Table 3 Women's normalized mean COM velocities, step lengths and frequencies and double support times during comfortable and brisk walking in each age group

Women: walking parameters by age group	Mean COM velocity				Step length				Step frequency				Double support times (pre-swing)			
	N	Mean	SD	95% CI	N	Mean	SD	95% CI	N	Mean	SD	95% CI	N	Mean	SD	95% CI
Comfortable walking																
40s	228	0.542	0.060	0.535–0.550	267	0.905	0.072	0.896–0.913	223	0.602	0.044	0.596–0.608	212	14.9	1.7	14.7–15.2
50s	224	0.547	0.066	0.538–0.556	252	0.902	0.082	0.891–0.912	219	0.607	0.051	0.600–0.614	214	14.9	1.7	14.7–15.1
60s	210	0.536	0.064	0.527–0.544	236	0.890	0.079	0.880–0.900	207	0.602	0.045	0.596–0.608	189	15.0	1.9	14.8–15.3
70–	173	0.472	0.071	0.461–0.483	189	0.833	0.093	0.820–0.847	169	0.570	0.051	0.562–0.578	148	15.8	1.9	15.5–16.1
P for trend[†]	<0.001				<0.001				<0.001				<0.001			
(Tukey–Kramer test)[‡]	40s, 50s, 60s >70–				40s, 50s, 60s >70–				40s, 50s, 60s >70–				70– > 60s, 50s, 40s			
Brisk walking																
40s	216	0.702	0.072	0.692–0.711	269	0.972	0.070	0.963–0.980	210	0.728	0.071	0.719–0.738	201	13.9	1.6	13.7–14.2
50s	215	0.675	0.080	0.665–0.686	252	0.960	0.087	0.950–0.971	212	0.706	0.073	0.696–0.715	209	14.2	1.7	13.9–14.4
60s	212	0.653	0.072	0.643–0.662	230	0.941	0.085	0.929–0.952	209	0.696	0.072	0.687–0.706	199	14.2	1.8	14.0–14.5
70–	173	0.577	0.084	0.565–0.590	187	0.890	0.109	0.875–0.906	163	0.651	0.064	0.562–0.578	157	14.3	8.8	12.9–15.7
P for trend[†]	<0.001				<0.001				<0.001				NS			
(Tukey–Kramer test)[‡]	40s > 50s > 60s > 70–				40s > 60s > 70–., 50s > 70–				40s > 50s, 60s > 70–				NA			

[†]Trend tests examine main effects of age in each gait parameter. [‡]Tukey–Kramer tests examine the significant difference among each age group. '>' indicates the significant difference between the age groups, with *P* < 0.05. Values are numbers of samples (N), means, standard deviations (SD) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) at each variable. Age group: 40s, 40–49 years age group; 50s, 50–59 years age group; 60s, 60–69 years age group; 70–, 70–84 years age group. COM, center of mass; NS, not significant; NA, not applicable.

Mean COM velocity, comfortable

□Men: 40s, 50s, 60s>70- *(p* for trend<.001)
■Women: 40s, 50s, 60s>70- *(p* for trend<.001)

Mean COM velocity, brisk

□Men: 40s>60s>70-., 50s>70- *(p* for trend<.001)
■Women: 40s>50s>60s>70- *(p* for trend<.001)

Double support time, comfortable

□Men: NA *(p* for trend>.05)
■Women: 70->60s, 50s, 40s *(p* for trend<.001)

Double support time, brisk

□Men: NA *(p* for trend>.05)
■Women: NA *(p* for trend>.05)

Figure 3 Age-related differences (trend tests and Tukey–Kramer tests); means and 95% confidence intervals of normalized mean center of mass (COM) velocities ($(\text{m/sec})/\sqrt{((\text{m/sec}^2)\times\text{m})}$) and double support times (s/s) during comfortable and brisk walking in men and women. Significant differences by age group in men and women are noted on the upper side of each figure. '>' indicates the significant difference between the age groups, with *P*-values of ≤0.05.

Table 4 Normalized mean COM velocities, step lengths and frequencies and double support times during comfortable and brisk walking among men and women

Walking parameters	Men				Women				*P*-value[‡]
	N	Mean	SD	95% CI	N	Mean	SD	95% CI	
Comfortable walking									
Mean COM velocity	881	0.516	0.064	0.512–0.521	835	0.527	0.071	0.523–0.532	<0.001
Step length	982	0.889	0.083	0.883–0.894	944	0.886	0.085	0.881–0.891	NS
Step frequency	866	0.583	0.069	0.580–0.586	818	0.597	0.045	0.593–0.600	<0.001
Double support time (pre-swing)	839	14.8	1.7	14.7–14.9	763	15.1	1.8	15.0–15.2	<0.001
Brisk walking									
Mean COM velocity	798	0.677	0.089	0.671–0.683	816	0.656	0.089	0.650–0.662	<0.001
Step length	941	0.987	0.092	0.981–0.993	938	0.945	0.092	0.939–0.951	<0.001
Step frequency	756	0.687	0.075	0.682–0.692	794	0.698	0.049	0.693–0.703	<0.001
Double support time (pre-swing)	731	13.5	5.0	13.2–13.9	766	14.2	4.3	13.9–14.5	<0.01

[‡]Student *t*-tests examine the sex differences. Values are numbers of samples (N), means, standard deviations (SD) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) at each variable. COM, center of mass; NS, not significant.

Further investigation should have discussed the difference between comfortable and brisk walking parameters.[38,42,43]

Age-related step length decreases during comfortable and brisk walking were almost concomitant with the COM velocity decreases, which was similar to the previous findings.[16,20] In brisk walking, however, age-related reduction in the step length seemed to be smaller than that in the step frequency compared with comfortable walking. For example, women's brisk step length decrease was 8.4% across middle-aged and elderly groups compared with their step frequency decrease of 10.7% (Table 3). This was observed also in men's. This may suggest that ambulatory ability observed in the COM velocity may be caused more by the step length during comfortable walking and the step frequency

during brisk walking in the elderly. This was also apparent in middle-aged women. The interpretation was limited qualitatively and should be further explored.

Step frequencies also decreased with age and this decrease was found even in middle-aged women during brisk walking. Previous studies in step frequency reported no age-related changes,[16,17,21] age-related decrease[8,18–20,25] and age-related increase.[26] Moreover, the current age- and sex-related decrease depending on required walking pace was not previously reported.[16,17] One explanation of these conflicts was that degree of the age-related reduction in step frequency was relatively less than that in other gait parameters such as velocity or step length.[8,17,19,20] Therefore, sample size, subject characteristics and measuring instruments may affect the age-related decrease in the step frequency.[16,25] Double support times in the present study did not increase with age, with the exception of women's comfortable data. On the other hand, exploratory analyses of actual values of double support times showed age-related increases in both sexes during both walking paces (data not shown, P for trend <0.001, <0.022). This shows that the double support as a percentage of one gait cycle remained almost constant in middle-aged and elderly subjects. Ferrandez et al.[32] found that double support time increased as velocity decreased, and that prolonged double support time was affected more by walking velocity than age.

The present study found brisk COM velocity and step length to be greater in men than in women. By contrast, step frequencies and double support times were greater in women than in men. This is characteristic of sex differences and is supported by previous findings.[8,17,21] Although the comfortable COM velocity was faster in women than in men, this is believed to be a result of the difference in body size as the actual comfortable COM velocity was significantly faster in men than in women (men, 1.46 ± 0.18 m/s; women, 1.43 ± 0.20 m/s; P < 0.001). The comfortable step length did not differ significantly between either sex group, perhaps because of the slower men's COM velocity.

The present gait data may give some insight into gait assessment and preventive walking exercise programs for older persons as previously reported.[42,44,45] The values for the gait parameters during one gait cycle may be useful to clinicians judging the ambulatory ability of patients from a short indoor walk.[7,42] Patients whose gait parameters are lower than that of their appropriate age group are at increased risk of ADL difficulties.[8,11] Comfortable and brisk walking velocities are predictive of adverse outcomes such as loss of physical function, requirement of caregivers, hospitalization and increased mortality in elderly persons.[8,10–12] Decreased step length and prolonged double support time are correlated with fear of falling and/or future fall risk.[4,5,9] Also, the other gait parameters such as gait velocity,[9,11] stride-to-stride

variability[4] and lateral sway[3,5,6,46] are associated with the falling events. We did not directly ascertain whether the participants had a history of falls and/or a fear of falling in our gait parameters. Further work should confirm which gait measure is the best independent predictor for future fall risk in a large sample.

A moderate workload prescription in walking exercise programs should be given by controlling both step length and step frequency during comfortable walking in the elderly. Brisk walking, which is recommended for moderately vigorous endurance training and has a high impact compared to comfortable pace walking, might be considered for middle-aged women and the elderly to improve physical functions such as muscle strength[7,40,43] and/or cardiovascular fitness.[33,41]

This study has some limitations. Some previous gait investigations used the results of several trials or mean values of gait, while we used gait data from one trial of each participant. This was done because of technical difficulties in the automatically computed 3-D gait parameters. Next, the conjunction of our excluding criteria with the potential diseases might overestimate gait disorders: the elderly subjects were more likely to be healthy and physically fit. Moreover, patients with dementia were considered to be less in the present sample. The general comparability of the present gait variables with previously reported data is limited because of the lack of data for young adults in their 20s and 30s. Furthermore, our cross-sectional analysis approach could not demonstrate a cause-and-effect relationship from aging. We are planning longitudinal studies to further determine the effects of aging on gait. The present study included regional limitations such as race, culture, lifestyle, genetics and socioeconomic status which also may be important. However, the findings did permit age- and sex-related differences in gait to be clarified in the elderly.

In conclusion, age- and sex-related gait alterations were apparent in one gait cycle of walking in a large sample of community-dwelling, middle-aged and elderly Japanese men and women, when analyzed by a 3-D gait system. There were marked age-related gait differences in subjects aged 70 years and over compared to subjects aged 40–69 years during comfortable walking, and subtle differences were also observed in subjects aged 40–69 years during brisk walking. The earlier age-related changes were clearer in women than in men. These results may guide the assessment of gait patterns attributed to usual aging and to develop moderate exercise programs for the elderly.

Acknowledgments

References

1 Bloem BR, Haan J, Lagaay AM, van Beek W, Wintzen AR, Roos RA. Investigation of gait in elderly subjects over 88 years of age. *J Geriatr Psychiatry Neurol* 1992; **5**: 78–84.

2 Marchetti GF, Whitney SL, Blatt PJ, Morris LO, Vance JM. Temporal and spatial characteristics of gait during performance of the Dynamic Gait Index in people with and people without balance or vestibular disorders. *Phys Ther* 2008; **88**: 640–651.

3 Tinetti ME, Speechley M, Ginter SF. Risk factors for falls among elderly persons living in the community. *N Engl J Med* 1988; **319**: 1701–1707.

4 Maki BE. Gait changes in older adults: predictors of falls or indicators of fear. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1997; **45**: 313–320.

5 Barak Y, Wagenaar RC, Holt KG. Gait characteristics of elderly people with a history of falls: a dynamic approach. *Phys Ther* 2006; **86**: 1501–1510.

6 Chiba H, Ebihara S, Tomita N, Sasaki H, Butler JP. Differential gait kinematics between fallers and non-fallers in community-dwelling elderly people. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2005; **5**: 127–134.

7 Bohannon RW. Comfortable and maximum walking speed of adults aged 20–79 years: reference values and determinants. *Age Ageing* 1997; **26**: 15–19.

8 Callisaya ML, Blizzard L, Schmidt MD, McGinley JL, Srikanth VK. Sex modifies the relationship between age and gait: a population-based study of older adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2008; **63**: 165–170.

9 Verghese J, Holtzer R, Lipton RB, Wang C. Quantitative gait markers and incident fall risk in older adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2009; **64A**: 896–901.

10 Shinkai S, Watanabe S, Kumagai S et al. Walking speed as a good predictor for the onset of functional dependence in a Japanese rural community population. *Age Ageing* 2000; **29**: 441–446.

11 Montero-Odasso M, Schapira M, Soriano ER et al. Gait velocity as a single predictor of adverse events in healthy seniors aged 75 years and older. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2005; **60A**: 1304–1309.

12 Krishnamurthy M, Verghese J. Gait characteristics in non-disabled community-residing nonagenarians. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2006; **87**: 541–545.

13 Verghese J, LeValley A, Hall CB, Katz MJ, Ambrose AF, Lipton RB. Epidemiology of gait disorders in community-residing older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2006; **54**: 255–261.

14 Berlau DJ, Corrada MM, Kawas C. The prevalence of disability in the oldest-old is high and continues to increase with age: findings from The 90+ Study. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2009; **24**: 1217–1225.

15 Demura S, Yamada T, Shin S. Age and sex differences in various stepping movements of the elderly. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2008; **8**: 180–187.

16 Oberg T, Karsznia A, Oberg K. Basic gait parameters: reference data for normal subjects, 10–79 years of age. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 1993; **30**: 210–223.

17 Auvinet B, Berrut G, Touzard C et al. Reference data for normal subjects obtained with an accelerometric device. *Gait Posture* 2002; **16**: 124–134.

18 Murray MP, Kory RC, Clarkson BH. Walking patterns in healthy old men. *J Gerontol* 1969; **24**: 169–178.

19 Himann JE, Cunningham DA, Rechnitzer PA, Peterson DB. Age-related changes in speed of walking. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1988; **20**: 161–166.

20 Kaneko M, Morimoto Y, Kimura M, Fuchimoto K, Fuchimoto T. A kinematic analysis of walking and physical fitness testing in elderly women. *Can J Sports Sci* 1991; **16**: 223–228.

21 Blanc Y, Balmer C, Landis T, Vingerhoets F. Temporal parameters and patterns of the foot roll over during walking: normative data for healthy adults. *Gait Posture* 1999; **10**: 97–108.

22 Winter DA. *Biomechanics and Motor Control of Human Movement*, 2nd edn. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1991.

23 Pai Y-C, Patton J. Center of mass velocity-position predictions for balance control. *J Biomech* 1997; **30**: 347–354.

24 Riley PO, Della Croce U, Kerrigan DC. Effect of age on lower extremity joint moment contributions to gait speed. *Gait Posture* 2001; **14**: 264–270.

25 Prince F, Corriveau H, Hebert R, Winter DA. Gait in the elderly. *Gait Posture* 1997; **5**: 128–135.

26 Judge JO, Ounpuu S, Davis RB. Effects of age on the biomechanics and physiology of gait. *Clin Geriatr Med* 1996; **12**: 659–678.

27 Jansen EC, Vittas D, Helberg S, Hansen J. Normal gait of young and old men and women Ground reaction force measurement on a treadmill. *Acta Orthop Scand* 1982; **53**: 193–196.

28 Shimokata H, Ando F, Niino N. A new comprehensive study on aging – National Institute for Longevity Sciences, Longitudinal Study of Aging (NILS-LSA). *J Epidemiol* 2000; **10** (1 Suppl): S1–S9.

29 Kozakai R, Tsuzuku S, Yabe K, Ando F, Niino N, Shimokata H. Age-related changes in gait velocity and leg extension power in middle-aged and elderly people. *J Epidemiol* 2000; **10** (1 Suppl): S77–S81.

30 Perry J. *Gait Analysis: Normal and Pathological Function*. Thorofare, NJ: Slack, Inc., 1992.

31 Dobbs RJ, Charlett A, Bowes SG et al. Is this walk normal? *Age Ageing* 1993; **22**: 27–30.

32 Ferrandez A-M, Pailhouse J, Durup M. Slowness in elderly gait. *Exp Ageing Res* 1990; **16**: 79–89.

33 Tully MA, Cupples ME, Chan WS, McGlade K, Young IS. Brisk walking, fitness, and cardiovascular risk: a randomized controlled trial in primary care. *Prev Med* 2005; **41**: 622–628.

34 Clinical Gait Analysis Forum of Japan. *DIFF Manual*, ver. 1992.06, 1999.

35 Chandler RF, Clauser CE, McConville JT, Reynolds HM, Young JW. *Investigation of Inertial Properties of the Human Body*. Technical Report AMRL-TR-74-137. Dayton, OH: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, 1975.

36 SAS Institute. *Base SAS 9.1.3 Procedures Guide*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, 2006.

37 Hof AL. Scaling gait data to body size. *Gait Posture* 1996; **4**: 222–223.

38 Graham JE, Ostir GV, Kuo YF, Fisher SR, Ottenbacher KJ. Relationship between test methodology and mean velocity in timed walk tests: a review. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2008; **89**: 865–872.

39 Liu MQ, Anderson FC, Schwartz MH, Delp SL. Muscle contributions to support and progression over a range of walking speeds. *J Biomech* 2008; **41**: 3243–3252.

40 Goldberg EJ, Neptune RR. Compensatory strategies during normal walking in response to muscle weakness and increased hip joint stiffness. *Gait Posture* 2007; **25**: 360–367.

41 Fleg JL, Morrell CH, Bos AG *et al.* Accelerated longitudinal decline of aerobic capacity in healthy older adults. *Circulation* 2005; **112**: 674–682.

42 Dobkin BH. Short-distance walking speed and timed walking distance: redundant measures for clinical trials? *Neurology* 2006; **66**: 584–586.

43 Kozakai R, Doyo W, Tsuzuku S *et al.* Relationships of muscle strength and power with leisure-time physical activity and adolescent exercise in middle-aged and elderly Japanese women. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2005; **5**: 182–188.

44 Oh-Park M, Zohman LR, Abraham C. A simple walk test to guide exercise programming of the elderly. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 1997; **76**: 208–212.

45 Morris JN, Hardman AE. Walking to health. *Sports Med* 1997; **23**: 306–332.

46 Gabell BA, Nayak US. The effect of age on variability in gait. *J Gerontol* 1984; **39**: 662–666.

Impact of Caregiver Burden on Adverse Health Outcomes in Community-Dwelling Dependent Older Care Recipients

Masafumi Kuzuya, M.D., Ph.D., Hiromi Enoki, Ph.D.,
Jun Hasegawa, M.D., Sachiko Izawa, Ph.D.,
Yoshihisa Hirakawa, M.D., Ph.D., Hiroshi Shimokata, M.D., Ph.D.,
Akihisa Iguchi, M.D., Ph.D.

Objective: *To determine whether caregiver burden is associated with subsequent all-cause mortality or hospitalization among dependent community-dwelling older care recipients.* **Methods:** *A prospective cohort study of 1,067 pairs of community-dwelling 65-year-old or older care recipients and their informal caregivers was conducted. The 1,067 pairs completed the baseline assessment including caregiver burden assessed by the Zarit Burden Interview and a 3-year follow-up for all-cause mortality and hospitalization.* **Results:** *During the 3-year follow-up, 268 recipients died and 455 were admitted to hospitals. The multivariate Cox proportional hazards model revealed that the recipients with caregivers with a baseline ZBI score in the highest quartile were 1.54 and 1.51 times more likely to show increased risks of all-cause mortality and hospitalization, respectively, in comparison with those with caregivers in the lowest quartile after adjustment for potential confounders. The highest quartile of caregiver burden was associated with all-cause mortality and hospitalization within nonusers of respite services including day-care services, home-help services, and nursing-home respite stay services. No apparent association was observed within the users of these services except for day-care services, for which users showed a statistically significant association between the highest quartile and the risk of hospitalization.* **Conclusions:** *Heavy caregiver burden is associated with mortality and hospitalization among community-dwelling dependent older adults, even after adjusting for potential confounders. The reduction of caregiver burden and improvement of caregiver well-being may not only prevent the deterioration of caregiver health but also reduce adverse health outcomes for care recipients.* (Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 2011; 19:382–391)

Key Words: Caregiver burden, mortlity, hospitalization, adverse health outcomes of care recipient

The current trend toward a community-based healthcare system means that when older people require care, much of it is provided at home. Thus, family members are providing care for ill or disabled older relatives. Family caregiving has been intensively studied in the past decade, particularly the impact on caregivers of providing home care to a family member. Caregiver burden has been defined as a negative reaction to the impact of providing care on the caregiver's social, occupational, and personal roles.[1-3] It is well documented that informal care for the disabled elderly places heavy burdens on family caregivers.[1-3] Previous studies demonstrated that caregiver burden is associated with the substantial care needs of seriously ill patients, which are in turn associated with the presence of dementia, behavioral problems, poorer physical functioning, and factors that are not readily modifiable.[4-7] Caregiver burden can lead to a chronic stress response that can worsen caregiver health, contribute to psychiatric morbidity in the form of increased depression,[8] contribute to the risk of health problems such as wound healing impairment, elevated blood pressure, and coronary heart disease risk and immune function impairment,[9-11] and is an independent risk factor for mortality.[12]

Thus, most of the previous studies on caregiver burden have focused on examining its cause(s) and extensively examining caregiver health. However, conversely, much less attention has been paid to the impact of caregiver burden or distress on the health of the partner, the care recipient. In fact, it remains uncertain whether caregiver burden or distress has any influence on the health-related outcomes of care recipients, although the association of caregiver burden with long-term care placement has been well demonstrated.[13,14] In this study, we investigated whether caregiver burden is associated with adverse health outcomes of the care recipients, including all-cause mortality and hospitalization for acute illness, during a 3-year study period. In addition, we examined the effect of community-based respite care services, including day-care, home-help, and nursing-home respite stay services on the adverse outcomes of care recipients.

METHODS

Study Setting and Cohort Participants

In this study, we employed baseline data on the care recipient and caregiver pairs in the Nagoya Longitudinal Study for Frail Elderly (NLS-FE) and data on the mortality and hospitalization of the care recipients during the 3-year follow-up period. Japan introduced a universal-coverage long-term care insurance (LTCI) program in 2000. Under the LTCI program, each applicant's care levels are determined according to eligibility criteria. Eligibility status is classified into six levels ("needs support" and care levels 1-5) by the estimation of care needs based on an assessment of the current physical and mental status of the patient and their use of medical procedures.[15] The NLS-FE was designed to compare the outcomes of different uses of community-based care services provided by the LTCI program.[16,17] The study sample consisted of 1,875 community-dwelling elderly (632 men and 1,243 women, age 65 years or older) with some degree of physical or mental disability. They were eligible for the LTCI program, lived in Nagoya City, Japan, and received various kinds of community-based services from the Nagoya City Health Care Service Foundation for Older People, which has 17 visiting nursing stations associated with care-managing centers. These 1,875 NLS-FE participants and 1,502 caregivers (373 of the 1,875 participants lacked a primary caregiver), who were enrolled between December 1, 2003, and January 31, 2004, were scheduled to undergo comprehensive in-home assessments by trained nurses at the baseline and at 6, 12, and 24 months. At 3-month intervals, data were collected about any important events in the lives of the participants, including mortality and admission to the hospital for acute illness during the 3-year follow-up. Written informed consent for participation was obtained from the participants, care recipients, and caregivers, or, for those with substantial cognitive impairment, from a surrogate (usually the closest relative or legal guardian), according to procedures approved by the Institutional Review Board of Nagoya University Graduate School of Medicine.

Data Collection

The data were collected at the clients' homes through structured interviews with care recipients or surrogates and caregivers and from care-managing center records taken by trained nurses. The data included each participant's demographic characteristics, general socioeconomic status, living arrangements, subjective economic status, use of medical services, and the utilization of a total of seven community-based services available under LTCI programs, including the day-care service, visiting nurse service, home-help service, visiting bathing service, visiting rehabilitation, assistive device leasing, and nursing-home respite stay (overnight respite, temporary stays at nursing facilities). The data also included depressive symptoms as assessed by the 15-item Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS-15) (range: 0–15, with higher values indicating more depressive symptoms)[18] and a rating for eight basic activities of daily living (bADL) using summary scores ranging from 0 (total disability) to 20 (no disability). The information on the following physician-diagnosed chronic conditions was obtained from care-managing center records: ischemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, cerebrovascular disease, diabetes mellitus, dementia, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cancer, hypertension, and other diseases comprising the Charlson Comorbidity Index,[19] which represents a sum of weighted indexes that takes into account the number and seriousness of preexisting comorbid conditions (range: 0–19, with a higher value indicating higher comorbidity).

Data were also obtained from caregivers concerning their own personal demographic characteristics including caregiver relationship to care recipient (spouse or not), and the presence of behavioral disturbance of the care recipient according to the primary assessment dataset of the public LTCI, including wandering, hallucinations, physically aggressive behaviors, verbal aggression, delusions, altered sleep-wake cycles, sexually disinhibited behaviors, aberrant behaviors, abnormal eating behaviors, and resistance to care. Depressive symptoms were assessed by the GDS-15, and the caregiver's subjective burden was assessed by the Japanese version of the Zarit Burden Interview (ZBI), which is a 22-item self-report inventory that examines the burden associated with functional behavioral impairments in the home care situation (range: 0–88, with higher values

indicating a greater burden). The primary caregivers were also asked to rate their current overall health in three categories of subjective health status (poor, fair, and good to excellent).

Subjects for the Analysis

Among the original 1,502 pairs at baseline, 276 caregivers could not complete or refused to assess the ZBI, and the data on comorbidity condition or sociodemographic characteristics were lacking for 159 participants. The study sample, therefore, consisted of 1,067 community-dwelling disabled elderly (387 men, 680 women, age range: 65–104 years) and paired caregivers (256 men, 811 women, age range: 31–90 years). There were no statistical differences in mortality and hospitalization rates during the follow-up period between participants with and without caregiver ZBI measurements among the 1,502 participants. Of these 1,067 pairs, 259 care recipients could not complete the GDS-15 because of severe cognitive impairment or communication impairment, and 101 caregivers because of refusal to do the assessment.

Statistical Analysis

The ZBI score was categorized into quartiles (quartile 1: score, 0–15, N = 284; quartile 2: 16–26, N = 253; quartile 3: 27–39, N = 269; quartile 4: 40–84, N = 261). Baseline characteristics of the study participants, including both care recipients and caregivers, were examined using the Jonckheere–Terpstra test or the General Linear Models for trends across the quartiles of the ZBI score. Analysis of variance for multiple comparisons was used to determine differences among the quartiles of the ZBI score for continuous variables, and the Pearson χ^2 test was used to test categorical variables. The end point of this study was defined as the time to all-cause death or hospitalization because of acute illness, whichever occurred first, during follow-up. Cox proportional hazard models and the Kaplan–Meier method (differences between strata of the ZBI score levels determined using log-rank tests) were used to assess the association of quartiles of the ZBI score with those adverse outcomes after enrollment during a 3-year period (3-month intervals). To create an ideal model for a multivariate Cox proportional hazards model, we first evaluated the association between

each covariate and all-cause death or hospitalization, using the univariate Cox proportional hazards model. Covariates included, for the recipient, sociodemographic characteristics, the presence or absence of regular medical checkups, the number of community-based services, economic status, bADL score, the Charlson comorbidity index, and the presence or absence of selected major comorbidities and behavioral problems. Covariates also included, for the caregiver, sociodemographic characteristics, subjective health status, and categorized ZBI score. In the multivariate analysis, the covariates included were variables associated with each event with p <0.05 in univariate analysis. In models considering the quartiles of the caregiver ZBI score, we compared hazard ratios (HRs) with a corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI) in the second, third, and fourth quartiles with those in the first quartile (referent).

Additional analyses stratified by the use or nonuse of community-based respite care services including day-care, home-help, and nursing-home respite stay services were also performed using a consistent set of covariates to examine the data for possible interactions of these variables with the adverse health outcomes of care recipients. Student's *t*-test and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) were used to compare the caregiver ZBI score according to the service use and nonuse groups. Covariates of ANCOVA included recipient gender, age, bADL score, the Charlson comorbidity index, the presence or absence of dementia and behavior problems, caregiver gender, and caregiver age.

The data were analyzed using the SAS, Release 9.13. Probability value of <0.05 was considered significant.

RESULTS

The baseline distribution of the sociodemographic characteristics of the care recipients and caregivers according to the quartiles of the ZBI score is shown in Table 1. We used analysis of variance or Pearson χ^2 test to evaluate differences among the quartiles of the ZBI score. The bADL score decreased, and the number of community-based services used, the Charlson comorbidity index, and recipient GDS-15 score increased as the level of the ZBI quartile increased. The care recipients whose caregivers' ZBI

scores were in higher quartiles were more likely to show a higher prevalence of dementia (χ^2 test: $\chi^2 = 61.09$, degrees of freedom [*df*] = 3, p <0.001; Jonckheere-Terpstra test: z statistics, Z value = 7.51, N = 1,067, p <0.001), behavioral problems ($\chi^2 = 14.75$, $df = 3$, p = 0.002; Jonckheere-Terpstra test, Z value = 8.58, N = 1,067, p <0.001) and a history of cerebrovascular disease ($\chi^2 = 10.31$, $df = 3$, p = 0.016; Jonckheere-, Terpstra test, Z value = 2.37, N = 1,067, p = 0.018). The caregiver's GDS-15 score increased (General Linear Model, F value = 313.48, $df = 1,964$, p <0.001), and the prevalence of good to excellent subjective health status of the caregiver decreased with increasing quartiles of the ZBI score (Jonckheere-Terpstra test, Z value = 5.37, N = 1,067, p <0.001). There were no differences in the rate of regular medical checkups (χ^2 test, $\chi^2 = 5.66$, $df = 3$, p = 0.130), living arrangements (living alone or with one person versus living with two or more, $\chi^2 = 1.46$, $df = 3$, p = 0.692), and three categories of economic status ($\chi^2 = 6.70$, $df = 3$, p = 0.349) among the quartiles of the ZBI score.

During the 3-year period, 268 care recipients died and 455 were admitted to hospitals (Table 2). The participants whose caregivers' ZBI scores were in the higher quartiles were more likely to die and be hospitalized during the follow-up period than those whose caregivers' scores were in the lower quartile categories (χ^2 test, $\chi^2 = 9.78$, $df = 3$, p = 0.020; $\chi^2 = 11.09$, $df = 3$, p = 0.007, respectively).

Kaplan–Meier curves of survival and the cumulative incidence of hospitalization during the 3-year period among care recipients according to the quartile of the caregivers' ZBI scores demonstrated that all-cause mortality and hospitalization increased with higher quartiles of caregiver ZBI at baseline (log-rank χ^2 test, mortality: $\chi^2 = 17.29$, $df = 3$, p <0.001; hospitalization: $\chi^2 = 23.61$, $df = 3$, p <0.001; Fig. 1).

The univariate Cox proportional hazards model revealed that the recipients whose caregivers' ZBI scores were in the highest quartile were 1.93 times and 1.86 times more likely to suffer all-cause mortality and hospitalization, respectively, during the 3-year period than those in the lowest quartile (95% CI: 1.38–2.71, Wald χ^2 test, $\chi^2 = 14.80$, $df = 1$, p <0.001; 95% CI: 1.43–2.42, Wald $\chi^2 = 21.16$, $df = 1$, p <0.001). The GDS-15 score of the care recipients and caregivers was not associated with mortality and hospitalization in univariate analysis (mortality: HR: 1.03; 95% CI: 0.98–1.07, Wald χ^2

TABLE 1. Baseline Characteristics of Study Participants According to ZBI Score Quartile of Caregivers

	Quartile Group of Caregiver ZBI Score					
	1st, Score: 0–15, n = 284	2nd, Score: 16–26, n = 253	3rd, Score: 27–39, n = 269	4th, Score: 40–84, n = 261	F	p
Care recipients (n = 1067)						
Men/women, N (% of men)	89/195 (31.3)	88/165 (34.8)	100/169 (37.2)	110/151 (42.1)		0.065
Age, M (SD), year[a]	81.0 (7.1)	81.1 (7.7)	81.2 (7.8)	80.8 (8.5)	0.10	0.962
Basic ADL (rage: 0-20), M (SD)[a]	14.2 (6.1)	12.5 (6.2)	11.0 (6.5)	10.4 (6.3)	20.07	<0.001
Charlson comorbidity index, M (SD)[a]	1.8 (1.5)	2.2 (1.5)	2.3 (1.5)	2.4 (1.7)	7.06	<0.001
GDS-15 (range: 0-15), M (SD)[a,b]	5.4 (3.4)	6.2 (3.2)	6.6 (3.4)	8.1 (3.7)	21.19	<0.001
No. of service uses (range: 0-7), M (SD)[a]	2.0 (1.1)	2.2 (1.2)	2.4 (1.3)	2.5 (1.3)	8.97	<0.001
Presence of chronic disease, no. (%)						
Ischemic heart disease	36 (12.7)	31 (12.3)	36 (13.4)	29 (11.1)		0.882
Congestive heart failure	17 (6.0)	20 (7.9)	22 (8.2)	27 (10.3)		0.321
Cerebrovascular disease	93 (32.7)	110 (43.5)	120 (44.6)	111 (42.5)		0.016
COPD	11 (3.9)	11 (4.3)	14 (5.2)	18 (6.9)		0.400
Dementia	66 (23.2)	92 (36.4)	135 (50.2)	135 (51.7)		<0.001
Cancer	29 (10.2)	22 (8.7)	14 (5.2)	28 (10.7)		0.098
Presence of behavioral problems, no. (%)	8 (2.8)	11 (4.3)	21 (7.8)	26 (10.0)		0.002
Caregiver variables (n = 1067)						
Men/women, no. (% of men)	71/213 (25.0)	69/184 (27.3)	56/213 (20.3)	60/201 (23.0)		0.350
Age, M (SD), year[a]	64.1 (13.0)	65.4 (12.2)	63.5 (12.6)	65.8 (11.3)	2.05	0.106
GDS-15 (range: 0-15), M (SD)[a,c]	3.4 (3.0)	4.7 (3.2)	5.8 (3.5)	8.5 (3.4)	107.98	<0.001
Relationship to care recipient, no. (%)						
Spouse	115 (40.5)	119 (47.0)	106 (39.4)	128 (49.0)		0.061
Nonspouse	169 (59.5)	134 (53.0)	163 (60.6)	133 (51.0)		
Health status, no. (%)						
Good to excellent	150 (52.8)	101 (39.9)	98 (36.4)	80 (26.2)		<0.001
Fair	103 (36.3)	127 (50.2)	148 (55.0)	169 (55.4)		
Poor	31 (10.9)	25 (9.9)	23 (8.6)	56 (18.4)		
ZBI score (range: 0-88), M (SD)[a]	9.4 (4.7)	21.0 (3.1)	32.6 (4.0)	52.5 (9.8)	2553.05	<0.001

Notes: M: mean; SD: standard deviation; COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary diseasee.

[a]Analysis of variance for multiple comparisons was used to determine differences among the quartiles of the ZBI score for continuous variables (df = 3,1063 except for recipient GDS-15 [df = 3, 804] and caregiver GDS-15 [df = 3,962]), and the Pearson χ^2 test was used to test categorical variables (df = 3).

[b]n = 808.

[c]n = 966.

**TABLE 2. Adverse Events During 3-year Period According to the Quartile Group of ZBI Score**

	Quartile Group of ZBI Score					
	1st, n = 284	2nd, n = 253	3rd, n = 269	4th, n = 261	Total, n = 1,067	p[a]
Adverse outcomes, no. (% of each quartile)						
All-cause death	58 (20.4)	63 (24.9)	64 (23.8)	83 (31.8)	268 (25.1)	0.020
Hospitalization	98 (34.5)	111 (43.9)	119 (44.2)	127 (48.7)	455 (42.6)	0.007

[a]Pearson χ^2 test. Degree of freedom is equal to 3.

test, χ^2 = 1.52, df = 1, p = 0.218, and HR: 1.02; 95% CI: 0.98–1.05, Wald χ^2 = 1.072, df = 1, p = 0.301, respectively; hospitalization: HR: 1.02; 95% CI: 0.99–1.05; Wald χ^2 test, χ^2 = 1.54, df = 1, p = 0.215, and HR: 1.01; 95% CI: 0.99–1.04; Wald χ^2 = 0.81, df = 1, p = 0.369, respectively).

As shown in Table 3, multivariate adjustment for confounders, including recipient gender and age,

bADL score, number of community-based services used, the Charlson comorbidity index, caregiver gender and age, presence or absence of behavioral problems (only for all-cause mortality analysis), and the subjective health status of the caregiver (only for hospitalization analysis), showed that the highest quartile of caregivers' ZBI scores (compared with the lowest quartile) was associated with a 1.54-fold risk

FIGURE 1. Kaplan–Meier Plot for Probability of Event-Free Survival (A) and Probability of Hospital Admission (B) According to Increasing Quintiles of the Zarit Burden Interview Score

A

Quartiles of ZBI score		0	6	12	18	24	30	36
	1st	284	277	250	219	199	181	155
	2nd	253	245	217	196	171	150	123
	3rd	269	259	228	196	159	137	114
	4th	261	234	202	159	135	110	89

B

Quartiles of ZBI score		0	6	12	18	24	30	36
	1st	284	268	233	200	172	152	126
	2nd	253	230	196	169	137	119	86
	3rd	269	243	193	157	125	103	80
	4th	261	213	169	128	102	79	65

Log-rank χ^2 test, mortality (A): $\chi^2 = 17.29$, $df = 3$, p <0.001; hospitalization (B): $\chi^2 = 23.61$, $df = 3$, p <0.001.

of all-cause death and a 1.51-fold risk of recipient hospitalization. When the analyses were conducted using the ZBI score as a continuous variable, the recipients who had caregivers with higher ZBI scores were associated with higher risk of mortality and hospitalization (HR: 1.01, 95% CI: 1.00–1.02, Wald χ^2 test, $\chi^2 = 6.92$, $df = 1$, p = 0.009, and HR: 1.01, 95% CI: 1.00–1.01, Wald $\chi^2 = 8.86$, $df = 1$, p = 0.003, respectively). The HRs of the top quartile were similar when the comorbidity index score was replaced with the presence or absence of chronic diseases that were identified as risk factors by univariate analysis in each event (Table 3).

Based on ANCOVA adjusted for recipient gender, age, bADL score, the Charlson comorbidity index, the presence or absence of dementia and behavior problems, caregiver gender, and caregiver age, no differences in the adjusted average ZBI scores were detected between users and nonusers of these services (ANCOVA, adjusted mean ZBI score (standard deviation): day-care service, nonuse, 27.9 (16.4) versus use, 29.3 (16.5), F value = 1.92, $df = 1,1057$, p = 0.166; home-help service: nonuse, 29.0 (16.4) versus use, 27.9 (16.4), F value = 1.06, $df = 1$, 1057, p = 0.304) except for the nursing-home respite service, for which users showed higher ZBI scores than nonusers (nonuse, 28.1 [16.4], versus use, 32.1 [16.8], F value = 5.26, $df = 1$, 1057, p = 0.022).

In Table 4, using the multivariate Cox proportional hazards model, we examined the association between higher versus lowest quartile of the ZBI score and care recipient all-cause ·mortality and hospitalization within subgroups of various community-based respite service use status. Overall, within nonusers of these respite care services, the highest quartile of caregiver burden was associated with all-cause mortality and hospitalization. No apparent association was observed within users of these services except for users of the day-care service, who showed a statistically significant association between the highest quartile and the risk of hospitalization (HR: 1.56, 95% CI: 1.03–2.36, Wald χ^2 test, $\chi^2 = 4.50$, $df = 1$, p = 0.034).

DISCUSSION

In the present study, we observed that the recipients with caregivers with a baseline ZBI score in the highest quartile were 1.54 and 1.51 times more likely to show increased risk of all-cause mortality and hospitalization during a 3-year follow-up period, respectively, in comparison with those with caregivers in the lowest. These relationships existed independently of various other risk factors for mortality and hospitalization, including gender, age, number of community-based services used, ADL status, and

TABLE 3. Multivariate Cox Proportional Hazards Models and Association Between Baseline Characteristics and Risk of Mortality and Hospitalization During 3-year Follow-up

	All Death						Hospitalization					
	Model 1[a]			Model 2[b]			Model 1[c]			Model 2[d]		
	Wald χ^2	p	HR (95% CI)	Wald χ^2	p	HR (95% CI)	Wald χ^2	p	HR (95% CI)	Wald χ^2	p	HR (95% CI)
Care recipient variables												
Men (versus women)	22.41	<0.001	1.98 (1.49-2.63)	24.25	<0.001	2.06 (1.54-2.75)	3.39	0.065	1.23 (0.99-1.54)	3.05	0.081	1.22 (0.98-1.52)
Age[e]	66.21	<0.001	1.07 (1.05-1.09)	45.71	<0.001	1.06 (1.04-1.08)	6.08	0.014	1.02 (1.00-1.03)	3.24	0.072	1.01 (1.00-1.03)
Basic ADL score[e]	26.01	<0.001	0.94 (0.92-0.96)	32.04	<0.001	0.93 (0.91-0.96)	7.89	0.005	0.97 (0.96-0.99)	12.95	<0.001	0.97 (0.95-0.99)
No. of service uses[e]	0.84	0.360	0.94 (0.83-1.05)	0.90	0.343	0.93 (0.83-1.05)	2.28	0.131	1.07 (0.97-1.17)	1.75	0.186	1.06 (0.97-1.16)
Charlson comorbidity index[e]	8.84	0.003	1.12 (1.04-1.22)			—	2.13	0.145	1.05 (0.98-1.12)			—
Chronic disease (versus absence)												
Congestive heart failure			—	5.16	0.023	1.54 (1.06-2.23)			—			—
COPD			—			—			—	3.090	0.079	1.40 (0.96-2.03)
Dementia			—	4.298	<0.001	1.33 (1.02-1.74)			—			—
Cancer			—	14.64	<0.001	1.99 (1.40-2.82)			—	18.10	<0.001	1.84 (1.39-2.44)
Behavioral problems (versus absence)	0.20	0.657	1.11 (0.72 to 1.70)	0.23	0.629	1.12 (0.72-1.74)			—			—
Caregiver's variables												
Men (versus women)	0.03	0.863	1.02 (0.74-1.42)	0.01	0.984	0.99 (0.71-1.38)	0.01	0.942	0.99 (0.77-1.27)	0.13	0.714	0.95 (0.74-1.22)
Age[e]	0.36	0.551	1.00 (0.99-1.02)	0.47	0.492	1.00 (0.99-1.02)	0.07	0.788	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	0.04	0.847	1.00 (0.99-1.01)
Subjective caregiver health status (versus good to excellent)												
Fair			—			—	2.95	0.086	1.21 (0.97-1.50)	2.52	0.113	1.19 (0.96-1.48)
Poor			—			—	2.99	0.084	1.32 (0.96-1.82)	2.69	0.101	1.31 (0.95-1.80)
ZBI score (versus 1st quartile)												
2nd	0.13	0.717	1.07 (0.75-1.53)	0.23	0.629	1.09 (0.76-1.57)	2.06	0.151	1.22 (0.93-1.61)	2.51	0.113	1.25 (0.95-1.64)
3rd	0.01	0.942	1.01 (0.71-1.46)	0.06	0.809	1.05 (0.73-1.51)	2.93	0.087	1.27 (0.97-1.68)	3.95	0.047	1.32 (1.00-1.75)
4th	5.80	0.016	1.54 (1.09-2.17)	4.44	0.035	1.45 (1.03-2.05)	8.62	0.003	1.51 (1.15-1.98)	8.29	0.004	1.50 (1.14-1.97)

Notes: Degree of freedom is equal to 1. COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

[a]Model 1 included gender, age, bADL score, number of community-based services used, regular medical checkups, Charlson comorbidity index, behavioral problems, caregiver's age and gender, the Zarit categories that are associated with mortality in univariate analysis.

[b]Model 2 for analysis of all-death, which included variables used in Model 1 plus presence or absence of heart failure, dementia, and cancer, which are associated with all-death in univariate analysis, instead of Charlson comorbidity index.

[c]Model 1 included gender, age, bADL score, number of community-based services used, regular medical checkups, Charlson comorbidity index, caregiver's age and gender, subjective caregiver health status, and the Zarit categories that are associated with mortality in univariate analysis.

[d]Model 2 for analysis of hospitalization, which included variables used in Model 1 plus presence or absence of cancer and COPD, which are associated with all-death in univariate analysis, instead of Charlson comorbidity index.

[e]Continuous variables.

TABLE 4. Subgroup Cox Hazard Analysis According to Quartiles of the ZBI Score

| | | Quartile Group of ZBI Score (1st: Reference) | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of | 2nd | | | 3rd | | | 4th | | |
Use or Nonuse	Case Total	Wald χ^2	p	HR (95% CI)	Wald χ^2	p	HR (95% CI)	Wald χ^2	p	HR (95% CI)
All death[a]										
Day-care service										
Nonuse	165/573	1.03	0.310	1.26 (0.81–1.96)	0.07	0.791	0.95 (0.58–1.54)	5.06	0.024	1.66 (1.07–2.59)
Use	103/494	0.31	0.579	0.84 (0.45–1.58)	0.15	0.695	1.12 (0.64–1.97)	0.75	0.387	1.29 (0.72–2.31)
Home-help service										
Nonuse	155/618	0.76	0.382	1.25 (0.76–2.05)	0.16	0.688	1.11 (0.67–1.85)	12.7	<0.001	2.32 (1.46–3.69)
Use	113/449	0.10	0.757	0.92 (0.54–1.57)	0.23	0.633	0.88 (0.52–1.49)	0.63	0.426	0.80 (0.46–1.39)
Nursing-home respite stay service										
Nonuse	237/959	0.34	0.558	1.12 (0.76–1.65)	0.09	0.768	1.06 (0.72–1.56)	9.75	0.002	1.79 (1.24–2.58)
Use	31/108	0.42	0.517	0.70 (0.24–1.79)	0.77	0.381	0.63 (0.23–1.76)	1.86	0.173	0.46 (0.15–1.41)
Hospitalization[b]										
Day-care service										
Nonuse	250/573	1.72	0.189	1.27 (0.89–1.82)	3.46	0.063	1.43 (0.98–2.10)	5.07	0.024	1.54 (1.06–2.24)
Use	205/494	0.86	0.353	1.23 (0.80–1.88)	0.93	0.334	1.22 (0.81–1.84)	4.50	0.034	1.56 (1.03–2.36)
Home-help service										
Nonuse	260/618	3.56	0.059	1.45 (0.99–2.14)	4.88	0.027	1.54 (1.05–2.25)	18.00	<0.001	2.25 (1.55–3.27)
Use	195/449	0.01	0.945	1.01 (0.68–1.51)	0.01	0.930	1.02 (0.67–1.54)	0.40	0.528	0.87 (0.57–1.33)
Nursing-home respite stay service										
Nonuse	400/959	2.30	0.130	1.25 (0.94–1.67)	2.09	0.148	1.24 (0.93–1.67)	9.32	0.002	1.57 (1.18–2.10)
Use	55/108	0.21	0.646	1.26 (0.47–3.34)	0.65	0.419	1.43 (0.60–3.41)	0.02	0.891	1.06 (0.44–2.56)

Notes: Multivariate Cox proportional hazard models. Degree of freedom for all variables is equal to 1.
[a]Model included gender, age, basic activities of daily living (bADL) score, number of community-based services used, Charlson comorbidity index, behavioral problems, caregiver's age and gender, and the Zarit categories.
[b]Model included gender, age, bADL score, number of community-based services used, Charlson comorbidity index, caregiver's age and gender, subjective caregiver health status, and the Zarit categories.

comorbidity. To our knowledge, this is the first report addressing the relationships between caregiver burden and mortality or hospitalization for dependent older care recipients living in the community.

In addition, subgroup analysis revealed that the association between a high caregiver burden and adverse health outcomes of care recipients was mainly observed in nonusers of community-based respite services, including day-care, home help, or nursing-home respite stay services. No association was found between high caregiver burden and adverse health outcomes of care recipients among users of these services except for users of day-care services with a hospitalization risk.

There are a number of possible mechanisms for these associations. Previous research has found caregiver burden to be a factor in determining the quality of care given and, specifically, a negative indicator of the willingness of caregivers to continue in the caregiving role.[2,20] The caregiver burden may lead to a lower quality of care, leading over time to abuse or neglect and, ultimately, to negative health outcomes for the care recipient.[21,22] In fact, it has been demon-

strated that a lack of needed care for disabled older individuals or a decreased quality of family caregiving results in poor outcomes for care recipients.[23–25] Thus, caregiver burden and emotional distress can be a detriment to the health and well-being of care recipients through inadequate provision of care.

In this study, we demonstrated that the GDS-15 score of the caregiver as well as the care recipient increased as the level of the ZBI quartile increased. These results may indicate that caregiver burden is associated with depressive symptoms in the care recipients and that there may be interrelationships between the emotional distress of the caregiver and depressive symptoms in care recipients. A number of reports have suggested that depressive symptoms have been shown to be an important risk factor for mortality and to increase the risk of physical disability through poorer adherence to healthy life styles.[26–28] However, the GDS-15 scores of care recipients were not associated with all-cause mortality and hospitalization in this cohort. There are several possible reasons for this difference between our cohort and others. The subjects of the current

investigation had multiple medical problems and functional limitations and were probably at higher mortality and hospitalization risk than those in these prior studies.[26–28]

It has been demonstrated that the death or serious illness of a spouse increases the risk of death or affects the health of a partner.[29,30] A possible mechanism of this association is that spousal illness or death may deprive a partner of social, emotional, or other practical support.[29,30] In the present study, subjective poor health status of the caregiver was associated with risk of hospitalization for the care recipient but not with mortality in this cohort. The highest level of caregiver burden was associated with hospitalization for dependent elderly care recipients, even after adjustment for the subjective health status of the caregivers, making it unlikely that our findings were confounded by the poor health status of the caregiver, at least at baseline.

Community-based long-term care services are believed to relieve stress on family caregivers and enable older people with disabilities to remain at home for a longer period of time.[31] However, the usefulness of these services for reducing caregiver burden is still controversial. Some studies have demonstrated a positive effect of respite service on caregiver burden, but others have shown no effect or a negative relationship between respite service use and caregiver burden.[32–36] In our cohort, no difference in the caregiver ZBI score was observed between users and nonusers of day-care services and home-help services, and a rather higher average ZBI score in users of nursing-home respite stay services compared with nonusers was observed, although cross-sectional determination of respite care service use and the ZBI measurement do not allow evaluation of the causal and consequent relationships between service use and caregiver burden. However, the present study found that the adverse outcome for care recipients with caregivers with the highest burden is more evident in nonusers of respite services than in service users. It is possible that the use of these long-term care services decreased the adverse health outcomes of care recipients through other factors beyond caregiver burden.

Our study has several strengths, including the relatively large number of paired participants and outcome events, a prospective design, and a well-defined population. Our analyses took into account potential confounders including age, gender, bADL,

comorbidity, and subjective health status of the caregiver. We also adjusted for the number of community-based services used and conducted an analysis stratified by the use or nonuse of community-based respite care services.

This study has potential limitations. Subjects with acute illness at enrollment were excluded from participating in the NLS-FE, and the present study used statistical control of potential confounding variables to rule out third factors that might produce an association between caregiver burden and care recipient adverse health outcomes during the follow-up period. However, because of the observational design of the present study, differences in unmeasured factors, including social circumstances, caregiver's competence in caring for a disabled recipient, the health condition of the caregivers during the study period not at baseline, and the length of caregiving may in part account for the findings. We used only the presence or absence of selected major comorbidities and behavioral problems as covariates in the analyses. The lack of assessment of the severity of the recipient's medical illness or significant behavioral problems, both of which would require more time for care providing, may have influenced the results in the present study. The present findings may not be generalizable to other populations, given that health practices, a variety of social and economic factors, ethnic attitudes about caring for very old people, and the cost of healthcare may have influenced these results. It should be noted that multiple analyses in the present study increased the chances of making high likelihood of Type I errors.

We demonstrated high caregiver burden as an important risk of the adverse health outcomes of care recipients, including all-cause mortality and hospitalization. This risk of care recipient adverse health outcomes associated with a heavy caregiver burden was attenuated in community-based respite care service users. In the community setting, interventions directed toward the reduction of caregiver burden and improving caregiver well-being may not only delay long-term care placement and prevent the deterioration of caregiver health but also reduce care recipient adverse health outcomes. A community-based service may thus yield benefits for care recipients and may favorably affect the complex and interrelated variables of the caregiver and the recipient. These efforts may facilitate the continuation of home care of the disabled elderly.

References

1. George LK, Gwyther LP: Caregiver well-being: a multidimensional examination of family caregivers of demented adults. Gerontologist 1986; 26:253-259
2. Zarit SH, Todd PA, Zarit JM: Subjective burden of husbands and wives as caregivers. Gerontologist 1986; 26:260-266
3. Schulz R, Visintainer P, Williamson GM: Psychiatric and physical morbidity effects of caregiving. J Gerontol 1990; 45:181-191
4. Torti FM Jr, Gwyther LP, Reed SD, et al: A multinational review of recent trends and reports in dementia caregiver burden. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord 2004; 18:99-109
5. Covinsky KE, Goldman L, Cook EF, et al: The impact of serious illness on patients' families. SUPPORT Investigators. Study to Understand Prognoses and Preferences for Outcomes and Risks of Treatment. JAMA 1994; 272:1839-1844
6. Scholte op Reimer WJ, de Haan RJ, et al: The burden of caregiving in partners of long-term stroke survivors. Stroke 1998; 29:1605-1611
7. Vitaliano PP, Katon W, Unützer J: Making the case for caregiver research in geriatric psychiatry. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 2005; 13:834-843
8. Gallicchio L, Siddiqi N, Langenberg P, et al: Gender differences in burden and depression among informal caregivers of demented elders in the community. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry 2002; 17:154-163
9. Kiecolt-Glaser JK, Marucha PT, Malarkey WB, et al: Slowing of wound healing by psychological stress. Lancet 1995; 346:1194-1196
10. Kiecolt-Glaser JK, Glaser R, Gravenstein S, et al: Chronic stress alters the immune response to influenza virus vaccine in older adults. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1996; 93:3043-3047
11. von Känel R, Mausbach BT, Patterson TL, et al: Increased Framingham Coronary Heart Disease Risk Score in dementia caregivers relative to non-caregiving controls. Gerontology 2008; 54:131-137
12. Schulz R, Beach SR: Caregiving as a risk factor for mortality: the Caregiver Health Effects Study. JAMA 1999; 282:2215-2219
13. Yaffe K, Fox P, Newcomer R, et al: Patient and caregiver characteristics and nursing home placement in patients with dementia. JAMA 2002; 287:2090-2097
14. Gaugler JE, Kane RL, Kane RA, et al: Caregiving and institutionalization of cognitively impaired older people: utilizing dynamic predictors of change. Gerontologist 2003; 43:219-229
15. Tsutsui T, Muramatsu N: Care-needs certification in the long-term care insurance system of Japan. J Am Geriatr Soc 2005; 53:522-527
16. Kuzuya M, Masuda Y, Hirakawa Y, et al: Day care service use is associated with lower mortality in community-dwelling frail older people. J Am Geriatr Soc 2006; 54:1364-1371
17. Kuzuya M, Masuda Y, Hirakawa Y, et al: Underuse of medications for chronic diseases in the oldest of community-dwelling older frail Japanese. J Am Geriatr Soc 2006; 54:598-605
18. Yesavage JA: Geriatric Depression Scale. Psychopharmacol Bull 1988; 24:709-711
19. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, et al: A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. J Chronic Dis 1987; 40:373-383
20. Pearlin LI, Mullan JT, Semple SJ, et al: Caregiving and the stress process: an overview of concepts and their measures. Gerontologist 1990; 30:583-594
21. Lachs MS, Pillemer K. Abuse and neglect of elderly persons. N Engl J Med 1995; 332:437-443
22. Beach SR, Schulz R, Williamson GM, et al: Risk factors for potentially harmful informal caregiver behavior. J Am Geriatr Soc 2005; 53:255-261
23. Blazer DG, Sachs-Ericsson N, Hybels CF: Perception of unmet basic needs as a predictor of mortality among community-dwelling older adults. Am J Public Health 2005; 95:299-304
24. Sands LP, Wang Y, McCabe GP, et al: Rates of acute care admissions for frail older people living with met versus unmet activity of daily living needs. J Am Geriatr Soc 2006; 54:339-344
25. Lachs MS, Williams CS, O'Brien S, et al: The mortality of elder mistreatment. JAMA 1998; 280:428-432
26. Schulz R, Drayer RA, Rollman BL: Depression as a risk factor for non-suicide mortality in the elderly. Biol Psychiatry 2002; 52:205-225
27. Cronin-Stubbs D, de Leon CF, Beckett LA, et al: Six-year effect of depressive symptoms on the course of physical disability in community-living older adults. Arch Intern Med 2000; 160:3074-3080
28. Williams LS, Ghose SS, Swindle RW: Depression and other mental health diagnoses increase mortality risk after ischemic stroke. Am J Psychiatry 2004; 161:1090-1095
29. Martikainen P, Valkonen T: Mortality after the death of a spouse: rates and causes of death in a large Finnish cohort. Am J Public Health 1996; 86:1087-1093
30. Christakis NA, Allison PD: Mortality after the hospitalization of a spouse. N Engl J Med 2006; 354:719-730
31. Zarit SH, Gaugler JE, Jarrott SE: Useful services for families: research findings and directions. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry 1999; 14:165-177
32. Sörensen S, Pinquart M, Duberstein P: How effective are interventions with caregivers? An updated meta-analysis. Gerontologist 2002; 42:356-372
33. Shaw C, McNamara R, Abrams K, et al: Systematic review of respite care in the frail elderly. Health Technol Assess 2009; 13:1-224
34. Cox C: Findings from a statewide program of respite care: a comparison of service users, stoppers, and nonusers. Gerontologist 1997; 37:511-517
35. Baumgarten M, Lebel P, Laprise H, et al: Adult day care for the frail elderly: outcomes, satisfaction, and cost. J Aging Health 2002; 14:237-259
36. Grant I, McKibbin CL, Taylor MJ, et al: In-home respite intervention reduces plasma epinephrine in stressed Alzheimer caregivers. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 2003; 11:62-72

Dietary patterns of antioxidant vitamin and carotenoid intake associated with bone mineral density: findings from post-menopausal Japanese female subjects

M. Sugiura · M. Nakamura · K. Ogawa · Y. Ikoma ·
F. Ando · H. Shimokata · M. Yano

Abstract

Summary Recent studies show that antioxidants may reduce the risk of osteoporosis. This study showed the associations of bone mineral density with dietary patterns of antioxidant vitamins and carotenoids. The findings suggest the combination of vitamin C and β-cryptoxanthin intakes might provide benefit to bone health in post-menopausal Japanese female subjects.

Introduction Recent epidemiological studies show antioxidants may reduce the risk of osteoporosis, but little is known about the dietary patterns of antioxidant vitamin and carotenoid intakes and their relation with bone mineral density (BMD).

Methods A total of 293 post-menopausal female subjects who had received health examinations in the town of Mikkabi, Shizuoka Prefecture, Japan, participated in the study. Radial

M. Sugiura (✉) · K. Ogawa · Y. Ikoma · M. Yano
Research team for health benefit of fruit,
National Institute of Fruit Tree Science,
485-6 Shimizu-Okitsu-nakachou,
Shizuoka-shi, Shizuoka 424-0292, Japan
e-mail: msugiura@affrc.go.jp

M. Nakamura
Department of Community Health and Preventive Medicine,
Hamamatsu University School of Medicine,
1-20-1 Handayama,
Hamamatsu-shi, Shizuoka 431-3192, Japan

F. Ando
Department of Community Care Philanthropy,
Aichi Shukutoku University,
23 Sakuragaoka,
Nagoya-shi, Aichi 464-8671, Japan

H. Shimokata
Department of Epidemiology,
National Institute for Longevity Sciences,
36-3 Moriokachou,
Obu-shi, Aichi 474-8522, Japan

BMD was measured using dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry. Dietary intakes of antioxidant vitamins and carotenoids were assessed by using a validated food-frequency questionnaire. Dietary patterns were identified on a selected set of antioxidants through principal component factor analysis.

Results Three dietary patterns were identified. The "retinol" pattern, characterized by notably high intakes of preformed retinol, zeaxanthin, and vitamin E, was positively associated with the risk for low BMD. In contrast, the "β-cryptoxanthin" pattern, characterized by notably high intakes of β-cryptoxanthin and vitamin C, was negatively associated with low BMD. The odds ratios for low BMD in the highest tertiles of dietary intakes of preformed retinol, vitamin C, and β-cryptoxanthin against the lowest tertiles were 3.22 [95% confidence interval (CI), 1.38–7.51], 0.25 (CI, 0.10–0.66), and 0.40 (CI, 0.17–0.92), respectively, after adjustments for confounders. However, negative associations of vitamin C and β-cryptoxanthin with low BMD were not significant after further adjustment for intake of β-cryptoxanthin or vitamin C, respectively. Higher intakes of both vitamin C and β-cryptoxanthin were significantly associated with low BMD ($P<0.05$).

Conclusions The combination of vitamin C and β-cryptoxanthin may be associated with radial BMD in post-menopausal Japanese female subjects.

Keywords Bone mineral density · Carotenoid · Dietary pattern · Preformed retinol · Vitamin

Introduction

Osteoporosis and related fractures are a major public health problem [1]. Osteoporosis is a chronic disease characterized by low bone mineral density and microarchitectural

disruption, leading to bone fragility and an increased susceptibility to fractures [2]. Nutrition is an important modifiable factor in the development and maintenance of bone health, and numerous studies on nutrition and bone health have been conducted [3, 4]. Recent epidemiological studies have shown an association between fruit and vegetable intake and bone mineral density (BMD) in both young and elderly subjects [5–10].

Fruits and vegetables are rich sources of antioxidant vitamins and carotenoids, which have been shown to contribute to the body's defense against reactive oxygen species [11, 12].

Recent animal experiments and in vitro studies have shown that reactive oxygen species and free radicals are involved in osteoclastogenesis, in apoptosis of osteoblasts and osteocytes and therefore also in bone resorption [13–15]. Furthermore, recent epidemiological studies have shown a relationship between oxidative stress and BMD or osteoporosis [16–18]. These previous findings in epidemiological and experimental studies suggest that antioxidant micronutrients may provide benefits to bone metabolism against oxidative stress. In fact, recent epidemiological studies have reported inverse associations of antioxidant vitamin and carotenoid intake and/or serum level with low BMD, risk of fracture, and/or osteoporosis [19–24]. Very recently, we found that serum concentrations of carotenoids such as β-cryptoxanthin and β-carotene were weakly but positively associated with radial BMD in post-menopausal female subjects [25]. Therefore, antioxidant vitamins and carotenoids may be beneficial to the maintenance of bone health.

With regard to antioxidant vitamins and carotenoids, most studies have focused on a single antioxidant and examined the relationship between antioxidant intake and/or serum level and the status of bone health. However, these common approaches may not adequately account for the complicated interactions of these antioxidants because people consume diets consisting of a variety of foods with complex combinations of antioxidants rather than single antioxidant. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the beneficial effects of these antioxidants on bone health are synergistic or additive. To answer such questions, the identification of dietary patterns using factor analysis has been widely used to elucidate the relationship between diet and disease. This type of statistical analysis allows the development of appropriate recommendations for overall dietary habits.

The objective of this study was to identify the dietary patterns of antioxidant vitamin and carotenoid intake associated with radial BMD in post-menopausal Japanese female subjects and to investigate the association of interactions of these antioxidants with bone health. The dietary patterns of antioxidant vitamin and carotenoid intake with radial BMD were evaluated cross-sectionally.

Subjects and methods

Subjects

In this survey, study subjects were recruited from participants in an annual health check-up program conducted by the local government of the town of Mikkabi, Shizuoka Prefecture, Japan in April 2005. Mikkabi is located in western Shizuoka, and about 40% of its residents work in agriculture. Fruit trees are the key industry in Mikkabi, which is an important producer of mandarin orange in Japan. A total of 1,891 males and females were subjects for the annual health check-up program. In total, 1,369 males and females (72.4% of total subjects), ranging in age from 30 to 70 years, had received the health check-up through the program.

Participants were recruited for this study, and informed consent was obtained from 699 subjects (222 males and 477 females). The response rate was 51.1%. This study was approved by the ethics committees of the National Institute of Fruit Tree Science and the Hamamatsu University School of Medicine. For the present study, we used the data of post-menopausal female subjects because, in our previous study, we had found inverse associations of serum antioxidant carotenoids with risk for low BMD in post-menopausal female subjects [25].

Bone mineral density measurement

The radial BMD was measured using dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) of each participant's nondominant forearm with an osteometer (model DCS-600EX-III, ALOKA Co., LTD., Tokyo, Japan). This osteometer automatically measured the forearm length from the styloid process on the ulna, and DXA scan was automatically placed on the radial centered 1/3 of the forearm length. Calibration of the machine was performed daily, and quality assurance was performed by measuring the manufacturer's phantom. The CV of the radial BMD measurement was within 0.5%. In this study, the measurement of the radial BMD of each participant was performed by well-trained clinical technologists of the Seirei Preventive Health Care Center (Shizuoka, Japan).

Self-administered questionnaire

A self-administered questionnaire was used to collect information about a subject's history of osteoporosis, medications and/or hormone use, and lifestyle, including tobacco use (current smoker, ex-smoker, or non-smoker), exercise (1+ times per week), regular alcohol intake (1+ time per week), dietary supplement use (non-user, occasional-user, and current-user), and dietary habits. Diet

was assessed with a modified validated simple food-frequency questionnaire (FFQ) developed especially for the Japanese [26, 27]. In this FFQ, Wakai et al. selected a total of 97 foods and dishes through a two-step procedure, first by ranking food items according to the contribution to the population intake of energy and nutrients and second by stepwise multiple regression analysis of individual food items as the independent variables and of total nutrient intake as the dependent variable. For simplicity, questions on portion sizes were not included except for a few selected food items, resulting in short time to complete the questionnaire. They validated this FFQ for food groups by referring to four 4-day dietary records (DRs), and correlation coefficients between FFQ and DRs were larger than 0.4 for most food groups. Information about alcohol consumption and the daily intake of 18 nutrients was estimated from the monthly food intake frequencies with either standard portion size (for most types of food) or subject-specified usual portion size (for rice, bread, and alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages) using FFQ analysis software package for windows (Food-Frequency Questionnaire System, System Supply Co., LTD., Kanagawa, Japan). This FFQ analysis software computes an individual's food and nutrient intake form FFQ data based on "Standard tables of food composition in Japan" [28, 29].

The dietary carotenoid intakes of each individual were computed to obtain the amount of six carotenoids, lycopene, α-carotene, β-carotene, lutein, β-cryptoxanthin, and zeaxanthin using a published database of the carotenoid composition of fruit and vegetables [30, 31]. In our survey, we calculated an individual's carotenoid intake from important sources of carotenoids. In this data analysis, the dietary carotenoid intakes were calculated from the FFQ data of individual food items not dishes [32].

The dietary intakes of total energy, calcium, potassium, magnesium, vitamins C, D, and E, preformed retinol, lycopene, α-carotene, β-carotene, lutein, β-cryptoxanthin, and zeaxanthin of each subject were used in this report.

Statistical analyses

For this study, the following subjects were excluded from the data analyses: (1) those who reported a history of osteoporosis or taking medications for bone metabolism in the self-administered questionnaire ($n=14$); (2) those for whom the self-administered questionnaire data were incomplete ($n=1$); and (3) those for whom blood samples for serum-carotenoid analysis were not collected ($n=1$). As a result, a total of 293 post-menopausal female subjects were included in further data analysis.

Intakes of preformed retinol, vitamins C, D, and E, and six carotenoids were skewed toward the higher concentrations. These values were log$_e$ (natural)-transformed to

improve the normality of their distribution. All variables were presented as an original scale. The data are expressed as means (standard deviation), geometric mean (95% confidence interval), range, or percent.

A principal component analysis was used to derive the dietary patterns on the basis of the intakes of nine antioxidant vitamins and carotenoids obtained from the FFQ. To identify the number of factors to be retained, we used the criterion of eigenvalues>1.0, the most widely used criterion in factor analysis. Finally, we decided to retain three factors for further analysis. We applied a varimax rotation to the factor-loading matrix to achieve a simpler structure with greater interpretability. After the varimax rotation, the factor scores for each subject were saved from the principal component analysis. The factor-loading matrix represents correlation coefficients between individual antioxidants and dietary patterns. The percentage of variance explained by each factor was calculated by dividing the sum of the squares of the respective factor loadings by the number of variables.

Participants were divided into three categories according to tertiles of factor scores. Low radial BMD was defined as the lowest quartile of the value among study participants, i.e., equal to or less than 0.501 g/cm^2 in post-menopausal female subjects. To assess the relationship between dietary patterns and low radial BMD, logistic regression analyses were performed using three models. In model 1, we adjusted for age, weight, and height. Model 2: Years since menopause, current tobacco use, regular alcohol intake, exercise habits, supplement use, and total energy intake were further adjusted. Model 3: Intakes of calcium, magnesium, potassium, and vitamin D were further adjusted. The goodness-of-fit for logistic regression model was evaluated by Hosmer–Lemeshow Goodness-of-Fit test, and then, we calculated odds ratios.

For dietary intake of each antioxidant vitamin and carotenoid, participants were further divided into three categories according to tertiles of antioxidant vitamin and carotenoid intake, and logistic regression analyses were performed to assess the relationship between antioxidant vitamin and carotenoid intake with low radial BMD.

All statistical analyses were performed using a statistical software package for Windows (SPSS ver. 17.0, SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) on a personal computer.

Results

Clinical, biochemical, and nutrient intake profiles of study subjects

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the study subjects. The mean radial BMD in post-menopausal Japanese female

Table 1 Characteristics of the study subject

	Post-menopausal female	
Number study subjects	293	
Age (years)	60.2	(6.2)
Body height (cm)	152.0	(5.5)
Body weight (kg)	51.9	(7.6)
Body mass index (kg/m2)	22.5	(3.0)
Bone mineral density (g/cm2)	0.561	(0.084)
Range		0.366–0.820
Intake		
Total energy including ethanol (MJ/day)	8.20	(2.01)
Total energy excluding ethanol (MJ/day)	8.15	(2.00)
Calcium (mg/day)	651	(256)
Potassium (mg/day)	2910	(967)
Magnesium (mg/day)	281	(81)
Retinol (μg/day)[a, b]	281	(259–305)
Vitamin C (mg/day)[b]	170	(161–179)
Vitamin D (μg/day)[b]	6.4	(5.9–6.9)
Vitamin E (mg/day)[b]	8.1	(7.8–8.4)
Lycopene (mg/day)[b]	0.15	(0.13–0.17)
α-Carotene (mg/day)[b]	0.25	(0.23–0.27)
β-Carotene (mg/day)[b]	1.86	(1.74–1.99)
Lutein (mg/day)[b]	2.06	(1.92–2.20)
β-Cryptoxanthin (mg/day)[b]	0.62	(0.52–0.73)
Zeaxanthin (mg/day)[b]	0.67	(0.61–0.73)
Current tobacco use (%)	1.7	
Exercise habits (%)[c]	21.5	
Regular alcohol intake (%)[c]	11.0	
Current supplement use (%)	9.6	

Data are mean (standard deviation), geometric mean (95% confidence interval)

[a] Preformed retinol

[b] These variables were represented as original scale after analysis by log

[c] ≥1 time per week

subjects was 0.561 g/cm^2. The percent of subjects with osteoporosis whose radial BMD was less than 70% of that of the young adult mean was 9.2% [33]. The mean daily intakes of calcium, potassium, magnesium, preformed retinol, and vitamins C, D, and E were at least comparable to the recommended dietary allowance. Of the six carotenoids analyzed, that with the highest intake was lutein; the second was β-carotene, and the lowest was lycopene. In our survey, 9.6% of study subjects used supplements, but most used multivitamin supplements. The rate of supplement users among study subjects for vitamin C and D, β-carotene, and calcium were 3.1%, 0.3%, 0.7%, and 5.5%, respectively. Therefore, we think that specific quantitative intakes of vitamin, carotenoid, and mineral from supplement were negligible compared with those from foods.

Principal component analysis of dietary patterns of antioxidant vitamin and carotenoid intake

The factor-loading matrices for the three retained factors are shown in Table 2. The high positive loadings indicate strong associations between given antioxidants and dietary patterns. Factor 1 had heavy loadings on β-carotene, α-carotene, lutein, lycopene, and vitamins E and C. This pattern was especially heavily loaded on carotenoids and was labeled the "Carotene" pattern. Factor 2 had heavy loadings on preformed retinol, zeaxanthin, vitamin E, lutein, vitamin C, and β-carotene. This pattern, heavily loaded on preformed retinol, zeaxanthin, and vitamin E, was labeled the "Retinol" pattern. Factor 3 had heavy loadings on β-cryptoxanthin, vitamin C, β-carotene, lutein, and vitamin E. This pattern, heavily loaded on β-cryptoxanthin and vitamin C, was labeled the "β-cryptoxanthin" pattern. Overall, the three dietary patterns accounted for 73.1% of the variance in antioxidant vitamin and carotenoid intake.

Odds ratio of low radial BMD in the highest group of factor scores of each dietary pattern

The odds ratios of low radial BMD associated with the tertiles of factor scores of each of the three dietary patterns after adjustments for confounding factors are shown in Table 3. The odds ratios for the risk of low radial BMD in the highest tertile of factor scores against the lowest tertile used for the reference group were calculated. In the

Table 2 Factor-loading matrix for the three dietary patterns of antioxidant vitamins and carotenoid intakes identified among 293 post-menopausal Japanese female subjects

	Factor 1: carotene	Factor 2: retinol	Factor 3: β-cryptoxanthin
Retinol[a]		0.825	
Vitamin C	0.435	0.285	0.773
Vitamin E	0.464	0.711	0.258
Lycopene	0.633		
α-Carotene	0.788		
β-Carotene	0.852	0.257	0.369
Lutein	0.740	0.447	0.270
β-Cryptoxanthin			0.920
Zeaxanthin		0.712	
Percentage of variance (%)	30.3	22.8	20.1

Data for 293 subjects from the self-administered food-frequency questionnaire. Absolute values <0.25 were excluded from the table for simplicity

[a] Preformed retinol

Table 3 The odds ratios (and 95% confidence intervals) of tertiles of three dietary patterns on low bone mineral density in post-menopausal Japanese female subjects

Dietary patterns	Factor score	Number	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
			OR	95% CI	P for trend	OR	95% CI	P for trend	OR	95% CI	P for trend
Factor 1: carotene	Lowest (Q1)	97	1.00			1.00			1.00		
	Middle (Q2)	98	0.83	(0.40–1.72)		0.94	(0.44–2.00)		1.14	(0.51–2.54)	
	Highest (Q3)	98	1.31	(0.65–2.64)	0.370	1.38	(0.66–2.89)	0.340	2.30	(0.93–5.70)	0.064
Factor 2: retinol	Lowest (Q1)	97	1.00			1.00			1.00		
	Middle (Q2)	98	1.16	(0.55–2.45)		1.35	(0.61–2.98)		1.08	(0.47–2.47)	
	Highest (Q3)	98	2.02	(0.99–4.09)	0.041	3.09	(1.28–7.47)	0.009	2.31	(0.90–5.89)	0.059
Factor 3: β-cryptoxanthin	Lowest (Q1)	97	1.00			1.00			1.00		
	Middle (Q2)	98	0.55	(0.26–1.16)		0.54	(0.25–1.18)		0.53	(0.24–1.17)	
	Highest (Q3)	98	0.26	(0.11–0.59)	0.001	0.22	(0.09–0.54)	0.001	0.30	(0.11–0.77)	0.017

Model 1: Age, weight and height were adjusted. Model 2: Years since menopause, current tobacco use, regular alcohol intake, exercise habits, supplement use, and total energy intake were further adjusted. Model 3: Intakes of calcium, magnesium, potassium, and vitamins D were further adjusted

"Carotene" pattern, there was no significant association between the factor score and low radial BMD. In the "Retinol" pattern, a significantly higher odds ratio was observed in the highest tertile of factor score after adjustments for age, years since menopause, weight, height, current tobacco use, regular alcohol intake, exercise habits, use of dietary supplements, and total energy. However, this significant association was not observed after further adjustments for intake of calcium, magnesium, potassium, and vitamin D. On the other hand, in the "β-cryptoxanthin" pattern, a significantly lower odds ratio was observed in the highest tertile of factor scores after multivariate adjustment.

Odds ratios of low radial BMD in the highest group of antioxidant vitamin and carotenoid intake

The odds ratios for the risk of low radial BMD associated with the tertiles of daily intakes of each antioxidant vitamin and carotenoid after adjustments for confounding factors are shown in Table 4. A significantly higher odds ratio was observed in the highest tertile of preformed retinol intake after adjustments for age, weight, and height. This significant association was also observed after multivariate adjustments. Similarly, a significantly higher odds ratio was observed in the highest tertile of zeaxanthin intake after adjustments for age, years since menopause, weight, height, current tobacco use, regular alcohol intake, exercise habits, use of dietary supplements, and total energy, but this significant association was not observed after further adjustments for intakes of calcium, magnesium, potassium, and vitamin D. In contrast, a significantly lower odds ratio was observed in the highest tertile of vitamin C intake after

multivariate adjustments. Also, a significantly lower odds ratio was observed in the highest tertile of β-cryptoxanthin intake after adjustments for age, years since menopause, weight, height, current tobacco use, regular alcohol intake, exercise habits, use of dietary supplements, and total energy, but this significant association was not observed after further adjustments for intakes of calcium, magnesium, potassium, and vitamin D.

Next, study subjects were divided into two groups by median values of vitamin C and/or β-cryptoxanthin intake. And then, all subjects were ranked into four groups as follows: group 1: lower intake of vitamin C (47–169 mg/day) with lower intake of β-cryptoxanthin (0–0.96 mg/day); group 2: lower intake of vitamin C (47–169 mg/day) with higher intake of β-cryptoxanthin (0.97–7.91 mg/day); group 3, higher intake of vitamin C (170–625 mg/day) with lower intake of β-cryptoxanthin (0–0.96 mg/day); group 4, higher intake of vitamin C (170–625 mg/day) with higher intake of β-cryptoxanthin (0.97–7.91 mg/day). In both groups of higher intake of vitamin C with lower intake of β-cryptoxanthin and/or lower intake of vitamin C with higher intake of β-cryptoxanthin, significantly lower odds ratios were not observed against the lower intake group of both of them used for the reference group. In contrast, a significantly lower odds ratio was observed in the higher intake group of both of them after adjustments for age, years since menopause, weight, height, current tobacco use, regular alcohol intake, exercise habits, use of dietary supplements, and total energy (Table 5). However, this significant lower odds ratio became insignificant after further adjustments for intakes of calcium, magnesium, potassium, and vitamin D (data not shown).