



# Reaction time to incidents as a function of age and neurological disease: preliminary findings from a large driving simulation experiment



A. Economou<sup>1</sup>, I. Beratis<sup>2</sup>, D. Pavlou<sup>3</sup>, N. Andronas<sup>2</sup>,  
A. Liosidou<sup>2</sup>, S. Stougioti<sup>4</sup>, G. Yannis<sup>3</sup>, S. G. Papageorgiou<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Athens, <sup>2</sup>“Attikon” University General Hospital, Department of Neurology, University of Athens, <sup>3</sup>Department of Transportation Planning & Engineering, National Technical University of Athens, <sup>4</sup>“Attikon” University General Hospital, <sup>2</sup>nd Department of Ophthalmology, University of Athens

aoikono@psych.uoa.gr

## Background & Aims

Reaction time (RT) of the driver in unexpected incidents is an important component of accident probability, yet it is difficult to investigate during on-road driving. Herein, we present initial findings from RT performance and other measures of neurology patients and healthy control drivers of different ages in two driving simulation environments: Rural and Urban, in order to examine the factors that influence RT. The research is part of an ongoing project aiming at integrating subject variables with driving environments/conditions in a driving simulator experiment.

## Experimental design

A mixed factorial design, with **within-subjects factors**: area type, traffic flow, and presence/type of distractor, and **between-subjects factor**: participant type. Traffic and distractor are fully counterbalanced for each area type.

| SESSION | AREA TYPE | TRIAL | TRAFFIC  | DISTRACTOR   | LENGTH (km) | DURATION (min) |
|---------|-----------|-------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------|
| 1       | URBAN     | 1     | MODERATE | NONE         | 1.7         | 3:30           |
|         |           | 2     | HIGH     | NONE         | 1.7         | 3:30           |
|         |           | 3     | MODERATE | CELL PHONE   | 1.7         | 3:30           |
|         |           | 4     | HIGH     | CELL PHONE   | 1.7         | 3:30           |
|         |           | 5     | MODERATE | CONVERSATION | 1.7         | 3:30           |
|         |           | 6     | HIGH     | CONVERSATION | 1.7         | 3:30           |
| 2       | RURAL     | 7     | MODERATE | NONE         | 2.1         | 3:30           |
|         |           | 8     | HIGH     | NONE         | 2.1         | 3:30           |
|         |           | 9     | MODERATE | CELL PHONE   | 2.1         | 3:30           |
|         |           | 10    | HIGH     | CELL PHONE   | 2.1         | 3:30           |
|         |           | 11    | MODERATE | CONVERSATION | 2.1         | 3:30           |
|         |           | 12    | HIGH     | CONVERSATION | 2.1         | 3:30           |
| TOTAL   |           |       |          |              | 22.8        | 42:00          |

## Preliminary results (cont'd)

**Table 1.** Performance of the participant groups in the two driving conditions

| Condition | Variable                 | Controls (49) ± SD   | MCI (14) ± SD   | Dementia (13) ± SD  | PD (11) ± SD  |
|-----------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Rural     | Avg speed (km)           | 48.36 ± 6.09         | 42.56 ± 7.94    | 36.03 ± 8.84        | 36.91 ± 11.37 |
|           | Avg lateral position (m) | 0.79 ± 0.14          | 0.72 ± 0.10     | 0.79 ± 0.18         | 0.82 ± 0.11   |
|           | Reaction time (sec)      | 1.51 ± 0.32          | 1.86 ± 0.49     | 2.34 ± 0.60         | 1.98 ± 1.05   |
|           |                          | Controls (n=45) ± SD | MCI (n=12) ± SD | Dementia (n=9) ± SD | PD (n=5) ± SD |
| Urban     | Avg speed (km)           | 33.25 ± 4.15         | 26.32 ± 3.63    | 26.19 ± 8.14        | 27.27 ± 7.93  |
|           | Avg lateral position (m) | 2.42 ± 0.53          | 1.95 ± 0.53     | 2.22 ± 0.69         | 2.02 ± 0.49   |
|           | Reaction time (sec)      | 1.32 ± 0.38          | 1.57 ± 0.40     | 1.69 ± 0.50         | 1.58 ± 0.35   |

## Materials & Methods

### Participants

In these analyses, 87 drivers participated: 49 controls (22-30 years N= 23; 33-53 years N= 14; 56-78 years N= 12), 14 Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI) patients, 13 mild Dementia patients (AD= 6), and 11 Parkinson's disease (PD) patients.

### Measures

RT; average speed (in km); average lateral position (distance of the vehicle from the right road border in m). Measures were recorded during the unexpected incidents.

### Data collection

**Phase 1:** Practice session (5-10 min.)

**Phase 2:** Two driving sessions (about 20 min. each) on urban streets with multiple lanes, and on a two-lane rural road. An unexpected incident occurs in each of the two sessions (sudden appearance of pedestrian or child on an urban road, of an animal on a rural road).

## Preliminary results


Univariate analyses of variance, with group as fixed variable and age as covariate, showed that RT was affected by age but not by group in both environments.

Contrasts of the RT of each patient group with the control group showed that mild Dementia patients were slower than control participants in the Rural environment ( $p = .053$ ), only. Small samples precluded analyses by gender.

**Table 2.** Univariate analyses of variance of performance in the two driving conditions

| Condition | Variable                 | Age   | Participant type                           |
|-----------|--------------------------|---|--|
| Rural     | Avg speed (km)           | $F(1, 82) = 25.13, p < .0001, \eta_p^2 = .24$ | $F(3, 82) = 3.40, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .11$ |
|           | Avg lateral position (m) | $F(1, 82) = 7.47, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .08$    | $F(3, 82) = 1.82, ns$                      |
|           | Reaction time (sec)      | $F(1, 82) = 19.72, p < .0001, \eta_p^2 = .19$ | $F(3, 82) = 2.24, ns$                      |
| Urban     | Avg speed (km)           | $F(1, 66) = 17.84, p < .0001, \eta_p^2 = .21$ | $F(3, 66) = 0.81, ns$                      |
|           | Avg lateral position (m) | $F(1, 66) = 7.53, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .10$    | $F(3, 66) = 0.74, ns$                      |
|           | Reaction time (sec)      | $F(1, 66) = 8.51, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .11$    | $F(3, 66) = 0.19, ns$                      |

**Figure 1.** Reaction time of participants in the rural condition




## Procedure

### Neurological assessment



Participants underwent a neurological assessment and clinical history evaluation

### Ophthalmological assessment



Participants' visual acuity and other possible visual problems were assessed

### Neuropsychological assessment



Participants underwent a two-stage neuropsychological assessment and personality testing

### Driving experiment



Driving was assessed with a Foerst FPF driving simulator, in different conditions

## Discussion

Initial findings show that younger participants reacted faster than older participants of all groups. Age was also the determining factor of overall differences in speed and lateral position of the vehicle in both Rural and Urban driving environments.

Dementia patients were slower to react in unexpected incidents in the Rural environment, possibly because of higher driving speed than in the Urban environment.

A driver's diagnosis does not suffice for predicting RT performance or speed of driving. The contribution of other subject variables (e.g., gender, driving experience), as well as neuropsychological measures, to driving performance will be explored in future analyses with larger samples.