Dissociating the Nocturnal Physiological Drivers of Agitation Occurrence and Severity in Dementia: An Explanatory Study Using Contactless Sleep Sensing

Zhen Liu[a,*], Marta Bono[a], Ajda Flisar[c], Robbe Decloedt[c], Maarten Van Den Bossche[c,d,e,†], Maarten De Vos[a,b,†]

[a]*STADIUS Center for Dynamical Systems, Signal Processing and Data Analytics, Department of Electrical Engineering, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium*
[b]*Woman and Child, Department of Development and Regeneration, KU Leuven, Belgium*
[c]*Geriatric Psychiatry, University Psychiatric Center KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium*
[d]*Neuropsychiatry, Department of Neurosciences, Leuven Brain Institute, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium*
[e]*Maastricht University Medical Centre+ (MUMC+), Maastricht, The Netherlands*

Abstract

Background: Agitation is a common and burdensome neuropsychiatric symptom in dementia that fluctuates from day to day, but objective tools for short-term risk stratification are limited. We examined whether nocturnal physiological signals from unobtrusive under-mattress sensors predict next-day daytime agitation and whether associations differ for agitation occurrence versus severity.

Methods: We extracted cardiorespiratory, movement, and sleep-proxy features from two long-term care cohorts (N=55; 333 nights) and one external home-monitoring cohort (N=17; 801 nights). A two-part mixed-effects framework was used to model next-day agitation episodes.

Results: Lower nocturnal respiratory rate and greater activity instability independently predicted higher odds of next-day agitation occurrence. Associations were stronger for motor than verbal agitation. Respiration-related predictors were validated externally. Conversely, no nocturnal features significantly predicted agitation severity.

Discussion: Passive sleep monitoring identified reproducible, physiologically interpretable markers of next-day agitation occurrence, supporting the potential of under-mattress sensing for short-term risk stratification and more proactive dementia care.

Keywords: Dementia, Alzheimer's disease, agitation, sleep disturbance, mixed-effects model, unobtrusive physiological sensing, Withings sleep analyzer, Emfit QS.

1. Introduction

Agitation is among the most frequent and clinically challenging behavioral and psychological symptoms of dementia (BPSD) [1]. It typically manifests as excessive or inappropriate motor activity (e.g., pacing, restlessness), verbal agitation (e.g., repetitive calling out), and/or aggressive behaviors (physical or verbal), and is often accompanied by emotional distress and impaired self-regulation [2, 3]. Beyond its immediate impact on people living with dementia (PLWD), agitation is strongly associated with caregiver burden, safety incidents, increased healthcare utilization, and earlier institutionalization, making it a key target for monitoring and intervention in dementia care [4, 5].

Pharmacological interventions for agitation, including antipsychotics and sedatives, are associated with clinically important risks in PLWD, including adverse events and increased mortality [6]. Accordingly, current management emphasizes identifying triggers, addressing unmet needs, and prioritizing non-pharmacological approaches. However, implementation in real-world care settings remains difficult because of limited staffing, incomplete contextual information, and the episodic, fluctuating nature of symptoms [4]. Conceptual frameworks such as the Unmet Needs Model further suggest that agitation may arise from interactions between neurodegenerative vulnerability and modifiable precipitating factors (e.g., discomfort, pain, environmental stressors), highlighting the importance of identifying actionable antecedents in daily life [7].

Sleep is a promising and potentially modifiable upstream factor in this context. Sleep disturbances are highly prevalent in Alzheimer's disease (AD) and related dementias across both community and long-term care settings [8–10]. Beyond being a common comorbidity, sleep disruption may interact bidirectionally with AD pathophysiology and downstream neurobehavioral function, providing biological plausibility that poor sleep may amplify next-day emotional distress and behavioral dysregulation [11, 12]. More broadly, experimental evidence indicates that sleep loss alters affective brain circuitry by reducing prefrontal regulatory control over limbic responses, offering a plausible framework for how disturbed sleep may heighten emotional reactivity and behavioral dysregulation [13]. Together, these observations support a day-to-day perspective in which nightly sleep features may shape subsequent daytime agitation risk.

However, establishing the sleep-agitation relationship in real-world dementia settings remains challenging because both constructs are difficult to measure. Although polysomnography (PSG) provides rich physiological information, it is resource-

*Corresponding author. zhen.liu@kuleuven.be
†Both senior authors contributed equally to this study.

intensive, intrusive, and may not reflect habitual sleep patterns in naturalistic environments [14]. Actigraphy is more scalable but provides limited physiological specificity beyond movement-derived proxies [15–17]. Agitation, in turn, is often measured using retrospective caregiver reports or intermittent observational ratings, which are vulnerable to recall bias and may miss short-term symptom fluctuations [18, 19]. Recent advances in passive in-home sensing (e.g., under-mattress monitoring) provide a promising opportunity for low-burden, longitudinal characterization of nocturnal physiology in everyday dementia care contexts [20–22].

Even with these sensing tools, the sleep-agitation relationship remains insufficiently characterized. Several studies using similar sensors have focused on other outcomes, such as sleep phenotyping or long-term disease progression, rather than day-to-day agitation [22, 23]. Other work predicting agitation has relied on multimodal inputs spanning sleep, daytime activity, and environmental factors over multi-day windows, making it difficult to isolate the specific contribution of nightly sleep or capture rapid day-to-day changes [24]. A proof-of-concept study [18] showed that integrating behavioral, environmental, and sleep sensing can help characterize and predict agitation in care settings; however, the sleep component relied on a single composite score, and the small sample limited generalizability. More broadly, although sensor-based agitation detection and prediction is an active area, relatively few studies have examined sleep-derived signals in isolation, and the literature remains fragmented with respect to sensing modalities, outcome definitions, and validation strategies [25, 26]. Collectively, these gaps motivate rigorous, temporally aligned analyses that isolate the contribution of nightly sleep to next-day agitation while accounting for repeated measures and confounding.

Therefore, we aimed to quantify the association between objectively measured nocturnal sleep characteristics and next-day daytime agitation using longitudinal, real-world data and analytic methods designed for hierarchical and zero-inflated outcomes. Specifically, we evaluated whether sleep-derived physiological and behavioral features predicted (i) agitation occurrence and (ii) agitation severity among agitation-positive days, while adjusting for key confounders and accounting for between-subject heterogeneity. By focusing on a clinically actionable night-to-next-day window and low-burden monitoring suitable for long-term deployment, this work aims to inform interpretable digital biomarkers for more proactive and personalized dementia care. A schematic overview of the study is shown in Figure 1.

2. Methods

2.1. Study design and data sources

This study utilized data from three distinct cohorts to ensure robustness and generalizability. The primary dataset, comprising cohorts "EMFIT" and "WSA", was collected at "Cog K", a specialized neuropsychiatric ward within the University Psychiatric Centre (UPC) KU Leuven [19, 27]. This unit treats patients with dementia exhibiting severe BPSD, corresponding to Tiers 6 and 7 of Brodaty's seven-tiered care model [28]. Using convenience sampling, data were collected via unobtrusive under-mattress sensors integrated into the daily clinical workflow and retrieved via cloud APIs. Further protocol details are available in [19]. The specific monitoring configurations for each cohort were as follows:

- **Cohort "EMFIT"** involved one week of continuous monitoring using the Emfit QS® sensor, paired with a hybrid signal- and event-contingent ecological momentary assessment (EMA) strategy. Annotations were collected daily, averaging 6.3 labels per day (SD = 2.7).
- **Cohort "WSA"** comprised two weeks of monitoring using the Withings Sleep Analyzer® (WSA), supported by a high-density event-contingent EMA protocol. This dataset exhibited a high annotation density, with a daily average of 22.1 events (SD = 10.2).
- **Cohort "TIHM"** is a public dataset [29] used for external validation. While the original TIHM dataset includes 56 subjects monitored for an average of 50 days in a home setting with twice-daily annotations, only the subset of 17 subjects containing valid sleep data was included in this analysis.

Both devices employ an under-mattress pressure sensor and ballistocardiography (BCG) to derive heart rate (HR) and respiratory rate (RR) and to estimate in-bed movement/activity (Act) from the same signal, without requiring the user to wear a sensor or to have direct skin contact. Our exported data contains continuous HR/RR/Act time-series at high temporal resolution (WSA: 1-min; EMFIT: 4-s). Notably, although both of our proprietary datasets include activity metrics (WSA: 0–255; EMFIT: 0–32768; both right-skewed), the public TIHM dataset does not provide accessible activity data.

Agitation was quantified using the Pittsburgh Agitation Scale (PAS) [30], which evaluates severity on a scale of 0–4 across four behavioral subtypes: motor, verbal, aggressive, and resistance to care. We defined Agitation Occurrence as a binary variable, classified as true if the score for any PAS subtype exceeded 0. Furthermore, to capture the intensity of behavioral disturbances, Agitation severity was defined as the daily peak intensity ($PAS_{max} \in [0, 4]$), calculated as the maximum score among the four subtypes to reflect the most severe symptom manifested on that day. The TIHM dataset provided only agitation occurrence labels; therefore, the following analyses regarding agitation severity were restricted to the WSA and EMFIT cohorts.

2.2. Ethical considerations

Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Ethics Committee Research of University Hospitals Leuven (reference ID S62882). Given the participants' diagnosis of dementia, written informed consent was primarily secured through legal representatives. However, to ensure patient inclusion, the study details were explained verbally in a manner commensurate with each patient's cognitive abilities. All patient data were



Figure 1: Study Design. (A) cohort structure and night-to-next-day alignment between nocturnal sensor-derived physiology (night j) and next-day daytime agitation labels (day $j+1$), with EMFIT and WSA used for primary analysis and TIHM for external evaluation; (B) data processing and feature extraction; (C) two-part mixed-effects modeling of agitation occurrence (GLMM) and severity among agitation-positive days (CLMM); and (D) study objective to quantify sleep–agitation relationships.

pseudonymized and handled with strict confidentiality. Participation was voluntary and uncompensated, with the explicit understanding that the decision to enroll would not impact the standard of care received during admission.

2.3. Data preprocessing

Time-Series Non-contact sleep sensors have demonstrated good reliability in the long-term, continuous collection of vital-sign data from older adults and PLWD [20, 21]. The sleep-related metrics they provide, including sleep heart rate (HR) and breathing rate (RR), show good concordance with the gold standard PSG. Moreover, coarse sleep-wake classification (binary Sleep-Wake) tends to exhibit higher PSG agreement than more fine-grained four-class staging (Wake, Light, REM, Deep). Accordingly, this study computes sleep features from sleep-wake, HR, RR, and activity time series.

A median filter (three-minute window) was applied to raw HR and RR time-series data to suppress non-physiological spikes. For activity data, a two-step process was used: (i) Winsorization at the 1st and 99th percentiles within each device type to cap extreme outliers; (ii) Log-transformation ($\log(x+1)$) to correct skewness. For continuous features such as HR, RR, and activity, we applied device-wise robust Z-score normalization using device-specific medians and interquartile ranges (IQRs).

Feature Extraction We implemented a comprehensive feature extraction pipeline to characterize the multidimensional nature of nocturnal physiology and behavior. From the sleep-wake sequence, we derived macro-structural indicators of sleep quality (e.g., efficiency, duration) and micro-architectural measures of fragmentation and stability (e.g., entropy, sleep bout lengths). To capture autonomic dynamics and activity intensity, we computed a robust set of high-order statistical descriptors, spanning central tendency, variability, and distributional shape (e.g., skewness, kurtosis) for all continuous heart rate, respiratory rate, and activity time series, complemented by specific markers for circadian timing and out-of-bed behavior. Detailed fifty sleep indicators and their explanations are shown in Table S1.

2.4. Statistical analysis

We employed a two-part mixed-effects framework to account for the hierarchical structure of the data (nights nested within subjects), the zero-inflated distribution of agitation scores, and systematic cohort differences.

2.4.1. Feature screening and selection

To identify robust physiological predictors while adjusting key covariates, we performed feature screening and selection in two stages. In Stage 1, we assessed the marginal association between each sleep feature (derived from night j) and next-day daytime agitation (day $j+1$) using mixed-effects models to account for within-subject correlation. In Stage 2, we addressed redundancy and multicollinearity among candidate predictors via correlation analysis and VIF before fitting the final multivariable mixed-effects models.

Agitation Occurrence. We employed a Generalized Linear Mixed Model (GLMM) with a binomial family and logit link function. Let Y_{ij} denote the binary agitation status (0 or 1) for subject i on night j, and $p_{ij} = P(Y_{ij} = 1)$ be the probability of an agitation episode. The model is specified as:

$$\text{logit}(p_{ij}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{ij} + \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \mathbf{C}_i + u_i$$

In this equation, X_{ij} represents the standardized physiological feature of interest (robust z-scored), β_0 denotes the fixed intercept, and β_1 is the regression coefficient quantifying its association with the log-odds of agitation. The term $\mathbf{C}_i$ denotes the vector of fixed covariates (Age, Sex, and Data Source) with corresponding coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, controlling for demographic and device-specific variations. The random intercept $u_i \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2)$ accounts for the subject-specific baseline risk and intra-individual correlation.

Agitation Severity. We utilized a Cumulative Link Mixed Model (CLMM) to accommodate the ordinal nature of the Pittsburgh Agitation Scale (PAS) scores ($Y_{ij} \in \{0, 1, \ldots, 4\}$). Unlike

linear models that assume equidistant intervals between scores, the CLMM estimates the cumulative probability that the severity falls at or below a specific category k:

$$\text{logit}(P(Y_{ij} \leq k)) = \theta_k - (\beta_1 X_{ij} + \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \mathbf{C}_i + u_i)$$

Here, θ_k represents the threshold parameters separating the k-th and $(k+1)$-th severity levels, preserving the natural ordering of the PAS scores. The latent physiological effect is subtracted from these thresholds, implying that a positive coefficient β_1 indicates an increased probability of falling into higher severity categories (i.e., exceeding the threshold).

To mitigate the risk of the Type I error rate associated with multiple testing, we applied the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure to control the False Discovery Rate (FDR). Only features meeting a corrected significance threshold of $p < 0.05$ were retained. Subsequently, we addressed multicollinearity among the significant predictors. A Spearman correlation matrix was computed, and for any pair of features with $|r| > 0.7$, the feature with the higher statistical significance (lower p-value) was prioritized. A final check using Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) ensured that all retained predictors satisfied VIF < 5.

2.4.2. Multivariable modeling

Building upon the univariate screening phase, we extended the analytical framework to a multivariable context to isolate the independent contributions of the selected physiological markers. This step is critical for disentangling the complex interplay between co-occurring sleep metrics—such as separating the effects of respiratory instability from those of general sleep fragmentation—and determining which markers remain robust predictors after mutual adjustment.

We constructed final multivariable models using the independent features identified in the screening stage. The model specifications mirrored the GLMM and CLMM frameworks defined in Section 2.4.1, with the expansion of the single predictor X_{ij} into a vector of selected independent features $\mathbf{X}_{ij}$. A multivariable GLMM was fitted to the full dataset to estimate the adjusted odds of agitation occurrence, identifying the physiological states that trigger an episode. Conversely, a multivariable CLMM was fitted to the subset of agitation-positive nights to determine the drivers of episode intensity conditional on its occurrence.

2.4.3. Model evaluation

Quantitative results were reported as adjusted Odds Ratios (OR) with 95% Confidence Intervals (CI). To assess the explanatory power of the models, we calculated two goodness-of-fit metrics: Marginal R^2 (R^2_m), representing the variance explained by the fixed effects (physiological predictors), and Conditional R^2 (R^2_c), representing the variance explained by the full model including subject-specific random effects. Furthermore, the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) was computed to quantify the proportion of variance attributable to between-person (subject-level) differences. Although our primary objective was to estimate adjusted associations, we additionally reported the Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (AUC) as a descriptive summary of the model's ability to discriminate between agitation and non-agitation nights. All statistical analyses were performed using R statistical software (version 4.5.1) with the lme4 and ordinal packages.

2.5. Sensitivity analyses

To ensure the robustness of the identified biomarkers, we assessed cross-cohort consistency by stratifying the analysis based on device type (WSA vs. EMFIT). We examined whether the directionality and effect sizes of the associations remained consistent across these sub-cohorts. This verification process was critical for distinguishing whether the identified physiological triggers represent universal biological mechanisms or were driven by device-specific biases inherent to a single sensor type.

2.6. External validation

To evaluate the generalizability of the sleep-agitation biomarkers, we performed a targeted external validation using the independent TIHM cohort ($N = 17$). Due to the absence of activity data in this dataset, the validation was restricted to the available physiological metrics (heart rate, respiratory rate, and sleep architecture). We fitted adjusted GLMMs (controlling for age and sex) to the TIHM data to verify whether the key physiological features identified in the discovery phase retained predictive value for agitation occurrence in this external, home-living population.

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive statistics

Table 1 summarizes the study population, data volume, and demographics of the three cohorts. Male patients outnumber female patients across cohorts, and the EMFIT cohort approaches a 1:1 sex ratio. The mean ages for the WSA and EMFIT cohorts are both around 80. Their MMSE (Mini-Mental State Examination) scores are 13.1 (SD = 8.9) and 11.4 (SD = 6.2), respectively, indicating moderate to severe dementia. Due to differences in data collection and annotation protocols, the three cohorts exhibited significant heterogeneity in the proportion of nights with documented next-day agitation.

The pooled analytical dataset (EMFIT & WSA) comprised 333 complete observation pairs (nightly sleep data matched with next-day agitation labels) from 55 participants across the pooled cohorts. The distribution of agitation occurrence varies by subtype, as illustrated in Figure 2. For overall agitation, the dataset exhibited a high prevalence of behavioral symptoms, with 234 agitation-positive days (70.3%) and 99 agitation-negative days (29.7%). This indicates a sufficient number of positive events for statistical modeling. Among subtypes, motor agitation was the most frequent, while verbal agitation was observed less often.

Table 1: Study design and night-to-next-day modeling framework. Overview of cohorts, night-to-next-day alignment between sleep features and agitation labels, and the two-part mixed-effects modeling strategy for agitation occurrence and severity.

Cohort	Subjects	Age (Mean ± SD)	Diagnosis	MMSE	Nights w/ Agit.	Nights w/o Agit.	Sum
EMFIT	21 Male 18 Female	79.7 ± 8.4	AD: 19 Vascular: 5 Mixed: 3 DLB: 7 N/A: 6	11.4 ± 6.2 (N/A: 5)	133	68	201
WSA	11 Male 5 Female	80.2 ± 8.0	AD: 10 Vascular: 1 DBL: 1 Other: 1 N/A: 3	13.1 ± 8.9 (N/A: 7)	101	31	132
TIHM	11 Male 6 Female (from 56 subjects)	84.7 ± 8.6	AD: 40 Vascular: 6 Other: 9 N/A: 1	N/A	31	770	801

Note: AD = Alzheimer's Disease; DLB = Dementia with Lewy Bodies; Agit. = Agitation; MMSE = Mini-Mental State Examination.



Figure 2: Distribution of agitation occurrence across subtypes. Counts of agitation-positive and agitation-negative days are shown for all agitation, motor agitation, and verbal agitation (pooled WSA&EMFIT).

3.2. *Univariate screening and feature selection for agitation occurrence*

3.2.1. *All agitation*

Initial univariate screening was performed on the pooled samples from the WSA and EMFIT cohorts using GLMM. Following FDR correction ($p_{adj} < 0.05$), four nocturnal features were identified as significant predictors of daytime agitation occurrence (Table S2). We observed distinct patterns in respiratory and activity metrics in Figure 3. Lower nocturnal respiratory rates were associated with higher odds of agitation (e.g., Min. RR: OR = 0.50, 95% CI: 0.35–0.72; Mean RR: OR = 0.46, 95% CI: 0.30–0.70). In contrast, greater nocturnal activity instability (or variability), quantified here as the standard deviation of activity, was associated with higher odds of agitation (OR = 1.93, 95% CI: 1.30–2.88). Longer bed presence was also associated with an increased risk of agitation (OR = 1.66, 95% CI: 1.17–2.36). Full results of the univariate analysis are detailed in Supplementary Table S2.

Given the physiological interdependencies among these features, we assessed collinearity before multivariable modeling. Spearman correlation analysis (Figure 3) showed strong redundancy between median RR and mean RR ($r = 0.98, p < 0.001$); mean RR was retained because it showed stronger statistical evidence. Similarly, activity SD was prioritized over activity CV ($r = 0.76$). The final feature set comprised minimum and mean RR, activity SD, and presence time. Variance inflation factor (VIF) analysis (Table S2) confirmed negligible multicollinearity among retained predictors (all VIFs ≤ 1.10).

3.2.2. *Motor and verbal agitation*

Beyond the binary classification of agitation occurrence, we conducted a finer-grained analysis to examine whether agitation subtypes exhibited distinct sleep patterns. Although PAS recorded four subtypes (motor, verbal, resistance to care, and aggression), our analysis focused exclusively on motor and verbal agitation. The prevalence of resistance to care and aggression in our dataset was insufficient to support robust statistical modeling.

Figure 4 shows that a similar set of nocturnal biomarkers drove motor agitation as overall agitation. Respiratory features (Min. RR, OR = 0.49; Mean RR, OR = 0.53) and minimum heart rate (Min. HR) were associated with lower odds of motor agitation, whereas higher nocturnal activity volatility (Activity SD) approximately doubled the odds (OR = 1.99). In contrast, minimum activity intensity showed an inverse association (OR = 0.48). However, verbal agitation showed limited coupling with sleep physiology (Figure 4). Except for minimum heart rate (OR = 0.49), no respiratory or activity features remained significant after FDR correction, suggesting subtype-specific differences in sleep-related correlations.

3.3. *Multivariable predictors of agitation occurrence*

After screening individual predictors with univariate GLMM, a multivariable GLMM was fitted to estimate the independent associations of selected sleep features with next-day agitation while accounting for random effects and covariates.



Figure 3: Univariate screening results for agitation occurrence. Effect-size estimates from univariate GLMMs highlight FDR-significant nocturnal features, and the accompanying Spearman correlation heatmap summarizes redundancy among these predictors.



Figure 4: Subtype contrast between motor and verbal agitation. Effect-size comparison for selected sleep features shows stronger associations for motor agitation than verbal agitation.

As shown in Table 2, three nocturnal physiological features remained significantly associated with the odds of next-day agitation after adjustment for age, sex, and cohort effects.

In the multivariable model, higher nocturnal respiratory rate levels were associated with a lower likelihood of next-day agitation, whereas greater activity volatility was associated with a higher risk. Specifically, a higher minimum respiratory rate (Min. RR) was the strongest independent predictor, corresponding to a 40% reduction in the odds of agitation per one-unit increase in the robust Z-score (OR = 0.60, 95% CI: 0.42–0.87, p = 0.006). Similarly, a higher mean respiratory rate was also associated with reduced agitation risk (OR = 0.65, p = 0.048). Conversely, higher instability in nocturnal activity (Activity SD) was an independent risk factor, increasing the odds of agitation by approximately 62% (OR = 1.62, 95% CI: 1.08–2.42, p = 0.02). Although presence time was significant in univariate screening, it did not retain statistical significance in the multivariable model (p = 0.069), suggesting its effect was likely captured by other physiological or demographic factors.

Regarding covariates, a significant cohort effect was observed: patients in the WSA cohort exhibited substantially higher baseline odds of agitation compared to the reference EMFIT cohort (OR = 2.71, p < 0.001), confirming the necessity of controlling for device and annotation protocol differences. Increasing age showed a slight but significant protective effect (OR = 0.996, p = 0.031), while sex was not a significant predictor (p = 0.78).

Table 2: Multivariable mixed-effects model for next-day agitation occurrence. Adjusted GLMM estimates (OR, 95% CI) are reported alongside model summary metrics.

Physiological Features	**OR (95% CI)**	**P-value**
Min. RR **	0.60 (0.42 – 0.87)	**0.006**
Activity SD *	1.62 (1.08 – 2.42)	**0.020**
Mean RR *	0.65 (0.43 – 1.00)	**0.048**
Presence Time	1.40 (0.98 – 2.01)	0.069
Covariates		
Age *	0.996 (0.992 – 0.999)	0.031
Sex (Male vs. Female)	0.94 (0.63 – 1.41)	0.775
Cohort (WSA vs. EMFIT) ***	2.71 (1.60 – 4.57)	< 0.001
Model Performance		
Samples / Subjects	333 / 55	
ICC	0.367	
Marginal R^2	0.139	
Conditional R^2	0.455	
AUC	0.710	

*Note: AUC = Area Under the ROC Curve; CI = Confidence Interval; ICC = Intraclass Correlation Coefficient; Min. = Minimum; OR = Odds Ratio; RR = Respiratory Rate; SD = Standard Deviation. ORs are adjusted for age, sex, and cohort. * indicates statistical significance (p < 0.05). Reference categories are Female for Sex and EMFIT for Cohort.*

The multivariable model also demonstrated satisfactory discriminative ability on the study dataset (In-sample AUC = 0.71). Variance decomposition revealed that the fixed effects (physiological features and demographics) explained approximately 14% of the variance in agitation occurrence (R^2_m = 0.139). However, the full model accounted for 46% of the total variance (R^2_c = 0.455). The substantial gap between R^2_m and R^2_c, along with an Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) of 0.37, indicates that between-subject heterogeneity accounted for a larger share of the variability in agitation likelihood than the nightly physiological fluctuations.

3.4. Exploratory univariate screening for agitation severity

In the second stage of the two-part model, we analyzed the drivers of agitation intensity strictly within the subset of nights preceding next-day agitation events (N = 234 nights from 52 patients).



Figure 5: Association between sleep features and agitation severity. Across agitation-positive days, no sleep feature showed a robust association with severity after FDR correction.

Contrary to the findings for agitation occurrence, Figure 5 shows that the univariate CLMM analysis revealed no statistically significant associations between any nocturnal sleep features and the severity of subsequent daytime agitation after FDR correction. We therefore constructed a baseline CLMM including only covariates (age, sex, and cohort) to characterize the variance in agitation severity (Table 3).

Table 3: Baseline severity model among agitation-positive days. Covariate-only CLMM estimates summarize the association of demographic and cohort factors with severity.

Fixed Effects	**OR (95% CI)**	**P-value**
Age	1.05 (0.99 – 1.10)	0.084
Sex (Male vs. Female)	0.98 (0.42 – 2.31)	0.966
Cohort (WSA vs. EMFIT)	0.90 (0.37 – 2.15)	0.806
Model Performance		
Samples / Subjects	234 / 52	
ICC	0.270	
Marginal R^2	0.031	
Conditional R^2	0.292	

Note: CI = Confidence Interval; ICC = Intraclass Correlation Coefficient; OR = Odds Ratio. The model includes subject-specific random intercepts. Reference categories are Female for Sex and EMFIT for Cohort.

None of the demographic or cohort-related covariates showed a significant association with severity intensity. The fixed effects (demographics and device) explained a negligible proportion of the variance in severity ($R^2_m = 0.031$). However, the inclusion of patient-specific random effects significantly improved model fit, accounting for approximately 26% of the variance ($R^2_c = 0.292$; ICC = 0.270). This discrepancy between marginal and R^2_c indicates that while observable characteristics fail to predict severity, stable patient-specific traits captured by the random intercept remain the primary identifiable driver of agitation intensity.

Therefore, the nightly sleep and demographic characteristics do not meaningfully explain between-day fluctuations in agitation severity. Instead, the substantial increase in R^2_c, along with the high ICC, indicates that the majority of the variance in severity was attributable to subject-level random effects rather than the fixed effects.

3.5. Sensitivity analysis

3.5.1. WSA-only and emfit-only on GLMM

To verify that the predictors of agitation occurrence were not driven by a single device type, we fitted cohort-specific univariate GLMMs for the WSA and EMFIT cohorts. In Figure S1, while no individual features retained statistical significance after FDR correction in these smaller subsamples due to reduced statistical power, the direction of effects (Odds Ratios) for the key predictors identified in the pooled analysis (Section 3.2.1) remained highly consistent across both cohorts. Features that were significant in the pooled model (e.g., respiration and activity variability) consistently showed ORs < 1 and ORs > 1, respectively, in both device-specific forest plots.

3.6. External validation on TIHM cohort

Univariate GLMM results for TIHM are shown in Figure S2. The external validation replicated the protective association of respiratory stability with agitation. In line with the primary pooled analysis, a higher mean respiratory rate was significantly associated with lower odds of agitation in the TIHM cohort (OR = 0.41, 95% CI: 0.23–0.72, $p = 0.002$), with an effect size even stronger than that observed in the discovery cohort. Additional markers of respiratory variability (e.g., RR SD, RR IQR) also demonstrated significant protective associations and yielded good discriminative performance (AUCs 0.70–0.75). Therefore, these findings support autonomic respiratory regulation as a robust and cross-cohort physiological biomarker of agitation risk.

4. Discussion

4.1. Principle findings

This study utilized contactless under-mattress sensors to examine associations between nocturnal features and next-day agitation in real-world dementia settings. In multivariable analyses, respiration-related features and nocturnal activity instability emerged as the strongest independent predictors of agitation occurrence, suggesting that night-to-night differences in nocturnal physiological regulation and activity patterns are associated with short-term agitation risk. A key finding of the two-part modeling framework was that sleep-derived features were more consistently associated with agitation occurrence than with agitation severity among agitation-positive days. This pattern suggests that nocturnal physiology may be more closely linked to short-term vulnerability to agitation, whereas severity may depend more on patient-specific and contextual factors. We also observed subtype differences, with stronger sleep-related associations for motor agitation than for verbal agitation, supporting the view that agitation phenotypes may differ in their physiological correlates.

The physiological signature of agitation risk. The identification of respiratory metrics (Min. RR and Mean RR) and nocturnal activity instability (Activity SD) as dominant predictors suggests that night-to-night fluctuations in physiological regulation are associated with next-day agitation risk. Specifically, a lower nocturnal respiratory baseline was independently

associated with a higher likelihood of next-day agitation. Given the tight coupling between respiratory rhythms and autonomic regulation [31, 32], this pattern may reflect altered autonomic tone, which has been linked to agitation and broader behavioral dysregulation in AD and related neurodegenerative conditions [33]. Furthermore, this interpretation aligns with recent in-home monitoring work in which respiration-related features contributed to identifying agitation episodes [24].

Elevated nocturnal activity instability may indicate increased nighttime restlessness and poorer sleep continuity. This interpretation is consistent with prior literature in which movement-derived indices are used as behavioral proxies of fragmented sleep [34, 35], and echoes earlier evidence linking disrupted sleep continuity to daytime agitation in PLWD [36].

More broadly, our findings fit within established models of sleep-dependent emotional regulation, which posit that sleep disruption can reduce prefrontal regulatory influence and heighten next-day emotional reactivity [13]. Moreover, disrupted sleep continuity has been associated with diminished emotional and executive regulation in dementia populations [37], linking sleep disruption to adverse emotional, behavioral, and cognitive outcomes.

Notably, although prolonged time in bed (Presence Time) was significant in univariate analysis, it did not remain significant in the multivariable model. While extended time in bed is a common feature of disturbed sleep in people living with dementia [23], it is a relatively coarse indicator that may also reflect broader factors such as reduced mobility, functional impairment, or care routines, rather than the proximal nocturnal processes most relevant to agitation risk. In contrast, our results suggest that next-day agitation is more closely associated with markers of disrupted sleep continuity and nocturnal physiological dysregulation during the time spent in bed.

Differential sleep–agitation associations across phenotypes and outcomes. A key insight from this work is that sleep-derived metrics reliably predicted motor agitation, whereas associations with verbal agitation were weaker in our analyses. This distinction is consistent with Cohen-Mansfield's "Unmet Needs Model", which proposes that behavioral symptoms arise from distinct underlying etiologies [7]. In our context, motor agitation may be more tightly linked to compromised nocturnal restoration (e.g., disrupted sleep and physiological instability), whereas verbal agitation may be driven primarily by proximal psychosocial factors such as distress, pain, unmet needs, or environmental deprivation. Similar subtype-dependent physiological patterns and patient-level heterogeneity have also been reported in wearable-sensing studies of agitation, supporting the need to consider agitation type when interpreting physiological signals [38]. Accordingly, sleep-targeted interventions may be particularly beneficial for motor phenotypes, while verbal agitation may require tailored psychosocial and environmental strategies.

Furthermore, our two-part model suggests a differential association pattern between the occurrence and the intensity of agitation. Nocturnal physiological instability appears to be more strongly related to whether an agitation episode occurs on the following day than to how severe it becomes. However, the low R^2_m (~3%), together with a moderate ICC (~0.27) and a high proportion of unexplained variance (~70%), suggests that, once triggered, episode severity is only weakly captured by antecedent sleep features. Instead, this pattern is consistent with a state-versus-trait interpretation, in which sleep quality may modulate the probability of an agitation episode, whereas the intensity of the behavior may be more dictated by other factors, such as disease stage, temperament, or premorbid personality [39, 40]. This distinction is important for managing caregiver expectations: physiological monitoring may help estimate the risk of an event, but not necessarily its severity.

4.2. *Clinical implications and robustness*

Our findings highlight the potential of sleep monitoring to advance "precision medicine" approaches in dementia care. The ability of sleep biomarkers to predict agitation risk supports the development of an "early warning system" based on passive nighttime monitoring [23, 24]. Such systems can alert caregivers to "high-risk days" and implement sleep interventions to effectively prevent agitation episodes, particularly for motor-dominant phenotypes. We also found that advanced age was associated with a lower risk of agitation, which may reflect the "burnout effect," where physiological reserves influence behavioral performance. Clinically, these suggest a stratified assessment framework: for patients with physiological instability, the focus should be on "prevention" via sleep improvement; for patients prone to severe agitation, care plans must address underlying individual characteristics rather than relying solely on sleep interventions. This distinction helps optimize resource allocation and may alleviate caregiver burden [41].

We adopted a two-part framework, GLMM for occurrence and CLMM for severity, and provided a rigorous statistical separation of these two clinically distinct outcomes. The robustness of these findings is evidenced by their replication across distinct sensor hardware (WSA vs. EMFIT) and independent cohorts (institutional vs. home-based). The successful external validation of the minimum respiratory rate biomarker in the TIHM home-care cohort confirms that these are not site-specific artifacts but genuine physiological warning signs, demonstrating the sensor-specific reproducibility and population generalizability of these biomarkers in naturalistic home settings. This overcomes major limitations of prior studies that relied on subjective diaries or intrusive wearable actigraphy, which often suffer from compliance issues and fail to capture rich cardiorespiratory data [15–17].

4.3. *Limitations and future work*

Several limitations merit consideration. First, the potential "sedative effect" of psychotropic medications may confound the relationship between sleep efficiency and agitation severity, as sedatives can influence sleep metrics while masking or exacerbating behavioral symptoms through disinhibition. Future analyses must account for pharmacological treatments to disentangle these effects. Moreover, while our dense labeling strategy improves upon spot-checks and we employed daily aggregation to mitigate label noise, the behavioral ground truth remains subject to observer bias.

Future research should focus on deploying multimodal monitoring systems that combine nocturnal physiology with objective daytime activity tracking (e.g., wearables) and environmental sensing (noise, light) to capture the full 24-hour behavioral cycle. Furthermore, integrating medication timing data is essential to disentangle physiological sleep regulation from drug-induced sedation. Validating these biomarkers in larger, medication-controlled trials is a critical step toward translating these findings into real-time, personalized early warning systems for dementia care.

4.4. Conclusion

This study establishes a contactless, device-independent framework that decouples the physiological drivers of agitation. We identify respiratory and motor instability as potent, modifiable triggers for the occurrence of agitation, specifically within motor phenotypes, providing a robust biological rationale for sleep-focused interventions in dementia. These findings pave the way for scalable Early Warning Systems that empower caregivers with predictive insights, facilitating a paradigm shift from reactive crisis management to proactive, personalized prevention.

Data availability

The primary dataset analyzed in the current study is not publicly available due to patient privacy and ethical restrictions, but de-identified data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. The secondary TIHM dataset used in this study is publicly available on Zenodo at: https://zenodo.org/records/7622128.

Code availability

The code for experiments presented in this study will be made available by the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Funding sources

This work was supported by the Flanders AI Research (FAIR) Program; the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) under grant number G046925N; the 'Funds Malou Malou, Perano, Georgette Paulus, JMJS Breugelmans and Gabrielle, François and Christian De Mesmaeker' managed by the King Baudouin Foundation of Belgium (2021-J1990130-222081); KU Leuven (grants C2M/23/053, CELSA/24/019, and the Global PhD partnerships with the University of Melbourne GPUM/22/022); the Paris Brain Institute and KU Leuven (Big Brain Theory 4 grant); the 'Klinische onderzoeks- en opleidingsraad (KOOR)' of the University Hospitals Leuven; and the AI-PROGNOSIS project under the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation program (Grant Agreement No. 101080581). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Consent statement

Consent was provided by all human subjected in accordance with the institutional review board approved protocol. All participants provided written informed consent to participate in this study. For participants unable to provide consent due to cognitive impairment, consent was obtained from their legal representatives or caregivers in accordance with the Ethics Committee Research of University Hospitals Leuven.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Zhen Liu: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - original draft. **Marta Bono:** Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - review & editing. **Ajda Flisar:** Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - review & editing. **Robbe Decloedt:** Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - review & editing. **Maarten Van Den Bossche:** Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing - review & editing. **Maarten De Vos:** Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing - review & editing.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Declaration of generative AI use

During the preparation of this work, the authors used Google's Gemini for English editing, code debugging, and optimization during manuscript preparation. All content was reviewed and verified by the authors, who retain full responsibility for the final work.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank all participating patients and their families, as well as the nursing staff and psychiatrists in training at Cog K of UPC KU Leuven.

References

[1] J. Cerejeira, L. Lagarto, E. B. Mukaetova-Ladinska, Behavioral and psychological symptoms of dementia, Frontiers in neurology 3 (2012) 73. doi:10.3389/fneur.2012.00073.

[2] J. Cummings, J. Mintzer, H. Brodaty, M. Sano, S. Banerjee, D. Devanand, S. Gauthier, R. Howard, K. Lanctôt, C. G. Lyketsos, et al., Agitation in cognitive disorders: International psychogeriatric association provisional consensus clinical and research definition, International psychogeriatrics 27 (1) (2015) 7–17. doi:10.1017/S1041610214001963.

[3] M. Sano, J. Cummings, S. Auer, S. Bergh, C. E. Fischer, D. Gerritsen, G. Grossberg, Z. Ismail, K. Lanctôt, M. I. Lapid, et al., Agitation in cognitive disorders: progress in the international psychogeriatric association consensus clinical and research definition, International psychogeriatrics 36 (4) (2024) 238–250. doi:10.1017/S1041610222001041.

[4] C. Carrarini, M. Russo, F. Dono, F. Barbone, M. G. Rispoli, L. Ferri, M. Di Pietro, A. Digiovanni, P. Ajdinaj, R. Speranza, et al., Agitation and dementia: prevention and treatment strategies in acute and chronic conditions, Frontiers in neurology 12 (2021) 644317. doi:10.3389/fneur.2021.644317.

[5] H. C. Kales, L. N. Gitlin, C. G. Lyketsos, Assessment and management of behavioral and psychological symptoms of dementia, Bmj 350. doi:10.1136/bmj.h369.

[6] L. S. Schneider, K. S. Dagerman, P. Insel, Risk of death with atypical antipsychotic drug treatment for dementia: meta-analysis of randomized placebo-controlled trials, Jama 294 (15) (2005) 1934–1943. doi:10.1001/jama.294.15.1934.

[7] J. Cohen-Mansfield, M. Dakheel-Ali, M. S. Marx, K. Thein, N. G. Regier, Which unmet needs contribute to behavior problems in persons with advanced dementia?, Psychiatry research 228 (1) (2015) 59–64. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2015.03.043.

[8] L. Shi, S.-J. Chen, M.-Y. Ma, Y.-P. Bao, Y. Han, Y.-M. Wang, J. Shi, M. V. Vitiello, L. Lu, Sleep disturbances increase the risk of dementia: a systematic review and meta-analysis, Sleep medicine reviews 40 (2018) 4–16. doi:10.1016/j.smrv.2017.06.010.

[9] L. Webster, S. Costafreda Gonzalez, A. Stringer, A. Lineham, J. Budgett, S. Kyle, J. Barber, G. Livingston, Measuring the prevalence of sleep disturbances in people with dementia living in care homes: a systematic review and meta-analysis, Sleep 43 (4) (2020) zsz251. doi:10.1093/sleep/zsz251.

[10] Y. Zhang, R. Ren, L. Yang, H. Zhang, Y. Shi, H. R. Okhravi, M. V. Vitiello, L. D. Sanford, X. Tang, Sleep in alzheimer's disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis of polysomnographic findings, Translational psychiatry 12 (1) (2022) 136. doi:10.1038/s41398-022-01897-y.

[11] Y.-E. S. Ju, B. P. Lucey, D. M. Holtzman, Sleep and alzheimer disease pathology—a bidirectional relationship, Nature Reviews Neurology 10 (2) (2014) 115–119. doi:10.1038/nrneurol.2013.269.

[12] A. Falter, M. Van Den Bossche, How non-rapid eye movement sleep and alzheimer pathology are linked, World Journal of Psychiatry 11 (11) (2021) 1027–1038. doi:10.5498/wjp.v11.i11.1027.

[13] S.-S. Yoo, N. Gujar, P. Hu, F. A. Jolesz, M. P. Walker, The human emotional brain without sleep—a prefrontal amygdala disconnect, Current biology 17 (20) (2007) R877–R878. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2007.08.007.

[14] Q. Pan, D. Brulin, E. Campo, Current status and future challenges of sleep monitoring systems: Systematic review, JMIR Biomedical Engineering 5 (1) (2020) e20921. doi:10.2196/20921.

[15] J. M. Hughes, Y. Song, C. H. Fung, J. M. Dzierzewski, M. N. Mitchell, S. Jouldjian, K. R. Josephson, C. A. Alessi, J. L. Martin, Measuring sleep in vulnerable older adults: a comparison of subjective and objective sleep measures, Clinical gerontologist 41 (2) (2018) 145–157. doi:10.1080/07317115.2017.1408734.

[16] G. J. Hjetland, I. H. Nordhus, S. Pallesen, J. Cummings, R. E. Tractenberg, E. Thun, E. Kolberg, E. Flo, An actigraphy-based validation study of the sleep disorder inventory in the nursing home, Frontiers in Psychiatry 11 (2020). doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2020.00173.

[17] R. A. Wijbenga, F. J. Blaauw, S. I. Janus, C. Tibben, A. E. Smits, R. C. Oude Voshaar, S. U. Zuidema, M. Zuidersma, Individual differences in the temporal relationship between sleep and agitation: a single-subject study in nursing home residents with dementia experiencing sleep disturbance and agitation, Aging & Mental Health 26 (8) (2022) 1669–1677. doi:10.1080/13607863.2021.1935464.

[18] W.-T. M. Au-Yeung, L. Miller, Z. Beattie, H. H. Dodge, C. Reynolds, I. Vahia, J. Kaye, Sensing a problem: Proof of concept for characterizing and predicting agitation, Alzheimer's & Dementia: Translational Research & Clinical Interventions 6 (1) (2020) e12079. doi:10.1002/trc2.12079.

[19] H. Davidoff, L. Van den Bulcke, M. Vandenbulcke, M. De Vos, J. Van den Stock, N. Van Helleputte, C. Van Hoof, M. J. Van Den Bossche, Toward quantification of agitation in people with dementia using multimodal sensing, Innovation in Aging 6 (7) (2022) igac064. doi:10.1093/geroni/igac064.

[20] K. K. G Ravindran, C. Della Monica, G. Atzori, D. Lambert, H. Hassanin, V. Revell, D.-J. Dijk, Three contactless sleep technologies compared with actigraphy and polysomnography in a heterogeneous group of older men and women in a model of mild sleep disturbance: sleep laboratory study, JMIR mHealth and uHealth 11 (2023) e46338. doi:10.2196/46338.

[21] K. K. G Ravindran, C. Della Monica, G. Atzori, D. Lambert, H. Hassanin, V. Revell, D.-J. Dijk, Reliable contactless monitoring of heart rate, breathing rate, and breathing disturbance during sleep in aging: digital health technology evaluation study, JMIR mHealth and uHealth 12 (2024) e53643. doi:10.2196/53643.

[22] L. Rigny, N. Fletcher-Lloyd, A. Capstick, R. Nilforooshan, P. Barnaghi, Assessment of sleep patterns in dementia and general population cohorts using passive in-home monitoring technologies, Communications Medicine 4 (1) (2024) 222. doi:10.1038/s43856-024-00646-0.

[23] E. Soreq, M. A. Kolanko, C. group, K. K. Ravindran, C. della Monica, V. Revell, S. Daniels, A. Joffe, H. Lai, M. Golemme, et al., Contactless longitudinal monitoring in the home characterizes aging and alzheimer's disease–related night-time behavior and physiology, Alzheimer's & Dementia 21 (10) (2025) e70758. doi:10.1002/alz.70758.

[24] M. Bafaloukou, A.-K. Schalkamp, N. Fletcher-Lloyd, A. Capstick, C. Walsh, C. Sandor, S. Kouchaki, R. Nilforooshan, P. Barnaghi, An interpretable machine learning tool for in-home monitoring of agitation episodes in people living with dementia: a proof-of-concept study, EClinicalMedicine 80. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2024.103117.

[25] B. S. Husebo, H. L. Heintz, L. I. Berge, P. Owoyemi, A. T. Rahman, I. V. Vahia, Sensing technology to monitor behavioral and psychological symptoms and to assess treatment response in people with dementia. a systematic review, Frontiers in pharmacology 10 (2020) 1699. doi:10.3389/fphar.2019.01699.

[26] J. K. Deters, S. Janus, J. A. L. Silva, H. J. Wörtche, S. U. Zuidema, Sensor-based agitation prediction in institutionalized people with dementia a systematic review, Pervasive and Mobile Computing 98 (2024) 101876. doi:10.1016/j.pmcj.2024.101876.

[27] M. Bono, Z. Liu, N. Van Helleputte, M. De Vos, M. Van Den Bossche, Multimodal sensing and machine learning for continuous monitoring of agitation in dementia, Alzheimer's & Dementia 21 (2025) e101188. doi:10.1002/alz70857_101188.

[28] H. Brodaty, B. M. Draper, L.-F. Low, Behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia: a seven-tiered model of service delivery, Medical Journal of Australia 178 (5) (2003) 231–234. doi:10.5694/j.1326-5377.2003.tb05169.x.

[29] F. Palermo, Y. Chen, A. Capstick, N. Fletcher-Loyd, C. Walsh, S. Kouchaki, J. True, O. Balazikova, E. Soreq, G. Scott, et al., Tihm: An open dataset for remote healthcare monitoring in dementia, Scientific data 10 (1) (2023) 606. doi:10.1038/s41597-023-02519-y.

[30] J. Rosen, L. Burgio, M. Kollar, M. Cain, M. Allison, M. Fogleman, M. Michael, G. S. Zubenko, The pittsburgh agitation scale: A user-friendly instrument for rating agitation in dementia patients, The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry 2 (1) (1994) 52–59. doi:10.1097/00019442-199400210-00008.

[31] L. M. Allan, C. G. Ballard, J. Allen, A. Murray, A. W. Davidson, I. G. McKeith, R. A. Kenny, Autonomic dysfunction in dementia, Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry 78 (7) (2007) 671–677. doi:10.1136/jnnp.2006.102343.

[32] E. I. Borovkova, M. D. Prokhorov, A. R. Kiselev, A. N. Hramkov, S. A. Mironov, M. V. Agaltsov, V. I. Ponomarenko, A. S. Karavaev, O. M. Drapkina, T. Penzel, Directional couplings between the respiration and parasympathetic control of the heart rate during sleep and wakefulness in healthy subjects at different ages, Frontiers in Network Physiology 2 (2022) 942700. doi:10.3389/fnetp.2022.942700.

[33] K. Y. Liu, E. A. Whitsel, G. Heiss, P. Palta, S. Reeves, F. V. Lin, M. Mather, J. P. Roiser, R. Howard, Heart rate variability and risk of agitation in alzheimer's disease: The atherosclerosis risk in communities study, Brain Communications 5 (6) (2023) fcad269. doi:10.1093/braincomms/fcad269.

[34] A. S. Lim, M. Kowgier, L. Yu, A. S. Buchman, D. A. Bennett, Sleep fragmentation and the risk of incident alzheimer's disease and cognitive decline in older persons, Sleep 36 (7) (2013) 1027–1032. doi:10.5665/sleep.2802.

[35] D. Saleh, S. M. Bertisch, M. Reid, A. Lim, S. Purcell, S. Redline, Actigraphy-derived sleep fragmentation index: convergent validity and associations with clinical outcomes, Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine 21 (9) (2025) 1557–1565. doi:10.5664/jcsm.11754.

[36] D. T. Brown, J. L. Westbury, B. Schüz, Sleep and agitation in nursing home residents with and without dementia, International psychogeriatrics

27 (12) (2015) 1945–1955. doi:10.1017/S1041610215001568.

[37] D. V. Petrovsky, M. V. McPhillips, J. Li, A. Brody, L. Caffeé, N. A. Hodgson, Sleep disruption and quality of life in persons with dementia: A state-of-the-art review, Geriatric Nursing 39 (6) (2018) 640–645. doi:10.1016/j.gerinurse.2018.04.014.

[38] H. Davidoff, A. Van Kraaij, L. Van den Bulcke, E. Lutin, M. Vandenbulcke, N. Van Helleputte, M. De Vos, C. Van Hoof, M. Van Den Bossche, Physiological profiling of agitation in dementia: insights from wearable sensor data, Innovation in Aging 8 (7) (2024) igae057. doi:10.1093/geroni/igae057.

[39] A. Kolanowski, M. Litaker, Social interaction, premorbid personality, and agitation in nursing home residents with dementia, Archives of psychiatric nursing 20 (1) (2006) 12–20. doi:10.1016/j.apnu.2005.08.006.

[40] K. Y. Liu, A. E. Stringer, S. J. Reeves, R. J. Howard, The neurochemistry of agitation in alzheimer's disease: a systematic review, Ageing research reviews 43 (2018) 99–107. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2018.03.003.

[41] C.-F. Tsai, W.-S. Hwang, J.-J. Lee, W.-F. Wang, L.-C. Huang, L.-K. Huang, W.-J. Lee, P.-S. Sung, Y.-C. Liu, C.-C. Hsu, J.-L. Fuh, Predictors of caregiver burden in aged caregivers of demented older patients, BMC Geriatrics 21 (59). doi:10.1186/s12877-021-02007-1.

Supplementary Material

Table S1: Night-level features extracted from time-series sensor data. Summary of candidate sleep-derived features (respiratory, cardiac, movement, and sleep-timing proxies) computed per night for downstream screening and modeling.

Feature	Description
Time in bed	Total time in bed (minutes)
Time in sleep	Total sleep duration (minutes)
Presence time	Total duration between the first bed entry and the final bed exit (minutes)
Sleep efficiency	Time in sleep / Time in bed
Awake time	Awake time during presence (minutes)
WASO	Wake after sleep onset (minutes)
Awake ratio	WASO / total sleep time
Awakenings	Number of awakenings after first sleep onset
Sleep latency	Time from on-bed to first sleep (minutes)
Mean sleep bout length	Mean continuous sleep bout length (minutes)
Mean wake bout length	Mean continuous wake bout length (minutes)
Sleep-wake entropy	Shannon entropy of sleep-wake state transitions
HR-RR correlation in sleep	Spearman correlation between HR and RR during sleep
Sleep midpoint_sin	Sine component of midsleep time (circular encoding)
Sleep midpoint_cos	Cosine component of midsleep time (circular encoding)
OOB count	Number of Out-of-Bed (OOB) events during sleep period
OOB duration	Total duration of OOB events during sleep period (minutes)
OOB percent	OOB percentage (OOB duration/presence duration)
Average OOB time	Average duration per OOB event (minutes)
Long OOB Flag	Flag indicating if max OOB duration $\geq$ 20 minutes (1=yes, 0=no)
Statistics of HR, RR, Activity	Mean, Median, Min, Max, SD, CV, IQR, MAD, Skewness, Kurtosis

Table S2: Univariate screening results for agitation occurrence. Odds ratios (OR, 95% CI) are shown for candidate sleep features, adjusted for age, sex, and cohort with a subject-level random intercept. P values are FDR-adjusted; redundancy and collinearity checks were applied before multivariable modeling.

Feature	OR	95% CI	P-value	VIF
Mean RR	0.461	[0.304, 0.698]	0.007	1.10
Median RR	0.501	[0.328, 0.764]	0.013	-
Min. RR	0.502	[0.351, 0.718]	0.007	1.10
Activity SD	1.932	[1.297, 2.880]	0.013	1.06
Activity CV	1.928	[1.293, 2.875]	0.013	-
Presence Time	1.661	[1.168, 2.361]	0.039	1.05

Note: ORs are adjusted for age, sex, and cohort. VIF = Variance Inflation Factors. Features in bold were retained for the final multivariable model.



Figure S1: Distribution of agitation occurrence across subtypes. Counts of agitation-positive and agitation-negative days are shown for all agitation, motor agitation, and verbal agitation (pooled WSA&+EMFIT).



Figure S2: External evaluation in TIHM. Single-feature mixed-effects models in TIHM show consistent respiration-related associations with agitation occurrence (OR, 95% CI; AUC annotated). CV = Coefficient of Variation; IQR = Interquartile Range; SD = Standard Deviation.