

Cost-effectiveness of dementia insurance for cognitively-unimpaired *APOE-ε4* homozygotes – a simulation study

1 Kenichiro Sato^{1,2}, Saki Nakashima³, Yoshiki Niimi^{2,4}, Takeshi Iwatsubo^{1,2,*}

2 ¹ Department of Neuropathology, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo

3 ² Unit for Early and Exploratory Clinical Development, The University of Tokyo Hospital

4 ³ Department of Neurology, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo

5 ⁴ Department of Healthcare Economics and Health Policy, Graduate School of Medicine, The
6 University of Tokyo

7

8 * Correspondence: Dr. Takeshi Iwatsubo (iwatsubo@m.u-tokyo.ac.jp)

9 **Running Title:** Cost-effectiveness of dementia insurance

10 **Keywords:** dementia insurance, *APOE*, ε4-homozygote, cost-effectiveness, Alzheimer's disease.

11

12 **Abstract**

13 Dementia insurance, a private insurance product covering the first diagnosis of dementia of the
14 insured, may be economical for asymptomatic individuals who are aware of their own high genetic
15 risk of developing Alzheimer's disease (AD) in advance. This is a retrospective study conducted
16 based on National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center (NACC) data including cognitively unimpaired
17 individuals, aiming to simulate income and expenses of dementia insurance for the insured
18 perspectives. Loss ratio (= total benefits gained / total premium paid) was calculated by *APOE-ε4*
19 subgroup as a measure of cost-effectiveness, applying the premium rates of actual dementia
20 insurance products being sold in Japan. As a result, for up to 18 years of longitudinal follow-up, the
21 estimated cost-effectiveness improved over the longer observation periods. In individuals in their 60s
22 or older at baseline, the cost-effectiveness was best in the *APOE-ε4* homozygotes, followed by

23 heterozygotes, and $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals. The dementia insurance for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes for
24 observation periods ≥ 10 years in this age group was approximately 3 to 4 times more economical
25 than for $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals. Although actively pursuing *APOE* testing for asymptomatic
26 individuals may not be currently recommended due to the concern of adverse selection in the
27 insurance and the absence of available disease-modifying therapy approved for the preclinical stage
28 of AD, our study may provide an important basis for further investigating the advantages and
29 limitations of dementia insurance for asymptomatic individuals with pathogenic or high-risk genes.

30

31 **1 Introduction**

32 Along with the growing population of elderly individuals, there is an increasing awareness among
33 people of the need to prepare for life after retirement, including expenses for long-term care services
34 and medical care services [Yamazaki 2020]. In line with this trend, a private insurance product called
35 “dementia insurance” has been introduced over the past 10-20 years in some countries such as South
36 Korea [Park 2017; RGA HP] and Japan [Šestáková 2019; Goncharova 2020; Eisai HP]. The
37 dementia insurance product is typically designed as diagnostic coverage for middle-aged or elderly
38 non-demented individuals, providing a predetermined insurance benefit if the insured individuals are
39 diagnosed with dementia at certain stages for the first time during the policy period [Eisai HP].
40 Additional benefits are sometimes provided, such as coverage for dementia prevention, dementia
41 treatment, long-term care services, and medical care services [Park 2017; RGA HP].

42 In Japan, a super-aging society [Muramatsu 2011] where elderly population comprised 29%
43 in 2021 [eStat], the sale of dementia insurance is reportedly not very popular (e.g., 6.6% of
44 households from a 2021 survey of 4,000 in Japan had purchased it [Japanese Institute of Life
45 Insurance]). This may be due, in part, to the good availability of national health and long-term care
46 (LTC) insurance [Tamiya 2011]. A typical dementia insurance product for older individuals (e.g.,
47 aged 60 years) requires the insured to pay thousands of JPY as a monthly premium (c.f., USD 1 =
48 JPY 160 in early July 2024) for life, with a benefit amount of JPY 1,000,000 (i.e., USD 6,250 when

49 1 USD = JPY 160) upon the occurrence of an event (e.g., first diagnosis of dementia and/or
50 certification as requiring nursing care in the long-term care insurance system).

51 If a person knew that they had an objectively high risk of developing dementia in the future,
52 they might consider it beneficial for them to purchase a dementia insurance policy while still
53 cognitively unimpaired. However, such objective information is usually not available. For this reason,
54 dementia insurance might be viewed as a viable insurance product for private insurance companies
55 that need to make a profit.

56 Meanwhile, in some rare cases, people have been found to have an objectively high risk of
57 developing AD, which is the most common cause of dementia [Jack 2013]. These include those with
58 familial AD mutations or two *APOE*- $\epsilon 4$ alleles [Liu 2013; Nicolas 2016; Husain 2021; Fortea 2023].
59 *APOE*- $\epsilon 4$ homozygotes are at very high risk of developing AD (e.g., odds ratio (OR) 5.9 in $\epsilon 4/\epsilon 3$ and
60 OR 33.1 in $\epsilon 4/\epsilon 4$ compared to $\epsilon 4$ -negative in Japanese population [Farrer 1997]), and they are more
61 prevalent than those with familial AD mutations in the general population [Nicolas 2016]. While
62 *APOE* genotype testing has not been covered by health insurance [Arias 2021], it may become more
63 common testing with the recent approval of anti-amyloid therapies (such as lecanemab [van Dyck
64 2023] and donanemab [Sims 2023]) and the subsequent need to stratify the risk of developing a
65 specific adverse effect called Amyloid-Related Imaging Abnormalities (ARIA) [Sperling 2011]. This,
66 in turn, may lead to an increase in the number of people unexpectedly found to be $\epsilon 4$ homozygous at
67 their asymptomatic stage, when there is no treatment available, apart from the requirement for testing
68 in the context of anti-amyloid treatment.

69 Currently, private insurance companies in some regions and countries – mainly Western
70 countries – are not allowed to use genetic information in their underwriting process to prevent
71 genetic discrimination [Muto 2023]. For example, in the United States, it is legally prohibited for
72 medical insurance under federal law, and for other kinds of insurance under state law in some states.
73 In Japan, it is self-regulated by insurance industry association based on a voluntary guideline issued
74 in May 2022 [The Life Insurance Association of Japan 2022]. Current underwriting and payment

75 practices for dementia insurance in Japan do not exclude individuals with a genetically high risk of
76 developing AD, regardless of whether they know their objective risk in advance, as long as they are
77 asymptomatic at the time of insurance purchase.

78 Private insurance products targeting the general population and operated by for-profit
79 companies are, like lotteries, basically loss-making in terms of expected income versus expenses
80 from the viewpoint of the insured. The same can be said for dementia insurance, where it is
81 estimated that more than half of the policyholders would be relatively low-risk, *APOE* $\epsilon 4$ -negative
82 people. On the other hand, $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes are especially susceptible to developing AD, as well as
83 experiencing ARIA during anti-amyloid therapy, and specific opportunities of research and trials for
84 this group are gaining recognition [Fortea 2023]. Given the high risk of developing AD in
85 $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes, we hypothesized that there could possibly be a surplus in terms of expected income
86 versus expenses for those who are $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes, or that the dementia insurance may be at least
87 more economical for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes than for $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals. If so, can dementia insurance
88 possibly be an option for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes to mitigate their future disease burden?

89 This study aims to examine the cost-effectiveness of dementia insurance from the
90 perspective of the insured individuals, using long-term, large observational data to emulate the
91 development of AD and dementia within the longitudinal insurance policyholding history. We apply
92 the actual premium rate settings of dementia insurance products sold in Japan to the data, thereby
93 simulating the balance of income and expenses at the genotype group level, and clarifying the degree
94 of cost-effectiveness of dementia insurance for the $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes compared to other genotypes
95 under Japanese circumstances.

96

97 **2 Methods**

98 **2.1. Study Design**

99 This is a retrospective study using National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center (NACC) data, a
100 publicly-available database that includes observational data of more than 50,000 unique participants

101 collected from Alzheimer’s Disease Research Centers in the United States [Beekly 2004]. Our study
102 was approved by a local ethics committee [ID:11754-(1)]. Our study requires a sufficient number of
103 participants with two ε4 alleles with a considerable length of observation period, making the NACC
104 data suitable for our simulation despite it being obtained from North American citizens. We applied
105 the actual premium rate settings of dementia insurance products sold in Japan.

106

107 *2.2. Simulation Settings*

108 We regarded the NACC longitudinal observation data of participants, from their baseline to the
109 development of dementia or dropout from the study, as the longitudinal policyholding data of insured
110 individuals. The maximum length of follow-up for NACC participants is approximately 18 years. Let
111 us consider a typical dementia insurance product to simulate: cognitively unimpaired middle-aged or
112 elderly individuals within a certain age range (e.g., 50-75 years old) at enrollment, without
113 significant past medical history that may directly influence cognitive function, are eligible to
114 purchase the insurance. The insured pay a fixed monthly premium until death or policy cancellation,
115 and receive a lump-sum benefit when they are diagnosed with dementia for the first time, regardless
116 of the cause. For simplicity, we set the benefit as JPY 1,000,000 (= USD 6,250 when USD 1 = JPY
117 160) for this analysis.

118 We searched the Internet on July 1, 2024, using a Japanese keyword equivalent to
119 “dementia insurance”, and identified nine simplified-issue dementia insurance products with details
120 available online (Table S1). All provided a primary benefit of a one-time diagnostic lump-sum
121 payment, with exclusion period of up to 2 years from the purchase date. The conditions for receiving
122 benefits were similar across products, with many requiring diagnosis of non-treatable dementia by a
123 physician, and some additionally requiring certification of nursing care necessity in the LTC
124 insurance system. Common reasons for denial of insurance coverage included concurrent
125 hospitalization, a history of neuropsychiatric diseases including MCI or dementia, applying for or
126 being certified for public LTC insurance benefits, and recent surgery or hospitalization. The age

127 range for whole-life dementia insurance largely overlapped across products, with a typical minimum
128 age of 40 and maximum of 79.

129 Among these products, we selected two whole-life dementia insurance products, where the
130 premium rate for diagnostic coverage of dementia development was available by sex and detailed
131 age at enrollment, and where the insurance benefit was lump-sum JPY 1,000,000 without additional
132 plans required to include. The names of these products or companies are not publicized in this study,
133 as reviewing specific products in an identifiable manner is not the aim of this study.

134 For simulation using NACC data, we included participants whose Clinical Dementia Rating
135 global score (CDR-GS) was 0 at baseline, who had visited study site twice or more, who had no
136 specific medical history (i.e., stroke, Parkinson's disease, alcohol abuse, schizophrenia, bipolar
137 disorder, depression within two years, traumatic brain injury, and any other neurological diseases) at
138 baseline, who had no dominantly-inherited AD mutations, and whose *APOE* genotype information
139 was available. The event of interest (i.e., first development of dementia) was defined as a CDR-GS
140 of 1 or more for the first time during observation.

141

142 ***2.3. Calculation of Income and Expenses***

143 By regarding the NACC longitudinal observation as the insurance policyholding data, we calculated
144 the balance of income and expenses for insured individuals by applying the age-dependent monthly
145 premium data. Figure 1A illustrates several patterns of the period during which monthly premiums
146 were assumed to be paid for up to T years ($1 \leq T \leq 18$). Pattern (a) represents those without the
147 occurrence of an event within the period of T years, resulting in only premium payments without
148 gaining a benefit. Pattern (b) is for those who developed dementia within the period, and such
149 individuals gain a benefit, having paid premiums until the time of dementia diagnosis. Patterns (c)
150 and (e) resemble the patterns (a) and (b), respectively.

151 However, pattern (d) requires attention: individuals in this pattern dropped out of the NACC
152 study without observation of an event during the period, so their income is set to zero. Some of these

153 individuals may have developed dementia after their dropout, meaning their potential income could
154 be underestimated. To address this, we applied two scenarios for balance calculation: scenario (i)
155 assumes pattern (d) individuals canceled their insurance at dropout, while scenario (ii) assumes a
156 fraction of pattern (d) individuals actually developed dementia at dropout. The proportion of those
157 who developed dementia in scenario (ii) is assumed to be the same as those in patterns [b] and [e]
158 combined.

159 For a given period of T years we can obtain the total income from all participants who
160 developed dementia within the period and total payments made by all participants during their
161 policyholding period. This leads to the calculation of loss ratio [Grace 2023], defined as follows:

$$\text{Loss ratio} = (\text{Paid claims} + \text{Loss adjustment expenses}) / \text{Earned premium}$$

162 The loss ratio indicates whether an insurance product is financially favorable (< 1) or unfavorable ($>$
163 1) for the insurance company. Conversely, a higher loss ratio (> 1) is favorable for the insured,
164 indicating a higher expected value of benefits. The loss adjustment expense (LAE) is the cost
165 incurred by the insurance companies for claim verification. For simplicity, we assumed the LAE to
166 be at most 10% of the total claims. The simplified loss ratio from the insured's standpoint is defined
167 as:

$$\text{Loss ratio}' = \text{Gained claims} / \text{Paid premium}$$

168 We calculated the loss ratio for each $APOE$ - $\epsilon 4$ subgroup ($\epsilon 4$ -negative, $\epsilon 4$ -heterozygous, and
169 $\epsilon 4$ -homozygous). The ratio of the loss ratio between subgroups was further calculated as:

$$\text{Ratio}_{\text{homo/negative}} = \text{Loss ratio}_{\text{homo}} / \text{Loss ratio}_{\text{negative}}$$

$$\text{Ratio}_{\text{homo/hetero}} = \text{Loss ratio}_{\text{homo}} / \text{Loss ratio}_{\text{hetero}}$$

170 These ratios indicate how much more economical dementia insurance is for the $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes than
171 for the $\epsilon 4$ -heterozygotes or $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals. The ratios and their 95% confidence intervals
172 (CIs) are obtained by bootstrapping ($B = 1,000$). Since younger NACC participants at baseline would
173 be less likely to develop dementia over the 18-year period, we examined the cost-effectiveness

174 metrics for all eligible NACC cases, as well as for the subgroups stratified by the age at baseline (i.e.,
175 50s or younger, 60s, and 70s or older).

176

177 **3 Results**

178 **3.1. Included Participants**

179 **Table 1** shows the baseline characteristics of the examined cognitively unimpaired participants (i.e.,
180 CDR-GS of 0) at baseline. The $\epsilon 4$ -heterozygotes and homozygotes accounted for approximately 30%
181 and 4%, respectively. An event (i.e., conversion to $\text{CDR-GS} \geq 1$ for the first time) during the
182 observation period was seen in 3.41% of these participants, with the median occurrence in the 7th
183 year from their observation. The median follow-up period was 4.5 years, with a slight difference in
184 follow-up length by *APOE* genotype ($p = 0.021$, ANOVA test): a Poisson regression model
185 examining the effect of the number of $\epsilon 4$ alleles on follow-up length revealed that $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes
186 and $\epsilon 4$ -heterozygotes had 0.900 and 0.968 times shorter maximum follow-up periods compared to
187 $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals.

188 **Figure 1B** shows the survival curve of participants until their development of dementia
189 ($\text{CDR-GS} \geq 1$). Cox-proportional hazards analysis, including intercept and *APOE*- $\epsilon 4$ alleles as
190 explanatory variables, revealed a hazard ratio (HR) for conversion to $\text{CDR-GS} \geq 1$ of 1.899 (95%CI:
191 1.469 ~ 2.456) for $\epsilon 4$ -heterozygotes and 4.106 (95%CI: 2.674 ~ 6.305) for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes,
192 compared to $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals.

193

194 **3.2. Loss Ratio by *APOE* Genotype**

195 **Figure 2A** shows the loss ratio in each $\epsilon 4$ subgroup, based on the any baseline age of participants, for
196 different observation periods T ($1 \leq T \leq 18$). In either insurance product ([a] or [b]), for observation
197 periods ≥ 10 years, the loss ratio was highest in the *APOE*- $\epsilon 4$ homozygotes, followed by
198 heterozygotes and $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals. The loss ratio for $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals remained
199 consistently low, regardless of the examined range of T . As T increased, the estimated loss ratio

200 notably rose for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes, irrespective of the scenario assumed ([i] or [ii]). Meanwhile, the
201 loss ratio did not exceed the economically favorable threshold (loss ratio = 1) even for
202 $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes.

203 **Figure S1** shows the distribution of loss ratio by baseline age subgroup (50s or younger
204 [**Figure S1A**], 60s [**Figure S1B**], and 70s or older [**Figure S1C**]). Since $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes in their 50s
205 at baseline did not convert to dementia, the loss ratio for individuals in their 50s is zero across all
206 periods (**Figure S1A**). The loss ratios of individuals in their 60s or older at baseline were similar to
207 the results for all age combined (**Figure 2B, C**).

208

209 **3.3. Relative Cost-Effectiveness**

210 **Figure 2B** demonstrates the ratio of the loss ratios: ratio(homo/hetero) and ratio(homo/negative). For
211 $T = 1$, no meaningful ratios were obtained because no $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals developed dementia
212 within a 1-year period. Broad 95% CIs spanning 1 were observed for $T = 2 \sim 7$, but the
213 ratio(homo/negative) consistently and significantly exceeded 1, ranging from 3 to 4 at $T \geq 8$. The
214 ratio(homo/hetero) showed a similar distribution, reaching as high as 2 and remaining consistently
215 and significantly above 1 at $T \geq 12$. The 95% CIs of the ratio(homo/negative) and the
216 ratio(homo/hetero) showed slight overlap.

217 **Figure S2** presents the ratio of the loss ratios distribution by baseline age subgroup (50s or
218 younger [**Figure S2A**], 60s [**Figure S2B**], and 70s or older [**Figure S2C**]). Since $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes in
219 their 50s at baseline did not reveal conversion to dementia, the ratio for individuals in their 50s at
220 baseline is zero or all periods (**Figure S2A**). The ratios for individuals in their 70s or older at baseline
221 were similar to the all-age results (**Figure S2C**), while the ratios for those in their 60s showed limited
222 difference between the ratio(homo/negative) and the ratio(hetero/negative) (**Figure S2B**).

223

224 **4 Discussion**

225 In this study, we examined the cost-effectiveness of dementia insurance from the perspective of the
226 insured, using longitudinal NACC data to simulate the development of dementia and the subsequent
227 group-level income and expenses. As a result, we found that the estimated loss ratio for
228 $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes increases as the length of the observation period extends, while the loss ratio for
229 $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals remains low regardless of the duration of the period examined (up to
230 18-year). Furthermore, we identified the loss ratio for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes is 2 and 3-4 times better than
231 that for $\epsilon 4$ -heterozygotes and for $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals, respectively, especially among those in
232 their 60s-70s at baseline. These results suggest that non-demented $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes of this age group
233 may find it significantly more economical to purchase dementia insurance than $\epsilon 4$ -negative
234 individuals, provided the insurance policy is held for 10 years or longer. Asymptomatic
235 $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes are known as susceptible to developing AD and experiencing ARIA during
236 anti-amyloid therapy, and specific opportunities of research and trials for them are getting
237 recognized [Fortea 2023]. Dementia insurance could potentially serve as a form of support to
238 mitigate their future disease burden. Our results will provide an important basis for further
239 investigating the advantages and shortcomings of dementia insurance for asymptomatic but high-risk
240 people, not limited to *APOE- $\epsilon 4$* homozygotes.

241 A major characteristic of this study is applying actual premium rate settings to longitudinal
242 observational data, treating it as the longitudinal insurance history data of the insured. The dementia
243 insurance itself is designed based on the probability of dementia development in the target
244 population; however, there is limited statistical data on the long-term probability of dementia
245 conversion in $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes, as required in our study. This is an advantage of our approach, which
246 overcomes the data shortage.

247 Meanwhile, simulations using observational data require careful interpretation. NACC
248 participants may be either less or more motivated to continue participating in the study than insured
249 individuals are to maintain an insurance policy. If so, mid-study dropouts from the NACC data may
250 not always be equivalent in frequency to the cancellation of an insurance policy during the period

251 (i.e., scenario [i]). Additionally, the participants' age significantly influenced the level of
252 cost-effectiveness (Figure S1, S2), due to their difference in the prevalence of dementia development.
253 We were unable to conduct meaningful discussions on the results from participants who were in their
254 50s or younger (Figure S1A, S2A). Furthermore, although the prevalence of *APOE*- ϵ 4 genotypes in
255 the examined NACC data – *APOE*- ϵ 4-heterozygotes 30% and homozygotes 4% – was not far from
256 real-world estimates, as previously reported [Husain 2021], there is no guarantee that the proportion
257 of ϵ 4-heterozygotes and homozygotes among actual dementia insurance policyholders would be
258 consistent with the prevalence observed in this study. In addition, since the premium rate settings
259 applied were those of dementia insurance sold in Japan, the calculated loss ratio might differ from
260 our results if we had used the premium rate of insurance policies sold in the United States.

261 For these reasons, the value of the loss ratio itself, as estimated in this study (Figure 2A) for
262 each ϵ 4 genotype, may not be completely reliable. This is also suspect from the aspect of the degree
263 of the loss ratio in ϵ 4-negative individuals (Figure 2A), who should be the majority of the insured: it
264 is lower than 0.25 and appears too favorable for the insurance companies, so the loss ratio estimated
265 in our simulation may actually be underestimated to a considerable degree. This is the major
266 limitation of our study. Although another scenario, assuming that some of the dropout participants
267 had actually developed dementia (i.e., scenario [ii]), attempted to address these shortcomings by
268 demonstrating a larger loss ratio than in the scenario [i], it is necessary to identify the precise method
269 to correct for mid-way dropout cases.

270 In turn, the relative relationship of the loss ratio between different genotypes, i.e., ratio in
271 the loss ratios (Figure 2B), might be more robust against the shortcomings of directly referring to the
272 loss ratio value. Although this is another measure of cost-effectiveness, it does not directly tell us
273 how economical dementia insurance is, but rather indirectly shows how much more economical
274 dementia insurance is for ϵ 4-homozygotes are than for other ϵ 4 genotypes. This is also easy to
275 understand intuitively, as the ratio in the loss ratios largely corresponds to the risk of developing
276 dementia: the loss ratio for ϵ 4-homozygotes was approximately 3 ~ 4 and 2 times consistently higher

277 than for $\epsilon 4$ -negative and $\epsilon 4$ -heterozygous individuals, respectively, and the HR for conversion to
278 CDR-GS ≥ 1 was approximately 2 for $\epsilon 4$ -heterozygotes and approximately 4 for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes.
279 Higher cost-effectiveness here means that $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes will have 3 to 4 times more expected
280 benefits to gain compared to $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals, as well as similar expected benefits with 3 to 4
281 times lower premium payments than $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals. Based on these evaluations, some
282 $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes in their 60s-70s may find dementia insurance valuable to purchase.

283 Evaluating dementia insurance as valuable for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes does not necessarily mean
284 recommending *APOE* testing when considering purchasing dementia insurance, or does it encourage
285 actively pursuing *APOE* testing for asymptomatic individuals as a way to secure insurance with high
286 odds of payoff. Dementia insurance is usually offered only to those without cognitive decline, and
287 *APOE* testing is only considered for individuals who may receive anti-amyloid treatment as part of
288 the risk assessment for developing ARIA [Cummings 2023], with treatment currently limited to MCI
289 or mild AD. This means that people considering purchasing dementia insurance will generally not
290 have access to *APOE* testing in current usual clinical practice. In addition, the prevalence of
291 $\epsilon 4$ -homozygote remaining cognitively unimpaired in their 60s-70s is relatively not high: for example,
292 it has been reported that approximately 60% and 40% of cognitively unimpaired $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes in
293 their 60s and 70s, respectively, remain stable over the next 8 years [Bonham 2016]. In these respects,
294 there may be limited situations where our finding will be clearly applicable.

295 Meanwhile, it is technically possible for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes to know their $\epsilon 4$ genotype, such as
296 through *APOE* testing services offered in medical practices not covered by health insurance [Sato
297 2024(a)], via direct-to-consumer services [Pavarini 2021], or by participating in prevention trials or
298 clinical studies related to AD. Indeed, our previous online survey [Sato 2024(b)] revealed that
299 approximately 45% of questionnaire respondents expressed a willingness to undergo *APOE* testing,
300 even without the immediate need for testing prior to anti-amyloid treatment [Sato 2024(c)]. If the
301 potential cost-effectiveness of dementia insurance for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes becomes widely recognized,
302 it may lead to adverse selection, with $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes being more likely to concentrate in dementia

303 insurance policies far more than the general population, resulting in a significant increase in paid
304 benefits for insurance companies, and eventually necessitating higher premiums or the
305 discontinuation of dementia insurance products in the long term. It may also lead to the misuse of
306 *APOE* testing. Therefore, we do not recommend actively seeking *APOE* testing when considering
307 purchasing dementia insurance. However, it may be unavoidable to consider dementia insurance for
308 exceptional cases, such as those who already know their $\epsilon 4$ status before deciding to purchase
309 insurance. A similarly complex discussion on risk stratification by *APOE* testing prior to purchasing
310 insurance may also apply to blood-based biomarker (BBM) testing results, which now provides
311 highly accurate predictions of pre-symptomatic pathological changes in AD [Niimi 2024], although
312 it is not a genetic test.

313 In conclusion, our study demonstrated that dementia insurance may be more cost-effective
314 for *APOE*- $\epsilon 4$ homozygotes compared to other genotypes. Although the dementia insurance could
315 serve as a potential supportive option to alleviate the future potential disease burden for some
316 $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes, we would need further investigation on the advantages and limitations of dementia
317 insurance for asymptomatic individuals with pathogenic or high-risk genes, including but not limited
318 to *APOE*- $\epsilon 4$ homozygotes.

319

320 **5 Conflict of Interest**

321 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
322 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

323

324 **6 Author Contributions**

325 KS: Conceptualization, Study Design, Data Acquisition, Data Curation, Analysis, Writing draft. SN:
326 Data Acquisition, Review & Editing. YN: Review & Editing. TI: Supervision. All authors read and
327 approved the final manuscript.

328

329 7 Funding

330 This study was supported by AMED Grant Numbers JP23dk0207048 (TI) and JP24dk0207054 (YN),
331 and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP24K10653 (KS). The sponsors had no role in the design and
332 conduct of the study; collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; preparation of the manuscript;
333 or review or approval of the manuscript.

334

335 References

- 336 1. Yamazaki H. Dementia and Life Insurance ~Development and Background of Dementia
337 Insurance Products~. *Japanese Journal of Insurance Medicine* (2020). 118;2:162-171. [Article in
338 Japanese]
- 339 2. Park KW, Kim JY. New Proposal of Private Insurance Program for Dementia Patients: Design of
340 Sustainable Private Insurance Program in Korea. *Dement Neurocogn Disord*. 2017
341 Mar;16(1):1-6. doi: 10.12779/dnd.2017.16.1.1.
- 342 3. Reinsurance Group of America. South Korea Provides a Road Map for Dementia Insurance.
343 ([https://www.rgare.com/knowledge-center/article/south-korea-provides-a-road-map-for-dementia](https://www.rgare.com/knowledge-center/article/south-korea-provides-a-road-map-for-dementia-insurance)
344 [a-insurance](https://www.rgare.com/knowledge-center/article/south-korea-provides-a-road-map-for-dementia-insurance)) Accessed on July 1, 2024.
- 345 4. Šestáková, A., & Plichtová, J. (2020). More than a medical condition: Qualitative analysis of
346 media representations of dementia and Alzheimer’s disease. *Human Affairs*, 30(3), 382-398.
- 347 5. Goncharova, N. L. (2020). Development of financial service methods for people with dementia
348 during digitalization: a partnership between citizens and the Russian state. *International Journal*
349 *of Technology*, 11(8).
- 350 6. Eisai Global. Lifenet and Eisai Co-Develop Dementia Insurance “be”.
351 (<https://www.eisai.com/news/2024/news202416.html>) Accessed on September 30, 2024.
- 352 7. Muramatsu N, Akiyama H. Japan: super-aging society preparing for the future. *Gerontologist*.
353 2011 Aug;51(4):425-32.
- 354 8. Japan Population Census. Ministry of Internal Affairs and

- 355 Communications. (<https://www.e-stat.go.jp/stat-search/files?toukei=00200524>) Accessed on July
356 1, 2024. [Article in Japanese]
- 357 9. Japan Institute of Life Insurance. National Survey on Life Insurance.
358 (<https://www.jili.or.jp/research/report/zenkokujittai.html>): Accessed on July 1, 2024.
- 359 10. Tamiya N, Noguchi H, Nishi A, Reich MR, Ikegami N, Hashimoto H, Shibuya K, Kawachi I,
360 Campbell JC. Population ageing and wellbeing: lessons from Japan's long-term care insurance
361 policy. *Lancet*. 2011 Sep 24;378(9797):1183-92.
- 362 11. Jack CR Jr, Knopman DS, Jagust WJ, Petersen RC, Weiner MW, Aisen PS, Shaw LM, Vemuri P,
363 Wiste HJ, Weigand SD, Lesnick TG, Pankratz VS, Donohue MC, Trojanowski JQ. Tracking
364 pathophysiological processes in Alzheimer's disease: an updated hypothetical model of dynamic
365 biomarkers. *Lancet Neurol*. 2013 Feb;12(2):207-16.
- 366 12. Liu CC, Liu CC, Kanekiyo T, Xu H, Bu G. Apolipoprotein E and Alzheimer disease: risk,
367 mechanisms and therapy. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2013 Feb;9(2):106-18. doi:
368 10.1038/nrneurol.2012.263. Epub 2013 Jan 8. Erratum in: *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2013.
- 369 13. Nicolas G, Charbonnier C, Campion D. From Common to Rare Variants: The Genetic
370 Component of Alzheimer Disease. *Hum Hered*. 2016;81(3):129-141.
- 371 14. Husain MA, Laurent B, Plourde M. APOE and Alzheimer's Disease: From Lipid Transport to
372 Physiopathology and Therapeutics. *Front Neurosci*. 2021 Feb 17;15:630502.
- 373 15. Fortea J, Pegueroles J, Alcolea D, Belbin O, Dols-Icardo O, Vaqué-Alcázar L, Videla L, Gispert
374 JD, Suárez-Calvet M, Johnson SC, Sperling R, Bejanin A, Lleó A, Montal V. APOE4
375 homozygosity represents a distinct genetic form of Alzheimer's disease. *Nat Med*. 2024
376 May;30(5):1284-1291.
- 377 16. Farrer LA, Cupples LA, Haines JL, Hyman B, Kukull WA, Mayeux R, Myers RH,
378 Pericak-Vance MA, Risch N, van Duijn CM. Effects of age, sex, and ethnicity on the association
379 between apolipoprotein E genotype and Alzheimer disease. A meta-analysis. APOE and
380 Alzheimer Disease Meta Analysis Consortium. *JAMA*. 1997 Oct 22-29;278(16):1349-56.

- 381 17. Arias JJ, Tyler AM, Douglas MP, Phillips KA. Private payer coverage policies for ApoE-e4
382 genetic testing. *Genet Med*. 2021 Apr;23(4):614-620.
- 383 18. van Dyck CH, Swanson CJ, Aisen P, Bateman RJ, Chen C, Gee M, Kanekiyo M, Li D,
384 Reyderman L, Cohen S, Froelich L, Katayama S, Sabbagh M, Vellas B, Watson D, Dhadda S,
385 Irizarry M, Kramer LD, Iwatsubo T. Lecanemab in Early Alzheimer's Disease. *N Engl J Med*.
386 2023 Jan 5;388(1):9-21.
- 387 19. Sims JR, Zimmer JA, Evans CD, Lu M, Ardayfio P, Sparks J, Wessels AM, Shcherbinin S, Wang
388 H, Monkul Nery ES, Collins EC, Solomon P, Salloway S, Apostolova LG, Hansson O, Ritchie C,
389 Brooks DA, Mintun M, Skovronsky DM; TRAILBLAZER-ALZ 2 Investigators. Donanemab in
390 Early Symptomatic Alzheimer Disease: The TRAILBLAZER-ALZ 2 Randomized Clinical Trial.
391 *JAMA*. 2023 Aug 8;330(6):512-527.
- 392 20. Sperling RA, Jack CR Jr, Black SE, Frosch MP, Greenberg SM, Hyman BT, Scheltens P, Carrillo
393 MC, Thies W, Bednar MM, Black RS, Brashear HR, Grundman M, Siemers ER, Feldman HH,
394 Schindler RJ. Amyloid-related imaging abnormalities in amyloid-modifying therapeutic trials:
395 recommendations from the Alzheimer's Association Research Roundtable Workgroup.
396 *Alzheimers Dement*. 2011 Jul;7(4):367-85.
- 397 21. Muto K, Nagai A, Ri I, Takashima K, Yoshida S. Is legislation to prevent genetic discrimination
398 necessary in Japan? An overview of the current policies and public attitudes. *J Hum Genet*. 2023
399 Sep;68(9):579-585. doi: 10.1038/s10038-023-01163-z. Epub 2023 Jun 8. Erratum in: *J Hum*
400 *Genet*. 2023 Sep;68(9):587.
- 401 22. The Life Insurance Association of Japan. "Current Handling of Genetic Information in
402 Underwriting and Payment Practices. (2022)
403 (<https://www.seiho.or.jp/info/news/2022/20220527.html>): Accessed on July 1, 2024.
- 404 23. Beekly DL, Ramos EM, van Belle G, Deitrich W, Clark AD, Jacka ME, Kukull WA;
405 NIA-Alzheimer's Disease Centers. The National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center (NACC)
406 Database: an Alzheimer disease database. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2004

- 407 Oct-Dec;18(4):270-7. PMID: 15592144.
- 408 24. Grace, M. F. (2023). Loss ratio dynamics. *Risk Management and Insurance Review*, 26(3),
409 343-366.
- 410 25. Cummings J, Apostolova L, Rabinovici GD, Atri A, Aisen P, Greenberg S, Hendrix S, Selkoe D,
411 Weiner M, Petersen RC, Salloway S. Lecanemab: Appropriate Use Recommendations. *J Prev*
412 *Alzheimers Dis.* 2023;10(3):362-377.
- 413 26. Bonham LW, Geier EG, Fan CC, Leong JK, Besser L, Kukull WA, Kornak J, Andreassen OA,
414 Schellenberg GD, Rosen HJ, Dillon WP, Hess CP, Miller BL, Dale AM, Desikan RS, Yokoyama
415 JS. Age-dependent effects of APOE ϵ 4 in preclinical Alzheimer's disease. *Ann Clin Transl*
416 *Neurol.* 2016 Aug 26;3(9):668-77.
- 417 27. Sato K (a), Niimi Y, Ihara R, Iwata A, Ikeuchi T, Iwatsubo T. Advertisement by medical facilities
418 as an opportunity route of APOE genetic testing in Japan: a website analysis. *J Community*
419 *Genet.* 2024 Apr;15(2):195-204.
- 420 28. Pavarini G, Hamdi L, Lorimer J, Singh I. Young people's moral attitudes and motivations
421 towards direct-to-consumer genetic testing for inherited risk of Alzheimer disease. *Eur J Med*
422 *Genet.* 2021 Jun;64(6):104180.
- 423 29. Sato K (b), Niimi Y, Ihara R, Suzuki K, Iwata A, Iwatsubo T. Usability of a Web-Based Registry
424 for Preclinical Alzheimer's Disease: Implications from a Cross-Sectional Online Survey. *J Prev*
425 *Alzheimers Dis.* 2024;11(3):661-671.
- 426 30. Sato K (c), Niimi Y, Ihara R, Iwata A, Suzuki K, Nemoto K, Arai T, Higashi S, Igarashi A,
427 Kasuga K, Awata S, Iwatsubo T. Public perceptions related to healthcare preparedness to
428 anti-amyloid therapies for Alzheimer's Disease in Japan. *Alzheimers Res Ther.* 2024 Oct
429 3;16(1):205.
- 430 31. Niimi Y, Janelidze S, Sato K, Tomita N, Tsukamoto T, Kato T, Yoshiyama K, Kowa H, Iwata A,
431 Ihara R, Suzuki K, Kasuga K, Ikeuchi T, Ishii K, Ito K, Nakamura A, Senda M, Day TA,
432 Burnham SC, Iaccarino L, Pontecorvo MJ, Hansson O, Iwatsubo T. Combining plasma A β and

433 p-tau217 improves detection of brain amyloid in non-demented elderly. *Alzheimers Res Ther.*

434 2024 May 23;16(1):115.

435

436

437 **Tables**

438 Table 1. Basic characteristics of NACC participants whose age at baseline is 40-79

	Total N	9,306
	Follow-up period (years)	Median 4.5 (IQR: 1.7 ~ 8.5)
	Sex (female)	6,074 (65.3%)
	Age at baseline	Median 69 (IQR: 64 ~ 73)
Age	50s or less	1,280 (13.7%)
	60s	3,760 (40.4%)
	70s	4,266 (45.8%)
APOE-ε4	Negative	6,206 (66.7%)
	Heterozygous	2,759 (29.6%)
	Homozygous	341 (3.7%)
Race	White (vs others)	7,116 (76.5%)
	Black (vs others)	1,676 (18.0%)
	Education years	Median 16 (IQR: 14 ~ 18)
	CDR-GS at baseline (= 0)	9,306 (100%)
	CDR-SOB at baseline	Median 0 (IQR: 0 ~ 0)
	MMSE at baseline	Median 29 (IQR: 29 ~ 30)
	Became CDR-GS \geq 1 within 18 years	391 (4.2%)
	Timing when CDR-GS became \geq 1 (years)	Median 7.7 (IQR: 5.0 ~ 11.3)
	Amyloid positive (in PET or CSF)*	89 / 371 (24.0%)

439 (*) Amyloid data has been obtained only in a fraction of participants.

440

441 Abbreviations: NACC, National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center; IQR, interquartile range;

442 CDR-GS, Clinical Dementia Rating Global Score; CDR-SOB, Clinical Dementia Rating Sum of

443 Boxes; MMSE, Mini-Mental State Examination; PET, positron emission tomography; CSF,

444 cerebrospinal fluid.

445

446 **Figure Legends**

447 Figure 1. Several patterns in simulating policyholding based on NACC longitudinal observation, and
448 survival curve by *APOE* genotype

449

450 In (A), several patterns of the period during which the monthly premium is assumed to be paid for up
451 to T years ($1 \leq T \leq 18$) are illustrated. Patterns (a), (c), and (d) represent cases without the
452 occurrence of an event (i.e., development of dementia) within the T -year period, while patterns (b)
453 and (e) represent cases where the development of dementia is observed during the period. Diamond
454 shapes in the schema denote the occurrence of the event during the longitudinal observation, and
455 double arrows indicate the period in which the insured are to pay monthly premium.

456 The survival curve of the included participants until their development of dementia
457 (CDR-GS ≥ 1) is shown in (B). Cox-proportional hazards analysis revealed that the hazard ratio
458 (HR) for conversion to CDR-GS ≥ 1 was 1.899 for $\epsilon 4$ -heterozygotes and 4.106 for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes,
459 compared to $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals.

460

461 Abbreviations: NACC, National Alzheimer's Coordinating Center; CDR-GS, Clinical Dementia

462 Rating global score.

463

464

465 Figure 2. Loss ratio by $\epsilon 4$ subgroup, and the ratio in the loss ratios

466

467 In either insurance product ([a] or [b]), for observation periods of ≥ 10 years, the loss ratio (A) was
468 highest in the *APOE*- $\epsilon 4$ homozygotes, followed by heterozygotes, and $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals. The
469 loss ratio for $\epsilon 4$ -negative individuals remained low regardless of the examined range of *T*. As *T*
470 increased, the estimated loss ratio rose, particularly for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes, regardless of whether
471 scenario ([i] or [ii]) was assumed. Meanwhile, the loss ratio did not surpass the threshold of
472 economically favorable level (loss ratio = 1), even for $\epsilon 4$ -homozygotes.

473 The ratio of the loss ratios are shown in (B): ratio(homo/hetero) and ratio(homo/negative).

474 Especially broad 95% CIs spanning 1 are observed for $T = 2 \sim 7$, and the ratio(homo/negative)
475 reaches as high as 3 ~ 4, consistently and significantly higher than 1 at $T \geq 8$. The ratio(homo/hetero)
476 also displayed a similar pattern, reaching as high as 2, and was consistently and significantly higher
477 than 1 at $T \geq 12$. The 95% CIs of the ratio(homo/negative) and the ratio(homo/hetero) show slight
478 overlap with each other.

479

480







