MMSE. The statistical analyses revealed that men, older age, lower educational level, current smoking, and hyperlipidemia were significantly associated with lower scores on the MMSE. Hypertension was significantly associated with MMSE scores, but not with the MMSE categories.

### ***Associations of going outdoors and physical function with cognitive function (MMSE score)***

Figure 1 shows the results of the analysis of covariance. As shown in Figure 1, the

interaction effect of going outdoors and physical function on MMSE scores was significant ( $p = 0.009$ ). Multiple comparisons showed that going outdoors at least once a week was not significantly associated with higher MMSE scores among study participants without limited physical function (going outdoors at least once a week = 26.3; going outdoors less than once a week = 26.0;  $p = 0.090$ ). However, going outdoors at least once a week was significantly associated with higher MMSE scores among patients with limited physical function (going outdoors at least once a week = 26.0; going outdoors less than once a week = 24.4;  $p < 0.001$ ).

***Associations of going outdoors and physical function with cognitive function (MMSE < 24 points or not)***

Table 2 shows the result of the logistic regression for all participants. Sex, age, education, and current smoking were included as independent variables in the adjusted model, based on the stepwise regression method. While a significant relationship was found between physical function and MMSE (Adjusted OR = 1.41; 95% CI = 1.11–1.81), no significant relationship was found between going outdoors and MMSE (Adjusted OR = 1.22; 95% CI = 0.90–1.67).

Table 3 shows the results of the logistic regression analyses that were stratified by physical function. Sex, age, and history of heart disease were included as independent variables for participants with limited physical function, and sex, age, education, and current smoking were included for participants without limited physical function, using the stepwise method. The study participants with limited physical function who went outdoors less than once a week were more likely to have a lower MMSE than those who went outdoors at least once a week (Adjusted OR = 2.25; 95%

CI = 1.11–4.58). However, no significant association was found between going outdoors and MMSE among participants without limited physical function (Adjusted OR = 1.04; 95% CI = 0.73–1.48).

## **Discussion**

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the moderating role of physical function on the relationships between going outdoors and cognitive function among community-dwelling older adults. While various risk/preventive factors of cognitive decline have been revealed in previous studies,<sup>1-10</sup> the association between going outdoors and cognitive function has been studied insufficiently. Although a previous study<sup>19</sup> indicated that the relationship between life space and cognitive function is moderated by personal control beliefs, other moderating factors of the association between going outdoors and cognitive function have not been examined.

The major finding of this study is that going outdoors at least once a week is associated with better cognitive function in older adults with limited physical function. The finding indicates that going outdoors less often might be associated with cognitive decline, especially among elderly people with limited physical function. Larsons et al. suggested that one of the ways that exercise might reduce the risk for dementia is through modulating the relationship between physical functioning and dementia.<sup>28</sup> Our results are consistent with earlier research showing that physical activity had a greater effect on cognitive function among persons with lower levels of physical functioning compared with persons with higher levels of physical functioning. Going outdoors could accompany some physical and social activities.<sup>17,25</sup> Increased outdoor activities entailing physical and social activities might have positive effects on brain health

among older adults,<sup>9,26,27</sup> including the preservation of brain volume and the enhancement of brain activation.<sup>37-39</sup> Additionally, prospective cohort studies<sup>16,18</sup> have reported the preventive role of life space on cognitive decline. However, they<sup>16,18</sup> have not focused on the mediating role of individual differences on the relationship between going outdoors, or life space, and cognitive function. Except for personal control beliefs,<sup>19</sup> the factors moderating these relationships have not been clarified. Physical function has a linkage with both cognitive function and level of physical activity. Lower physical functioning is associated with cognitive impairment and cognitive decline,<sup>38,39</sup> and older adults with lower physical activity have been found to have poorer limb function.<sup>42</sup> Expanding upon these previous studies, the current study suggests that the relationship between going outdoors and cognitive function differs with the level of physical functioning of older people. According to the findings of this study, individual differences must be taken into account (e.g., differences in physical function status and by personal control beliefs<sup>19</sup>) when considering the role of going outdoors in cognitive function.

With regard to differences in physical function, previous studies indicated that people with limited physical function lose opportunities to engage in physical and social activities<sup>17,25</sup> and are at higher risk of cognitive decline.<sup>21-24</sup> Therefore, individuals with limited physical function could exhibit further cognitive decline by failing to go outdoors. In contrast, those individuals without limited physical function have enough opportunities to engage in various physical and social activities. Thus, going outdoors itself might not be sufficiently influential to have an effect on their cognitive function, and more intensive activities might be needed to influence cognitive functioning among individuals without limited physical functions.

Analyses of the total sample of this study did not reveal an association of going outdoors with cognitive function even though previous studies<sup>15,17</sup> have shown this. This might be because this study measured going outdoors by only a single item. The item used in this study is part of the Frailty Checklist for Care Prevention developed by the Japan Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare,<sup>15</sup> and the cut-off point of frequency of going outdoors employed in this study (less than once a week) has been widely used to screen for the risk of being homebound.<sup>15,30-32</sup> However, the single item may not be sensitive to detect other differences. Further research is needed to better understand how different aspects of going outdoors, such as duration and frequency, may influence cognitive function.

The prevalence of going outdoors less than once a week was 5.0% in this study. In contrast, previous studies<sup>17,31,32</sup> have reported that the prevalence of going outdoors less than once a week was 10.3% to 19.5%. These previous studies<sup>17,31,32</sup> employed (at least partially) door-to-door surveys. Participants in the present study had to come to community centers where the research was conducted, and the measure of going outdoors was collected by self-reports. Thus, sampling bias could be predominant in this study, and the inconsistency of survey methods might influence the differences in prevalence between this study and previous studies. Furthermore, because a significant association was found between going outdoors and cognitive function with a lower prevalence of going outdoors less than once a week, it is possible that the associations may be larger among people with a higher prevalence of going outdoors less than once a week. Thus, the influence of going outdoors on cognitive function may be underestimated in this study.

The strength of this study is that it analyzed a community-based sample with

an adequate sample size. However, the study has some limitations. First, these data are cross-sectional and therefore causal associations cannot be demonstrated. Second, as previously discussed, sampling bias might have existed in the survey. Despite these limitations, the present study contributes to understanding the influence of going outdoors on cognitive function.

In conclusion, the major finding of this study indicates that going outdoors is associated with cognitive decline among older adults with limited physical function. According to these findings, encouraging individuals to go outdoors might be effective to prevent cognitive decline among older persons with limited physical function. Further research on the causal role of going outdoors in preventing cognitive decline is recommended.

### **Acknowledgments**

This work was supported by a Health and Labour Sciences Research Grant (23-001) from the Japan Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare and the Research Finding for Longevity Sciences (22-16) from National Center for Geriatric and Gerontology, Japan.

### **Disclosure statement**

There are no potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

### **References**

1. Caamaño-Isorna F, Corral M, Montes-Martínez A, Takkouche B. Education and dementia: a meta-analytic study. *Neuroepidemiology* 2006; 26: 226–32.
2. Joosten H, van Eersel MEA, Gansevoort RT, Bilo HJG, Slaets JPJ, Izaks GJ. Cardiovascular risk profile and cognitive function in young, middle-aged, and

- elderly subjects. *Stroke* 2013; 44: 1543–9.
3. Jorm AF. History of depression as a risk factor for dementia: an updated review. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 2011; 35: 776–81.
  4. Kloppenborg RP, van den Berg E, Kappelle LJ, Biessels GJ. Diabetes and other vascular risk factors for dementia: which factor matters most? A systematic review. *Eur J Pharmacol* 2008; 585: 97–108.
  5. Sadigh-Eteghad S, Talebi M, Farhoudi M. Association of apolipoprotein E epsilon 4 allele with sporadic late onset Alzheimer's disease. A meta-analysis. *Neurosciences* 2012; 17: 321–6.
  6. Anstey KJ, von Sanden C, Salim A, O'Kearney R. Smoking as a risk factor for dementia and cognitive decline: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Am J Epidemiol* 2007; 166: 367–78.
  7. Ridley NJ, Draper B, Withall A. Alcohol-related dementia: an update of the evidence. *Alzheimers Res Ther* 2013; 5: 3.
  8. Solfrizzi V, Panza F, Frisardi V, et al. Diet and Alzheimer's disease risk factors or prevention: the current evidence. *Expert Rev Neurother* 2011; 11: 677–708.
  9. Weuve J, Kang JH, Manson JE, Breteler MMB, Ware JH, Grodstein F. Physical activity, including walking, and cognitive function in older women. *JAMA* 2004; 292: 1454–61.
  10. Fratiglioni L, Paillard-Borg S, Winblad B. An active and socially integrated lifestyle in late life might protect against dementia. *Lancet Neurol* 2004; 3: 343–53.
  11. Fujita K, Fujiwara Y, Chaves PHM, Motohashi Y, Shinkai S. Frequency of going outdoors as a good predictors for incident disability of physical function as well as disability recovery in community-dwelling older adults in rural Japan. *J Epidemiol*



- 2006; 16: 261–70.
12. Kono A, Kai I, Sakato C, Rubenstein LZ. Frequency of going outdoors: a predictor of functional and psychosocial change among ambulatory frail elders living at home. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2004; 59: 275–80.
  13. Kono A, Kai I, Sakato C, Rubenstein LZ. Frequency of going outdoors predicts long-range functional change among ambulatory frail elders living at home. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2007; 45: 233–42.
  14. Shimada H, Ishizaki T, Kato M, et al. How often and how far do frail elderly people need to go outdoors to maintain functional capacity? *Arch. Gerontol. Geriatr* 2010; 50: 140–6.
  15. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Kaigo yobo manyuaru kaitei ban [Revised manual for prevention of long-term care need]. 2009. (in Japanese) [cited 2013 Nov 22]: Available from: [http://www.mhlw.go.jp/topics/2009/05/dl/tp0501-1\\_1.pdf](http://www.mhlw.go.jp/topics/2009/05/dl/tp0501-1_1.pdf).
  16. Crowe M, Andel R, Wadley VG, Okonkwo OC, Sawyer P, Allman RM. Life-space and cognitive decline in a community-based sample of African American and Caucasian older adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2008; 63: 1241–5.
  17. Fujita K, Fujiwara Y, Kumagai O, et al. The frequency of going outdoors, and physical, psychological, and social functioning among community-dwelling older adults. *Jap J Public Health* 2004; 51: 168-180. (in Japanese)
  18. James BD, Boyle PA, Buchman AS, Barnes LL, Bennett DA. Life space and risk of Alzheimer disease, mild cognitive impairment, and cognitive decline in old age. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2011; 19: 961–9.

19. Sartori AC, Wadley VG, Clay OJ, Parisi JM, Rebok GW, Crowe M. The relationship between cognitive function and life space: the potential role of personal control beliefs. *Psychol Aging* 2012; 27: 364–74.
20. Fried LP, Carlson MC, Freedman M, et al. A social model for health promotion for an aging population: initial evidence on the Experience Corps model. *J Urban Health* 2004; 81: 64–78.
21. Tung JY, Rose RV, Gammada E, et al. Measuring life space in older adults with mild-to-moderate Alzheimer’s disease using mobile phone GPS. *Gerontology* 2014; 60: 154–62.
22. Atkinson HH, Rapp SR, Williamson JD, et al. The relationship between cognitive function and physical performance in older women: results from the women’s health initiative memory study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2010; 65: 300–6.
23. Rosano C, Simonsick EM, Harris TB, et al. Association between physical and cognitive function in healthy elderly: the health, aging and body composition study. *Neuroepidemiology* 2005; 24: 8–14.
24. Wang L, Larson EB, Bowen JD, van Belle G. Performance-based physical function and future dementia in older people. *Arch Intern Med* 2006; 166: 1115–20.
25. Tanaka C, Yoshida H, Amano H, et al. Physical activity level and physical, mental, and social factors in community-dwelling elderly people. *Jap J Public Health* 2006; 53: 671-680. (in Japanese)
26. Wang H-X, Jin Y, Hendrie HC, et al. Late life leisure activities and risk of cognitive decline. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2013; 68: 205–13.
27. James BD, Wilson RS, Barnes LL, Bennett DA. Late-life social activity and cognitive decline in old age. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc* 2011; 17: 998–1005.

28. Larson EB, Wang L, Bowen JD, et al. Exercise is associated with reduced risk for incident dementia among persons 65 years of age and older. *Ann Intern Med* 2006; 144: 73–81.
29. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. “Mini-mental state”. A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res* 1975; 12: 189–98.
30. Cohen-Mansfield J, Shmotkin D, Hazan H. The effect of homebound status on older persons. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2010; 58: 2358–62.
31. Cohen-Mansfield J, Shmotkin D, Hazan H. Homebound older persons: prevalence, characteristics, and longitudinal predictors. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2012; 54: 55–60.
32. Ganguli M, Fox A, Gilby J, Belle S. Characteristics of rural homebound older adults: a community-based study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1996; 44: 363–70.
33. Sheikh JI, Yesavage JA. Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS): recent evidence and development of a shorter version. *Clin Gerontol* 1986; 5: 165-173.
34. Kloppenborg RP, van den Berg E, Kappelle LJ, Biessels GJ. Diabetes and other vascular risk factors for dementia: which factor matters most? A systematic review. *Eur J Pharmacol* 2008; 585: 97–108.
35. Justin BN, Turek M, Hakim AM. Heart disease as a risk factor for dementia. *Clin Epidemiol* 2013; 5: 135–45.
36. Holsinger T, Deveau J, Boustani M, Williams JW. Does this patient have dementia? *JAMA* 2007; 297: 2391–404.
37. Erickson KI, Raji CA, Lopez OL, et al. Physical activity predicts gray matter volume in late adulthood: the Cardiovascular Health Study. *Neurology* 2010; 75: 1415–22.

38. Mortimer JA, Ding D, Borenstein AR, et al. Changes in brain volume and cognition in a randomized trial of exercise and social interaction in a community-based sample of non-demented Chinese elders. *J Alzheimers Dis* 2012; 30: 757–66.
39. Makizako H, Doi T, Shimada H, et al. Relationship between going outdoors daily and activation of the prefrontal cortex during verbal fluency tasks (VFTs) among older adults: a near-infrared spectroscopy study. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2013; 56: 118–23.
40. Aggarwal NT, Wilson RS, Beck TL, Bienias JL, Bennett DA. Motor dysfunction in mild cognitive impairment and the risk of incident Alzheimer disease. *Arch Neurol* 2006; 63: 1763–9.
41. Mielke MM, Roberts RO, Savica R, et al. Assessing the temporal relationship between cognition and gait: slow gait predicts cognitive decline in the Mayo Clinic Study of Aging. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2013; 68: 929–37.
42. Trayers T, Lawlor DA, Fox KR, et al. Associations of objectively measured physical activity with lower limb function in older men and women: findings from the Older People and Active Living (OPAL) study. *J Aging Phys Act* 2014; 22: 34–43.

**Figure Legends**

*Figure 1.* Interaction of physical function and going outdoors on cognitive function.

MMSE scores were adjusted for sex, age, education, living with others, current drinking, current smoking, hypertension, heart disease, diabetes, hyperlipidemia, and depressive mood. Interaction of physical function and going outdoors (Analysis of Covariance) was  $F = 43.4, p = 0.009$ .

MMSE, Mini-Mental State Examination. \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

Table 1. Characteristics of the participants and the associations of demographic and health-related factors with cognitive function

|                         | Scores on the MMSE |      |      |                      | Categories of the MMSE |          |                      |
|-------------------------|--------------------|------|------|----------------------|------------------------|----------|----------------------|
|                         | Total              | Mean | SD   | p value <sup>a</sup> | < 24 (%)               | ≥ 24 (%) | p value <sup>b</sup> |
| Total                   | 4450               | 26.3 | 2.68 |                      | 24.5                   | 75.5     |                      |
| Sex                     |                    |      |      | <0.001               |                        |          | <0.001               |
| Men                     | 2196               | 25.9 | 2.61 |                      | 28.8                   | 71.2     |                      |
| Women                   | 2254               | 26.9 | 2.71 |                      | 20.4                   | 79.6     |                      |
| Age (in years)          |                    |      |      | <0.001               |                        |          | <0.001               |
| 65–69                   | 1809               | 26.9 | 2.33 |                      | 17.2                   | 82.8     |                      |
| 70–74                   | 1389               | 26.3 | 2.56 |                      | 23.5                   | 76.5     |                      |
| 75–79                   | 787                | 25.6 | 2.90 |                      | 33.2                   | 66.8     |                      |
| ≥ 80                    | 465                | 24.9 | 3.10 |                      | 41.3                   | 58.7     |                      |
| Education (in years)    |                    |      |      | <0.001               |                        |          | <0.001               |
| ≥ 13                    | 996                | 26.8 | 2.33 |                      | 16.8                   | 83.2     |                      |
| 10–12                   | 1871               | 26.7 | 2.48 |                      | 19.6                   | 80.4     |                      |
| ≤ 9                     | 1583               | 25.4 | 2.90 |                      | 35.2                   | 64.8     |                      |
| Living with others      |                    |      |      | 0.731                |                        |          | 0.705                |
| No                      | 415                | 26.3 | 2.68 |                      | 25.3                   | 74.7     |                      |
| Yes                     | 4035               | 26.3 | 2.68 |                      | 24.5                   | 75.5     |                      |
| Current drinking habits |                    |      |      | 0.694                |                        |          | 0.496                |
| No                      | 2385               | 26.3 | 2.79 |                      | 24.9                   | 75.1     |                      |
| Yes                     | 2065               | 26.3 | 2.55 |                      | 24.1                   | 75.9     |                      |
| Current smoking         |                    |      |      | 0.002                |                        |          | 0.003                |

|                                      |      |      |      |        |      |        |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|--------|------|--------|
| No                                   | 4002 | 26.3 | 2.67 |        | 23.9 | 76.1   |
| Yes                                  | 448  | 25.9 | 2.76 |        | 30.4 | 69.6   |
| History of hypertension              |      |      |      | 0.018  |      | 0.083  |
| No                                   | 2440 | 26.4 | 2.67 |        | 23.5 | 76.5   |
| Yes                                  | 2010 | 26.2 | 2.69 |        | 25.8 | 74.2   |
| History of heart disease             |      |      |      | 0.470  |      | 0.774  |
| No                                   | 3741 | 26.3 | 2.70 |        | 24.5 | 75.5   |
| Yes                                  | 709  | 26.2 | 2.57 |        | 25.0 | 75.0   |
| History of diabetes                  |      |      |      | 0.488  |      | 0.684  |
| No                                   | 3863 | 26.3 | 2.67 |        | 24.4 | 75.6   |
| Yes                                  | 587  | 26.2 | 2.77 |        | 25.2 | 74.8   |
| History of hyperlipidemia            |      |      |      | <0.001 |      | 0.001  |
| No                                   | 2648 | 26.1 | 2.75 |        | 26.2 | 73.8   |
| Yes                                  | 1802 | 26.5 | 2.55 |        | 22.0 | 78.0   |
| Depressive mood (GDS $\geq$ 6)       |      |      |      | <0.001 |      | <0.001 |
| No                                   | 3843 | 26.4 | 2.63 |        | 23.5 | 76.5   |
| Yes                                  | 607  | 25.8 | 2.94 |        | 31.1 | 68.9   |
| Going outdoors (1 $\geq$ day a week) |      |      |      | <0.001 |      | 0.016  |
| No                                   | 4230 | 26.3 | 2.64 |        | 24.2 | 75.8   |
| Yes                                  | 220  | 25.5 | 3.27 |        | 31.4 | 68.6   |
| Limited physical function            |      |      |      | <0.001 |      | <0.001 |
| Without                              | 4091 | 26.3 | 2.61 |        | 23.6 | 76.4   |
| With                                 | 359  | 25.5 | 3.26 |        | 35.4 | 64.6   |

---

MMSE, Mini-Mental State Examination; GDS, Geriatric Depression Scale short version

<sup>a</sup>t-test or analysis of variance, <sup>b</sup>chi-square test or Mann–Whitney test



Table 2. Associations of going outdoors and physical function with cognitive function

|                             | n    | Crude OR (95% CI) | p value | Adjusted OR      | p value |
|-----------------------------|------|-------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Sex</b>                  |      |                   |         |                  |         |
| Men                         | 2196 | 1.00              |         | 1.00             |         |
| Women                       | 2254 | 0.63 (0.55–0.73)  | <0.001  | 0.57 (0.49–0.66) | <0.001  |
| <b>Age (in years)</b>       |      |                   |         |                  |         |
| 65–69                       | 1809 | 1.00              |         | 1.00             |         |
| 70–74                       | 1389 | 1.48 (1.24–1.76)  | <0.001  | 1.42 (1.19–1.70) | <0.001  |
| 75–79                       | 787  | 2.38 (2.00–2.89)  | <0.001  | 2.10 (1.72–2.57) | <0.001  |
| ≥ 80                        | 465  | 3.37 (2.71–4.21)  | <0.001  | 2.75 (2.17–3.46) | <0.001  |
| <b>Education (in years)</b> |      |                   |         |                  |         |
| ≥ 13                        | 996  | 1.00              |         | 1.00             |         |
| 10–12                       | 1871 | 1.21 (0.99–1.48)  | 0.062   | 1.35 (1.09–1.66) | 0.005   |
| ≤ 9                         | 1583 | 2.70 (2.22–3.29)  | <0.001  | 2.71 (2.21–3.33) | <0.001  |
| <b>Current smoking</b>      |      |                   |         |                  |         |
| No                          | 4002 | 1.00              |         | 1.00             |         |
| Yes                         | 448  | 1.39 (1.12–1.72)  | 0.003   | 1.39 (1.10–1.75) | 0.005   |
| <b>Going outdoors</b>       |      |                   |         |                  |         |
| ≥ 1 day/week                | 4230 | 1.00              |         | 1.00             |         |
| < 1 day/week                | 220  | 1.43 (1.07–1.92)  | 0.016   | 1.22 (0.90–1.67) | 0.207   |
| <b>Physical function</b>    |      |                   |         |                  |         |
| Normal                      | 4091 | 1.00              |         | 1.00             |         |
| Limited                     | 359  | 1.77 (1.41–2.23)  | <0.001  | 1.41 (1.11–1.81) | 0.005   |

Dependent variable: Mini-Mental State Examination < 24

OR, odds ratio; 95% CI, 95% confidence interval

Going outdoors and physical function were included by the forced-entry method. Other factors were selected by the stepwise method.

Hosmer–Lemeshow test for the adjusted model:  $\chi^2=4.65(8)$ ,  $p=0.795$

Table 3. Association of going outdoors with cognitive function in participants with or without limited physical function

|                             | Without limited physical function (n = 4091) |                   |         |                  |         | With limited physical function (n = 359) |                   |         |                  |         |
|-----------------------------|--|-------------------|---------|------------------|---------|--|-------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
|                             | n  | Crude OR (95% CI) | p value | Adjusted OR      | p value | n  | Crude OR (95% CI) | p value | Adjusted OR      | p value |
| <b>Sex</b>                  |  |                   |         |                  |         |  |                   |         |                  |         |
| Men                         | 2086   | 1.00              |         | 1.00             |         | 110                                      | 1.00              |         | 1.00             |         |
| Women                       | 2005   | 0.62 (0.54–0.72)  | <0.001  | 0.60 (0.51–0.70) | <0.001  | 249                                      | 0.41 (0.26–0.65)  | <0.001  | 0.35 (0.22–0.58) | <0.001  |
| <b>Age (in years)</b>       |  |                   |         |                  |         |  |                   |         |                  |         |
| 65–69                       | 1729   | 1.00              |         | 1.00             |         | 80                                       | 1.00              |         | 1.00             |         |
| 70–74                       | 1303   | 1.48 (1.24–1.77)  | <0.001  | 1.44 (1.20–1.73) | <0.001  | 86                                       | 1.32 (0.66–2.63)  | 0.438   | 1.39 (0.68–2.86) | 0.370   |
| 75–79                       | 692  | 2.25 (1.84–2.76)  | <0.001  | 2.05 (1.66–2.53) | <0.001  | 95                                       | 2.66 (1.38–5.11)  | 0.003   | 2.78 (1.41–5.47) | 0.002   |
| ≥ 80                        | 367  | 3.47 (2.72–4.42)  | <0.001  | 2.89 (2.25–3.72) | <0.001  | 98                                       | 2.21 (1.15–4.26)  | 0.017   | 2.67 (1.36–5.27) | 0.002   |
| <b>Education (in years)</b> |  |                   |         |                  |         |  |                   |         |                  |         |
| ≥ 13                        | 955  | 1.00              |         | 1.00             |         |  | –                 |         | –                |         |
| 10–12                       | 1737   | 1.21 (0.98–1.49)  | 0.080   | 1.35 (1.09–1.67) | 0.006   |  | –                 |         | –                |         |
| ≤ 9                         | 1399   | 2.70 (2.21–3.32)  | <0.001  | 1.36 (1.07–1.73) | <0.001  |  | –                 |         | –                |         |
| <b>Current smoking</b>      |  |                   |         |                  |         |  |                   |         |                  |         |

|                          |      |                  |       |                  |       |     |                  |       |                        |
|--------------------------|------|------------------|-------|------------------|-------|-----|------------------|-------|------------------------|
| No                       | 3662 | 1.00             |       | 1.00             |       | –   |                  | –     |                        |
| Yes                      | 429  | 1.38 (1.11–1.73) |       | 1.36 (1.07–1.73) | 0.011 | –   |                  | –     |                        |
| History of heart disease |      |                  |       |                  |       |     |                  |       |                        |
| No                       | 3459 | –                |       | –                |       | 282 | 1.00             |       | 1.00                   |
| Yes                      | 632  | –                |       | –                |       | 77  | 0.57 (0.33–1.01) | 0.053 | 0.48 (0.27–0.88) 0.018 |
| Going outdoors           |      |                  |       |                  |       |     |                  |       |                        |
| ≥ 1 day/week             | 3912 | 1.00             |       | 1.00             |       | 318 | 1.00             |       | 1.00                   |
| < 1 day/week             | 179  | 1.16 (0.83–1.63) | 0.390 | 1.04 (0.73–1.48) | 0.840 | 41  | 2.35 (1.22–4.53) | 0.011 | 2.25 (1.11–4.58) 0.025 |

---

Dependent variable: Mini-Mental State Examination < 24

OR, odds ratio; 95% CI, 95% confidence interval

Going outdoors and physical function were included by the forced-entry method. Other factors were selected by the stepwise method.

Hosmer–Lemeshow test for the adjusted model of those without limited physical function:  $\chi^2=8.19(8)$ ,  $p=0.415$

Hosmer–Lemeshow test for the adjusted model of those with limited physical function:  $\chi^2=2.23(6)$ ,  $p=0.898$

