

# Aging Clinical and Experimental Research

## A systematic review of specialist inpatient dementia care services versus standard inpatient dementia care in acute hospitals

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	ACER-D-18-00306
<b>Full Title:</b>	A systematic review of specialist inpatient dementia care services versus standard inpatient dementia care in acute hospitals
<b>Article Type:</b>	Review
<b>Funding Information:</b>	
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>Background: Specialist inpatient dementia units (SIDU) have been developed to address adverse outcomes often experienced by people living with dementia admitted to acute hospitals. However, the evidence base of their effectiveness remains limited.</p> <p>Aim: To review the current literature to establish the comparative effectiveness of acute hospital SIDU versus standard ward care (SWC).</p> <p>Methods: Computerised searches of 12 biomedical databases from inception to 31st October 2017. Studies of inpatients with any form of dementia in acute hospitals, published in English-language peer-reviewed journals, using experimental, observational or qualitative study designs, comparing SIDU with SWC and which measured any qualitative or quantitative outcome of the patient or carer experience were included in the search criteria. We used a standardised data extraction and appraisal form.</p> <p>Results: Three of 46 full-text studies evaluated were suitable for analysis. Due to study heterogeneity, pooled odds ratios were only possible for mortality (OR 1.06 (CI 1.0 - 1.4)). Otherwise, a narrative synthesis was performed. Although quantitative measures of length of stay, mortality and behavioural and psychiatric symptoms of dementia are not significantly lower, SIDU are associated with greater patient and carer satisfaction, reduced readmission rates, more accurate and comprehensive assessment processes, documentation of resuscitation decisions, and increased rates of discharge to the patient's own home.</p> <p>Conclusions: Although SIDU may be associated with improved care outcomes, the current evidence of their effectiveness is markedly limited. Further research and service evaluation of SIDU as a method for providing high quality dementia care in acute NHS Trusts is needed. PROSPERO: CRD42017078364.</p>
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Beth McCausland, MBBS, BSc University of Southampton UNITED KINGDOM
<b>Corresponding Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:</b>	
<b>First Author:</b>	Beth McCausland, MBBS, BSc
<b>First Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Beth McCausland, MBBS, BSc Harnish Patel Jay Amin David Baldwin Kieran Loughran

	Victoria Osman-Hicks
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Author Comments:</b>	<p>We emailed the following cover letter to the editors and were advised to submit the review for consideration, many thanks.</p> <p>Dr Beth McCausland, MBBS, BSc University of Southampton Faculty of Medicine (Clinical and experimental Sciences), Medicine for Older People and Department of Psychological Medicine University Hospital Southampton.</p> <p>Department of Psychological Medicine, Princess Anne Hospital, Coxford Rd, Southampton, SO16 5YA.</p> <p>16th May 2018</p> <p>To the Editors at ACER,</p> <p>We wish to submit an original research article entitled "A systematic review of specialist inpatient dementia care services versus standard inpatient dementia care in acute hospitals" for consideration.</p> <p>In this paper, we conduct a systematic review of the evidence available for specialist inpatient dementia care units. These wards are being recommended nationally as a means to address the potential health inequalities faced by people with dementia admitted to acute trusts with a co-morbid medical condition.</p> <p>If these wards can reduce length of stay by one week, it could save the NHS £80million yearly. The surprising paucity in eligible studies directly contradicts the growing number of older people living with dementia admitted acutely. Hospitals nationwide need to develop innovative ways to provide high quality specialist dementia care in line with NHS and Royal College standards, whilst maintaining flow and avoiding inappropriate re-admission.</p> <p>We believe that this manuscript is appropriate for publication by ACER because it meets the journal's aims and scope regarding clinical gerontology.</p> <p>We are passionate about promoting the best possible care for people with dementia, in the context of busy acute hospitals with bed pressures and variable funding. Our review demonstrates that although quantitative measures such as length of stay, morbidity and mortality are not significantly different between the specialist dementia units and standard ward care, both patients and carers felt there was a qualitative difference in the care given. Patient dignity, autonomy and carer satisfaction are as important in our opinion as the quantitative measures analysed. We believe this model of care is therefore worthwhile, and the lack of significant evidence available may simply be because these wards are still relatively new.</p> <p>It is vital therefore to publish more research in this area. This review is a call for further research and published service evaluation of specialist dementia care units nationally.</p> <p>We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.</p> <p>Please address all correspondence concerning this manuscript to me at <a href="mailto:bmccausland@doctors.org.uk">bmccausland@doctors.org.uk</a>.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of this manuscript.</p>

Sincerely,

Dr Beth McCausland  
Academic Foundation Year Two trainee  
University of Southampton Faculty of Medicine (clinical and experimental sciences)  
University Hospital Southampton Medicine for Older People and Department of  
Psychological Medicine

1 **A systematic review of specialist inpatient dementia care services**  
2  
3  
4 **versus standard inpatient dementia care in acute hospitals**  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 McCausland BMS<sup>1,2</sup>, Patel HP<sup>3-6</sup>, Amin J<sup>1,2</sup>, Baldwin DS<sup>1</sup>, Loughran K<sup>1</sup>, Osman-Hicks  
10 VC<sup>1,2</sup>.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 <sup>1</sup>University of Southampton Faculty of Medicine (Clinical and Experimental Sciences),  
17

18 <sup>2</sup>Department of Psychological Medicine, University Hospital Southampton, <sup>3</sup>Academic  
19 Geriatric Medicine, University of Southampton, University Hospital Southampton NHS  
20 Foundation Trust, <sup>4</sup>Medicine for Older People Southampton, Hampshire, UK, <sup>5</sup>Medical  
21 Research Council Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University Hospital Southampton,  
22

23  
24  
25

26  
27  
28

29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 **Address for Correspondence:**  
44

45 Dr Beth McCausland (ORCID 0000-0001-9096-3289)  
46

47 University of Southampton Faculty of Medicine (Clinical and Experimental Sciences),  
48

49 University Hospital Southampton,  
50

51 Tremona Road,  
52

53 Southampton,  
54

55 SO16 6YD.  
56

57 Email: [bmccausland@dcoctors.org.uk](mailto:bmccausland@dcoctors.org.uk)  
58

59 Telephone: (+44) 07917336195  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Abstract

**Background:** Specialist inpatient dementia units (SIDU) have been developed to address adverse outcomes often experienced by people living with dementia admitted to acute hospitals. However, the evidence base of their effectiveness remains limited.

**Aim:** To review the current literature to establish the comparative effectiveness of acute hospital SIDU versus standard ward care (SWC).

**Methods:** Computerised searches of 12 biomedical databases from inception to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2017. Studies of inpatients with any form of dementia in acute hospitals, published in English-language peer-reviewed journals, using experimental, observational or qualitative study designs, comparing SIDU with SWC and which measured any qualitative or quantitative outcome of the patient or carer experience were included in the search criteria. We used a standardised data extraction and appraisal form.

**Results:** Three of 46 full-text studies evaluated were suitable for analysis. Due to study heterogeneity, pooled odds ratios were only possible for mortality (OR 1.06 (CI 1.0 – 1.4)). Otherwise, a narrative synthesis was performed. Although quantitative measures of length of stay, mortality and behavioural and psychiatric symptoms of dementia are not significantly lower, SIDU are associated with greater patient and carer satisfaction, reduced readmission rates, more accurate and comprehensive assessment processes, documentation of resuscitation decisions, and increased rates of discharge to the patient's own home.

**Conclusions:** Although SIDU may be associated with improved care outcomes, the current evidence of their effectiveness is markedly limited. Further research and service evaluation of SIDU as a method for providing high quality dementia care in acute NHS Trusts is needed. PROSPERO: CRD42017078364.

## **Introduction**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Dementia represents a significant and increasing health and social care problem in  
6  
7 the context of an ageing population [1,2]. Approximately 850,000 people in the UK live  
8  
9 with dementia, costing the UK economy an estimated £26 billion annually [3,4]. Recent  
10  
11 data indicate that 86.7% of patients aged over 75 admitted to UK NHS Trusts for longer  
12  
13 than 72 hours were identified as potentially having dementia [5]. Acute hospital  
14  
15 admission for patients living with dementia is associated with adverse outcomes from  
16  
17 increased length of stay (LOS), morbidity and mortality [6]. The continued assessment  
18  
19 and improvement of NHS dementia care is therefore necessary [7].  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Multidisciplinary, specialist inpatient dementia units (SIDU) have been developed  
28  
29 within acute Trusts for patients with dementia and concomitant acute medical illness,  
30  
31 whose needs are more complex. Their aim is to increase patient dignity and autonomy  
32  
33 with person-centred care [8] provided by staff from both psychiatric and geriatric care  
34  
35 backgrounds; trained in managing the behavioural and psychological symptoms of  
36  
37 dementia (BPSD) and delirium [9]. These symptoms are often difficult to identify and  
38  
39 manage for untrained staff, particularly within the pressured environment of acute  
40  
41 hospitals [10,11]. If SIDU can reduce LOS by one week per patient, the NHS could  
42  
43 save up to £80million yearly [12].  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 The aim of this systematic review was to determine whether acute hospital SIDU are  
52  
53 effective when compared with standard inpatient ward care (SWC) in improving  
54  
55 outcomes for patients living with dementia.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## **Methods**

### **Search strategy and selection criteria**

We attempted to locate all peer-reviewed published studies meeting the selection criteria: 1) included men and/or women of any age with any form of dementia 2) presented the results of peer-reviewed English-language research using the following study designs: experimental studies (e.g. randomised controlled trials, non-randomised controlled trials, parallel group studies), before and after studies, interrupted time series studies, case note reviews, cohort studies, case-control studies, cross-sectional studies, case studies, case series, or any qualitative design (e.g., in depth interviews, focus groups); 3) included participants who were inpatients of an acute hospital; 4) compared SIDU with SWC; 5) measured qualitative or quantitative outcome measures of patient and/or carer experience of the hospital stay. PRISMA reporting guidelines were followed [13,14]. PROSPERO registration: CRD42017078364.

General discussion papers, comments, letters, book chapters, single case studies, national reports and published conference abstracts were excluded. As there are no gold diagnostic standards aside from post mortem examination, searches were not restricted to studies that used a validated dementia diagnostic method. If stated the method of assessing dementia was recorded. As we were focusing on acute Trusts in the UK and Ireland, we did not include non-English language studies. If multiple eligible publications from the same study were identified, the one with the largest sample size was included to minimise duplication.

1 The search strategy comprised 1) electronic searches of 12 biomedical databases  
2 (Cochrane, Medline, Embase, Web of Science, Psychinfo, Health Management  
3 Information Consortium, British Nursing Index, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied  
4 Health Literature, Science Direct, Allied and Complementary Medicine Database,  
5 Health Business Elite and Pubmed), from their inception to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2017; 2)  
6 citation tracking by manual reference list screening of included studies; 3) expert  
7 recommendations (Professors Rowan Harwood and Sube Bannerjee).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 **Search Terms**

20  
21 Dementia search terms were adapted from a Cochrane systematic review [15]. These  
22 were combined with MESH subject heading terms for dementia and health care  
23 services, then limited to acute hospitals or inpatient settings, whichever yielded most  
24 results, Appendix 1.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 **Data extraction and quality appraisal**

33  
34 Identified abstracts were downloaded to Endnote© software (Thompson Reuters,  
35 Version X7) and assessed against the inclusion criteria. A random selection of 10% of  
36 the abstracts was screened independently as a quality check. Potentially eligible  
37 studies were downloaded and evaluated against a standardised inclusion checklist. A  
38 standardised data extraction form was then used (Appendix 2). Excluded references  
39 were categorised by the primary reason for exclusion. If necessary, the corresponding  
40 authors were contacted for clarification or raw data.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Two reviewers independently methodologically assessed the included studies using a  
57 standardised appraisal form with a maximum score of 40, developed by Trevillion et  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

al. using criteria adapted from validated tools [16-18] (Appendix 3). The overall study quality was reported for all included studies.

## **Data analysis**

Descriptive analyses were conducted to summarise the included studies. Forest plots were generated using primary data extracted from the studies using DistillerSR Forest Plot Generator from Evidence Partners. Studies that scored poorly in domains relating to bias were not included in the meta-analysis. Funnel plots for detecting publication bias, Cochrane's  $I^2$  statistic for quantification of study heterogeneity and meta-analyses were not performed as not enough studies met the inclusion criteria.

## **Results**

The results of the study selection strategy and reasons for exclusion are presented in Figure 1. Only three studies qualified for inclusion, with little consistency in their outcome measures [19-21]. This heterogeneity meant that aside from mortality, the data were not suitable to pool for meta-analysis. A narrative synthesis of the remaining data was performed. The study characteristics are summarised in Table 1 [*table should be included here*]. Simplified schematic results for comparison are given in Table 2; excluding the study by Spencer et al. [19] as their qualitative results could not be similarly summarised. The combined result for the critical appraisal is included in Table 1. None of the included studies were excluded for scoring poorly on quality.

Outcome	Briggs et al. [20]		Goldberg et al. [21]	
	SIDU	SWC	SIDU	SWC
<b>Quantitative:</b>				
Length of stay	↔	↔	↔	↔
Days spent at home	-	-	↔	↔
Discharged to their own home	-	-	↑	↓
Discharged to new care home	-	-	↓	↑
Rate of readmission	-	-	↓	↑
Mortality	↔	↔	↔	↔
Rates of BPSD	↔	↔	↔	↔
Incidence of delirium**	↑	↓	-	-
New antipsychotic medications**	↑	↓	-	-
Overall antipsychotic prescription rates	↔	↔	-	-
Documentation of treatment decisions	↔	↔	-	-
Accurate drug history**	↑	↓	-	-
Accurate co-morbidities documented**	↑	↓	-	-
Collateral history taken regarding cognition**	↑	↓	-	-
Single plan for discharge**	↑	↓	-	-
Resuscitation status documented**	↑	↓	-	-
Barthel index score	-	-	↔	↔
MMSE score	-	-	↔	↔
<b>Qualitative:</b>				
Patient Quality of Life	-	-	↔	↔
Carer strain index	-	-	↔	↔
Carer Psychological wellbeing	-	-	↔	↔
Patient positive mood/engaged*	-	-	↑	↓
Patient active	-	-	↑	↓
Patient interacting with others socially	-	-	↑	↓

**Table 2 – Schematic results summary.** SIDU: Specialist Inpatient Dementia Units (as defined by the source papers); SWC: Standard Ward Care. The symbols ↑ for more, ↓ for less and ↔ for equivalent outcomes are used to summarise the results simply. A dash (-) is used to denote that this was not measured by the study. \*P value <0.05; \*\*Odds ratio > 1.

## Results synthesis

1  
2 Only LOS, rates of BPSD and mortality were measured by more than one study. From  
3  
4 these, only mortality data allowed the generation of odds ratios and a Forest plot,  
5  
6 Figure 2. No significant difference was found in mortality between the SIDU and SWC  
7  
8 in either study; Briggs et al. [20] (SIDU 9% vs. SWC 8%, OR 1.21; CI 0.65 – 2.22;  
9  
10 P=0.55) Goldberg et al. [21] (22% SIDU vs. 25% for SWC; OR 0.87; CI 0.60 – 1.23;  
11  
12 P=0.46). The pooled odds ratio was 1.06 (CI 1.0 – 1.4).  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Neither quantitative study found a significant difference in LOS between the SIDU and  
20  
21 SWC (SIDU 28.5 ± 31.4 days vs. SWC 25.1 ± 38.7, P=0.471) [22]; (SIDU 16 vs. SWC  
22  
23 16 median days; adjusted CI 0.93-1.23, P=0.32) [21]. However, Briggs et al. [20] found  
24  
25 that fewer admissions on the SIDU lasted less than 7 days (SIDU 22.0% vs. SWC  
26  
27 28.3%, p=0.250) and Goldberg et al. [21] found that the SIDU had a non-significantly  
28  
29 lower rate of readmission (32% vs. 35% for SWC; CI -10 – 5%). Neither study found  
30  
31 that rates of BPSD varied significantly between SIDU and SWC; SIDU 30% vs. SWC  
32  
33 24%, (OR 1.36; CI 0.88-2.10) [22]; SIDU 18.5 vs. SWC 17 median number of recorded  
34  
35 symptoms at 90 days (CI -5 – 7.5, P=0.77) [21].  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

## Quantitative outcomes

44  
45 Briggs et al. [20] found the incidence of delirium was slightly greater on SIDU (SIDU  
46  
47 46% vs. 33%, OR 1.70; CI 1.14-2.53), as was the rate of new prescriptions of  
48  
49 antipsychotic medications (SIDU 50% vs. SWC 34%, OR 1.95; CI 1.08-3.51). Overall  
50  
51 antipsychotic prescription rate differences between the wards were non-significant  
52  
53 (SIDU 37% vs. SWC 38%, OR 0.96; CI 0.66-1.38) and there was little difference  
54  
55 between the wards in documenting the reasoning behind the prescriptions (SIDU 60%  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 vs. SWC 59%, OR; CI 0.55-1.98). SIDU patients more often had an accurate drug  
2 history documented (SIDU 97% vs. SWC 89%, OR 3.55; CI 1.41-8.92), accurate co-  
3 morbidity listed (SIDU 81% vs. SWC 79%, OR 1.62; CI 0.98-2.68) and had a  
4 recorded collateral history regarding cognitive impairment (SIDU 38% vs. 25%, OR  
5 1.85; CI 1.28-2.68). They were also more likely to have documented discharge plans  
6 (SIDU 66% vs. 45%, OR 2.38; CI 1.58-3.60) and resuscitation status decisions (SIDU  
7 39% vs. SWC 34%, OR 1.23; CI 0.82-1.84).

18 Goldberg et al. [21] found no significant difference in days spent at home 90 days post  
19 randomisation (SIDU 51 vs. 45 days median for SWC; CI -12 – 24, P=0.3). SIDU  
20 patients were non-significantly more likely to be discharged to their original home (74%  
21 vs. 70% for SWC; CI -3 – 11%) and less likely to go to a new care home (20% vs. 28%  
22 for SWC; CI -16 – 0%). There were no significant differences in Barthel index scores  
23 for physical disability (mean scores: SIDU 11.6/20 vs. 11.6/20 for SWC; adjusted CI -  
24 1.1 – 0.8, P=0.78) and Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) for cognitive  
25 impairment (SIDU 16/30 vs. SWC 16/30 median score; CI -4 – 2, P=0.83).

### 41 **Qualitative outcomes**

42 Goldberg et al. [21] found no significant difference at 90 days in patient quality of life  
43 (QOL) using multiple measures, carer strain index (SIDU 5.7/13 vs. SWC 5.8/13;  
44 adjusted CI -0.49 – 1.04, P=0.48) or carer psychological wellbeing (SIDU 12.5 (GHQ-  
45 12 - out of total 36) vs. SWC 12 (GHQ-12/36); adjusted CI 1.0-1.23, P=0.05). More  
46 carers were happy with the care received on the SIDU (91% satisfied overall vs. 83%  
47 on SWC, CI 2 – 15%; P=0.004). However, both study groups included care givers who  
48 were very dissatisfied with the quality of care received. The highest percentages of  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 very unsatisfied carer responses for both were around communication and keeping  
2 carers informed (SIDU 11% vs. SWC 17% 'very unsatisfied') and discharge  
3 arrangements (SIDU 12% vs. SWC 19% 'very unsatisfied'). In a subsample of patients,  
4 mood and engagement was represented by the proportion of time that a behaviour  
5 was observed during the designated period; SIDU patients were significantly more  
6 often in a positive mood/engaged (SIDU 79% vs. SWC 68%; CI 2-20, P=0.03), with  
7 trends for being more active (82% SIDU vs. 74% SWC; CI -2 – 16, P=0.10) and  
8 interacting with others (47% SIDU vs. 39% SWC; CI -3 – 19; P=0.06).  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Spencer et al. [19] performed a qualitative study of 40 carers' views of their experience  
22 of the Goldberg et al. [21] SIDU. The themes from semi-structured interviews included  
23 activities and boredom, staff knowledge, dementia, dignity and fundamental care,  
24 ward environment, communication between carers and staff and carer expectations.  
25 Carers of patients on SIDU commented their relatives were more often engaged in  
26 activities, whereas the SWC carers more often stated that their relatives had little to  
27 do. Staff on the SIDU were described as patient and compassionate with good  
28 knowledge of how to care for people with dementia, particularly regarding wandering  
29 and BPSD, displaying personalised support. This was the opposite for SWC, where  
30 carers felt the staff sometimes had negative attitudes towards dementia care, ignoring  
31 or shouting at the patients; particularly if they were showing challenging behaviours.  
32 Some carers felt they had to provide their relative one-to-one care as the ward staff  
33 were inexperienced.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 Both carer groups had some negative comments about dignity and privacy, including  
55 inadequate personal hygiene care and lack of privacy when 'toileting'. Both groups  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 were happy with the meals provided and efforts taken to offer alternatives if their  
2 relative had reduced appetite. However, neither were completely satisfied with the  
3 level of personal assistance given for eating and drinking. Both ward environments  
4 were felt to be clean, but the personalised touches on the SIDU were appreciated by  
5 the carers. Both SIDU and SWC carers wanted more communication with the ward  
6 staff; their main concern being feeling uninformed about their relatives' care and  
7 discharge. Both groups had positive experiences of interactions with the staff.  
8 However, poor relationships with staff or certain staff members were associated with  
9 greater general dissatisfaction with the level of care provided. It was commented that  
10 despite some measures being taken to understand patients' personal lives, particularly  
11 on the SIDU, the typically short LOS on acute wards made it difficult for staff to get to  
12 know their patients.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Overall, there was greater satisfaction with the level of care provided by the SIDU than  
32 by SWC. To address unmet expectations, carers were asked to suggest  
33 improvements. These included staff introducing themselves, increased stimulation for  
34 patients, allowing carers to attend ward rounds, extending visiting hours, using named  
35 nurses, daily updates from staff and having a separate bay for patients with more  
36 BPSD.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

## 48 **Discussion**

49 The SIDU model of care has been developed within acute Trusts as a means to  
50 improve the quality of care delivered and optimise flow through the hospital for people  
51 with dementia. However due to the limited number of eligible studies, this review found  
52 no significant differences in rates of BPSD, mortality and LOS between SIDU or SWC  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 from either study measuring quantitative outcomes [21,20]. As no other measure was  
2 used consistently across the eligible studies, the results of other quality and flow  
3 outcomes are from individual studies.  
4

5  
6  
7 This review cannot be used to draw firm conclusions about SIDU care and whether  
8 they should be established more widely. Nevertheless, it appears that more patients  
9 are being discharged to their own homes from SIDU, fewer to care home placements  
10 and that SIDU are associated with lower rates of readmission to hospital. This clearly  
11 has benefits to the acute trust as well as to the health economy. The SIDU model is  
12 associated with better recorded plans for discharge and recording of drug, medical  
13 and collateral histories and of resuscitation decisions. The higher incidence of delirium  
14 and of new antipsychotic prescriptions on SIDU found by Briggs et al. [20] may reflect  
15 more accurate recognition and treatment of delirium on SIDU compared with SWC,  
16 possibly be due to differences in staff expertise. Goldberg et al. [21] found that patients  
17 on the SIDU were more often in a positive mood, active and interacting with others  
18 than SWC patients. Overall carers were more satisfied with the care received on the  
19 SIDU, although both SIDU and SWC groups generated areas for improvement, and  
20 neither showed quantitative difference in measures of long-term patient QOL or carer  
21 strain and psychological wellbeing [19].  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **Critical appraisal**

46  
47 All three original studies were limited by omitting the definition of dementia used to  
48 classify their participants. Briggs et al. [20] did not record the severity of dementia  
49 which may have confounded their results. They studied patients admitted from home  
50 rather than care homes, and used the prevalence of BPSD as a proxy measure for  
51 dementia severity, stating that as there was no significant baseline difference between  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 groups, any confounders would be equally distributed and therefore not affect the  
2 analysis.  
3  
4  
5  
6

7 Briggs et al. [20] used retrospective data. This is reliant on accurate and thorough  
8 documentation of the care given throughout a patient's admission, which is often not  
9 completed. The authors argue that this is likely to be an issue for any similarly  
10 designed study and will have affected both SIDU and SWC equally, being therefore  
11 unlikely to significantly skew their results.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Goldberg et al. [21] and Spencer et al. [19] studies are generated from the same  
22 randomised controlled trial; the former presenting quantitative and qualitative  
23 outcomes from their entire study, the latter presenting the results of a smaller, more  
24 in-depth qualitative arm. Both studies were limited by differences between the groups  
25 at baseline due to pragmatically having to recruit participants after randomisation  
26 because of pressures on acute unit beds. This was adjusted for in the analysis, but  
27 may have introduced confounders.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Following up people with dementia is difficult as they are often frail and may move  
42 frequently between their home, healthcare systems and care placements. There are  
43 also ethical concerns relating to fluctuating capacity to consent to inclusion in a  
44 prolonged trial [21,23,24]. Goldberg et al. [21] used statistical imputation to address  
45 their missing follow up data, a model which replaces the missing value(s) with an  
46 estimate based on known results [25]. Although this is an established method of  
47 minimising bias introduced by missing data, it would have been preferable to have the  
48 complete data set to increase the likelihood of statistically significant results [26].  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2 As Briggs et al. [20] used data from a multi-centre systematic audit in Northern Ireland  
3  
4 and Ireland, it is likely that their results are externally valid. However, the other two  
5  
6 studies are from the same single hospital in the UK and so their results may not be  
7  
8 generalisable.  
9  
10

### 11 12 13 **Strengths and limitations of this review**

14  
15  
16 This review expands on previous research assessing the efficacy and cost-  
17  
18 effectiveness of SIDU. To our knowledge it is unique in being a systematic analysis  
19  
20 and appraisal of this literature. The protocol was published on PROSPERO for  
21  
22 transparency and replication, and PRISMA reporting guidelines were followed [13,14].  
23  
24 The searches and quality appraisal were checked and performed by an independent  
25  
26 reviewer to generate a more rigorous result. The data extraction and critical appraisal  
27  
28 tools used are standardised and have been piloted previously, with good reliability  
29  
30 [27]. Direct correspondence with experts ensured we had not missed unpublished,  
31  
32 potentially eligible studies.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 Publication and reporting bias may have affected our results as we did not include  
43  
44 non-English language studies, and due to the general preferential publication of  
45  
46 studies with positive results [28]. This review is limited by the lack of studies eligible  
47  
48 for inclusion, meaning we are not able to infer direction of causality between SIDU and  
49  
50 outcomes, or make definitive conclusions about the relative advantages or  
51  
52 disadvantages of SIDU.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## **Conclusion and future research**

1  
2 Although there is little consistent evidence that SIDU are superior to SWC, this more  
3  
4 person-focused form of clinical care for people with dementia appears to be associated  
5  
6 with greater patient and carer satisfaction, possible reduced readmission rates, more  
7  
8 accurate history taking and documentation of resuscitation decisions and increased  
9  
10 rates of discharge to the patients' own home. Although mortality data was comparable,  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

SIDU may represent a higher quality model of care for patients living with dementia.

Acute Trusts need to develop and demonstrate 'gold standard' dementia care models. Whilst quantitative measures such as LOS are important in evaluating service delivery, qualitative assessments are vital in ascertaining broader aspects of clinical care such as maintenance of dignity and autonomy.

The surprising paucity in eligible studies of SIDU directly contradicts the growing number of older people living with dementia admitted acutely. Hospitals nationwide need to develop innovative ways to provide high quality specialist dementia care in line with NHS and Royal College standards, whilst maintaining flow and avoiding inappropriate re-admissions [29]. It is vital to publish more research and service evaluation in this area.

## **Relevance to key groups**

These findings are relevant to any involved in developing dementia services, from healthcare workers to commissioning groups and policy makers.

## **Summary Box**

- What is known already:
  - Dementia in acute NHS hospitals is a growing challenge which needs to be addressed to meet the increasing need
  - SIDU have been developed to tackle the health inequalities experienced by people with dementia during acute admissions
- What this review adds:
  - Despite limited eligible studies, we can infer that some outcomes are improved by SIDU, such as lower rates of admission to a care home, rates of re-admission and of failed discharge from hospital
- What needs to be further investigated:
  - There needs to be further investigation of the efficacy and acceptability of these SIDU if they are being offered as a method nationally for improving dementia care in acute NHS Trusts
- Our future research aims:
  - We will conduct a service evaluation of our new SIDU ('Enhanced Dementia Care Ward') as informed by this review, evaluating dementia care by comparing the SIDU with general medicine and geriatric ward care in a busy Tertiary Care Centre in Southampton, UK.

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank Professor Helen Roberts and Dr Kylee Trevillion for their help and contributions towards this review.

## **Author contributions**

BM, KL, JA, DSB and VOH were involved in the conceptualisation of this review. BM performed the searches, study selection, analysis, critical appraisal and drafted the manuscript. VOH checked 10% of the searches and independently performed the critical appraisal. BM, JA, HPP and VOH edited the drafts and all authors read and approved the final version of this manuscript.

1  
2 **Conflict of interest**  
3

4 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest. HPP is supported by the  
5 National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) through the NIHR Southampton  
6 Biomedical Research Centre. No funding grants were used for this review. There were  
7 no competing interests from any of the authors in the completion of this manuscript.  
8  
9 There are no additional data for access.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## **References**

1. Parkin E, Baker C (2016) Dementia: policy, services and statistics. Briefing paper.
2. DepartmentofHealth (2015) Prime Minister's challenge on dementia 2020.  
GOV.UK, Cabinet Office
3. NationalHealthServiceEngland (2017) Dementia.  
<https://www.england.nhs.uk/mental-health/dementia/>.
4. Prince M, Knapp M, Guerchet M, McCrone P, Prina M, Comas-Herrera A, Wittenberg R, Adelaja B, Hu B, King D, Rehill A, Salimkumar D (2014) Dementia UK: Update. Alzheimer's Society. Second edn.,
5. NationalHealthServiceEngland (2017) Dementia Assessment and Referral Data Collection – Q2 2017-18.  
<https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/category/statistics/dementia/>. 2017
6. Reynish EL, Hapca SM, De Souza N, Cvorov V, Donnan PT, Guthrie B (2017) Epidemiology and outcomes of people with dementia, delirium, and unspecified cognitive impairment in the general hospital: prospective cohort study of 10,014 admissions. BMC medicine 15 (1):140. doi:10.1186/s12916-017-0899-0
7. O'Shea E, Manning E, Ross E, McErlean S, Timmons S (2015) Northern Ireland Audit of Dementia Care in Acute Hospitals. Northern Ireland Audit of Dementia: Cork
8. Harwood R, Porock D, King N, Edwards G, Hammond S, Howe L, Russell C, Howard S, Jones R, Marrant J (2010) Development of a specialist medical and mental health unit for older people in an acute general hospital. University of Nottingham Medical Crises in Older People discussion paper series 5
9. RoyalCollegeofPsychiatrists (2005) Who cares wins: improving the outcome for older people admitted to the general hospital: guidelines for the development of Liaison Mental Health Services for older people.
10. Digby R, Lee S, Williams A (2017) The experience of people with dementia and nurses in hospital: an integrative review. Journal of clinical nursing 26 (9-10):1152-1171. doi:10.1111/jocn.13429
11. Moonga J, Likupe G (2016) A systematic literature review on nurses' and health care support workers' experiences of caring for people with dementia on

orthopaedic wards. *Journal of clinical nursing* 25 (13-14):1789-1804.

doi:10.1111/jocn.13158

12. Alzheimer's Society (2009) Counting the cost: caring for people with dementia on hospital wards.
13. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG (2009) Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS medicine* 6 (7):e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097
14. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D, Moher D, Becker BJ, Sipe TA, Thacker SB (2000) Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *Jama* 283 (15):2008-2012
15. Fage BA, Seitz DP, Gill SS, Herrmann N, Smailagic N, Chan CCH, Nikolaou V (2013) Mini-Cog for the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease dementia and other dementias within a community setting (Protocol). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* (11). doi:10.1002/14651858.CD010860
16. Downs SH, Black N (1998) The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the methodological quality both of randomised and non-randomised studies of health care interventions. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 52:377-384
17. Loney PL, Chambers LW, Bennet KJ, Roberts JG, Stratford PW (2000) Critical appraisal of the health research literature: prevalence or incidence of a health problem. *Chronic Diseases in Canada* 19:170-177
18. Saha S, Chant D, Welham J, McGrath J (2005) A systematic review of the prevalence of schizophrenia. *PLoS Med* 2 (5):e141
19. Spencer K, Foster P, Whittamore KH, Goldberg SE, Harwood RH (2013) Delivering dementia care differently - evaluating the differences and similarities between a specialist medical and mental health unit and standard acute care wards: a qualitative study of family carers' perceptions of quality of care. *Bmj Open* 3 (12). doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004198
20. Briggs R, O'Neill D, Kennelly SP, O'Shea E, De Siun A, Gallagher P, Timmons S (2016) Does admission to specialist Geriatric Medicine Wards lead to improvements in aspects of acute medical care for patients with dementia? *European Geriatric Medicine* 7

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
21. Goldberg SE, Bradshaw LE, Kearney FC, Russell C, Whittamore KH, Foster PE, Mamza J, Gladman JR, Jones RG, Lewis SA, Porock D, Harwood RH (2013) Care in specialist medical and mental health unit compared with standard care for older people with cognitive impairment admitted to general hospital: randomised controlled trial (NIHR TEAM trial). *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 347:f4132. doi:10.1136/bmj.f4132
  22. Briggs R, Coary R, Collins R, Coughlan T, O'Neill D, Kennelly SP (2016) Acute hospital care: how much activity is attributable to caring for patients with dementia? *Qjm* 109 (1):41-44. doi:10.1093/qjmed/hcv085
  23. Kim SYH (2011) The ethics of informed consent in Alzheimer disease research. *Nature reviews Neurology* 7 (7):410-414. doi:10.1038/nrneurol.2011.76
  24. AlzheimerEurope (2011) Informed consent to dementia research. <http://www.alzheimer-europe.org/Ethics/Ethical-issues-in-practice/2011-Ethics-of-dementia-research/Informed-consent-to-dementia-research>. Accessed 4th January 2017
  25. Kenward MG (2013) The handling of missing data in clinical trials. *Clinical Investigation* 3 (3):241-250
  26. Chan A-W, Altman DG (2005) Identifying outcome reporting bias in randomised trials on PubMed: review of publications and survey of authors. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 330 (7494):753. doi:10.1136/bmj.38356.424606.8F
  27. Trevillion K, Oram S, Feder G, Howard LM (2012) Experiences of Domestic Violence and Mental Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLOS ONE* 7 (12):e51740. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0051740
  28. Dwan K, Altman DG, Arnaiz JA, Bloom J, Chan A-W, Cronin E, Decullier E, Easterbrook PJ, Von Elm E, Gamble C, Gherzi D, Ioannidis JPA, Simes J, Williamson PR (2008) Systematic Review of the Empirical Evidence of Study Publication Bias and Outcome Reporting Bias. *PLOS ONE* 3 (8):e3081. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0003081
  29. NationalHealthServiceImprovement (2017) Dementia assessment and improvement framework.

1 **Fig. 1** Flow diagram of literature search, including the results of the study selection  
2 strategy, numbers screened and excluded at each stage and reasons for full-text  
3 article exclusion  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Author (year)	Where was the study done	Clinical setting and PICO	Sampling method and follow up period	Dementia assessment method	Sample size, age (years) and gender of participants	Which patient outcomes were measured	Quality appraisal score
<b>Briggs et al. [20]</b>	Ireland and Northern Ireland	All acute public hospitals in Ireland and Northern Ireland  PICO: in patients with dementia, does admission to a specialist geriatric medicine ward improve quantitative acute care outcomes vs. SWC?	Systematic – national audit data  Follow up period: one year (2013-2014)	Not specified	N= 900 total, N=150 on specialist geriatric ward (17%), N=750 (83%) on general medical/surgical wards  Mean age 83.0 (SD 7.1) for all participants  Not disaggregated by gender	Quantitative outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admission length</li> <li>• Mortality</li> <li>• Behavioural and Psychiatric symptoms</li> <li>• Incidence of delirium during admission</li> <li>• Psychotropic medications</li> <li>• Accurate recording of medications, co-morbidities and collateral history</li> <li>• Documented decision about resuscitation status</li> <li>• Compliance with multidisciplinary assessments</li> </ul> Qualitative outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not included</li> </ul>	78%  (31/40)

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

<b>Goldberg et al. [21]</b>	UK	Single acute General Hospital (not named)	Convenience sampling	Identified by clinicians as “confused” on admission – encompassing both delirium and dementia	N=874 approached, N=600 agreed to participate.  N=310 on specialist unit, N=290 on standard care wards (acute geriatric/general medical)  Median age 85 in both groups (Inter-quartile range (IQR) 80-88 on specialist unit, IQR 80-89 on standard care wards)  Males N=288, Females N=312	Quantitative outcomes:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of days spent at home in 90 days after randomisation (encompassing death, time in hospital, re-admissions, rehabilitation and new care home placement)</li> <li>• Behavioural and psychological symptoms</li> <li>• Falls</li> <li>• Physical disability</li> <li>• Cognitive impairment</li> </ul>	85%  (34/40)
		PICO: in patients with cognitive impairment, does care on a specialist medical and mental health unit in a general hospital give better qualitative and quantitative outcomes vs. SWC?	Follow up period: one year (2010-2011)			Qualitative outcomes:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patient quality of life</li> <li>• Carer strain index</li> <li>• Carer psychological wellbeing</li> <li>• Carers’ satisfaction with care</li> <li>• Patients’ mood and engagement on the wards (direct observation of a random subsample of patients)</li> </ul>	

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

<b>Spencer et al. [19]</b>	UK	Single acute General Hospital (not named)	Convenience sampling	Not specified	N=40 patients and N=40 carers included	Quantitative outcomes: • Not included	70% (28/40)
<b><i>N.B. this is the qualitative arm of the Goldberg et al study above</i></b>		PICO: in carers for patients with delirium or dementia, does care on a specialist medical and mental health unit in a general hospital result in better reported qualitative outcomes vs. SWC?	Follow up period: one year (2010-2011)		Mean age 87 on specialist unit (range 83-97) vs. 85 (range 69-95) on standard care wards  Males N=18, Females N=22 (specialist unit: Males N=7, Females=13; standard care Males=11, Females=9)	Qualitative outcomes: • Face-to-face semi-structured interviews with carers pooled into 6 themes: 1. Activities and boredom 2. Staff knowledge 3. Dementia, dignity and fundamental care 4. Ward environment 5. Communication between carers and staff 6. Carer expectations	

**Table 1 – Summary table of included articles.** The information is presented here as it is given in the included articles, meaning there are some differences in comparison data, e.g. median vs. mean ages. PICO: Patient, Intervention, Comparison and Outcome; we have summarised the PICO questions for each paper for clarity and as part of the critical appraisal process.

1 **Fig. 2** Forest plot odds estimates for mortality comparing SIDU with SWC. No  
2 significant difference was found by either in mortality between the SIDU and SWC;  
3  
4 Briggs et al. [20] (SIDU 9% vs. SWC 8%, OR 1.21; CI 0.65 – 2.22; P=0.55); Goldberg  
5 et al. [21] (22% SIDU vs. 25% for SWC; OR 0.87; CI 0.60 – 1.23; P=0.46). The pooled  
6  
7 odds ratio for mortality was 1.06 (CI 1.0 – 1.4)  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Appendices

### **Appendix 1 – Search terms for replication of review**

**This example was used on the Psychinfo database:**

exp dementia/ or \*"alzheimer's disease"/ or \*"cognitive impairment"/ or  
\*"vascular dementia"/ or \*"senile dementia"/ or \*"dementia with lewy bodies"/  
or ("dementia" or "amnesic, cognitive disorders" or "alzheimer" or "ad" or  
"lewy body" or dlb or lbd or ftd or ftld or "frontotemporal lobar degeneration" or  
"frontotemporal dementia" or "cognitive impairment" or "memory complaint,  
decline or disorder").ti,ab) and (exp "health care services"/ or (exp "quality of  
care"/ or exp "health care services"/ or exp "health care delivery"/ or exp  
"health service needs"/ or exp "integrated services"/ or exp "mental health  
programs"/ or exp "quality of services"/))) and (acute hospital).ti,ab"

Appendix 2 - Checklist and Data Extraction Form

Study Type:

Author Name:

Paper title:

Reviewer ID:

**CHECKLIST**

Does the paper meet **each** of the following inclusion criteria?

Inclusion criteria	If yes tick box
Study is published in a peer-reviewed journal, report, or is a thesis/dissertation.	
Study uses an eligible study design (randomised controlled trial, non-randomised controlled trial, parallel group study, before and after study, interrupted time series, cohort study, case-control study, case review, cross-sectional study, qualitative interview, focus group interviews)	
Case series will be kept for separate analysis	
Sample includes participants aged 16 years or older	
Sample includes participants with dementia	
Sample includes participants who are inpatients of an acute hospital (including Emergency Department setting, mental healthcare setting (only as part of an acute Trust liaison inpatient setting), acute hospital/medical services, inpatient acute hospital Neurology services, other acute Trust healthcare setting)	
Study compares specialist dementia services versus standard care in acute hospitals	
Study results include qualitative or quantitative outcome measures of patient and/or carer experience of the hospital stay.	

If the paper does not meet **all** of the above criteria, please indicate below the reasons why:

Exclusion criteria	If yes tick box
Study is published in a book, conference paper, general comment paper, letter, editorial or other non-peer reviewed format.	
Study uses an ineligible study design (e.g. single case study)	
Sample is aged 15 or younger (or includes participants aged 15 or younger and does not provide appropriately disaggregated data)	
Sample does not include participants with a diagnosis of dementia	
Study does not measure appropriate patient outcome measures	
Study does not compare specialist dementia services versus standard care in acute hospitals	
Study does not use patients from an acute hospital setting (Non-clinical setting, Primary healthcare setting, Mental healthcare setting (community mental health setting), Mental healthcare setting (outpatient unit), Mental healthcare setting (inpatient unit), outpatient Memory Clinic/ Dementia services, Residential Care/Retirement/Nursing home, Not specified	

If the paper meets any of the exclusion criteria do not proceed any further.

## DATA EXTRACTION

### Study Design

Please enter the dates of data collection:

Year of start of data collection	
Year of end of data collection	

Please select the study design:

Study Type	If yes tick box(es)	Please specify if required
Randomised controlled trial		
Non-randomised controlled study		
Parallel group studies		
Before and after studies		
Interrupted time series studies		
Cohort Study		
Case review		
Case Control Study		
Cross Sectional Study		
Qualitative interview		
Focus group interviews		
Other (please specify):		

Please select the study sample type:

Study Setting	If yes tick box(es)	Please specify if required
Emergency Department setting		
Mental healthcare setting (inpatient liaison service as part of acute Trust)		
Acute hospital/medical services		
Acute neurology services		
Other acute healthcare setting (please specify):		



Please select the sampling method used in the study:

Sampling Method	If yes, tick box(es)	Specify if required
Random sampling		
Systematic sampling		
Stratified sampling		
Convenience sampling		
Matched sampling (please provide details)		
Quota sampling		
Other (please specify)		
Not specified		

### Study Population

Please enter the country(s) in which the study was conducted:

--

Please enter the number of males and females in the study sample:

Sex	N
Males	
Females	
Not specified	

Please enter details of the age of the study sample:

	Age (yrs)
Youngest	
Oldest	
Mean	
Standard deviation	
Not specified	

Please enter the study's inclusion criteria:

Please enter the study's exclusion criteria:

Please enter information about response rate:

Number approached to participate	
Number who agreed to participate	
Not specified	

Please enter any comments about response rate:

## Dementia

Please enter the definition of dementia used in this study:

Please select the categories of dementia recorded for the sample (tick as many as apply and provide further detail if available):

Category of Dementia (ICD 10) [DSM-5]	If yes tick box(es)	Provide further detail if available (e.g., specific diagnostic code)	Please indicate whether disorder was assessed with a diagnostic or screening instrument
Major Neurocognitive Disorder [possible 331.9; probable 294.1x]			
Mild Neurocognitive Disorder [331.83]			
Dementia in Alzheimer's disease (F00) [331.0]			
Vascular Dementia (F01) [290.40]			

1	Dementia in other diseases classified elsewhere (F02)			
2	Dementia in Pick's disease (F02.0)			
3	Dementia in Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (F02.1)			
4	Dementia in Huntington's disease (F02.2)[333.4]			
5	Dementia in Parkinson's disease (F02.3)[332.0]			
6	Dementia in human immunodeficiency virus disease (F02.4)[042]			
7	Dementia in other specified diseases classified elsewhere (F02.8)			
8	Frontotemporal Lobar Degeneration [331.19]			
9	Lewy Body Disease [331.82]			
10	Traumatic Brain Injury [907.0]			
11	Prion disease [046.79]			
12	Unspecified dementia (F03) [799.59]			
13	Other (please specify)			
14	Not specified			

35 If specified, please enter the dementia assessment measure used for this study:

45 Please select the criteria against which dementia is assessed:

Criteria	If yes tick box(es)	Specify if required
48 ICD-10 (or earlier versions)		
49 DSM-5 (or earlier versions)		
50 Not specified		

1 **Outcomes**

2  
3 Please select whether outcome measures are qualitative or quantitative (tick as many as  
4 apply):  
5

6 Qualitative	
7 Quantitative	
8 Not specified	

9  
10  
11 Please state what measure of patient outcome was used (tick as many as apply)

12 Admission length	
13 Access to services	
14 Patient reported outcomes	
15 Carer reported outcomes	
16 Cost to Trust	
17 Mortality	
18 Psychotropic medications started	
19 Readmissions	
20 Discharge care needs assessment/ 21 discharge planning and discussion	
22 Other (please specify)	

23  
24  
25  
26  
27 If specified, please enter any additional information about patient outcome measures provided  
28 by this study:

29  
30  
31

32  
33 Please enter any notes about these outcomes (e.g., are disaggregated figures available for  
34 analysis, were odds ratios adjusted?)

35  
36  
37

38  
39 Please enter the following raw data:

40 Total number of people included in the analysis	
41 Total number of people with dementia in specialist 42 wards/using specialist dementia care	
43 Total number of people without dementia in general 44 medical or surgical wards	

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52 **\*\* Please repeat the outcomes section if you have further estimates for subgroups\*\***

53  
54  
55 Please enter any further comments not covered elsewhere:

56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Appendix 3 - Quality Appraisal Form

The critical appraisal tool for prevalence studies, developed by Loney et al. [17], incorporates a number of sources on study methodology from the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme checklists, sources on confounding and attrition and on quality rating of diagnosis ascertainment Downs, Black [16],[17,18].

**Please complete part 1 for all study designs and complete the relevant sections for part 2, specific to study design.**

Score the answer to each question by ticking 0, 1 or 2:

0 – study does not meet criteria/answer question

1 – Study partially meets criteria/gives a partially satisfactory answer to the question

2 – Study fully meets criteria/gives a fully satisfactory answer to the question

Part 1					
Screening questions				Score	
	Question	Comments	0	1	2
1	Did the study ask a clearly focused question? <i>- Is the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly described?</i> <i>-Is the study question focused in terms of the outcomes considered?</i>				
2	Is the study design appropriate for the research question?				
<b>Continue only if score on <u>each</u> of questions 1 and 2 is one or more</b>					
Detailed questions					
Measurement of risk of selection bias					
3a	Is the sampling method appropriate for the research question? <i>Consider:</i> <i>-The sampling method used (i.e. random selection of subjects)</i> <i>- If applicable, is there appropriate selection of controls?</i>				
3b	Are subjects appropriately defined? <i>Consider:</i> <i>- Inclusion/ exclusion criteria specified</i> <i>- Inclusion/exclusion criteria appropriate</i>				
3c	Is the sample size appropriate? <i>Consider:</i> <i>- Is the sample size justified?</i> <i>- Were a sufficient number of cases selected?</i>				

	- If applicable, were a sufficient number of controls selected?				
3d	Is the study sample representative of the population of interest? <i>-Do the authors assess the representativeness of the study sample?</i>				
3e	Does the level of non-participation risk introduce bias? <i>Consider:</i> <i>-Are key demographic characteristics of non-participants reported and compared against participants?</i> <i>-Does the study report on the impact of non-participation?</i> <i>-If applicable, rates of attrition reported</i>				
4	Is the study setting appropriate to the aims of the research? (e.g. setting, location, relevant dates)				
5	Is the method of data collection appropriate for the aims of the research?				
<b>Measurement of risk of reporting bias</b>					
6	Are suitable/standard criteria used for measurement of dementia? <i>Consider:</i> <i>-Criteria of dementia diagnosis was clearly defined</i> <i>-Potential for bias of measurement</i> <i>-If measures piloted</i>  <i>- Standardised/pre-validated measures (score 2 points)</i> <i>- Researchers developed their own measure (score 1 point)</i> <i>- No details of measurement were provided (score 0 point)</i>				
7	Are known confounders accounted for by study design? <i>- Was consideration of confounding factors accounted for in study design?</i>				
8	Are known confounders accounted for in the analyses?				

9	Are the statistical tests used to assess the main outcomes appropriate? <i>-Was there adequate adjustment for confounding in the analyses?</i> <i>- Do the analyses adjust for different lengths of follow-up (if applicable)?</i>				
10a	Are the estimates reported with confidence intervals and in detail by sub-group (if appropriate)? <i>- Were the findings reported clearly?</i>				
10b	Are statistically non-significant results presented?				
10c	Are data for relevant variables complete?				
11	Was the conduct of the fieldwork appropriate to the study setting? <i>-Was the allocation of the interviewer/interpreter sensitive to the background of the participant?</i> <i>-Were fieldworkers trained and supported to work with people who have dementia?</i>				
12	Were ethical considerations appropriately considered?  <i>-Did researchers obtain informed consent from all participants?</i>  <i>- Did researchers take adequate precautions to safeguard participant anonymity and confidentiality?</i>  <i>-Did fieldworkers offer information about dementia support and referral options to all participants?</i>  <i>-Were fieldworkers appropriately trained to deal with participant distress?</i>				
13	Do the findings support the conclusions?				
14	Are the strengths and weaknesses of the research discussed?				

Calculate total score (out of a possible total of 40): \_\_\_\_\_





