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This supplementary material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.
**eFigure.** Flowchart of follow-up visits

Follow-Up Visit 1, n=2929
- Cases: 90
- Died: 216, Withdrew: 109, Brain injury: 21
- Not yet seen for next visit: 325

Follow-Up Visit 2, n=2177
- Cases: 73
- Died: 190, Withdrew: 74, Brain injury: 20
- Not yet seen for next visit: 260

Follow-Up Visit 3, n=1560
- Cases: 100
- Died: 121, Withdrew: 59, Brain injury: 16
- Not yet seen for next visit: 48

Follow-Up Visit 4, n=1216
- Cases: 75
- Not yet seen for next visit: 97

Follow-Up Visit 5, n=868
- Cases: 40
- Died: 134, Withdrew: 19, Brain injury: 1
- Not yet seen for next visit: 671

Follow-Up Visit 6, n=3
- Cases: 1
- Died: 1, Withdrew: 0, Brain injury: 0
- Not yet seen for next visit: 2
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**eTable 1. Sensitivity analyses of the difference in follow-up cognitive scores by hospitalization status, adjusted for additional possible confounders compared with primary models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visit Status</th>
<th>Not following hospitalization</th>
<th>Following non-critical illness hospitalization</th>
<th>Following critical illness hospitalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY MODEL: Adjusted difference in follow-up CASI (95% CI, p-value)</td>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>-0.85 (-1.13 to -0.56, p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>--1.39 (-2.72 to -0.07, p=0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS*: Adjusted difference in follow-up CASI (95% CI, p-value)</td>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>-0.86 (-1.13 to -0.57, p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>-1.37 (-2.68 to -0.06, p=0.040)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Linear regression with GEE to account for repeated observations, specifying an exchangeable correlation matrix and robust variance estimates; note that these analyses include 49 fewer individuals and 212 fewer observations than analyses in Table 3, because of missing data

# adjusted for the above covariates plus race/ethnicity, smoking status, and additional baseline comorbidities

**eTable 2. Sensitivity analysis of the risk of incident dementia by hospitalization status, adjusted for additional possible confounders compared with primary models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospitalization Status</th>
<th>No hospitalizations during study (n=1601)</th>
<th>One or more non-critical hospitalizations (n=1287)</th>
<th>One or more critical illness hospitalizations (n=41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY MODEL: Adjusted risk of incident dementia, hazard ratio (95% CI, p-value)</td>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>1.4 (1.1 to 1.8, P=0.002)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.7 to 6.0, p=0.204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSITIVITY MODEL: Adjusted risk of incident dementia, hazard ratio (95% CI, p-value)</td>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>1.3 (1.1 to 1.7, p=0.005)</td>
<td>1.9 (0.7 to 5.7, p=0.234)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cox proportional hazards regression, with age as the time axis, left-truncated at age at study entry; note that these analyses include 49 fewer individuals and 212 fewer observations than analyses in Table 5, because of missing data

# adjusted for the above covariates plus race/ethnicity, smoking status, and additional baseline comorbidities