Roadmap

1. Describe the shift in ethical, policy, and legal focus on issues in Alzheimer's disease

2. Four Issues to Highlight as Examples
   - Employment & Insurance Discrimination
   - Prison & Criminal Justice Health
   - Payer Coverage and Access
   - Data & Research
Alzheimer’s disease and Related Dementias (ADRD): Traditional Challenges

**Preventing**
- Modifiable risk factors
- Predictive testing (biomarker & genetic)

**Treating**
- Diagnosis
- Disease-modifying therapies

**Caring For**
- Symptom management
- Caregiver burden
- Safety (including elder abuse)
- Long-term Care Services
“he scored a 24, so it didn't go anywhere. It's just like, ‘Okay, that's what it is.’ He just has some memory-- and they just kind of turned us away. So then three years later I'm like, ‘This is not getting any better. There's definitely something.’ [...] So I set up another appointment.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes in Missed/Misdiagnosis</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms disregarded</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear Responses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated for another condition (menopause, depression, sleep apnea, etc)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed phenotype of AD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A shift in novel ethical and legal challenges

Preventing
- Modifiable risk factors
- Predictive testing (biomarker & genetic)

Treating
- Diagnosis
- Disease-modifying therapies

Caring For
- Symptom management
- Caregiver burden
- Safety (including elder abuse)
- Long-term Care Services
“since the diagnosis, I'm just overwhelmed. And because everything's on my shoulders, I have to do the research. Before, it was, "Okay, honey, take care of this," and then she would do it, and it would get done. Where now, I've got to do it. Well, I can't do it because I'm at work, and I'm gone for days at a time, and so things are just not getting done. And so, I just feel like I'm way behind, trying to plan and get ready for the next phase of this.” (caregiver report, paper under development)

A new shift in ADRD research leads to a shift in public health considerations

**Preventing**
- Modifiable risk factors
- Predictive testing (biomarker & genetic)

**Treating**
- Diagnosis
- Disease-modifying therapies

**Caring For**
- Symptom management
- Caregiver burden
- Safety (including elder abuse)
- Long-term Care Services
A SHIFT in how Alzheimer’s is defined & diagnosed. Including the potential for preclinical risk assessment.
Some Emerging Issues
Issue 1. Chronic Illness & Discrimination

• Employment discrimination based on disease or risk for disease

More Americans Working Past 65

Report says most have college degrees and higher incomes
by America Edson, AARP, April 22, 2019 | Comments: 16

Adults age 65 and older are twice as likely to be working today compared with 1985, and many of them are making good money, according to a new report. But the likelihood of their being able to work past the traditional retirement age is shaped by how much education they have and what type of work they do.

Harvard Health Letter

Working later in life can pay off in more than just income

Benefits such as mental stimulation and social engagement are associated with staving off chronic disease.
Published: June, 2018
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Punching a time clock is still part of the regular routine for an increasing number of older adults. They're staying employed or going back to work, even though they're beyond the traditional retirement age of 65.
“the downside would be if this information got into the wrong hands [. . .] and it was used to do her harm in terms of employment or insurability [. . .] There are certainly laws in place to prevent those things from happening [. . .]”

Arias et al, *in process*
# Anti-Discrimination Protections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Summary of the scope of legal protections to prevent employment and insurance discrimination in persons who have either genetic markers or biomarkers for developing Alzheimer disease dementia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection from employment discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genetic markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
<td>Uncertain&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Care Act</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) does not directly address genetic disposition. However, the EEOC has interpreted the 2008 amendment to the Americans with Disabilities Act to broaden the definition of disability in favor of coverage.  

<sup>b</sup>Affordable Care Act provisions to limit discrimination in health insurance for persons with a preexisting condition start in 2014. Whether these provisions will apply to the concept of preclinical Alzheimer disease is uncertain—the analysis is complicated by the fact that preclinical biomarkers have yet to be validated and thus may not qualify as a preexisting condition.

---

**Unfair Treatment:**

“It wasn’t fair. She didn’t understand all the processes and stuff. […] She was an administrator, a vice principal at junior high school for seven years. […] and instead of recognizing it as what it was, it just became her losing it as a teacher or her not putting enough effort into it. And my God, she was staying up almost all night through no fault, trying to nail down the curriculum and to go the next day, and it still wouldn’t work out.”

Husband of Patient with EOAD
“Well, he realized that he's a liability on some of the things for-- because as the engineer, there are lots of liability issues. So he was very cognizant on how this all plays out. So from the get-go-- I think from that moment on, he thought about whether or not he should be signing drawings, being the ultimate decision-maker on things. He continued down that path probably through end of last year. And then he made a decision to notify everyone-- I mean, not everyone but the other partners in the firm that he shouldn't be signing drawings and that the other partners should be doing that. So that's kind of what came about for that.” Wife of Patient with EOAD
Alzheimer’s disease biomarkers: another tool for FAA pilot screening?
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The mean age of federal government officials is at a historical high. Twelve members of the 116th Congress (2019-2021) are older than 80 years, and President Donald Trump is the oldest elected president in history (70 years old at inauguration),¹ which is consistent with societal trends. Age in mean age creates an increased risk that federal officials will develop age-associated cognitive disorders, including Alzheimer disease and similar dementias. Age-associated neurodegenerative disorders can lead to profound behavioral and cognitive changes, including difficulty with memory, problem solving, judgment, insight, and social and emotional functioning. These deficits may affect job performance and substantially affect the competence of federal officials. This risk is more than hypothetical. Recent events have reported that evaluations of President Ronald Reagan’s speech indicate he experienced Alzheimer disease while serving in office. More recently, an investigative report³ uncovered evidence that a pharmacy service delivers drugs used to treat Alzheimer disease to members of Congress.

Screening for cognitive disorders as part of a general health assessment typically relies on preliminary screening tools (e.g., the Mini-Mental State Examination or Montreal Cognitive Assessment) that are inexpensive. The public’s right to information regarding the cognitive status of an official or candidate is legally unsettled, although current political and regulatory standards are the side of protecting health information as private. Disclosing officials’ health information to the public raises concerns between individual privacy rights and a public interest in officials’ capacity to serve. The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act restricts access to health information for uses outside the provision and/or payment of healthcare. In addition, political considerations may influence decisions to restrict disclosure of health concerns that could affect perceived capacity to serve. Several historical examples reveal efforts to keep health information from the public, including disclosing stroke (Woodrow Wilson), Addison disease (John F. Kennedy), gastrointestinal disease (Dwight Eisenhower), and terminal cardiovascular disease (Franklin D. Roosevelt).

The US Constitution lacks a singular approach for removal of individuals from office owing to illness or other grounds. The 25th Amendment is the only constitutional provision that supports the removal of an official (the president) from office on the grounds of illness or disability. It permits a transfer of power if the president is no longer capable of serving. The amendment’s primary objective is to
Issue 2. Dementia in Prison & Criminal Health

An Ethical Examination of Sentencing Decisions & Treatment of Inmates with Dementia (ARCH Network Pilot Grant)
What is the sequence of events in the criminal justice system?

Source: Adapted from The challenge of crime in a free society. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967. This revision, a result of the Symposium on the 30th Anniversary of the President's Commission, was prepared by the Bureau of Justice Statistics in 1997.

Note: This chart gives a simplified view of caseflow through the criminal justice system. Procedures vary among jurisdictions. The weights of the lines are not intended to show actual size of caseloads.
Understanding how the Criminal Justice System Manages Individuals with Dementia

• 15 Semi-structured interviews: Prosecutors and defense attorneys to identify experiences with dementia and/or potential challenges post-arrest.

• Empirical legal methods: Systematically map standards for post-arrest, trial, and sentencing.

## Results: Interviews with legal stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female (9), Male (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Ranges</td>
<td>30-39 = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-59 = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Role</td>
<td>State Prosecutor = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Public Defender = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Practice = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unanswered = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of legal practices</td>
<td>Range 5-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = &lt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 = 10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = &gt;20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In varying scenarios, competency is almost always an issue. Sometimes it's pretty clear that the person isn't competent and they're found not competent. Unfortunately, here, it's also not uncommon for the state to demand a restoration period to try and, quote-unquote, "restore" them to competency, even though they have a diagnosis with absolutely no chance of that occurring. So it's not uncommon for people to be sent to the state mental hospital for restoration to try and stand trial for their criminal charges. I have a gentleman there right now whose only diagnosis is dementia. **They recommended restoration, even though there's no reason to believe that would ever cause anything to improve.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Decision Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>State v. McLaughlin, 725 N.W.2d 703 (2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Anderson v. State, 185 So.3d 403 (2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>McAfee v. State, 467 S.W.3d 622 (2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>People v. Weinstein, 156 Misc.2d 34 (1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>People v. Hix, Not Reported in Cal.Rptr.3d (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>People v. Simon, Not Reported in Cal.Rptr.2d (2001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Pollock also determined that appellant suffered from a neurological disease of the brain and central nervous system and that he suffered from dementia as well. Dr. Pollock testified that appellant's disorders were aggravated by stress and that exposure to severe stress could cause him to develop psychotic behavior. Dr. Pollock acknowledged that his opinion that appellant suffered from a vascular neurocognitive disorder [...]. McAfee

Olivia Li, et al, in process
Early Takeaways

• Lack of systematic screening process for dementia post-arrest

• Placement is a significant challenge

• Attorneys lack training on dementia to be able to understand how the disease could impact decision-making

• The two legal mechanisms available to divert miss the mark given their focus on psychiatric populations
  o Competency Hearing
  o Plea of “not guilty by reason of insanity” (Arias, 2020)

Arias, et al, in progress
ARTICLE
Private payer coverage policies for ApoE-e4 genetic testing
Jalayne J. Arias, JD, MA,1 Ana M. Tyler, JD, MA,1 Michael P. Douglas, MS2 and Kathryn A. Phillips, PhD2

PURPOSE: ApoE-e4 has a well-established connection to late-onset Alzheimer’s disease. However, there have been no analyses of payer coverage policies for ApoE. Our objective was to assess private payer coverage policies for ApoE testing, examine the rationales, and describe supporting evidence methods.

METHODS: We searched for policies from the eight largest private health plans in the United States. We implemented content analysis methods to evaluate policies from the eight largest private health plans.

RESULTS: Seven payers had policies with positions on ApoE testing. Policies varied in their decisions about whether or not to cover testing, with some requiring preauthorization.

CONCLUSION: Seven of the eight largest private payers’ coverage policies for ApoE testing reflect a lack of clinical utility. As the field advances, ApoE testing may have the potential to modify treatment decisions. However, policies inconsistent with private payers’ policies may contribute to unnecessary costs.
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Developing an Economic and Policy Research Agenda for Blood Biomarkers of Neurodegenerative Diseases
Jalayne J. Arias, JD; Kathryn A. Phillips, PhD; Jason Karlawish, MD
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Table 2. Monthly payment to nursing homes and non-nursing home facilities, by dementia status and facility type of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel A. All adults</th>
<th>Adults with dementia</th>
<th>Adults with no dementia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential care</td>
<td>Nursing home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with self/family payment</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with payment from social security</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with payment from Medicaid</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with payment from Medicare</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with payment from private insurance</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent w/ payment from other government source</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel B. Adults with OOP payment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average (SD) self/family payment</td>
<td>3089.6</td>
<td>3848.6</td>
<td>2800.7</td>
<td>2176.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median self/family payment</td>
<td>2906</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interquartile range of self/family payment</td>
<td>[1593,4500]</td>
<td>[851,7500]</td>
<td>[769,3666]</td>
<td>[319,3100]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The data are weighted using NHATS survey weights to represent 2019 survivors among Medicare beneficiaries living in the contiguous United States in 2015. The results are based on 505 respondents (319 with dementia and 186 without dementia) who were non-community dwelling (column n from left to right: 195, 124, 158, 28).
Issue 4: Data And Research

Two Novel Issues Emerging

Whether and How Investigators Return Results to Participants

How investigators SHARE data with each other
Ability to learn genetic status appears to be a driver for enrolling in the study.

And so part of the reason for my enrollment in it was-- is because of the genetic testing that came out of it and knowing if I was a carrier or not. And then that was kind of one of the reasons that I did it. So I went through some genetic counseling at the time with [redacted]. I think she's no longer there. But did some stuff with her, and that was, again, one of the reasons that I started this study. And now I continue to do the study just to help be part of it, so.
Researchers may face unique challenges associated with Return of Results in Familial Dementia Research

**Difference within Families**

*Investigator:*

One family member knows and yet doesn't want the other family member to know and making sure that we're respecting all of those complicated directives and wishes within families.

**Participants:**

The only thing that I don't really understand from some of their perspectives is of not wanting to know the results of their testing. A lot of them have been tested and keep going up every year to help the study, but don't want to find out whether they're carrying the gene or not. That's what I don't really understand.

**Disclosure to Family/Capacity**

*Investigators:*

And then another thing we've added is that to whom, kind of next of kin, can this be disclosed to because a number of our patients die. And so sometimes they die before the genetic data comes back, and so we want to be clear about is it okay to tell the next of kin. And if so, who do we tell about this, and so we try to make sure that all of those things are in there.
I think it's paramount, right? I mean, I do not think for these complex diseases that we're going to solve problems if people don't share data. And my impression is that even with the current policies in place, not everybody is being-- there's not good faith sharing across the board - right? (Investigator)
Investigators described challenges and barriers

**Data Use (Secondary Analysis):** “And so sharing data is not exactly appealing most of the time because you never know if people are going to use it well or what they'll do with it.”

**Embargo/Incentives:** “On the data-gatherer side of things-- I mean, there is a little bit of frustration in the sense that you do all the QC and the processing of the data, and then you release it, and then actually, even though you've been involved in all of that, you're basically in the same point as everybody else when it comes to analysis.”

**Data withholding:** “I mean, I think people are not straightforward, right? [...] I mean the most common reason, I think, you hear is, "Oh, only one consented to be able to share their information." And that may be true, but I have no way of really knowing, right? I mean, I can't go in there and say, "Well, [Name], I want to see your consent form."
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