Lifetime risk of incident dementia and incident mild cognitive impairment in older Black and White adults

Lianlian Du, PhD[1,2], Lei Yu, PhD[1,2], Tianhao Wang, PhD[1,2], Patricia A. Boyle, PhD[1,3], Lisa L. Barnes, PhD[1,2,3], David X. Marquez, PhD[1,4], David A. Bennett, MD[1,2]

[1]Rush Alzheimer's Disease Center, Rush University Medical Center; Chicago, IL, USA

[2]Department of Neurological Sciences, Rush University Medical Center; Chicago, IL, USA

[3]Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, IL, USA

[4]Department of Kinesiology and Nutrition, University of Illinois Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

Correspondence to: Lianlian Du

Rush Alzheimer's Disease Center

1750 W Harrison Street, Suite 1000

Chicago, IL 60612

Email: lianlian_du@rush.edu

Running head: Lifetime risk of dementia and mild cognitive impairment

ABSTRACT

Background and Objectives

Estimating the lifetime risk of dementia and mild cognitive impairment (MCI) is critical for understanding population burden and informing prevention strategies. This study aimed to estimate the lifetime risk of incident dementia and MCI from age 55 to 105, accounting for competing risk of death and delayed study entry, and to examine differences by sex, race, and Latino ethnicity.

Methods

We analyzed data from five harmonized community-based cohort studies at the Rush Alzheimer's Disease Center, including 4,611 older adults (mean age 76.6 years) for dementia risk estimation and 3,915 for MCI. Diagnoses were based on annual clinical evaluations. Lifetime risk was estimated using nonparametric cumulative incidence function curves with age as the time scale, adjusting for left truncation and competing risk of death. Analyses were stratified by sex and race, with exploratory analyses by Latino ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and vascular morbidity. Cox models were used to evaluate baseline risk factor associations.

Results

The lifetime risk of incident dementia from age 55 was 43% (95% CI: 38–47%), with a median diagnosis age of 88 years (IQR: 83–92). For MCI, the risk was 62% (95% CI: 57–67%), with a median diagnosis age of 86 (IQR: 80–90). Females had higher lifetime risks than males for both dementia (45% vs. 39%) and MCI (63% vs. 60%). Racial differences were modest: dementia risk was 45% in Black participants vs. 44% in White participants; Black participants had higher MCI risk through age 95 (41% vs 39%). Latino participants showed higher lifetime risks for both outcomes, these results warrant further replications due to small sample size and younger baseline ages. Stroke history was the strongest baseline predictor of elevated lifetime risk.

Discussion

These findings provide detailed age-stratified lifetime risk estimates for dementia and MCI in a well-characterized, predominantly Black and White U.S. cohort, extending beyond age 90. By incorporating competing risks and delayed entry, this study offers robust estimates that can inform individualized risk communication and support population-level cognitive aging planning. Exploratory analyses highlight the need for continued enrollment and follow-up of Latino participants to improve equity in risk prediction.

INTRODUCTION

Dementia is a growing public health crisis, affecting over 7 million Americans and projected to reach about 14 million by 2060.[1,2] Among those aged 90–95, it contributes to over 40% of females and 30% of males deaths.[3] The financial impact is severe, with healthcare, long-term care and unpaid caregiving costs projected to exceed $700 billion in 2024.[2] Mild cognitive impairment (MCI) an intermediate clinical stage associated with elevated risks of dementia and mortality, affects more than 12 million individuals in the United States as of 2020 and is expected to increase to 22 million by 2060.[1] Prevalence increases with age, from 7% at 60–64 to 25% at 80–84.[4] Since no cure exists for dementia, prevention is critical.[5]

Lifetime dementia risk is a critical public health metric that informs policy, supports stakeholder engagement (e.g., American Heart Association, Alzheimer's Association), and helps estimate the potential benefits of early interventions.[6–8] However, accurate estimation is methodologically challenging due to competing mortality and left truncation from variable age at study entry. In prior work, we found that individuals diagnosed after age 85 survived less than three years on average,[9] highlighting the need for short-interval assessments in the oldest old to capture incident cases. Standard methods such as the Kaplan-Meier estimator overestimate risk by ignoring competing events, particularly problematic in late-life diseases like dementia.[10] Proper estimation must therefore incorporate both competing risks and delayed entry.[11] Given known sex, racial, and ethnic disparities in dementia risk, subgroup-specific lifetime risk estimates are essential.[6,7,12] Prior research has made significant advances in documenting the risk and burden of cognitive impairment.[7,13–16] A recent study using a subset of these data predicted dynamic lifetime risk of Alzheimer's disease using longitudinal cognitive assessment data.[17] However, few studies include large numbers of individuals age 90+, most studies focus on non-Latino White populations,[12] and only one to date has estimated lifetime risk for MCI.[13] As cognitive impairment grows more prevalent in an aging, tech-dependent society,[18] efforts to refine and extend lifetime risk estimates are increasingly urgent.

Here, we used harmonized longitudinal data from five Rush Alzheimer's Disease Center (RADC) cohorts to estimate lifetime risks of dementia and MCI. We further examined differences by sex and race to characterize disparities in risk across aging populations.

METHODS

Participants

We used data from five harmonized longitudinal cohort studies at the RADC: Religious Orders Study (ROS)[19], Rush Memory and Aging Project (MAP),[19] Minority Aging Research Study (MARS),[20] African American Clinical Core (AACORE)[21] and the Latino CORE (LATC).[22] All participants were community-dwelling older adults without known dementia at enrollment and agreed to annual clinical evaluations with high retention (withdrawal rate <10%). These studies share similar protocols for design and data collection, as outlined previously.[22] For lifetime dementia risk estimation, we excluded participants with dementia at baseline (n = 281), without follow-up data (n = 248), including those not yet eligible for an annual evaluation at of 2025 January, those who died, or those who declined further clinical participation, and those younger than age 55 at baseline (n = 8) to support left truncation. To ensure diagnostic consistency, we further excluded 194 deceased participants whose last visit was > 3 years before death (see *Dementia and MCI Ascertainment*), resulting in an analytic sample of 4611. For lifetime MCI risk estimation, we additionally excluded participants with MCI at baseline (n=696), yielding a final sample of 3915. See eFigure 1 (STROBE flow diagram) for details. No imputation was performed for missing cognitive outcomes. Our primary analysis used the Aalen–Johansen estimator with pseudo-observations, which is robust to independent censoring.

Standard Protocol Approvals, Registrations, and Patient Consents

All participants provided written informed consent; individual studies were approved by an institutional review board at Rush University Medical Center.

Dementia and MCI ascertainment

All five RADC cohorts follow a standardized diagnostic protocol.[22,23] At baseline and annual follow-ups, participants undergo a structured evaluation including medical history, neurological examination, and

neuropsychological testing. Diagnoses are determined via a validated three-step process and validated across numerous RADC studies.[23–25] Dementia diagnoses follow NINCDS/ADRDA criteria.[26] MCI is defined as cognitive impairment per neuropsychologist review without meeting dementia criteria. Importantly, clinicians were masked to prior diagnoses during evaluations.

Dementia was treated as an absorbing state, with onset defined as the first diagnosis. MCI onset was defined as the first diagnosis followed by a second MCI diagnosis, dementia, or death within three years. Those transitioning from MCI to death had cognitive scores comparable to those remaining with MCI, supporting their inclusion (see Supplementary eFigure 2).

Demographic characteristics

All participants self-report their sex (male or female), date of birth, and years of education. Age is calculated based on the time between the reported birth date and the date of clinical assessment. Race (e.g., African American/Black) and ethnicity (e.g., Latino/Hispanic: yes or no) are reported following the 1990 U.S. Census format.

Details on the construction of comorbidity and socioeconomic variables (SES) are provided in Supplementary eMethods.

Statistical Analysis

We examined baseline characteristics and dementia/MCI incidence. Group differences by sex and race were assessed using chi-squared, Fisher’s exact, ANOVA, or Kruskal-Wallis tests, as appropriate.

We estimated lifetime risk of dementia and MCI from ages 55–105 using non-parametric cumulative incidence function curves, accounting for competing risks to avoid overestimation.

While the Fine-Gray model is commonly used for competing risks, its proportional hazards assumption and limited flexibility under left truncation made it less suitable here. Given the cohort's older baseline age, we

used age as the time scale and applied left truncation, implementing a generalized linear model with pseudo-observations derived from the Aalen–Johansen estimator. This approach produces interpretable, model-free estimates of absolute risk, even in the presence of delayed entry and independent censoring.[11] Although pseudo-observation methods may yield wider confidence intervals, particularly in smaller subgroups, they offer conservative and robust estimates.

We defined two competing events ϵ_i: where $\epsilon = 1$ is the diagnosis of interest (dementia or MCI) and $\epsilon = 2$ is the competing event (death without diagnosis). Using age as the time scale, we defined L as the entry age, T as the age at failure, C as the age at censoring, and an indicator $\delta = I(T < C)$. We considered an index age τ_0 such that $L \geq \tau_0$. The observed data for each individual $i(i = 1, \ \ldots, \ n)$ consisted of $(L_i, X_i, \delta_i \cdot \epsilon_i, \boldsymbol{Z}_i)$, where we observe $X = T \wedge C$ represents the age at diagnosis, death without diagnosis, or censoring, and $\boldsymbol{Z}$ denotes a matrix of covariates (e.g., sex). Lifetime risk was estimated as the cumulative incidence from index age τ_0 (e.g., 55 years) to an advanced age τ (e.g., 105 years):

$$F_1\,(\tau \mid T > \tau_0) \ = p(T \leq \tau, \epsilon = 1 | T > \tau_0) = \ \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau} S(t|t > \tau_0)\alpha_1(t)dt$$

where $\alpha_1(t)$ is the cause-specific hazard function for event 1, , and $S(t|t > \tau_0) = \exp(-\int_{\tau_0}^{\tau} A(u)du)$ is the overall survival function where $A(t)$ is the cumulative all-cause hazard function. Age 55 was the index age. Person-time was counted until dementia/MCI diagnosis, death, age 105, or administrative censoring (Jan 2025).

In secondary analyses, we estimated lifetime risk using cumulative incidence function curves with index ages at 65, 75, and 85. Among individuals with incident dementia, we calculated the median age at diagnosis and the proportion diagnosed between ages 55–74, 75–84, 85–95, and 95–105. We repeated the analysis for MCI, and then stratified by sex and race. Exploratory subgroup analyses are described in Supplementary eMethods.

All analyses were conducted using R (version 4.4.1), with statistical significance determined at α=0.05.

Data Availability

Data used for this study can be requested for research purposes via the Rush Alzheimer's Disease Center Research Resource Sharing Hub at https://www.radc.rush.edu/.

RESULTS

Baseline Characteristics and Incidence of Dementia and MCI

Baseline characteristics of participants in the dementia (n = 4611) and MCI (n = 3915) lifetime risk sets are in Table 1. Across both groups, ~75% were female, ~27% Black, and ~6% Latino among White and ~2% among Black participants. Age distributions (55–64, 65–74, 75–84, 85+) were 206, 1799, 1904, and 702 for dementia; 190, 1649, 1573, and 503 for MCI. Subgroup comparisons are shown in Table 1 and Supplementary eTables 1–2. Baseline age was similar by sex but ~5 years younger in Black adults.

In the dementia set, over a mean follow-up of 9 years (range: 1–29 years), there were 1278 incident dementia cases, 1461 deaths without dementia, and 1872 individuals alive and dementia-free at last visit. The total numbers of participants aged 55–74, 75–84, 85–94, and 95–105 years were 544, 1692, 1986, and 389. The distributions of the three outcomes: censor (alive and dementia-free), event (incident dementia), and competing risk (death without dementia) across different age groups are presented in eFigure 3A, and stratified by sex and race in eFigures 3B and 3C. Dementia incidence was higher in White than Black participants (31.3% vs. 21.2%; $p < 0.001$), and similar across sex (27.7% vs. 27.6%). Conversely, death without dementia was more common in White individuals (36.2% vs. 23.7%; $p < 0.001$) and males (39.9% vs. 28.9%; $p < 0.001$). Black participants died ~6 years earlier than White participants (82 vs. 88).

In the MCI set, 1520 participants developed MCI, 820 died without MCI, and 1575 remained MCI-free. The total numbers of participants aged 55–74, 75–84, 85–94, and 95–105 years were 567, 1584, 1541, and 223, respectively. The distributions of the three outcomes (alive and MCI-free, incident MCI, and death without MCI) across these age groups are presented in eFigure 4A. Stratified distributions by sex and race are shown in eFigures 4B and 4C, respectively. Incidence was higher among White participants (43.5% vs. 30.2%; $p < 0.001$), and similar by sex (40.9% in males vs. 38.2% in females). Death without MCI was more common in White participants (23.7% vs. 16.7%; $p < 0.001$) and male participants (26.3% vs. 19.2%; $p < 0.001$). As with dementia, Black adults died ~6 years earlier (81 vs. 87).

Overall Results

Lifetime Risk of Dementia

From age 55 to 105, the lifetime risk of incident dementia was 43% (95% CI: 38–47) (Figure 1A). The risk remained low until age 75 (6%), then increased sharply. Interestingly, the increase slows and plateaus at 39% after age 95 and only increases to 43% over the next decade. The cumulative incidence of dementia at each year of age is shown in eTable 3. Median age at diagnosis was 88 (IQR: 83–92) (Table 2). Notably, 83% of cases were diagnosed between ages 75-95, with 53% occurring between ages 85 and 95.

Lifetime risk was related to index ages (Table 3). Among participants who are alive and dementia-free, it rose from 43% among persons starting at age 55 to 48% among those starting at age 75. However, it was 45% among those starting at 85, likely due to a smaller sample size and shorter life expectancy, as suggested by the wider confidence interval.

Between ages 55 and 105, the overall cumulative incidence of death without dementia was 57% (95% CI: 53–62), as shown in Figure 1A. In parallel with the incidence of dementia, risk of death also plateaued at 51% at age 95 increasing to only 57% over the next decade. The cumulative risks of death at each year of age are provided in eTable 4.

Lifetime Risk of MCI

Lifetime MCI risk from age 55 to 105 was 62% (95% CI: 57–67), ~20% higher than dementia risk (Figure 1B). The cumulative incidence of MCI increased rapidly after age 65, roughly 10 years earlier than for dementia. In parallel with dementia, the increase slows and plateaus at 58% after age 95 and only increases to 62% over the next decade. Corresponding cumulative incidence estimates across ages are provided in eTable 3. Median age at diagnosis was 86 (IQR: 80–90), about two years younger than the median age at dementia diagnosis (Table 2). 84% of MCI cases were diagnosed between ages 75-95, with 46% occurring between ages 85-95.

MCI risk rose from 62% (index age 55) to 69% (age 75), and declined to 64% at age 85 (Table 3), likely reflecting smaller sample sizes and shorter life expectancy, as indicated by wider confidence intervals.

The overall cumulative incidence of death without MCI between ages 55 and 95 was 35% increasing to only 38% (95% CI: 33–43) at age 105 (Figure 1B). Age-specific cumulative incidence estimates corresponding to this figure are detailed in eTable 4.

Sex Differences in Lifetime Risk

Lifetime Risk of Dementia by Sex

Females had a higher lifetime risk of dementia than males (45% vs. 39%) (Figure 2A), with detailed estimates provided in eTable 3. Most of the differences were seen after age 90. The increasing risk of dementia attenuated after age 95 for both males and females. The median age at diagnosis was approximately two years later in females compared to males (88 vs. 86, $p < 0.01$; Table 2). While most dementia diagnoses occurred after age 75 in both sexes, a greater proportion of females were diagnosed between ages 85 and 105 (67% vs. 59%), whereas males had a higher proportion of diagnoses between ages 75 and 84 (37% vs 28%).

Lifetime risk increased from 45% in females and 39% in males if estimates started at age 55 to 49% and 48%, respectively, if started at age 75, but it lowered slightly to 46% in females and 44% in males if started at age 85, likely due to smaller sample sizes and shorter life expectancy, as indicated by wider confidence intervals (Table 3). A notable sex difference was observed at age 65, with lifetime risk at 49% in females and 38% in males.

The cumulative incidence of death without dementia from age 55 to 105 was higher in males than in females (61% vs. 55%) with the differences starting at about age 80 (Figure 2A; eTable 4).

Lifetime Risk of MCI by Sex

The lifetime risk of MCI was higher in females than males through age 105 (63% vs. 60%) (Figure 2B; eTable 3), with most differences emerging after age 90. MCI risk plateaued after age 95 for both males and females. Like dementia, females were diagnosed with MCI approximately two years later than males (median age: 86 vs. 84 years, $p < 0.05$; Table 2). Most MCI cases occurred after age 75 in both sexes, with a higher proportion of diagnoses between ages 85 and 105 in females (54% vs. 47%), and between ages 75 and 84 in males (44% vs 35%).

Lifetime MCI risk increased from 63% for females, 60% for males among persons starting at 55 to 70% for females, and 67% for males among those starting at age 75 (Table 3). However, it was 64% for females, 62% for males among those starting at 85, likely due to a smaller sample size and shorter life expectancy, as suggested by the wider confidence intervals.

The cumulative incidence of death without MCI from age 55 to 105 was higher in males than in females (40% vs. 37%) (Figure 2B and eTable 4).

Racial Differences in Lifetime Risk

Lifetime Risk of Dementia by Race

Starting at age 55, the lifetime risk of dementia through age 105 was slightly higher in Black than White participants (45% vs. 44%). However, confidence intervals for these estimates overlapped, and the difference should be interpreted with caution given reduced precision in smaller subgroups. Additionally, projections for Black adults extended only to age 100 due to their younger baseline ages and ages at death (Figure 3A; eTable 3). Dementia was diagnosed approximately five years earlier in Black individuals compared to White individuals (median age: 84 vs. 89 years, $p < 0.001$; Table 2). A greater proportion of dementia cases in Black adults occurred before age 75 (11% vs. 3%) and between ages 75 and 84 (44% vs. 26%), compared to White participants.

Lifetime risk increased from 44% in White adults and 45% in Black adults among persons aged 55 to 48% and 50%, respectively, among those age 75 (Table 3). Among those age 85, it declined to 46% in White adults and 35% in Black adults, likely reflecting smaller sample sizes and shorter life expectancy, as suggested by wider confidence intervals.

Black individuals had a higher cumulative incidence of death without dementia before age 85 (from ages 55 to 85, 33% vs. 29%; Figure 3A; eTable 4) with the differences starting at about age 70. However, at older ages, racial differences diminished with a modest cross-over at about age 95 driven by females, a phenomenon reported previously.[27]

Lifetime Risk of MCI by Race

Starting at index age 55, Black adults had a higher lifetime risk of MCI beginning around age 65, but a lower risk after age 95 compared to White adults. From ages 55 to 75, the risk was 16% in Black participants versus 10% in White participants, and from ages 55 to 105, 60% versus 65% (Figure 3B; eTable 3). However, confidence intervals overlapped across much of the age range, and subgroup comparisons, especially among the oldest-old, should be interpreted with caution. Projections for Black participants extended only to age 100 due to younger baseline ages and shorter life expectancy, and the wider confidence intervals at older ages reflect reduced precision in this subgroup. MCI diagnosis occurred approximately six years earlier in Black than in White participants (median age: 81 vs. 87 years, $p < 0.001$; Table 2). A greater proportion of MCI diagnoses in Black participants occurred before age 75 (22% vs. 5%) and between ages 75 and 84 (49% vs. 34%).

Lifetime MCI risk rose from 65% in White adults and 60% in Black adults among persons starting at 55 to 68% and 69%, respectively, among those starting at 75(Table 3). However, it was 65% for White adults, 52% for White adults among those starting at 85, likely due to a smaller sample size and shorter life expectancy, as indicated by the wider confidence interval.

Death without MCI was more frequent in Black adults, with a cumulative incidence through age 105 of 39% compared to 35% in White adults (Figure 3B and eTable 4); differences became apparent beginning around age 65.

Supplementary eResults show lifetime risk estimates by SES, comorbidities, and Latino ethnicity. Stroke history was significantly associated with both outcomes (eTable 5). Latino participants had higher lifetime risk estimates, but small sample sizes and younger baseline age limit interpretation (eTables 6–7, eFigures 5–6).

DISCUSSION

This study provides estimates of the lifetime risk of dementia and MCI from age 55 to 105, using high-quality data from five harmonized longitudinal cohorts. By incorporating competing risk and left truncation methods, our findings build upon previous estimates. In the absence of effective public health strategies, our findings suggest that nearly half of older adults will develop dementia, while close to 2/3rds will develop MCI during their lifetime, with notable differences across sex and race. Actual numbers may be lower as some evidence suggests a slight decline in age-specific dementia prevalence over the past four decades,[28] likely reflecting improvements in education, cardiovascular health, and lifestyle. However, rising life expectancy and persistent racial differences in healthcare access may offset these gains.[29] While the figures suggest that dementia incidence plateaus in the oldest old, the analytic approach precludes drawing this inference. Prior studies reported that dementia incidence increases with age but may peak and decline among the extremely old,[30] or rise at a slower rate beyond age 85.[31] Our earlier work showed AD pathology peaked around age 95 and leveled off thereafter,[32] though findings across cohorts remain inconsistent.[33–35]

Lifetime Risk Compared with Previous Studies and Clinical Implications

Our most striking finding is the high lifetime burden of MCI, which begins to rise as early as age 65, nearly a decade before dementia onset. This underscores a large window for intervention and the urgency of prioritizing MCI as a target for early detection and prevention strategies. In clinical settings, these findings reinforce the importance of systematic cognitive surveillance in midlife or early older adulthood. From a public health perspective, the magnitude of MCI risk, affecting over half of the population by age 105, suggests a growing need for resource allocation toward early detection infrastructure and community-based cognitive health programs. This is the first study, to our knowledge, to estimate cumulative MCI risk from age 55 to 105 while accounting for competing mortality and left truncation, offering novel insights into the timing and scale of MCI burden in aging populations. A previous study using Health and Retirement Study (HRS) data reported higher MCI lifetime risk,[13] likely due to broader diagnostic criteria and younger sample ages. By

contrast, our use of a more conservative definition, requiring two consecutive assessments, likely reduced misclassification but shifted onset estimates later and yielded more conservative risk estimates.

These results have several clinical and translational implications. Individuals with persistent MCI may represent ideal targets for preventive trials and interventions. Groups at elevated risk of early-onset or prolonged MCI, such as female, individuals with stroke history, and Black adults, may benefit from more intensive monitoring. The extended pre-dementia phase observed here highlights the importance of timely detection to support care planning and lifestyle interventions. Recent guidelines encourage brief cognitive assessments in primary care, especially for underserved and high-risk populations.[36] Implementation studies have shown that identifying MCI early improves management of reversible contributors, reduces fall risk and hospitalizations, and facilitates access to support services.[37] Nonetheless, over 90% of older adults with MCI remain undiagnosed, with lower recognition rates among Black and low-income individuals,[2] reflecting a significant gap in care delivery.

In addition to MCI, we observed a high lifetime risk of dementia, especially between ages 75 and 95. The risk increased progressively with older index ages (65 and 75), further supporting the importance of long-term cognitive follow-up in aging populations. Compared to prior estimates, our dementia risk was similar or higher,[7,12,13,15,17,38] which may reflect differences in population age distribution, diagnostic methods, follow-up frequency, or analytic methods. For instance, our findings build on those from the ARIC study[12] by estimating risk beyond age 95 and reveal slightly higher risk prior to age 84. Compared to the HRS,[13] our dementia estimates were higher but had later onset. These contrasts emphasize the importance of consistent longitudinal tracking and harmonized diagnosis in producing comparable estimates across cohorts.

Sex Differences in Lifetime Risk

Sex-specific analyses revealed no clear differences in incidence of dementia or MCI, but females exhibited a higher overall lifetime risk of both outcomes, largely driven by higher mortality among males prior to dementia and MCI onset. This pattern aligns with multiple prior studies, including ARIC (48% vs. 35%),[12]

Framingham Heart Study[7,15] (23% vs. 14%), HRS (37% vs. 24%),[13] and a biomarker-based study (27% vs. 21% at age 75).[16] Our lifetime estimates were similar to ARIC and generally higher than others, which may reflect differences in population age structures, follow-up duration, mortality rates, and diagnostic approaches. By using conservative clinical criteria and accounting for both competing risks and left truncation, we provide more refined sex-specific lifetime risk estimates.

This elevated burden likely reflects women's longer life expectancy, but survival alone may not fully account for these differences. Female generally show better performance on verbal and global cognitive tasks at baseline, suggestive of higher reserve, but several studies have found that they decline faster in global cognition and executive function.[39] Biological contributors, including greater tau pathology, higher white matter burden, and hormonal changes, may heighten female's vulnerability once cognitive decline begins.[40,41] Social and structural factors, like caregiving roles, depression, lower early-life educational quality, and delayed recognition of symptoms, may also contribute.[42,43] Importantly, recent studies suggest that age, *APOE* ε4, and vascular risk factors may exert differential effects by sex.[44] Growing evidence of more aggressive tau pathology in female[45] further supports the need for sex-stratified approaches in aging and dementia research.

Racial Differences in Lifetime Risk

Racial disparities in lifetime dementia and MCI risk were observed. Black participants had a higher risk of both dementia and MCI before age 85, but a lower risk of MCI after age 95, likely due to selective survival. These patterns may reflect younger baseline ages, higher competing mortality, and the possibility that long-lived Black participants constitute a particularly resilient subgroup. While our findings are consistent with the ARIC study,[12] the magnitude of racial differences was smaller after adjusting for left truncation. Prior studies, particularly those with a sample restricted to survivors to age 90, reported wider disparities but were potentially biased by survival conditioning.[35]

Beyond survival dynamics, racial disparities in cognitive aging may be influenced by higher rates of vascular/metabolic conditions, reduced healthcare access, chronic stress, and socioeconomic factors.[46,47] Our

results extend earlier studies [1,13,18,38] that primarily focused on prevalence or relative risk without considering competing risks. While barriers to care and biomarker differences likely contribute to these disparities,[50] our results emphasize the need for life-course, context-sensitive approaches. Future research should include larger, more diverse samples with harmonized data to better address racial disparities in lifetime dementia and MCI risk, particularly in the oldest-old.

Our exploratory findings show that Latino participants had higher lifetime risk estimates for dementia and MCI compared to non-Latino participants. However, these estimates require further validation due to the smaller sample sizes. We also observed that participants with a history of stroke had higher risk and earlier onset of both dementia and MCI. These findings point to the need for tailored dementia prevention and monitoring strategies.

Strengths and Limitations

This study has several strengths. We used data from five large, harmonized cohorts of older adults without known dementia at baseline, followed annually for up to 29 years. Annual evaluations allowed detection of rapidly progressive cases that might be missed in studies with longer follow-up intervals. Our follow-up rates were high, with over 90% retention of survivors and minimal attrition. The use of consistent clinical diagnostic protocols across cohorts enhances comparability. Our conservative MCI definition likely reduced misclassification, increasing diagnostic specificity. Our analytic strategy accounted for both delayed entry and competing risks using pseudo-observations derived from the Aalen–Johansen estimator. This nonparametric approach avoids strong assumptions and yields interpretable estimates of absolute risk. While confidence intervals may be wider, particularly in small subgroups or advanced age ranges, this reflects methodological rigor rather than imprecision. Nevertheless, subgroup differences should be interpreted cautiously when intervals overlap. Despite these strengths, limitations exist. Our sample was primarily Black and White, urban-dwelling, and relatively well-educated, with limited Latino and no Asian American representation, potentially limiting generalizability. Missing data were not imputed, although the high retention and

robustness of our methods mitigate potential bias. Inverse probability weighting could further reduce informative censoring but is not readily implemented within the pseudo-observation framework. Genetic and cohort effects (e.g., *APOE* genotype, secular trends) were not examined here, though separate analyses are underway. Finally, observed plateaus in risk after age 95 should be interpreted cautiously and warrant further investigation using flexible modeling approaches such as splines.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to the study participants and their families. They also thank the investigators and staff at the Rush Alzheimer's Disease Center.

STUDY FUNDING

This study is funded by National Institute on Aging Grants P30AG10161, P30AG72975, R01AG15819, R01AG34374, and R01AG022018.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

DAB, LY and LD contributed to the conception and design of the study; LD contributed to the acquisition and analysis of data; LD, DAB and LY contributed to the drafting of the text and preparation of figures and tables; all authors contributed to critical revision of the manuscript.

DISCLOSURE

The authors report no relevant disclosures. Go to Neurology.org/N for full disclosures.

REFERENCES

1. Rajan KB, Weuve J, Barnes LL, McAninch EA, Wilson RS, Evans DA. Population estimate of people with clinical Alzheimer's disease and mild cognitive impairment in the United States (2020-2060). Alzheimers Dement. 2021;17:1966–1975.

2. 2025 Alzheimer's disease facts and figures. Alzheimers Dement. 2025;21:e70235.

3. Klijs B, Mitratza M, Harteloh PP, et al. Estimating the lifetime risk of dementia using nationwide individually linked cause-of-death and health register data. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2021;50:809–816.

4. Petersen RC, Lopez O, Armstrong MJ, et al. Practice guideline update summary: Mild cognitive impairment: Report of the Guideline Development, Dissemination, and Implementation Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Neurology. 2018;90:126–135.

5. Hampel H, Au R, Mattke S, et al. Designing the next-generation clinical care pathway for Alzheimer's disease. Nat Aging. Nature Publishing Group; 2022;2:692–703.

6. 2024 Alzheimer's disease facts and figures. Alzheimers Dement. United States; 2024;20:3708–3821.

7. Seshadri S, Wolf PA. Lifetime risk of stroke and dementia: current concepts, and estimates from the Framingham Study. Lancet Neurol. 2007;6:1106–1114.

8. Licher S, Darweesh SKL, Wolters FJ, et al. Lifetime risk of common neurological diseases in the elderly population. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2019;90:148–156.

9. James BD, Leurgans SE, Hebert LE, Scherr PA, Yaffe K, Bennett DA. Contribution of Alzheimer disease to mortality in the United States. Neurology. 2014;82:1045–1050.

10. Hu J, Pike JR, Lutsey PL, et al. Age of Diabetes Diagnosis and Lifetime Risk of Dementia: The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) Study. Diabetes Care. 2024;47:1576–1583.

11. Conner SC, Beiser A, Benjamin EJ, LaValley MP, Larson MG, Trinquart L. A comparison of statistical methods to predict the residual lifetime risk. Eur J Epidemiol. 2022;37:173–194.

12. Fang M, Hu J, Weiss J, et al. Lifetime risk and projected burden of dementia. Nat Med. Nature Publishing Group; Epub 2025 Jan 13.:1–5.

13. Hale JM, Schneider DC, Mehta NK, Myrskylä M. Cognitive impairment in the U.S.: Lifetime risk, age at onset, and years impaired. SSM - Population Health. 2020;11:100577.

14. Seshadri S, Wolf PA, Beiser A, et al. Lifetime risk of dementia and Alzheimer's disease. The impact of mortality on risk estimates in the Framingham Study. Neurology. 1997;49:1498–1504.

15. Chêne G, Beiser A, Au R, et al. Gender and incidence of dementia in the Framingham Heart Study from mid-adult life. Alzheimers Dement. 2015;11:310–320.

16. Brookmeyer R, Abdalla N. Estimation of lifetime risks of Alzheimer's disease dementia using biomarkers for preclinical disease. Alzheimers Dement. 2018;14:981–988.

17. Ding H, Ye Z, Paschalidis A, Bennett DA, Au R, Lin H. Dynamic lifetime risk prediction of Alzheimer's disease with longitudinal cognitive assessment measurements. Alzheimer's & Dementia. 2025;21:e70055.

18. Wolff J. How Is Technology Changing the World, and How Should the World Change Technology? Global Perspectives. 2021;2:27353.

19. Bennett DA, Buchman AS, Boyle PA, Barnes LL, Wilson RS, Schneider JA. Religious Orders Study and Rush Memory and Aging Project. J Alzheimers Dis. 2018;64:S161–S189.

20. Barnes LL, Shah RC, Aggarwal NT, Bennett DA, Schneider JA. The Minority Aging Research Study: Ongoing Efforts to Obtain Brain Donation in African Americans without Dementia. Curr Alzheimer Res. 2012;9:734–745.

21. Schneider JA, Aggarwal NT, Barnes L, Boyle P, Bennett DA. The neuropathology of older persons with and without dementia from community versus clinic cohorts. J Alzheimers Dis. 2009;18:691–701.

22. Marquez DX, Glover CM, Lamar M, et al. Representation of Older Latinxs in Cohort Studies at the Rush Alzheimer's Disease Center. Neuroepidemiology. 2020;54:404–418.

23. Bennett DA, Schneider JA, Aggarwal NT, et al. Decision rules guiding the clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease in two community-based cohort studies compared to standard practice in a clinic-based cohort study. Neuroepidemiology. 2006;27:169–176.

24. Bennett DA, Wilson RS, Schneider JA, et al. Natural history of mild cognitive impairment in older persons. Neurology. 2002;59:198–205.

25. Bennett DA, Schneider JA, Arvanitakis Z, et al. Neuropathology of older persons without cognitive impairment from two community-based studies. Neurology. 2006;66:1837–1844.

26. McKhann G, Drachman D, Folstein M, Katzman R, Price D, Stadlan EM. Clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: report of the NINCDS-ADRDA Work Group under the auspices of Department of Health and Human Services Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease. Neurology. 1984;34:939–944.

27. Johnson NE. The racial crossover in comorbidity, disability, and mortality. Demography. 2000;37:267–283.

28. Stallard PJE, Ukraintseva SV, Doraiswamy PM. Changing Story of the Dementia Epidemic. JAMA [online serial]. Epub 2025 Mar 12. Accessed at: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2831385.

29. Span P. Dementia May Not Always Be the Threat It Is Now. Here's Why. The New York Times [online]. 2025. Accessed at: https://www.nytimes.com/2025/03/22/health/dementia-rates-elderly.html.

30. Miech RA, Breitner JCS, Zandi PP, Khachaturian AS, Anthony JC, Mayer L. Incidence of AD may decline in the early 90s for men, later for women: The Cache County study. Neurology. 2002;58:209–218.

31. Hall CB, Verghese J, Sliwinski M, et al. Dementia incidence may increase more slowly after age 90: results from the Bronx Aging Study. Neurology. 2005;65:882–886.

32. Farfel JM, Yu L, Boyle PA, et al. Alzheimer's disease frequency peaks in the tenth decade and is lower afterwards. Acta Neuropathol Commun. 2019;7:104.

33. Corrada MM, Brookmeyer R, Paganini-Hill A, Berlau D, Kawas CH. Dementia Incidence Continues to Increase with Age in the Oldest Old The 90+ Study. Ann Neurol. 2010;67:114–121.

34. Lucca U, Tettamanti M, Tiraboschi P, et al. Incidence of dementia in the oldest-old and its relationship with age: The Monzino 80-plus population-based study. Alzheimer's & Dementia. 2020;16:472–481.

35. Gilsanz P, Corrada MM, Kawas C, et al. Incidence of Dementia After Age 90 in a Multiracial Cohort. Alzheimers Dement. 2019;15:497–505.

36. Mattke S, Batie D, Chodosh J, et al. Expanding the use of brief cognitive assessments to detect suspected early-stage cognitive impairment in primary care. Alzheimer's & Dementia. 2023;19:4252–4259.

37. Fowler NR, Partrick KA, Taylor J, et al. Implementing early detection of cognitive impairment in primary care to improve care for older adults. J Intern Med. 2025;298:31–45.

38. Carone M, Asgharian M, Jewell NP. Estimating the lifetime risk of dementia in the Canadian elderly population using cross-sectional cohort survival data. J Am Stat Assoc. 2014;109:24–35.

39. Rosende-Roca M, García-Gutiérrez F, Cantero-Fortiz Y, et al. Exploring sex differences in Alzheimer's disease: a comprehensive analysis of a large patient cohort from a memory unit. Alzheimer's Research & Therapy. 2025;17:27.

40. Lopez-Lee C, Torres ERS, Carling G, Gan L. Mechanisms of sex differences in Alzheimer's disease. Neuron. 2024;112:1208–1221.

41. Sindi S, Toopchiani S, Barbera M, et al. Chapter 10 - Sex and gender differences in genetic and lifestyle risk and protective factors for dementia. In: Ferretti MT, Dimech AS, Chadha AS, editors. Sex and Gender Differences in Alzheimer's Disease [online]. Academic Press; 2021. p. 269–308. Accessed at: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780128193440000132.

42. Anstey KJ, Peters R, Mortby ME, et al. Association of sex differences in dementia risk factors with sex differences in memory decline in a population-based cohort spanning 20–76 years. Scientific Reports. 2021;11:7710.

43. Brady B, Zheng L, Kootar S, Anstey KJ. Sex and gender differences in risk scores for dementia and Alzheimer's disease among cisgender, transgender, and non-binary adults. Alzheimer's & Dementia. Wiley Online Library; 2024;20:5–15.

44. Miramontes S, Pereda Serras C, Woldemariam SR, et al. Alzheimer's disease as a women's health challenge: a call for action on integrative precision medicine approaches. NPJ Womens Health. 2024;2:17.

45. Coughlan GT, Klinger HM, Boyle R, et al. Sex Differences in Longitudinal Tau-PET in Preclinical Alzheimer Disease: A Meta-Analysis. JAMA Neurology [online serial]. Epub 2025 Mar 3. Accessed at: https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaneurol.2025.0013. Accessed April 8, 2025.

46. Zahodne LB, Sharifian N, Kraal AZ, et al. Socioeconomic and psychosocial mechanisms underlying racial/ethnic disparities in cognition among older adults. Neuropsychology. 2021;35:265–275.

47. Beydoun MA, Beydoun HA, Banerjee S, Weiss J, Evans MK, Zonderman AB. Pathways explaining racial/ethnic and socio-economic disparities in incident all-cause dementia among older US adults across income groups. Transl Psychiatry. Nature Publishing Group; 2022;12:478.

48. Manly JJ, Jones RN, Langa KM, et al. Estimating the Prevalence of Dementia and Mild Cognitive Impairment in the US: The 2016 Health and Retirement Study Harmonized Cognitive Assessment Protocol Project. JAMA Neurology. 2022;79:1242–1249.

49. Chen P, Cai H, Bai W, et al. Global prevalence of mild cognitive impairment among older adults living in nursing homes: a meta-analysis and systematic review of epidemiological surveys. Transl Psychiatry. Nature Publishing Group; 2023;13:1–11.

50. Xiong C, Luo J, Wolk DA, et al. Baseline levels and longitudinal changes in plasma Aβ42/40 among Black and white individuals. Nat Commun. 2024;15:5539.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Overall Lifetime Risk of Dementia, MCI, and Death Without Diagnosis (Ages 55–105) in the Five RUSH Cohorts. Panel A: cumulative incidence of dementia (solid line) and death without dementia (dashed line) (n = 4,611).

Panel B: cumulative incidence of MCI (solid line) and death without MCI (dashed line) (n = 3,915). Estimates are percentages accounting for competing risk of death. Shaded areas show 95% confidence intervals (CIs).

Age-specific cumulative risks overall are provided in eTable 3 (dementia/MCI) and eTable 4 (death without diagnosis).

Abbreviation: MCI, Mild Cognitive Impairment.

Figure 2. Lifetime Risk of Dementia, MCI, and Death Without Diagnosis by Sex (Ages 55–105) in the Five RUSH Cohorts. Panel A: The cumulative incidence of dementia (solid lines) and death without dementia (dashed lines) is shown for female and male (colored separately). Panel B: The cumulative incidence of MCI (solid lines) and death without MCI (dashed lines) is also shown for female and male. Estimates are percentages accounting for the competing risk of death. Shaded areas show 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Age-specific cumulative risks by sex are provided in eTable 3 (dementia/MCI) and eTable 4 (death without diagnosis).

Abbreviation: MCI, Mild Cognitive Impairment.

Figure 3. Lifetime Risk of Dementia and MCI and Death without Diagnosis by Race (Ages 55–105) in the Five RUSH Cohorts. Panel A: The cumulative incidence of dementia (solid lines) and death without dementia (dashed lines) is shown for white and black (colored separately). Panel B: The cumulative incidence of MCI (solid lines) and death without MCI (dashed lines) is also shown for white and black. Estimates are percentages accounting for the competing risk of death. Shaded areas show 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Age-specific cumulative risks by race are provided in eTable 3 (dementia/MCI) and eTable 4 (death without diagnosis).

Abbreviation: MCI, Mild Cognitive Impairment.

TABLES

Table 1 Characteristics of Study Participants in Estimating Lifetime Risk of Dementia and MCI.

Characteristic	**N = 4611**	**N = 3915**
Age at baseline, years	76.59 (7.72)	75.87 (7.53)
Age at last visit, years	85.36 (7.87)	85.08 (7.92)
Follow up years	8.50 (5.76)	8.92 (5.83)
Female, n (%)	3431 (74.4)	2967 (75.8)
White, n (%)	3151 (68.4)	2661 (68.0)
Latino, n (%)	393 (8.5)	347 (8.9)
Education, years	15.77 (3.95)	15.83 (3.98)
APOE ε4 carriers, n (%)	990 (26.7)[a]	795 (25.4)[b]
Study, n (%)		
ROS	1323 (28.7)	1144 (29.2)
MAP	1962 (42.6)	1600 (40.9)
MARS	748 (16.2)	649 (16.6)
AA	341 (7.4)	309 (7.9)
LATC	237 (5.1)	213 (5.4)
Alive free of dementia/MCI, n (%)	1872 (40.6)	1575 (40.2)
Incident cases of dementia/MCI, n (%)	1278 (27.7)	1520 (38.8)
Deaths without dementia/MCI, n (%)	1461 (31.7)	820 (20.9)
Age at death	86.82 (7.34)	85.77 (7.60)
Interval between age at last and at death (median [IQR])	0.69 [0.39, 1.01]	0.69 [0.39, 1.04]

Note: Column 2 is the dataset in estimating the lifetime risk of Dementia, and column 3 is the dataset in estimating the lifetime risk of MCI. Values are mean (SD) and for the entire analytic sample unless otherwise stated.

Abbreviations: MCI, Mild Cognitive Impairment; ROS, Religious Orders Study; MAP, Memory and Aging Project; MARS, Minority Aging Research Study; AACORE, Clinical Core; LATC, Latino Core; *APOE*, Apolipoprotein E; IQR: Interquartile range

[a] Data missing for 901 participants; [b] Data missing for 790 participants.

Table 2 Median age at dementia and MCI diagnosis and distribution of diagnosis age, overall and by sex and race.

	Median age (IQR) at diagnosis, years	Percentage diagnosed between ages 55 and 74	Percentage diagnosed between ages 75 and 84	Percentage diagnosed between ages 85 and 95	Percentage diagnosed between ages 95 and 105
Dementia					
Overall	87.59 [82.65, 91.78]	5.3%	30.0%	53.2%	11.4%
Sex					
Female	87.94 [82.78, 92.37]	5.7%	27.6%	54.1%	12.6%
Male	86.45 [82.28, 90.57]	4.3%	37.1%	50.6%	8.0%
Race					
White	88.53 [84.04, 92.68]	3.0%	26.2%	57.1%	13.6%
Black	84.35 [80.01, 88.62]	10.8%	43.7%	41.4%	4.1%
MCI					
Overall	85.61 [80.12, 90.13]	9.7%	37.6%	46.1%	6.6%
Sex					
Female	85.90 [80.26, 90.45]	9.8 %	35.4%	47.4%	7.3%
Male	84.47 [79.84, 89.52]	9.3%	44.1%	42.0%	4.6%
Race					
White	86.89 [82.22, 90.90]	5.3%	34.3%	52.0%	8.4%
Black	80.55 [75.33, 85.67]	22.1%	48.8%	27.9%	1.2%

Note: Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. IQR, interquartile range.

Table 3 Lifetime risk of dementia and MCI after select index ages (ages 55, 65, 75, and 85) to 105 years, overall and by sex and race using primary analysis.

	Index age			
	55 years	65 years	75 years	85 years
Lifetime risk of dementia	(n=4611)	(n=4405)	(n=2606)	(n=702)
Overall	43 (38,47)	45 (43,47)	48 (46,51)	45 (41,50)
Sex				
Female	45 (40,50)	49 (46,51)	49 (46,52)	46 (40,51)
Male	39 (35,43)	38 (33,42)	48 (42,54)	44 (35,53)
Race				
White	44 (37,50)	45 (42,48)	48 (45,51)	46 (42,51)
Black	45 (40,50)	47 (42,52)	50 (43,56)	35 (21,49)
Lifetime risk of MCI	(n=3915)	(n=3725)	(n=2076)	(n=503)
Overall	62 (57,67)	64 (62,67)	69 (66,72)	64 (59,69)
Sex				
Female	63 (58,69)	67 (65,70)	70 (67,73)	64 (58,70)
Male	60 (55,64)	58 (52,63)	67 (62,72)	62 (51,73)
Race				
White	65 (62,67)	64 (62,67)	68 (65,71)	65 (60,70)
Black	60 (54,65)	62 (57,67)	69 (63,75)	52 (34,70)

Note: Estimates are presented as percentages, representing cumulative incidence through the age of last observation (up to age 105), accounting for the competing risk of death. Corresponding 95% confidence intervals are shown in parentheses.