

1 **Title:** Randomized Clinical Trial of ICECaP (Individualized Coordination and Empowerment for Care Partners
2 of Persons with Dementia): Primary Mental Health and Burden Outcomes
3

4 **Short Title:** ICECaP Pilot RCT: Mental Health and Burden Outcomes
5

6 **Authors:** Virginia T. Gallagher, PhD*¹, Anna Arp, BS², Ryan Thompson, PhD¹, Agustina Rossetti, PhD¹,
7 James Patrie, MS³, Shannon E Reilly, PhD¹, Carol A. Manning, PhD¹
8

9 *Corresponding author, vgallagher@virginia.edu, PO BOX 801018, Charlottesville, Virginia, 22903

10 ¹Department of Neurology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia

11 ²Brain Institute, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia

12 ³Department of Biostatistics, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia
13

14 **Funding:** This work was funded by the Department of Defense (AZ190036); program development and pilot
15 feasibility testing was funded by the Virginia Department for Aging and Rehabilitative Services (45918).
16 REDCap support at the University of Virginia is supported in part by the National Center for Advancing
17 Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award # UL1TR003015.
18

19 **Conflicts of interest:** None.
20

21 **Registration:** ClinicalTrials.gov NCT04495686 An Innovative Support Care Model for Dementia and Traumatic
22 Brain Injury
23

24 The full trial protocol can be made available upon request.

25 **Abstract:** Efficacy of the Individualized Coordination and Empowerment for Care Partners of Persons with
26 Dementia (ICECaP), an intervention that involves one-on-one individualized support from a dementia care
27 coordinator for a dementia care partner, compared to an active control group. At least once monthly contact is
28 made from a dementia care coordinator to the dementia care partner by telephone, video conferencing, email,
29 or in-person support at clinical visits for the person with dementia. In this pilot randomized unblinded control
30 trial of ICECaP, n=61 (n=90 randomized) care partners completed 12-months of the ICECaP intervention and
31 n=69 (n=92 randomized) care partners received routine clinical support (controls) in an outpatient memory care
32 clinic at an academic medical center, from which the participants were recruited (ClinicalTrials.gov:
33 NCT04495686, funded by Department of Defense and Virginia Department for Aging and Rehabilitative
34 Services). Early termination endpoints (death and higher level of care) and trial drop out were comparable
35 across groups. Primary efficacy outcomes were evaluated by comparing changes in care partner mental
36 health, burden, and quality of life from baseline to 12-months between ICECaP and controls. Linear-mixed
37 ANCOVA revealed no significant group differences in longitudinal changes on measures of caregiving burden,
38 care partner depression, anxiety, quality of life, or reactions to the behavioral symptoms of the person with
39 dementia. Hypothesized reasons for lack of initial efficacy on primary 12-month outcomes are discussed.

Introduction

There are over 11 million family members and friends providing unpaid care for persons with dementia in the United States. Informal dementia caregiving is valued at \$350 billion and 18.4 billion hours of care per year nationally.¹ Although many dementia care partners experience meaning and fulfillment in the context of their caregiving role, caring for a person with dementia is associated with increased levels of psychosocial stress, depression, and emotional burden.^{2–9}

Many programs and interventions have been developed to support dementia care partners and improve their mental health, quality of life, and caregiving readiness. Among them, collaborative care coordination has emerged as a promising, individualized intervention to help care partners and their care recipients with dementia navigate complex health systems, financial/insurance systems, and community resources. Additionally, care partners are provided with social and emotional support.^{10–13} A team at the University of Virginia, along with its partners, developed an intervention for dementia care partners called ICECaP: Individualized Coordination and Empowerment for Care Partners of Persons with Dementia to support dementia care partners. ICECaP involves individualized elements of care coordination, supportive counseling, psychoeducation, and skills training and is delivered in a hybrid setting – combining an optional initial home visit; ongoing, at least-monthly telehealth interactions via phone, email, and HIPAA-compliant video calls; and accompaniment to clinic visits for the person with dementia.

In this article, we report preliminary, primary efficacy outcomes for a pilot, randomized unblinded control trial (RCT) of ICECaP. Please see Gallagher et al. 2024 for program details, the ICECaP protocol, and analytical plan.¹⁴ We evaluate Aim 1 of the ICECaP RCT: determine whether ICECaP improves care partner burden, symptoms of depression, reaction to the behavioral symptoms of dementia, and quality of life. We hypothesized that after controlling for baseline characteristics, including level of care-recipient functional dependence, care partners in the ICECaP group would significantly improve from baseline to 12 months (post-intervention) on mental health and quality of life measures, whereas controls would not improve.

Methods

66 This study was approved by the University of Virginia Institution Research Board for Health Services
67 Research and registered with clinicaltrials.gov (NCT04495686). All care partners underwent a written informed
68 consent process one-on-one with a trained clinical research coordinator (CRC) prior to initiating study
69 procedures. Consent was documented with the signature of the participant and the CRC. All participants were
70 provided with a signed copy of the consent document.

71 **Recruitment**

72 As reported in the published protocol¹⁴ and the feasibility and acceptability data for the ICECaP clinical
73 trial (Thompson et al., currently under review), care partners were recruited from March 1, 2021 to September
74 30, 2022 from the University of Virginia's multidisciplinary Memory and Aging Care Clinic (MACC) when
75 accompanying a patient with dementia to a clinical appointment. Care partners were required to be aged ≥ 18
76 years, possess basic spoken and written English skills, have home-based internet access, and self-identify as
77 the primary care partner for a patient diagnosed with mild to moderate dementia living in the community (e.g.,
78 not living in a continuing care facility). During the course of the trial, eligibility criteria was expanded to include
79 patient populations being overlooked for recruitment. Changes made included lowering age requirements, and
80 including multiple etiologies of dementia. Using a random permuted block randomization scheme generated by
81 the study statistician and implemented by the clinical research coordinator at enrollment, care partners were
82 randomly assigned to 12-months of ICECaP or 12-months of routine clinical care (controls).

83 **Target sample size**

84 Based on an a priori power analysis, the target sample size was $n=140$ CPs, (50% ICECaP and 50%
85 control) to achieve at least 0.80 power for detecting a small-to-medium Cohen's d effect size ($d = 0.3$ to 0.5)
86 when comparing baseline to 12-month mean change in the care partner's depression score (Center for
87 Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale–Revised) and when comparing the baseline to 12-month mean
88 change the care partner's burden score (Zarit Burden Interview) between ICECaP and control groups at a
89 significance level of $\alpha = .05$.

91 **Sample and Attrition**

As described in Thompson et al. (under review), of the n=169 (control n=87, ICECap n=82) care partners recruited into the RCT who completed baseline assessments (out of 182 participants randomized), 23.08% were withdrawn from the final sample because within 12-months, the person with dementia died (n=9), moved to a higher level of care (n=8), or moved out of state (n=1); or the care partner chose to withdraw (n=4), was lost to follow-up despite two attempts to contact (n=13), or did not complete 12-month assessments (n=4). See Figure 1. The final sample of care partners included n=69 controls and n=61 ICECaP who completed baseline and 12-month assessments.

Procedures and Intervention

Please see Gallagher et al., 2024 for details. Questionnaires listed in Table 1 were completed online by both ICECaP and control groups at baseline and 12-months after baseline. Additional questionnaires for sample characterization included the Katz Index of Independence in ADLs (Katz Basic ADLs),¹⁵ the Lawton-Brody Instrumental ADL Scale (Lawton-Brody Complex ADLs),¹⁶ and the Neuropsychiatric Inventory Questionnaire, all completed by the care partner about the person with dementia.¹⁷ All measures were collected and stored using REDCap¹⁸, hosted by the University of Virginia, and were monitored by the clinical research coordinator for missing data.

Construct	Self-report Measure	Measure Details
Care partner burden	Zarit Burden Interview (ZBI) ¹⁹	22-item measure assessing degree of caregiving burden
Care partner depression	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale—Revised (CESD-R) ²⁰	20-item measure assessing symptoms of depression
Care partner anxiety	Geriatric Anxiety Inventory (GAI) ²¹	20-item measure assessing symptoms of anxiety
Care partner reaction to behavioral symptoms of dementia	Revised Memory and Behavior Problem Checklist (RMBPC) ²²	24-item measure assessing care partner-reported problematic behaviors in the person with dementia and the care partner's reaction to the behaviors
Care partner quality of life	WHO (Five) Well-Being Index (WHO-5) ²³	5-item measure assessing dimensions of psychological well-being

Intervention. After baseline questionnaires were completed, a trained dementia care coordinator (referred to going forward as care coordinator) called or e-mailed care partners in the ICECap group to schedule the initial contact. Care coordinators contacted the care partner at least once per month via email, telehealth phone/video, or an in-person meeting for at least 15 minutes. During these contacts, care coordinators

provided supportive counseling and related services based on the needs of the care partner (e.g., behavioral management, safety strategies, case management, healthcare referrals, psychoeducation). Care partners were encouraged to contact care coordinators as needed. After the initial contact, care coordinators were also required to attend regular follow-up appointments in the Memory and Aging Care Clinic with the care partner and their associated person with dementia. These follow-up appointments typically occur every 6 to 12 months. Control Group. Care partners in the control group received standard care as provided by the MACC (e.g., follow-up appointments every 6 to 12 months). They filled out the same questionnaires at baseline and 12 months as the care partners in the ICECaP intervention group.

Statistical Analysis

Data summarization. Descriptive categorical data were summarized by frequencies (n) and relative frequencies (%), and descriptive continuous scaled data were summarized by either the mean and standard deviation (SD) or the median and interquartile range of the distribution.

Baseline analysis. Although randomization imbalance with respect to the baseline demographic and caregiving characteristics of the ICECaP and control groups would expect to be rare, sensitivity analyses were conducted to assess for such imbalances. Statistical comparisons of distribution means were conducted via the Welch two-sample t-test, while statistical comparisons of distribution medians were conducted by the Wilcoxon two-sample Rank Sum test. Statistical comparisons of the relative frequencies of each characteristic were conducted by the Pearson two-sample exact test.

Efficacy analyses. Pre- to post-intervention 12-month changes in care partner burden (ZBI total score), depression (CESD-R total score), anxiety (GAI total score), reaction to dementia symptoms (RMBPC Reaction score) and quality of life (WHO-5 score) were the focus of the ICECaP trial efficacy analyses. Each efficacy analysis was conducted using a two-step analytical approach. In step 1, a linear mixed ANOVA model was used to estimate under the relaxed heterogenous, versus homogenous equal variance assumption, the intervention-specific mean pre- to post-intervention 12-month efficacy outcome change. A linear mixed model-derived one-sample t-test was then used to test the null hypothesis that the mean pre- to post-intervention 12-month efficacy outcome change is equal to zero (versus the alternative: not equal to zero). A two-sided $\alpha=0.05$ significance level was used. In step 2, a linear mixed ANCOVA model was used to test the null hypothesis that

139 the mean pre- to post-intervention 12-month efficacy outcome change is equal for the two groups after
 140 accounting for between-group disparities in the relevant baseline care partner outcome, in baseline Katz Basic
 141 ADLs, and in baseline Lawton-Brody Complex ADLs (versus the alternative: the mean pre- to post-intervention
 142 12-month adjusted efficacy outcome change is not equal). A linear model adjusted contrasts of means was
 143 used to test the null hypothesis, and a two-sided $\alpha=0.05$ significance level was used.

144 Results

145 Baseline Results

146 There were no significant group differences on baseline demographic and caregiving characteristics between
 147 the ICECaP and control groups ($ps > .05$ across comparisons; see Table 2).

	ICECaP (n=61)	Controls (n=69)	P-value
Years of age [M(SD)]	64.8 (12.3)	64.9 (11.6)	0.968
Gender (women)	42 (68.9%)	52 (75.4%)	0.438
Race/Ethnicity			
Non-Hispanic White	57 (93.4%)	60 (87.0%)	0.790
Non-Hispanic Black/African American	3 (4.9%)	4 (5.8%)	
Hispanic/Latino	1 (1.6%)	3 (4.3%)	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.4%)	
Highest level of education completed			
High school diploma or GED	5 (8.2%)	5 (7.2%)	0.810
Some college	10 (16.4%)	8 (11.6%)	
Associate's degree	4 (6.6%)	8 (11.6%)	
Bachelor's degree	27 (44.3%)	25 (36.2%)	
Master's degree	11 (18.0%)	15 (21.7%)	
Doctoral degree	4 (6.6%)	6 (8.7%)	
Employment status*			
Retired	24 (39.3%)	39 (56.5%)	0.051
Full-time	15 (24.6%)	15 (21.7%)	
Part-time	9 (14.8%)	2 (2.9%)	
Unemployed	2 (3.3%)	3 (4.3%)	
Monthly income			
\$1–\$4,999	24 (39.3%)	19 (27.5%)	0.255
\$5,000–\$9,999	13 (21.3%)	18 (26.1%)	
\$10,000–\$14,999	4 (6.6%)	5 (7.2%)	
\$15,000–\$24,999	4 (6.6%)	11 (15.9%)	
Relationship to PWD			
Spouse/Partner	44 (72.1%)	49 (71.0%)	1.000
Adult Child	14 (23.0%)	16 (23.2%)	
Co-dwelling with PWD	47 (77.0%)	54 (78.3%)	0.688
CP hours/month supporting basic ADLs for PWD [MD [IQR]]	3.8 [0, 30.0]	0 [0, 48.7]	0.976
CP hours/month supporting complex ADLs for PWD [MD [IRQ]]	30.0 [7.1, 9.0]	60.0 [19.0, 120.0]	0.067
Katz Index of Independence in (Basic) ADLs for PWD [M(SD)]	7.3 (0.9)	7.6 (1.1)	0.109

	ICECaP (n=61)	Controls (n=69)	P-value
Lawton-Brody Instrumental (Complex) ADL Scale for PWD [M(SD)]	3.9 (2.2)	3.7 (2.1)	0.659
Neuropsychiatric Inventory Questionnaire- PWD Severity Score [M(SD)] ¹⁷	6.1 (5.1)	5.7 (4.7)	0.630

Note. Data presented as *n* (% of group) unless otherwise noted. ADLs = activities of daily living; CP = care partner; M(SD) = Mean (Standard Deviation); MD [IQR] = Median [Interquartile Range] PWD = person with dementia.

148

149 There were no significant differences in baseline scores on any primary outcome measures between groups
150 (see Table 3). Within both groups at baseline, caregiver burden fell in the mild to moderate range; mean
151 depression scores and anxiety scores fell below the threshold for at- risk clinical depression and anxiety,
152 respectively; mean reaction to behavioral symptoms of dementia fell between “a little” to “moderately” bothered
153 by the person with dementia’s symptoms. There is no established cut-off for the WHO-5 quality of life score.

154

	ICECaP (n=61)				Controls (n=69)				ANCOVA Models
Construct	Baseline Mean (SD)	12-Month Mean (SD)	Mean Δ [95% CI]	P-value¹	Baseline Mean (SD)	12-Month Mean (SD)	Mean Δ [95% CI]	P-value²	P-value³
Burden	17.30 (7.84)	18.38 (7.82)	1.25 [-0.56, 3.06]	0.173	17.74 (7.96)	18.74 (7.58)	1.00 [-0.44, 2.44]	0.170	0.955
Depression	9.11 (11.06)	10.43 (10.83)	1.33 [-1.55, 4.21]	0.358	11.22 (11.15)	13.14 (13.68)	1.93 [-0.10, 3.96]	0.062	0.563
Anxiety	4.46 (4.70)	4.31 (4.61)	-0.15 [-1.28, 0.99]	0.796	4.62 (4.81)	5.01 (4.64)	0.39 [-0.31, 1.10]	0.272	0.396
Reaction to dementia sx	1.31 (0.69)	1.25 (0.71)	-0.05 [-0.26, 0.16]	0.621	1.34 (0.65)	1.40 (0.65)	0.06 [-0.09, 0.21]	0.441	0.204
Quality of life	14.21 (5.13)	13.95 (5.31)	-0.40 [-1.62, 0.82]	0.515	13.77 (4.71)	13.41 (5.20)	-0.38 [-1.41, 0.65]	0.468	0.954

Constructs were measured using the following questionnaires: Burden = ZBI-SF; Depression = CESD-R; Anxiety = GAI; Reaction to Dementia sx (Symptoms) = RMBPC Reaction score; Quality of Life = WHO-5
P-values¹⁻² were derived from linear mixed model one-sample t-test for testing the null hypothesis that the mean change (Δ) from baseline to 12-months is equal to zero. P-values³ were derived from the linear mixed ANCOVA model two-sample test for comparing the mean change from baseline to 12-months (Δ) between ICECaP and control groups after adjusting for baseline Katz Index of Independence in (Basic) ADLs and Lawton-Brody Instrumental (Complex) ADL Scale for PWD.
Analysis was by originally assigned groups.

157 **Longitudinal Results**

158 There were no significant differences in baseline to 12-month change on primary outcome
159 measures between ICECaP and controls (see Table 3). Results were consistent when the Katz
160 Basic ADLs and Lawton-Brody Complex ADLs were included as covariates in analyses.

161 **Harms**

162 There were no harms associated with the intervention. Inherent harms of providing care for a
163 person with dementia include possible depressive episodes.

164 **Discussion**

165 This paper presents the preliminary, 12-month efficacy results of a pilot RCT of the
166 ICECaP intervention for care partners of persons with dementia. On average, the 12-month
167 intervention did not appear to significantly change care partners' self-reported levels of burden,
168 depression, anxiety, quality of life, or reaction to behavioral symptoms in the person with
169 dementia. There were no significant differences between the ICECaP intervention group and the
170 control group in key outcomes at baseline, 12-months, or in change from baseline to 12-months.

171 There are several possible explanations why there were no significant mental health,
172 burden, or quality of life benefits detected in this 12-month RCT of ICECaP. First, this cohort of
173 dementia care partners did not indicate experiencing elevated mental health distress, severe
174 caregiving burden, or poor quality of life at baseline according to self-report measures. This is
175 consistent with the relatively high socioeconomic status of this sample, who are majority non-
176 Hispanic White and well educated, rendering them less vulnerable to adverse impacts of
177 caregiving. Therefore, a floor effect may be present in which care partners' self-report measure
178 scores did not have ample room to allow for change in a positive (i.e., improved) direction.
179 Additionally, the relatively high socioeconomic status of the current sample limits generalizability
180 of these findings to caregivers from more diverse socioeconomic backgrounds. In sum, future
181 efficacy testing of ICECaP should have more restrictive inclusion criteria to include only care

182 partners who have elevated levels of the target factor (e.g., burden, depression, and/or anxiety)
183 and greater consideration of diverse socioeconomic statuses.

184 Additionally, no differential group-by-time effects may have been detected in this RCT
185 due to the nature of the control group in this study. Specifically, all care partners included in
186 both the intervention and control group received follow-up care in the UVA Memory and Aging
187 Care Clinic (MACC). Follow-up care in MACC typically involves a one-hour appointment for the
188 person with dementia and their care partner(s) one to two times per year with a multidisciplinary
189 team of neuropsychologists, neuropsychology postdoctoral fellows, a nurse practitioner, a
190 pharmacist, an occupational therapist, and a speech-language pathologist, among other
191 specialties. While these appointments are scheduled for the person with dementia, the
192 accompanying care partner receives information about pharmacological and non-
193 pharmacological behavioral management strategies; long-term care planning support; dementia
194 psychoeducation; psychotherapy and support group options for care partners; information
195 regarding adult day, continuing care, and respite facilities; and other local resources. Further,
196 care partners are often provided emotional support, validation, and encouragement; at times,
197 the care partner and the person with dementia are separated during the appointment so a care
198 partner can receive one-on-one validation and support (e.g., while the person with dementia is
199 completing brief testing to inform treatment recommendations). Although once to twice yearly
200 support in the multidisciplinary clinic is a lower frequency and intensity of support relative to the
201 monthly support care partners receive in ICECaP, it is possible that there is too much overlap in
202 support that was provided to both the ICECaP group and the control group to detect a signal. In
203 the future, it may be more appropriate to restrict the control group to care partners in the
204 community who are on the waitlist for specialty care services.

205 Another possible reason for the lack of differential changes on outcome measures
206 between the ICECaP and control groups over time could be the variability in “dosage” of the
207 intervention in the ICECaP group. As Thompson et al. (manuscript currently under review)

208 reported, the number of contacts between dementia care coordinators and care partners in the
209 ICECaP group was significantly variable. Care partners and care coordinators had an average
210 of 2.2 contacts per month, averaged across 12-months within the ICECaP group; however, the
211 number of contacts in a month ranged from 0 to 15 contacts. Further, while all care partners had
212 a least one contact with a care coordinator during at least 11 of the 12 months of ICECaP,
213 25.6% of care partners had one month with 0 contacts with the care coordinator. In sum, it is
214 possible that the intervention is efficacious for improving mental health, burden, and quality of
215 life for those who are highly engaged in the program (e.g., > monthly contact with a care
216 coordinator; care partner utilizes resources effectively by following through on care coordinator
217 recommendations) but that engagement was too variable within the intervention group to detect
218 improvement on outcome measures relative to the control group. Future analyses will focus on
219 the extent to which engagement metrics impact efficacy of the intervention.

220 While the ICECaP pilot RCT did not demonstrate significant impacts of ICECaP on care
221 partner mental health and caregiving burden, secondary analyses have revealed promising
222 effects on other aspects of caregiver wellbeing (manuscript in preparation). Specifically, ICECaP
223 appears to improve care partners' preparedness for caregiving, which has downstream
224 correlates with improvement in mental health measures. Collectively, the results from this
225 manuscript and the forthcoming manuscript on ICECaP primary and secondary outcomes will
226 provide important considerations for further refinement and testing of the ICECaP intervention.

227

228 **Acknowledgements**

229 None.

230

231

References

- 232
233
234 1. Alzheimer's Association. 2024 Alzheimer's Disease Facts and Figures. n.d.
- 235 2. Mahoney R, Regan C, Katona C, et al. Anxiety and depression in family caregivers of
236 people with Alzheimer disease: the LASER-AD study. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry*
237 2005;13(9):795–801; doi: 10.1176/appi.ajgp.13.9.795.
- 238 3. Abdollahpour I, Nedjat S, Salimi Y, et al. Which variable is the strongest adjusted predictor
239 of quality of life in caregivers of patients with dementia? *Psychogeriatrics* 2015;15(1):51–57;
240 doi: 10.1111/psyg.12094.
- 241 4. Huang S-S. Depression among caregivers of patients with dementia: Associative factors
242 and management approaches. *World J Psychiatry* 2022;12(1):59–76; doi:
243 10.5498/wjp.v12.i1.59.
- 244 5. Sallim AB, Sayampanathan AA, Cuttilan A, et al. Prevalence of Mental Health Disorders
245 Among Caregivers of Patients With Alzheimer Disease. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*
246 2015;16(12):1034–1041; doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2015.09.007.
- 247 6. Chiao C-Y, Wu H-S, Hsiao C-Y. Caregiver burden for informal caregivers of patients with
248 dementia: A systematic review. *Int Nurs Rev* 2015;62(3):340–350; doi: 10.1111/inr.12194.
- 249 7. Zarit SH, Savla J. Caregivers and Stress. In: *Stress: Concepts, Cognition, Emotion, and*
250 *Behavior.* (Fink G. ed) Academic Press: San Diego; 2016; pp. 339–344; doi: 10.1016/B978-
251 0-12-800951-2.00042-X.
- 252 8. Collins RN, Kishita N. Prevalence of depression and burden among informal care-givers of
253 people with dementia: a meta-analysis. *Ageing & Society* 2020;40(11):2355–2392; doi:
254 10.1017/S0144686X19000527.
- 255 9. Steinsheim G, Malmedal W, Follestad T, et al. Factors associated with subjective burden
256 among informal caregivers of home-dwelling people with dementia: a cross-sectional study.
257 *BMC Geriatrics* 2023;23(1):644; doi: 10.1186/s12877-023-04358-3.
- 258 10. Bernstein A, Harrison KL, Dulaney S, et al. The Role of Care Navigators Working with
259 People with Dementia and their Caregivers. *J Alzheimers Dis* 2019;71(1):45–55; doi:
260 10.3233/JAD-180957.
- 261 11. Possin KL, Merrilees JJ, Dulaney S, et al. Effect of Collaborative Dementia Care via
262 Telephone and Internet on Quality of Life, Caregiver Well-being, and Health Care Use: The
263 Care Ecosystem Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med* 2019;179(12):1658–1667;
264 doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2019.4101.
- 265 12. Kallmyer BA, Bass D, Baumgart M, et al. Dementia care navigation: Building toward a
266 common definition, key principles, and outcomes. *Alzheimer's & Dementia: Translational*
267 *Research & Clinical Interventions* 2023;9(3):e12408; doi: 10.1002/trc2.12408.
- 268 13. Hirschman KB, McHugh M, Morgan B. An integrative review of measures of transitions and
269 care coordination for persons living with dementia and their caregivers. *Alzheimers Dement*
270 (N Y) 2023;9(3):e12391; doi: 10.1002/trc2.12391.

- 271 14. Gallagher VT, Reilly SE, Worthington G, et al. Individualized Coordination and
272 Empowerment for Care Partners of Persons with Dementia (ICECaP): Study rationale and
273 protocol. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2024;137:107418; doi: 10.1016/j.cct.2023.107418.
- 274 15. Katz S, Ford AB, Moskowitz RW, et al. STUDIES OF ILLNESS IN THE AGED. THE INDEX
275 OF ADL: A STANDARDIZED MEASURE OF BIOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOSOCIAL
276 FUNCTION. *JAMA* 1963;185:914–919; doi: 10.1001/jama.1963.03060120024016.
- 277 16. Lawton MP, Brody EM. Assessment of older people: self-maintaining and instrumental
278 activities of daily living. *Gerontologist* 1969;9(3):179–186.
- 279 17. Kaufer DI, Cummings JL, Ketchel P, et al. Validation of the NPI-Q, a Brief Clinical Form of
280 the Neuropsychiatric Inventory. *JNP* 2000;12(2):233–239; doi: 10.1176/jnp.12.2.233.
- 281 18. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international
282 community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform* 2019;95:103208; doi:
283 10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208.
- 284 19. Bédard M, Molloy DW, Squire L, et al. The Zarit Burden Interview: a new short version and
285 screening version. *Gerontologist* 2001;41(5):652–657; doi: 10.1093/geront/41.5.652.
- 286 20. Eaton WW, Smith C, Ybarra M, et al. Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale:
287 Review and Revision (CESD and CESD-R). In: *The Use of Psychological Testing for*
288 *Treatment Planning and Outcomes Assessment: Instruments for Adults, Volume 3, 3rd Ed*
289 *Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers: Mahwah, NJ, US; 2004; pp. 363–377.*
- 290 21. Johnco C, Knight A, Tadic D, et al. Psychometric properties of the Geriatric Anxiety
291 Inventory (GAI) and its short-form (GAI-SF) in a clinical and non-clinical sample of older
292 adults. *Int Psychogeriatr* 2015;27(7):1089–1097; doi: 10.1017/S1041610214001586.
- 293 22. Teri L, Truax P, Logsdon R, et al. Assessment of behavioral problems in dementia: the
294 revised memory and behavior problems checklist. *Psychol Aging* 1992;7(4):622–631; doi:
295 10.1037//0882-7974.7.4.622.
- 296 23. Topp CW, Østergaard SD, Søndergaard S, et al. The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: a
297 systematic review of the literature. *Psychother Psychosom* 2015;84(3):167–176; doi:
298 10.1159/000376585.

299
300

301 Figure 1. Sample Consort Flow Diagram.

