Healthcare and long-term care for people with cognitive impairment in the US: A latent transition analysis

Bo Hu[1] Pengyun Wang[2, 3] Xi Chen[4, 5*]

1. Care Policy and Evaluation Centre, Department of Health Policy, London School of Economics and Political Science
2. Department of International Economics and Trade, Nankai University
3. Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford
4. Department of Health Policy and Management, Yale School of Public Health
5. Department of Economics, Yale University

* Corresponding author. Health Policy & Management Epidemiology & Public Health, PO BOX 208034 New Haven, CT 06520-8034, United States. Email: xi.chen@yale.edu

Healthcare and long-term care for people with cognitive impairment in the US: A latent transition analysis

Key Points

Questions How is the use of healthcare and long-term care services clustered in people with cognitive impairment? Are changes in cognitive functioning associated with transitions in service clusters?

Findings Three classes of healthcare and long-term care services were identified in the latent transition analyses. The progression of cognitive impairment was associated with transitioning to a class characterized by more use of healthcare and long-term care services, whereas an improvement in cognitive improvement was associated with transitioning to a class characterized by less use of care in both sectors.

Meaning The findings underscore the importance of integration between the healthcare and long-term care sectors and point to the value of using cognitive functioning to guide resource allocation and coordinate care planning.

Abstract

IMPORTANCE

People with cognitive impairment often have complex care needs. Both healthcare and long-term care are crucial to the well-being of people with mild cognitive impairment (MCI) or dementia.

OBJECTIVE

To understand the clustering patterns of healthcare and long-term care use in people with MCI or dementia and the relationships between changes in cognitive functioning and transitions of care.

DESIGN

This cohort study used longitudinal data from three recent waves of the Health and Retirement Study (HRS) collected between 2014 and 2018.

SETTING

HRS is a nationally representative biennial survey of older persons aged 50 years and over in the US.

PARTICIPANTS

The study cohort included 4,469 people with MCI or dementia in 2014. The same participants were followed until 2018. The total sample size across the three waves was 10,155.

EXPOSURE

Changes in cognitive functioning based on the Langa-Weir Classifications.

MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES

The outcome measures included five types of healthcare and three types of long-term care services. Latent transition analyses were conducted to identify the clustering patterns of healthcare and long-term care use and map out the transition pathways between different care classes over time. Multilevel regression models were estimated to investigate the relationships between changes in cognitive functioning status and care transitions. Sociodemographic, health, and socioeconomic factors before care transitions were controlled for.

RESULTS

Three user groups were identified: high healthcare and low long-term care (MM-LC, 56%, n=5,657), medium healthcare and high long-term care (HM-HC, 37%, n=3,743), and low healthcare and low long-term care (LM-LC, 7%, n=736). The progression of cognitive impairment was associated with a higher probability of transitioning from MM-LC to HM-HC class (β= 0.070; $p<0.001$). An improvement in cognitive functioning was associated with a higher probability of transitioning from HM-HC to MM-LC class (β =0.042, $p<0.05$).

CONCLUSION

People with MCI or dementia use specific combinations of services to meet their complex care needs, which underscores the importance of integration between healthcare and long-term care. Changes in cognitive functioning are useful indicators that can assist policymakers and practitioners with early care planning, resource allocation, and care coordination from diverse care providers.

Healthcare and long-term care for people with cognitive impairment in the US: A latent transition analysis

Introduction

Cognitive impairment is a broad spectrum of deficits affecting various aspects of cognitive functioning in individuals. Cognitive impairment has various stages, progressing from mild cognitive impairment (MCI) to dementia. The estimated prevalence of MCI among the U.S. population aged 65 years and older is over 20% [1]. Individuals with MCI have an elevated risk of progression to dementia, the estimated prevalence of which is 10% in adults aged 65 and older. Cognitive impairment and dementia impose many adverse effects at both family and societal levels, such as increased complexity of healthcare and long-term care needs and a significant economic burden, especially when the disease progresses. Early identification of cognitive impairment may offer multiple benefits, such as access to treatment, support, and future care and life planning for persons with dementia and their caregivers, and delay of institutionalization.[2,3]

Existing studies have examined the service use of people with MCI or dementia. Overall, a diagnosis of dementia has been found to be a major determinant of service use, with increased service use in more severe disease stages, including inpatient admissions,[4] physician services, home health, skilled nursing facilities,[5,6] and use of medications.[7] People with dementia use healthcare services more often than community services.[8-10] The factors associated with higher levels of service use include impaired ADL,[11] neuropsychiatric symptoms,[12] comorbidities,[13] older age,[14] having received more education,[15] not having a spousal caregiver or living alone,[15] knowledge of available services,[16] a larger caregiver burden,[17] and having more care infrastructure.[18]

Despite the continued interest in care utilization by people with MCI and dementia, a substantial evidence gap remains. First, most of the existing studies focus on single types of service use, while more research is needed to identify the combinations of a broader range of healthcare and long-term care services to meet people's care needs.[18-20] Second, studies often examine service use at a particular time point, while less attention is paid to understanding the dynamics of care type transitions.[21] Finally, previous studies have tended to concentrate on service use in later stages of cognitive impairment, i.e., dementia, while people with MCI already have higher medical costs and receive more informal care compared to people without MCI.[19,22] It is especially unclear what types of healthcare and long-term care services are normally being used as cognitive impairment progresses. Yet, such information is crucial if we want to identify and avoid unmet care needs in people with cognitive impairment.

Given the complexity of care needs for people with MCI and dementia, we expect that healthcare and long-term care services are used in combination and clustered into distinct groups. By applying latent transition analysis (LTA), this longitudinal study aims to identify the subgroups of service users and map out their patterns of care transitions over time. Moreover, we hypothesise that the progression of cognitive impairment is an important predictor of care transition. An improved understanding of the relationship between cognitive function and care transition is important for timely access to, and the integration of, healthcare and long-term care for people with MCI or dementia. Furthermore, because many different care providers are involved in the disease diagnostic process and care provision, insights into factors related to service use types and their transitions could lead to better coordination of care between providers and caregivers.

Research methods

Data and sample

The data used in this paper came from three recent waves of the Health and Retirement Study (HRS), a nationally representative biennial survey of community-dwelling older persons aged 50 years and over in the US.[23] We focused on those people who participated in the survey and were living with MCI or dementia in 2014, and we followed them until 2018. MCI and dementia were identified by the Langa-Weir Classifications.[24,25]

Out of the 18,747 participants in the HRS 2014, 4,469 persons were identified as living with MCI or dementia in 2014, among whom 3,313 persons and 2,373 persons participated in the survey in 2016 and 2018, respectively. The rest were either dead or lost to follow-up. There were 10,155 observations across the three waves, which was the total sample size of our analyses.

Outcome variables

The key outcome variables of interest are the use of healthcare and long-term care services. We focused on five healthcare services, including doctor visits, prescription medication, hospital inpatient stays, special facilities and services, and outpatient surgery. We examined three types of long-term care, including nursing home services, informal care, and formal home care. To focus on long-term nursing home users, we excluded people staying for less than 30 days in the past two years. The HRS asked participants whether they had difficulties that were expected to last more than three months in performing six activities of daily living (ADLs; dressing, walking, bathing, eating, getting in and out of bed, and using the toilet) and five instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs; cooking, shopping, making phone calls, taking medication, and managing money), and if so, who helped them. Informal care recipients refer to those living at home and receiving help with ADL or IADL difficulties

from family members, while formal home care recipients refer to those receiving paid help. Each type of service was coded as a binary variable (0=not using service; 1=service user).

Key explanatory variables of interest

The cognitive functioning variable had three categories: normal, MCI, and dementia. We tracked changes in cognitive functioning by comparing participants' cognitive functioning status between two adjacent waves. There were three categories: staying in the same status, progressing in cognitive impairment, and improving in cognitive functioning. The progression of cognitive impairment includes transitioning from normal functioning to MCI or dementia, or transitioning from MCI to dementia. An improvement in cognitive functioning refers to transitioning from MCI to normal cognitive functioning.

Control variables

We controlled for demographic factors, socioeconomic status, and health conditions. Our demographic variables consisted of age, gender, ethnicity, and marital status. The ethnicity variable had three categories: white American, Black/African American, and other ethnicities. The marital status variable was dichotomised: 0=single (never married, separated, divorced, widowed or spouse absent) and 1=married. Regarding socioeconomic status, we focused on years of education (range: 0-17) and annual household income. To investigate the health factors, we counted the number of ADL difficulties, the number of IALD difficulties, and the number of chronic diseases. We investigated nine chronic diseases: hypertension, diabetes, cancer, lung disease, heart problems, stroke, psychological problems, arthritis, and sleep disorders.

Analytic strategy

Our analyses consisted of two stages. Stage one involved identifying the patterns of care transitions based on latent class analyses (LCA) and latent transition analyses (LTA). We first

conducted exploratory latent class analyses (LCA) for each of the three waves to decide the optimal number of classes. We evaluated the log-likelihood, BIC value, entropy, and average posterior probability (APP) of different solutions.[26] On balance, the three-class model had the most satisfactory model fit and classification quality and thus was considered the optimal solution (eTable 1 in Appendix).

We then constructed a three-class latent transition model, which was specified as follows:

$$P(\boldsymbol{Y}=\boldsymbol{y}) = \sum_{s_1=1}^{3}\sum_{s_2=1}^{3}\sum_{s_3=1}^{3}[\delta_{s_1}\tau_{s_2|s_1}\tau_{s_3|s_2}\prod_{t=1}^{3}\prod_{j=1}^{8}\prod_{r_{j,t}=1}^{2}\rho_{j,r_{j,t}|s_t}^{I(y_{j,t}=r_{j,t})}] \quad (1)$$

Where $P(\boldsymbol{Y}=\boldsymbol{y})$ denotes the joint probabilities of a vector of responses for the eight types of care services across three-time points, δ_{s_1} denotes the probabilities of membership in each latent class at time 1, and $\tau_{s_2|s_1}$ denotes the probabilities of memberships in each latent class at time 2 conditional upon belonging to a particular latent class at time 1. $\rho_{j,r_{j,t}|s_t}^{I(y_{j,t}=r_{j,t})}$ denotes the time-specific probability of using a particular type of service conditional upon belonging to a latent class (i.e., item response probability). Item response probabilities were assumed to be equal across time (namely, $\rho_{s_1}=\rho_{s_2}=\rho_{s_3}$) for model parsimony.[27] We derived the transition matrices from the LTA model. Death and loss-to-follow-up were treated as absorbing states. The LTA model was built using Mplus version 8.4.

Stage two involved deriving dichotomised transition variables (0=staying in the same status and 1=making transitions) from the LTA model in stage one, which tracked the changes in the use of healthcare and long-term care services over time. Transition variables were treated as outcome variables and regressed on the cognitive functioning variables in linear probability models. Since many individuals made transitions twice across the three waves, random intercepts were added to the regression models to account for intra-individual

correlation.[28] This resulted in two-level linear probability models, which were specified as follows:

$$CAT_{i,t+1} = \alpha + \beta_1 \times COG_{i,t+1} + \beta_2 \times COG_{it} + \boldsymbol{\gamma_{it}} \times \boldsymbol{Z_{it}} + \zeta_i + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

Where $CAT_{i,t+1}$ is a particular type of care transition for individual i from time point t to time point $t+1$ $(t = 1,2)$, $COG_{i,t+1}$ denotes the transitioning in cognitive functioning from t to t+1, COG_{it} denotes the status of cognitive functioning at time point t, and $\boldsymbol{Z_{it}}$ is a vector of control variables. β_1, β_2, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma_{it}}$ are their respective coefficients. ζ_i denotes the level-two individual-specific error (i.e., random intercept) and ε_{it} is the level-one error term. Only a small proportion of observations (<1%) in our sample had missing values. Regression analyses were conducted on completed cases using Stata version 17.

Results

Table 1 shows the proportion of people who used healthcare and long-term care services broken down by the year of the survey. Around 90% of the sample visited doctors or took prescription medication. Around 40% of the sample reported hospital inpatient stays. One-quarter of the sample used specialist facilities, and one-fifth had had outpatient surgeries. A third of the sample used informal care, whereas 24% used formal home care. More than 10% of the sample had lived in a nursing home for more than 30 days.

The results of the three-class LTA model are reported in Figure 1. People in class 1, labelled as the low healthcare and low long-term care class (LM-LC), had a moderate probability of visiting doctors and a low probability of using all other care services. People in class 2 were labelled as the medium healthcare and low long-term care class (MM-LC). This class was characterised by a high probability of visiting doctors and taking medication and a moderate probability of having inpatient stays and outpatient surgeries. People in class 3 had a high probability of using all care services and were labelled as the high healthcare high long-term

care class (HM-HC). The MM-LC class was the major class, with 56% of the sample (n=5,676) belonging to this group. While 37% of the sample (n=3,743) belonged to the MM-LC group, only 7% (n=736) were classified into the LM-LC group.

People with poorer cognitive functioning used more healthcare and long-term care services (Table 2). Among the 736 people in the LM-LC group, 21% had normal cognitive functioning, 61% had MCI, and 17% were living with dementia. They stand in contrast to people in the HM-HC group where the proportions of people in the three cognitive functioning categories were 10%, 43%, and 47%, respectively. Older people, females, White Americans, married people, and people of higher socioeconomic status on average used more healthcare and long-term care services. People with more ADL/IADL difficulties and co-morbidities used more healthcare and long-term care services.

Table 3 shows the probabilities of transitions between the different classes. Mortality and loss to follow-up were treated as the absorption states. The raw numbers underlying the transition probabilities are reported in eTable 2 in the Appendix. Among the 334 people in the LM-LC class in 2014, 15% moved to the MM-LC class and 3.0% moved to the HM-HC class in 2016. There were 240 people in the LM-LC class in 2016, among whom 3.3% moved to the MM-LC class and 3.8% moved to the HM-HC class in 2018. Among the 2,431 people in the MM-LC class in 2014, 9.8% moved to the HM-HC class in 2016. Among the 1,840 people in the MM-LC class, 6.0% moved to the HM-HC class in 2018. Among the 1,706 people in the HM-HC class in 2014, 3.8% moved to the MM-LC class in 2016, and among the 1,233 people in the HM-HC class in 2016, 4.8% moved to the MM-LC class in 2018. Three transition pathways were most common in the transition matrices: (1) from the LM-LC class to either the MM-LC or HM-HC class vs. staying in the LM-LC class; (2) from the MM-LC class to the HM-HC class vs. staying in the MM-LC class; and (3) from the HM-HC class to

the MM-LC class vs. staying in the HM-HC class. Since the proportions of people in other transition pathways are negligible (<0.5%), they were not further investigated.

Table 4 shows the association between transitions in care utilization and changes in cognitive functioning based on the two-level linear probability models. In Model 2, people experiencing an improvement in cognitive functioning were less likely to transition from the MM-LC class to the HM-HC class than to stay in the MM-LC class (β==-0.034, $p<0.001$); and in Model 3 people were more likely to transition from the HM-HC class to the MM-LC classes than to stay in the HM-HC class ($\beta=0.042$, $p<0.05$). People experiencing a progression in cognitive impairment were more likely to transition from the MM-LC class to the HM-HC class than to stay in the MM-LC class ($\beta=0.070$, $p<0.001$); and were less likely to transition from the HM-HC class to the MM-LC class than to stay in the HM-HC ($\beta=-0.037$, $p<0.01$). There is no evidence that changes in cognitive functioning were strongly associated with transitions from the LM-LC class to the MM-LC or HM-HC classes.

The initial status of cognitive functioning matters. People with MCI or dementia in the previous wave were more likely than those with normal cognitive functioning to transition from the MM-LC class to the HM-HC class by the next wave. In addition, the probability of transitions from the MM-LC class to the HM-HC class was lower among females and higher among older adults and people receiving more years of education. Both the likelihood ratio test of the random intercept and the coefficient of intra-class correlation suggest that individual-level transitions were strongly correlated over time and thus should be accounted for in a multilevel model.

Discussion

Drawing on longitudinal data from a nationally representative survey, this study investigated the trajectories of healthcare and long-term care utilization in people with MCI or dementia in

the US. The latent transition analyses show that people with cognitive impairment did not choose care forms randomly but used specific combinations of services to meet their complex care needs, which is consistent with findings from other countries.[29,30] The most common class in our sample was characterized by a high probability of doctor visits and prescription medication combined with a medium or low probability of using other healthcare and long-term care services. The second most prevalent user group consisted of individuals engaging much more intensively with all of the care services under investigation, relative to all of the other groups. The third group were individuals whose utilization of services was low across the board, but they were the least common.

Although more than half of the sample stayed in the same care utilization group, which indicated a degree of stability over time, a noticeable proportion transitioned to other groups. It was common that people transitioned from the LM-LC group to the MM-LC group or from the MM-LC group to the HM-HC group, which represented more engagement with healthcare and long-term care services. Meanwhile, a decline in the utilization of care services was also observed with around 4.5% of the sample transitioning from the HM-HC group to the MM-LC group.

We found that the progression of cognitive impairment was often accompanied by a heightened utilization of healthcare and long-term care, whereas an improvement in cognitive functioning went in tandem with a decrease in care utilization. Care needs are the most immediate driver care use.[11-13] While many existing studies have investigated the need for healthcare and long-term care separately, our study shows that cognitive impairment is a strong driver of care utilization in both sectors. More importantly, the current level of and changes in cognitive functioning not only indicate the existing need for care services but also provide valuable information about how care utilization might change in the future.

Our research findings have important policy implications. First, the combined use of healthcare and long-term care among people with MCI or dementia brings to the fore the importance of care integration and coordination. Meaningful collaboration, information sharing facilitated by communication technology, joint training, and the designation of care coordinators between the two sectors are fundamental to healthcare and long-term care integration.[20,31] Integrated care is expected to play an increasingly significant role considering that the prevalence and the absolute number of people with MCI or dementia will continue to rise with population ageing.[1] Second, given the predictive power of cognitive functioning, practitioners and policymakers may want to closely monitor individuals' changes in cognitive functioning over time and make plans regarding care arrangements accordingly. Early planning allows for sufficient time for resource allocation, which promotes the timely delivery of personalised care and decreases the risks of unmet care needs.

The limitations of the study should be acknowledged. First, our study reported a strong association between changes in cognitive functioning and transitions in care utilization, while disentangling the direction of causality will be challenging. Second, the analyses focused on whether people used individual services, but did not touch upon the frequency and intensity of care use. The latter would merit a separate study in the future. Finally, the utilization of healthcare and long-term care was based on self-reported and recalled information, which might be vulnerable to recall bias.

Conclusion

People with MCI or dementia form distinct groups in the utilization of healthcare and long-term care. LTA proves to be a useful tool to identify these groups from a wide range of services and to map out how service trajectories unfold as individual circumstances change over time. Changes in cognitive functioning are among the most important predictors of care

transitions and thus can be useful indicators for policymakers in terms of facilitating care integration, optimizing resource allocation, and coordinating care supply from diverse providers.

Reference

1. Manly JJ, Jones RN, Langa KM, et al. Estimating the prevalence of dementia and mild cognitive impairment in the US: The 2016 Health and Retirement Study Harmonized Cognitive Assessment Protocol Project. 2022;79(12):1242-1249. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2022.3543.

2. Giezendanner S, Monsch AU, Kressig RW, et al. General practitioners' attitudes towards early diagnosis of dementia: a cross-sectional survey. *BMC Fam Pract.* 2019;20(1):65. doi:10.1186/s12875-019-0956-1.

3. Patnode CD, Perdue LA, Rossom RC, et al. Screening for Cognitive Impairment in Older Adults: Updated Evidence Report and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA.* 2020;323(8):764-785. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.22258.

4. Zhu CW, Cosentino S, Ornstein K, et al. Medicare Utilization and Expenditures Around Incident Dementia in a Multiethnic Cohort. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2015;70(11):1448-1453. doi:10.1093/gerona/glv124.

5. Hoffman GJ, Maust DT, Harris M, Ha J, Davis MA. Medicare spending associated with a dementia diagnosis among older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2022;70(9):2592-2601. doi:10.1111/jgs.17835.

6. Lin PJ, Zhong Y, Fillit HM, Chen E, Neumann PJ. Medicare Expenditures of Individuals with Alzheimer's Disease and Related Dementias or Mild Cognitive Impairment Before and After Diagnosis. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2016;64(8):1549-1557. doi:10.1111/jgs.14227.

7. Rabinovici GD, Gatsonis C, Apgar C, et al. Association of Amyloid Positron Emission Tomography With Subsequent Change in Clinical Management Among Medicare Beneficiaries With Mild Cognitive Impairment or Dementia. *JAMA.* 2019;321(13):1286-1294. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.2000.

8. Chung SD, Liu SP, Sheu JJ, Lin CC, Lin HC, Chen CH. Increased healthcare service utilizations for patients with dementia: a population-based study. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(8):e105789. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0105789.

9. Chen L, Reed C, Happich M, Nyhuis A, Lenox-Smith A. Health care resource utilisation in primary care prior to and after a diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: a retrospective, matched case-control study in the United Kingdom. *BMC Geriatr.* 2014;14:76. doi:10.1186/1471-2318-14-76.

10. Weber SR, Pirraglia PA, Kunik ME. Use of services by community-dwelling patients with dementia: a systematic review. *Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Demen.* 2011;26(3):195-204. doi:10.1177/1533317510392564.

11. Bergvall N, Brinck P, Eek D, et al. Relative importance of patient disease indicators on informal care and caregiver burden in Alzheimer's disease. *Int Psychogeriatr.* 2011;23(1):73-85. doi:10.1017/S1041610210000785.

12. Jonsson L, Eriksdotter Jonhagen M, Kilander L, et al. Determinants of costs of care for patients with Alzheimer's disease. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry.* 2006;21(5):449-459. doi:10.1002/gps.1489.

13. Scalmana S, Di Napoli A, Franco F, et al. Use of health and social care services in a cohort of Italian dementia patients. *Funct Neurol.* 2013;28(4):265-273.

14. Boersma F, Eefsting JA, van den Brink W, van Tilburg W. Care services for dementia patients: predictors for service utilization. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry.* 1997;12(11):1119-1126. doi:10.1002/(sici)1099-1166(199711)12:11<1119::aid-gps702>3.0.co;2-h.

15. Toseland RW, McCallion P, Gerber T, Banks S. Predictors of health and human services use by persons with dementia and their family caregivers. *Soc Sci Med.* 2002;55(7):1255-1266. doi:10.1016/s0277-9536(01)00240-4.

16. Lim J, Goh J, Chionh HL, Yap P. Why do patients and their families not use services for dementia? Perspectives from a developed Asian country. *Int Psychogeriatr.* 2012;24(10):1571-1580. doi:10.1017/S1041610212000919.

17. Wolfs CA, de Vugt ME, Verkaaik M, Verkade PJ, Verhey FR. Empowered or overpowered? Service use, needs, wants and demands in elderly patients with cognitive impairments. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry.* 2010;25(10):1006-1012. doi:10.1002/gps.2451.

18. Beeber AS, Thorpe JM, Clipp EC. Community-based service use by elders with dementia and their caregivers: a latent class analysis. *Nurs Res.* 2008;57(5):312-321. doi:10.1097/01.NNR.0000313500.07475.eb.

19. Janssen N, Handels RL, Koehler S, et al. Combinations of Service Use Types of People With Early Cognitive Disorders. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2016;17(7):620-625. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2016.02.034.

20. Draper B, Low LF, Brodaty H. Integrated care for adults with dementia and other cognitive disorders. *Int Rev Psychiatry.* 2018;30(6):272-291. doi:10.1080/09540261.2018.1564021.

21. Penning MJ, Cloutier DS, Nuernberger K, MacDonald SWS, Taylor D. Long-term Care Trajectories in Canadian Context: Patterns and Predictors of Publicly Funded Care. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci.* 2018;73(6):1077-1087. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbw104.

22. Zhu CW, Sano M, Ferris SH, Whitehouse PJ, Patterson MB, Aisen PS. Health-related resource use and costs in elderly adults with and without mild cognitive impairment. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2013;61(3):396-402. doi:10.1111/jgs.12132.

23. Bugliari D, Carroll J, Hayden O, et al. *RAND HRS Longitudinal File 2018 (V2) Documentation: Includes 1992-2018 (Final Release).* RAND; 2022.

24. Langa KM, Weir DR, Kabeto M, Sonnega A. *Langa-Weir classification of cognitive function (1995 onward).* Survey Research Center Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan; 2020.

25. Crimmins EM, Kim JK, Langa KM, Weir DRJJoGSBPS, Sciences S. Assessment of cognition using surveys and neuropsychological assessment: the Health and Retirement Study and the Aging, Demographics, and Memory Study. 2011;66(suppl_1):i162-i171. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbr048.

26. Collins LM, Lanza ST. *Latent class and latent transition analysis: With applications in the social, behavioral, and health sciences.* New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons; 2010.

27. Lanza ST, Bray BC, Collins LM. An introduction to latent class and latent transition analysis. In: Schinka JA, Velicer WF, Weiner IB, eds. *Handbook of psychology: Research methods in psychology.* New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons; 2013:691-716.

28. Sophia R-H, Skrondal A. *Multilevel and longitudinal modeling using Stata.* STATA press; 2012.

29. Janssen N, Handels RL, Koehler S, et al. Combinations of service use types of people with early cognitive disorders. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2016;17(7):620-625. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2016.02.034.

30. Cloutier DS, Penning MJ, Nuernberger K, Taylor D, MacDonald SJJoA, Health. Long-term care service trajectories and their predictors for persons living with dementia: Results from a Canadian study. 2019;31(1):139-164. doi:10.1177/0898264317725618.

31. Bäck MA, Calltorp J. The Norrtaelje model: a unique model for integrated health and social care in Sweden. *International Journal of Integrated Care.* 2015;15(September). doi:10.5334/ijic.2244.

Table 1 Proportion of people using health and long-term care, HRS 2014-2016 (N=10,155)

	2014	2016	2018
Doctor visits	91	90	89
Prescription medication	93	92	93
Hospital inpatient stays	43	43	39
Specialist facilities	24	25	24
Outpatient surgery	20	21	19
Informal care	34	33	32
Formal care	24	25	24
Nursing home	15	15	12
n	4,469	3,313	2,373

Table 2 Sample characteristic according to the three latent classes, HRS 2014-2018 (N=10,155)

	LM-LC	MM-LC	HM-HC
		% or mean	
Cognitive functioning			
Normal	21	21	10
MCI	61	61	43
Dementia	17	18	47
Age	67.0	72.3	78.6
Gender			
Male	46	42	37
Female	54	58	63
Race/ethnicity			
White American	43	54	64
African American	37	34	27
Other race/ethnicities	20	12	9
Marital status			
Single	77	56	63
Married	23	44	37
Years of education	10.2	10.6	10.9
Annual household income ($)	28,692	35,364	33,964
Number of ADL difficulties (0-6)	0.31	0.46	2.28
Number IADL difficulties (0-5)	0.28	0.40	2.23
Number of chronic diseases (0-9)	0.14	0.22	0.33
n	736	5,676	3,743

Notes: LM-LC: low health care and low long-term care; MM-LC: Medium health care and low long-term care; HM-HC: High health care and high long-term care

Table 3 Transition matrix of healthcare and long-term care utilization, HRS 2014-2018 (N=10,155)

	2016					
2014	LM-LC	MM-LC	HM-HC	Mortality	Loss to follow up	Total number of people
LM-LC	67.4%	15.0%	3.0%	3.9%	10.8%	334
MM-LC	0.3%	70.5%	9.8%	10.5%	8.8%	2,429
HM-HC	0.4%	4.4%	57.7%	30.3%	7.2%	1,706
	2018					
2016	LM-LC	MM-LC	HM-HC	Mortality	Loss to follow up	Total number of people
LM-LC	62.5%	3.3%	3.8%	4.2%	26.3%	240
MM-LC	0.1%	70.7%	6.0%	8.0%	15.2%	1,840
HM-HC	0.3%	4.8%	54.4%	24.6%	15.9%	1,233

Notes: LM-LC: low healthcare and low long-term care; MM-LC: Medium healthcare and low long-term care; HM-HC: High healthcare and high long-term care

Table 4 Association between changes in cognitive functioning and transitions in the utilization of health and long-term care, two-level linear probability models

	Model 1: LM-LC -> MM-LC/HM-HC	Model 2: MM-LC -> HM-HC	Model 3: HM-HC -> MM-LC
	Coefficient (standard error)		
Improved cognitive functioning	0.014 (0.350)	-0.034***(0.012)	0.042*(0.017)
Unchanged cognitive functioning	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Progression in cognitive impairment	0.030 (0.044)	0.070***(0.015)	-0.037*(0.018)
Normal cognitive functioning	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
MCI	0.030 (0.047)	0.047***(0.015)	-0.039 (0.023)
Dementia	0.047 (0.074)	0.107***(0.023)	-0.041 (0.028)
Age	0.003 (0.002)	0.005***(0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)
Male	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Female	0.038 (0.046)	-0.027**(0.013)	-0.004 (0.015)
White American	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
African American	-0.074 (0.056)	-0.017 (0.015)	-0.007 (0.016)
Other ethnicities	-0.022 (0.063)	-0.033 (0.021)	0.023 (0.026)
Single	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Married	0.040 (0.056)	0.024 (0.013)	-0.004 (0.015)
Years of education	0.011 (0.006)	0.007***(0.002)	0.00004 (0.002)
Household income	0.003 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.003)	-0.007 (0.005)
ADL difficulties	0.057* (0.022)	0.012 (0.007)	-0.002 (0.004)
IADL difficulties	-0.070* (0.026)	0.006 (0.007)	-0.022*** (0.005)
Chronic diseases	0.006 (0.034)	0.006 (0.010)	-0.013 (0.010)
n	441	3,335	1,792
LR test of random effects	$\chi^2(1) = 44.6$***	$\chi^2(1) = 57.0$***	$\chi^2(1) = 7.1$**
Intra-class correlation	0.756	0.510	0.331

Notes: (1) LM-LC: low healthcare and low long-term care; MM-LC: Medium healthcare and low long-term care; HM-HC: High healthcare and high long-term care. (2) For outcome variables, transition in care utilization was coded as 1 and staying in the same class was coded as 0. (3) Ref.: reference category; (4) The income variable was logarithmically transformed. (5) *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

Figure 1 Item response probabilities of the latent transition model, HRS 2014-2018 (N=10,155)



Notes: LM-LC: low health care and low long-term care; MM-LC: Medium health care and low long-term care; HM-HC: High health care and high long-term care