medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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.

"I'm worth saving"- A Qualitative Study of People with Alzheimer's Disease Considering Lecanemab Treatment

Anna L Parks, MD (1), Ayush Thacker, BS (2), Daniel Dohan, PHD (3) Liliana A Ramirez Gomez, MD (4), Christine S Ritchie, MD, MSPH (2, 5) Joanna Paladino, MD* (2, 5) and Sachin J Shah, MD, MPH (2, 6)*

(1) University of Utah, Division of Hematology and Hematologic Malignancies, Salt Lake City, UT, USA
(2) Massachusetts General Hospital, Mongan Institute Center for Aging and Serious Illness, Boston, MA, USA
(3) University of California San Francisco, Institute for Health Policy Studies, San Francisco, CA, USA,
(4) Massachusetts General Hospital, Memory Disorders Division, Department of Neurology, Boston, MA, USA
(5) Massachusetts General Hospital, Division of Palliative Care and Geriatric Medicine, Boston, MA, USA
(6) Massachusetts General Hospital, Division of General Internal Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

*Co-senior authors

Word count: 2,980

Contact
Anna L. Parks, MD
2000 Circle of Hope Drive
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Anna.parks@hsc.utah.edu
801-213-2648

Acknowledgements: Dr. Shah reports research funding from NIA (K76AG074919).

COI: The authors have no financial conflicts of interest.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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.

Key Points (75-100 words=100)

Question
How do people with Alzheimer's disease (AD) decide on treatment with newly available anti-amyloid monoclonal antibodies?

Findings
In this qualitative analysis, people with AD considering treatment relied on multiple information sources; were motivated by hope to delay cognitive decline and preserve independence; and worried side effects would impair quality of life. Personality traits, family support, and trust in expertise determined how they balanced these tradeoffs. People with AD wanted more personalized information and to hear from others who had taken the medications.

Meaning
As access to treatment expands, these findings inform how clinicians can help people with AD make individualized treatment decisions.

Abstract

Importance
People with Alzheimer's disease (AD) now have access to disease-modifying treatment with anti-amyloid monoclonal antibodies (mAbs). Their perception of risks and benefits and approach to treatment decisions remain unknown.

Objective
To understand how people with early AD consider benefits and costs of anti-amyloid mAbs and make decisions about treatment.

Design
Qualitative semi-structured interviews

Setting
Memory care clinics at two academic medical centers

Participants
People with biomarker or imaging-confirmed early AD referred for evaluation for treatment with anti-amyloid mAbs

Main Outcomes and Measures
Themes identified through content analysis

Results
Among 22 participants, mean age was 70 years, 8 (36%) were women, 22 (100%) were White, 8 (36%) had less than a college degree, 11 (50%) had annual income less than $100,000, and 6 (27%) lived in a rural area. The analysis revealed 3 major themes and associated subthemes: 1) People with AD sought and obtained information from different sources—advocacy organizations, the Internet, and clinicians; 2) hopes, expected benefits, and the existential threat of dementia drove willingness and readiness to start lecanemab—hopes included more time feeling like themselves and doing enjoyable activities; expected benefits included stalling progression, reversing cognitive decline or cure; 3) individual traits and preferences, family factors, and degree of trust in expertise influenced how people balanced risks and benefits—

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

some would accept treatment at any cost; others carefully weighed risks and burdens carefully, but were motivated to pursue treatment by supportive families, insurance coverage, and trust in expertise; for a few, costs decidedly outweighed their personal benefits. People with AD desired more individualized information on risks and benefits and wanted to hear more from patients who took the medication.

Conclusions and Relevance

Results from this qualitative analysis inform clinician, health system and policy efforts to promote individualized treatment decisions for anti-amyloid mAb treatment through multimodal education and outreach, evidence-based communication skills, and adaptation of similar care models.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

Introduction

Approval of anti-amyloid monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) is a major advance in the field of Alzheimer's disease (AD). This medication class is the first potentially disease-modifying therapy for people with dementia. Lecanemab, approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in 2023, can slow cognitive decline in early AD by six months.[1] Donanemab was FDA-approved in July 2024, and clinical trials of additional mAbs are in process.[2]

Alongside therapeutic optimism is growing recognition of potential tradeoffs that complicate treatment decisions. Side effects include intracranial swelling (amyloid-related imaging abnormalities-edema), and intracranial bleeding (amyloid-related imaging abnormalities-hemorrhage [ARIA-H]).[3] Certain comorbidities and medications, like anticoagulants, and genotypes, like apolipoprotein E ε4 (*ApoE4*), increase the ARIA-H risk.[4] Although most ARIA is asymptomatic, it can result in death and disability.[5] How patients fare long-term remains unknown. Treatment requires time expenditure, including subspecialty visits, diagnostic testing, monitoring, and infusions every two-to-four weeks. And anti-amyloid mAbs are financially costly for individuals and society.[6]

Many have called for shared decision-making to address the complexity of treatment decisions.[4,5,7–9] To be effective, shared decision-making requires understanding how patients perceive the risks and benefits of treatment and how they approach decisions.[10] In the new era of anti-amyloid mAbs, our aim was to understand how people with AD weigh potential benefits of treatment against costs and how they make treatment decisions.

Methods

Study Design and Data Collection

We conducted an exploratory qualitative study using semi-structured interviews of people with AD who were referred for lecanemab evaluation between February-March 2024. A multidisciplinary team developed an interview guide using the Ottawa Decision Support Framework.[11] The guide included questions about 1) information received, 2) hopes, motivations, and concerns about treatment, 3) level of certainty about starting treatment, 4) factors influencing decision-making, and 5) the decision-making process. Interviews were conducted remotely by Zoom or telephone by trained study personnel (A.P., A.T.). The institutional review boards of participating institutions approved this study as exempt. We adhered to Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Studies (COREQ) guidance.[12]

Setting and Participants

Participants were recruited by mail and telephone from memory clinic referral centers at two academic medical centers, the University of Utah and Massachusetts General Hospital. Participants were English-speakers, between ages 50-90 years, with early AD confirmed by amyloid on cerebrospinal fluid and/or positron-emission tomography who had been referred to undergo screening for lecanemab. Interviews were conducted prior to receiving lecanemab. Participants completed verbal informed consent and an online demographic questionnaire before participation and received a $50 gift card.

Data Analysis

Interviews were digitally recorded, transcribed, and de-identified. Qualitative thematic analysis was performed in March-April 2024 using a stepwise approach and hybrid deductive-inductive coding methods.[13,14] The primary analytic team was comprised of AP (female physician-researcher with qualitative research expertise), AT (male clinical research coordinator), and JP (female researcher with serious illness communication and qualitative research expertise).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

Coders independently coded the first five transcripts deductively using the interview guide as a framework; additional codes were added inductively to create the preliminary codebook. AT, AP, and JP coded the remaining transcripts and met every five interviews to discuss discrepancies, resolve differences by consensus, revise codes and ensure iterative content building. The final codebook was applied to all interviews. Using meetings with two additional experts (DD, SS), codes were grouped to develop preliminary themes and sub-themes. Associations were confirmed by the entire group to identify final themes. AP, AT, and JP reviewed transcripts iteratively to assess data saturation, or when interviews were not gleaning new information, at which point recruitment was stopped.[15–17]

Results

Characteristics for the 22 participants are provided in **Table 1**. The study cohort included 12 (55%) people from Massachusetts General Hospital and 10 (45%) from the University of Utah. Mean age was 70 years, 8 (36%) were women, and 22 (100%) were non-Hispanic White. Eight (36%) had less than a college degree, 8 (50%) had annual income less than $100,000 (6 [27%] were unsure or had no income), and 6 (27%) lived rurally. A majority (12 [55%]) were ready to decide on lecanemab treatment, and the remainder were evenly split between ready but wanting more information (5 [23%]) and not ready (5 [23%]). A small proportion would decline (3 [14%]), a similar proportion needed more information (4 [18%]), and most would pursue treatment (15 [68%]).

Through analysis, we identified three primary themes and associated subthemes (**Figure 1**), with representative quotations in the manuscript text. **Table 2** provides additional supportive quotations.

People with AD sought and obtained information from different sources

Nearly all respondents reported self-directed information gathering. In addition to the Internet and media, advocacy organizations played a prominent role in disseminating information and empowering patients.

> *"I've actually gone out and sought out information on my own…I was able to connect from the Alzheimer's page to an article on it. And I basically printed that and then kind of read it in its entirety so that I could highlight areas of concern for myself." (ID5)*

Most learned about anti-amyloid mAbs from their clinicians. Some learned from primary care providers—often the physician to whom they first presented with cognitive complaints—while others obtained information from subspecialty providers. Level of detail conveyed by clinicians varied, ranging from comprehensive to only a broad overview.

> *"You can do it over at our local hospital. I don't really know much more than that...It just was, like, a couple of minutes or something. He just said it'd be an infusion, and so I asked him if that was—I don't know. He didn't really say much." (ID 18)*

A few participants experienced motivating narratives from other people with AD who had received anti-amyloid mAbs. In other instances, information from family members with healthcare expertise played a role.

> *"…I met a gal who was a little younger than me who's been getting the treatment and she really feels like it's helped her quite a bit. She's done very well on it, so that was another exciting thing." (ID12)*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

Hopes, expected benefits, and the existential threat of dementia drive willingness and readiness to start lecanemab

Delaying progression of cognitive decline dominated the hopes for treatment. Some participants' expectations exceeded the benefits seen in clinical trials. Several hoped for a cure, while others hoped that lecanemab would reverse memory loss or completely remove amyloid from the brain.

> *"[I hope] that they'll come in in a year and say, 'We can't find any amyloid plaque—- in your brain. And that the tau tangles, or whatever they are, seem not to be there.'" (ID 9)*

Patient motivation to accept treatment came from the opportunities to a) gain more time feeling like themselves and doing enjoyable activities; b) have a plan to fight dementia rather than succumbing to the status quo; or c) preserve independence.

> *"I would like to be able to live a life and be able to speak and not get wound up in my mind.... This is the anxiety.... I'm hoping it can help not only just the hope, but it's good to have a plan and, 'This is what I'm gonna do.' And 'I've got good people around me.' I feel good when that happens, I have to say." (ID 8)*

Some people felt motivated knowing that they were receiving the "latest and greatest" compared to existing non-pharmacologic alternatives and that they were still cognitively able to assess the risks and benefits.

> *"I'm, you know, cognitively up with what people are saying to me and what I can read about or have my wife read to me about. So, I'm still pretty confident and —how do I put this? I'm worth saving." (ID 22)*

Respondents also described lecanemab as a stopgap until the development of more effective therapies. This was coupled with anxiety about whether receiving lecanemab would preclude them from future treatments.

> *"The other thing that comes in is if you get on something, does it preclude the something better coming along? In the next two years you know, or whatever it is, that's better. But because you've been on this or on this, you can't do that. I don't know how likely that is." (ID 25)*

Some described feeling conflicted because they worried about tradeoffs (e.g., diminished quality of life from complications). Several raised concerns that lecanemab would have side effects like chemotherapy (e.g., nausea, hair loss) because both are infusions.

> *"It's because, you know, I've had so much trouble with drug reactions in my life that I've tried as best I can to stay off drugs and stay away from drugs. So, I'm real—would be really concerned about, I'd rather have like two good years with as clear a mind as I can have, rather than having three years, but being so affected by the drugs that I'm taking that it wouldn't be worth the extra year." (ID 11)*

Individual traits and preferences, family factors, degree of trust in expertise influence, and sense of pressure or urgency influenced how people with AD balance risks and benefits in decision-making.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

When asked to consider risks and benefits, some noted that their approach was rooted in their personal tendency to "look past the negatives", rather than the specifics of anti-amyloid mAbs. For others, the perceived inevitability of decline without intervention helped them decide to accept treatment at any cost.

> *"What do I have to lose? Is basically the way I look at it. I mean, even if it does cause problems for me, I'm headed that way already. I'm not—might be a different kind of problem. I don't care." (ID 10)*

The complication of ARIA-H weighed on most participants' minds. Although people with AD wanted more information on their individual risk, they felt that bleeding risk was not high and surmountable. Very few mentioned death as a potential outcome.

> *"I just know that there's things that could go bad, and I'm ready for that. I'd rather be able to get onto the drug and… I'd rather be able on it. At least try it, and… if I die, I die." (ID 17)*

Costs, insurance coverage, and logistical hurdles also influenced willingness to pursue treatment. Some felt that infusions every two weeks would not affect their lifestyle, while others found this disruptive. People with AD likened the logistics of anti-amyloid mAbs to receiving chemotherapy for cancer.

> *"It also goes with a medication that caused you to lose what you already have as far as your physicalness, your aliveness, those kinds of things. So if it's a medication that's going to maybe give you longer memory, but less life, that would make a difference." (ID 25)*

Family also influenced how people with AD weighed side effects and costs. Some described family members as being very supportive, while others described hesitation. Those whose desire for treatment conflicted with family members reminded them of their autonomy despite their declining cognition and again drew comparisons to cancer to address concerns. A few equated forgoing treatment with unnecessarily burdening family.

> *"My [relative] has been wonderful about it. I think he has more worries about the risks than I do, partly because he's like, 'I'd rather have you even if you don't know who I am anymore. I'd rather have you as long as I can.'" (ID2)*

People with AD voiced trust in expertise and felt that the medical team took their individualized risk and benefit into account. Faith in the drug approval process and their healthcare system also influenced decision-making.

> *"I know that no doctor is perfect. I do honestly believe that they know a lot more about this than I do—in many ways. And I trust that they're very, very good. And that's the only way I know how to answer...I don't even think about it because I trust it. Unless something went wrong, then it might change... It's like I say, I feel like something happens that makes me lose that trust. That's hard to get back." (ID 10)*

People with AD described a sense of pressure to accept treatment. Pressure came from family members, clinicians, or a sense of personal urgency to act now (versus waiting until they may not have a choice).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

> *"I suppose I could wait later, but I also feel like the damage that is happening, I know at some point—I don't wanna get to the point where I don't have the choice anymore, right?" (ID 2)*

When making a final treatment decision, a small proportion indicated that they would decide alone, and a small proportion would make a group decision with family. The majority described gathering input from physicians and family but ultimately felt that the decision was theirs to make.

> *"I will decide on my own—with agreement from the doctor. I'm certainly willing to listen to any concerns from my family member, but ultimately it is my body, my decision." (ID 5)*

Ideal future state of knowledge and decision-making

We also synthesized information that people with AD wanted to improve their knowledge and decision-making (**Table 3**).

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first study evaluating how people with AD understand and deliberate about anti-amyloid mAb treatment (**Figure 1**). People with AD sought out information to supplement knowledge from their physicians. They hoped that state-of-the-art treatment would forestall inexorable cognitive decline and bridge to more effective treatments. They were motivated by taking action that could buy more time, rather than passively letting nature take its course. Diminished quality of life due to side effects, costs and burdens of treatment were concerns. How people with AD balanced these tradeoffs was determined by personality, family, and confidence in expertise.

Our findings help clarify a new stage in the dementia disease trajectory: decisions about disease-modifying therapy. Before effective therapies were developed, qualitative studies in people with AD focused on experiences and end-of-life care. Our findings have some similarities, including a shared desire for greater guidance from clinicians on expected disease course. Distinct from our findings, participants in prior studies focused on behavioral (versus pharmacologic) interventions and the need for more palliative care.[18–21] Research examining decision-making for people with dementia focuses on moving to a nursing home and advance care planning. Some key facets overlap with our findings, like variation in perceptions of risks and benefits, emotional complexity, and desire for autonomy. [22,23] In a recent systematic review of 13 qualitative studies, true decisional autonomy was rare and confined to minor decisions, whereas it was nearly universal in our population with mild symptoms.[24]

These results reveal the sensitivity and skill with which clinicians caring for people with dementia must approach conversations about treatment. Our results inform how communication strategies could be adapted for this need. Some participants had misconceptions about lecanemab's benefits, and potential side effects were considered minor. Given the gravity of a dementia diagnosis, expressions of "unrealistic hope" may reflect normal coping or a lack of cognitive understanding.[25,26] Some clinicians may be prone to overstating benefits and minimizing harms, while others focus on potential adverse sequelae.[27] Our results also underscore the salience and complexity of emotions in treatment decisions for people with AD, such as grief over loss of identity and worries about burdening family. Evidence-based communication training could address these needs, including sharing personalized risks and benefits, naming uncertainty, using pictorials, creating space for questions, partnering in decision-making, and using empathy.[28–32]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

Our findings also highlight that promoting informed decisions about anti-amyloid mAbs would benefit from incorporating messaging channels outside the clinic. External resources were important for people with AD. Heightened media attention to anti-amyloid mAbs may have led to passive exposure.[33–35] Alternative resources may also have filled a vacuum while awaiting subspecialty appointments or when incomplete information was provided by clinicians, a phenomenon seen previously in dementia.[18] Interestingly, no people with AD reported hearing about lecanemab through direct-to-consumer marketing, which is both common and can distort decision-making.[36,37] Given patients' multiple streams of information, interventions to provide education and decision-making support should use various modalities and start before and continue after interaction with the healthcare system.

Patient-drawn parallels between lecanemab and chemotherapy raise potential opportunities to learn from oncology care models. This comparison is apt given the rapid transformation of AD care into a landscape not unlike oncology care. People with dementia who might previously have felt stigmatized and hopeless about their diagnosis may now identify with cancer patients who often have access to effective therapies and are valorized for their bravery.[38] Clinicians caring for people with memory loss must now add responsibilities that are common among oncologists like in-depth side effect monitoring.[39] Healthcare systems must now provide services common in oncology care, including helping people with dementia navigate complicated visit schedules. These commonalities suggest that oncology models could be adapted to support people with dementia, clinicians and healthcare systems in making informed, cost-conscious and goal-concordant decisions about anti-amyloid mAbs.[40,41]

Limitations

Our participants had some of the earliest access to anti-amyloid mAbs. These early adopters may not reflect all people with AD. For example, we identified consistent themes of self-efficacy, autonomy, and eagerness to start. Our findings could simply be interpreted as natural enthusiasm in response to relief from a devastating—and previously unmodifiable—diagnosis. Additionally, aspects of decision-making overlapped with those in previous studies in dementia, suggesting broader relevance.[18–21] Our sample lacked racial and ethnic diversity. This is broadly in line with the population characteristics at memory care clinics.[42] Our participants exhibited more educational, income and geographic diversity. Subsequent studies should examine whether our findings apply in settings with greater diversity. Moreover, this should serve as a call to action to improve equity in access, as we could only recruit from the subset of people referred for treatment consideration.

Conclusions

In this first qualitative study of front-line people with dementia considering treatment with anti-amyloid mAbs, we found variation in hopes for treatment, information sought and obtained, and contextual factors in decision-making, supporting the need for an individualized approach. Identifying these features can help identify targets for interventions to improve individualized decision-making for anti-amyloid mAb treatment.

Tables and Figures

Table 1 Patient Characteristics

Characteristic	N=22

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

Characteristic	**N=22**
Age, mean (SD)	70 (10)
Institution, n (%)	
Massachusetts General Hospital	12 (55%)
University of Utah	10 (45%)
Gender n (%)	
Male	14 (64%)
Female	8 (36%)
Orientation n (%)	
Heterosexual or straight	22 (100%)
Race n (%)	
White	22 (100%)
Ethnicity n (%)	
Non-Hispanic	22 (100%)
Geographic Location n (%)	
Suburban	14 (64%)
Rural	6 (27%)
Urban	2 (9.1%)
Religious Affiliation n (%)	
Christian	16 (73%)
Agnostic	3 (14%)
Atheist	1 (4.5%)
Buddhist	1 (4.5%)
Prefer not to answer	1 (4.5%)
Highest level of education obtained n (%)	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

Characteristic	N=22
High School	1 (4.5%)
Some college	5 (23%)
Associate's Degree	2 (9.1%)
Bachelor's Degree	7 (32%)
Master's Degree	4 (18%)
Doctorate Degree	3 (14%)
Household Income n (%)	
$30,000-59,999	1 (4.5%)
$60,000-99,999	7 (32%)
$100,000 or more	8 (36%)
Unsure/No Income	6 (27%)
How ready do you feel to decide about treatment n (%)	
Ready to make a decision	12 (55%)
Ready to make a decision but has more questions	5 (23%)
Not ready to make a decision	5 (23%)
If you had to decide today about treatment n (%)	
Yes to treatment	15 (68%)
Not sure, need more information	4 (18%)
No to treatment	3 (14%)

Table 2 Additional Illustrative Quotations from People with AD by Theme

Theme	Illustrative quotation
People with AD sought and obtained information from different sources	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

Theme	Illustrative quotation
Advocacy organizations, the Internet and the media as resources for self-study	*"I think we went to the conference in [city] the year before. And that was when they were going through the approval process and that was a big focus of the conference, so that pretty much made me more aware… it was kind of emphasizing how this was a new avenue to explore. And so that's what got me interested." (ID 12)*
Variably detailed information from clinicians	*"It wasn't until our local doctor here gave us a whole fistful, this little stack of articles that described what it was and how it worked and what are the complications, and what are some of the things that would make it difficult for me, like the distance. It was like an article from The New England Journal of Medicine and one from the American Medical Association. He's one of these people that really keeps on top of things. I mean they were legitimate articles. Because he has access to all that kind of information through his—he's a [medical professional]." (ID 15)*
Motivating interactions with treated patients and informed family members	*"Our [family member] is… a [medical professional]. He runs the tests and all this, exactly this, but with younger people. And he's been very helpful with phone calls and his network that he's got fairly wide, going to conferences and things, talking with people. And has been instrumental." (ID 25)*
Hopes, expected benefits, and the existential threat of dementia driving willingness and readiness to start anti-amyloid mAbs.	
Stalling, reversal or cure of cognitive decline	*"Obviously the hope is that it can stall this disease. At least I'd feel better if they could give us some kind of parameters around…You know, for somebody with your subtype, you know, what we're seeing thus far, it can stall it two years, three years." (ID 5)*
Optimism drawn from mechanism of action and novelty compared to non-pharmacologic options	*"I think the biggest selling point was this is the best there is. Nothing any better and this is the way we have to go, or should go, and I was all for that." (ID 24)*
Stopgap until more effective therapy	*"I just made the decision that, for me, not only because of the immediacy of the potential help from lecanemab, but I don't know what's gonna happen in the future... hopefully, this gives me more time to see if something else happens as well." (ID 2)*
Motivated by desire to buy time for enjoyable activities, preserve independence, and do "something" vs nothing	*"I feel like I could manage going forward with the capabilities that I've retained thus far to function fairly independently if needed. So, I'm in a good spot, so if we can stop it in its tracks, that would be wonderful." (ID 5)*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

Theme	Illustrative quotation
Individual traits and preferences, family factors, degree of trust in expertise influence, and sense of pressure or urgency influenced how people with AD balance risks and benefits in decision-making.	
Impact of personality	*"I have the ability to pass over the negativity a bit. So my answer to that is I—when the negatives came up, I didn't listen very well…I think I kind of passed over it. I was really centered on the idea that I was going to get better. I let the rest—if there was any rest, I let it fly by. You know, being a man [in their 80's] who is cognitively challenged is not all bad. You're kind of a funny old bastard wandering through life. And I kind of like being that. It's not that bad." (ID 16)*
Perceived inevitability of decline	*"What do I have to lose? Is basically the way I look at it. I mean, even if it does cause problems for me, I'm headed that way already…might be a different kind of problem. I don't care."(ID 10)*
Weighing side effects, costs and logistical burdens	*"Well, the biggest drawback is how much it's gonna cost. I don't know if I can afford it. My understanding was that there would be some, but I don't know what the price is and the cost—out of pocket. That will make—that's-that's a stop right there, if it's too high…That to me is the only thing that will possibly stop." (ID 10)*
Importance of supportive families	*"How I rationalize that in my mind and then turn around and had a conversation with my husband, I said, 'If I had breast cancer, nobody would question if I was going for chemotherapy tomorrow, but technically chemotherapy is a poison.' And at some point long before we became conditioned to hearing about chemotherapy, it sounded big, bad, and scary too… once I kind of laid that scenario out about the chemotherapy, I think it kind of put everything into perspective and nobody's really said anything negative since." (ID 5)*
Trust in expertise	*"I feel, I gotta think the FDA has done its job. Like I think that you guys are, you know, have one of the-the best hospitals in the world and the best doctors. So if you're gonna have this disease, I think I have it at the right place with the right hospital, with the right doctors, with the right partner." (ID 12)*
Family and physicians as sources of pressure	*"I kinda got the impression that he [the physician] was recommending it or that it would give me more years. Pushing it's too strong a word, but that he was encouraging it in some way… I got the impression he was definitely pro doing the drugs. I don't know if that's based on good results he's seen in patients or whether it's just kinda the latest thing to try. The latest thing to do." (ID 15)*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

Theme	Illustrative quotation
Making calculated risks and conscious tradeoffs	*I'm ready to do it, willing to do it…Is it a perfect world? Not always. But I'm fine with that. Calculated risk." (ID 8)*
Sense of urgency to decide	*"I'm ready. 'Cause I feel like the longer it takes, I feel like I lose more cognitive abilities. And so I'm anxious to get started in the hopes that this will slow everything down. Because once you lose what you lose, you don't get it back." (ID 6)*
Autonomy	*"I think it's a combination of two things. I'd like to talk to the doctor to understand what he or she knows and take that information with the family and say listen, there's no guarantees. But I honestly think that my family would say, 'Go for it.' Got nothin' to lose, really, in a sense." (ID 8)*

Table 3: Desired information and support for anti-amyloid mAb treatment decisions

Desired information and support	Representative quotation
Personalized information on benefits	*"I need to know what the results of other patients are. And preferably other patients that fit my same general condition, age, that kind of stuff..." (ID 26)*
Personalized information on risks	*"Obviously, I wanna know how prevalent the bad side effects are. If it's a little discomfort on getting the infusion, that's not a problem. The things that I'm concerned about are the things that would either make it far worse or sooner than letting it run its course." (ID 3)*
Detailed and personalized information on ARIA-H and its treatments	*"That sounds pretty drastic. It could be. I'd wanna know more about why... And if there can be blood in the brain, you know, is that—do I need an operation to get that fixed? Am I gonna die, or will that—is that normal? (ID 18)*
Updates on long-term outcomes from patients in the trials	*"I read about the studies and the results of their initial trials, but I guess I don't know if there's been any documentation or anywhere I should look for follow up information on what's been learned now to date. Not just from the initial study but what's been learned from circling back to those original patients. Like is it still stalled or did they have to do another course?" (ID 5)*
Testimonials from people with AD to give a "human face" to statistics	*"But in terms of, just kind of on a daily basis how it would help you out or not help you out. Not just the—'cause the-the stuff we read was all like statistics on, you know, improved this for so many months or weeks or a year or whatever. There was nothing personal about how people who've taken it actually reacted to it and how they felt about it." (ID 15)*
Handout	*"Is there-are there papers? I don't wanna read all the big papers.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

Desired information and support	Representative quotation
	But like is there a one or two side paper or something? It would be nice to have something like that from the doctors not the drug company." (ID 4)
Website	*"A website? You mean, like, that'll give me information? Yeah. That would be helpful. Maybe to reassure—the information, I guess, is the best." (ID 17)*

Figure 1 Major Themes, Subthemes and Implications Identified in People with AD Undergoing Evaluation for Lecanemab Treatment

References

1. van Dyck CH, Swanson CJ, Aisen P, Bateman RJ, Chen C, Gee M, Kanekiyo M, Li D, Reyderman L, Cohen S, Froelich L, Katayama S, Sabbagh M, Vellas B, Watson D, Dhadda S, Irizarry M, Kramer LD, Iwatsubo T. Lecanemab in Early Alzheimer's Disease. New England Journal of Medicine. Massachusetts Medical Society; 2023 Jan 5;388(1):9–21. PMID: 36449413

2. Yadollahikhales G, Rojas JC. Anti-Amyloid Immunotherapies for Alzheimer's Disease: A 2023 Clinical Update. Neurotherapeutics. 2023 Jul;20(4):914–931. PMCID: PMC10457266

3. Sperling RA, Jack CR, Black SE, Frosch MP, Greenberg SM, Hyman BT, Scheltens P, Carrillo MC, Thies W, Bednar MM, Black RS, Brashear HR, Grundman M, Siemers ER, Feldman HH, Schindler RJ. Amyloid-related imaging abnormalities in amyloid-modifying therapeutic trials: recommendations from the Alzheimer's Association Research Roundtable Workgroup. Alzheimers Dement. 2011 Jul;7(4):367–385. PMCID: PMC3693547

4. Ko D, Pascual-Leone A, Shah SJ. Use of Lecanemab for Patients With Cardiovascular Disease: The Challenge of Uncertainty. JAMA [Internet]. 2024 Mar 15 [cited 2024 Mar 27]; Available from: https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2024.2991

5. Cummings J, Apostolova L, Rabinovici GD, Atri A, Aisen P, Greenberg S, Hendrix S, Selkoe D, Weiner M, Petersen RC, Salloway S. Lecanemab: Appropriate Use Recommendations. J Prev Alzheimers Dis. 2023;10(3):362–377. PMCID: PMC10313141

6. Arbanas JC, Damberg CL, Leng M, Harawa N, Sarkisian CA, Landon BE, Mafi JN. Estimated Annual Spending on Lecanemab and Its Ancillary Costs in the US Medicare Program. JAMA Intern Med. 2023 Aug 1;183(8):885–889. PMCID: PMC10176174

7. Widera EW, Brangman SA, Chin NA. Ushering in a New Era of Alzheimer Disease Therapy. JAMA. 2023 Aug 8;330(6):503–504.

8. Sarkisian CA, Romanov A, Mafi JN. Talking With Patients About the New Anti-amyloid Alzheimer Disease Medications. Ann Intern Med. American College of Physicians; 2024 Feb 20;177(2):246–248.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

9. Chin NA, Widera E, Brangman SA, Karlawish J. Monoclonal anti-amyloid antibodies for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease and the hesitant geriatrician. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society. 2024;72(2):643–645.

10. Shay LA, Lafata JE. Where is the evidence? A systematic review of shared decision making and patient outcomes. Med Decis Making. 2015 Jan;35(1):114–131. PMCID: PMC4270851

11. Stacey D, Légaré F, Boland L, Lewis KB, Loiselle MC, Hoefel L, Garvelink M, O'Connor A. 20th Anniversary Ottawa Decision Support Framework: Part 3 Overview of Systematic Reviews and Updated Framework. Med Decis Making. 2020 Apr;40(3):379–398. PMID: 32428429

12. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. International Journal for Quality in Health Care. 2007 Dec 1;19(6):349–357.

13. Vaismoradi M, Turunen H, Bondas T. Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. Nurs Health Sci. 2013 Sep;15(3):398–405. PMID: 23480423

14. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology. Routledge; 2006 Jan 1;3(2):77–101.

15. Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies: Guided by Information Power. Qual Health Res. 2016 Nov;26(13):1753–1760. PMID: 26613970

16. Hennink MM, Kaiser BN, Marconi VC. Code Saturation Versus Meaning Saturation: How Many Interviews Are Enough? Qual Health Res. 2017 Mar;27(4):591–608. PMCID: PMC9359070

17. What is an adequate sample size? Operationalising data saturation for theory-based interview studies - PubMed [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jul 11]. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20204937/

18. Shafir A, Ritchie CS, Garrett SB, Sideman AB, Naasan G, Merrilees J, Widera E, Flint L, Harrison KL. "Captive by the uncertainty" – Experiences with anticipatory guidance for people living with dementia and their caregivers at a specialty dementia clinic. J Alzheimers Dis. 2022;86(2):787–800. PMCID: PMC9717709

19. Harrison KL, Garrett SB, Halim M, Sideman AB, Allison TA, Dohan D, Naasan G, Miller BL, Smith AK, Ritchie CS. "I didn't sign up for this": perspectives from persons living with dementia and care partners on challenges, supports, and opportunities to add geriatric neuropalliative care to dementia specialty care. J Alzheimers Dis. 2022;90(3):1301–1320. PMCID: PMC9712265

20. Bunn F, Goodman C, Sworn K, Rait G, Brayne C, Robinson L, McNeilly E, Iliffe S. Psychosocial Factors That Shape Patient and Carer Experiences of Dementia Diagnosis and Treatment: A Systematic Review of Qualitative Studies. PLoS Med. 2012 Oct 30;9(10):e1001331. PMCID: PMC3484131

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

21. Prorok JC, Horgan S, Seitz DP. Health care experiences of people with dementia and their caregivers: a meta-ethnographic analysis of qualitative studies. CMAJ. 2013 Oct 1;185(14):E669–E680. PMCID: PMC3787191

22. Young JA, Lind C, Orange J. A qualitative systematic review of experiences of persons with dementia regarding transition to long-term care. Dementia. SAGE Publications; 2021 Jan 1;20(1):5–27.

23. Sellars M, Chung O, Nolte L, Tong A, Pond D, Fetherstonhaugh D, McInerney F, Sinclair C, Detering KM. Perspectives of people with dementia and carers on advance care planning and end-of-life care: A systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative studies. Palliat Med. SAGE Publications Ltd STM; 2019 Mar 1;33(3):274–290.

24. Bhatt J, Walton H, Stoner CR, Scior K, Charlesworth G. The nature of decision-making in people living with dementia: a systematic review. Aging & Mental Health. Routledge; 2020 Mar 3;24(3):363–373.

25. Patients' Expectations of the Benefits and Harms of Treatments, Screening, and Tests: A Systematic Review | Nursing | JAMA Internal Medicine | JAMA Network [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 12]. Available from: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamainternalmedicine/article-abstract/2038981

26. Brenner K, Greer JA, Jackson V, Park E, Wright E, Jacobsen J, Topping C, Jagielo A, Elyze M, Sereno I, Temel JS, El-Jawahri A. Development of a Prognostic Awareness Impact Scale for Patients with Advanced Cancer. J Palliat Med. 2022 Mar;25(3):445–454. PMID: 34637630

27. Morgan DJ, Pineles L, Owczarzak J, Magder L, Scherer L, Brown JP, Pfeiffer C, Terndrup C, Leykum L, Feldstein D, Foy A, Stevens D, Koch C, Masnick M, Weisenberg S, Korenstein D. Clinician Conceptualization of the Benefits of Treatments for Individual Patients. JAMA Network Open. 2021 Jul 21;4(7):e2119747.

28. Barry MJ, Edgman-Levitan S. Shared decision making--pinnacle of patient-centered care. N Engl J Med. 2012 Mar 1;366(9):780–781. PMID: 22375967

29. Dahm MR, Cattanach W, Williams M, Basseal JM, Gleason K, Crock C. Communication of Diagnostic Uncertainty in Primary Care and Its Impact on Patient Experience: an Integrative Systematic Review. J Gen Intern Med. 2023 Feb;38(3):738–754. PMCID: PMC9971421

30. Paladino J, Bernacki R, Neville BA, Kavanagh J, Miranda SP, Palmor M, Lakin J, Desai M, Lamas D, Sanders JJ, Gass J, Henrich N, Lipsitz S, Fromme E, Gawande AA, Block SD. Evaluating an Intervention to Improve Communication Between Oncology Clinicians and Patients With Life-Limiting Cancer: A Cluster Randomized Clinical Trial of the Serious Illness Care Program. JAMA Oncol. 2019 Jun 1;5(6):801–809. PMID: 30870556

31. Paladino J, Koritsanszky L, Nisotel L, Neville BA, Miller K, Sanders J, Benjamin E, Fromme E, Block S, Bernacki R. Patient and clinician experience of a serious illness conversation guide in oncology: A descriptive analysis. Cancer Med. 2020 May 4;9(13):4550–4560. PMCID: PMC7333843

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313315; 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.

32. Braddock CH, Edwards KA, Hasenberg NM, Laidley TL, Levinson W. Informed decision making in outpatient practice: time to get back to basics. JAMA. 1999 Dec 22;282(24):2313–2320. PMID: 10612318

33. Allen A. The real costs of the new Alzheimer's drug, Leqembi — and why taxpayers will foot much of the bill - CBS News [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Jun 12]. Available from: https://www.cbsnews.com/news/alzheimers-drug-leqembi-cost-patients-taxpayers/

34. Leqembi and Alzheimer's: What to Know About the New Drug, Treatment and Benefits - The New York Times [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 12]. Available from: https://www.nytimes.com/2024/06/10/well/mind/alzheimers-treatment-leqembi.html

35. J, o, n, H, a, m, i, l, t, o, n. An experimental Alzheimer's drug outperforms one just approved by the FDA. NPR [Internet]. 2023 Jul 17 [cited 2024 Jun 12]; Available from: https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2023/07/17/1188075646/donanemab-experimental-alzheimers-drug-outperforms-lecanemab-leqembi

36. Schwartz LM, Woloshin S. Medical Marketing in the United States, 1997-2016. JAMA. 2019 Jan 1;321(1):80–96.

37. O'Donoghue AC, Johnson M, Sullivan HW, Parvanta S, Ray S, Southwell BG. Aging and Direct-to-Consumer Prescription Drug Television Ads: The Effects of Individual Differences and Risk Presentation. Journal of Health Communication. Taylor & Francis; 2019 Apr 3;24(4):368–376.

38. Robb KA, Simon AE, Miles A, Wardle J. Public perceptions of cancer: a qualitative study of the balance of positive and negative beliefs. BMJ Open. 2014 Jul 10;4(7):e005434. PMCID: PMC4120326

39. Garrett SB, Matthews TM, Abramson CM, Koenig CJ, Hlubocky FJ, Daugherty CK, Munster PN, Dohan D. Before Consent: Qualitative Analysis of Deliberations of Patients With Advanced Cancer About Early-Phase Clinical Trials. JCO Oncol Pract. 2020 Jan;16(1):e56–e63. PMCID: PMC6993554

40. Shickh S, Leventakos K, Lewis MA, Bombard Y, Montori VM. Shared Decision Making in the Care of Patients With Cancer. Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book. Wolters Kluwer; 2023 Jun;(43):e389516.

41. Henrikson NB, Shankaran V. Improving Price Transparency in Cancer Care. J Oncol Pract. 2016 Jan;12(1):44–47. PMID: 26759467

42. Boyd ND, Naasan G, Harrison KL, Garrett SB, D'Aguiar Rosa T, Pérez-Cerpa B, McFarlane S, Miller BL, Ritchie CS. Characteristics of people with dementia lost to follow-up from a dementia care center. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry. 2022 Jan;37(1). PMCID: PMC8740544

Supplement

Appendix 1 COREQ checklist
Appendix 2 Master coded thematic statements

Figure 1 Major Themes, Subthemes and Implications Identified in People with AD Undergoing Evaluation for Lecanemab Treatment

Major Themes	Subthemes	Implications
People with dementia sought and obtained information from different sources	▪ Advocacy organizations, the Internet and the media as resources for self-study ▪ Variably detailed information from clinicians ▪ Motivating interactions with treated patients and informed family members	Incorporate messaging approaches and channels outside the clinical encounter and healthcare system.
Hopes, expected benefits, and the existential threat of dementia driving willingness and readiness to start anti-amyloid mAbs.	▪ Stalling, reversal or cure of cognitive decline ▪ Optimism drawn from mechanism of action and novelty compared to non-pharmacologic options ▪ Stopgap until more effective therapy ▪ Motivated by desire to buy time for enjoyable activities, preserve independence, and do "something" vs nothing	Apply communication skills that balance validating the importance of hope with accurate portrayal of personalized risks and benefits.
Individual traits and preferences, family factors, and degree of trust in expertise influence how people with dementia balance risks and benefits.	▪ Impact of personality ▪ Perceived inevitability of decline ▪ Weighing side effects, costs and logistical burdens ▪ Importance of supportive families ▪ Trust in expertise ▪ Family and physicians as sources of pressure ▪ Making calculated risks and conscious tradeoffs ▪ Sense of urgency to decide ▪ Autonomy	Adapt communication training that acknowledges and builds upon strong emotions. Capitalize on patient-identified parallels with oncology and consider adapting oncology models of care.