Development of a Living Library of Digital Health Technologies for Alzheimer's Disease and Related Dementias: Initial Results from a Landscape Analysis and Community Collaborative Effort

Sarah Averill Lott[1], Emmanuel Streel[2], Shelby L. Bachman[3], Kai Bode[4], John Dyer[5], Cheryl Fitzer-Attas[6], Jennifer C. Goldsack[1], Ann Hake[7], Ali Jannati[8], Ricardo Sainz Fuertes,[9] Piper Fromy[1]

1. Digital Medicine Society (DiMe), Boston, MA, USA

2. Altoida, Washington DC, USA

3. VivoSense, Inc., Newport Coast, CA, USA

4. Merck, Rahway, PA, USA

5. Cumulus Neuroscience, Belfast, UK

6. Cogniant Pte Ltd, Singapore and ClinMed LLC, Dayton, NJ, USA

7. Eli Lilly and Company, Indianapolis, IN, USA

8. Linus Health, Inc., Boston, MA, USA; Department of Neurology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

9. Academy and Industry Alliance (A&I) Department, Deep Human Biology Learning (DHBL) Office, Eisai, Spain

* Corresponding author: Sarah Averill Lott, sarah.lott@dimesociety.org, 970-408-0780

Abstract

Digital health technologies offer valuable advantages to dementia researchers and clinicians as screening tools, diagnostic aids, and monitoring instruments. To support the use and advancement of these resources, a comprehensive overview of the current technological landscape is essential.

A multi-stakeholder working group, convened by the Digital Medicine Society (DiMe), conducted a landscape review to identify digital health technologies for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia populations. We searched studies indexed in PubMed, Embase, and APA PsycInfo to identify manuscripts published between May 2003 to May 2023 reporting analytical validation, clinical validation, or usability/feasibility results for relevant digital health technologies. Additional technologies were identified through community outreach. We collated 172 peer-reviewed manuscripts, poster presentations, or regulatory documents for 106 different technologies for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia assessment covering diverse populations such as Lewy Body, vascular dementias, frontotemporal dementias, and all severities of Alzheimer's disease. Wearable sensors represent 32% of included technologies, non-wearables 61%, and technologies with components of both account for the remaining 7%. Neurocognition is the most prevalent concept of interest, followed by physical activity and sleep. Clinical validation is reported in 69% of evidence, analytical validation in 34%, and usability/feasibility in 20% (not mutually exclusive).

These findings provide a landscape overview for clinicians and researchers to appraise the clinical utility and relative maturity of technologies for assessing Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

Keywords: digital health technologies, Alzheimer's disease, assessment, digital medicine

Introduction

The uses for digital health technologies (DHTs) for clinical research, personalized medicine, and general wellness are well established and continue to expand (1,2). In the field of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias (ADRD), growth in the development and use of DHTs (3) is occurring alongside increased research and development of drugs for the prevention and treatment of Alzheimer's disease (AD) and other dementia-inducing disorders including Lewy Body and frontotemporal dementias (4-6). The recent regulatory approval of some therapeutic agents targeting AD pathophysiology highlights the complexity of dementia management, as new treatment opportunities emerge alongside ongoing challenges in dementia research, clinical management, and holistic patient care (7). These challenges include identifying digital biomarkers that signal changes early in the disease course when intervention is more likely to provide a substantial impact; assessing clinical manifestations of dementia such as activities of daily living (ADLs), cognitive function, physical activity, and sleep; evaluating and demonstrating response to therapeutic interventions (8); and improving recruitment (including recruitment of diverse patient groups (9), retention, and assessment of participants in clinical trials). In addressing these challenges, clinicians and researchers will benefit from utilizing DHTs as fit-for-purpose tools that can play a strategic role in screening, monitoring, and longitudinal assessment in research, clinical, and real-world settings.

Members of a global, multi-stakeholder working group convened by the Digital Medicine Society (DiMe) (10) met over several months to assess the current availability and characteristics of DHTs in ADRD populations, recognizing the immense opportunity for further research and clinical impact alongside the ever-increasing burden of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias (11, 12). DiMe, a global non-profit dedicated to driving scientific progress and broad acceptance in digital medicine to redefine healthcare and improve lives, hosts the Digital Health

Measurement Collaborative Community (DATAcc) (13), a U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Center for Diagnostic and Radiological Health (CDRH) collaborative community (14), and convenes a wide range of stakeholders and subject matter experts in pre-competitive forums to advance the field.

While others have examined the evidence for ADRD-relevant DHTs (15, 16) such efforts are often limited to a subset of available technologies or therapeutic domains, obscuring substantial portions of the DHT landscape and restricting opportunities for translation of the benefits of these tools across different dementias. To obtain a more comprehensive view, our ADRD working group aggregated multiple technologies across ADRD-therapeutic areas by conducting a landscape review of the peer-reviewed literature supplemented by additional evidence sourced from DHT users and developers. By doing so, we are advancing awareness of these technologies and their uses, collating scientific supporting evidence, and demonstrating fit-for-purpose evaluation processes to assess the maturity of DHTs (17). The results of this innovative effort are reported here, benchmarking the current state of digital innovation in ADRD research. A subset of the results are captured in an open access living library, hosted and maintained by DiMe, that provides an interactive overview of the landscape of ADRD-relevant DHTs with corresponding uses and evidence.

Methods

Data Sources:

In May 2023, we conducted a landscape review of peer-reviewed literature to identify DHTs being used for assessment in ADRD populations. The search strings (*see supplementary material*) included terminology to identify DHTs, diagnostic and descriptive terms to focus on ADRD-relevant populations, and pertinent concepts of interest measured by a DHT including

sleep health, memory, language, social function, oculomotor function, cognition, life space mobility, essential bodily functioning, and emotional or behavioral concerns. The selection of these concepts of interest was informed by literature focused on meaningful aspects of health (8, 18, 19) for ADRD stakeholders. We restricted search results to primary research studies with human participants and published within the last 20 years. To avoid over-representation of any given technology brand, we intentionally excluded name-brand affiliated keywords in the search terms (e.g. Actigraph, iPhone, iPad, Android), knowing this might mean relevant studies were omitted from the results if they included only brand identifiers for utilized technologies. The search string was performed within PubMed, APA PsycInfo, and Embase literature databases, and the results were then aggregated and deduplicated within reference management software Zotero (20).

Literature Review Screening

Identified articles were screened by two reviewers (SAL, PF), with a random sample of 100 articles co-reviewed to ensure harmony on inclusion/exclusion standards. Articles were included or excluded based on the criteria outlined in Table 1.

Literature Screening Criteria	
Population	Exclude studies that do not capture data from human participants Include studies that reference a DHT used for assessment or diagnosis in Alzheimer's or related dementia populations Exclude studies limited to Parkinson's disease populations
Concept of interest	Include studies where a DHT focused on sleep health, memory, language, social function, oculomotor function, cognition, life space mobility, essential bodily functioning, and emotional or behavioral concerns
Application	Exclude studies where the featured DHT was: ● being explicitly evaluated as a digital therapeutic or as an intervention ● dependent on in-hospital or in-clinic administration and unlikely to be accessible in a real-world setting, e.g., magnetic resonance or computed tomography imaging ● an algorithm exclusively trained for and on aggregated imaging or electronic health record data. We did include any algorithms trained on data capable of being collected outside a laboratory setting through remote digital sensor technology
Evidence characteristics	Include studies with data reporting at least one of the following: ● verification ● analytical validation ● clinical validation ● use in clinical trial settings ● usability or feasibility.
Time frame	Include studies published in the last 20 years

Table 1. Inclusion/exclusion criteria applied to identified papers in the landscape review.

Extraction

From each qualifying manuscript, we extracted the name and manufacturer of the technology being utilized; the technology type, form factor, and wear location; the reported therapeutic category as described verbatim by study authors; population descriptors; and the general health concepts and outcomes under assessment. Categories used elsewhere in assessing and categorizing DHTs informed our classification labels (21, 22) for technology types and health outcomes. Technology types were sorted into ambient (standalone, not worn on the body), wearable (worn on the body for any period of time), implantable (surgically placed), or ingestible (swallowed); while form factor descriptions were as described by study authors in the text. Broad health outcome categories were sorted into activities of daily living, mental health, neurocognitive, neurological or sensory, physical activity, and sleep. More specific category labels were derived from study descriptors and are reported in Table 4 in the results of this paper. Lastly, we labeled evidence according to the type of data it reported, such as evidence for verification, analytical validation, clinical validation, and usability or feasibility (17). When extracting evidence type and other characteristics such as diagnostic classifications, study populations descriptors, or outcome measures, we adhered to author/publication verbiage as closely as possible with the goal of collating rather than interpreting or assessing individual pieces of evidence as to their rigor or performance.

Community Sourcing:

Subject matter experts in DHT development, clinical trials, and clinical care from the DiMe ADRD project team (10) reviewed and added to the list of technologies created during extraction, to identify additional technologies not captured in our literature search. To supplement the evidence collected through the landscape review, developers of identified DHTs were contacted by email (when contact information was accessible) to notify them of a technology's potential inclusion in a technology library. Developers were provided a structured

survey via a Qualtrics (23) link where they could return peer reviewed articles, conference posters or oral presentations, regulatory documents, datasets, open-source algorithms, or other supporting materials for their technologies in line with the V3 (17) framework. Finally, the survey link and a description of the library were shared on LinkedIn during World Alzheimer's Month (September, 2023).

Results

The combined literature search resulted in an initial dataset of 1,743 manuscripts; after screening we identified 155 relevant articles related to 118 unique DHTs. Project partners made us aware of an additional 41 technologies, resulting in 159 unique DHTs for ADRD assessment. 121 surveys were disseminated via email to technology developers to request additional data; as of this writing, 42 survey submissions featuring 17 different technologies were returned. Survey responses included peer-reviewed publications, conference poster and oral presentation materials, and documentation of regulatory approvals. Manuscripts compiled through the literature search and community outreach that met the inclusion/exclusion eligibility criteria detailed above were compiled into an online library for public access to source material. As of October 2023, the public library holds 172 total pieces of evidence highlighting 106 technologies, with additional submissions pending.

Populations Represented

Our results captured a variety of ADRD populations, as described by study authors or DHT developers (Table 2). The classifications most represented include Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI) Not Otherwise Specified (NOS), in 39% of evidence records and 49% of technologies, followed by Alzheimer's disease NOS, indicated in 31% of evidence records and 40% of technologies.

Population		Evidence Records (n=172)	Associated Technologies (n=106)
Dementia	Cognitive-Frailty	1	1
	Subjective Cognitive Decline	7	5
	Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI) NOS	67	52
	Prodromal Dementia NOS	5	5
	Preclinical Dementia	21	16
	Mild Dementia NOS	4	4
	Moderate Dementia NOS	1	1
	Severe Dementia NOS	1	1
	Dementia NOS	55	44
	Vascular Dementia NOS	3	3
Alzheimer's Disease	Prodromal Alzheimer's Disease	5	4
	Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI), Alzheimer's Disease	27	21
	Mild Alzheimer's Disease	31	24
	Moderate Alzheimer's Disease	19	16
	Severe Alzheimer's Disease	9	9
	Alzheimer's Disease Not Otherwise Specified (NOS)	53	42
Frontotemporal Dementia	Frontotemporal Dementia, behavioral variant	4	3
	Frontotemporal Dementia, primary progressive aphasia	6	4
	Frontotemporal Dementia NOS	13	12
Lewy Body Dementia	Lewy Body Dementia	12	8
Parkinson's Disease	Prodromal Parkinson's Disease	1	1
	Parkinson's Disease	11	8

Table 2. Frequencies of population areas of focus in the library, with descriptors as reported in the literature. Many pieces of evidence reference multiple diagnostic classifications.
Abbreviations: NOS, Not Otherwise Specified

Technology Types, Form Factors, and Health Concepts

Ambient (or non-wearable sensor technologies) are the most prevalent technology type, representing 61% of included DHTs and 68% of the evidence (Table 3). This category includes environmental or stand-alone sensors as well as software and application-based technologies which are not tied to a given device. 83% of ambient technologies fall into the software and application category. Wearable sensor devices represent 32% of DHTs and 26% of evidence. Seven percent of technologies incorporate both wearable and ambient technologies. The most common form factors are software and applications designed for a tablet or smartphone (42% DHTs; 45% of evidence) and sensors worn on the body but not as a smartwatch (e.g. attached via a strap or brace) (19% DHTs; 16% of evidence). Cameras and contactless sensors are also strongly represented in the ambient category (collectively 13% DHTs; 14% evidence), while smartwatches represent a smaller portion of the results (8% DHTs; 5% evidence). Most studies feature commercially available DHTs (89% of evidence) though we included experimental/noncommercial DHTs if relevant to our population and concepts of interest (11% evidence).

Technology Type and Form Factor		Evidence Records (n-172)	Technologies (n=106)
Type	Ambient	117	65
	Wearables	45	34
	Combination ambient/wearable	10	7
Physical Form Factor*			
	Accessory such as ring or pendant	2	2
	Adhesive patch	6	4
	Camera	11	7
	Clothing	2	2
	Contactless	13	7
	Floor mat or plate	3	2
	Headset, helmet, or headband	8	6
	Mattress pad or sheet	3	2
	Microphone, handheld or fixed	7	1
	Other accessory**	5	5
	Ring	1	1
	Smartphone or tablet	78	44
	Strap or brace	27	20
	Watch	9	8

* not mutually exclusive **digitized pen, wearable pendant

Table 3. Prevalent technology types and form factors represented in the ADRD DHT library. Ambient includes environmental and software or application-based technologies.

DHTs are classified into the health concepts of interest they assess, including but not limited to activities of daily living; mental health, neurocognitive function, neurological or sensory function, physical activity, and sleep (Table 4). The most frequent concept of interest is neurocognitive function with 43% of technologies and 51% of the evidence, but physical activity represents a larger portion of DHTs (48%) and is addressed in 42% of evidence. Measured outcomes as

reported in included studies were analyzed to categorize the evidence into more specific health concepts. Memory is the concept of interest addressed most often as a primary focus of 26% of DHTs and 26% of evidence, but life space mobility, speech patterns and characteristics, gait and mobility, sleep, and several subdomains of memory and cognitive function are also well represented (Table 4).

Health Concepts Being Assessed		**Evidence Records (n=172)**	**Technologies (n=106)**
Broad	Activities of daily living	11	10
	Mental health	8	6
	Neurocognitive	87	46
	Neurological or sensory	6	5
	Physical activity	72	51
	Sleep	20	16
		Evidence Records	Technologies
Specific, in order of frequency	Memory, general	45	28
	Life space mobility (physical functioning)	43	31
	Speech pattern or characteristics	36	14
	Gait	27	16
	Executive function	24	18
	Attention	17	9
	Language (production)	17	12
	Sleep duration or continuity	16	13
	Processing speed	15	10
	Working memory	15	9
	Fine motor function	14	7
	Visuospatial processing	14	9
	Energy expenditure	12	9
	Joint or head kinematics	10	9
	Gaze or visual movement	8	6
	Brain activity	6	5
	Performing activities of daily living	6	6
	Agitation	4	3
	Balance	4	3
	Sleep staging	4	4

Table 4. **Prevalent concepts of interest in the ADRD DHT library.** These are not mutually exclusive. These figures represent frequency in library evidence along with the number of corresponding technologies as of October 2023.

V3, other evidence standards in action:

The V3 framework (17) codifies best practices for evaluating verification, analytical validation, and clinical validation to determine whether DHTs are fit for purpose. To reflect these standards, we categorized evidence to indicate when it reports verification, analytical validation, clinical validation, and/or usability. Most of the current evidence reports validation: 34% of the evidence reports analytical validation while a majority (69%) reports evidence for clinical validation within ADRD populations. Nineteen percent of the evidence reports demonstrated usability or feasibility within ADRD populations. Just 3 manuscripts reported verification. These categories are not mutually exclusive; a single manuscript might report on multiple aspects.

Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this review is the first to broadly document the landscape of DHTs available for assessment within the ADRD space. DHTs focused on cognition and memory are unsurprisingly prevalent in our results. However, we identified several other concepts of interest in the literature, underscoring the versatility DHTs offer for holistic assessment of ADRD populations. When examining technology types, mobile or software applications are prevalent, and their broad scope is notable. We find these technologies are being used by researchers and clinicians to assess multiple aspects of neurocognition (including several types of memory, attention, executive functioning, and processing speed); speech production and language characteristics; fine motor functioning; oculomotor behavior; sleep; gait, mobility, or balance; life space mobility dynamics; and even emotional or other behavioral patterns. Given the ubiquity of smartphones and web-based options for assessment, these findings indicate a large capacity for sensitive and ongoing patient assessment or monitoring in clinical and real-world settings,

including the critical opportunity to reach patients not previously accessible to research or therapeutic settings. A majority (89%) of our results feature commercially available DHTs, emphasizing that mature technological solutions are accessible, providing a wealth of ready-to-deploy solutions to clinicians and researchers even as additional development continues.

Biomarkers, early detection opportunities, and digital phenotyping

Our results indicate researchers are leveraging DHTs to identify digital biomarkers and behavioral changes that can provide early indicators of functional and cognitive changes in both clinical and remote settings. Examples include but are not limited to wearable headbands for in-home EEG assessment to monitor sleep, sophisticated analysis of speech patterns and vocal dynamics as captured by smartphone speakers, cameras tracking patterns in narrow applications (gaze/eye movement) as well as broad (behavioral) patterns in the home; and inertial sensors worn on the lower back, chest, arm, or leg to monitor mobility patterns. These technologies detect subtle functional and behavioral differences that can differentiate patients from healthy controls and discriminate between disease stages. When tablet or smartphone apps, wearables, and other DHTs are used in aggregate, the results can be quite illustrative, providing a “digital phenotype” (24) that captures a comprehensive in-situ portrait of someone’s daily functional and cognitive status, providing a better window into a patient’s emotional state, social patterns, and physical experiences to generate research insights and guide clinical care in ways that are meaningful to patients (25). Our results also returned several examples of “smart home” applications, which were a combination of several different technology types. Examples of smart home ambient-sensing features that provide personalized monitoring might include cameras that track life space mobility and bed pressure mats to detect sleep patterns, restlessness, or agitation. When combined with DHTs such as wearable pendants, wristbands, or smartwatches to detect signals such as behavioral and activity changes, a digital phenotype can be established. Such setups are currently utilized in a variety of ways including

discriminating between disease states (26), detecting agitation or apathy (27), unobtrusively monitoring response to therapeutics in care settings (28), and improving the selection of candidates for clinical research purposes (29).

Clinical research

The importance for understanding the landscape of ADRD-based DHTs is apparent when considering clinical research. Broadly, DHTs can improve trials by (a) reducing within-participant measurement noise (30), ultimately leading to improved statistical power, smaller trials, and faster paths to regulatory judgment of new therapies and (b) decentralizing assessments, enabling the participation of individuals located in more diverse geographical areas and therefore acquiring a more representative and diverse sample of the population under study (9). Although there is a recent example elsewhere in clinical research using a DHT as a primary clinical endpoint (31), this is not current practice in the ADRD space. However, the growing acceptance of DHTs as secondary endpoints in ADRD research (32, 33) is slowly moving the field towards this possibility (34, 35). In our results, studies employed DHTs for monitoring response to treatment in a variety of ways, such as using actigraphy to discern impacts of Mevidalen on activity and sleep within Lewy Body dementia cohorts (36, 37) or using smartwatches to detect suvorexant-induced changes in sleeping patterns for persons with Alzheimer's experiencing insomnia (38).

Digital neuropsychology

The dominance of technologies assessing memory (short term, long term, working), executive function, attention, processing speed, verbal fluency, and visuospatial processing document an increasingly digital shift within neuropsychological assessment, illustrating the ongoing desire of clinicians to assess functional status in real world settings (39) even as they grapple with concerns around ecological validity (25, 40) and the conceptual and administrative challenges

that occur when moving from a traditional test setting (administered in person by a trained clinician in a controlled environment) to remote assessment where variations in technology, computer literacy, and environmental factors, and the presence or lack of supervision by a trained observer must all be considered (40, 41). While further research is needed to assuage these concerns, data continues to emerge illustrating that innovative digital assessment modalities can successfully discriminate between healthy controls and individuals in early stages of Alzheimer's disease (42). Such DHTs provide clear advantages with regard to scalability and increasing access to patients for whom an in-person assessment may not be feasible (40), as well as the potential for real world and longitudinal evidence gathering (43) in populations where early detection is key.

Wearables versus ambient sensors

Wearable sensors generally (32%), and smartwatches in particular (8%) were less represented in our landscape review than anticipated. Given their abundance and relative accessibility, wearable sensors can play an important role in the sensitive assessment of many ADRD-relevant measures, including mobility (44) (including but not limited to gait, life space pattern changes, and fall detection) and other biomarkers such as late-onset essential tremor (45) or heart rate variability (3). However, the lower proportion of wearables to ambient technologies may be a reflection of the versatility and advantages of the latter for dementia populations. For example, ambient sensors may be more appropriate for populations where memory or awareness concerns might make adherence with wearables a challenge. The aforementioned smart home possibilities with cameras, pressure sensors, and/or smart speakers/smartphones that detect changes in behavioral patterns or vocal biomarkers offer a powerful modality for real world continuous data collection while posing minimal burden on patients or caregivers.

Diagnostic classifications

Our results encompass a wide spectrum of dementia diagnoses and severity classifications. However, we note the prevalence of Alzheimer's disease in our results compared to Frontotemporal dementias and Lewy Body dementia, as well as nonspecific dementia diagnoses like Mild Cognitive Impairment, Alzheimer's disease NOS, or Dementia NOS, as compared to results that specifically examined populations with moderate or advanced diagnoses. This suggests an opportunity for DHT developers and researchers to study additional uses and clinical validity within populations that are more narrowly defined within disease severity class, or in dementias other than Alzheimer's disease.

Digital Measurement Products Library: A living resource

A subset of data from the landscape review are collated into the Library of Digital Measurement Products, an open access resource hosted by DiMe (46). While our landscape search included evidence published between 2003-2023 featuring DHTs that are both commercial and experimental, the library is exclusive to DHTs that are commercially available and is restricted to evidence from 2020-present. It is a living resource intended to assist researchers and clinicians who may be considering a current and specific ADRD use case. Evidence is tagged according to the study type by which it is reported in the published literature, such as verification, analytical validation, clinical validation, or usability. Categorical fields are filterable so the end user can sort and view evidence according to a specific technology or technology type, therapeutic area or concept of interest, or by reported evidence type.

This library aligns with the mission of the Digital Health Measurement Collaborative Community (13, 14) to share knowledge and resources to advance digital medicine and ultimately improve patient lives; we encourage the wider ADRD community to join our collective efforts to ensure diverse evidence-supported DHTs are represented in this important resource. A link to submit

evidence for potential inclusion into the library is available to the public on DiMe's Library of Digital Measures Products web page (46).

Limitations

While our search results provide a broad overview of DHTs for ADRD assessment across 20 years of literature, we intentionally excluded brand-name identifiers from our search strings so as not to disproportionately represent some market technologies over others. Additionally, we omitted search terms specific to Parkinson's disease dementia because it has differentiating features from other dementias, and therefore we will focus on it separately in future research. Due to this intentional limiting of some search terms, we do not claim the search results to be exhaustive or a fully systematic review representing the entire sum of evidence for ADRD-relevant DHTs.

Conclusion

DHTs show great promise for ADRD populations by enabling objective, continuous, and repeatable measurements of functioning and symptoms, to be taken longitudinally in a range of settings. This review confirms the multifaceted uses for and significant potential of DHTs as clinicians and researchers seek clarity and insights beyond the reach of traditional assessment modalities. Ambient, application-based, and wearable technologies offer vast real world and longitudinal evidence generation possibilities, as well as the opportunity to take traditional neuropsychological and neurocognitive assessment out of the clinic or laboratory and into homes and care settings. They offer clinicians additional information to facilitate clinical decision making and provide opportunities for clinical research to identify earlier signals of disease onset, monitor disease trajectory, or detect response to therapeutic treatment at a time when demand is increasing for precision medicine that better identifies and targets appropriate candidates for

care and intervention, particularly in the prodromal or earliest stages (47,48). These technologies continue to elucidate insights about domains such as cognitive function, sleep, mobility, language changes, and social and behavioral trends, which will prove invaluable alongside traditional dementia research and management modalities. Our landscape review highlights the applicability and potential for evidence-based ADRD-specific DHTs, advancing the field and giving users a credible resource that can lend confidence in an increasingly crowded digital health environment.

Supplementary Material

Search Terms

Number	Theme/COIs	Terms
1	Performing activities of daily living	Activities of daily living; independent activities of daily living, Instrumental activities of daily living; Finances; scheduling; managing medicine; medication, dressing; eating/meals
2	Sleep health	Sleep onset latency; sleep quality; sleep waking; sleep duration; sleep staging; circadian; sleep disturbance; daytime sleepiness; sleep quality
3	Memory	Encoding; Episodic memory; learning; remembering; recollection
4	Language	Vocabulary; communication; fluency; speech; language; lexicon; lexical; linguistic; verbal fluency
5	Social connection/activities	time spent; distance; location; calendar; social; sms; social media; activities;
6	Oculomotor	Reaction time; eye movements; pupillometry
7	Cognition	Learning; skills; technological confidence; self-efficacy; digital literacy; attention; executive function; social cognition; app usage, cognitive function; cognitive dysfunction; cognitive impairment; cognitive decline; dementia
8	Life space mobility	Gait Function; walking; transitions; physical activity; driving; time spent; distance; location; navigation; Variability of activity; spatial awareness; balance
9	Essential bodily function	Eating; food; swallowing; dressing; showering; using the bathroom; continence
10	Emotions/behavioral issues	Depression; anxiety; emotion; emotional lability; anger; outbursts; emotional blunting, aggression; agitation;

		delirium; behavioral change; impulse control; impulsive; personality
11	Population of interest diagnostic status	Preclinical/MCI/Prodromal/Mild AD (Amnestic/non amnestic); Subjective Cognitive Decline; Subjective Cognitive Concerns; Cognitive Dysfunction; Mild Cognitive Impairment; Moderate AD; Severe AD; Vascular Dementia; FTD; Lewy body; General dementia; Mixed-Domain Cognitive Impairment; Mixed AD/Vascular Dementia

Abbreviations:

AD: Alzheimer's disease

ADRD: Alzheimer's disease and related dementias

DATAcc: Digital Health Measurement Collaborative Community

DHT: Digital health technology

EVIDENCE: EValuatIng connecteD sENsor teChnologiEs

NOS: Not otherwise specified

V3: Verification, analytical validation and clinical validation

Acknowledgments:

We appreciate the support of our collaborating partners and experts who comprise the DATAcc by DiMe ADRD Project team and supported this manuscript: Abbvie; Altoida, Alzheimer's Drug Discovery Foundation, Aural Analytics, Biogen, BioSensics, Boston University, Cambridge Cognition, Cogniant Pte Ltd, Cognito Therapeutics, Cogstate, Cumulus Neuroscience, Eisai, Eli Lilly & Company, Gates Ventures, ki:elements, Koneksa, Linus Health, Luca Health, Medidata, Merck, Northwestern University, Oregon Health & Science University, Roche, Sage Bionetworks, VivoSense, Winterlight Labs.

Author Contributions:

All authors contributed to the conceptual development of this manuscript. All authors have approved the final submitted version and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work presented here.

Graphics:

Literature Screening Criteria	
Population	Exclude studies that do not capture data from human participants Include studies that reference a DHT used for assessment or diagnosis in Alzheimer's or related dementia populations Exclude studies limited to Parkinson's disease populations
Concept of interest	Include studies where a DHT focused on sleep health, memory, language, social function, oculomotor function, cognition, life space mobility, essential bodily functioning, and emotional or behavioral concerns
Application	Exclude studies where the featured DHT was: ● being explicitly evaluated as a digital therapeutic or as an intervention ● dependent on in-hospital or in-clinic administration and unlikely to be accessible in a real world setting, e.g., magnetic resonance or computed tomography imaging ● an algorithm exclusively trained for and on aggregated imaging or electronic health record data. We did include any algorithms trained on data capable of being collected outside a laboratory setting through remote digital sensor technology
Evidence characteristics	Include studies with data reporting at least one of the following: ● verification ● analytical validation ● clinical validation ● use in clinical trial settings ● usability or feasibility.
Time frame	Include studies published in the last 20 years

Table 1. Inclusion/exclusion criteria applied to identified papers in the landscape review.

Population		Evidence Records (n=172)	Associated Technologies (n=106)
Dementia	Cognitive-Frailty	1	1
	Subjective Cognitive Decline	7	5
	Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI) NOS	67	52
	Prodromal Dementia NOS	5	5
	Preclinical Dementia	21	16
	Mild Dementia NOS	4	4
	Moderate Dementia NOS	1	1
	Severe Dementia NOS	1	1
	Dementia NOS	55	44
	Vascular Dementia NOS	3	3
Alzheimer's Disease	Prodromal Alzheimer's Disease	5	4
	Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI), Alzheimer's Disease	27	21
	Mild Alzheimer's Disease	31	24
	Moderate Alzheimer's Disease	19	16
	Severe Alzheimer's Disease	9	9
	Alzheimer's Disease Not Otherwise Specified (NOS)	53	42
Frontotemporal Dementia	Frontotemporal Dementia, behavioral variant	4	3
	Frontotemporal Dementia, primary progressive aphasia	6	4
	Frontotemporal Dementia NOS	13	12
Lewy Body Dementia	Lewy Body Dementia	12	8
Parkinson's Disease	Prodromal Parkinson's Disease	1	1
	Parkinson's Disease	11	8

Table 2. Frequencies of population areas of focus in the library, with descriptors as reported in the literature. Many pieces of evidence reference multiple diagnostic classifications.
Abbreviations: NOS, Not Otherwise Specified

Technology Type and Form Factor		Evidence Records (n-172)	Technologies (n=106)
Type	Ambient	117	65
	Wearables	45	34
	Combination ambient/wearable	10	7
Physical Form Factor*			
	Accessory such as ring or pendant	2	2
	Adhesive patch	6	4
	Camera	11	7
	Clothing	2	2
	Contactless	13	7
	Floor mat or plate	3	2
	Headset, helmet, or headband	8	6
	Mattress pad or sheet	3	2
	Microphone, handheld or fixed	7	1
	Other accessory**	5	5
	Ring	1	1
	Smartphone or tablet	78	44
	Strap or brace	27	20
	Watch	9	8

* not mutually exclusive **digitized pen, wearable pendant

Table 3. Prevalent technology types and form factors represented in the ADRD DHT library. Ambient includes environmental and software or application-based technologies.

Health Concepts Being Assessed		**Evidence Records (n=172)**	**Technologies (n=106)**
Broad	Activities of daily living	11	10
	Mental health	8	6
	Neurocognitive	87	46
	Neurological or sensory	6	5
	Physical activity	72	51
	Sleep	20	16
		Evidence Records	Technologies
Specific, in order of frequency	Memory, general	45	28
	Life space mobility (physical functioning)	43	31
	Speech pattern or characteristics	36	14
	Gait	27	16
	Executive function	24	18
	Attention	17	9
	Language (production)	17	12
	Sleep duration or continuity	16	13
	Processing speed	15	10
	Working memory	15	9
	Fine motor function	14	7
	Visuospatial processing	14	9
	Energy expenditure	12	9
	Joint or head kinematics	10	9
	Gaze or visual movement	8	6
	Brain activity	6	5
	Performing activities of daily living	6	6
	Agitation	4	3
	Balance	4	3
	Sleep staging	4	4

Table 4. Prevalent concepts of interest in the ADRD DHT library. These are not mutually exclusive. These figures represent frequency in library evidence along with the number of corresponding technologies as of October 2023.

References

1. Perry B, Herrington W, Goldsack JC, et al. Use of mobile devices to measure outcomes in clinical research, 2010–2016: a systematic literature review. *Digital Biomarkers.* 2018 Jan 31;2(1):11-30. https://doi.org/10.1159/000486347

2. Abernethy A, Adams L, Barrett M, et al. The promise of digital health: then, now, and the future. *NAM perspectives.* 2022;2022. https://doi.org/10.31478/202206e

3. Kourtis LC, Regele OB, Wright JM, Jones GB. Digital biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease: the mobile/wearable devices opportunity. *NPJ digital medicine.* 2019 Feb 21;2(1):9. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-019-0084-2

4. van Dyck CH, Swanson CJ, Aisen P, et al. Lecanemab in early Alzheimer's disease. *New England Journal of Medicine.* 2023 Jan 5;388(1):9-21. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2212948

5. Watts KE, Storr NJ, Barr PG, Rajkumar AP. Systematic review of pharmacological interventions for people with Lewy body dementia. *Aging & Mental Health*. 2023 Feb 1;27(2):203-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2022.2032601

6. Trieu C, Gossink F, Stek ML, Scheltens P, Pijnenburg YA, Dols A. Effectiveness of pharmacological interventions for symptoms of behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia: a systematic review. *Cognitive and Behavioral Neurology.* 2020 Mar 1;33(1):1-5. https://doi.org/10.1097/WNN.0000000000000217

7. Vaz M, Silva V, Monteiro C, Silvestre S. Role of aducanumab in the treatment of Alzheimer's disease: Challenges and opportunities. *Clinical Interventions in Aging.* 2022 May 18:797-810. https://doi.org/10.2147/CIA.S325026

8. Manta C, Patrick-Lake B, Goldsack JC. Digital measures that matter to patients: a framework to guide the selection and development of digital measures of health. *Digital Biomarkers.* 2020 Sep 15;4(3):69-77. https://doi.org/10.1159/000509725

9. Digital Medicine Society (DiMe). Improving and Increasing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Digitized Clinical Trial Design and Implementation. *Digital Medicine Society (DiMe).* https://dimesociety.org/access-resources/diversity-equity-inclusion/ (2023).

10. Digital Medicine Society. Digital Measures: Alzheimer's Disease and Related Dementias. *DATAcc by DiMe*. https://datacc.dimesociety.org/digital-measures-adrd/ (2023).

11. Li X, Feng X, Sun X, Hou N, Han F, Liu Y. Global, regional, and national burden of Alzheimer's disease and other dementias, 1990–2019. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience.* 2022 Oct 10;14:937486. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2022.937486

12. Tahami Monfared AA, Byrnes MJ, White LA, Zhang Q. The humanistic and economic burden of Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology and Therapy.* 2022 Jun;11(2):525-51. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40120-022-00335-x

13. Digital Medicine Society. *DATAcc by the Digital Medicine Society (DiMe).* https://datacc.dimesociety.org/ (2024).

14. Center for Devices, Radiological Health. Collaborative Communities: Addressing Health Care Challenges Together. *U.S. Food and Drug Administration*, https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/cdrh-strategic-priorities-and-updates/collaborative-communities-addressing-health-care-challenges-together (2024).

15. Curcic J, Vallejo V, Sorinas J, et al. Description of the method for evaluating digital endpoints in Alzheimer disease study: Protocol for an exploratory, cross-sectional study. *JMIR Research Protocols.* 2022 Aug 10;11(8):e35442. https://doi.org/10.2196/35442

16. Muurling M, Hinds C, Wu Y, et al. User Experience and Compliance Rates of Remote Monitoring Technologies in Alzheimer's Disease: Preliminary Results of the RADAR-AD Study. *Alzheimer's & Dementia.* 2022 Dec;18:e064507. https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.064507

17. Goldsack JC, Coravos A, Bakker JP, et al. Verification, analytical validation, and clinical validation (V3): the foundation of determining fit-for-purpose for Biometric Monitoring Technologies (BioMeTs). *npj digital Medicine.* 2020 Apr 14;3(1):55.https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-0260-4

18. DiBenedetti DB, Slota C, Wronski SL, et al. Assessing what matters most to patients with or at risk for Alzheimer's and care partners: a qualitative study evaluating symptoms, impacts, and outcomes. *Alzheimer's Research & Therapy.* 2020 Dec;12:1-5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13195-020-00659-6

19. Hauber B, Paulsen R, Krasa HB, et al. Assessing what matters to people affected by Alzheimer's disease: a quantitative analysis. *Neurology and Therapy.* 2023 Apr;12(2):505-27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40120-023-00445-0

20. Corporation for Digital Scholarship. *Zotero*, https://www.zotero.org/ (accessed 15 June 2023).

21. Olaye IM, Belovsky MP, Bataille L, et al. Recommendations for defining and reporting adherence measured by biometric monitoring technologies: systematic review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research.* 2022 Apr 14;24(4):e33537. https://doi.org/10.2196/33537

22. Sharma Y, Djambazova KV, Marquez CD, et al. A systematic review assessing the state of analytical validation for connected, mobile, sensor-based digital health technologies. *bioRxiv*. Epub ahead of print 23 May 2023. https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.22.23290371

23. Qualtrics. *Qualtrics XM - Experience Management Software*, https://www.qualtrics.com/ (2015, accessed 30 June 2023).

24. Torous J, Kiang MV, Lorme J, Onnela JP. New tools for new research in psychiatry: a scalable and customizable platform to empower data driven smartphone research. *JMIR Mental Health.* 2016 May 5;3(2):e5165. https://doi.org/10.2196/mental.5165

25. Hackett K, Giovannetti T. Capturing Cognitive Aging in Vivo: Application of a Neuropsychological Framework for Emerging Digital Tools. *JMIR Aging* 2022; 5: e38130. https://doi.org/10.2196/38130

26. Akl A, Taati B, Mihailidis A. Autonomous unobtrusive detection of mild cognitive impairment in older adults. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering.* 2015 Jan 9;62(5):1383-94. https://doi.org/10.1109/TBME.2015.2389149

27. Au-Yeung WT, Miller L, Beattie Z, et al. Monitoring behaviors of patients with late-stage dementia using passive environmental sensing approaches: a case series. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry.* 2022 Jan 1;30(1):1-1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jagp.2021.04.008

28. Thomas NW, Beattie Z, Marcoe J, et al. An ecologically valid, longitudinal, and unbiased assessment of treatment efficacy in Alzheimer disease (the EVALUATE-AD Trial): proof-of-concept study. *JMIR Research Protocols.* 2020 May 27;9(5):e17603. https://doi.org/10.2196/17603

29. Wu CY, Beattie Z, Mattek N, Sharma N, Kaye J, Dodge HH. Reproducibility and replicability of high-frequency, in-home digital biomarkers in reducing sample sizes for clinical trials. *Alzheimer's & Dementia: Translational Research & Clinical Interventions.* 2021;7(1):e12220. https://doi.org/10.1002/trc2.12220

30. Öhman F, Hassenstab J, Berron D, Schöll M, Papp KV. Current advances in digital cognitive assessment for preclinical Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment & Disease Monitoring.* 2021;13(1):e12217. https://doi.org/10.1002/dad2.12217

31. Bellerophon Announces Top-Line Data from Phase 3 REBUILD Clinical Trial of INOpulse® for Treatment of Fibrotic Interstitial Lung Disease. *Bellerophon Therapeutics, Inc.*, https://investors.bellerophon.com/news-releases/news-release-details/bellerophon-announces-top-line-data-phase-3-rebuild-clinical (2023, accessed 5 June 2023).

32. O'Hanlon CE, Farmer CM, Ryan J, Ernecoff N. Clinical outcome assessments and digital health technologies supporting clinical trial endpoints in early Parkinson's disease: roundtable proceedings and roadmap for research. RAND; 2023. https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/conf_proceedings/CFA2500/CFA2550-1/RAND_CFA2550-1.pdf

33. Perry B, Kehoe L, Swezey T, et al. How much evidence is enough? research sponsor experiences seeking regulatory acceptance of digital health technology-derived endpoints. *Digital Biomarkers.* 2023 Jun 8;7(1):45-53. https://doi.org/10.1159/000529878

34. Masanneck L, Gieseler P, Gordon WJ, Meuth SG, Stern AD. Evidence from ClinicalTrials.gov on the growth of digital health technologies in neurology trials. *npj Digital Medicine*. 2023 Feb 10;6(1):23. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00767-1

35. Brem AK, Kuruppu S, de Boer C, et al. Digital endpoints in clinical trials of Alzheimer’s disease and other neurodegenerative diseases: challenges and opportunities. *Frontiers in Neurology.* 2023 Jun 15;14:1210974. https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2023.1210974

36. Wang J, Battioui C, McCarthy A, et al. Evaluating the use of digital biomarkers to test treatment effects on cognition and movement in patients with Lewy body dementia. *Journal of Parkinson's Disease.* 2022 Jan 1;12(6):1991-2004. https://doi.org/10.3233/JPD-213126

37. Chen C, Kowahl NR, Rainaldi E, et al. Wrist-worn sensor-based measurements for drug effect detection with small samples in people with Lewy Body Dementia. *Parkinsonism & Related Disorders.* 2023 Apr 1;109:105355. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.parkreldis.2023.105355

38. Svetnik V, Wang TC, Ceesay P, et al. Pilot evaluation of a consumer wearable device to assess sleep in a clinical polysomnography trial of suvorexant for treating insomnia in patients with Alzheimer's disease. *Journal of Sleep Research.* 2021 Dec;30(6):e13328. https://doi.org/10.1111/jsr.13328

39. Parsons T, Duffield T. Paradigm shift toward digital neuropsychology and high-dimensional neuropsychological assessments. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2020 Dec 16;22(12):e23777. https://doi.org/10.2196/23777

40. Van Patten R. Introduction to the special issue-neuropsychology from a distance: Psychometric properties and clinical utility of remote neurocognitive tests. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology.* 2021 Sep 14;43(8):767-73. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803395.2021.2021645

41. Lunardini F, Luperto M, Romeo M, et al. Supervised digital neuropsychological tests for cognitive decline in older adults: usability and clinical validity study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth.* 2020 Sep 21;8(9):e17963. https://doi.org/10.2196/17963

42. Muurling M, de Boer C, Vairavan S, et al. Augmented reality versus standard tests to assess cognition and function in early Alzheimer's disease. *NPJ digital medicine.* 2023 Dec 18;6(1):234. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00978-6

43. Hampshire A, Ballard C, Williams G. Computerized neuropsychological tests undertaken on digital platforms are cost effective, achieve high engagement, distinguish and are highly sensitive to longitudinal change: Data from the PROTECT and GBIT studies: Advancing clinical trial design and methods in a digital age. *Alzheimer's & Dementia.* 2020 Dec;16:e041122. https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.041122

44. Cullen A, Mazhar MK, Smith MD, Lithander FE, Ó Breasail M, Henderson EJ. Wearable and portable GPS solutions for monitoring mobility in dementia: a systematic review. *Sensors.* 2022 Apr 27;22(9):3336. https://doi.org/10.3390/s22093336

45. Wang X, St George RJ, Bai Q, Tran S, Alty J. New horizons in late-onset essential tremor: a pre-cognitive biomarker of dementia?. *Age and Ageing*. 2022 Jul;51(7):afac135. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afac135

46. Digital Medicine Society (DiMe). Library of Digital Measurement Products. *DATAcc by DiMe*. https://datacc.dimesociety.org/digital-measurement-library/ (2024).

47. Forloni G. Alzheimer's disease: from basic science to precision medicine approach. *BMJ Neurology Open*. 2020;2(2). https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjno-2020-000079

48. Lukiw WJ, Vergallo A, Lista S, Hampel H, Zhao Y. Biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease (AD) and the application of precision medicine. *Journal of Personalized Medicine.* 2020 Sep 21;10(3):138. https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm10030138