**Supplementary Materials**

**Supplementary Text 1.**  Model specification

Logit [P (Yi = 1 | X = X1, X2)] = β0 + β1 \* X1 + β2 \* X2

Logit [P (Yi = 1 | infcare, profcare)] = β0 + β1 \* infcare + β2 \* profcare

Parameter notes: Where Yi: Stated health status, Negative impact on health, Depression, Anxiety, Feeling alone, Making sacrifices, Feeling the need to be replaced. X1: duration of informal care provided and X2: professional care.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dependent variables | Y1: Stated health status  Ref. 1=Very good or good | Y2: Negative impact on health  Ref. 1=Yes | Y3: Depression  Ref. 1=Yes | | Y4: Anxiety  Ref. 1=Yes | Y5: Feeling alone  Ref. 1=Yes | Y6: Making sacrifices  Ref. 1=Yes | Y7: Feeling the need to be replaced  Ref. 1=Yes |
| Effect size | OR (95% CI) | OR (95% CI) | | OR (95% CI) | OR (95% CI) | OR (95% CI) | OR (95% CI) | OR (95% CI) |
| Independent variables  *Duration of informal care provided* |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model 1a  Model 2b | 0.74 (0.38-1.42)  0.97 (0.47-1.99) | 2.16 (0.98-4.77)\*  1.54 (0.66-3.60) | | 1.23 (0.48-3.14)  0.65 (0.22-1.90) | 2.25 (1.14-4.46)\*\*  1.73 (0.83-3.60) | 2.61 (1.30-5.24)\*\*\*  2.15 (1.02-4.5)\* | 2.23 (1.03-4.51)\*\*  1.87 (0.89-3.94)\* | 2.09 (0.91-4.83)\*  2.89 (1.15-7.30)\* |
| *Professional care*  No  Yes  Model 1  Model 2  Hosmer –Lemeshow test ‘Model 2’  AUCd ‘Model 2’ | Reference (1.00)  1.25 (0.65-2.40)  1.37 (0.62-3.05)  §  0.72 | Reference (1.00)  0.67 (0.31-1.44)  0.49 (0.20-1.22)  §  0.70 | | Reference (1.00)  0.71 (0.28-1.79)  0.38 (0.12-1.23)  §  0.73 | Reference (1.00)  0.68 (0.35-1.34)  0.54 (0.24-1.22)  §  0.71 | Reference (1.00)  0.54 (0.27-1.07)\*  0.51 (0.23-1.14)\*  §  0.72 | Reference (1.00)  0.45 (0.22-0.90)\*  0.40 (0.17-0.88)\*  §  0.71 | Reference (1.00)  0.19 (0.08-0.45)\*\*\*  0.19 (0.07-0.51)\*\*\*  §  0.76 |

**Supplementary Table 1.** Association of caregiving activity with the health indicators stated by caregivers according a logistic regression.

a Model 1 : unadjusted. b Model 2 : adjusted for sex, age, and cohabitation. dAUC: area under the ROC curve with adjusted model (Model 2).

OR: Odds Ratio; CI: Confidence Interval

\*\*\* p < 0.01; \*\* p < 0.05 and \* p < 0.1

§ p>0.05.

**Supplementary Table 2.** Estimation of the average value of informal care provided per main caregiver according to the time of the occurrence of the MI event (in euros)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Valuation method | MI onset <1 year (±SD) | MI onset ≥1 year (±SD) | Totald (±SD) | Mean cost of 1 hour (median) [min-max] |
| *Contingent valuation methodabc (n=79)* | n=23 | n=56 |  |  |
| Unrestricted  Restricted | 12,089 (±15,362) (1)  11,545 (±12,913) | 8,689 (±15,555) (3)  8,000 (±13,888) | 9,679 (±18,827) (5)  9,033 (±16,933) | 10.9 (10.0) [0.0-30.0]  10.8 (10.0) [0.0-30.0] |
| *Opportunity cost method (n=147)*  Unrestricted  Restricted  *Proxy good method (n=147)*  Unrestricted  Restricted  T-test (*p* value) | n=52  11,925 (±13,464)  10,904 (±10,789)  n=52  11,727 (±13,593) (2)  10,707 (±10,930)  (1)(2) : >0.05 | n=95  10,939 (±14,771) (4)  9,627 (±11,345)  n=95  10,513 (±14,933)  9,185 (±11,424)  (3)(4) : >0.05 | 11,288 (±14,284) (6)  10,079 (±11,131)  10,943 (±14,438)  9,723 (±11,238)  (5)(6) : >0.05 | 10.6 (9.9) [9.4-16.3]  10.7 (9.9) [9.5-16.3]  8.6 (8.6) [8.6-8.6]  8.6 (8.6) [8.6-8.6] |

a Sixty individuals were not able to provide a WTP value.

b Eight individuals refused to provide a WTP value

c Twenty caregivers indicated a WTP equal to 0.

d Total means the average cost of informal care per main caregiver per year.

All statistics were performed with Student test.

**Supplementary Table 3.** Estimation of the average value of informal care provided per main caregivers according to cohabitation (in euros)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Valuation method | Total (±SD) | Mean cost of 1 hour (median) [min-max] | | *p* value | |
| *Contingent valuation method(n=79)* |  | |  | |  |
| Cohabitation  Non-cohabitation | 11,391 (±3,650)  7,833 (±1,356) | | 11.5 (10.0) [0.0-30.0]  10.1 (10.0) [0.0-30.0] | | <0.05 |
| *Opportunity cost method (n=147)*  Cohabitation  Non-cohabitation  *Proxy good method (n=147)*  Cohabitation  Non-cohabitation | 13,638 (±7,212)  7,834 (±3,606)  13,797 (±7,212)  7,029 (±3,521) | | 10.2 (9.9) [9.4-16.3]  11.0 (9.9) [9.5-16.3]  8.6 (8.6) [8.6-8.6]  8.6 (8.6) [8.6-8.6] | | <0.05  <0.05 |

All statistics were performed with Student test.