medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supporting decision-making for individuals living with dementia and their care partners with knowledge translation: an umbrella review

Marie Biard[1,2,3] *, Flavie E. Detcheverry[2,3,4,5] *, William Betzner[6,7], Sara Becker[7,8], Karl S. Grewal[9], Sandi Azab[10,11], Patrick F. Bloniasz[12,13], Erin L. Mazerolle[14], Jolene Phelps[6], Eric E. Smith[6], AmanPreet Badhwar[2,3,4,5 #]

* indicates equal first co-authorship

[1]Department of Medicine, Université de Montréal, 2900 Boulevard Édouard-Montpetit, Montréal, QC, H3T 1J4, Canada; [2]Multiomics Investigation of Neurodegenerative Diseases (MIND) lab, 4545 Chemin Queen May, Montréal, QC, H3W 1W4, Canada; [3]Centre de Recherche de l'Institut Universitaire de Gériatrie de Montréal (CRIUGM), 4545 Chemin Queen May, Montréal, QC, H3W 1W4, Canada; [4]Department of Pharmacology and Physiology, Université de Montréal, 2900 Boulevard Édouard-Montpetit, Montréal, QC, H3T 1J4, Canada; [5]Institute of Biomedical Engineering, Université de Montréal, 2960 Chemin de la Tour, Montréal, QC, H3T 1J4, Canada; [6]Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, 3330 Hospital Dr NW, Calgary, AB, T2N 4N1, Canada; [7]Hotchkiss Brain Institute, University of Calgary, 3330 Hospital Dr NW, Calgary, AB, T2N 4N1, Canada; [8]Department of Psychology, University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive NW, Calgary, AB, T2N 1N4, Canada; [9]Department of Psychology, University of Saskatchewan, 9 Campus Drive, Saskatoon, SK, S7N 5A5, Canada; [10]Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, 1280 Main St W., Hamilton, ON, L8S 4L8, Canada; [11]Department of Pharmacognosy, Alexandria University, 1 Khartoum Square,

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Azarita, Alexandria, 21521, Egypt; [12]Program in Neuroscience, Bowdoin College, 255 Maine St, Brunswick, ME, 04011, US; [13]Graduate Program for Neuroscience, Boston University, Office 428, Center for Computing & Data Sciences, 665 Commonwealth Ave, Boston, MA, 02215, US; [14]Departments of Psychology, Computer Science, and Biology, St. Francis Xavier University, PO Box 5000, Antigonish, NS, B2G 2W5, Canada.

[#]Corresponding author: AmanPreet Badhwar, MSc, PhD

[2]Multiomics Investigation of Neurodegenerative Diseases (MIND) lab, 4545 Chemin Queen May, Montréal, QC, H3W 1W4, Canada; [3]Centre de Recherche de l'Institut Universitaire de Gériatrie de Montréal (CRIUGM), 4545 Chemin Queen May, Montréal, QC, H3W 1W4, Canada; [4]Department of Pharmacology and Physiology, Université de Montréal, 2900 Boulevard Édouard-Montpetit, Montréal, QC, H3T 1J4, Canada; [5]Institute of Biomedical Engineering, Université de Montréal, 2960 Chemin de la Tour, Montréal, QC, H3T 1J4, Canada.

E-mail: amanpreet.badhwar@umontreal.ca

Fax number: 001 (514) 340-3530

Work phone: 001 (514) 340-3540, extension 3345

Postal address: 4565, chemin Queen Mary, Montreal, QC, Canada, H3W 1W5

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ABSTRACT

Living with dementia requires decision-making about numerous topics including daily activities, such as advance care planning (ACP). Both individuals living with dementia and care partners require informed support for decision-making. We conducted an umbrella review to assess knowledge translation (KT) interventions supporting decision-making for individuals living with dementia and their informal care partners. Four databases were searched using 50 different search-terms, identifying 22 reviews presenting 32 KT interventions. The most common KT decision topic was ACP (N=21) which includes advanced care directives, feeding options, and placement in long-term care. The majority of KT interventions targeted care partners only (N=16), or both care partners and individuals living with dementia (N=13), with fewer interventions (N=3) targeting individuals living with dementia. Overall, our umbrella review offers insights into the beneficial impacts of KT interventions, such as increased knowledge and confidence, and decreased decisional conflicts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

1. INTRODUCTION

The word dementia is an umbrella term including a wide range of specific medical conditions caused by abnormal brain changes. Alzheimer's disease (AD) and vascular dementia are the two most prevalent forms of dementia, and sometimes co-exist as mixed dementia [1,2]. Over 55 million people worldwide currently live with dementia, a number projected to reach 139 million by 2050 [3]. While the presenting symptoms of dementia may vary, most individuals experience mild cognitive impairment (MCI), often years before the dementia diagnosis [4]. Eventually, the progressive cognitive decline associated with dementia conditions impedes the individual's autonomy and self-efficacy, generally requiring the involvement of family members or other informal care partners in caring for individuals living with dementia [3].

Assistance provided by informal care partners is estimated at around five hours per day per person with dementia [5]. This task is challenging and can have a negative impact on care partners' well being [6,7]. Informal caregiving accounts for approximately half of the overall costs of dementia, for a global total of 651.4 billion US$ in 2019 [8]. This substantial contribution of informal care led the World Health Organization to address the need for support to care partners of individuals living with dementia in the global action plan on the public health response to dementia [6]. While some progress has been made since its approval by the World Health Assembly in 2017, more is needed to support informal care partners in their role [3].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

One aspect of navigating dementia care involves making decisions regarding several topics, from day-to-day activities (e.g., driving cessation, fall prevention, medication management) to end-of-life care [9,10]. As dementia progresses, care partners are increasingly called upon to participate in this decision-making process. While some individuals living with dementia prefer to rely on their family for decision-making, others wish to participate in making their own decisions for as long as possible [11]. One way to support decision-making of individuals living with dementia and their care partners is through the development of Knowledge Translation (KT) interventions.

KT is the process of creating, synthesizing, and applying knowledge with the aim of improving health and strengthening the healthcare system [12]. Examples of KT interventions for end-users, such as patients and care partners range from structured discussions with a healthcare professional to more standardized tools such as decision aids (e.g., booklets, pamphlets, audiovisual interventions), which have been shown to help patients make decisions, on topics such as treatment or screening decisions [13,14].

We conducted an umbrella review to assess existing KT interventions aimed at helping individuals living with dementia and care partners make decisions about current or future matters. We specifically focused on KT interventions targeting the two most common forms of dementia, namely AD, vascular cognitive impairment and dementia (VCID; both the prodromal and dementia stages of vascular dementia), and mixed dementia. Our specific aims were to investigate: (a) What types of KT interventions exist for individuals living with dementia and their care partners to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

improve informed decision-making? (b) What are the outcomes of existing KT decision support interventions for individuals living with dementia and their care partners? and (c) What gaps exist in KT about decision-making support for individuals living with dementia and their care partners?

2. METHODS

This umbrella review was conducted based on the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) methodology for umbrella reviews [15,16]. Prior to redaction, the study protocol was registered on PROSPERO (CRD42023414419; Supplementary Material S1).

2.1 Search strategy

Following a pilot search on MEDLINE, a search strategy addressing key concepts of our review question, namely KT, decision-making, knowledge users, and dementia, was developed (M.B., E.L.M., E.E.S., A.B.). The full search strategy is available in the Supplementary Material S2. The search was conducted on January 7, 2023, using 50 different search terms in four electronic databases on Ovid: MEDLINE, APA PsycINFO, Embase, and Cochrane database of systematic reviews. No time period restriction was applied. Only English-written articles were considered, justified by findings from the pilot search that expanding to additional languages was unlikely to yield substantially more articles. The search was supplemented by citation tracking the references of the included studies as well as searching for grey literature such as reports from the Canadian Institute for Health Information. If review protocols or conference abstracts were retrieved, a search was carried out to check whether the findings were subsequently published as full length, peer-reviewed articles.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

2.2 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

2.2.1 Population

Literature syntheses focusing on individuals living with dementia or their informal care partners were included. Individuals living with any of the following major dementia subtypes were accepted: AD, VCID, and mixed dementia. Note that when provided, ethnicity information of the target population was extracted and specified. Reviews solely targeting individuals living with other dementia subtypes (e.g., Lewy Body dementia, Parkinson's disease related dementia), individuals with other illnesses (e.g., stroke), or older adults in general were excluded. We further excluded studies focusing only on health professionals or professional care partners (e.g., nurses), but included those with interventions directed at dyads (individual with dementia and informal care partner) or triads (individual with dementia, informal care partner, and health professional).

2.2.2 Intervention

Systematic reviews synthesizing interventions that support decision-making for individuals living with dementia and/or their care partners were included. For example, these could take the form of booklets, pamphlets, audiovisual interventions, structured discussion, or educational sessions.

2.2.3 Comparator

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

No review article was excluded based on the comparator used (i.e., usual care), or the lack of comparator, given the broad nature of our umbrella review question and the *a priori* inclusion of both qualitative and quantitative studies.

2.2.4 Outcome

Likewise, systematic reviews reporting any outcomes (e.g., increase in knowledge about dementia/dementia care and decision-making skills, satisfaction of quality of care, confidence) were included.

2.2.5 Type of studies

We included review articles that used (a) a defined, reproducible search strategy, (b) systematically applied inclusion and exclusion criteria, and (c) produced a synthesis of findings, which may be qualitative. These reviews are usually self identified as: “Systematic review”, ”Meta-analysis”, “Rapid review”, “Umbrella review”, and “Scoping review”. Pre-print reviews, conference abstracts, or review protocols were excluded.

2.3 Study screening and selection

The screening process was performed using the Covidence platform. Nine independent reviewers (M.B., F.E.D., S.A., S.B., W.B., P.F.B., K.S.G., J.P., and E.E.S.) participating in the Vascular Training (VAST) Platform collaborative initiative screened titles and abstracts against inclusion/exclusion criteria listed above. Every record was screened independently by M.B. and a second reviewer from the list of independent reviewers. Full-text review of included publications was independently

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

examined by two reviewers (M.B. and E.E.S.), and conflicts were resolved by discussion, with the help of a third reviewer when necessary.

2.4 Critical appraisal

Two reviewers (M.B. and F.E.D.) independently conducted the critical appraisal of the selected systematic reviews using the JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Systematic Reviews and Research Syntheses [15,16]. The checklist included eleven questions, of which nine assessed the validity of the study. The last two questions assessed the relevance of the recommendations and gaps identified. Reviewers did a pilot critical appraisal to calibrate their responses at the beginning of the quality assessment.

2.5 Data extraction

Two independent reviewers (M.B. and F.E.D.) used a modified version of the JBI Data Extraction Tool [15,16]. Specifically, the following elements were extracted in a standardized manner: author, year, country, type of review, aims, population, comparator, intervention, outcomes, databases searched, date range of included studies, basic information about primary studies, appraisal instrument and rating, results, and other comments. Reviewers completed a pilot data extraction beforehand to calibrate responses. Conflicts were resolved following the same process as outlined above.

2.6 Data summary

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Given that the knowledge syntheses found in the literature were likely to be heterogeneous in terms of design and objectives, a narrative format was adopted to synthesize the results of this umbrella review.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Study inclusion

The search yielded a total of 2,265 studies after duplicate removal, of which 82 remained after title and abstract screening. After full-text assessment, 60 additional studies were excluded, resulting in 22 included reviews. Our Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram is provided in Figure 1.

3.2 Methodological quality

The assessment of the risk of bias of our included studies was performed using the JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Systematic Reviews and Research Syntheses [15,16], and is displayed in Figure 2. According to the percentage of criteria met using the JBI critical appraisal checklist, 17 studies were of high quality, four were of medium quality, and one was of low qualities. For 9 of the 11 risk of bias questions (questions 1-5, 7, 8, 10, and 11), fewer than 25% of studies were rated as medium or high risk of bias. For question 6, which asked about whether critical appraisal conducted by two or more reviewers independently, more than 50% of studies were rated as medium to high risk of bias. For question 9, which asked about likelihood of publication bias, more than 50% of studies were rated as high risk of bias. Overall, the majority of studies clearly stated their review question, had appropriate inclusion

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

criteria and search strategy, and used adequate methods for data extraction and synthesis.

3.3 Characteristics of included reviews

General study characteristics are presented in Table 1. There were a total of 22 reviews from 2012 to 2023, stemming from the United Kingdom (N=7) [17–23], Australia (N=6) [24–29], the United States of America (N=6) [30–35], Canada (N=1) [36], Ireland (N=1) [37], and the Netherlands (N=1) (Figure 3) [38]. Out of the 22 reviews identified, 18 were systematic reviews [17–27,29,30,34,36–39], two were scoping reviews [33,35], and two were integrative reviews [31,32] (Table 1). All used a narrative synthesis to report the results. Finally, two reviews additionally performed a meta-analysis [23,34].

While all the selected reviews included primary studies of individuals living with the conditions (i.e., AD, VCID, or mixed dementia) that were specified in our selection criteria, most of them (18 of 22) also included studies of patients with other conditions. This was due to the fact that the majority of reviews had included additional objectives not specifically involving decision-making interventions or had targeted a mixed population of individuals living with dementia or other conditions. Altogether, the 22 reviews reported a total of 57 unique primary articles relevant to our aims (Supplementary Material S3). We were unable to assess one primary articlle [40], which was not available in English.

3.4 Findings

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Findings are reported based on three main KT intervention categories: (a) Advance Care Planning (ACP) (Section 3.4.1.), (b) everyday decision-making (Section 3.4.2.), and (c) eHealth interventions (Section 3.4.3.). In addition, we have summarised findings relative to KT interventions targeted at care partners only (N=16), dyads (N=12) or triads (N=1), and individuals living with dementia only (N=3), in Tables 2, 3, and 4, respectively.

3.4.1 Advance care planning

Of the 22 reviews included in our umbrella review [17–27,29–39], 15 reviews [17–19,22–27,30,34,35,37–39] identified 21 unique KT interventions in 40 primary articles for decisions related to end-of-life and ACP. ACP is "*the ability to enable individuals to define goals and preferences for future medical treatment and care, to discuss these goals and preferences with family and health-care providers, and to record and review these preferences if appropriate*" [41]. Examples of preferences for future medical treatment and care can include artificial feeding/hydration preference, do-not-hospitalize (DNH) orders, do-not-resuscitate (DNR) orders, or other directives such as health care power of attorney. In our umbrella review, we identified that ACP interventions (a) came in different formats, namely, written material, video decision aids, group interventions (i.e., large group sessions), and face-to-face interventions (i.e., smaller groups between individual living with dementia and/or care partner + coordinator) (sections 3.4.1.1 to 3.4.1.4), addressing general ACP topics, or (b) addressed specific topics, namely, feeding options, and respite services and long-term place of care (sections 3.4.1.5 and 3.4.1.6). ACP interventions have been summarized in the following sections.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

3.4.1.1 General topic: Written material

Five reviews [19,25–27,38] identified two written interventions, from seven primary articles [42–48], targeting (a) care partners only, and (b) older individuals (65+ years) and their care partners. The two written interventions were found to decrease decisional conflicts and increase ACP behaviors, as further described in the following paragraphs.

Five included reviews [19,25–27,38] presented the Canadian booklet *"Comfort care at the end of life for persons with dementia – A guide for care partners"*, an informational document developed in 2005 in both French and English, targeting care partners (informal and professional) only. This booklet aimed to help care partners in their decision-making process by teaching them about dementia trajectory and palliative care approaches [19,25–27,38]. While the level of family inclusion in decision-making was not evaluated [38], this written intervention (a) decreased the level of decisional conflict between care partners, and (b) did not increase the completion of the DNR order [19,27]. Upon examination of the relevant primary studies included in these reviews, we found (a) three studies featured the acceptability and usefulness of the booklet by professional care partners (e.g., nurse) [42–44], resulting in its adaptation in Dutch, Japanese, and Italian [45,46], and (b) one study describing an intervention combining the booklet with an ACP meeting between the informal care partner and a healthcare professional (e.g., nurse) [47].

In addition, one review [25] identified the usage of the "*Palliative and Therapeutic Harmonization (PATH) program*" targeting individuals of 65-years and older and their

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

care partners, which combined written decision-support intervention and consultation with a healthcare professional. Specifically, this program consisted of reviewing written and online materials describing frailty and dementia using narrative stories and case vignettes, followed by three consultations with a healthcare professional (physician or nurse practitioner) [48]. This program was shown to increase ACP behavior as reported by the participants [25].

3.4.1.2 General topic: Video decision aids

Nine reviews [19,22–26,30,34,37] identified four video decision aid interventions, from ten primary articles [49–58], targeting both individuals with dementia and their care partners, and individuals with advanced dementia only. Overall, video decision aid interventions were found to positively impact individuals with dementia and their care partners, by increasing knowledge and goals-of-care decision-making, and by decreasing decisional conflicts. More details about the video interventions are provided below.

Specifically, two reviews [23,30] identified a two-minute video targeting individuals with dementia and their care partners, which contained an audio description of advanced dementia [49–51,56]. Compared to a narrative/descriptive format (i.e., without visual format), this video significantly increased comfort care as a choice, and decreased the level of decisional conflict between individuals over 65-years-old and their care partners [23,30]. Later, Einterz et al. [57] created a longer version (18-minute video) of the above-mentioned two-minute video and combined it with an ACP consultation [23–26,37,57], which increased knowledge and decreased decisional conflict between individuals with moderate-to-severe dementia and their

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

care partners (both family members and healthcare professionals) [23,24,37]. This intervention (i.e., the 18-minute video combined with an ACP consultation) was more recently evaluated in a randomized clinical trial [53] and similar beneficial effects were reported [19,23,26,34]. Specifically, it was shown to be acceptable for care partners by increasing (a) knowledge, (b) quality of communication [23,26], and (c) decreasing decisional conflicts both with the individual living with dementia [23,34], and with health professionals (e.g., clinicians) [19,23]. However, the lower level of conflict between care partners and health professionals was considered to be of low certainty in a subset analysis by Walsh et al. [34] for dyads in a late-dementia stage.

Finally, one review [22] identified two additional video decision-support interventions: (a) one 12-minute video targeting both individuals with advanced dementia and their care partners [54], and (b) five 6-to-10-minute videos targeting only individuals with advanced dementia only [55]. While these two video interventions were found to increase goals-of-care discussions and ACP decision about tube feeding, no impact was shown on DNH decision making [22].

3.4.1.3 General topic: Group interventions

Two reviews [25,27] identified five group interventions, from six primary studies [59–64], targeting (a) family care partners, and (b) both individuals living with dementia and their care partners. The two reviews concluded that while the interventions did not impact outcomes for individuals living with dementia, they were beneficial for care partners and seemed to increase ACP interest as inferred from self-reported measures [25,27]. Details about the five interventions are provided below.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Group interventions targeting family care partners were: (a) the *"Legal-Financial Planning Workshop"* [63], and (b) an educational group intervention (including presentations and printed materials) [59] about dementia trajectory, life support, tube-feeding, and ACP for African American care partners, which increased their knowledge and decision-making self-efficacy regarding end-of-life care [25,27].

Of the three group interventions targeting individuals living with dementia and their care partners identified by one review [25], two were sponsored by the Alzheimer's Association: (a) the "*Taking Control of Alzheimer's Disease*", a 4-session intervention including ACP discussions at early-stage dementia related to finances, driving, and legal issues [60,61]; and (b) "*The Early Stage Memory Loss seminar"*, a similar intervention including ACP and financial planning [62]. The third intervention consisted of a seminar about different types of ACP documentation [64].

3.4.1.4 General topic: Face-to-face interventions

Seven included reviews [17–19,25,27,28,34] identified seven unique face-to-face interventions/consultations, from eight primary studies [65–72], regarding end-of-life decisions. These interventions were targeted at (a) care partners of individuals living with dementia, or (b) both individuals living with dementia and their care partners. Overall, the reviews agreed that face-to-face interventions increased the level of comfort for decision-making and ACP completion. Findings relative to these face-to-face interventions are described in more details below.

Regarding interventions targeted at care partners of individuals living with dementia, one review [39] identified one face-to-face intervention targeting Chinese family care

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

partners of older people living with dementia. This intervention involved presenting hypothetical scenarios featuring critical illness or irreversible coma to care partners, followed by information on possible life sustaining treatment outcomes [39,72]. The intervention was found to slightly improve the level of comfort for decision-making in the case of irreversible coma compared to critical illness, suggesting that the context (e.g., coma or critical illness) affected the decisions [39,72]. Five additional reviews [17,19,25,27,34] identified three interventions involving a specialized palliative care team targeting care partners of individuals living with advanced dementia [67–69]: (a) a structured palliative care consultation that included the opportunity to complete ACP followed by phone support by a palliative care nurse practitioner, with care partners receiving the booklet "*Advanced Dementia: A Guide for Families"* [19,34,67], (b) a palliative consult intervention delivered by a physician and a palliative care social worker [25,27,68], and (c) a nurse-delivered adapted version of the "*UK National Health Service Preferred Priorities of Care*" [69]. While the first two of the above-mentioned interventions reported positive effects, such as increased completion of ACP documentation and improved care partners decision making [19,25,27,34], the third intervention, in contrast, was shown to increase decisional conflict of care partners, with few of them completing ACP documentation [17,69].

Three reviews identified interventions targeting both individuals living with dementia and their care partners. Of these, two reviews [18,25] mentioned the "*Let Me Decide"* advanced directive program/intervention, which trained health professionals to counsel individuals living with dementia and their care partners about ACP [65,66]. The intervention was found to increase ACP documentation but did not change healthcare satisfaction [18,25]. Targeting individuals living with early-stage dementia

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

and their care partners, two reviews [19,25] identified two face-to-face interventions [70,71]: (a) the "*Preserving Identity and Planning for Advance Care (PIPAC)"* intervention [25,70] consisting of reminiscence and ACP sessions, and (b) the "*Support, Health, Activities, Resources, and Education (SHARE)*" psychoeducational program [19,71], an intervention including counseling on ACP. Both interventions (i.e., PIPAC and SHARE) were found to have positive effects, with PIPAC reporting decreased decisional conflict and improved decision-making self-efficacy [25], and with SHARE demonstrating increased ACP completion and satisfaction for care partners only, and decreased emotional disruption for both members of the dyad (i.e., individuals living with early-stage dementia and their care partners) [19].

3.4.1.5 Specific topic: Feeding options

Twelve reviews [17,19,23–26,30,33,34,37–39] identified one ACP intervention for decision-making about feeding options, from eight primary studies [73–80]. Five reviews [17,23,24,26,33] identified the original intervention by Mitchell et al. [78], specifically, the audiovisual intervention "*Making Choices: long-term tube feeding placement in elderly patients"* and personal worksheet. While this decision aid was initially targeted at care partners of older individuals (65+ years of age) [78], three more recent updates [19,23–26,30,33,34,37–39] of this intervention targeted: (a) dyads of individuals living with advanced dementia and their care partners [75,76], and (b) only care partners of individuals living with advanced dementia [74,79]. All twelve reviews noted that both the primary intervention study and its updates reported decreased decisional conflicts and expectations about tube feeding benefits, as well as increased goals-of-care, and knowledge and frequency/quality of communication [17,19,23–26,30,33,34,37–39]. Despite this, two reviews [19,34]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

found limitations in the updated versions, with limited degree of change in knowledge and decisional conflict, especially for care partners of individuals living with advanced dementia. However, due to the overall positive impact of this intervention, two reviews [23,33] noted that it was adapted into the "*International Patient Decision Aid Standards (IPDAS)* statement" by Elwyn et al. [80] (with up to six versions in different languages, such as Spanish and Chinese, translated from the original English version), as well as translated to other languages [33] including Portuguese [73] and Japanese [77].

3.4.1.6 Specific topic: Respite services and long-term place of care

Five reviews [17,23,26,30,35] identified two interventions, from two primary studies [81,82], targeting only care partners for decision-making about respite services and long-term place of care. Specifically, all five reviews [17,23,26,30,35] identified the "*Guiding Options for Living with Dementia (GOLD)*", a decision aid book from Australia targeting dementia care partners [82]. This intervention allowed care partners to (a) understand respite care through synthesized information and vignettes about care partners experiences, (b) find community respite care services, and (c) weigh their preferences to help make decisions [82]. While the GOLD intervention was found to be useful and relevant by care partners [23], only a non-significant trend towards lower decisional conflicts and higher knowledge was observed [17,23]. In addition, two reviews [23,26] identified the DECIDE manual [81], that supported care partners in their choice of long-term care placement through the completion of a workbook with the support of a decision coach. The DECIDE manual was found to reduce decisional conflicts of care partners [23,26].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

3.4.2 Everyday decision-making

Of the 22 reviews included in our umbrella review [17–27,29–39], four reviews [26,29,31,35,36] identified four unique KT interventions in four primary articles for decisions related to everyday decision-making. Within these articles, we identified three everyday decision-making topics, specifically driving cessation, fall prevention, and medication management. KT interventions about everyday decision-making have been summarized in the following sections.

3.4.2.1 Driving cessation

Three reviews [26,31,36] identified two interventions, from two primary studies [83,84], for decision-making about driving cessation targeting either care partners or individuals living with dementia, and noted beneficial impact. Specifically, two reviews [31,36] identified "*At the Crossroads"* intervention [83], a psycho-educational group intervention for care partners of individuals living with MCI, AD, or related dementia. The intervention increased care partners' confidence in managing driving cessation of their relatives living with dementia [31,36]. One review [26] identified the "*Driving with Dementia Decision Aid (DDDA)"* booklet [84], which targeted drivers living with dementia. The DDDA reduced decisional conflict and improved knowledge of individuals with dementia regarding driving cessation [26].

3.4.2.2 Fall prevention

One review [35] identified one intervention for decision-making about fall prevention from one primary study [85]. The discussion-based intervention was useful for supporting shared decision-making by individuals living with dementia and their care

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

partners, by discussing fall risk factors and strategies to reduce them, as well as their advantages and disadvantages [35].

3.4.2.3 Medication management

One review [29] identified an educational intervention for care partners, from one primary study [86], for decision-making about medication management. In-person sessions with a nurse or social worker were guided by a manual addressing seven areas of medication management: care partners responsibilities, common problems in medication administration/taking, preventing medication errors, talking with health care providers about medications, community resources, contingency planning, and changes in medication taking. The intervention improved care partners knowledge and medication management [29].

3.4.3 eHealth interventions

Finally, six reviews [20,21,26,29,32,35] identified seven interventions, from eleven primary studies [87–97], addressing multiple decision topics related to living with dementia. These interventions were eHealth interventions, defined as "*the use of information and communication technologies for health*" by the World Health Organization [98]. These seven eHealth interventions targeted (a) care partners only (N=4 interventions; informal only, or informal and professional), (b) individuals living with MCI only (N=1), (c) both individuals living with dementia and their care partners (N=1), and (d) triads of individuals living with dementia, family care partners, and professionals (N=1). It was found that eHealth interventions for decision-making about current or future matters had beneficial effects, especially for care partners

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(both informal and professional). Findings relative to these eHealth interventions are described in more details below.

Four reviews targeted (a) family care partners of AD individuals, and (b) both family and professional care partners. Specifically, one review [20] identified "*ComputerLink*" [87,88], a digital-based tool with three main functions: (a) information delivery through an electronic encyclopedia, (b) decision support program that used prioritization questions, and (c) communication with other care partners and nurses using a forum, private messages, and a Q&A module. This intervention had a positive impact on decisional family care partners' confidence, although it did not change decision-making skill and the decision support module may have been used sub-optimally [20]. In addition, two reviews [20,29] identified two other interventions for care partners: (a) Gench et al. [29] identified "*AlzMed*", a booklet and website [97] that significantly improved care partners' confidence and ability to manage dementia and monitor medication side effects, and (b) Hopwood et al. [20] identified the "*Building Better Caregiver (BBC)*", an internet-based, skills-enhancement workshop [89] that significantly reduced care partners' burden, depression, pain, and stress. Finally, one review [20] described an intervention for informal care partners of individuals living with dementia and healthcare professionals, the decision aid "*European eHealthMonitor project Dementia Portal (eHM-DP)*" [90,91]. Family care partners reported (a) high degree of perceived support by the eHM-DP from individualized information acquisition, access to support from home, and empowerment in health-related decisions, and (b) improved interactions between informal and professional care partners [20]. However, it did not improve care partners' burden and quality of life over the study period [91].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

One review [26] identified a promising web-based intervention for decision-making for older individuals living with MCI (60+ years) based on the personal values and preferences of the users [96]. In addition, three reviews [21,32,35] identified the "*Talking Mats*" [94], a picture-based communication framework for individuals with dementia and their family care partners. The "*Talking Mats*" (both the English [94] and Dutch version [99]) was reported to be easy to use and to increase (a) the perceived involvement of both members of the dyads, (b) decision-making, (c) well-being, and (d) overall satisfaction of the discussion [21,32,35]. However Mattos et al. [35] reported that despite a request for adding pictures and decreasing complexity of interventions using decision boxes, the overall feeling was positive regarding the decision aid for assistance in decision-making [95].

Finally, three reviews [20,21,35] identified an intervention for triads (individuals living with dementia, informal care partners, case managers – i.e., relatively new term for individuals helping dyads of individuals with dementia and their care partners). Specifically, they described "*DecideGuide*", an interactive web-based intervention for eight dementia-related life domains [92,93]. Case managers and most family care partners found this intervention to be user friendly, and (a) appreciated this tool (especially the chat function), (b) felt more involved, and (c) were able to share more information about daily issues [20,21,35]. However, it was noted that older adults (70+ years), with or without dementia, found it harder to use [20,21].

4. DISCUSSION

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

In our umbrella review, we assessed existing KT interventions aimed at helping individuals living with dementia and their care partners make decisions about current or future matters. Since the involvement of individuals living with dementia was found to be limited and difficult, due to their lack of understanding of topics that require decision-making, it is crucial to develop and offer interventions to increase their knowledge and help them being involved [11,25]. Specifically, we presented a total of 32 KT interventions for decision-making from 22 reviews. Of these 32 interventions, 21 (66%) were ACP interventions, highlighting the importance of ACP as a critical component for decision-making about current or future medical treatment or care. Based on the findings from prior systematic reviews, which found that written, video, and face-to-face KT interventions for ACP generally increased knowledge and reduced decisional conflict, we recommend that ACP interventions be made more available, both in terms of marketing and knowledge, to help older individuals (with or without dementia) and their care partners (informal or professional).

4.1 Targeted population

Care partners: Out of the 32 KT interventions, 16 (50%) targeted care partners only (Table 2), with the three most cited being ACP interventions, namely: (a) the Canadian booklet *"Comfort care at the end of life for persons with dementia – A guide for caregivers"* [19,25–27,38,42–47], (b) the audiovisual intervention *"Making Choices: long-term tube feeding placement in elderly patients"* and worksheet (including the three updates an three cultural adaptations) [17,19,23–26,30,33,34,37–39,73–80], and (c) the Australian book *"Guiding Options for Living with Dementia (GOLD)"* [17,23,26,30,35,82]. Overall, all KT interventions targeted at

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

care partners were found to have beneficial effects such as (a) increased knowledge (N=5), (b) increased confidence (N=4), and (c) decreased decisional conflicts (N=4). Only one KT intervention targeted at care partners, namely the "*UK National Health Service Preferred Priorities of Care*", had a negative effect with increased decisional conflicts reported [17,69]. This effect was negative due to the fact that many care partners were resistant to make decisions about hypothetical future scenarios, highlighting the importance of being prepared and enthusiastic about such interventions.

Individuals living with dementia and care partners: A total of 13 (41%) KT interventions were targeted at both individuals living with dementia and their care partners (N=12 dyads; N=1 triad; Table 3). The most cited intervention was an 18-minute video combined with an ACP consultation [23–26,37,57]. Targeting individuals living with dementia only (Table 4), the three (9%) KT interventions reported in our review were all found to have beneficial impacts on individuals living with MCI to advanced dementia [22,26,55,84,96]. Overall, across all 32 KT interventions, while the interventions were shown to have positive effects, the involvement of individuals living with dementia was low, and mostly at early stages of dementia. We therefore recommend more KT interventions targeted at individuals living with dementia.

4.2 Diversity of targeted population

Overall, six KT interventions were culturally and/or linguistically adapted (N=5 ACP, N=1 eHealth; Tables 2, 3). Specifically, we found that three ACP interventions all originally published in English, were later translated in several languages such as

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Dutch, Japanese, Portuguese, French, Italian, Spanish, and Chinese, namely: (a) *"Comfort care at the end of life for persons with dementia – A guide for caregivers"* [19,25–27,38,42–47], (b) *"Making Choices: long-term tube feeding placement in elderly patients"* and worksheet [17,23,24,26,33,73–80], and (c) the 18-minute video and consultation by Einterz et al. [23–26,37,57]. Furthermore, while ethnicity was not reported by the majority of studies (91%), two ACP interventions targeted African Americans (both individuals living with dementia and care partners) [23–27,37,57,59], and one ACP intervention targeted Chinese care partners specifically [39,72]. In addition, one eHealth intervention, specifically, the "*Talking Mats*", was also translated from English to Dutch [21,32,35,94,99].

We recommend that more English KT interventions be adapted to different languages and cultures, to reach a larger part of the population and address a broader range of issues individuals living with dementia and/or their care partners may face. Since our search was performed only in English, it is possible that KT intervention reviews in other languages may have been missed. However, this scenario is unlikely given that findings from our pilot search demonstrated that expanding to additional languages did not yield substantially more review articles.

4.3 Limitations

Three main limitations were identified. First, the heterogeneity of format delivery (e.g., face-to-face interventions, videos; Figure 3) and of decision-making outcome measures (e.g., level of knowledge, decisional conflicts), complicated the comparison of different interventions. We therefore recommend standardization of outcome measures to enable more reliable comparison of KT intervention

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

effectiveness. Secondly, many interventions identified were tested in small pilot studies, which limited the quality of evidence presented, thus, results should be interpreted with caution. In addition, since our review is an umbrella review, it should be noted that all developed interventions may not have been retrieved since we depended on published reviews, which themselves were dependent on the quality of primary articles. Quality assessment of primary studies was not always carried out adequately by the retrieved reviews. Specifically, five reviews did not conduct quality assessment, and of the 17 that did, seven were not done independently by more than one reviewer. Another limitation of the included reviews was that only two studies addressed the likelihood of publication bias. Despite these limitations, our umbrella review provides a good portrait of topics addressed by KT interventions, available in the literature thus far.

4.4 Clinical implications

The findings from this umbrella review address an important gap in the care of individuals living with dementia, who face difficult decisions as a result of their illness, including ones about safety, medical care, and, eventually, end-of-life care. Given the effects of dementia on reasoning and executive function, care partners must necessarily share some of, or even all of, the burden of decision-making. This can cause stress and decrease quality of life for both care partners and individuals living with dementia, particularly when their values are incongruent [100]. As this review shows, there are KT interventions that can decrease stress and decisional conflict, potentially improving quality of life. Although more research is needed, we suspect that standardized, validated decision-making interventions are probably under-utilized and/or less known in routine clinical care. Barriers to adoption include

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

lack of awareness of these interventions and their impact, lack of access to the tools, and lack of resources, including staff time, to provide interventions for decision support, particularly for face-to-face interventions. However, we found evidence that thirteen (41%) of the 32 KT interventions are currently available on the internet (Supplementary Material S4), and could be rapidly adopted into practice by interested clinicians. Examples of KT intervention freely accessible online include the *"Comfort care at the end of life for persons with dementia – A guide for care partners"*, the *"Palliative and Therapeutic Harmonization (PATH) program"*, and the "*Talking Mats"*. Further development of eHealth interventions might allow greater access to decision-making support at a reasonable cost and improve access to care in communities without dementia specialists, although some have been found to be harder to use for older individuals. Finally, we recommend that these KT interventions be brought together as a toolkit for healthcare system navigators to introduce to both individuals living with dementia and their care partners. Health systems should therefore consider investing more resources into decision support.

4.5 Future directions

Future research should focus on (a) the validation of developed KT interventions in diverse cohorts, ideally using a multicenter clinical trial design-based approach, (b) the development and/or adaptation of KT interventions that specifically target individuals living with MCI or dementia, ideally at earlier stages of the disease to enable their involvement in the decision-making process, and (c) the dissemination of KT interventions to enable more widespread adoption of the tools. In addition, with the advent of new eHealth and artificial intelligence tools such as large language models, it will be increasingly feasible to incorporate and use these models to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

streamline healthcare communication and education [101]. It is important that the interventions are tested robustly in different populations and with different practitioners (if applicable) to ensure the feasibility of the interventions. Such studies could also enable higher levels of dissemination and increase their use in the clinic. It is possible that cultural adaptations may be needed for specific groups and thus incorporating feedback from a diverse study population could increase efficacy and update.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, while our umbrella review identified several KT interventions for individuals living with dementia and their care partners, we recommend the continuation of implementing and disseminating proven tools, as well as increased awareness. KT interventions, especially when combined, have the potential to improve a variety of outcomes, such as decision making, quality of communication, and goals-of-care [23]. Further studies are required for various stages of dementia and in more culturally diverse populations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

REFERENCES

[1] Kurz AF. What is vascular dementia? Int J Clin Pract Suppl 2001:5–8.

[2] Mixed dementia. Alzheimer Society of Canada n.d. https://alzheimer.ca/en/about-dementia/other-types-dementia/mixed-dementia (accessed April 22, 2024).

[3] Global status report on the public health response to dementia. World Health Organization; 2021.

[4] Petersen RC. Mild cognitive impairment as a diagnostic entity. J Intern Med 2004;256:183–94. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2796.2004.01388.x.

[5] World failing to address dementia challenge n.d. https://www.who.int/news/item/02-09-2021-world-failing-to-address-dementia-challenge (accessed April 24, 2024).

[6] Global action plan on the public health response to dementia 2017 - 2025 2017. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/global-action-plan-on-the-public-health-response-to-dementia-2017---2025 (accessed January 8, 2024).

[7] Chiao C-Y, Wu H-S, Hsiao C-Y. Caregiver burden for informal caregivers of patients with dementia: A systematic review. Int Nurs Rev 2015;62:340–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/inr.12194.

[8] Wimo A, Seeher K, Cataldi R, Cyhlarova E, Dielemann JL, Frisell O, et al. The worldwide costs of dementia in 2019. Alzheimers Dement 2023;19:2865–73. https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.12901.

[9] Wilkins JM. Dementia, Decision Making, and Quality of Life. AMA Journal of Ethics 2017;19:637–9. https://doi.org/10.1001/journalofethics.2017.19.7.fred1-1707.

[10] Alzheimer Society of Canada. Decision-Making: Respecting Individual Choice 2022.

[11] Lord K, Livingston G, Robertson S, Cooper C. How people with dementia and their families decide about moving to a care home and support their needs: development of a decision aid, a qualitative study. BMC Geriatr 2016;16:68. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-016-0242-1.

[12] +Government of Canada, Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Public, Government,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Institute Affairs. About us 2005. https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/29418.html (accessed February 20, 2024).

[13] Brouwers M, Stacey D, O'Connor A. Knowledge creation: synthesis, tools and products. CMAJ 2010;182:E68–72. https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.081230.

[14] Stacey D, Légaré F, Lewis K, Barry MJ, Bennett CL, Eden KB, et al. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2017;4:CD001431. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD001431.pub5.

[15] Aromataris E, Fernandez R, Godfrey CM, Holly C, Khalil H, Tungpunkom P. Summarizing systematic reviews: methodological development, conduct and reporting of an umbrella review approach. Int J Evid Based Healthc 2015;13:132–40. https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.0000000000000055.

[16] Haile ZT. Critical Appraisal Tools and Reporting Guidelines. J Hum Lact 2022;38:21–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/08903344211058374.

[17] Lord K, Livingston G, Cooper C. A systematic review of barriers and facilitators to and interventions for proxy decision-making by family carers of people with dementia. Int Psychogeriatr 2015;27:1301–12. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1041610215000411.

[18] Robinson L, Dickinson C, Rousseau N, Beyer F, Clark A, Hughes J, et al. A systematic review of the effectiveness of advance care planning interventions for people with cognitive impairment and dementia. Age Ageing 2012;41:263–9. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afr148.

[19] Geddis-Regan A, Errington L, Abley C, Wassall R, Exley C, Thomson R. Enhancing shared and surrogate decision making for people living with dementia: A systematic review of the effectiveness of interventions. Health Expect 2021;24:19–32. https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13167.

[20] Hopwood J, Walker N, McDonagh L, Rait G, Walters K, Iliffe S, et al. Internet-Based Interventions Aimed at Supporting Family Caregivers of People With Dementia: Systematic Review. J Med Internet Res 2018;20:e216. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.9548.

[21] Daly RL, Bunn F, Goodman C. Shared decision-making for people living with dementia

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

in extended care settings: a systematic review. BMJ Open 2018;8:e018977. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018977.

[22] Tunnard I, Gillam J, Harvey C, Davies N, Vickerstaff V, Ellis-Smith C, et al. The acceptability and effectiveness of eHealth interventions to support assessment and decision-making for people with dementia living in care homes: A systematic review. Front Dement 2022;1. https://doi.org/10.3389/frdem.2022.977561.

[23] Davies N, Schiowitz B, Rait G, Vickerstaff V, Sampson EL. Decision aids to support decision-making in dementia care: a systematic review. Int Psychogeriatr 2019;31:1403–19. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1041610219000826.

[24] Cardona-Morrell M, Benfatti-Olivato G, Jansen J, Turner RM, Fajardo-Pulido D, Hillman K. A systematic review of effectiveness of decision aids to assist older patients at the end of life. Patient Educ Couns 2017;100:425–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2016.10.007.

[25] Kelly AJ, Luckett T, Clayton JM, Gabb L, Kochovska S, Agar M. Advance care planning in different settings for people with dementia: A systematic review and narrative synthesis. Palliat Support Care 2019;17:707–19. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1478951519000257.

[26] Ho M-H, Chang H-CR, Liu MF, Chien H-W, Tang L-Y, Chan S-Y, et al. Decision-Making in People With Dementia or Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Narrative Review of Decision-Making Tools. J Am Med Dir Assoc 2021;22:2056–62.e4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2021.06.034.

[27] Bryant J, Turon H, Waller A, Freund M, Mansfield E, Sanson-Fisher R. Effectiveness of interventions to increase participation in advance care planning for people with a diagnosis of dementia: A systematic review. Palliat Med 2019;33:262–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269216318801750.

[28] Petriwskyj A, Robinson A, Parker D, Banks S, Andrews S. Family involvement in decision making for people with dementia in residential aged care: a systematic review of quantitative and qualitative evidence. JBI Libr Syst Rev 2012;10:1–17.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

https://doi.org/10.11124/jbisrir-2012-173.

[29] Gench M, Sawan MJ, Langford A, Gnjidic D. Tools to evaluate medication management for caregivers of people living with dementia: A systematic review. Health Expect 2021;24:1570–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13318.

[30] Austin CA, Mohottige D, Sudore RL, Smith AK, Hanson LC. Tools to Promote Shared Decision Making in Serious Illness: A Systematic Review. JAMA Intern Med 2015;175:1213–21. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.1679.

[31] Davis RL, Ohman JM. Driving in Early-Stage Alzheimer's Disease: An Integrative Review of the Literature. Res Gerontol Nurs 2017;10:86–100. https://doi.org/10.3928/19404921-20160920-02.

[32] Davis R, Ziomkowski MK, Veltkamp A. Everyday Decision Making in Individuals with Early-Stage Alzheimer's Disease: An Integrative Review of the Literature. Res Gerontol Nurs 2017;10:240–7. https://doi.org/10.3928/19404921-20170831-05.

[33] Pei Y, Qi X, Schulman-Green D, Hu M, Wang K, Wu B. Decision Aid Interventions for Family Caregivers of Persons With Advanced Dementia in Decision-Making About Feeding Options: A Scoping Review. J Am Med Dir Assoc 2022;23:1927.e1–1927.e6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2022.08.014.

[34] Walsh SC, Murphy E, Devane D, Sampson EL, Connolly S, Carney P, et al. Palliative care interventions in advanced dementia. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2021;9:CD011513. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD011513.pub3.

[35] Mattos MK, Gibson JS, Wilson D, Jepson L, Ahn S, Williams IC. Shared decision-making in persons living with dementia: A scoping review. Dementia 2023;22:875–909. https://doi.org/10.1177/14713012231156976.

[36] Rapoport MJ, Cameron DH, Sanford S, Naglie G, Canadian Consortium on Neurodegeneration in Aging Driving and Dementia Team. A systematic review of intervention approaches for driving cessation in older adults. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry 2017;32:484–91. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.4681.

[37] Xie B, Berkley AS, Kwak J, Fleischmann KR, Champion JD, Koltai KS. End-of-life

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

decision making by family caregivers of persons with advanced dementia: A literature review of decision aids. SAGE Open Med 2018;6:2050312118777517. https://doi.org/10.1177/2050312118777517.

[38] Backhaus R, Hoek LJM, de Vries E, van Haastregt JCM, Hamers JPH, Verbeek H. Interventions to foster family inclusion in nursing homes for people with dementia: a systematic review. BMC Geriatr 2020;20:434. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-020-01836-w.

[39] Petriwskyj A, Parker D, Robinson A, Gibson A, Andrews S, Banks S. Family involvement in decision making for people with dementia in residential aged care: a systematic review of quantitative and qualitative evidence. JBI Evidence Synthesis 2013;11:131. https://doi.org/10.11124/jbisrir-2013-977.

[40] 劉建良, 林乃玉. 醫病共享決策及決策輔助工具之發展－以「失智末期‧嚥困難之進食方式選擇」為例. 榮總護理 2019;36:170–7. https://doi.org/10.6142/VGHN.201906_36(2).0007.

[41] Rietjens JAC, Sudore RL, Connolly M, van Delden JJ, Drickamer MA, Droger M, et al. Definition and recommendations for advance care planning: an international consensus supported by the European Association for Palliative Care. Lancet Oncol 2017;18:e543–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(17)30582-X.

[42] Arcand M, Brazil K, Nakanishi M, Nakashima T, Alix M, Desson J-F, et al. Educating families about end-of-life care in advanced dementia: acceptability of a Canadian family booklet to nurses from Canada, France, and Japan. Int J Palliat Nurs 2013;19:67–74. https://doi.org/10.12968/ijpn.2013.19.2.67.

[43] van der Steen JT, Toscani F, de Graas T, Finetti S, Nakanishi M, Nakashima T, et al. Physicians' and nurses' perceived usefulness and acceptability of a family information booklet about comfort care in advanced dementia. J Palliat Med 2011;14:614–22. https://doi.org/10.1089/jpm.2010.0484.

[44] van der Steen JT, de Graas T, Arcand M, Hertogh CMPM. Evaluation of a family booklet

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

on comfort care in dementia by professional and family caregivers. Tijdschr Gerontol Geriatr 2011;42:215–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12439-011-0037-y.

[45] van der Steen JT, Arcand M, Toscani F, de Graas T, Finetti S, Beaulieu M, et al. A family booklet about comfort care in advanced dementia: three-country evaluation. J Am Med Dir Assoc 2012;13:368–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2011.02.005.

[46] van der Steen JT, Hertogh CMPM, de Graas T, Nakanishi M, Toscani F, Arcand M. Translation and cross-cultural adaptation of a family booklet on comfort care in dementia: sensitive topics revised before implementation. J Med Ethics 2013;39:104–9. https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2012-100903.

[47] Brazil K, Carter G, Cardwell C, Clarke M, Hudson P, Froggatt K, et al. Effectiveness of advance care planning with family carers in dementia nursing homes: A paired cluster randomized controlled trial. Palliat Med 2018;32:603–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269216317722413.

[48] Moorhouse P, Mallery LH. Palliative and therapeutic harmonization: a model for appropriate decision-making in frail older adults. J Am Geriatr Soc 2012;60:2326–32. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2012.04210.x.

[49] Volandes AE, Paasche-Orlow MK, Barry MJ, Gillick MR, Minaker KL, Chang Y, et al. Video decision support tool for advance care planning in dementia: randomised controlled trial. BMJ 2009;338:b2159. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2159.

[50] Volandes AE, Mitchell SL, Gillick MR, Chang Y, Paasche-Orlow MK. Using video images to improve the accuracy of surrogate decision-making: a randomized controlled trial. J Am Med Dir Assoc 2009;10:575–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2009.05.006.

[51] Volandes AE, Ferguson LA, Davis AD, Hull NC, Green MJ, Chang Y, et al. Assessing end-of-life preferences for advanced dementia in rural patients using an educational video: a randomized controlled trial. J Palliat Med 2011;14:169–77. https://doi.org/10.1089/jpm.2010.0299.

[52] Hanson LC, Song M-K, Zimmerman S, Gilliam R, Rosemond C, Chisholm L, et al. Fidelity to a behavioral intervention to improve goals of care decisions for nursing home

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

residents with advanced dementia. Clin Trials 2016;13:599–604. https://doi.org/10.1177/1740774516650863.

[53] Hanson LC, Zimmerman S, Song M-K, Lin F-C, Rosemond C, Carey TS, et al. Effect of the Goals of Care Intervention for Advanced Dementia: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Intern Med 2017;177:24–31. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.7031.

[54] Mitchell SL, Shaffer ML, Cohen S, Hanson LC, Habtemariam D, Volandes AE. An Advance Care Planning Video Decision Support Tool for Nursing Home Residents With Advanced Dementia: A Cluster Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Intern Med 2018;178:961–9. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.1506.

[55] Mitchell SL, Volandes AE, Gutman R, Gozalo PL, Ogarek JA, Loomer L, et al. Advance Care Planning Video Intervention Among Long-Stay Nursing Home Residents: A Pragmatic Cluster Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Intern Med 2020;180:1070–8. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2366.

[56] Volandes AE, Ariza M, Abbo ED, Paasche-Orlow M. Overcoming educational barriers for advance care planning in Latinos with video images. J Palliat Med 2008;11:700–6. https://doi.org/10.1089/jpm.2007.0172.

[57] Einterz SF, Gilliam R, Lin FC, McBride JM, Hanson LC. Development and testing of a decision aid on goals of care for advanced dementia. J Am Med Dir Assoc 2014;15:251–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2013.11.020.

[58] Deep KS, Hunter A, Murphy K, Volandes A. “It helps me see with my heart”: how video informs patients’ rationale for decisions about future care in advanced dementia. Patient Educ Couns 2010;81:229–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2010.02.004.

[59] Bonner GJ, Wang E, Wilkie DJ, Ferrans CE, Dancy B, Watkins Y. Advance care treatment plan (ACT-Plan) for African American family caregivers: a pilot study. Dementia 2014;13:79–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/1471301212449408.

[60] Silverstein NM, Sherman R. Taking control of Alzheimer’s disease: a training evaluation. Gerontol Geriatr Educ 2010;31:274–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701960.2010.503136.

[61] Roberts JS, Silverio E. Evaluation of an Education and Support Program for Early-Stage

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Alzheimer's Disease. J Appl Gerontol 2009;28:419–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464809333883.

[62] Logsdon RG, McCurry SM, Teri L. Time-Limited Support Groups for Individuals with Early Stage Dementia and Their Care Partners: Preliminary Outcomes from a Controlled Clinical Trial. Clinical Gerontologist: The Journal of Aging and Mental Health 2007;30:5–19. https://doi.org/10.1300/J018v30n02_02.

[63] Pratt C, Nay T, Ladd L, Heagerty B. A model legal-financial education workshop for families caring for neurologically impaired elders. Gerontologist 1989;29:258–62. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/29.2.258.

[64] Lewis M, Rand E, Mullaly E, Mellor D, Macfarlane S. Uptake of a newly implemented advance care planning program in a dementia diagnostic service. Age Ageing 2015;44:1045–9. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afv138.

[65] Molloy DW, Guyatt GH, Russo R, Goeree R, O'Brien BJ, Bédard M, et al. Systematic implementation of an advance directive program in nursing homes: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2000;283:1437–44. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.283.11.1437.

[66] Caplan GA, Meller A, Squires B, Chan S, Willett W. Advance care planning and hospital in the nursing home. Age Ageing 2006;35:581–5. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afl063.

[67] Hanson LC, Kistler CE, Lavin K, Gabriel SL, Ernecoff NC, Lin F-C, et al. Triggered Palliative Care for Late-Stage Dementia: A Pilot Randomized Trial. J Pain Symptom Manage 2019;57:10–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2018.10.494.

[68] Reinhardt JP, Chichin E, Posner L, Kassabian S. Vital conversations with family in the nursing home: preparation for end-stage dementia care. J Soc Work End Life Palliat Care 2014;10:112–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/15524256.2014.906371.

[69] Sampson EL, Jones L, Thuné-Boyle ICV, Kukkastenvehmas R, King M, Leurent B, et al. Palliative assessment and advance care planning in severe dementia: an exploratory randomized controlled trial of a complex intervention. Palliat Med 2011;25:197–209. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269216310391691.

[70] Hilgeman MM, Allen RS, Snow AL, Durkin DW, DeCoster J, Burgio LD. Preserving

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Identity and Planning for Advance Care (PIPAC): preliminary outcomes from a patient-centered intervention for individuals with mild dementia. Aging Ment Health 2014;18:411–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2013.868403.

[71] Whitlatch CJ, Heid AR, Femia EE, Orsulic-Jeras S, Szabo S, Zarit SH. The Support, Health, Activities, Resources, and Education program for early stage dementia: Results from a randomized controlled trial. Dementia 2019;18:2122–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/1471301217743033.

[72] Kwok T, Twinn S, Yan E. The attitudes of Chinese family caregivers of older people with dementia towards life sustaining treatments. J Adv Nurs 2007;58:256–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04230.x.

[73] Derech RD, Neves FS. Cross-cultural adaptation and content validity of the the patient decision aid “Making Choices: Feeding Options for Patients with Dementia” to Brazilian Portuguese language. CoDAS 2021;33:e20200044.

[74] Ersek M, Sefcik JS, Lin F-C, Lee TJ, Gilliam R, Hanson LC. Provider staffing effect on a decision aid intervention. Clin Nurs Res 2014;23:36–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/1054773812470840.

[75] Hanson LC, Gilliam R, Lee TJ. Successful clinical trial research in nursing homes: the Improving Decision-Making Study. Clin Trials 2010;7:735–43. https://doi.org/10.1177/1740774510380241.

[76] Hanson LC, Carey TS, Caprio AJ, Lee TJ, Ersek M, Garrett J, et al. Improving decision-making for feeding options in advanced dementia: a randomized, controlled trial. J Am Geriatr Soc 2011;59:2009–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03629.x.

[77] Kuraoka Y, Nakayama K. A decision aid regarding long-term tube feeding targeting substitute decision makers for cognitively impaired older persons in Japan: a small-scale before-and-after study. BMC Geriatr 2014;14:16. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2318-14-16.

[78] Mitchell SL, Tetroe J, O’Connor AM. A decision aid for long-term tube feeding in cognitively impaired older persons. J Am Geriatr Soc 2001;49:313–6.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1532-5415.2001.4930313.x.

[79] Snyder EA, Caprio AJ, Wessell K, Lin FC, Hanson LC. Impact of a decision aid on surrogate decision-makers' perceptions of feeding options for patients with dementia. J Am Med Dir Assoc 2013;14:114–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2012.10.011.

[80] Elwyn G, O'Connor A, Stacey D, Volk R, Edwards A, Coulter A, et al. Developing a quality criteria framework for patient decision aids: online international Delphi consensus process. BMJ 2006;333:417. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.38926.629329.AE.

[81] Lord K, Livingston G, Cooper C. A feasibility randomised controlled trial of the DECIDE intervention: dementia carers making informed decisions. BJPsych Open 2017;3:12–4. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjpo.bp.116.003509.

[82] Stirling C, Lloyd B, Scott J, Abbey J, Croft T, Robinson A. A qualitative study of professional and client perspectives on information flows and decision aid use. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak 2012;12:26. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6947-12-26.

[83] Stern RA, D'Ambrosio LA, Mohyde M, Carruth A, Tracton-Bishop B, Hunter JC, et al. At the crossroads: development and evaluation of a dementia caregiver group intervention to assist in driving cessation. Gerontol Geriatr Educ 2008;29:363–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701960802497936.

[84] Carmody J, Potter J, Lewis K, Bhargava S, Traynor V, Iverson D. Development and pilot testing of a decision aid for drivers with dementia. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak 2014;14:19. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6947-14-19.

[85] Meyer C, Hill S, Hill KD, Dow B. Inclusive Decision Making for Falls Prevention: A Discussion Tool for Use With People With Dementia and Their Caregivers. J Aging Phys Act 2019;27:711–8. https://doi.org/10.1123/japa.2018-0167.

[86] Lingler JH, Sereika SM, Amspaugh CM, Arida JA, Happ ME, Houze MP, et al. An intervention to maximize medication management by caregivers of persons with memory loss: Intervention overview and two-month outcomes. Geriatr Nurs 2016;37:186–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gerinurse.2015.12.002.

[87] Bass DM, McClendon MJ, Brennan PF, McCarthy C. The buffering effect of a computer

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

support network on caregiver strain. J Aging Health 1998;10:20–43. https://doi.org/10.1177/089826439801000102.

[88] Brennan PF, Moore SM, Smyth KA. The effects of a special computer network on caregivers of persons with Alzheimer's disease. Nurs Res 1995;44:166–72.

[89] Lorig K, Thompson-Gallagher D, Traylor L, Ritter PL, Laurent DD, Plant K, et al. Building Better Caregivers: A Pilot Online Support Workshop for Family Caregivers of Cognitively Impaired Adults. J Appl Gerontol 2012;31:423–37. https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464810389806.

[90] Schaller S, Marinova-Schmidt V, Gobin J, Criegee-Rieck M, Griebel L, Engel S, et al. Tailored e-Health services for the dementia care setting: a pilot study of "eHealthMonitor." BMC Med Inform Decis Mak 2015;15:58. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-015-0182-2.

[91] Schaller S, Marinova-Schmidt V, Setzer M, Kondylakis H, Griebel L, Sedlmayr M, et al. Usefulness of a Tailored eHealth Service for Informal Caregivers and Professionals in the Dementia Treatment and Care Setting: The eHealthMonitor Dementia Portal. JMIR Res Protoc 2016;5:e47. https://doi.org/10.2196/resprot.4354.

[92] Span M, Smits C, Jukema J, Groen-van de Ven L, Janssen R, Vernooij-Dassen M, et al. An Interactive Web Tool for Facilitating Shared Decision-Making in Dementia-Care Networks: A Field Study. Front Aging Neurosci 2015;7:128. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2015.00128.

[93] Span M. Developing an interactive web tool to facilitate shared decision-making in dementia care networks: a participatory journey 2016.

[94] Murphy J, Oliver T. The use of Talking Mats to support people with dementia and their carers to make decisions together. Health Soc Care Community 2013;21:171–80. https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12005.

[95] Bilodeau G, Witteman H, Légaré F, Lafontaine-Bruneau J, Voyer P, Kröger E, et al. Reducing complexity of patient decision aids for community-based older adults with dementia and their caregivers: multiple case study of Decision Boxes. BMJ Open

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

2019;9:e027727. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027727.

[96] Bogza L-M, Patry-Lebeau C, Farmanova E, Witteman HO, Elliott J, Stolee P, et al. User-Centered Design and Evaluation of a Web-Based Decision Aid for Older Adults Living With Mild Cognitive Impairment and Their Health Care Providers: Mixed Methods Study. J Med Internet Res 2020;22:e17406. https://doi.org/10.2196/17406.

[97] Zimmerman S, Sloane PD, Ward K, Beeber A, Reed D, Lathren C, et al. Helping Dementia Caregivers Manage Medical Problems: Benefits of an Educational Resource. Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Demen 2018;33:176–83. https://doi.org/10.1177/1533317517749466.

[98] Guiding optimal development and use of digital health towards improved health outcomes n.d. https://www.who.int/westernpacific/activities/guiding-optimal-development-and-use-of-digital-health-towards-improved-health-outcomes (accessed March 11, 2024).

[99] Reitz C, Dalemans R. The use of “talking mats” by persons with Alzheimer in the Netherlands: Increasing shared decision making by using a low tech communication aid. J Soc Incl 2016;7:35. https://doi.org/10.36251/josi.110.

[100] Moon H, Townsend AL, Whitlatch CJ, Dilworth-Anderson P. Quality of Life for Dementia Caregiving Dyads: Effects of Incongruent Perceptions of Everyday Care and Values. Gerontologist 2017;57:657–66. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnw055.

[101] Meng X, Yan X, Zhang K, Liu D, Cui X, Yang Y, et al. The application of large language models in medicine: A scoping review. iScience 2024;27:109713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2024.109713.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

A.B., M.B., and E.E.S. designed the study. The search strategy was developed by M.B., E.L.M., E.E.S., and A.B. The screening process was performed independently by M.B., F.E.D., S.A., S.B., W.B., P.F.B., K.S.G., J.P., and E.E.S. Full-text review of included publications was done by M.B., F.E.D., and E.E.S. Clinical appraisal and data extraction were done by M.B. and F.E.D. First draft was written by M.B., F.E.D., J.P., E.E.S., and A.B. All authors edited and approved the final manuscript. All authors meet the ICMJE criteria for authorship.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Not applicable.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

All authors declare that they have no financial, personal, or competing interests/conflicts.

CONSENT STATEMENT

We confirm that consent was not necessary for this work.

FUNDING SOURCES

This work was supported by Vascular Training Platform (VAST) summer student project (2022, 2023) (M.B.); Fonds de Recherche Québec – Santé (FRQS) bourse de formation à la maîtrise (2021) and FRQS bourse de formation au doctorat (2024) (F.E.D.); VAST Health Research Training Program Doctoral Award and Canadian Consortium on Neurodegeneration in Aging (K.S.G.); VAST Postdoctoral fellowship

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(2022-2023) (S.A.); National Institutes of Health Training grant [PHS Grant number 1 T32 NS 131178-1, 2023-2024] (P.F.B.); VAST Health Research Training to Address Vascular Contributions to Cognitive Decline, Canadian Institutes of Health Research; Training Grant: Health Research Training Platform [RT0 179993] (E.L.M., E.E.S., and A.B.); Empowering Individuals at Risk for or Living with Vascular Cognitive Impairment: A Co-Developed Video Series Promoting Engagement, Prevention Strategies, and Self-Management; Canadian Institutes of Health Research Operating Grant: BHCIA: Knowledge Synthesis and Mobilization Grants – VCI [Funding number BK7 191189] (E.L.M., E.E.S., and A.B.); Enhancing Patient Engagement in the Vascular Contributions to Cognitive Decline Training Platform, Canadian Institutes of Health Research [SPOR, 2022-2024] (E.L.M., E.E.S., and A.B.); and FRQS Chercheurs boursiers Junior 1 (2020–2024) and the Fonds de soutien à la recherche pour les neurosciences du vieillissement from the Fondation Courtois (A.B.).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

KEYWORDS

Care partner; Individual living with dementia; Knowledge translation; Decision-making

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

FIGURES



FIGURE 1. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram of the umbrella review selection process.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Quality
Austin et al. 2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	High
Backhaus et al. 2020	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	Y	Y	N	U	Y	Medium
Bryant et al. 2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Cardona-Morrell et al. 2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	High
Daly et al. 2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Davies et al. 2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Davis and Ohman 2017	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Medium
Davis et al. 2017	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	U	U	Y	N	Y	Y	Medium
Geddis-Regan et al. 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Gench et al. 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Ho et al. 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Hopwood et al. 2018	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Kelly et al. 2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Lord et al. 2015	Y	Y	U	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Medium
Mattos et al. 2023	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Pei et al. 2022	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Petriwskyj et al. 2013	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Rapoport et al. 2017	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	High
Robinson et al. 2012	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Tunnard et al. 2022	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Walsh et al. 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	High
Xie et al. 2018	Y	U	U	Y	N	N/A	Y	Y	N	U	Y	Low



FIGURE 2. Critical appraisal for included reviews

% of criteria met: <50% high risk of bias; 50-75% medium risk of bias; >75% low risk of bias. *Abbreviations*: Y, Yes. N, No. U, Unclear. N/A, not applicable.

Q1. Is the review question clearly and explicitly stated?; Q2. Were the inclusion criteria appropriate for the review question?; Q3. Was the search strategy appropriate?; Q4. Were the sources and resources used to search for studies adequate?; Q5. Were the criteria for appraising studies appropriate?; Q6. Was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

critical appraisal conducted by two or more reviewers independently?; Q7. Were there methods to minimize errors in data extraction?; Q8. Were the methods used to combine studies appropriate?; Q9. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?; Q10. Were recommendations for policy and/or practice supported by the reported data?; Q11. Were the specific directives for new research appropriate?.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



FIGURE 3. Description of included reviews and KT interventions

Note: Numbers provided for categories of KT interventions per included reviews, while numbers for targeted population are per interventions. *Abbreviations:* ACP, advance care planning; KT, knowledge translation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

TABLE 1. Characteristics of included reviews

Abbreviations: UK, United Kingdom; US, United States.

Reference	Country	Type of review	Intervention	Population	Proportion of relevant primary studies
Austin et al., 2015	US	Systematic	Support interventions for current or future care decisions	Mixed population: adults with advanced or terminal illness	9/38
Backhaus et al., 2020	The Netherlands	Systematic	Interventions to facilitate the inclusion of family	Individuals living with dementia	4/29
Bryant et al., 2019	Australia	Systematic	Intervention to improve advance care planning	Individuals living with dementia	4/4
Cardona-Morrell et al., 2017	Australia	Systematic	Decision aids for end-of-life care	Mixed population: older adults with advanced or terminal illness	3/17
Daly et al., 2018	UK	Systematic	Shared decision-making interventions	Mixed population: any form of cognitive impairment	2/19
Davies et al., 2019	UK	Systematic	Decision aids	Individuals living with dementia	10/10
Davis and Ohman, 2017	US	Integrative	Driving related interventions	Individuals living with dementia or mild cognitive impairment	1/26
Davis et al., 2017	US	Integrative	Everyday decision-making related interventions	Individuals living with dementia	1/12
Geddis-Regan et al., 2021	UK	Systematic	Support interventions for shared or surrogate care decisions	Individuals living with dementia	6/8
Gench et al., 2021	Australia	Systematic	Medication management interventions	Individuals living with dementia	2/10
Ho et al., 2021	Australia	Systematic	Decision-making tools	Individuals living with dementia or mild cognitive impairment	14/35
Hopwood et al., 2018	UK	Systematic	Internet-based support interventions	Individuals living with dementia	6/40
Kelly et al., 2019	Australia	Systematic	Advance care planning interventions	Individuals living with dementia	16/30
Lord et al., 2015	UK	Systematic	Support interventions for surrogate decision-making	Individuals living with dementia	3/30
Mattos et al., 2023	US	Scoping	Shared decision-making interventions	Individuals living with dementia	6/32
Pei et al., 2022	US	Scoping	Decision aids about feeding options	Individuals living with dementia	6/6
Petriwskyj et al., 2013	Australia	Systematic	Family involvement in decision-making	Individuals living with dementia	2/26
Rapoport et al., 2017	Canada	Systematic	Support interventions for driving cessation	Mixed population: older adults with or without dementia	1/3
Robinson et al., 2012	UK	Systematic	Advance care planning interventions	Individuals living with dementia	2/4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Tunnard et al., 2022	UK	Systematic	eHealth interventions for care decision-making	Individuals living with dementia	2/26
Walsh et al., 2021	Ireland	Systematic	Palliative care interventions	Individuals living with dementia	4/9
Xie et al., 2018	US	Systematic	Decision aids for end-of-life care	Individuals living with dementia	5/5

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

TABLE 2. Interventions targeting care partners

Note that the original version of the audiovisual booklet *"Making Choices: long-term tube feeding placement in elderly patients"* and worksheet targeted older individuals without dementia. *Abbreviations*: ° multiple languages and/or cultural adaptations available; ACP, advance care planning; KT, knowledge translation.

KT intervention		Targeted population	Main results	Primary study		Review	
Category	Name			N	Refs	N	Refs
ACP – Written	"Comfort care at the end of life for persons with dementia – A guide for caregivers" °	Care partners	↓ decisional conflicts No effect on DNR Available in: English, French, Dutch, Japanese, Italian	6	Arcand et al. (2013) van der Steen et al. (2011A, 2011B, 2012 2013) Brazil et al. (2018)	5	Kelly et al. (2019) Ho et al. (2021) Bryant et al. (2019) Backhaus et al. (2020) Geddis-Regan et al. (2021)
ACP – Group	"Legal-Financial Planning Workshop"	Family care partners	↑ knowledge and decision about end-of-life care	1	Pratt et al. (1989)	2	Bryant et al. (2019) Kelly et al. (2019)
	Educational group intervention °	African American family care partners	↑ knowledge and decision about end-of-life care	1	Bonner et al. (2014)	2	Bryant et al. (2019) Kelly et al. (2019)
ACP – Face-to-face	Hypothetical scenarios (critical illness or irreversible coma) °	Chinese family care partners of older individuals living with dementia	↑ (small) of comfort level for irreversible coma	1	Kwok et al. (2007)	1	Petriwskyj et al. (2013)
	Structured palliative care consultation and booklet "Advanced Dementia: A Guide for Families"	Care partners of individuals living with advanced dementia	↑ completion of ACP documentation and decision-making	1	Hanson et al. (2019)	2	Walsh et al. (2021) Geddis-Regan et al. (2021)
	Palliative consult intervention by physician and palliative care social worker	Care partners of individuals living with advanced dementia	↑ completion of ACP documentation and decision-making	1	Reinhardt et al. (2014)	2	Bryant et al. (2019) Kelly et al. (2019)
	Nurse-delivered adapted version of the "UK National Health Service	Care partners of individuals living with advanced dementia	↑ decisional conflicts Little to no effect on completion of ACP documentation	1	Sampson et al. (2011)	1	Lord et al. (2015)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Preferred Priorities of Care"						
ACP – Feeding	Audiovisual booklet "Making Choices: long-term tube feeding placement in elderly patients" and worksheet ° Three updates and three cultural adaptations, including the "International Patient Decision Aid Standards (IPDAS) statement"	Original: Care partners of individuals 65+ yrs Update 1: Dyads of care partners and individuals living with advanced dementia Updates 2 and 3: Care partners of individuals living with advanced dementia	↓ decisional conflicts and expectations about benefits ↑ goals-of-care, knowledge, frequency/quality of communication Limited change in knowledge and decisional conflicts, especially for care partners of individuals living with advanced dementia, in updates 1 and 2 Available in multiple languages such as: English, Spanish, Chinese, Portuguese, Japanese	8	Original: Mitchell et al. (2001) Update 1: Hanson et al. (2010, 2011) Update 2: Snyder et al. (2013) Update 3: Ersek et al. (2014) International IPDAS: Elwyn et al. (2006) Portuguese adaptation: Derech and Neves (2021) Japanese adaptation: Kuraoka and Nakayama (2014)	1 2	Cardona-Morrell et al. (2017) Ho et al. (2021) Davies et al. (2019) Lord et al. (2015) Pei et al. (2022) Austin et al. (2015) Kelly et al. (2019) Petriwskyj et al. (2013) Geddis-Regan et al. (2021) Walsh et al. (2021) Xie et al. (2018) Backhaus et al. (2020)
ACP – Respite services and long-term place of care	"Guiding Options for Living with Dementia (GOLD)"	Care partners of individuals living with dementia	↑ understanding of respite care Were able to find respite care services and to weight their preferences to help decision-making Not significant: ↑ knowledge and ↓ decisional conflicts	1	Stirling et al. (2012)	5	Austin et al. (2015) Davies et al. (2019) Ho et al. (2021) Lord et al. (2015) Mattos et al. (2023)
	DECIDE manual: workbook and support of a decision coach	Care partners	Support for decision-making about long-term placement ↓ decisional conflicts	1	Lord et al. (2017)	2	Davies et al. (2019) Ho et al. (2021)
Everyday decisions – Driving cessation	"At the Crossroads"	Care partners of individuals living with mild cognitive impairment, Alzheimer's disease, or related dementia	↑ confidence in managing driving cessation	1	Stern et al. (2008)	2	Davis and Ohman (2017) Rapoport et al. (2012)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Everyday decisions – Medication management	In-person session with a nurse or social worker, and manual	Care partners	↑ knowledge and medication management	1	Lingler et al. (2016)	1	Gench et al. (2021)
eHealth – Various decisions	"ComputerLink"	Care partners	↑ confidence No effect on decision-making skills	2	Bass et al. (1998) Brenan et al. (1995)	1	Hopwood et al. (2018)
	"AlzMed" booklet and website	Care partners	↑ confidence ↑ ability to manage dementia and monitor medication side effects	1	Zimmerman et al. (2018)	1	Gench et al. (2021)
	"Building Better Caregiver (BBC)" internet-based workshop	Care partners	↓ burden, depression, pain, stress	1	Lorig et al. (2012)	1	Hopwood et al. (2018)
	"European eHealthMonitor project Dementia Portal (eHM-DP)"	Care partners (informal and professional)	Informal care partners: ↑ degree of perceived support, access to support from home, confidence in health-related decision. No effect on burden and quality of life Informal and professional care partners: ↑ interaction	2	Schaller et al. (2015, 2016)	1	Hopwood et al. (2018)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

TABLE 3. Interventions targeting dyads and triads

Note that the *"Palliative and Therapeutic Harmonization (PATH) program"* (reported by Kelly et al. (2019)) targeted older individuals without dementia. *Abbreviations*: ° multiple languages and/or cultural adaptations available; ACP, advance care planning; KT, knowledge translation.

KT intervention		Targeted population	Main results	Primary study		Review	
Category	Name			N	Refs	N	Refs
ACP – Written	"Palliative and Therapeutic Harmonization (PATH) program"	Individuals of 65+ yrs and their care partners	↑ ACP behaviors	1	Moorhouse and Mallery (2012)	1	Kelly et al. (2019)
ACP – Video	2-minute video	Individuals living with dementia and their care partners	↑ comfort care as a choice ↓ decisional conflicts	4	Volandes et al. (2008, 2009B, 2009B, 2011)	2	Davies et al. (2019) Austin et al. (2015)
	18-minute video (2-min video updated) and ACP consultation °	Individuals living with moderate-to-severe dementia and their care partners (50% African American)	↑ knowledge and quality of communication ↓ decisional conflicts	1	Einterz et al. (2014)	5	Cardona-Morrell et al. (2017) Davies et al. (2019) Kelly et al. (2019) Xie et al. (2018) Ho et al. (2021)
	12-minute video	Individuals living with advanced dementia and their care partners	↑ goals-of-care discussion and ACP decision about tube feeding No effect on DNR	1	Mitchell et al. (2018)	1	Tunnard et al. (2022)
ACP – Group	"Taking Control of Alzheimer's Disease"	Individuals living with early dementia and their care partners	No effect for individuals living with dementia ↑ ACP behavior	2	Silverstein and Sherman (2010) Roberts and Silverio (2009)	1	Kelly et al. (2019)
	"The Early Stage Memory Loss seminar"	Individuals living with dementia and their care partners	No effect for individuals living with dementia ↑ quality of life of care partners	1	Logsdon et al. (2007)	1	Kelly et al. (2019)
	Seminar about different types of ACP documentation	Individuals living with dementia and their care partners	No effect for individuals living with dementia ↑ (small) of ACP behavior	1	Lewis et al. (2015)	1	Kelly et al. (2019)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ACP – Face-to-face	"Let Me Decide"	Individuals living with dementia and their care partners	↑ ACP documentation No effect on healthcare satisfaction	2	Molloy et al. (2000) Caplan et al. (2006)	2	Kelly et al. (2019) Robinson et al. (2012)
	"Preserving Identity and Planning for Advance Care (PIPAC)"	Individuals living with early dementia and their care partners	↑ decision-making self-efficacy ↓ decisional conflicts	1	Hilgeman et al. (2014)	1	Kelly et al. (2019)
	"Support, Health, Activities, Resources, and Education (SHARE)"	Individuals living with early dementia and their care partners	For care partners: ↑ ACP completion and satisfaction For the two members of the dyad: ↓ emotional disruption	1	Whitlatch et al. (2019)	1	Geddis-Regan et al. (2021)
Everyday decisions – Fall prevention	Discussion-based based intervention	Individuals living with dementia and their care partners	↑ shared decision-making, discussion about risk factors and strategies to reduce them	1	Meyer et al. (2019)	1	Mattos et al. (2023)
eHealth – Various decisions	"Talking Mats" °	Individuals living with dementia and their care partners	Easy to use ↑ perceived involvement, decision-making, well-being, and overall satisfaction of discussion Available in: English and Dutch	2	Murphy and Oliver (2013) Dutch version: Reitz and Dalemans (2016)	3	Daly et al. (2018) Davis et al. (2017) Mattos et al. (2023)
	"DecideGuide"	Individuals living with dementia and their care partners (informal and professional)	Professional and most informal care partners: user friendly, appreciated tool. ↑ involvement and sharing of daily issues Individuals 70+ yrs (with or without dementia): hard to use	2	Span et al. (2015) Span (2016)	3	Hopwood et al. (2018) Daly et al. (2018) Mattos et al. (2023)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24312581; this version posted September 18, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

TABLE 4. Interventions targeting individuals living with dementia

Abbreviations: ACP, advance care planning; KT, knowledge translation.

KT intervention		Targeted population	Main results	Primary study		Review	
Category	Name			N	Refs	N	Refs
ACP – Written	Five 6-to-10-minute videos	Individuals living with advanced dementia	↑ goals-of-care discussion and ACP decision about tube feeding	1	Mitchell et al. (2020)	1	Tunnard et al. (2022)
Everyday decisions – Driving cessation	"Driving with Dementia Decision Aid (DDDA)"	Individuals living with dementia	↑ knowledge ↓ decisional conflict	1	Carmody et al. (2014)	1	Ho et al. (2021)
eHealth – Various decisions	Web-based intervention for decision-making based on personal values and preferences	60+ yrs individuals living with mild cognitive impairment	Promising web-based decision aid to support decision-making	1	Bogza et al. (2020)	1	Ho et al. (2021)