Continuous Monitoring and Injury Mitigation in the Non-Communicative Dementia Patient: A Comprehensive Geriatric Neurology Analysis

Section 1: The Critical Nexus of Dementia, Injury, and Communication Failure

1.1 The Vulnerability Profile: Dementia as an Independent Risk Factor for Injury

Alzheimer's disease (AD) and related dementias establish a profound vulnerability profile, distinctly increasing the risk of physical injury, particularly through falls. Epidemiological data confirms that dementia is not merely a co-morbidity but functions as a severe independent risk factor for falls.[1] Analysis of older adults diagnosed with AD reveals a remarkably high annual fall prevalence, consistently measured between 43.55% and 44.27%.[1] This incidence far surpasses that of individuals with mild cognitive impairment (MCI), whose annual fall prevalence is reported at 35.26%.[2] Quantifying the frequency, the yearly average number of falls in the AD population stands at 1.30 falls per person, significantly higher than the 0.77 falls per person observed in the MCI cohort.[2]

The severity of this risk is underscored by the high rate of consequential trauma: nearly half of all documented fall events in AD cohorts result in measurable injury, citing a reported rate of injured fallers at 45.0%.[1] The mechanisms driving these falls in AD patients are complex, extending beyond typical age-related mobility decline. Pathological changes in brain regions necessary for cognitive functioning, balance, and gait coordination result in compromised balance dysfunctions, postural instability, and overall mobility deficits.[1] Furthermore, clinical management practices can exacerbate this inherent risk; specifically, the severity of the cognitive decline is positively correlated with an increased risk of falling.[1] A review of pharmacological interventions notes that the initiation of psychotropic medications, particularly conventional antipsychotics and certain antidepressants, substantially elevates the risk of both death and hip fracture in the dementia population.[3]

The high prevalence of undetected cognitive impairment within care settings significantly amplifies this risk. For instance, in residential or nursing care facilities, the meta-prevalence of undetected dementia is substantial, estimated at 50.9%.[4] These individuals, despite their high-risk status (mirroring the 44% fall risk of diagnosed AD patients), are systematically excluded from proactive, tailored intervention protocols, such as comprehensive mobility training or targeted medication reviews, intended for known high-risk populations. The observation that approximately half of older adults in these settings are functionally at extreme risk but structurally unmanaged means that the overall high incidence of injurious falls observed in the elderly residential population is disproportionately driven by this large contingent of undiagnosed, high-risk residents who lack the appropriate care planning.[5] Therefore, passive monitoring technologies that cover the entire environment inherently address this systemic gap by protecting both clinically known and previously unrecognized high-risk patients.

1.2 Neuropathological Basis for Communication Loss and Pain Reporting Impairment

As dementia progresses, one of the most detrimental effects is the progressive erosion of communication capabilities, rendering patients increasingly unable to articulate their subjective experiences, including pain. Cognitive decline frequently manifests as communication disorders such as aphasia, dysphasia, or primary progressive aphasia (PPA).[6] PPA, for example, is caused by atrophy (shrinking) in specific brain areas, primarily the frontal, temporal, or parietal lobes, typically on the left side, which are crucial for speech and language processing.[6] This neurological degeneration leads to a gradual but inevitable loss of the ability to speak, write, and understand both written and spoken language, a process that can span 3 to 15 years.[6]

The consequence of this aphasia/dysphasia on clinical care is critical. Given that pain assessment traditionally relies heavily on verbal self-report, the patient's inability to convey or accurately describe pain places this vulnerable population—encompassing those with dementia, intellectual disabilities, or traumatic brain injury—at a substantially increased risk for non- and under-assessment.[8]

1.3 The Cycle of Undetected Pain and Injury: Clinical Consequences

The inability to verbally report pain initiates a dangerous cycle of under-treatment and accelerated decline. Individuals with dementia often exhibit a lower pain threshold (the minimum intensity perceived as painful) but simultaneously experience an increased pain tolerance. This paradox occurs because their cognitive capacity to recognize, quickly interpret, and cognitively process painful stimuli is compromised.[8] This neurological alteration contributes directly to the misinterpretation of their physical status by caregivers and medical staff, leading to pain being unrecognized even when severe.[8]

The under-treatment of pain in this population is a well-documented systemic failure. Studies indicate that patients suffering from dementia consistently receive less pain medication compared to cognitively intact patients experiencing similar painful conditions, a gap that widens significantly as the stage of dementia advances.[9] This deficiency is observed across cohorts; even among those patients reporting bothersome pain, a notable 30.3% stated they rarely or never utilized any medication for pain management.[10] The reliance on subjective hetero-evaluation (assessment by others) alone has been deemed insufficient to close this treatment gap.[9]

Unrelieved pain is not merely a matter of unnecessary suffering; it actively exacerbates cognitive impairment, leading to decreased memory function, increased agitation, and impaired physical function, thereby accelerating the functional decline.[11] Chronic pain is increasingly recognized as a neurobiological co-factor in the progression of AD itself. It is associated with changes in brain regions like the locus coeruleus and affects neurotransmitters such as norepinephrine, potentially causing inflammation in the pain-relaying cells of the brain.[12] This suggests that effective, continuous pain monitoring, necessitated by the failure of verbal self-report, transforms meticulous pain management from a purely palliative necessity into a foundational **neuroprotective strategy**. By aggressively detecting and treating physical suffering, potentially through technological assistance, healthcare providers may achieve a more effective means of delaying cognitive and functional deterioration than traditional methods allow.

Section 2: Epidemiology and Quantification of Physical Injury in Alzheimer's Disease (AD)

2.1 Specific Rates and Mechanisms of Fall-Related Trauma

The high incidence of falls in the dementia population translates directly into a high burden of significant trauma, particularly fractures. Data comparing Alzheimer's patients to non-Alzheimer's reference groups demonstrates that AD patients face a Relative Risk (RR) of 2.51 for non-vertebral fractures.[13] This elevated risk highlights the fragility and complexity of trauma in this cohort.

The most frequent catastrophic injuries resulting from falls are fractures, with hip fractures being the most common type, observed in 5.3% of the Alzheimer's cohort, and vertebral fractures affecting 3.3% of patients.[3] These types of trauma indicate high-impact events and often signal underlying comorbidities related to bone density or muscle weakness exacerbated by the dementia pathology. Although AD patients may demonstrate a marginally reduced risk of traumatic brain injuries (TBIs) compared to non-dementia controls (OR = 0.765), the broader category of patients with unspecified dementia demonstrates a statistically significant increased risk of diffuse TBI (Odds Ratio of 1.161).[14] This heterogeneity across dementia subtypes necessitates a comprehensive, vigilant approach to head injury prevention across all cognitively impaired populations.

2.2 The Dangers of Undetected Trauma and Sub-Clinical Injury

A severe complication of injury in the AD population is the compounding effect of cognitive impairment on outcome. Persons with dementia suffer demonstrably higher post-fracture mortality rates than those without dementia.[3] This outcome implies that a major fracture acts as a negative sentinel event, initiating a rapid decline characterized by immobilization, systemic complications, and accelerated cognitive deterioration.

The high prevalence of traumatic events is also visible in healthcare utilization patterns. People with dementia have a higher percentage of visits to clinics or emergency rooms for previous injuries in the last year compared to non-dementia counterparts (32.97% vs. 30.76%, $P < 0.001$).[15] While this confirms a substantial acute trauma burden, the persistent issue of under-assessment for pain suggests a chronic, lingering burden of sub-clinical injury. Common sources of unrecognized pain include pressure ulcers, stiff joints due to reduced mobility, and contractures, which are the tightening of muscles and tendons, often developing because patients avoid using or allowing repositioning of painful body parts.[12]

The challenge of detection is further evidenced by proxy reporting data. When caregivers (proxies) report on the patient's pain, they cite slightly higher rates of pain than the patients themselves report, even in cohorts where some verbal communication capacity remains. Specifically, proxies reported activity-limiting pain in 46.6% of patients, compared to 40.1% of patients reporting the same themselves.[10] This discrepancy confirms the unreliability of patient self-reporting even in earlier stages of cognitive impairment, necessitating objective detection methods.

The high incidence of fractures (RR 2.51) in patients who are already known to be under-assessed for falls risk factors [3] suggests a profound deficiency in proactive geriatric screening. Additionally, the prevalence of cognitive impairment—estimated at 42%—among older hip fracture patients [3] suggests that the **acute fracture event** often serves as the factor that finally identifies a patient who was already suffering from underlying, unrecognized dementia and chronic high risk. Continuous, subtle monitoring of mobility and gait could theoretically detect the precursory subtle deterioration that precedes the fall, thus facilitating intervention before this catastrophic sentinel event occurs.

The high post-fracture mortality rate in this cohort further underscores that injury mitigation must prioritize not only primary prevention (stopping the fall) but, critically, secondary prevention (rapid response). A reduction in the **Time On Ground (TOG)** following a fall is directly associated with a lower incidence of secondary complications, such as hypothermia and pressure necrosis, and significantly improves the post-fall prognosis.[16] Therefore, fast, technologically driven fall detection transitions from a convenience feature to a life-critical function that determines the patient’s chance of survival and functional recovery.

Section 3: Clinical Protocols for Pain Assessment in the Non-Communicative Patient

3.1 Establishing Reliable Observational Behavioral Assessment

Given that verbal communication fails in advanced dementia, effective pain assessment necessitates an interdisciplinary approach that utilizes reliable, validated behavioral indicators.[8] Medical consensus, including guidance from the American Geriatrics Society and the American Society for Pain Management Nursing, advocates for behavioral indicators such as facial expressions, body movements, vocalizations, and changes in mental status to develop specialized observational-based pain assessment tools.[17]

A range of specific tools has been validated for use in nonverbal or dementia patients, including the Pain Assessment in Advanced Dementia (PAINAD) scale, Doloplus-2, Algoplus, and the Non-communicative Patient's Pain Assessment Instrument (NOPPAIN).[18] The PAINAD scale, for instance, assesses parameters such as breathing, negative vocalizations, facial expressions, body language, and consolability.[19] The tool has demonstrated adequate psychometric properties, including high inter-rater reliability (Intra-Class Correlation of 0.92 at rest).[20] Other instruments, like the Nonverbal Pain Scale (NVPS), incorporate physiological indicators, scoring changes in vital signs such as a change in systolic blood pressure (SBP) or heart rate (HR) greater than 20 mmHg or 20 beats per minute, respectively, over baseline, alongside behavioral observation.[21]

However, reliance solely on observational tools presents clinical limitations. These instruments are not universally applicable ('not one size fits all') [18], and their sensitivity can be compromised. For example, the concurrent validity between PAINAD scores and patient self-ratings of pain has been found to be weak.[20] This suggests that reliance on observable behavior alone remains subjective and can easily be confounded by behavioral and psychological symptoms of dementia (BPSD) that are not pain-related.

3.2 The Transition to Objective Physiological Pain Biomarkers

To overcome the inherent subjectivity and resource intensity of manual behavioral observation, research is pivoting toward objective physiological monitoring to quantify pain severity accurately. This focus is driven by the recognition that hetero-evaluation remains insufficient for addressing the prevalent under-treatment of pain.[9]

Current research investigates variations in the autonomic nervous system (ANS) that accompany a painful stimulus, which can be recorded via cardiac, vascular, pupillary, or skin conductance changes.[9] Clinical trials are evaluating systems like the Nociception Level index (NoL® system) to induce experimental pain (e.g., the cold pressor test) in early-stage AD patients and measure resulting ANS parameters, with the goal of establishing objective markers that correlate with nociception.[9]

The core components utilized in established clinical scales, such as body movements, facial activity, and vocalizations [17], are precisely the types of multimodal data that modern Ambient

Assisted Living (AAL) and sensor systems are designed to collect passively and continuously. This convergence allows for the technological integration to potentially automate the observation component of tools like PAINAD or MOBID-2. Automated systems could continuously score these objective behaviors, alerting staff when observed indicators cross a clinically defined pain threshold, thereby drastically reducing the burden on human staff for manual, repeated observation.

Crucially, the development of objective ANS metrics provides a powerful tool for clinical advocacy. The pervasive under-treatment of pain is often linked to the perceived lack of clinical evidence of suffering. If ANS data can provide a quantifiable, irrefutable measure of nociception [9], this data overrides subjective assessment barriers and provides the necessary clinical support to compel medical teams to prescribe appropriate and effective analgesia, thereby securing proper patient care.

Section 4: The Strategic Benefits of Continuous Patient Monitoring (The "Why" of Monitoring)

The implementation of continuous patient monitoring, ranging from wearable devices to environmental sensors, offers strategic advantages that directly address the high injury rates and communication deficits inherent to advanced dementia care.

4.1 Efficacy of Fall Detection Technologies and Reduced Injury Complications

Ambient Assisted Living (AAL) systems, utilizing Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), smart devices, and medical sensors, are designed to enhance safety and provide technological assistance for health and home monitoring in the elderly.[22] These smart environments, incorporating technologies such as smart carpets, cushion sensors, accelerometers, gyroscopes, and motion detectors [23], are crucial for detecting catastrophic events.

The most vital immediate benefit provided by these fall detection technologies is the drastic reduction in **Time On Ground (TOG)** following an event. Studies evaluating sophisticated surveillance technologies demonstrate a capacity to reduce TOG by a factor of **3** over a six-month monitoring period.[16] This rapid detection ensured that 76.6% of fallers received human staff assistance in less than 10 minutes.[16] This expedited response time is essential for mitigating secondary complications such as hypothermia, dehydration, and pressure ulcers, ultimately leading to improved post-fall prognosis and reduced overall healthcare costs.[16]

4.2 Monitoring of Digital Biomarkers: Predicting Decline and Targeting Intervention

Continuous data acquisition systems, particularly wearable actigraphy and environmental sensors, provide unique physiological information not attainable through traditional in-clinic assessments.[24] This ongoing surveillance captures critical digital biomarkers related to mobility, sleep, and circadian rhythm, which hold significant prognostic value.

4.2.1 Gait and Activity Analysis

Wearable devices allow for the measurement of specific gait characteristics, posture, and overall walking activity.[24] Longitudinal monitoring has established a clear link between specific activity measures and cognitive function. For example, waist accelerometer-derived data showing moderate to vigorous physical activity levels is associated with better memory and executive functioning.[25] Conversely, infrared sensing-based activity monitoring has demonstrated that individuals experiencing cognitive decline exhibit reduced indoor movement over a study period, whereas stable individuals maintain their baseline activity levels.[25]

This continuous tracking of digital biomarkers transforms the safety model from purely reactive (detecting the fall) to **proactive and predictive**. Detecting a sudden, unexplained reduction in indoor movement or significant deterioration in gait velocity is highly indicative of impending physical or cognitive decline. This information should trigger a clinical review *before* a catastrophic fall or acute exacerbation occurs, allowing for preventative intervention.

4.2.2 Sleep and Circadian Rhythm

Wearable actigraphy effectively captures physiological disruptions common in persons with dementia (PwD). Studies show that adults with dementia exhibit statistically significant lower mean sleep efficiency compared to controls, alongside an increased fragmentation of their sleep-wake cycle and a loss of typical diurnal variation in circadian rhythm.[24] These findings serve as potential early and objective indicators of distress, acute illness, or cognitive decline, allowing caregivers to intervene before behavioral symptoms escalate.

4.3 Economic and Operational Benefits of Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM)

The deployment of Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM) systems embedded within the broader healthcare infrastructure demonstrates clear economic and operational efficacy, especially in populations with complex co-morbidities like dementia.

RPM systems are associated with a significant reduction in the frequency and duration of high-cost emergency care utilization. Analysis shows a reduction in the number of hospitalizations, Emergency Department (ED) visits, and the overall duration of hospital stays.[26] One study documented a significant median reduction of **14 days** spent at the hospital per patient per year for monitored older adults with polypathology.[26] Furthermore, the reduction in hospitalization and ED visit rates was found to be greater in participants characterized by severe disabilities, demonstrating the highest impact where the need is most critical.[26]

Beyond direct patient outcomes, technology serves a crucial role in supporting the immense burden carried by informal family caregivers. Family caregivers are estimated to save the U.S. healthcare system $375 billion annually by providing homecare for PwD.[27] These caregivers face significant stress, strain, and negative health outcomes resulting from managing progressive memory loss, communication failure, and disruptive behaviors.[27] Telehealth applications, which often include video monitoring and feedback, provide interdisciplinary teams with actionable video-recordings of behavioral antecedents and evaluations of caregiver responses.[27] By providing technological tools that alleviate the burden of constant physical surveillance and offer objective data for behavior management, monitoring technologies directly support caregiver retention and health, helping to mitigate the costs associated with early institutionalization driven by caregiver burnout.

Section 5: Ethical, Legal, and Implementation Challenges (The "How" of Monitoring)

The adoption of continuous technological monitoring for cognitively impaired individuals, while medically advantageous, presents unique ethical and legal challenges that require careful governance to balance patient safety against personal autonomy and privacy.

5.1 Navigating Informed Consent and Decisional Capacity for Surveillance

In the context of electronic surveillance, the principles governing informed consent must address compromised decisional capacity. The central challenge involves balancing the need for safety with the fundamental right to autonomy. Even when an individual is deemed legally incompetent or clinically incapacitated, geriatric ethics mandates that their input into healthcare decisions must be maximized.[28] People with compromised decisional capacity can often still articulate core values, preferences, and long-term goals that should guide the decision to implement surveillance.[28]

Unfortunately, a critical gap exists in the regulatory environment, as there is currently an absence of unified guidelines for human-subject reviews and implementation protocols regarding informed consent for technology use among the cognitively impaired.[29] This necessitates a highly ethical, collaborative physician-patient dialogue that strives to respect existing preferences while making decisions based on the patient's best interests, typically involving surrogate decision-makers.

5.2 Protecting Privacy, Preventing Stigma, and Data Governance

Continuous surveillance, whether by clinical staff or technology, represents a substantial intrusion into a patient's physical and informational privacy.[30] Monitoring systems must be designed to strictly prevent unauthorized identification of individuals and address the risk of inadvertently recording data from additional persons (e.g., caregivers or visitors).[30] The extent of the privacy violation is highly dependent on the type of technology used and how data is stored and managed.[30]

A major concern is the risk of stigma. Visible surveillance technology (SST) can be associated with shame or a sense of loss of control, potentially stigmatizing the patient.[30] To address this, the preference should be for **unobtrusive sensor systems** (e.g., ambient sensors rather than body cameras) that enhance safety while minimizing the violation of dignity and autonomy.[30]

Furthermore, the predictive nature of the collected data introduces new risks. Data related to accelerated gait deterioration, sleep fragmentation, or reduced activity levels are powerful digital biomarkers that predict future functional and cognitive decline.[24] If this highly sensitive, predictive data is transmitted to third parties, such as long-term care insurers or providers, it could lead to **informational stigma and discrimination** based on predicted deterioration rather than current capacity. Ethical governance frameworks must classify these digital biomarkers as protected health information and strictly regulate their use and access to ensure they serve only clinical welfare purposes.

5.3 Balancing Autonomy and Paternalism

A potential negative consequence of relying too heavily on technology is the risk of diminishing essential human interaction. Continuous surveillance by technology could lead to a reduction in the time clinical staff spend with patients, substituting relational care with machine dependence.[30] The goal of monitoring technology must be clearly defined as optimizing, not replacing, human care resources, allowing staff to use saved surveillance time to build meaningful relationships.[30]

Policy implementation must also address potential conflicts of interest. The development and deployment of sensor technologies often involves commercial entities, and policies must guard against the risk that adoption is driven by the financial interests of manufacturers rather than by objective patient welfare standards.[30]

When autonomy is lost due to communication failure, the monitoring system can be leveraged as a substitute "digital voice." For instance, objective ANS data confirming pain provides verifiable evidence of suffering. This allows surrogate decision-makers and medical teams to authorize necessary pain relief treatments with confidence, aligning with the patient's presumed fundamental preference for comfort and reducing suffering. The appropriate application of technology thus works to restore a mechanism for the patient to express their fundamental needs and exercise rights, even in an incapacitated state.

Section 6: Conclusion and Recommendations for

Advanced Dementia Care

6.1 Synthesis: Mandatory Integration of Detection and Response Systems

The evidence comprehensively demonstrates that individuals with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias are subject to extremely high rates of injury, particularly recurrent falls (44.27% annual prevalence) and catastrophic fractures (Relative Risk of 2.51).[1] This physical vulnerability is coupled with a profound loss of verbal communication capacity, leading to systematic under-assessment and under-treatment of pain.[8] This combined failure to communicate pain and to prevent injurious falls results in amplified suffering and elevated post-injury mortality.[3]

Continuous monitoring technologies are imperative to bridge the communication gap and mitigate the consequences of injury. They provide both the capability for rapid, life-saving response (reducing Time On Ground by a factor of 3) and the data necessary for proactive care through the analysis of digital biomarkers.[16] Successfully integrated systems demonstrably reduce the high economic burden associated with acute trauma, specifically by decreasing hospitalization days by a median of 14 days per patient per year.[26]

6.2 Targeted Recommendations for Advanced Care Policy

Based on this analysis, the following strategic recommendations are provided for advancing care protocols in non-communicative dementia populations:

1. Standardize and Automate Multi-Component Pain Assessment

All advanced care settings must be mandated to utilize clinically validated, observation-based behavioral pain scales (e.g., PAINAD, MOBID-2) as the minimum standard of care.[18] This clinical necessity should be integrated with technological solutions, specifically using ambient and motion sensors to automate the continuous tracking of behavioral indicators (body movements, vocalizations, facial cues). Furthermore, routine clinical examination must be formalized to proactively screen for secondary, chronic pain sources often overlooked in non-communicative patients, such as pressure ulcers and joint contractures resulting from previous injuries.[12]

2. Prioritize and Subsidize Unobtrusive Technological Fall Response

Investment should be directed toward Ambient Assisted Living (AAL) systems that are proven to minimize Time On Ground (TOG) following a fall. Priority must be placed on deploying sensor technologies that are highly unobtrusive (e.g., smart carpets or infrared systems) to respect patient privacy and autonomy, thereby avoiding the stigma associated with visible surveillance.[30] The efficacy of such systems in reducing secondary complications and improving prognosis warrants their classification as essential, rather than supplementary, care infrastructure.

3. Integrate Predictive Digital Biomarker Monitoring into Clinical Flow

Technological systems must be utilized to continuously acquire and process digital biomarkers, including gait characteristics, walking activity levels, and sleep-wake cycle fragmentation.[24] This prognostic data must be actively integrated into Electronic Health Records (EHRs) with algorithms designed to flag changes that signify impending cognitive or physical decline. This transformation shifts the care paradigm from reactive illness management to a predictive, preventative strategy, allowing for clinical intervention before the onset of a sentinel event like a major fall.

4. Establish Robust Ethical and Data Governance Frameworks

Policy must immediately address the ethical void surrounding technological surveillance. Explicit regulatory frameworks for informed consent are required to ensure that even patients with compromised decisional capacity have their values maximized in the decision-making process, often through collaborative physician-patient dialogues supported by surrogate consent.[28] Furthermore, strict data governance must be established for all collected predictive health data to prevent privacy breaches, unauthorized third-party access, and the potential for informational stigma and discrimination based on predicted longevity or capacity.[30]

5. Leverage Monitoring for Caregiver Empowerment and Support

Technological monitoring should be explicitly positioned as a support mechanism for family and professional caregivers. By providing objective data via telehealth platforms, technology helps identify antecedents to challenging behaviors and provides verifiable evidence of need, directly offsetting the significant emotional and operational burden associated with managing communication deficits and complex behavioral changes in PwD.[27]

Works cited

1. A META-ANALYSIS OF FALL RISK IN OLDER ADULTS WITH ... - NIH, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11065606/
2. Meta-Analysis-Based Comparison of Annual Fall Risk between Older Adults with Alzheimer's Disease and Mild Cognitive Impairment - NIH, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11081206/
3. Dementia, falls and fractures, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.nhfd.co.uk/20/hipfractureR.nsf/0/abc3339f00e6855280257a48003350e1/$FILE/Dementia,%20falls%20and%20fractures.pdf
4. Prevalence and determinants of undetected dementia in the community: a systematic literature review and a meta-analysis - NIH, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5293981/
5. Undetected Dementia in Community-Dwelling Older People: The Canadian Study

of Health and Aging | Request PDF - ResearchGate, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/12245108_Undetected_Dementia_in_Community-Dwelling_Older_People_The_Canadian_Study_of_Health_and_Aging
6. Primary progressive aphasia - Symptoms and causes - Mayo Clinic, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/primary-progressive-aphasia/symptoms-causes/syc-20350499
7. Aphasia - NIDCD - NIH, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.nidcd.nih.gov/health/aphasia
8. Controlling Pain and Discomfort, Part 2: Assessment in Non-verbal Older Adults - PMC - NIH, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4991889/
9. Study Details | NCT04614532 | Recognizing Pain Intensity in Alzheimer's Disease, accessed December 9, 2025, https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT04614532
10. Pain in Community-Dwelling Older Adults with Dementia: Results from the National Health and Aging Trends Study - NIH, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4778418/
11. Identifying Pain in Those Who Can't Communicate It - Ausmed, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.ausmed.com/learn/articles/identifying-pain
12. Dementia-related pain: What caregivers need to know - Mayo Clinic Health System, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.mayoclinichealthsystem.org/hometown-health/speaking-of-health/dementia-related-pain-and-caregivers
13. Prevalence of Falls and Fractures in Alzheimer's Patients Compared to General Population, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7906364/
14. Memory Loss and Missteps: Investigating Fall Risks in Alzheimer's and Dementia Patients, accessed December 9, 2025, https://agmr.hapres.com/htmls/AGMR_1645_Detail.html
15. Analysis of the risk and risk factors for injury in people with and without dementia: a 14-year, retrospective, matched cohort study - PMC - NIH, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6208020/
16. Reduction of Time on the Ground Related to Real-Time Video Detection of Falls in Memory Care Facilities: Observational Study - Journal of Medical Internet Research, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.jmir.org/2021/6/e17551/
17. Pain in non-communicative older adults beyond dementia: a narrative review - PMC, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11371413/
18. Identification, assessment, and management of pain in patients with advanced dementia - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6007582/
19. Development and Psychometric Evaluation of the Pain Assessment in Advanced Dementia (PAINAD) Scale - Baycrest - ECHO Care of the Elderly, accessed December 9, 2025, https://baycrest.echoontario.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Development-and-

psychometric-evaluation-of-the-Pain-Assessment-in-Advanced-Dementia-PAINAD-scale.pdf
20. Psychometric evaluation of the Pain Assessment in Advanced Dementia scale in an acute general hospital setting - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9828226/
21. Nonverbal Pain Scale (NVPS) for Nonverbal Patients - MDCalc, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.mdcalc.com/calc/3621/nonverbal-pain-scale-nvps-nonverbal-patients
22. Dementia care, fall detection, and ambient assisted living technologies help older adults age in place: a scoping review - PMC - NIH, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8514579/
23. Ambient Assisted Living: A Review of Technologies, Methodologies and Future Perspectives for Healthy Aging of Population - MDPI, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/21/10/3549
24. Evaluation of Wearable Technology in Dementia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/medicine/articles/10.3389/fmed.2020.501104/full
25. Shifting From Active to Passive Monitoring of Alzheimer Disease: The State of the Research, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/JAHA.123.031247
26. Impact of a Home-Based Remote Patient Monitoring System on Hospitalizations and Emergency Department Visits of Older Adults With Polypathology: Multicenter Retrospective Observational Study, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.jmir.org/2025/1/e64989
27. In-Home Monitoring Support for Dementia Caregivers: A Feasibility Study - PMC - NIH, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3633651/
28. Ethical Considerations in Electronic Monitoring of the Cognitively Impaired - Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.jabfm.org/content/jabfp/30/2/258.full.pdf
29. In-home monitoring of persons with dementia: Ethical guidelines for technology research and development - C2SHIP, accessed December 9, 2025, https://c2ship.missouri.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/In-home-monitoring-of-persons-with-dementia.pdf
30. Ethics of Sensor-Based Surveillance of People with Dementia in Clinical Practice - NIH, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11990963/
31. Full article: Monitored and Cared for at Home? Privacy Concerns When Using Smart Home Health Technologies to Care for Older Persons - Taylor & Francis Online, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23294515.2024.2416121