# Effectiveness of community non-pharmacological interventions for mild cognitive impairment and dementia: a systematic review of economic evaluations and a review of reviews

Gillian Eaglestone<sup>1</sup>, Evdoxia Gkaintatzi<sup>1</sup>, Charlotte Stoner<sup>1</sup>, Rosana Pacella<sup>1</sup>, Paul McCrone<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute for Lifecourse Development, University of Greenwich

Declaration of interests: No authors have interests to declare

#### Abstract

#### Background

Dementia prevalence is increasing with no cure at present. Drug therapies have limited efficacy and potential side effects. People with dementia are often offered non-pharmacological interventions to improve quality of life and relieve symptoms. Identifying which interventions are cost-effective is important due to finite resources in healthcare services.

#### Aims

To review published economic evaluations of community non-pharmacological interventions for people with mild cognitive impairment or dementia and assess usefulness for decision making in health services.

#### Methods

Systematic review (PROSPERO CRD42021252999) included economic evaluations of non-pharmacological interventions for dementia or mild cognitive impairment with a narrative approach to data synthesis. Exclusions: interventions for dementia prevention/early detection or end of life care. Databases searched: Academic search premier, MEDLINE, Web of Science, EMBASE, Google Scholar, CINAHL, PsycInfo, Psychology and behavioural sciences collection, PsycArticles, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Business Source Premier and Regional Business News; timeframe 01 January 2011 to 30 June 2021 (13 September 2021 for Embase). Study quality assessed using CHEERS.

#### Results

Included thirty-two studies and five reviews, evaluating community dementia interventions worldwide across several distinct forms of care: physical activity, cognition, training, multi-disciplinary interventions and other (telecare/assistive technology, specialist dementia care, group living, home care versus care home). No single intervention was shown to be cost-effective across all economic evaluations.

#### Conclusion

More economic evidence on the cost-effectiveness of specific dementia care interventions is needed, with consistency around measurement of costs and outcomes data. Better information and higher-quality studies could improve decision makers' confidence to promote future cost-effective dementia interventions.

#### Introduction

The worldwide economic burden of dementia care is high at US\$815 billion (1). The total annual cost of dementia in the UK is estimated at £24.2 billion (2). With the increase in numbers of patients being diagnosed with dementia and the high costs of dementia care, economic evaluations are needed to ensure that non-pharmacological therapies which are offered to patients are cost-effective. However, economic evidence of non-pharmacological dementia interventions remains limited (3).

By 2050 the number of people with dementia is projected to rise to 152 million due to population growth and an increasingly ageing population (4). There is currently no cure for dementia; drug therapies developed to date have limited efficacy and are primarily indicated for use in Alzheimer's Disease, which may account for 60-70% of cases (5). Probability of cost-effectiveness of drug therapies including rivastigmine and galantamine is low (6) with potential for serious side-effects including mortality (7). Therefore non-pharmacological therapies may be considered as complements to pharmacological treatments.

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence guideline for dementia care (8) recommends four non-pharmacological interventions: group cognitive stimulation therapy, group reminiscence therapy and cognitive rehabilitation or occupational therapy. The main aim of these types of dementia interventions is to reduce symptoms including cognitive decline, promote independence and wellbeing and improve quality of life.

Existing systematic reviews of economic evidence commonly focus on a particular intervention (9,10) or dementia symptom (11,12). Previous reviews have also included interventions to improve the quality of life of carers as well as people with dementia (PwD) (3,13). The aim of this review was to provide a comprehensive summary of the existing economic evidence on non-pharmacological interventions, evaluating a wide range of dementia symptoms and interventions which measured the impact on the PwD and not solely their carer.

#### Methods

The protocol for this systematic review was registered on PROSPERO (CRD42021252999). PRISMA guidelines were followed throughout (14).

#### Eligibility Criteria

Inclusion criteria (detailed in Table 1) stated that studies should be economic evaluations, observational studies or simulation studies; the population under observation was people with dementia or mild cognitive impairment. People with mild cognitive impairment were included as a high percentage go on to later develop dementia (15). To be eligible interventions needed to aim to delay progression of the disease or improve quality of life. Studies could have evaluated dementia interventions throughout the dementia pathway, ranging in severity from recent diagnosis to advanced dementia, but prevention/early detection of dementia studies

or end of life care studies were excluded. Both narrative and systematic reviews of economic studies were also eligible for inclusion.

#### Search Strategy

The databases searched were Academic search premier, Google Scholar, Web of Science, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, MEDLINE, CINAHL, PsycINFO, Psychology and behavioural sciences collection, PsycARTICLES, Business Source Premier and Regional Business News. Studies published between 01<sup>st</sup> January 2011 and 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021 (13<sup>th</sup> September 2021 for EMBASE) were included to search only most recent articles. Articles published in any languages were eligible.

Search terms used within the databases were the following disease specific terms: "dementia", "Alzheimer's" and "mild cognitive impairment" combined with the economic terms: "cost\*" or "econ\*" with additional search terms to identify interventions: "intervention" or "therapy". The reference lists of primary studies and review articles which met the inclusion criteria were manually searched for other relevant studies for inclusion.

#### Study Selection

Titles and abstracts were screened according to inclusion/exclusion criteria by author GE and results were verified by EG. Any disputes were resolved by PM. Full texts of selected articles were retrieved and reviewed by GE and EG.

#### Data Extraction

Extracted data included intervention description, participant numbers, follow-up period, study design, economic evaluation type, main economic outcome measure, primary outcome (PwD only) and perspective (see Table 2). Data extraction was performed by GE, with EG independently undertaking data extraction for 40% of the included articles. Any disagreement was resolved by PM.

Separate data extraction was undertaken for the review of reviews by GE (see Table 3). Extracted data included: interventions reviewed, number of studies included in the review and databases used.

#### Data Synthesis

A narrative approach to data synthesis was undertaken to summarise and allow comparison of the methods and results of the included studies whilst demonstrating heterogeneity. A narrative reporting approach was used as meta-analysis could not be carried out due to the context specific nature of the economic evaluations and the numerous outcomes used in these studies.

Interventions were classified according to the following categories representing distinct forms of care: physical activity, cognitive interventions, training interventions,

multi-disciplinary interventions, other interventions (including telecare/assistive technology, specialist dementia care, group living, home care versus care home).

#### Quality Appraisal

Quality appraisal was undertaken using the Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards statement (CHEERS) (16). CHEERS is designed to assess reporting quality rather than the quality of the study. The statements relate to the following aspects: title, abstract, introduction, methods, results, discussion and disclosure. Statements which related only to modelling studies were excluded for non-modelling studies and resulting scores adjusted accordingly. Each study was assigned a score, based on the number of statements met on the CHEERS checklist (0 =unmet, 0.5 =partially met, and 1 =met), the total was then translated into a percentage of items met. Quality appraisal was carried out by GE, EG undertook an independent appraisal of 30% of the articles and any disagreement was resolved by PM.

For the review of reviews, quality was assessed by GE using A Measurement Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews (AMSTAR 2) (17) with EG independently undertaking assessment for 60% of the included articles (see Table 4). The AMSTAR 2 assessment tool is intended to identify areas of potential bias by assessing each area of the study, with certain areas being defined as critical. An overall rating of confidence in quality was calculated based on the total number of unmet statements on the AMSTAR 2 checklist according to the following criteria:

- *High confidence* none or 1 non-critical weaknesses,
- Moderate confidence more than 1 non-critical weakness but no critical flaws,
- Low confidence 1 critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses,
- *Critically low confidence* more than 1 critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses.

#### Usefulness of Economic Evaluations to Decision Making

A score of usefulness of the economic evaluations to decision making was calculated for each included study. It was based on assessment of reporting quality, study design, time horizon (above or below 12 months) and whether an ICER was reported. Studies were then categorised as having a 'strong', 'moderate' or 'limited' level of usefulness (see Table 5).

#### Results

The systematic literature review identified 664 publications, duplicates were manually removed, and 405 articles were screened. Thirty-seven papers were included in the final review. The articles selected for inclusion comprised 32 single study papers and five reviews. The search strategy has been reported using the Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis (PRISMA) (14) flow diagram (Figure 1).

Study Characteristics

The specific conditions being studied included: people with dementia (n=26), Alzheimer's Disease (n=2), MCI (n=1), and mixed populations which included MCI, delirium and dementia (n=3). Types of interventions reviewed were: exercise (n=5), cognitive (n=9), multi-disciplinary (n=8), training (n=8) and other: telehealth/assistive technology (n=1), specialist dementia care unit (n=1). Studies recruited participants living in a variety of settings: nine were community based, nine were nursing home based, three were for people living either in a nursing home or the community and one was unspecified. Studies used varying criteria to define dementia/MCI in their inclusion criteria, ranging from a having symptoms of dementia (n=1) to a formal diagnosis of dementia (n=8). A number of studies defined specific Clinical Dementia Scores (n=3) and/or Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV) assessment criteria in their inclusion criteria (n=6).

The majority of studies were randomised controlled trials (n=26), followed by nonrandomised studies (n=5) and one modelling study. Study sample size varied greatly, ranging from 50 to 3269. International reach of the studies was the UK (n=13) (7,18–29), Germany (n=4) (30–33), Finland (n=3) (34–36) and Netherlands (n=3) (37–39), United States (n=2) (40,41)and Denmark (n=2) (42,43), Australia (n=1) (44), Japan (n=1) (45), Canada (n=1) (46), Singapore (n=1 (47) and there was a multi-national study involving Italy, Poland and the UK (48).

A range of interventions were identified, which focused on improving the behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia (BPSD), as well as interventions to prevent decline in cognitive function and mobility. In total 27 different primary outcome measures were used across the 33 studies. Outcomes included generic, dementia specific and utility-based quality of life scales.

Over half of the studies employed a cost utility analysis (n=18), followed by costeffectiveness analysis (n=11) and cost benefit analysis (n=3), QALY was the most frequently used measure of benefit (n=18). Costs and outcomes are reported in Table 6.

#### Quality Appraisal of Studies

Individual studies met between 62% and 98% of CHEERS quality assessment criteria items (mean 78%). Nineteen studies met over 80% of total assessed items. The studies that evaluated exercise were rated highest for quality with four of the five studies meeting above 80% of items. Evaluations of training interventions scored the lowest overall for number of items met. Although the "other" category met the highest number of items overall at 90% it should be noted that this category evaluated two completely different interventions.

#### Usefulness of Economic Evaluations to Decision Making

Scores for level of usefulness were as follows: studies rated as having strong usefulness (n=9), moderate (n=13) and limited (n=10). The results showed that a high CHEERS quality assessment score did not necessarily translate to a high usefulness score for aiding decision making (see Table 7).

#### Cognitive Interventions

Nine studies explored interventions focused on cognition (Table 2). The majority used data from randomised controlled trials except one study with matched controls (45). All studies used treatment as usual (TAU) as the comparison group. Five studies used QALYs as the main measure of benefit (18,22,23,25,42) the remainder used patient health related quality of life (34), agitation (44), anxiety (24) and Criterion Time for Certification of Needed Long-Term Care (45). Study populations mainly comprised community dwelling PwD; studies also recruited nursing home residents (44,45) and a combination of community and nursing home residents (18).

The cognitive interventions in this review have been further categorised according to type: cognitive stimulation therapy, multi-component cognitive interventions and other cognitive therapies. Cognitive stimulation therapies were evaluated in three studies which all used a CUA approach and calculated QALYs (18,22,23). The studies comprised a CST programme for participants who had not received CST previously (23) and studies evaluating follow-up programmes of maintenance stimulation therapy (MST) (18,22). Follow-up periods ranged between six (18,22) and 25 months (23) (mean 12, SD 10.97). The first MST study reported an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of £26,835 per QALY, using proxy EQ5D assessments completed by caregivers (22). In this study cost-effectiveness acceptability curves (CEAC) demonstrated a 40% probability that MST would be seen as cost-effective at the £20,000 WTP threshold and 54% probability at £30,000. In the second MST study TAU dominated MST in terms of QALYs for a sub-group of patients living alone, with a probability of 55% cost-effectiveness at £20,000 WTP (18). Although this study rated highest in the review for quality assessed by CHEERS, it used a small secondary dataset which may not have been representative of the general population and was not powered to detect sub-group changes, therefore results should be interpreted with caution. The CST intervention did not improve cognition or quality of life for PwD, the TAU option performed better in terms of Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale-Cognitive Subscale (ADAS-Cog) and was less costly so the TAU intervention dominated the CST intervention (23).

Multi-component cognitive interventions were also evaluated (42,45). The first study evaluated Learning Therapy, a combination of cognitive training and cognitive stimulation, in a nursing home population (45). The second assessed an early intervention approach which incorporated counselling, education and support in a community dwelling population (42). The Learning Therapy Trial conducted a CBA, matched controlled trial, whilst the second study with the early intervention approach used a CUA and a RCT design. Participants were followed up for significant periods of time at 12 months and 36 months respectively (42,45). Primary outcome measures differed, measuring time to institutionalisation (45) or QALYs (42).

The Learning Therapy study reported significant benefits at 12 months compared to TAU reporting \$21 per month average cost-savings and an 88.8% probability that the

intervention was cost-effective (45). However it should be noted that the matched control design was not gold-standard and such designs are at risk of introducing bias and confounding (49). The early intervention, multi-component, intervention was dominated by TAU in terms of QALYs (42).

The remaining four cognitive studies all evaluated different types of cognitive interventions. Woods et al used joint reminiscence therapy groups involving carers and PwD (25), Spector et al evaluated cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) to reduce anxiety in PwD (24), Laakkonen et al used cognitive rehabilitation and involved promotion of self-management skills for people recently diagnosed with dementia (34), and Mervin et al assessed PwD interaction with a regular soft toy and an interactive toy with artificial intelligence (44). All studies used an RCT design, and CEA with the exception of Woods et al which used RCT design and CUA (25). With regard to primary outcomes Mervin et al measured agitation, Woods et al and Laakkonen et al evaluated quality of life and Spector et al used patient anxiety scores (24,25,34,44).

Two of these studies, by Laakkonen et al and Spector et al, proved to be cost-neutral (24,34). Laakkonen et al's cognitive rehabilitation intervention study showed that participants in the intervention group showed significantly less decline in their verbal fluency scores compared with TAU, without increasing total costs (34). Similar improvements were seen for Clock Drawing Test scores. Spector et al's CBT study reported significant improvements in depression which remained significant at six months; improvements in anxiety scores were also reported but failed to reach statistical significance (24). Although in the short-term the intervention reduced health and social care costs for the CBT group, overall, it was reported as cost-neutral.

The results of the Mervin et al study showed that there was little difference in ICER values/per Cohen-Mansfield Agitation Inventory - short form (CMAI-SF) improvement relative to TAU between the soft toy (\$12.85) and interactive toy (\$13.01) (44). No statistically significant between-group differences in agitation were reported at ten weeks and the study findings did not support the intervention being cost-effective. The Woods et al reminiscence intervention reported no significant difference in outcomes or service use between the intervention group and TAU, with an ICER =  $\pounds 2,586/\text{per } 0.597$  unit change in Quality of Life in Alzheimer Disease (QoL-AD) score (25). Mean differences in QALYs between the two groups was negligible.

#### Training Interventions

Eight studies evaluated cost-effectiveness of specialised dementia training for staff looking after PwD, to improve the quality of patient care and patient experience (Table 2). Seven of the eight interventions involved training for nursing home staff with one community-based training intervention for GPs. All studies were RCTs except for one cluster-randomized trial.

Williams et al evaluated a staff training communication intervention aimed at improving dementia behaviours in nursing homes using a cluster-randomized waitlist-controlled approach (40). El Alili et al evaluated a multi-component intervention for residents with advanced dementia (37). Livingston et al evaluated a staff training intervention to manage agitation (27). Romeo et al and Ballard et al evaluated interventions to reduce agitation by using a person-centred care intervention (21,26). Meads et al and Van de Ven et al both evaluated dementia care mapping (DCM) interventions in nursing homes (7,38) which involves observing an individual's behaviour and then implementing an individualised care plan. A study to evaluate cost-effectiveness of GP training in dementia care and promote support groups and carer counselling was carried out by Menn et al (30).

With regard to study design El Alili et al, Livingston et al, Meads et al and Romeo et al all carried out CUAs, whilst Van de Ven et al used a CBA and Ballard et al, Menn et al and Williams et al undertook CEAs (7,21,26,27,30,37,38,40). The training intervention study with the longest follow up period was by Williams et al at 36 months (mean=15.4, SD 9.83) (40).

Four studies used QALYs (7,21,27,37) and one used quality of life assessed with a proxy Dementia Quality of Life (DEMQOL) measure (26). Van de Ven et al assessed health care consumption, falls, psychotropic drug use and staff absenteeism (38). Williams et al monitored percentage of time staff used 'childish' language with residents alongside the percentage of time residents were resistive to care (40). Menn measured time to institutionalisation (30). Meads et al and Van de Ven et al used similar methodology; both used patient assessment and observation to evaluate their DCM studies, using agitation as the primary outcome and a healthcare provider/services perspective (30,38).

Several training interventions showed improvements in primary outcomes. The Williams et al staff communication intervention reduced resistiveness to care behaviours and reported an ICER of US\$4.31 per resident per one percentage point reduction in resistiveness to care (40). This study was limited by lack of appropriate statistical analysis, no ICER in terms of QALYs was reported making direct comparison with other studies difficult. A strength of this study was its long timehorizon of 36 months; however it is limited by the small sample size and generalisability is limited due to the small geographical location of the nursing homes. Ballard et al showed a statistically significant improvement of 2.54 points in quality of life (mean difference, DEMQOL proxy) for the patient centred care intervention compared to TAU (26). Statistically significant benefits were also demonstrated for Cohen-Mansfield Agitation Inventory (CMAI) and Neuropsychiatric Inventory Nursing Home Version outcomes compared to TAU: cost savings were reported for this multi-component intervention. The perspective of the study and it's relation to the costs being evaluated was unstated which was a limitation. Romeo et al's person-centred care based intervention also demonstrated clinically significant benefits with reduction in agitation and improvement in guality of life, when used with people with clinically significant agitation living in nursing homes (21). The Ballard et al intervention was dominant compared to TAU in terms of QALYs gained; when used in combination with TAU it demonstrated 100% probability of cost-effectiveness at a WTP threshold of £70,000 compared with TAU alone (26).

The multi-component intervention evaluated by El Alili et al was reported to dominate TAU in terms of QALYs; a strength of this intervention was its one-year time horizon (37). The Van de Ven et al DCM intervention was evaluated as cost-neutral, and the number of outpatient hospital appointments was reduced compared to usual care (38). Analysis of uncertainty was not stated and no ICER was presented.

The Livingston et al staff training intervention was cost-effective in terms of QALYs and reported an ICER of £14,064 per QALY gained with a 62% probability of cost-effectiveness at a WTP of £20,000 per QALYs (27). The authors report that it was not effective in terms of improving the primary outcome of agitation measured by CMAI scores between the intervention group and TAU.

Despite having the longest of all follow up periods at 48 months, the Menn et al GP training intervention showed no significant reduction in time to institutionalisation (30). The Meads et al intervention was not cost-effective in terms of QALYs, ICER= £64,380 per QALY gained (7). Small improvements were achieved in reducing agitation measured by CMAI, but it failed to reach statistical significance.

#### Multi-disciplinary Interventions

Eight articles evaluated multi-disciplinary dementia care programmes. Interventions have been further categorised according to type: dementia care management, case management, and other multi-disciplinary dementia care (meeting centres and a primary care dementia clinic were separately evaluated in two studies).

Dementia care management evaluations by Jennings et al, Michalowsky et al and Rädke et al used multi-disciplinary care in the community to assess and support patients (32,33,41). Rosenvall et al evaluated three interventions: care management, family support and multi-disciplinary rehabilitation; modelling potential cost savings of each (35). Study designs varied, with RCT (32,41) a cluster RCT (33) and a modelling approach being taken (35). Rädke et al undertook a CEA and Michalowsky et al performed a CEA using the same participant dataset (32,33). Rädke et al undertook sub-group analysis to determine which group of patients benefitted most from this type of programme (33). Jennings et al had the largest sample size (n=3269) not just in this category but across all intervention categories (41).

The dementia care management interventions evaluated by Michalowsky et al and Rädke et al, dominated TAU in terms of QALYs (32,33). Both used QALYs derived from the 12-Item Short Form Survey (SF-12) quality of life measure as their primary outcome. Compared to TAU the Michalowsky et al dementia care management intervention was reported to increase QALYs (by an average of 0.05), reduce hospitalisation and delay the transfer to long-term care (seven months) and costs were decreased (by an average of  $\in$ 569) (32). Cost-effectiveness probability was 88% at WTP thresholds of  $\notin$ 40,000/QALY gained and was higher in patients who lived alone compared to those not living alone (96% versus 26%).

Rädke et al reported a probability of cost-effectiveness at 88% at a WTP threshold of €40,000 per QALY (33). For the sub study populations, higher probability of costeffectiveness was reported in older PwD (<80 years) than younger (>80 years) at the same WTP threshold (87% versus 48% respectively). Probability of costeffectiveness was very high in females compared to males (96% versus 16%), in PwD living alone compared to those not living alone (96% versus 26%) and in patients with more co-morbidity than less comorbidity (96% versus 26%). The authors suggest that the high probability of cost-effectiveness in females and those living alone could be attributed to these groups having fewer relatives or carers to provide care and support and therefore having a higher number of unmet needs, meaning that they are more likely to benefit from a multi-disciplinary management programme. The intervention was more effective in those with a higher functional deficit and in patients with moderate to severe cognitive impairment than those without cognitive impairment.

Jennings et al reported a hazard ratio of 0.60, demonstrating that dementia care management programme participants were less likely to be admitted to a long-term care facility than with TAU (41). The authors concluded that the intervention was cost neutral.

Rosenvall et al's modelling simulation concluded that cost savings were possible with care management, family support and multidisciplinary rehabilitation as they delayed admission time to long-term care (35). The estimated time taken to reach economic break-even points was based on the estimate of how long a patient's transition to long-term care could potentially be delayed by. For care management this was 2.8 days, for structured family support 1.8 days, for rehabilitative cognitive, physical and social activation the break-even point was 43.0 days. Rehabilitation was reported to be most cost-effective in the severe phases of Alzheimer's disease. Potential cost savings were demonstrated through saving costs on long term care by delaying the decline in cognition and social functioning of PwD and subsequently the time of transition to long term care.

Case management, supporting the person with dementia and their carer in conjunction with a multidisciplinary team, was evaluated by MacNeil Vroomen et al and Mostardt et al (31,39). MacNeil Vroomen et al undertook a CUA with an observational design and a societal perspective, whilst Mostardt et al evaluated CEA in a non-randomised matched controlled trial from a healthcare provider perspective (31,39). Mostardt et al reported an ICER of €53/per additional month in a home environment (31). The difference in average additional months spent in the home environment was significant at 16.14 months for the intervention group patients compared with 12.2 months for the control group patients (p = 0.02). However, it was

noted that no limitations were discussed in this study and they used a nonrandomised matched controlled study design. MacNeil Vroomen et al reported that the intensive care management model (ICMM) intervention was cost-effective compared to the linkage model and TAU (39). The difference in QALYs gained between ICMM and control was non-significant. The probability that ICMM was costeffective compared to control was 99% at WTP of €30,000/QALY and dominated TAU in terms of QALYs. However, no sensitivity analysis was conducted to test the robustness of the outcome. Additionally, the observational, non-randomised design may have introduced selection bias and more heterogeneity into the study population.

Henderson et al conducted a non-randomised study to evaluate meeting centres providing day support using CUA (48). The study had a short time horizon at six months and was not cost-effective in terms of QALYs. When using QOL-AD as the primary outcome, the probability of cost-effectiveness was 50% at a WTP of €5,000 for a one-point increase.

Saxena et al also undertook an evaluation of a multi-disciplinary intervention comparing a primary care dementia clinic (PCDC) with a hospital-based memory clinic (MC) using a non-randomised quasi-experimental design and CUA (47). QALYs were higher for the PCDC group and the ICER at 12 months was S\$29,042/per QALY which was less than the assumed threshold of S\$78,690. The authors concluded that the care provided by the PCDC had similar effectiveness to that provided by a hospital memory clinic and it was more effective than that provided by the other polyclinics evaluated so the authors suggest that these clinics could be cost-effectively set up elsewhere in primary care.

#### Exercise Interventions

Five articles looked at the effect of physical activity on people with dementia. Although all studies were randomised controlled trials, they employed various economic evaluation methods. Lamb et al, Sopina et al and D'Amico et al carried out a CUA (20,28,43), and Davis et al and Pitkala et al used a CEA (36,46). Only one intervention included people living in nursing homes (20), the rest focused on people living in the community. The majority of the studies focused on group-based exercise outside of the home.

None of the five exercise studies evaluated demonstrated cost-effectiveness in terms of QALYs, however, improvements in primary outcomes were seen in two of the studies (36,46). Davis et al evaluated group resistance training classes and aerobic training classes and compared these to group balance and tone classes which had not been specifically designed to target cognitive decline (46). They reported that the resistance and aerobic training classes dominated the balance and tone classes at six months in terms of seconds gained/lost on Stroop test of cognitive function and were less costly. In Pitkala et al's study, both the home exercise and group exercise intervention groups demonstrated significantly slower decline in functioning

measured by Functional Independence Measure (FIM) (-7.1, -10.3 FIM change respectively) than the control group (-14.4 FIM change) without increasing the total costs of health and social services (36).

#### Other Interventions

Tanajewski et al undertook a CUA with RCT design looking at developing a specialist unit to provide care for confused patients admitted to a general hospital (19). During a follow up period of three months the intervention was found to dominate TAU in terms of QALYs with a probability of cost-effectiveness of 81% at a WTP threshold of £20,000/QALY.

Howard et al carried out an RCT employing a CUA to evaluate telecare and assistive technology from both a health and social care and a societal perspective (29). The intervention was not cost-effective in terms of QALYs from either a health and social care or societal perspective and it did not enable people with dementia to live safely at home for longer.

### **Review of Reviews**

Alves et al undertook a systematic review of five RCT's on the efficacy and feasibility of cognitive interventions for those with Alzheimer's Disease (9). The review only included cognitive stimulation, cognitive training and cognitive rehabilitation. The review was rated as critically low for confidence in quality using AMSTAR 2 with no evidence of investigation of publication bias and its potential impact on results. Only one relevant economic study of cost-effectiveness was identified: a programme of cognitive stimulation for PwD living either at home or in nursing homes, not receiving cholinesterase inhibitor treatment (participant numbers not stated). The intervention was not reported as cost-effective.

A narrative review was undertaken by Banerjee into the efficacy of providing memory services (50), due partly to the non-systematic approach the review was rated as critically low for confidence in quality using AMSTAR 2. The author referred to a simulation model undertaken by Banerjee and Wittenberg which modelled the effectiveness of implementing a national memory service provision to prevent care home admissions (51). They estimated cost savings to society which increased over the ten-year period as the number of those admitted to care homes was reduced. Cost-effectiveness was reported at £20,000 per 0.02 QALY.

Home support interventions for PwD living in the community were systematically reviewed by Clarkson et al (13). The review included 14 economic evaluations, six of these evaluated only carer outcomes and as such were excluded here. The Pitkala et al study was reviewed, it has already been reviewed in this paper and will be not be reviewed again here to avoid duplication (36). The remaining seven relevant economic evaluations looked at the following interventions: care management (n=2), group living, occupational therapy, activity sessions, institution-based care and specialist dementia day care compared to usual care at home. Four of the

evaluations used CEA, two used CUA and one used cost-consequence analysis. Only occupational therapy was reported to show cost-effectiveness. Confidence in the Clarkson et al review was rated as critically low for confidence in quality using AMSTAR 2, risk of bias was not discussed in the review results.

As part of a systematic review of interventions to reduce agitation in people with dementia in any setting, Livingston et al identified two economic studies (11). Mintzer et al evaluated a programme to reduce hospitalisation using a blended inpatient/outpatient intervention and Norman et al evaluated a comparison of DCM and person-centred care (52,53). Both studies measured economic outcomes using CMAI scores. Mintzer et al recorded a 0.89 change in total CMAI for \$1000 expenditure for the inpatient/outpatient intervention versus only 0.27 for the inpatient programme (52). This suggests effectiveness but as cost-effectiveness thresholds are not known it is not possible to determine cost-effectiveness. Norman et al reported that for person-centred care relative to usual care there were costs of A\$6.43 per CMAI point averted, for the DCM intervention the costs were higher at A\$46.89 (53). The summary economic measure for this study was cost per CMAI score change, further data on effectiveness of this intervention was not available within the review.

Additionally, as part of the review Livingston et al created a simulation model using the most effective strategies identified from an effectiveness review of 30 studies of wide-ranging dementia therapies and existing patient cohort data (11). Modelling of a multi-component intervention for participants with mild to moderate dementia revealed 82% probability of cost-effectiveness at a maximum willingness to pay threshold of £20,000/QALY. However due to the multi-component nature it was not possible to determine which particular component of the intervention was most effective. The review rated moderate for confidence in quality using AMSTAR 2.

The Nickel et al review (3) contained three studies on physical activity (20,36,46) and six on cognitive interventions (22–25,34,42,54) which were relevant to this systematic review. The studies contained in this review have already been individually identified through the literature review, and methods and results are discussed above. The review rated low for confidence in quality using AMSTAR 2 as assessment of risk of bias was not detailed.

#### Discussion

#### Summary of main findings

This paper reviewed economic evaluations of both hospital-based and community interventions for dementia and MCI. A wide range of interventions from researchers around the world was evaluated for patients both at home and in nursing homes.

Of the 37 studies and five reviews evaluated in this paper 13 demonstrated evidence to favour interventions, although some of these had limitations. The intervention category with the strongest evidence of cost-effectiveness was multi-disciplinary interventions. Four of the eight multi-disciplinary interventions were likely to be costeffective in terms of QALYs gained compared to TAU. Dementia care management was the multi-disciplinary intervention which showed strongest evidence of costeffectiveness, two of the four studies demonstrated cost-effectiveness in terms of QALYs (32,33) and two reported delays in admission to long-term care (35,41).

In the cognitive intervention category, although short term CST was not shown to be cost-effective, MST demonstrated evidence of cost-effectiveness, although only two economic studies were available. As previously mentioned, group CST is already recommended as an intervention (8) and has been proven to be cost-effective in a large-scale study outside of the timeframe of this review (55). Both MST studies evaluated as part of this review were cost-effective in terms of QALYs compared to TAU. Overall, the cognitive interventions did not demonstrate evidence of cost-effectiveness. The economic evidence was limited due to low numbers of studies per intervention making it impossible to make an informed decision about their cost-effectiveness. In Clarkson et al's review occupational therapy was evaluated as cost-effective but this was the only study which reviewed this intervention.

There was also evidence for care home and nursing home staff training interventions. Three out of eight studies favoured the intervention over TAU and found cost-effectiveness in terms of QALYs or showed significant patient benefits. A fourth study was cost neutral.

Limitations were identified in some of the studies and evidence was weakened by small number of studies per intervention, small sample sizes, short timeline or reliability of evidence. Four of the studies reporting cost-effectiveness did not use an RCT design and this could have led to biased estimates of effect (31,39,45,47). The generalisability of the sample to the wider population was a potential issue in two studies as the study population was limited to a rural community (32,33). Three of the six multi-disciplinary studies took place in the same country, which may lead to a geographical bias (31–33). It should also be noted that only one of the multi-disciplinary studies assessed UK based services (48).

#### Limitations

Despite the broad search terms used it is possible that some economic evaluation studies may have been missed. There may be an element of publication bias as it is acknowledged that authors may be less willing to submit studies for publication that don't demonstrate cost-effectiveness or cost-savings.

Synthesising evidence from studies and reviews evaluating a wide range of interventions presented challenges. Due to the variety of outcome measures used, the heterogeneity of the study methods and the variety of different interventions it was difficult to compare the cost-effectiveness of different interventions. The lack of WTP thresholds for different countries made it difficult to compare the ICERs between countries.

The review was also hampered by lack of robust economic evidence generally for non-pharmacological studies. This in turn resulted in limited evidence for each category of intervention.

The narrative review by Banerjee was assessed as critically low using AMSTAR 2, however, it is acknowledged that the AMSTAR 2 tool was designed for use with systematic reviews and that this may account for the low quality score. However, non-systematic reviews can still be valuable and informative and can generate novel insights by allowing for a flexible and adaptable approach to article selection (56).

#### Recommendations for Future Research

The results of the review demonstrates gaps in the economic evidence on nonpharmacological interventions which could benefit from further research. There was a lack of economic studies on the cost-effectiveness of creative therapies such as art, music, drama, creative writing and dance and also sensory therapies such as aromatherapy and massage. There was limited evidence shown for multi-component cognitive studies and CBT. Further high-quality research would evaluate whether these interventions are cost-effective.

#### Conclusion

The intervention with the strongest evidence cost-effectiveness was dementia care management. There was also evidence to suggest cost-effectiveness of MST and occupational therapy, although evidence was limited by availability of studies. More economic evidence on the cost-effectiveness of dementia care interventions is needed, with consistency around measurement of costs and outcomes data to inform policy and decision makers future decision making. Better information and higher-quality studies are also needed in order to improve decision makers' confidence to promote cost-effective dementia interventions in the future.

#### **Contributions and Support**

GE, PM and RP contributed to the conception and design of the study and methodology; GE and PM contributed to the development of the protocol. Searches and screening were carried out by GE, PM and EG. Data extraction, and quality appraisal were conducted by GE and EG. GE drafted the manuscript. PM, RP, CS and EG critically reviewed the manuscript and revised it critically for important intellectual content; all authors approved the final version to be published.

#### Support acknowledgment

This research was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration Kent, Surrey, Sussex. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

#### Funding

This paper presents independent research undertaken as part of a funded VC PhD scholarship in the Centre for Mental Health in the Institute for Lifecourse Development at the University of Greenwich. The views expressed are those of the authors.

#### Data Availability

Data availability is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this review.

#### References

- 1. Prince M, Wimo A, Guerchet M, Ali G, Wu Y, Prina M. World Alzheimer Report. 2015; Available from: https://www.alz.co.uk/research/WorldAlzheimerReport2015.pdf
- 2. Wittenberg R, Knapp M, Hu B, Comas-Herrera A, King D, Rehill A, et al. The costs of dementia in England. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry. 2019;34(7):1095–103.
- 3. Nickel F, Barth J, Kolominsky-Rabas PL. Health economic evaluations of nonpharmacological interventions for persons with dementia and their informal caregivers: a systematic review. BMC Geriatr [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2021 May 13];18(69). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-018-0751-1
- Nichols E, Steinmetz JD, Vollset SE, Fukutaki K, Chalek J, Abd-Allah F, et al. Estimation of the global prevalence of dementia in 2019 and forecasted prevalence in 2050: an analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. Lancet Public Heal. 2022;7(2):e105–25.
- 5. World Health Organisation. Dementia [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Jun 1]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/dementia
- Bond M, Rogers G, Peters J, Anderson R, Hoyle M, Miners A, et al. The effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of donepezil, galantamine, rivastigmine and Memantine for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease (review of Technology Appraisal No . 111): a systematic review and economic model. Health Technol Assess (Rockv) [Internet]. 2012 Apr 30 [cited 2021 Apr 29];16(21):1–469. Available from: https://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta/hta16210/
- Meads DM, Martin A, Griffiths A, Kelley R, Creese B, Robinson L, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of Dementia Care Mapping in Care-Home Settings: Evaluation of a Randomised Controlled Trial. Appl Health Econ Health Policy [Internet]. 2020;18(2):237–47. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40258-019-00531-1
- National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Dementia: assessment, management and support for people living with dementia and their carers. NICE Guidel [Internet]. 2018;(June 2018):2–43. Available from: www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng97
- 9. Alves J, Magalhaes R, Thomas R. Is there evidence for cognitive intervention in Alzheimer Disease? A systematic review of efficacy, feasibility and cost-effectiveness. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord. 2013;27(3):195–203.
- 10. Pimouguet C, Lavaud T, Dartigues JF, Helmer C. Dementia case management effectiveness on health care costs and resource utilization: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. J Nutr Heal Aging. 2010;14(8):669–76.
- 11. Livingston G, Kelly L, Lewis-Holmes E, Baio G, Morris S, Patel N, et al. A systematic review of the clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of sensory, psychological and behavioural interventions for managing agitation in older adults with dementia. Health Technol Assess (Rockv). 2014;18(39).
- Robinson L, Hutchings D, Dickinson HO, Corner L, Beyer F, Finch T, et al. Effectiveness and acceptability of non-pharmacological interventions to reduce wandering in dementia: A systematic review. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry. 2007;22(1):9– 22.
- Clarkson P, Davies L, Jasper R, Loynes N, Challis D. A Systematic Review of the Economic Evidence for Home Support Interventions in Dementia. Value Heal [Internet]. 2017;20(8):1198–209. Available from:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2017.04.004

- 14. Page MJ, Moher D, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: Updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372.
- 15. Gauthier S, Reisberg B, Zaudig M, Petersen RC, Ritchie K, Brioch K, et al. Mild cognitive impairment. Lancet. 2006;367(9527):1979.
- 16. Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, Carswell C, Moher D, Greenberg D, et al. Consolidated health economic evaluation reporting standards (CHEERS)-explanation and elaboration: A report of the ISPOR health economic evaluation publication guidelines good reporting practices task force. Value Heal. 2013 Mar;16(2):231–50.
- 17. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, et al. AMSTAR 2: A critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. BMJ. 2017;358:1–9.
- 18. Brown H, D'Amico F, Knapp M, Orrell M, Rehill A, Vale L, et al. A cost effectiveness analysis of maintenance cognitive stimulation therapy (MCST) for people with dementia: examining the influence of cognitive ability and living arrangements. Aging Ment Heal. 2019;23(5):602–7.
- 19. Tanajewski L, Franklin M, Gkountouras G, Berdunov V, Harwood RH, Goldberg SE, et al. Economic evaluation of a general hospital unit for older people with delirium and dementia (team randomised controlled trial. PLoS One. 2015;10(12):1–21.
- D'Amico F, Rehill A, Knapp M, Lowery D, Cerga-Pashoja A, Griffin M, et al. Costeffectiveness of exercise as a therapy for behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia within the EVIDEM-E randomised controlled trial. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry. 2016;31(6):656–65.
- Romeo R, Zala D, Knapp M, Orrell M, Fossey J, Ballard C. Improving the quality of life of care home residents with dementia: Cost-effectiveness of an optimized intervention for residents with clinically significant agitation in dementia. Alzheimer's Dement [Internet]. 2019 Feb 1 [cited 2021 Apr 30];15(2):282–91. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30470592/
- 22. D'Amico F, Rehill A, Knapp M, Aguirre E, Donovan H, Hoare Z, et al. Maintenance Cognitive Stimulation Therapy: An Economic Evaluation Within a Randomized Controlled Trial. J Am Med Dir Assoc [Internet]. 2015;16(1):63–70. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2014.10.020
- 23. Orgeta V, Leung P, Yates L, Kang S, Hoare Z, Henderson C, et al. Individual cognitive stimulation therapy for dementia: A clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness pragmatic, multicentre, randomised controlled trial. Health Technol Assess (Rockv). 2015;19(64):7–73.
- 24. Spector A, Charlesworth G, King M, Lattimer M, Sadek S, Marston L, et al. Cognitivebehavioural therapy for anxiety in dementia: Pilot randomised controlled trial. Br J Psychiatry. 2015;206(6):509–16.
- 25. Woods RT, Bruce E, Edwards RT, Elvish R, Hoare Z, Hounsome B, et al. REMCARE: Reminiscence groups for people with dementia and their family caregivers -Effectiveness and costeffectiveness pragmatic multicentre randomised trial. Health Technol Assess (Rockv) [Internet]. 2012;16(48):v–116. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3310/hta16480
- 26. Ballard C, Corbett A, Orrell M, Williams G, Moniz-Cook E, Romeo R, et al. Impact of

person-centred care training and person-centred activities on quality of life, agitation, and antipsychotic use in people with dementia living in nursing homes: A cluster-randomised controlled trial. PLoS Med. 2018;15(2):1–18.

- 27. Livingston G, Barber J, Marston L, Stringer A, Panca M, Hunter R, et al. Clinical and cost-effectiveness of the Managing Agitation and Raising Quality of Life (MARQUE) intervention for agitation in people with dementia in care homes: a single-blind, cluster-randomised controlled trial. The Lancet Psychiatry [Internet]. 2019;6(4):293–304. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(19)30045-8
- 28. Lamb SE, Mistry D, Alleyne S, Atherton N, Brown D, Copsey B, et al. Aerobic and strength training exercise programme for cognitive impairment in people with mild to moderate dementia: The DAPA RCT. Health Technol Assess (Rockv). 2018 May 1;22(28):1–201.
- Howard R, Gathercole R, Bradley R, Harper E, Davis L, Pank L, et al. The effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of assistive technology and telecare for independent living in dementia: a randomised controlled trial. Age Ageing. 2021;50(3):882–90.
- 30. Menn P, Holle R, Kunz S, Donath C, Lauterberg J, Leidl R, et al. Dementia care in the general practice setting: A cluster randomized trial on the effectiveness and cost impact of three management strategies. Value Heal [Internet]. 2012;15(6):851–9. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2012.06.007
- Mostardt S, Matusiewicz D, Schröer W, Wasem J, Neumann A. Efficacy and cost effectiveness of case management in patients with dementia. Z Gerontol Geriatr. 2012;45(7):642–6.
- 32. Michalowsky B, Xie F, Eichler T, Hertel J, Kaczynski A, Kilimann I, et al. Costeffectiveness of a collaborative dementia care management—Results of a clusterrandomized controlled trial. Alzheimer's Dement. 2019;15(10):1296–308.
- 33. Rädke A, Michalowsky B, Thyrian J, Eichler T, Xie F, Hoffmann W. Who benefits most from collaborative dementia care from a patient and payer perspective? A subgroup cost effectiveness analysis. J Alzheimers Dis. 2020;74:449–62.
- 34. Laakkonen ML, Kautiainen H, Hölttä E, Savikko N, Tilvis RS, Strandberg TE, et al. Effects of Self-Management Groups for People with Dementia and Their Spouses -Randomized Controlled Trial. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2016;64(4):752–60.
- 35. Rosenvall A, Saaksvuori L, Finne-Soveri H, Linnosmaa I, Malmivaara A. Potential cost savings for selected non-pharmacological treatment strategies for patients with alzheimer's disease in finland. J Rehabil Med. 2020;52(9).
- 36. Pitkäl □ a KH, Pöysti MM, Laakkonen ML, Tilvis RS, Savikko N, Kautiainen H, et al. Effects of the Finnish Alzheimer Disease Exercise Trial (FINALEX): A randomized controlled trial. JAMA Intern Med. 2013;173(10):894–901.
- 37. El Alili M, Smaling HJA, Joling KJ, Achterberg WP, Francke AL, Bosmans JE, et al. Cost-effectiveness of the Namaste care family program for nursing home residents with advanced dementia in comparison with usual care: A cluster-randomized controlled trial. BMC Health Serv Res. 2020;20(1):1–11.
- 38. Van De Ven G, Draskovic I, Van Herpen E, Koopmans RTCM, Donders R, Zuidema SU, et al. The economics of dementia-care mapping in nursing homes: A cluster-randomised controlled trial. PLoS One. 2014;9(1).
- 39. MacNeil Vroomen J, Bosmans JE, Eekhout I, Joling KJ, Van Mierlo LD, Meiland FJM,

et al. The cost-effectiveness of two forms of case management compared to a control group for persons with dementia and their informal caregivers from a societal perspective. PLoS One [Internet]. 2016;11(9):1–20. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0160908

- 40. Williams KN, Ayyagari P, Perkhounkova Y, Bott MJ, Herman R, Bossen A. Costs of a staff communication intervention to reduce dementia behaviors in nursing home care. J Nurs Home Res Sci [Internet]. 2017;3:22–7. Available from: https://www.jnursinghomeresearch.com/all-issues.html?article=128
- 41. Jennings LA, Laffan AM, Schlissel AC, Colligan E, Tan Z, Wenger NS, et al. Health Care Utilization and Cost Outcomes of a Comprehensive Dementia Care Program for Medicare Beneficiaries. JAMA Intern Med. 2019;179(2):161–6.
- Sogaard R, Sorensen J, Waldorff, Eckermann, Buss D, Waldemar G. Cost analysis of early psychosocial intervention in Alzheimers disease. J Alzheimers Dis [Internet]. 2013;37:141–53. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1159/000355368
- Sopina E, Sørensen J, Beyer N, Hasselbalch SG, Waldemar G. Cost-effectiveness of a randomised trial of physical activity in Alzheimer's disease: A secondary analysis exploring patient and proxy-reported health-related quality of life measures in Denmark. BMJ Open. 2017 Jun 1;7(6).
- 44. Mervin MC, Moyle W, Jones C, Murfield J, Draper B, Beattie E, et al. The Cost-Effectiveness of Using PARO, a Therapeutic Robotic Seal, to Reduce Agitation and Medication Use in Dementia: Findings from a Cluster–Randomized Controlled Trial. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2018;19(7):619-622.e1.
- 45. Sado M, Funaki K, Ninomiya A, Knapp M, Mimura M. Does the combination of the cognitive interventions improve the function of daily living and save the long-term care cost? A pilot study of effectiveness and cost saving analysis of "Learning Therapy" for people with dementia. J Alzheimers Dis [Internet]. 2020;74:775–84. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3233/jad-190886
- 46. Davis JC, Bryan S, Marra CA, Sharma D, Chan A, Beattie BL, et al. An Economic Evaluation of Resistance Training and Aerobic Training versus Balance and Toning Exercises in Older Adults with Mild Cognitive Impairment. PLoS One. 2013;8(5).
- 47. Saxena N, George PP, Teo KWS, Tan WS, Ng C, Heng BH, et al. Evaluation of an integrated primary care-led dementia shared care program in Singapore: An effectiveness and cost-effectiveness study. Geriatr Gerontol Int. 2018;18(3):479–86.
- 48. Henderson C, Rehill A, Brooker D, Evans SC, Evans SB, Bray J, et al. Costs and cost-effectiveness of the meeting centres support programme for people living with dementia and carers in Italy, Poland and the UK: The MEETINGDEM study. Heal Soc Care Community. 2021;29(6):1756–68.
- 49. Rose S, Laan MJ Van Der. Why Match? Investigating Matched Case-Control Study Designs with Causal Effect Estimation. 2009;5(1). Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2827892/pdf/ijb1127.pdf
- 50. Banerjee S. A narrative review of evidence for the provision of memory services. Int Psychogeriatrics. 2015;27(10):1583–92.
- 51. Banerjee S, Wittenberg R. Clinical and cost effectiveness of services for early diagnosis and intervention in dementia. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry. 2009;24(7):748–54.
- 52. Mintzer JE, Colenda C, Waid LR, Lewis L, Meeks A, Stuckey M, et al. Effectiveness of a continuum of care using brief and partial hospitalization for agitated dementia

patients. Psychiatr Serv. 1997;48(11):1435-9.

- 53. Norman R, Haas M, Chenoweth L, Jeon Y-H, King M, Brodaty H, et al. Dementia care mapping and patient-centred care in Australian residential homes: an economic evaluation of the CARE Study [Internet]. Sydney: Centre for Health Economics Research and Evaluation. CHERE Working Paper 2008/4. 2008. Available from: http://www.epistemonikos.org/documents/a3959e104b2bf9f50ecd26e7eda3ffe9059ea 4ee
- Easton T, Milte R, Crotty M, Ratcliffe J. Where's the evidence? a systematic review of economic analyses of residential aged care infrastructure. BMC Health Serv Res. 2017 Mar 21;17(1).
- 55. Knapp M, Thorgrimsen L, Patel A, Spector A, Hallam A, Woods B, et al. Cognitive stimulation therapy for people with dementia: Cost-effectiveness analysis. Br J Psychiatry. 2006;188(JUNE):574–80.
- 56. Cook DA. Systematic and Nonsystematic Reviews: Choosing an Approach. In: Healthcare Simulation Research. Springer International Publishing; 2019. p. 55–60.

## Figures

Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram (14)



#### Table 1. Eligibility Criteria

Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Population with dementia (including	Studies of intervention purely for the
Alzheimer's disease) or mild cognitive	carers of people with dementia
impairment	
Trial based economic evaluations,	Interventions focusing solely on
observational or simulation studies	homeopathic or herbal remedies
Interventions designed to either delay	End of life care interventions
progression of the disease or to	
improve/maintain health-related quality of	
life	
All study designs including reviews and	Interventions aimed at prevention/early
systematic reviews	detection of dementia
Papers in any language, both abstracts	Studies without any costings data
and full texts will be translated	
	Letters, commentaries, study protocol
	papers and conference abstracts

Table 2. Study Characteristics									
Author, Country	Int	Intervention Description	N	F/up mont hs	Design	EE	Main economic outcome measure	Primary Outcome	Perspective
Brown et al (18), UK	Cog	Maintenance cognitive stimulation therapy with a group that had previously received cognitive stimulation therapy.	INT 123, TAU 113	6	RCT	CUA	QALYS	EQ-5Q (self and proxy), DEMQOL (self and proxy)	Societal
D'Amico et al (22), UK	Cog	Maintenance cognitive stimulation therapy in addition to usual care.	INT 64 dyads, TAU 67 dyads	6	RCT	CUA	QALYS	ADAS-Cog, QoL-AD	H&SC
Laakkonen et al (34), Finland	Cog	Separate group rehabilitation sessions run for people with dementia and for spouses.	INT 67 TAU 69	24	RCT	CEA	Patient health related quality of life	15D	Not stated
Mervin et al (44), Australia	Cog	Individual, non-facilitated sessions with a soft toy. Groups received toy with artificial intelligence (PARO) or same toy (Plush toy) with artificial intelligence disabled.	Paro 138, Plush 140, TAU 137	2.5	RCT	CEA	Patient agitation level	CMAI-SF	HCP
Orgeta et al (23), UK	Cog	Home-based, individual cognitive stimulation therapy, led by own carer. Up to three 30-minute activity sessions/week over 25 weeks. Initial training and ongoing support provided.	INT 180, TAU 176	25	RCT	CUA	QALYS	ADAS-Cog, QoL-AD	H&SC/ Societal
Sado et al	Cog	A learning therapy intervention	INT 30,	12	Non-	CBA	Criterion Time	CT for CNLTC	HCP

#### ~

(45), Japan		carried out in nursing homes. A combination of cognitive training and stimulation.	TAU 27		randomised matched control		for Certification of Needed Long-Term Care		
Sogaard et al (42), Denmark	Cog	Intensive, multi-component, semi-tailored, psychosocial intervention programme with counselling, education and support.	INT 163 dyads TAU 167 dyads	36	RCT	CUA	QALYS	QALYS (measured by EQ-5D-5L)	Societal
Spector et al (24), UK	Cog	A cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) manual developed for anxiety in dementia and trialled in sessions with participant/carer dyads.	INT 25, TAU 25	6	RCT	CEA	Patient anxiety	RAID score	H&SC
Woods et al (25), UK	Cog	Group reminiscence therapy for participants and with carers.	INT 206 dyads TAU 144 dyads	10	RCT	CUA	QALYS	QoL-AD, GHQ- 28 (carer)	Public sector
Ballard et al (26), UK	Train	Staff training programme on person-centred care for care staff, promoting tailored activities, antipsychotic medication review.	INT 404, TAU 443	9	RCT	CEA	Patient quality of life	DEMQOL- (Proxy)	Not stated
El Alili et al (37), Netherlands	Train	Multi-dimensional care programme for nursing home residents with advanced dementia.	INT 116, TAU 115	12	RCT	CUA	QALYS	QUALID, GAIN	Societal
Livingston et al (27), UK	Train	Evidence-based, manualised, intervention, delivered to staff in 6 interactive sessions.	INT 189, TAU 215	8	Cluster RCT	CUA	QALYS	CMAI	Not stated

		Comprising training getting to know and understand residents.							
Meads et al (7), UK	Train	Dementia Care Mapping: a care-home staff training intervention aimed to embed person-centred care, improve care quality and health outcomes for residents.	INT 418, TAU 308	16	RCT	CUA	QALYS	QALYS (measured by EQ-5D-5L)	HCP
Menn et al (30), Germany	Train	GPs in 3 groups (A, B, C) trained in dementia care. At different timepoints groups B and C actively recommended support groups and promoted caregiver counselling.	B 88, C 108, TAU 107	48	RCT	CEA	Time to institution- alisation	Remaining time the patient lived at home	Societal
Romeo et al (21), UK	Train	Person-centred care intervention delivered by staff in nursing homes. Staff were trained in person-centred care, management of agitation, and psychosocial approaches.	INT 404, TAU 443	9	RCT	CUA	QALYS	QOL measured by DEMQOL	H&SC
Van de Ven et al (38), Netherlands	Train	Dementia-care mapping, multi- component intervention. Staff from participating nursing homes attended training, then assessed residents' needs and implemented care interventions.	INT 154, TAU 164	18	RCT	СВА	Health care consumption, falls and psychotropic drug use and staff absenteeism	Agitation	HCS
Williams et al (40), USA	Train	Staff training intervention to improve communication with residents by encouraging staff to stop using 'childish'	INT 42 dyads, TAU unstated	36	Observational	CEA	% Time staff used Elderspeak, % time residents	% Time staff used Elderspeak, % time residents	not stated

		language/way of speaking and interacting (Elderspeak).					resistive to care	resistive to care	
Henderson et al (48), Italy, Poland, UK	Multi- discipli nary	Meeting centre support programme; person-centred, psychosocial approach combining day centre services with support for carers.	INT 83, TAU 69	6	Non- randomised matched control	CUA	QALYS	QOL-AD	H&SC /Societal
Jennings et al (41), USA	Multi- discipli nary	Dementia care programme co- managed by nurse practitioners and physicians, comprising structured assessments, individualised care plans, referral to community support/advice services, and 24hr access to a clinician.	INT 1083, TAU 2186	36	RCT	CEA	Patient health care utilisation	Admission to long-term care, healthcare utilisation	Not stated
MacNeil Vroomen et al (39), Netherlands	Multi- discipli nary	Comparison of 2 types of case management. Intensive Case Management Model: carried out within one care organization, and Linkage Model where care was provided by different care organisations within 1 region.	Intensive 234, Linkage 214, TAU 73	24	Non- randomised observational controlled, cohort study	CUA	QALYS	NPI score	Societal
Michalowsky et al (32), Germany	Multi- discipli nary	Dementia care management intervention using multi- disciplinary care to assess and support the dementia patient and carer.	INT 315, TAU 129	24	RCT	CUA	QALYS	SF-12	Societal
Mostardt et al (31), Germany	Multi- discipli nary	Case management intervention aiming to improve support networks and quality of care and enable PwD to stay at	INT 38, TAU 76	12	Non- randomised matched control	CEA	Additional time in the home environment	Time in the home environment	НСР

		home for longer.							
Rädke et al (33), Germany	Multi- discipli nary	Dementia care management intervention, delivered in participant's homes by dementia-trained nurses. Focus on interprofessional treatment and care, medication management and support/education of carers.	INT 315, TAU 129	24	Cluster randomised	CEA	Patient functional independence	SF-12	HCS
Rosenvall et al (35), Finland	Multi- discipli nary	Three interventions for people with Alzheimer's: care- management (CM), family support (FS) and physical activity (P). Analysed using existing data then a modelling simulation was carried out.	924 (simulation )	48	Modelling	СВА	Use of health and care services, clinical outcome measures	Delay in transition to long term care	Not stated
Saxena et al (47), Singapore	Multi- discipli nary	Primary care dementia clinic (PCDC) compared with a hospital-based memory clinic (MC). PCDC was run by GPs and nurses assisted by the MC team.	MC 101, PCDC 99, TAU 63	12	Non- randomised quasi- experimental design	CUA	QALYS	QALYS (measured by EQ-5D-5L)	Societal
D'Amico et al (20), UK	PE	Individually tailored dyadic regime, walking daily for 12 weeks.	INT 30, TAU 22	3	RCT	CUA	QALYS	NPI score	Societal
Davis et al (46), Canada	PE	Twice-weekly group classes for older women, comparing resistance or aerobic training with balance and tone classes.	Resistanc e 28, Aerobic 30, Balance & Tone 28	6	RCT	CEA	Patient executive cognitive function	Stroop test	HCP

Lamb et al (28), UK	PE	Weekly group exercise programme of aerobic and resistance training led by a physio.	INT 329, TAU 165	12	RCT	CUA	QALYS	ADAS-Cog score	HCP/ Societal
Pitkala et al (36), Finland	PE	Group-based exercise sessions twice a week compared to home-based exercise.	Home 70, Group 70, TAU 70	12	RCT	CEA	FIM score changes and SPPB score changes	FIM, SPPB	H&SC
Sopina et al (43), Denmark	PE	Supervised, hour-long group sessions of aerobic exercise, three times a week.	INT 107, TAU 93	4	RCT	CUA	QALÝS	Symbol Digit Modalities Test	Danish healthcare perspective
Howard et al (29), UK	Other	Assistive technology and telecare assessment followed by installation of all appropriate devices.	INT 248, TAU 247	24	RCT	CUA	QALYS	Time to institution- alisation	H&SC /Societal
Tanajewski et al (19), UK	Other	A specialist unit was developed within a general hospital, for older people admitted for acute medical care assessed as having delirium and dementia.	INT 309, TAU 290	3	RCT	CUA	QALYS	QALYS (measured by EQ-5D-5L)	H&SC

**Key:** ADAS-Cog - Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale–Cognitive Subscale, Cat – Category, CBA – cost-benefit analysis, CEA – costeffectiveness analysis, CUA – cost-utility analysis, DEMQOL - Dementia Quality of Life, EE – method of economic evaluation, EQ-5D - health related quality of life measure, EQ-VAS - EQ-Visual Analogue Scale, F/up – length of follow up in months, FIM - Functional Independence Measure, GAIN - Alzheimer's care instrument, H&SC – health and social care, HCP – healthcare provider, HRQol - health-related quality of life, HS – health service, INT - intervention, N – number in sample, NPI - neuropsychiatric Inventory, PE – physical exercise, QALYS – quality adjusted life years, QOL – quality of life, QoL-AD - Quality of Life in Alzheimer Disease, QUALID - Quality of life in late stage dementia, RCT – randomised controlled trial, SF-12 - Short Form Health Survey, SPPB - Short Physical Performance Battery, TAU – treatment as usual

Study	Review Method	Interventions reviewed	Intervention Descriptions	No. studies included	Databases Used
Alves et al (9)	Systematic	Cognitive	Cognitive stimulation, cognitive training or cognitive rehabilitation	5	PubMed, PsychINFO, The Cochrane Library, EMBASE, metaRegister of Clinical Trials, OVID, EBM Reviews
Banerjee (50)	Narrative	Multi-disciplinary	Memory services	Not stated	Not stated
Clarkson et al (13)	Systematic	Multi-disciplinary	Home support interventions	8	British National Health Service Economic Evaluation Database (NHSEED)
Livingston et al (11)	Systematic	Cognitive/Multi-disciplinary	Blended inpatient and outpatient programme to reduce hospitalisation. Also an Australian comparison of dementia care mapping and person-centred care programmes.	2	MEDLINE, Web of Knowledge; EMBASE; British Nursing Index; the Health Technology, NHS Economic Evaluation Database, the HTA programme database and the DARE Assessment programme database; PsycINFO; NHS Evidence; System for Information on Grey Literature; The Stationery Office Official Documents website; The Stationery National Technical Information Service; Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature; and The Cochrane Library.
Nickel et al (3)	Systematic	Physical exercise/Cognitive	Physical exercise, cognitive interventions	16	Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, EconLit, Embase, Cochrane Library, PsycINFO and PubMed

StudyAlves et alBanerjee (50)Clarkson et al (13)Livingston et al (11)Nickel et al et al (11)1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?metunmetmetmetunmetmetunmet	Table 4. Quality Assessment of Systematic Reviews using AMSTAR 2 (	17)				
1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?(50)al (13)et al (11)(3)2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol? (critical domain) 3. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? (critical domain)metunmetunmetmetunmetmetunmet3. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? (critical domain)unmetunmetunmetunmet <th>Study</th> <th>Alves et al</th> <th>Banerjee</th> <th>Clarkson et</th> <th>Livingston</th> <th>Nickel et al</th>	Study	Alves et al	Banerjee	Clarkson et	Livingston	Nickel et al
1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?metunmetmetmetunmetmetunmet2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protoco?? (critical domain) 3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?unmetunmetunmetunmetmetpartially met4. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate? 5. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?unmetunmetunmetmetunmet<		(9)	(50)	<b>al</b> (13)	et al (11)	(3)
2. Did the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol? (critical domain)unmetunmetunmetunmetmetpartially met3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?unmetunmetunmetunmetmetmetmetmet4. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?unmetunmetunmetmetmetunmet5. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?unmetunmetunmetmetunmet7. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?unmetunmetunmetmetpartially met8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?unmetunmetunmetmetmetpartially met9. Did the review authors seport on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?unmetunmetunmetmetunmetunmet10. Did the review authors seport on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?unmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmet11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review?critical domain)metN/AN/AmetN/A12. Did the review authors second for RoB in individual studies on the review?metunmetunmetunmetunmet13. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any hetorgen	1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?	met	unmet	met	met	unmet
report justify any significant deviations from the protocol? (critical domain) a. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?unmetunmetunmetunmetmet4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? (critical domain)unmetunmetunmetmetpartially met5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?unmetunmetunmetmetunmetunmet6. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? (critical domain)unmetunmetunmetmetunmetunmet8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?unmetunmetunmetmetpartially metpartially met9. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included domain)10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included to the review?unmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmet11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?N/AN/AN/AN/A13. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?metunmetunmetunmetmet14. Did the review authors seport on the sources of funding for , and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the review?metN/AN/AN/A15. Did the review authors account for RoB in individua	2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the	unmet	unmet	unmet	met	partially met
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? (critical domain)partially metunmetpartially metmetpartially met6. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?unmetunmetunmetmetunmetunmet7. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?metunmetmetunmetmetunmetunmet7. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?unmetunmetmetunmetmetunmet8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?unmetunmetunmetmetmetmet9. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included domain)unmetunmetunmetmetunmetunmet10. Did the review authors aperformed did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the review? (critical domain)metN/AN/AmetN/A13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?metunmetmetmetN/A14. Did the review authors performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out any heterogeneity observed in the review? (critical domain)metunmetmetmetmet15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an dequate investigation of publication bias (small study	<b>report justify any significant deviations from the protocol? (critical domain)</b> 3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?	unmet	unmet	unmet	met	met
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?unmetunmetmetunmetmetunmet6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?metunmetmetmetunmetmetunmet7. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?unmetunmetmetunmetmetmetunmet8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?unmetunmetunmetmetmetmetmet9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review? (critical domain)unmetunmetunmetmetunmetmetunmet10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?unmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmet11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential 	4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? (critical domain)	partially met	unmet	partially met	met	partially met
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate? met unmet met met unmet met unmet partially met partially met   7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? (critical domain) unmet unmet unmet met met met met partially met partially met partially met   8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail? unmet unmet unmet met me	5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	unmet	unmet	met	unmet	unmet
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? (critical domain)unmetunmetpartially metmetpartially met8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?unmetunmetunmetmetmetmetmet9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review? (critical domain)metunmetmetunmetmetunmetmetunmet10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?unmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmet11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the review?N/AN/AmetN/AN/A13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?metunmetunmetunmetmetmetmet14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?metunmetunmetunmetmetmetmet15. If they performed quantitative synthesis (critical domain)unmetN/AN/AmetN/AM/A16. Did the review authors report any potentialsources of conflict of interest,unmetunmetunmetunmetmet16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflic	6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	met	unmet	met	met	unmet
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail? unmet unmet met m	7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? (critical domain)	unmet	unmet	partially met	met	partially met
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review? (critical domain) met unmet partially met met unmet   10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review? unmet N/A unmet unmet unmet unmet unmet unmet unmet unmet N/A N/A <td>8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</td> <td>unmet</td> <td>unmet</td> <td>met</td> <td>met</td> <td>met</td>	8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	unmet	unmet	met	met	met
domain) 10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?unmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmet11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results? (critical domain) 12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?N/AN/AM/AmetN/A13. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review? 15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? (critical domain) 16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest,unmetmetN/AN/AmetN/A16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest,unmetmetunmetunmetunmet	9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review? (critical	met	unmet	partially met	met	unmet
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review? unmet N/A Did the review authors secont f	domain)					
11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results? (critical domain) 12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?metN/AN/AmetN/A13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review? (critical domain)metN/AN/AmetN/A14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?metunmetmetmetmet15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? (critical domain)unmetN/AN/AMet16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest,unmetmetunmetunmetunmet	10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	unmet	unmet	met	unmet	unmet
12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or othermetN/AN/AmetN/A13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review? (critical domain)metunmetunmetmetmet14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?metunmetmetmet15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? (critical domain)unmetN/AN/AmetN/A16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest,unmetmetunmetunmetunmetunmet	11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results? (critical domain)	met	N/A	N/A	met	N/A
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review? (critical domain)metunmetmetmetmet14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?metunmetmetmetmetmetmet15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? (critical domain)unmetN/AN/AmetN/A16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest,unmetmetunmetunmetunmetunmetunmet	12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?	met	N/A	N/A	met	N/A
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?metunmetmetmetmetmet15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? (critical domain)metmetmetmetmetmet16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest,unmetN/AN/AunmetN/A	13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review? (critical domain)	met	unmet	unmet	met	met
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? (critical domain) unmet N/A N/A met N/A   16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, unmet met unmet unmet unmet unmet unmet unmet unmet unmet unmet N/A Met N/A	14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	met	unmet	met	met	met
16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, unmet unmet unmet unmet unmet	15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? (critical domain)	unmet	N/A	N/A	met	N/A
	16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest,	unmet	met	unmet	unmet	unmet

including any funding they received for conducting the review?						
	Overall rating	Critically low	Critically low	Critically low	Moderate confidence	Low confidence
Key: N/A – not applicable	Overall rating	connuence	connuence	connuence		

Table 5. Usefulness of Economic Evaluations to Decision	Making
---	--------

Study	Level of usefulness	Primary reasons
MacNeil Vroomen et al (39)	Strong	Appropriate statistical analysis, time horizon > than one year
Meads et al (7)	Strong	Appropriate statistical analysis, time horizon > than one year
Michalowsky et al (32)	Strong	Appropriate statistical analysis, time horizon > than one year
Orgeta et al (23)	Strong	Appropriate statistical analysis, time horizon > than one year
Rädke et al (33)	Strong	Appropriate statistical analysis, time horizon > than one year
Tanajewski et al (19)	Strong	Appropriate statistical analysis, time horizon > than one year
Rosenvall et al (35)	Strong	Sensitivity analysis performed, 4-year time horizon
El Alili et al (37)	Strong	Appropriate statistical analysis, time horizon one year
Lamb et al (28)	Strong	Appropriate statistical analysis, time horizon one year
Brown et al (18)	Moderate	Short time horizon, ICER was reported
Laakkonen et al (34)	Moderate	Long time horizon, ICER not reported
D'Amico et al (22)	Moderate	Appropriate statistical analysis, short time horizon
D'Amico et al (20)	Moderate	Appropriate statistical analysis, short time horizon
Howard et al (29)	Moderate	Appropriate statistical analysis, short time horizon
Livingston et al (27)	Moderate	Appropriate statistical analysis, short time horizon
Pitkala et al (36)	Moderate	Appropriate statistical analysis, no ICER reported
Romeo et al (21)	Moderate	Appropriate statistical analysis, short time horizon
Sogaard et al (42)	Moderate	Appropriate statistical analysis, no ICER presented
Sopina et al (43)	Moderate	Appropriate statistical analysis, short time horizon
Woods et al (25)	Moderate	Appropriate statistical analysis, short time horizon
Mostardt et al (31)	Moderate	Appropriate statistical analysis, not an RCT or observational study
Williams et al (40)	Moderate	Statistical analysis not appropriate, time horizon > than one year
Saxena et al (47)	Limited	ICER not reported for all comparison groups
Menn et al (30)	Limited	Statistical analysis not appropriate, no ICER presented
Ballard et al (26)	Limited	Short time horizon, no ICER presented
Davis et al (46)	Limited	Short time horizon, no ICER presented
Jennings et al (41)	Limited	Analysis of uncertainty not stated, no ICER presented
Spector et al (24)	Limited	Short time horizon, no ICER presented
Van de Ven et al (38)	Limited	Statistical analysis not appropriate, no ICER presented
Henderson et al (48)	Limited	Short time horizon, not an RCT or observational study
Sado et al (45)	Limited	No ICER presented, not an RCT or observational study
Mervin et al (44)	Limited	Short time horizon, no ICER presented, lack of sensitivity analysis

Table 6. Study Results									
Author, Country	Int	Intervention group cost <sup>a</sup>	Comparison group cost	Intervention group outcome	Comparison group outcome	Main result			
Brown et al (18), UK	Cog	Care Home £18,635; Lives alone £9,053; lives with someone £18,853; Low ADAS-Cog 18,675; High ADAS-Cog £15,266	Care Home £17,485; Lives alone £9,155; lives with someone £15,026; Low ADAS-Cog £16,398; High ADAS-Cog £13,791	0.07 QALYS (EQ- 5D) Lives alone		Intervention dominant over TAU in terms of QALYS for the sub-group living alone			
D'Amico et al (22), UK	Cog	£11,306	£11,440		Incremental effect: 0.0176 QALYS (calculated with Proxy EQ-5D)	ICER = £26,835/QALYS (calculated by Proxy EQ-5D)			
Laakkonen et al (34), Finland	Cog	€8,947	€9,383	-0.03 HRQoL mean score	-0.04 mean change in HRQoL	There was no change between the groups in HRQoL according to 15D. However, the intervention had beneficial effects on cognitive function without increasing total costs			
Mervin et al (44), Australia	Cog	\$13,827 (PARO, interactive toy); \$12,078 (Soft toy)	\$6,862	-2.66 CMAI-SF mean change (PARO), -1.68 CMAI-SF mean change (Soft toy)	1.22 CMAI-SF mean change	Incremental cost per unit improvement in CMAI-SF was \$13.01 for the PARO group and \$12.85 for the soft toy group relative to usual care			
Orgeta et al (23), UK	Cog	£4,740 (HSC); £9770 (Societal)	£4,670 (HSC); £10,630 (Societal)	ADAS-Cog 20.53, QoL-AD 37.96	21.19 ADAS- Cog, 37.71 QoL- AD	Intervention dominated by TAU in terms of ADAS-Cog, no differences in primary outcomes of cognition or quality of life			
Sado et al (45), Japan	Cog	\$795	not stated	68.4 CT for CNLTC mean	83.3 mean score CT for	Intervention showed \$21 per month cost- saving/unit of CT for CNLTC for avoiding			

	1					
				score	CNLTC	increased long term care costs
Sogaard et al (42), Denmark	Cog	€ 84,142 per dyad	€ 80,741	3.26 QALYS	3.46 QALYS	Intervention dominated by TAU in terms of QALYS
Spector et al (24), UK	Cog	£2,344	£1,259	-4.59 mean score Rating anxiety in dementia for PwD		Intervention was cost neutral
Woods et al (25), UK	Cog	£5,853	£4,309	37.013 QoL-AD, 0.644 QALYS	36.416 QoL-AD, 0.643 QALYS	ICER = £2,586/per 0.597 change in QoL-AD score (no ICER expressed in £/QALYS)
Ballard et al (26), UK	Train	£2,713 (intervention cost); £29702 (total HSC costs)	£0 (intervention cost); £34,442 (total HSC costs)	4.78-point improvement in DEMQOL	2.54-point improvement in DEMQOL (mean difference)	Intervention demonstrates benefits in terms of quality of life, agitation, and neuropsychiatric symptoms, as well as cost savings
El Alili et al (37), Netherlands	Train	£7,173 (total societal costs)	£7,484 (total societal costs)	Incremental effect: 0.40 QALYS	0.39 QALÝS	Intervention dominant over TAU in terms of QALYS
Livingston et al (27), UK	Train	£1,379	£1,175	0.346 QALYS	0.332 QALYS	ICER = £14,064/QALYS gained
Meads et al (7), UK	Train	£3,539	£2,060	0.718 QALYS	0.708 QALYS	ICER = £64,380/QALYS gained
Menn et al (30), Germany	Train	€80,361 (Group B); €75,754 (Group C)	Group A €82,745	x	X	Group B = $0.858$ Hazard rate on time to institutionalisation over 4 years Group C = $1.133$ Hazard rate on time to institutionalisation over 4 years
Romeo et al (21), UK	Train	£32,112	£34,215	1.96 DEMQOL proxy score (mean change)		Intervention dominant over TAU in terms of QALYS gained
Van de Ven et al (38), Netherlands	Train	\$0.63 per resident/day	not stated	3.33 falls (mean annual no.), \$3.50 per resident/day (total healthcare consumption), \$0.13 per	1.81 falls (mean annual no.), \$3.23 per resident/day (total healthcare consumption), \$0.25 per	Intervention was cost neutral

				resident/day	resident/day	
				drug use)	drug use)	
Williams et al (40), USA	Train	\$79.69/per staff member (Elderspeak); \$39.84/per resident (Resistive to care)	x	11.80% (reduction in time staff used Elderspeak), 9.24 % reduction in time residents resistive to care	5 /	ICER = \$4/resident per one percentage point reduction in Resistiveness to care ICER = \$7/staff member per one percentage point reduction in Elderspeak
Henderson et al (48), Italy, Poland, UK	Multi- discipl inary	£10,650 (total health & social care costs)	£4,709 (total health & social care costs)	Incremental effect 0.40 QALYS	0.40 QALYS, mean difference 0.01 QALYS	ICER = £832,636/QALYS gained for PwD. For QALYS the probability of c/e was 0 at WTP of £0 to £350,000. For QOL-AD, the probability of c/e of intervention was 50% at WTP of €5,000 for a one-point increase
Jennings et al (41), USA	Multi- discipl inary	\$317 per quarter	not stated	not stated	not stated	Hazard ratio of 0.60, program participants less likely to be admitted to long-term care facility than TAU
MacNeil Vroomen et al (39), Netherlands	Multi- discipl inary	€69,435 (ICMM); €84,155 (LM)	€107,627	1.25 QALYS (ICMM), 1.18 QALYS (LM)	1.27 QALYS	ICER (ICMM v LM) = ICMM dominates ICER (LM v control) = $\notin$ 460,135 ICER (ICMM v control) = unstated
Michalowsky et al (32), Germany	Multi- discipl inary	€24,046	€ 24,615	1.349 QALYS	1.300 QALYS	Intervention dominant over TAU in terms of QALYS
Mostardt et al (31), Germany	Multi- discipl inary	€1,409	€ 1,292	16.4 (months in home environment)	12.2 (months in home environment)	ICER= €53 per additional month in a home environment
Rädke et al (33), Germany	Multi- discipl inary	unavailable	unavailable	+0.05 QALYS	Incremental effect: +0.049 QALYS	Intervention dominant over TAU in terms of QALYS gained
Rosenvall et al (35), UK	Multi- discipl inary	€527 (CM); €8,000 (Rehabilitative); €341 (SFS)	N/A		N/A	Economic break-even points reached if a patient's transition to long-term care is delayed by: Care management = 2.8 days

		All costs per pt/year				Structured family support = 1.8 days Rehabilitative cognitive, physical and social activation = 43.0 days
Saxena et al (47), Singapore	Multi- discipl inary	\$15,308 (MC); \$13,275 (PCDC); \$15,766 (Other clinics)		0.78 (PCDC), 0.76 (Other polyclinics clinics) (EQ-5D scores)		ICER = \$S29,042/QALYS for the PCDC group when compared with the MC group
D'Amico et al (20), UK	PE	£10,533	£7,805	N/A	Incremental effect: 0.0055 QALYS	ICER = £286,440 QALYS (calculated by DEMQOL-Proxy) Not c/e when outcomes are calculated by QALYS
Davis et al (46), Canada	PE	\$2,255 (CAD) (Resistance); \$1,417.15 (CAD) (Aerobic)	\$2,387 (CAD) (Balance and tone)	44.61 (Resistance), 48.27 (Aerobic) (seconds gained/lost on Stroop test)	54.69 (Balance and tone) (seconds gained/lost on Stroop test)	Both the aerobic and the resistance classes dominate balance and tone classes in terms of seconds gained/lost on Stroop test
Lamb et al (28), UK	PE	£5,580	£3,917	0.787 QALYS	0.826 QALYS	Intervention dominated by TAU in terms of QALYS
Pitkala et al (36), Finland	PE	\$25,112 per dyad/per year (HE group); \$2,2066 per dyad/per year (GE group)	\$34,121per dyad/per year (Control group)	-7.1 (HE group), -10.3 (GE group) (FIM change)	-14.4 (control group) (FIM change)	HE & GE interventions had beneficial effects on the physical functioning of pts with AD, without increasing the total costs of health and social services
Sopina et al (43), Denmark	PE	£608 (including transport)	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	ICER= €158,520/QALYS gained
Howard et al (29), UK	Other	£19,649 (HSC), £56,000 (Societal)	£15,186 (HSC), £53,378 (Societal)	1.201 QALYS	1.306 QALYS	ICER= £8,635/QALYS (HSC), £33,672/QALYS (Societal)
Tanajewski et al (19), UK	Other	£7,714	£7,862	0.109 QALYS	0.108 QALYS	Intervention dominant over TAU in terms of QALYS
<sup>a</sup> - Mean cost per perso intervention unless other	n over the wise stated	length of the d.				

**Key:** ADAS-Cog - Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale–Cognitive Subscale, CAD – Canadian dollars, C/E – cost effectiveness, CMAI-SF - Cohen-Mansfield Agitation Inventory – short form, CM – Care management, Cog – cognitive, Collab – multi-disciplinary, CT for CNLTC - Criterion Time for Certification of Needed Long-Term-Care, DEMQOL - Dementia Quality of Life, EQ-5D – health related quality of life measure, FIM - Functional Independence Measure, GE group – group-based exercise, HE group – tailored home-based exercise, HRQol - Health related quality of life, HSC – health and social care, ICER – incremental cost effectiveness ratio, ICMM – intensive care management model, INT – intervention type, LM – linkage model, MC – memory clinic, PCDC – primary care dementia clinic, PE – physical exercise, PwD – person with dementia, QALYS – quality adjusted life years, QoL-AD - Quality of Life in Alzheimer Disease, RTC – resistiveness to care, SFS – Structured family support, TAU – treatment as usual, Train – training interventions, WTP – willingness to pay

Study	Title/Abstract	Introduction (2 items)	Methods (10 <sup>ª</sup> items)	Results (4 <sup>b</sup> items)	Discussion (1 item)	Disclosure (2 items)	Total	% Items
Cognitive					(Thom)			mot
Brown et al (18)	1.5	2	6.5	2.5	1	2	15.5	74%
D'Amico et al (22)	2	1.5	9	4	1	2	19.5	93%
Laakkonen et al (34)	1.5	2	6.5	3.5	1	1	15.5	74%
Mervin et al (44)	1.5	2	8	1	1	2	15.5	74%
Orgeta et al (23)	1.5	2	8	3	1	2	17.5	83%
Sado et al (45)	1	2	9	2	1	2	17	81%
Sogaard et al (42)	2	2	8.5	2	1	2	17.5	83%
Spector et al (24)	1.5	2	6	2	1	2	14.5	69%
Woods et al (25)	1.5	1	8	4	1	2	17.5	83%
Means	1.6	1.8	7.7	2.7	1.0	1.9	16.7	79%
Training								
Ballard et al (26)	1.5	2	4	3	1	2	13.5	64%
El Alili et al (37)	2	2	8	3	1	2	18.0	86%
Livingston et al (27)	1.5	2	8.5	3	1	1	17.0	81%
Meads et al (7)	2	1.5	8.5	3	1	2	18.0	86%
Menn et al (30)	2	2	8.5	4	1	1	18.5	88%
Romeo et al (21)	1.5	2	9.5	1	1	1	16.0	76%
Van de Ven et al (38)	1	2	7	1	0.5	2	13.5	64%
Williams et al (40)	1	1.5	7	1.5	1	2	14.0	67%
Means	1.6	1.9	7.6	2.4	0.9	1.6	16.1	76%
Multi-disciplinary								
Henderson et al (48)	1.5	2	9	3	1	2	18.5	88%
Jennings et al (41)	1	1	6.5	3	0.5	1	13	62%
MacNeil Vroomen et al (39)	1.5	2	9	4	1	1.5	19	90%
Michalowsky et al (32)	2	2	8.5	1.5	1	2	17	81%
Mostardt et al (31)	2	2	9.5	4	1	2	20.5	98%
Rädke et al (33)	1.5	2	6	2	1	2	14.5	69%
Rosenvall et al (35)	1	2	8.5	4	1	2	18.5	69%

#### Table 7. Quality Assessment of Studies using CHEERS (16)

39

Saxena et al (47)	1	2	5.5	4	1	2	15.5	74%
Means	1.4	1.9	7.8	3.2	0.9	1.8	17.1	79%
Exercise								
D'Amico et al (20)	2	2	10	3	1	2	20	95%
Davis et al (46)	1.5	1.5	9	3	1	2	18	86%
Lamb et al (28)	1.5	2	9	4	1	2	19.5	93%
Pitkala et al (36)	1.5	2	8.5	2	1	2	17	81%
Sopina et al (43)	1	1.5	7.5	3	1	0	14	67%
Means	1.5	1.8	8.8	3.0	1.0	1.6	17.7	84%
Other								
Tanajewski et al (19)	1.5	2	9	4	1	2	19.5	93%
Howard et al (29)	2	2	8.5	4	1	1	18.5	88%
Means	1.8	2.0	8.8	4.0	1.0	1.5	19.0	90%
a 1 C it among a second of the Dara								

<sup>a</sup> 15 items assessed for Rosenvall et al modelling study <sup>b</sup> 5 items assessed for Rosenvall et al modelling study