The Global Care Crisis: A Comparative Analysis of Caregiving Dynamics across Canada, the United States, Central Asia, and Angola

The global care economy is undergoing a profound structural transformation. Driven by rapid demographic aging, urbanization, and a widening gap between long-term care demands and formal support systems, the reliance on unpaid family caregivers has evolved from a private domestic arrangement into a major macroeconomic variable.[1] Across advanced industrial economies and rapidly developing nations alike, unpaid caregivers sustain the foundational layer of public health and social protection systems, often at a severe cost to their own financial security, physical health, and occupational stability.[1] This report delivers a detailed comparative analysis of caregiving dynamics, focusing on Canada, the United States, the Central Asian nations of the historic Silk Road (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan), and Angola. By evaluating caregiver prevalence, time commitments, psychological distress, workforce disruption, and corporate productivity losses, this analysis highlights the systemic risks that unmanaged caregiving burdens pose to global economic stability.

Comparative Framework of Caregiver Demographics and Prevalence

A comparative evaluation of caregiver demographics reveals distinct structural patterns. In advanced Western economies like Canada and the United States, caregiving is characterized by formal statistical tracking and a significant, highly visible intersection with the formal labor market.[1] In contrast, in the Central Asian republics and Angola, caregiving is deeply embedded in cultural norms and legal family mandates, though these traditional structures are experiencing severe strain due to demographic shifts and rapid urbanization.[2]

Demographic Profiles and Caregiver Prevalence

Geography	Caregiver Prevalence (% of Adult Population)	Estimated Size of Caregiving Population	Primary Demographic Drivers
Canada	25.0% of the population (up to 33.3% lifetime)	8 to 10 million individuals	Rapidly aging baby-boomer cohort, high life

			expectancy, and formal healthcare system decompression.
United States	24.2% of the adult population [1]	63 million total (59 million caring for adults 18+) [1]	Complex chronic disease prevalence, an aging population, and a lack of affordable long-term care infrastructure.[1]
Kazakhstan	~11.0% to 15.0% (estimated) [3]	Growing elderly cohort; 65+ population to reach 3.4 million by 2050 [3]	Rapid demographic transition from a traditional "pyramid" structure to a top-heavy "mushroom" shape.[2]
Uzbekistan	Broadly distributed across multigenerational homes [8]	Unmeasured formally; relies heavily on youth and women [8]	Youth bulges combined with cultural mandates of intergenerational care, starting as early as age 9.[9]
Angola	Highly informal, rural-urban split [4]	2.7% of the national population is aged 65 or older [4]	Rapid urbanization, weakening of traditional intergenerational safety nets, and post-conflict socioeconomic changes.[4]

Canada: The Multi-Tiered Care Demography

Within the Canadian context, demographic realities reveal a highly vulnerable system. Approximately 25% of Canadians are actively engaged as family caregivers, while wider longitudinal tracking indicates that up to 1/3 of the population acts as a family caregiver at some point in their life course. The societal pressure is most acute for the 2.4 million Canadians

who comprise the sandwich generation, a cohort defined by the simultaneous care of aging parents and young children. This dual-front care dynamic takes a heavy toll on families, acting as a major driver of early workforce exits and chronic mental stress.

United States: Parallel Crises in Western Markets

These patterns are mirrored in the United States, where the caregiving population has grown by 45% over the past decade.[6] The family caregiving population rose from 43 million in 2015 to 63 million in 2025, meaning nearly 1 in 4 American adults now provide ongoing, complex care.[1] Of these 63 million caregivers, 59 million are caring for an adult over 18, reflecting the growing care needs of an aging population.[1]

The American sandwich generation represents nearly 1 in 3 caregivers (29%) who are simultaneously raising children under 18 while caring for an adult loved one.[1] This figure rises to 47% among caregivers under the age of 50 and is especially common among Latino (43%) and Black (36%) caregivers.[1] The concentration of care burdens among younger, diverse populations highlight how caregiving inequalities compound existing socioeconomic disparities.[1]

Central Asia: The "Mushroom" Transition and Legislative Mandates

In Eastern Europe and Central Asia, the demographic profile is shifting from a traditional population pyramid to a "mushroom" shape with a distinct bulge at older ages.[2] In Kazakhstan, the population aged 65 and older is projected to double from 1.4 million in 2019 to 3.4 million by 2050, growing from 7.5% to over 14% of the total population.[3] Currently, 1 in 5 older adults in Kazakhstan requires physical assistance, a figure that rises to 31% for those aged 70 and older.[3] Because the formal long-term care system remains underdeveloped, 69% of older Kazakhs seek help from their children, while only 0.8% access formal social services.[3] This heavy reliance on family is reinforced by the country's legislative framework, which dictates that the care of older parents is a legal responsibility of able-bodied children.[3] The state reserves the official designation of "caregiver" almost exclusively for those assisting individuals with first-degree disabilities, leaving approximately 95% of informal caregivers without formal status, financial support, or social recognition.[3]

Uzbekistan faces a similar structural gap. Its legal framework for elder care is limited to elderly individuals living alone who require external care.[8] This narrow definition excludes elderly individuals living in family households, even if those families lack the financial or physical capacity to provide adequate care.[8]

Angola: Urbanization and the Erosion of Intergenerational Safety Nets

In Angola, approximately 2.7% of the population is over the age of 65.[4] However, the country is undergoing rapid urbanization and profound sociological changes.[4] Historically, older adults in Sub-Saharan Africa were supported by extensive, multi-generational family networks.[4] Urbanization has weakened these traditional safety nets by reducing the geographic proximity of family members and shifting the cultural view that the elderly will always be supported by

their offspring.[4] Consequently, older adults in urban areas like Luanda face heightened vulnerability, with studies showing that institutionalization and reaching the "oldest old" stage (80 years or older) are associated with severe declines in social support, perceived health, and life satisfaction.[4]

The Quantitative Toll: Caregiving Hours and Intensity

The volume of time required to sustain informal care reflects its demanding nature, showing consistent trends across both developed and developing economies.[1]

Weekly Caregiving Time Commitments by Geography and Gender

Geography	Average Weekly Caregiving Hours	High-Intensity Caregiver Prevalence	Primary Activities & Tasks
Canada	10 to 20 hours per week for 1 in 3 caregivers; 6 to 10 hours for care coordination	Variable; high concentration among the sandwich generation	Direct physical care, transportation, and extensive clinical care coordination.
United States	27.0 hours average per week [10]	24.0% provide 40+ hours per week [1]; 33.3% caregive for 5+ years [1]	ADLs, complex medical/nursing tasks (injections, wound care, medications).[1]
Kazakhstan	4.1 hours daily for women vs. 1.8 hours for men [11]	95.0% receive no formal medical/social support [3]	Housekeeping, domestic services, and uncompensated elder care.[11]
Uzbekistan	46.9 hours weekly for women vs. 16.5 hours for men [9]	58.5 hours weekly for young women (18–29) [9]	Multigenerational care, domestic duties, and child care.[8]
Angola	High, unquantified informal hours	Primarily uncompensated family labor	In-home assistance, personal care, and support for

			age-related chronic illnesses.[4]

Time Commits in Canada and the United States

In Canada, approximately 1 in 3 caregivers spend between 10 to 20 hours per week providing direct family care. This unpaid labor is compounded by the administrative demands of navigating the healthcare system: Canadian studies show that coordinating care for aging parents requires an additional 6 to 10 hours per week.
In the United States, caregivers dedicate an average of 27 hours per week to caregiving duties.[10] For nearly 1 in 4 caregivers (24%), this responsibility grows into a full-time job of 40 or more hours per week, with one-third of these high-intensity caregivers having provided care for five years or more.[1]
Furthermore, US caregivers are increasingly performing complex medical and nursing tasks: over half manage clinical responsibilities like injections, wound care, and medication administration, yet only 20% have received formal medical training.[1]

Deepening Gender Disparities in Central Asia

In Central Asia, time-use data reveals a highly unequal gender division of care labor.[5] In Kazakhstan, a woman's average day is characterized by a "133/246" ratio: 133 minutes spent on paid work and 246 minutes (4.1 hours) spent on unpaid care and domestic work.[11] Conversely, a man's day is characterized by a "203/110" ratio: 203 minutes on paid work and only 110 minutes (1.8 hours) on unpaid care.[11] While Kazakh women spend over 4 hours daily on housekeeping and family care, men devote less than 2 hours to these activities.[12]
This disparity is even more stark in Uzbekistan, where women spend an average of 46.92 hours per week on unpaid care, compared to 16.48 hours for men.[9] For young women in the 18–29 age bracket, this commitment rises to 58.45 hours per week, compared to just 18.23 hours for young men.[9] This high caregiving burden on young women acts as a major barrier to their higher education and formal career opportunities, perpetuating long-term gender inequalities.[8]

The Psychosocial and Health Cost: Burnout, Distress, and Isolation

The mental and physical toll of long-term caregiving is severe, resulting in significant health declines for caregivers across different regions.[1]

Mental and Physical Health Impacts of Caregiving

Geography	High Emotional Stress & Burnout	Reported Self-Rated Health Decline	Social Isolation & Alienation

Canada	33.0% experience clinical burnout; 40.0% experience high distress	70.0% report an overall decline in personal wellbeing	High, particularly among working caregivers and the sandwich generation.
United States	66.0% moderate-to-high emotional stress [6]; 43.0% high stress [16]	20.0% report fair or poor health [1]; 24.0% struggle with own health [1]	24.0% feel socially isolated [1]; worse for LGBTQ+ and women.[1]
Kazakhstan	High, unquantified due to lack of burden assessments [3]	Elevated physical strain due to lack of primary care integrated support [3]	High; social networks are strained by the physical demands of informal care.[3]
Angola	33.0% experience high overload (comparative data) [14]	Direct links to physical exhaustion, memory issues, and sleep disruption [13]	High; driven by rapid urbanization and the loss of local family support.[4]

Psychosocial Pressures in Canada and the United States

In Canada, the emotional toll of caregiving is clear: 33% of family caregivers experience burnout, 40% report feeling distress, and 70% report a decline in their overall wellbeing.
In the United States, two-thirds of family caregivers face moderate to high emotional stress.[6]
On average, American caregivers experience four days per month where poor mental or physical health prevents them from conducting their usual activities.[17]
This is supported by the CDC Healthy Days measure, which reveals that caregivers spend an average of 5.4 days per month in poor physical health and 7.0 days in poor mental health.[17]
Furthermore, 24% of US caregivers report feeling socially isolated, a number that is growing and is particularly high among women, LGBTQ+ caregivers, and those who felt they had no choice but to assume caregiving duties.[1]

Untracked Burden in Central Asia

In Central Asia, the physical and mental health of caregivers is worsened by a lack of state support and formal recognition.[3] In Kazakhstan, strategic healthcare documents lack provisions for identifying and assessing caregiver burden, meaning that over 95% of informal caregivers do not receive medical or social support tailored to their needs.[3]
In Uzbekistan, the state's uniform approach to social protection fails to address the unique physical and mental health needs of caregivers, leaving many vulnerable to chronic health

conditions and long-term financial insecurity.[8]

Physical Overload in Angola

In Angola, informal caregivers experience high levels of physical and emotional overload ("sobrecarga").[13] A qualitative study in the Bengo province highlighted that the physical demands of caregiving often lead to chronic exhaustion, sleep disturbances, and memory issues, which in turn affect the caregiver's overall quality of life.[13]

These findings are consistent with comparative Portuguese-language studies, which show that over half of evaluated caregivers experience significant overload, with 34.1% reporting intense overload.[19] Despite this high burden, only 4.3% of these caregivers are able to access respite care ("descanso do cuidador"), illustrating a severe gap in local support systems.[19]

Workforce Participation and Corporate Productivity Losses

The conflict between caregiving responsibilities and professional employment is a major source of economic friction, causing significant career disruptions and substantial productivity losses for businesses.[1]

Workforce Adjustments in Canada

In Canada, 60% of family caregivers have been forced to leave the workforce entirely or make major adjustments to their employment to accommodate their caregiving responsibilities. For those who remain employed, the constant struggle to balance work and care has a severe impact on their mental health: working caregivers in Canada are two times (x2) more likely to miss work for mental health reasons compared to their non-caregiving colleagues.

The Career Penalty in the United States

In the United States, where approximately 60% of family caregivers are employed, the AARP/NAC 2025 study reveals that 61% of working caregivers experience significant work disruptions, such as arriving late, leaving early, or taking unexpected time off.[1]
Specific workforce adjustments in the US illustrate the progressive erosion of caregiver career paths [21]:

- **Workday Adjustments:** 49% of employed caregivers regularly arrive late, leave early, or take unexpected time off to manage care crises.[21]
- **Hours Reduction:** 10% to 14% of caregivers are forced to reduce their work hours or accept demotions.[20]
- **Workforce Exit:** 6% to 9% of employed caregivers leave the workforce entirely, while another 3% to 4% opt for early retirement.[20]

This career disruption results in significant financial losses. American caregivers aged 50 and older who leave the workforce early lose an estimated $3 trillion in cumulative wages, pensions, retirement savings, and Social Security benefits.[21] This financial penalty is unequal, with female caregivers losing an average of $324,044 over their lifetimes, compared to $283,716 for male

caregivers.[21]

Complete Workforce Exclusion in Uzbekistan

In Uzbekistan, the lack of accessible, affordable childcare and eldercare services acts as a structural barrier that keeps primary caregivers out of the formal economy.[5]
Among households where a family member is actively caring for a child under the age of three, 40.4% have no income whatsoever, compared to only 13.77% among households without intensive caregiving duties.[9] This highlights how the absence of a formal care infrastructure forces primary caregivers—mostly women—into complete workforce exclusion.[8]

Corporate and Employer Impacts: The Hidden Loss of Presenteeism

The financial impact of caregiving on businesses is substantial, driven primarily by "presenteeism"—where employees are physically present at work but distracted by coordinating care—rather than outright absenteeism.[22]

Detailed Financial and Operational Impact of Caregiving on Employers

Productivity Metric	Canada (Specific Case Study)	United States (Macro Market Average)
Weekly Coordination Time Lost	8.0 hours per week lost to care coordination	24.0 to 27.0 hours per week (total caregiving time) [10]
Labor Valuation / Cost Basis	$75.00 hourly income value	$22.00 to $30.00 hourly replacement value [24]
Annual Disruption Cost Per Employee	$31,200 direct disruption cost	$35,000 total caregiver cost (including absenteeism and turnover) [22]
Aggregate Business Loss	Highly significant; major driver of labor attrition	$522 billion annually in total employer losses [22]
Key Driver of Hidden Cost	On-the-job care coordination (6–10 hours/week)	Presenteeism (accounts for 71% of total productivity loss) [22]
Excess Healthcare Costs	Absorbed via public health	8% premium for caregiving employees ($13.4

to Employers	system	billion/year) [21]

The Canadian Corporate Burden

In Canada, coordinating care for aging parents requires an average of 6 to 10 hours per week. Because these tasks—such as communicating with doctors, arranging medical transport, and filling out social assistance forms—must occur during regular business hours, they directly drain employer productivity.
Model estimations of this impact demonstrate that a caregiving employee loses an average of 8 hours of work time per week to direct care coordination. Valued at a professional income rate of $75 per hour, this lost coordination time represents a weekly productivity drain of $600 per employee. Over a standard 52-week year, this results in an annual disruption and lost productivity cost of $31,200 per caregiving worker.
We can express this Canadian annual disruption cost per employee using the following equation:

$$\text{Annual Disruption Cost} = T_{\text{lost}} \times V_{\text{income}} \times W_{\text{annual}}$$

$$\text{Annual Disruption Cost} = \textbf{8 hours/week} \times \textbf{\$75/hour} \times \textbf{52 weeks} = \textbf{\$31,200 annually per employee}$$

The American Corporate Burden

These calculations align with employer impact metrics in the United States, where businesses lose an estimated $522 billion annually due to caregiving-related productivity losses.[22]
When broken down, a single caregiving employee costs a US company approximately $35,000 annually in lost productivity, absenteeism, and turnover costs.[22] Presenteeism, rather than total absence, accounts for 71% of this total productivity loss.[22]
Furthermore, US employers face an 8% increase in healthcare costs for employees with caregiving responsibilities, costing businesses an extra $13.4 billion annually due to the physical and mental toll of chronic stress on caregivers.[21]
This productivity gap is widened by a major disconnect between employees and corporate leadership. Research from Harvard Business School demonstrates that while 80% of employees report that caregiving responsibilities directly affect their productivity, only 25% of employers recognize caregiving as a driver of organizational performance.[27]
However, companies that address this disconnect by implementing care coordination benefits—such as a "care concierge" service to handle scheduling, referrals, and administrative tasks—see significant returns.[25] These services can reduce caregiver absenteeism by up to 50% and generate a return on investment (ROI) of up to 72% within the first year, primarily through improved retention and recovered work hours.[22]
To model the corporate turnover risk driven by unmanaged caregiving, we can use the

following formula:

$$\text{Annual Turnover Cost} = (N_{\text{workforce}} \times P_{\text{caregiver}}) \times S_{\text{average}} \times R_{\text{turnover}}$$

Where:

- $N_{\text{workforce}}$ is the total workforce size of the organization.
- $P_{\text{caregiver}}$ is the proportion of the workforce acting as caregivers (averaging 15% or 0.15).[22]
- S_{average} is the average employee salary, representing the replacement cost of a mid-career worker.
- R_{turnover} is the estimated caregiver turnover rate (averaging 20% or 0.20).[22]

Applying this to a mid-sized company of 500 employees with an average salary of $65,000:

$$\text{Annual Turnover Cost} = (500 \times 0.15) \times \$65,000 \times 0.20 = \$975,000 \text{ annually}$$

This highlights how caregiving-induced turnover alone can cost a mid-sized organization nearly $1 million per year, demonstrating that caregiving support programs are a critical corporate asset protection strategy rather than just a discretionary benefit.[22]

State Policy Responses and Structural Support Gaps

The policy response to the growing care crisis varies significantly across the analyzed regions, reflecting differing views on whether care is a public responsibility or a private family obligation.[1]

Canada and the United States: Moving Toward Structured Benefits

In the United States and Canada, policies are slowly shifting toward providing financial and structural support for caregivers.[1] The 2025 AARP data shows that 50% of working caregivers in the US now have access to paid family leave, a 56% increase since 2015.[6] Furthermore, there is overwhelming caregiver support for legislative interventions, with 69% favoring tax credits, 55% supporting paid family leave, and 68% advocating for programs that pay family caregivers.[1] However, access to these benefits remains highly unequal, with salaried, high-income workers far more likely to receive caregiver support than hourly wage employees.[1]

Central Asia: Legal Mandates and Care Deficits

In Central Asia, state policy often relies on the legal enforcement of filial obligation.[3] In Kazakhstan, the legal definition of an informal caregiver is highly restricted.[3] Because state support is limited to individuals caring for those with first-degree disabilities, the vast majority of those caring for aging parents are excluded from financial aid, social security credits, or

respite care.[3] This leaves an estimated 95% of Kazakh caregivers operating entirely outside the formal social safety net.[3]

Uzbekistan has taken initial steps to digitize its social safety net, using a registry under Presidential Decree No. PP-410 to manage social and medical assistance for vulnerable groups, including 471,100 individuals receiving disability payments in 2024.[8] However, the actual monthly cash transfers remain low relative to the cost of living:

- **Disability Group I Benefit:** 1,027,000 UZS/month (~$80 USD) [8]
- **Disability Group II Benefit:** 920,000 UZS/month (~$72 USD) [8]

These social assistance payments are insufficient to cover basic living costs or purchase formal care services. This issue is compounded by the high cost of private services in Uzbekistan; full-day private pre-school care averages 3,836,835 UZS per month, which is higher than prices in Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan, making private care inaccessible for most low-income families.[8]

Angola: Developing Primary Health and Care Frameworks

Angola's policy landscape for long-term care is in its early stages. The country's health and social welfare systems are focused on expanding primary healthcare access and reducing out-of-pocket costs for vulnerable populations.[28]

In partnership with the World Health Organization (WHO), the Angolan Ministry of Health has prioritized "Aging with Dignity" initiatives to strengthen local health systems and build financial risk protections.[28] However, formal social services, specialized dementia care, and respite care systems remain scarce, leaving families to bear the physical and financial burdens of care alone in an increasingly urbanized environment.[4]

Strategic Conclusions and Policy Implications

The comparative data across Canada, the United States, Central Asia, and Angola demonstrates that the informal care economy is a critical foundation supporting both public health systems and broader economic productivity.[1] Yet, this foundation is under severe strain.[1] Unmanaged caregiver burden acts as a drag on macroeconomic growth by forcing skilled workers out of the labor force, driving up employer healthcare costs, and causing widespread personal distress.[1]

To address this deepening crisis, public and corporate policymakers should consider several key structural changes:

- **Incorporate Caregiving into Corporate Risk Modeling:** Employers should move away from treating caregiving as a personal issue and instead view it as a direct business risk.[22] Providing targeted employee benefits, such as care concierge services, flexible working hours, and paid family leave, can help reduce absenteeism, lower turnover rates, and deliver a clear return on investment.[22]
- **Expand Legal Definitions and Financial Protections:** Governments, particularly in Central Asia, need to update restrictive legal definitions of "caregiver" to recognize and support those caring for aging parents.[3] This should include introducing caregiver tax credits, providing social security credits for unpaid care work, and offering direct financial

stipends.[1]

- **Invest in Regional Care Infrastructures:** To address gender inequality in the workforce, developing economies like Uzbekistan must prioritize investing in affordable, high-quality public childcare and eldercare services.[5] This infrastructure is essential to free up women's time, enabling them to participate in education and formal employment.[8]
- **Develop Community-Based and Digital Care Models:** In rapidly urbanizing environments like Angola and parts of Central Asia, policymakers should focus on building community-based care models and leveraging tele-care and mobile health platforms.[28] These technologies can help bridge the gap in formal healthcare access, provide essential caregiver training, and offer support to families navigating complex care demands without traditional local networks.[4]

Works cited

1. New Report Reveals Crisis Point for America's 63 million Family ..., accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.aarp.org/press/releases/2025-07-24-new-report-reveals-crisis-point-for-americas-63-million-family-caregivers.html
2. why should we care about care? the role of informal childcare and eldercare in aging societies - Documents & Reports, accessed May 21, 2026, https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/687741468257352228/pdf/ACS13024-REVISED-WP-PUBLIC-Box393205B.pdf
3. Measures to support informal care for the older adults in Kazakhstan ..., accessed May 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10475596/
4. Socio-Demographic Variables and Successful Aging of the Angolan Elderly - PMC, accessed May 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4819103/
5. CARING FOR THE FUTURE | A Multi-country Analysis of Care Systems in Europe and Central Asia | UNDP, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2026-03/care_report-multi-country.pdf
6. Caregiving in the US 2025: Report Highlights & Key Messages, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.caregiving.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/CGUS-2025-Toolkit-Highligts-and-Key-Messages_July-2025.pdf
7. Valuing the Invaluable 2023 Update Strengthening Supports for Family Caregivers, accessed May 21, 2026, https://archrespite.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/valuing-the-invaluable-2023-update.doi_.10.26419-2Fppi.00082.006.pdf
8. Care Report - Uzbekistan - United Nations Development Programme, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2026-01/eng_care_report-uzbekistan.pdf
9. Part 2 - United Nations Development Programme, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2024-06/en_Uzbekistan%20car

e%20sector%20II%20report.pdf
10. Caregiving Statistics US 2025: What the Caregiving in the U.S. 2025, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.zencaregiving.org/post/caregiving-statistics-us-2025-what-the-caregiving-in-the-u-s-2025-report-reveals-about-today-s-fam
11. Unpaid work in the global perspective and in Kazakhstan, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.undp.org/kazakhstan/stories/unpaid-work-global-perspective-and-kazakhstan
12. The experience of Kazakhstan in conducting time use surveys By Ainur Dossanova Agency of Statistics of the Republic of Kazakhsta, accessed May 21, 2026, https://unstats.un.org/unsd/gender/mexico_nov2014/Session%204%20Kazakhstan%20v3.pdf
13. Necessidade e sobrecarga dos cuidadores informais no cuidado à pessoa dependente - Repositório IC-Online, accessed May 21, 2026, https://iconline.ipleiria.pt/bitstreams/c2e0f6ad-808d-4b58-8c6a-6edaee950557/download
14. Sobrecarga e qualidade de vida de cuidadores informais de crianças com paralisia cerebral - Dialnet, accessed May 21, 2026, https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/8081522.pdf
15. Inês Costa Durão - Estudo Geral, accessed May 21, 2026, https://estudogeral.uc.pt/retrieve/276669/In%C3%AAs%20Dur%C3%A3o.pdf
16. Caregiving in the U.S. 2025: Connecticut - C G A, accessed May 21, 2026, https://cga.ct.gov/2026/agedata/TMY/2026SB-00285-R000224-Shurtleff,%20Natalie,%20Assoc%20State%20Director%20Advocacy-AARP%20Connecticut-Supports-TMY.PDF
17. Caregiving in the US 2025 - Research Report, accessed May 21, 2026, https://caregivingkinetics.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/AARP-NAC-caregiving-in-us-2025.doi_.10.26419-2fppi.00373.001.pdf
18. Os serviços de apoio domiciliário e a promoção da saúde e bem-estar das pessoas idosas: o caso da Santa Casa da Misericórdia da Amadora | RIAGE - Revista Ibero-Americana de Gerontologia, accessed May 21, 2026, https://riagejournal.com/index.php/riage/article/view/341/419
19. Mais de 18 mil cuidadores informais reconhecidos, maioria em sobrecarga - Segurança Social, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.saudemais.tv/noticia/60892-mais-de-18-mil-cuidadores-informais-reconhecidos-maioria-em-sobrecarga-seguranca-social
20. The MetLife Caregiving Cost Study: Productivity Losses to U.S. Business, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.caregiving.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Caregiver-Cost-Study.pdf
21. Caregiver Statistics: Work and Caregiving, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.caregiver.org/resource/caregiver-statistics-work-and-caregiving/
22. The $35000 Productivity Leak: What Caregiving Costs Your Employer, accessed May 21, 2026,

https://proactivecaregiver.com/employee-caregiving-productivity-cost/
23. The Caring Company - Harvard Business School, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.hbs.edu/managing-the-future-of-work/Documents/The_Caring_Company.pdf
24. What's the Real Cost of In-Home Care (With Local Greensboro Pricing Guide), accessed May 21, 2026, https://optionscorp.com/greensboro-nc/cost-in-home-care-greensboro-guide/
25. How Much Does It Cost to Hire a Caregiver for Elderly Care? - Gracious Hearts Inc, accessed May 21, 2026, https://graciousheartsinc.com/blog/cost-to-hire-a-caregiver/
26. The MetLife Study of - WorkingCaregivers and Employer Health Care Costs - KFF, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.kff.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2010/09/mmi-working-caregivers-employers-health-care-costs.pdf
27. Healthy Outcomes: How employers' support for employees with caregiving responsibilities can benefit the organization - Project on Workforce, accessed May 21, 2026, https://pw.hks.harvard.edu/post/healthy-outcomes-how-employers-support-for-employees-with-caregiving-responsibilities-can-benefit
28. WHO Angola Annual Report 2024.pdf - WHO | Regional Office for Africa, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.afro.who.int/sites/default/files/2025-03/WHO%20Angola%20Annual%20Report%202024.pdf
29. PROPOSTA DE CRIAÇÃO DE UM SERVIÇO DE APOIO AO DOMICÍLIO PARA IDOSOS COM DEMENCIA PARA GARANTIR A CONTINUIDADE DOS CUIDADOS N - SIGIISP, accessed May 21, 2026, https://sigiisp.ispcaala.com/_repositorio/Arqui_ELIAS%20JO%C3%83O%20SICATO%20SAHENO%20_6fc758015cf924792c71e3e9af2e4721.pdf
30. The Transformative Power of Care in an Ageing Society: Digitalisation in Care Systems and Services for Older Persons | United Nations Development Programme, accessed May 21, 2026, https://www.undp.org/turkiye/publications/transformative-power-care-ageing-society-digitalisation-care-systems-and-services-older-persons