Appendices

Appendices……...*1*

Table S1: Sensitivity analysis: potential family care availability and site of death, odds ratio and 95% confidence interval……..2

Table S2: Sensitivity analysis: place of death and caregiving intensity……..3

Table S3: Sensitivity analysis: place of death and caregiving intensity—adjusted for caregiver helping network size……...4

Table S1 Sensitivity analysis: potential family care availability and site of death, odds ratio and 95% confidence interval†

	Category ED death as hospital death (N=375)		Decedents living in community in 2016 (N=288)		Decedents living in residential care setting in 2016 (N=87)‡	
Family care availability	**Hospital Vs. home**	**Nursing/hospice facility Vs. home**	**Hospital Vs. home**	**Nursing/hospice facility Vs. home**	**Hospital Vs. home**	**Nursing/hospice facility Vs. home**
Presence of spouse/partner	1.168 (0.541 - 2.521)	1.707 (0.741 - 3.932)	1.010 (0.449 - 2.273)	1.135 (0.420 - 3.069)	0.438 (0.071 - 2.705)	1.604 (0.345 - 7.451)
Household size	0.960 (0.720 - 1.281)	0.456*** (0.277 - 0.750)	0.977 (0.737 - 1.295)	0.456*** (0.260 - 0.801)	0.594 (0.182 - 1.936)	0.397 (0.089 - 1.773)
Number of daughters	0.879 (0.702 - 1.102)	0.745*** (0.576 - 0.964)	0.908 (0.698 - 1.180)	0.691*** (0.493 - 0.968)	1.003 (0.541 - 1.860)	0.989 (0.565 - 1.731)
Number of sons	0.829 (0.605 - 1.136)	1.097 (0.869 - 1.385)	0.872 (0.613 - 1.239)	1.202 (0.871 - 1.659)	0.813 (0.498 - 1.326)	1.035 (0.636 - 1.686)

Data source: National Health and Aging Trends Study (NHATS) in 2017. Analyses were performed at the decedent level and were weighted to produce national representative estimates using NHATS weights for decedents.

†Multinomial logistic regression was performed adjusted for covariates same with Table 2 including decedents' socio-demographics (sex, age, race), socio-economic variables (education, family income, Medicaid enrollment, living arrangement), and health and functional status (activities of daily life, instrumental activities of daily life, comorbidities, use of hospice services).

‡ Multinomial logistic regression among decedents living in residential care setting in 2016 did not adjust for any covariates due to the small sample size and that the multinomial logistic regression model did not converge.

ED = emergency department.

***P<.05

Table S2 Sensitivity analysis: place of death and caregiving intensity†

	Category ED death as hospital death (N=267)		Caregivers of decedents living in community in 2016 (N=200)		Caregivers of decedents living in residential care setting in 2016 (N=67)	
Family care availability	**Hours spent providing care in LML**	**Perceived high emotional burden**	**Hours spent providing care in LML**	**Perceived high emotional burden**	**Hours spent providing care in LML**	**Perceived high emotional burden**
	Linear regression	Logistic regression	Linear regression	Logistic regression	Linear regression	Logistic regression
	Coef. (SE)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Coef. (SE)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Coef. (SE)	Odds ratio (95% CI)
Ref: home	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hospital	-26.915 (33.414)	4.022*** (1.566 - 10.334)	-38.156 (37.589)	4.613*** (1.510 - 14.095)	32.832 (34.124)	1.330 (0.088 - 20.083)
Nursing/hospice facility	-93.708*** (22.217)	1.216 (0.534 - 2.772)	-92.035*** (24.737)	0.881 (0.335 - 2.321)	-48.764 (31.000)	1.965 (0.528 - 7.320)

Data source: National Study of Caregiving (NSOC) linked with National Health and Aging Trends Study (NHATS) in 2017. Analyses were performed at the caregiver level (267 caregivers for 186 decedents) and weighted to produce national representative estimates using NSOC weights for LML caregivers.

†Covariates adjusted in all the models are the same with Table 3 including decedents' socio-demographics (sex, age, race, marital status), socio-economic variables (education, family income, Medicaid enrollment, living arrangement), health and functional status (activities of daily life, instrumental activities of daily life, comorbidities, use of hospice services), and caregivers' socio-demographics (relationship to and co-residence with decedents).

LML = last-month-of-life; SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval.

***P<.05

Table S3 Sensitivity analysis: place of death and caregiving intensity—adjusted for caregiver helping network size†

	Adjusted for caregiver helping network size (N=267)	
Family care availability	**Hours spent providing care in LML**	**Perceived high emotional burden**
	Linear regression	Logistic regression
	Coef. (SE)	Odds ratio (95% CI)
Ref: home	-	-
Hospital	-8.318 (29.945)	3.753*** (1.477 - 9.536)
Nursing/hospice facility	-78.079*** (19.933)	1.084 (0.483 - 2.431)

Data source: National Study of Caregiving (NSOC) linked with National Health and Aging Trends Study (NHATS) in 2017. Analyses were performed at the caregiver level (267 caregivers for 186 decedents) and weighted to produce national representative estimates using NSOC weights for LML caregivers.

†Covariates adjusted in all the models include decedents' socio-demographics (sex, age, race, marital status), socio-economic variables (education, family income, Medicaid enrollment, living arrangement), health and functional status (activities of daily life, instrumental activities of daily life, comorbidities, use of hospice services), and caregivers' socio-demographics (relationship to and co-residence with decedents) as in Table 3, as well as caregiver helping network size (i.e., number of caregivers taking care of the care recipient at LML).

LML = last-month-of-life; SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval.

***P<.05