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Objectives: To conduct a systematic literature review to determine if there were any intervention strategies that had any measurable effect on acute-care hospitalizations among community-dwelling adults with dementia.

Design: Studies were identified by a professional research librarian and content experts.

Setting: Community dwelling.

Participants: Participants were diagnosed with dementia, severity ranging from mild to severe, and were recruited from health care and community agencies.

Measurements: A study met the inclusion criteria if it: (a) was published in English; (b) included a control or comparison group; (c) published outcome data from the intervention under study; (d) reported hospitalization as one of the outcomes; (e) included community-dwelling older adults; and (f) enrolled participants with dementia. Ten studies met all inclusion criteria.

Results: Of the 10 studies included, most assessed health services use (ie, hospitalizations) as a secondary outcome. Participants were recruited from a range of health care and community agencies, and most were diagnosed with dementia with severity ratings ranging from mild to severe. Most intervention strategies consisted of face-to-face assessments of the persons living with dementia, their caregivers, and the development and implementation of a care plan. A significant reduction in hospital admissions was not found in any of the included studies, although 1 study did observe a reduction in hospital days.

Conclusions: The majority of studies included hospitalizations as a secondary outcome. Only 1 intervention was found to have an effect on hospitalizations. Future work would benefit from strategies specifically designed to reduce and prevent acute hospitalizations in persons with dementia.
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Rates of hospitalization of persons with dementia are rising and are projected to continue to increase over the 21st century.1 Hospitalization rates appear to be consistently higher for persons with dementia compared to those free of dementia,2–4 both for all-cause2,4 as well as potentially preventable hospitalizations.2–4 Studies consistently show hospitalization has negative effects on the individual living with dementia, their family and the healthcare system. The associated costs of hospitalization, which are consistently higher in individuals with diagnosed dementia,3 place increased pressure on policymakers as they seek to stem rising health care costs. At the individual level, hospitalization of a person with dementia may have unintended, deleterious health consequences such as delirium,5 falls,6 and procedure-related complications7 and may also increase the risk of discharge to a higher level of care.8 Persons with dementia may also experience a greater risk of unmet needs, such as treatment of pain9 and relief of thirst,10 and suffer increased psychological distress while hospitalized.11 Thus, avoiding hospitalizations of persons with dementia is a reasonable quality-of-care goal. For this reason, Healthy People 2020 has as one of its key dementia-related objectives “to reduce the proportion of preventable hospitalizations in persons with Alzheimer disease and other dementias.”12,13

As dementia becomes more prevalent due to the increase in the number of people surviving to late life, increasing attention is likely to be paid to optimizing care for
persons with this condition. With prevention of hospitalization as our particular focus, we searched but located no systematic review addressing this issue. The aim of our study was thus to conduct a review of the published literature to identify interventions designed to improve care for persons with dementia living in the community and to determine whether any measurable effect on acute-care hospitalizations was observed. We were specifically interested in studies with an explicit focus on keeping persons with dementia out of the hospital and in dementia that was not severe or end stage. A few reviews of intervention studies involving persons with dementia have focused on care/case management interventions.\textsuperscript{14–16} We sought to expand on previous reviews by including studies of any type of intervention and by looking specifically at whether the intervention reduced acute-care hospitalizations.

\textbf{METHODS}

This study was guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) format for reporting systematic reviews and thus occurred in 3 stages: (a) development of criteria for inclusion and literature search; (b) extraction and coding of study characteristics and findings; and (c) data analysis and aggregation of findings.

\textbf{Inclusion Criteria and Literature Search}

Our search was restricted to published intervention studies. We selected a study for inclusion if it: (a) was published in English; (b) included a control or comparison group; (c) published outcome data from the intervention under study; (d) reported hospitalization as one of the outcomes; (e) included community-dwelling older adults; and (f) enrolled participants with dementia. We excluded studies that involved people under the age of 50 (to avoid a priori omission of any studies that enrolled persons with early-onset dementia), older adults living in nursing homes, interventions solely targeting caregiver outcomes, purely lifestyle interventions, and pharmaceutical trials.

A professional research librarian obtained articles from database searches (from 1990 through December 2013) of PubMed, CINAHL, Cochrane, Embase, Psychnfo, Wholis, Proquest, EBSCO, and WOS (see Fig. 1 for PRISMA-formatted chart with search strategy and details). Additional sources included reference lists from published studies and representatives of organizations who have published work in the area of dementia (eg, Institute of Medicine; University of California at Los Angeles). Four hundred thirty-four references were identified in this initial search. Then, through an iterative process, all authors systematically identified articles that met the inclusion criteria. See Figure 1 for details of the steps included in the systematic review, including MESH terms. This process resulted in 10 articles for analysis.\textsuperscript{17–26}

\textbf{Data Extraction}

A list of data to be extracted was compiled by the group, and 2 authors (K.J.D. and E.A.P.) extracted data independently and thereafter resolved any discrepancies via discussion. Data were extracted on the study design, participant characteristics, features of the interventions, and outcomes of the interventions. Intervention descriptions were categorized by the format in which they were delivered, the content and intensity (number of contacts with intervention participants and intervention period duration) of the intervention, and the target (ie, patient, physician, or caregiver) of the intervention content. When provided in the article, quantitative outcome data were also extracted, including statistical test results. All data extracted are provided in Tables 1 to 3.

\textbf{Data Analysis}

As the focus of this review was to identify promising interventions for the prevention of hospitalizations among community-dwelling older adults, data analysis concentrated on the features of the interventions. Specifically, the authors examined characteristics of the interventions that might influence findings related to hospitalization. In the Results section, tables provide intervention details including the mechanisms that might underlie any observed intervention effects.

\textbf{RESULTS}

\textbf{Description of Included Studies}

As shown in Table 1, of the 10 included studies, 6 were conducted in the United States. Study participants were recruited from a range of settings, including health care organizations, assisted living facilities, and community-based agencies; 1 study\textsuperscript{24} used newspaper announcements and a health insurance registry of Alzheimer disease drug users. Half of the studies randomized the participant with dementia along with their caregiver. Sample sizes ranged from 43 to 408. The mean age of dementia participants across studies was 70.4 years. Dementia severity ranged from mild to severe; 4 studies focused on moderate-severity dementia, and in 1 study, dementia severity was not provided. The dementia type where specified was most often Alzheimer; in 5 studies, the dementia type was not characterized. Table 2 summarizes features of interventions in the included studies.

\textbf{Outcomes and Related Features of Interventions}

Although all included studies examined hospitalization as an outcome, hospitalization was a primary outcome in just half (Table 3). Most studies did not describe if health care utilization was tracked in real-time, such that that information would be known to the study interventionist and thereby permit him/her to take preemptive actions, either in the time period immediately leading up to admission (to prevent the admission) or at/shortly after the time of discharge (to prevent re-admission). A significant reduction in hospital admissions was not found in any of the included studies, although 1 study did observe a reduction in hospital days.\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{DISCUSSION}

With this review, we sought to summarize current evidence about interventions that reduce the risk of hospitalization of persons with dementia, an important outcome for both those with dementia and their families. None of the included studies demonstrated a significant effect on hospital
admission, although in 2 studies\(^ {18,19}\) the effect was in the desired direction.

**Why Were These Interventions Not Effective in Reducing Hospitalizations?**

In interpreting this main finding of our review, methodology as well as intervention content and delivery merit consideration. Of the 2 studies with nonsignificant effects on hospital admission, one did not use a randomized design (which tends to overestimate intervention effects),\(^ {19}\) and the other was likely underpowered to detect a significant between-group difference in hospitalization.\(^ {18}\) The study that measured a reduction in hospital days did not report hospitalization frequency by study group.\(^ {24}\) In the studies that used the most rigorous (randomized, controlled trial) design, an effect on risk of hospital admission was either not observed or another measure of hospitalizations (hospital days) was reported.\(^ {18,20,23,24,26,27}\)

Apart from methodologic limitations of included studies, the majority of interventions did not explicitly target either control of common chronic conditions (eg, congestive heart failure) or prevention of unintentional injuries (eg, falls, burns), both of which are common reasons for hospitalization in this age group and in persons with dementia.\(^ {3,4,28}\) Other common reasons for hospitalization include acute infections (eg, urinary tract infection, pneumonia) and dehydration\(^ {4,29}\); none of the interventions appeared to address these issues via caregiver education/training or other methods. Overall, a medical focus was lacking in most interventions tested.

Recommendations for future work on this topic are several. First, in light of the risks of hospitalization for persons with dementia, greater emphasis on this outcome in intervention studies is warranted. The advent of a Healthy People 2020 objective\(^ {13}\) specific to this issue—namely to “reduce the proportion of preventable hospitalizations in persons with diagnosed Alzheimer disease and other dementias”—may increase the focus on this as an outcome in future intervention research with this population.

Second, future studies should design and test interventions aimed at preventing avoidable acute health care utilization. In other words, interventions should have an explicit focus on keeping persons with dementia out of the hospital, whenever possible. In our effort to be comprehensive with this review, we chose not to exclude studies on this topic.

---

**FIGURE 1.** Steps of systematic review. *An Endnote file of excluded articles is available from the authors upon request.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Unit of Randomization</th>
<th>Sample Size and Participant Demographics</th>
<th>Dementia Type(s)</th>
<th>Dementia Severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bass et al</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Patients of a health maintenance organization whose medical records indicated a diagnosis of dementia or symptom code for memory loss</td>
<td>≥ 55 y Live in community (not a facility); reside in Cleveland catchment area of Alzheimer’s Association</td>
<td>Person living with dementia</td>
<td>N = 210 Mean age: 76.4 40% men</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark et al</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Patients with dementia moving into dementia-specific assisted living facilities in Connecticut</td>
<td>Residents with dementia</td>
<td>Person living with dementia</td>
<td>N = 100 Mean age: 82.2 37% men</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellantonio et al</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Patients at the Healthy Aging Brain Center</td>
<td>Patients referred to the Healthy Aging Brain Center for evaluation of memory or behavioral problems</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N = 208 (176 caregivers) Mean age: 73.8 33% men</td>
<td>Alzheimer type (78%); vascular (40%); mixed (27%)</td>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callahan et al</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Patients at 2 university-affiliated health care systems</td>
<td>Possible or probable Alzheimer disease by DSM-3 criteria; not a skilled nursing facility resident</td>
<td>Dyad (person living with dementia and caregiver)</td>
<td>N = 153 Mean age: 77.5 57% men</td>
<td>Alzheimer type</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challis et al</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Patients at community mental health agency</td>
<td>Diagnosis of dementia, new referrals or cases “with a major change in circumstances,” significant needs unmet by existing services, and risk of institutionalization</td>
<td>Dyad (person living with dementia and caregiver)</td>
<td>N = 43 Mean age: 80.1 30% men</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloniemi-Sulkava et al</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Newspaper announcements; Alzheimer disease drug users’ register of the Social Insurance Institution of Finland</td>
<td>Minimum score of 1.0 on CDR and MMSE score ≥23 Imaging and specialist examination consistent with dementia</td>
<td>Dyad (person living with dementia and caregiver)</td>
<td>N = 408 Mean age: 79.5 44% men</td>
<td>Alzheimer type (76%); vascular (8.3%); other (15.7%)</td>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graff et al</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Patients at memory clinic and a day clinic of a department of geriatrics</td>
<td>Mild to moderate dementia (by DSM-4 criteria) Living in catchment area of Helsinki</td>
<td>Dyad (person living with dementia and caregiver)</td>
<td>N = 125 Mean age: 77.5 62% men</td>
<td>Alzheimer type</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wray et al</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Patients at Veterans Administration in Upstate New York with encounter coded for a dementia diagnosis Referred from clinician or self or family referral in response to study publicity</td>
<td>Dementia diagnosis in medical record (at least moderate level) or ≥ 1 activities of daily living and ≥ 3 instrumental activities of daily living dependencies Residing in community Spouse or partner living with them for at least 1 y, serving as primary caregiver and moderate or greater caregiver strain</td>
<td>Dyad (person living with dementia and caregiver)</td>
<td>N = 158 Mean age: 78.5 100% men</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Moderate to severe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participant refers to the person with dementia enrolled in the study.

1Dementia severity assessed in most studies via the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE).18-20,24,25 MMSE score 21-24=mild; MMSE score 10-20=moderate; MMSE score <10=severe.33
CDR indicates Clinical Dementia Rating Scale; DSM, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders; MMSE, Mini-Mental State Examination; N/A, no randomization occurred.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Type</th>
<th>Mode of Contact</th>
<th>Duration of Intervention (mo)</th>
<th>No. Contacts With Intervention Participants</th>
<th>Collaboration With Primary Care</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case management/care coordination</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12 (Bass)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Bass et al.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>&gt;12</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Duru et al.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case management/care coordination</td>
<td>In-person and telephone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gallant et al.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-person and telephone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Boustani et al.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-person and telephone</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Callahan et al.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Graff et al.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Wray et al.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For interventions that were multicomponent or other single-component interventions.

Where the conceptual link between the focus of the intervention (e.g., self-care or coping strategies for caregivers) and our outcome of interest was not obvious/apparent. In the future, studies could test directed approaches that might include: counseling family caregivers about the risks of hospitalization, the most common reasons for hospitalization, and clinical signs of acute deterioration; educating caregivers about chronic condition control and simplifying medication regimens to optimize adherence; providing 24-hour access to nurse telephone care consultation for advice on concerns related to acute changes in the person with dementia; completion of advance directives with explicit statement of preferences regarding hospitalization; and notification of study interventionists if a patient with dementia presents to an emergency department for care. Although attention has been paid to potentially preventable hospitalizations among persons with dementia,2–413 research is needed on all-cause hospitalizations. A wide range of outcomes related to hospitalization for persons with dementia, including complications and adverse events, is also relevant. And, for the person admitted to hospital who has dementia, hospitalization due to any cause is just as relevant an outcome, as the risk of an adverse consequence of hospitalization is presumably no different regardless of the reason for hospitalization.

Third, based on observational studies examining reasons for hospitalization of persons with dementia,3428 future intervention studies should test approaches to managing chronic conditions and preventing injuries in persons living in the community with dementia. Current work in the area of dementia and multiple chronic conditions may help shape this understanding.3031 Effective interventions for the prevention of falls in community-dwelling elders with dementia are lacking; this is another worthy—albeit challenging—avenue of investigation.

Limitations of our review should be noted. The review includes only those articles written in English and published studies. However, the review did benefit from using multiple sources to search for eligible studies, including a professional research librarian search of online databases and interviews with professionals with expertise in dementia and healthcare utilization. Data for this review were abstracted from descriptions available in the article. Thus, the characterizations of the intervention and outcomes were not verified through potential secondary published sources that may have described the study design or interventions and no input was sought from the authors. This review intentionally included studies that examined any measure of hospitalization as an outcome. As a consequence, the heterogeneity of outcomes and assessment methods precluded performing a formal meta-analysis. Despite these limitations, this review provides an important summary of the state of the evidence regarding interventions and their effect on hospitalizations of persons living with dementia.

We support the prevailing belief among many in the field that dementia is not “just another diagnosis” on a patient’s problem list. Dementia impairs an individual’s ability to manage his/her other chronic conditions, to recognize and articulate the onset of new physical or emotional symptoms, and to seek assistance/care in the face of alterations in one’s overall condition. Dementia implies that self-management support must be available, and due to its progressive nature,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Was Hospitalization a Primary or Secondary Outcome?</th>
<th>Real-Time Tracking of Health Care Use</th>
<th>Effect on Hospital Admissions?</th>
<th>Putative Mechanism of Intervention Effects on Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bass et al(^{17})</td>
<td>Primary: Service utilization Traditional medical services [Emergency Department use, hospitalizations, physician visits] Case management visits Community services</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>No; findings for traditional medical services, including emergency department visits, hospital admissions, and physician visits, did not show any significant intervention ((M = 0.18)) control ((M = 0.26)) group differences ((\beta = -0.02))</td>
<td>Minimizing crisis-driven episodes of care caused by dementia/memory loss will reduce service use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark et al(^{22})</td>
<td>Primary: Service utilization Traditional medical services Case management Community services</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>No, no significant intervention ((M = 0.09)) control ((M = 0.11)) group differences ((b = -0.76; OR = 0.47))</td>
<td>“The more severe the impairment, the greater likelihood services will be used and benefits of intervention realized”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellantonio et al(^{18})</td>
<td>Primary: time to any unanticipated transition out of assisted living (first ED visit, first hospitalization, or permanent SNF placement)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>No, no significant differences; 34 subjects were hospitalized. The intervention reduced the risk of all transition types, ED visits were lowered 12% ((P = 0.80)) and hospital admission was lowered 45% ((P = 0.13)).</td>
<td>Proactive attention to medical, functional, and behavioral issues will delay transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boustani et al(^{19})</td>
<td>Primary: Acute utilization</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Uncertain (no statistical significance testing); 14% of intervention vs. 26% controls were hospitalized at least once*</td>
<td>Enhanced care, communication and self-management support will result in better outcomes (clinical and utilization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callahan et al(^{20})</td>
<td>Secondary: resource use</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>No; no difference in cumulative hospitalization rates between augmented usual care and intervention patients at 12 mo ((18.8% vs. 22.6%); respectively; (P = 0.69)) or at 18 mo ((24.6% vs. 29.8%; P = 0.59)) or in mean hospital days at 12 mo ((1.0 vs. 1.7; P = 0.24)) or at 18 mo ((1.5 vs. 2.6; P = 0.28)).</td>
<td>Intervening on behavioral symptoms will improve those symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challis et al(^{21})</td>
<td>Primary: service utilization Costs</td>
<td>Yes (service utilization and cost data were tracked through time over a 12-mo period)</td>
<td>No ((49% of intervention group vs. 37% of controls used inpatient medical care)*</td>
<td>Responding to needs of caregivers will prevent/reduce stress and keep persons with dementia in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duru et al(^{23})</td>
<td>Secondary: costs of intervention</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>No; no significant differences in inpatient ((P = 0.78)) utilization between the 2 study groups at baseline or at follow-up. At baseline, &lt;20% of patients in either group had been hospitalized. During follow-up, approximately 30% in each group were hospitalized</td>
<td>Education and support of caregivers will improve care and reduce need for costly health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloniemi-Sulkava et al(^{24})</td>
<td>Secondary: use of services (community, hospital, and long-term care)</td>
<td>Yes (ie, during the study …all …services… were examined)</td>
<td>Uncertain effect on hospital admissions (not reported); reduced hospital days in primary care and specialty care hospitals*</td>
<td>“Flexible and immediate actions in problematic situations may explain differences in hospital days” (crisis aversion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graff et al(^{25})</td>
<td>Secondary: costs and cost-effectiveness</td>
<td>No (ie, at 6 and 12 wk the researchers received the diary…filled out… in the previous 6 wk…)</td>
<td>Uncertain, as no statistical significance testing performed (mean hospital days 1.6 in intervention group vs. 2.1 in control group)*</td>
<td>Goal setting and treatment planning targeting daily functioning, social participation, and well-being of people with dementia and improving caregiver competence and well-being will reduce costs of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wray et al(^{26})</td>
<td>Primary: costs and utilization</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>No; no significant findings related to number ((F_{1,321} = 0.00)) or days ((F_{1,321} = 0.09)) of acute utilization or ICU number ((F_{1,321} = 0.08)) or days ((F_{1,321} = 0.33)) of utilization</td>
<td>Ongoing support of caregivers will result in decreased utilization and therefore costs of care in the care recipient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional data were not available in published article.
changing care needs over time.\textsuperscript{32,33} Thus, a diagnosis of dementia should shape the focus and the approach to management of all other health issues in the context of routine outpatient care. The next generation of intervention research must identify the elements of high-quality outpatient care for persons with established dementia.

REFERENCES