eTable 1. Associations between health conditions and exposure status, adjusted for age and education:

| Outcome | Neither speak nor read Japanese | Speak Japanese but do not read Japanese | Both speak and read Japanese |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hypertension (defined as $\mathrm{BP} \geq$ | 1.09 (0.54-1.40) | 1 (reference) | 1.16 (0.90-1.50) |
| $140 / 90$ or on an antihypertensive medication) |  |  |  |
| Hypertension (defined as $\mathrm{BP} \geq$ | 1.00 (0.80-1.25) | 1 (reference) | 0.96 (0.77-1.21) |
| $160 / 95$ or on an antihypertensive medication) |  |  |  |
| Diabetes | 0.83 (0.61-1.15) | 1 (reference) | 0.91 (0.66-1.25) |
| Parkinsonism* (probable or possible) | 1.42 (0.72-2.77) | 1 (reference) | 0.94 (0.46-1.92) |
| Stroke (any self-report) | 0.89 (0.60-1.31) | 1 (reference) | 0.77 (0.51-1.16) |
| * Note that these models are somewhat unstable due to the extremely small number of cases - total of 28 across all 3 groups |  |  |  |

eTable 2. Educational attainment in years according to exposure status

|  |  | r spoke $n$ Japanes | read |  | but did no Japanese (reference) | read | Both sp | e and read | Japanese |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of years of education | n | n with thi number fewer | Percent with this number or fewer | n | n with this number or fewer | Percent with this number or fewer | n | n with this number or fewer | Percent with this number or fewer |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 1 | 0\% | 4 | 4 | 1\% |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 0\% | 8 | 9 | 0\% | 6 | 10 | 1\% |
| 4 | 2 | 3 | 1\% | 21 | 30 | 2\% | 8 | 18 | 2\% |
| 5 | 6 | 9 | 2\% | 14 | 44 | 2\% | 16 | 34 | 5\% |
| 6 | 15 | 24 | 4\% | 69 | 113 | 6\% | 37 | 71 | 10\% |
| 7 | 17 | 41 | 7\% | 91 | 204 | 11\% | 32 | 103 | 14\% |
| 8 | 107 | 148 | 26\% | 344 | 548 | 30\% | 127 | 230 | 31\% |
| 9 | 78 | 226 | 40\% | 250 | 798 | 43\% | 75 | 305 | 42\% |
| 10 | 32 | 258 | 46\% | 112 | 910 | 49\% | 30 | 335 | 46\% |
| 11 | 16 | 274 | 49\% | 56 | 966 | 52\% | 17 | 352 | 48\% |
| 12 | 182 | 456 | 81\% | 584 | 1,550 | 84\% | 181 | 533 | 73\% |
| 13 | 16 | 472 | 84\% | 52 | 1,602 | 87\% | 27 | 560 | 77\% |
| 14 | 25 | 497 | 89\% | 79 | 1,681 | 91\% | 47 | 607 | 83\% |
| 15 | 6 | 503 | 90\% | 20 | 1,701 | 92\% | 17 | 624 | 85\% |
| 16 | 34 | 537 | 96\% | 90 | 1,791 | 97\% | 61 | 685 | 94\% |
| 17 | 13 | 550 | 98\% | 23 | 1,814 | 98\% | 16 | 701 | 96\% |
| 18 | 5 | 555 | 99\% | 19 | 1,833 | 99\% | 9 | 710 | 97\% |
| 19 | 3 | 558 | 99\% | 8 | 1,841 | 100\% | 10 | 720 | 98\% |
| 20 | 1 | 559 | 100\% | 5 | 1,846 | 100\% | 9 | 729 | 100\% |
| 21 | 0 | 559 | 100\% | 0 | 1,846 | 100\% | 1 | 730 | 100\% |
| 22 | 1 | 560 | 100\% | 0 | 1,846 | 100\% | 0 | 730 | 100\% |
| 23 | 0 | 560 | 100\% | 0 | 1,846 | 100\% |  | 731 | 100\% |
| 24 | 1 | 561 | 100\% | 1 | 1,847 | 100\% | 0 | 731 | 100\% |

eTable 3. Data available regarding language use during the interview stratified by exposure group*.

|  | Neither spoke nor read Japanese |  | Spoke but did not read Japanese (reference) |  | Both spoke and read Japanese |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Entirely English -- no problems with language | 430 | 98\% | 1444 | 95\% | 515 | 89\% |
| English, but some language problems encountered | 9 | 2\% | 58 | 4\% | 31 | 5\% |
| English, validity uncertain or poor | 1 | 0\% | 3 | 0\% | 5 | 1\% |
| Mixed, with HHP interpreter | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 0\% | 9 | 2\% |
| Mixed; interviewer spoke Japanese and English | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 0\% | 4 | 1\% |
| Mixed: with family member/friend interpreter | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 0\% | 3 | 1\% |
| Japanese; interviewer spoke Japanese | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 0\% | 1 | 0\% |
| Japanese; with HHP interpreter (full translation) | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 0\% | 10 | 2\% |
| Missing | 121 |  | 332 |  | 153 |  |
| Total | 561 |  | 1847 |  | 731 |  |

* HHP refers to Honolulu Heart Program
eTable 4. Comparison of responses to Japanese language questions at Examination 1 (1965) and Examination 5 (1994-1996)

eTable 5. Results of sensitivity analyses limiting the analyses to those with income data and when including income category in the model*

|  | n or personyears | Neither spoke nor read Japanese |  |  | Spoke but did not read Japanese (reference) |  |  | Both spoke and read Japanese |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Any dementia | AD | Vascular dementia | Any dementia | AD | Vascular dementia | Any dementia | AD | Vascular dementia |
| Analysis 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| As reported in Table 3 | 3,139 | 0.78 | 0.48 | 0.96 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.80 | 2.07 | 1.22 |
| Limited to those with reported income | 2,715 | 0.64 | 0.58 | 0.95 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.46 | 3.03 | 1.91 |
| Adjusted for income | 2,715 | 0.64 | 0.57 | 0.95 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.46 | 3.03 | 1.91 |
| Analysis 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| As reported in Table 3 | 13,838 | 0.68 | 0.79 | 0.47 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.03 | 0.84 | 1.22 |
| Limited to those with reported income | 12,746 | 0.65 | 0.80 | 0.44 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.99 | 0.85 | 1.39 |
| Adjusted for income | 12,746 | 0.65 | 0.80 | 0.43 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.99 | 0.85 | 1.37 |
| Analysis 3a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| As reported in Table 3 | 7,178 | 0.88 | 0.74 | 1.66 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.01 | 0.86 | 1.47 |
| Limited to those with reported income | 6,652 | 0.88 | 0.76 | 1.37 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.89 | 0.68 | 1.96 |
| Adjusted for income | 6,652 | 0.89 | 0.77 | 1.40 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.89 | 0.68 | 1.99 |

* $\mathrm{AD}=$ Alzheimer disease. This table shows results of analyses as reported in Table 3 (first row), limited to those with data for
reported income (second row) and adjusting for income category (third row) for Analyses 1, 2, and 3a. Entries in these cells represent the point estimate of the odds ratio (Analysis 1) and hazard ratios (Analysis 2 and Analysis 3). Corresponding 95\% confidence intervals were slightly wider than those reported in Table 3, as expected given the smaller numbers when limiting to individuals with data for income. Comparing the second and third rows, the largest change was for vascular dementia outcomes in Analysis 3a, which changed by 0.03 for those who neither spoke nor read Japanese and by 0.03 for those who both spoke and read Japanese. All other changes were smaller than this negligible change when including income category.
eFigure. Distribution of baseline Cognitive Abilities Screening Instrument (CASI) scores by exposure status


