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Abstract
The British Association for Psychopharmacology coordinated a meeting of experts to review and revise its previous 2011 guidelines for clinical practice with anti-dementia drugs. As before, levels of evidence were rated using accepted standards which were then translated into grades of recommendation A–D, with A having the strongest evidence base (from randomised controlled trials) and D the weakest (case studies or expert opinion). Current clinical diagnostic criteria for dementia have sufficient accuracy to be applied in clinical practice (B) and both structural (computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging) and functional (positron emission tomography and single photon emission computerised tomography) brain imaging can improve diagnostic accuracy in particular situations (B). Cholinesterase inhibitors (donepezil, rivastigmine, and galantamine) are effective for cognition in mild to moderate Alzheimer's disease (A), memantine for moderate to severe Alzheimer's disease (A) and combination therapy (cholinesterase inhibitors and memantine) may be beneficial (B). Drugs should not be stopped just because dementia severity increases (A). Until further evidence is available other drugs, including statins, anti-inflammatory drugs, vitamin E, nutritional supplements and Ginkgo biloba, cannot be recommended either for the treatment or prevention of Alzheimer's disease (A). Neither cholinesterase inhibitors nor memantine are effective in those with mild cognitive impairment (A). Cholinesterase inhibitors are not effective in frontotemporal dementia and may cause agitation (A), though selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors may help behavioural (but not cognitive) features (B). Cholinesterase inhibitors should be used for the treatment of people with Lewy body dementias (both Parkinson's disease dementia and dementia with Lewy bodies), and memantine may be helpful (A). No drugs are clearly effective in vascular dementia, though cholinesterase inhibitors are beneficial in mixed dementia (B). Early evidence suggests multifactorial interventions may have potential to prevent or delay the onset of dementia (B). Though the consensus statement focuses on medication, psychological interventions can be effective in addition to pharmacotherapy, both for cognitive and non-cognitive symptoms. Many novel pharmacological approaches involving strategies to reduce amyloid and/or tau deposition in those with or at high risk of Alzheimer's disease are in progress. Though results of pivotal studies in early (prodromal/mild) Alzheimer's disease are awaited, results to date in more established (mild to moderate) Alzheimer's disease have been equivocal and no disease modifying agents are either licensed or can be currently recommended for clinical use.
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Introduction

The British Association for Psychopharmacology (BAP) produced a first edition of clinical practice guidelines for anti-dementia drugs in 2006 (Burns and O’Brien, 2006), which were subsequently revised (O’Brien and Burns, 2011). As with other BAP guidelines, these were explicitly based on the published evidence available and formulated by an expert group following a face to face consensus meeting. Given advances in the field, a review of these guidelines was planned at that stage for five years later. An expert consensus group therefore reconvened to review and grade the strength of current evidence, consider its clinical implications and agree on revised guidelines for the use of anti-dementia drugs. The focus was on new evidence which had become available since the first guidelines were published. The current, third, revision of the guidelines have been drawn up after extensive feedback from participants and have undergone independent peer review prior to publication. The revised guideline covers the diagnosis of dementia, its treatment with anti-dementia drugs, its management in primary and secondary care and its prevention. The guidelines do not directly deal with drug treatments specifically for behavioural disturbances in dementia (e.g. antidepressants, antipsychotics and other agents) but do consider these symptoms when impacted upon by drugs aimed specifically at the disease processes thought to underpin the cognitive decline.

Dementia affects around 800,000 people in the UK, of which Alzheimer’s disease (AD) is the commonest cause (60%) followed by vascular dementia (VaD; 15–20%), dementia with Lewy bodies (DLB; 10–15%), frontotemporal dementias, other rarer causes and occasionally reversible conditions (5%). These figures include a substantial proportion of cases where there is evidence of mixed pathology, which is more common in older people. The diagnosis of subtype of dementia is based on clinical history, physical and mental state (cognitive) examination and appropriate investigations. Currently the mainstay of pharmacological treatment for the cognitive deficits of AD are the cholinesterase inhibitors (ChEIs; donepezil, Aricept; galantamine, Reminyl; and rivastigmine, Exelon), which are licensed for the treatment of mild to moderate disease; and memantine (Ebixa) licensed for moderate to severe illness. There is general agreement that anticholinergic burden should be minimised in those with dementia, especially before prescribing cholinergic medication. Anticholinergic use has been associated with poorer cognitive and functional performance, cognitive decline (Ancelin et al., 2006; Fox et al., 2011a, 2011b; Shah et al., 2013a) and with increased risk for dementia (Gray et al., 2015). Scales to assess anticholinergic burden are available (for reviews see Cardwell et al., 2015; Salahudeen et al., 2015) and while minimising anticholinergic burden makes clinical sense, there are no definitive studies on the effects of such a reduction on cognitive and functional decline in people with dementia.

Associated non-cognitive symptoms, often called behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia (BPSD), are frequently seen in all dementias, cause distress to patients and carers and are a major factor in predicting institutional care. Many types of BPSD, including agitation, aggression and psychosis, have traditionally been treated with neuroleptic (antipsychotic) agents. However, concerns over cerebrovascular adverse events and increased mortality has forced consideration of alternative approaches to the treatment of BPSD, including ChEIs, memantine and increased the emphasis on non-pharmacological therapies including activity, music therapy and aromatherapy. Management of VaD primarily involves the identification and treatment of vascular risk factors, amelioration of BPSD and, where there is coexistent AD, prescription of ChEIs and memantine. DLB is treated symptomatically with cautious use of anti-parkinsonian medication where necessary (L-dopa monotherapy having the least propensity to exacerbate psychosis) and ChEIs. Management of BPSD is more challenging and antipsychotic drugs should be avoided because of parkinsonian side effects and the likelihood of prolonged and severe sensitivity reactions.

Other guidelines and guidance are available for the diagnosis and treatment of dementia, including those of the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE; www.nice.org.uk), the European Federation of Neurological Sciences (Hort et al., 2010; Schmidt et al., 2015; Waldemar et al., 2007), the American Academy of Neurology (Knopman et al., 2001) and the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines network (SIGN; www.sign.ac.uk). Guidelines are also available on non-pharmacological management, which is not discussed in detail here (British Psychological Society, 2014).

Methodology

We held a consensus meeting in London in March 2016. The participants were selected for their clinical and research experience in the field of dementia care, and also included a person with dementia. The group arrived at its decisions after expert papers were written independently and then presented and discussed at the meeting. Guidelines were then prepared following the format of previous BAP consensus meetings, and the first and second consensus meetings on anti-dementia drugs (Burns and O’Brien, 2006, O’Brien and Burns, 2011). All participants provided an evidence summary based on their own expert knowledge of the literature, combined with a recent literature review in their own specialist area. All relevant papers published up to and including December 2015 were considered. Particular emphasis was placed on reviewing the previous recommendations in the light of new evidence published since the last guidelines. The objectives of the guidelines were to:

1. Review evidence for the clinical diagnosis of dementia and its subtypes and the role of investigations in improving diagnostic accuracy.
2. Assess evidence for the efficacy of currently available anti-dementia drugs in all common types of dementia and, based on that, make clear recommendations for clinical practice.
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3. Appraise the evidence for the efficacy of drugs for those with pre-dementia conditions such as mild cognitive impairment or prodromal/preclinical dementia

4. Appraise the evidence for drugs with potential to delay or prevent dementia, or modify its disease course.

The level of evidence was categorised according to standard criteria, and level of evidence was then translated into strength of recommendation as detailed in Table 1.

### Diagnosis and investigations

The criteria used to define dementia and cognitive disorders continue to cause controversy. Since the last guideline, a revision of the influential *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition* (DSM 5) has been published (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Two key changes from the fourth edition (DSM-IV; American Psychiatric Association, 2000) of relevance here are (a) a move away from the terms of dementia and mild cognitive impairment to major and mild neurocognitive disorder respectively and (b) the inclusion of Lewy body disorder (major or mild neurocognitive disorder with Lewy bodies). There have been several proposals to revise the criteria for AD, with the inclusion of biomarkers aiming to both improve the accuracy of diagnosis, and allow diagnosis at an earlier pre-dementia or prodromal stage. The International Working Group has proposed criteria for very early AD (Dubois et al., 2007), which were later expanded to include prodromal AD (Dubois et al., 2010) and further revised to include amyloid imaging (Dubois et al., 2014). The National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer’s Association (NIA-AA) group has published new criteria for AD dementia (McKhann et al., 2011), mild cognitive impairment due to AD (Albert et al., 2011) and preclinical AD (Sperling et al., 2011). Within these criteria, prodromal AD or mild cognitive impairment due to AD refers to early (pre-dementia) but symptomatic disease, whilst preclinical refers to pre-symptomatic or ‘at risk’ states. The main purpose of many of these changes has been to allow internationally agreed criteria to be used for subject selection and stratification for ongoing natural history and therapeutic studies, though the validation and clinical usefulness of these criteria remains to be fully determined. There have been no new revisions of the criteria for DLB (McKeith et al., 2005) or Parkinson’s disease dementia (Emre et al., 2007) since the last guideline, though the DLB criteria are under review at the time of writing. In keeping with the moves in the Alzheimer field towards earlier diagnosis, criteria for mild cognitive impairment in Parkinson’s disease have been published (Litvan et al., 2012).

Clinical criteria for frontotemporal dementia (FTD) have been updated (Rascovsky et al., 2011). New criteria are sensitive and specific for the diagnosis of behavioural variant FTD although the related syndromes of semantic dementia and progressive non-fluent aphasia are now classified according to new primary progressive aphasia (PPA) recommendations (Gorno-Tempini...
et al., 2011) (see Figure 1). The PPA classification system has lower diagnostic accuracy in terms of predicting pathological diagnosis and includes a clinical syndrome mostly associated with Alzheimer pathology (Mesulam and Weintraub, 2014). This poses further potential problems in performing and interpreting treatment trials in this disease area. There have been no internationally agreed formal revisions of criteria for VaD, but consensus groups have offered frameworks whereby some apparently contradictory concepts, such as the dimensional nature of vascular cognitive impairment (O’Brien et al., 2003) can to some extent be reconciled with the dimensional approach of major and minor neurocognitive disorder (Sachdev et al., 2014). What is clear is that in all areas, new knowledge, especially regarding genetics and biomarkers, and the need to stratify people at an early stage in their disease, have been the driving forces behind these revisions, more of which can be expected over time as further advances are made.

**Neuroimaging and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) biomarkers**

There is increasing interest in the use of brain imaging and CSF biomarkers, both to assist with early and accurate differential diagnosis, and as potential markers of disease progression which may be used as surrogate outcome measures for clinical trials.

Brain imaging is extensively used to assist with diagnosis, both by excluding other causes for a dementia syndrome and providing information to support a subtype specific diagnosis (for review see O’Brien, 2007). Evidence for its use in excluding other causes for cognitive impairment and for supporting subtype diagnosis of dementia was discussed in the first and second guideline. Cerebrovascular changes on imaging are necessary for the application of standard diagnostic criteria for VaD (Román et al., 1993), and increasingly imaging changes are being incorporated into other diagnostic criteria. FTD is associated with frontal and anterior temporal lobe atrophy, with a variable extent of hippocampal atrophy depending on the subtype, on structural imaging and frontotemporal hypoperfusion on single photon emission computerised tomography (SPECT) and hypometabolism on FDG PET (fluoro-deoxy glucose positron emission tomography). AD is associated with medial temporal lobe atrophy, particularly of the entorhinal cortex and hippocampus, and temporoparietal hypoperfusion on SPECT and hypometabolism on FDG PET. Early onset AD is also associated with parietal and precuneus atrophy. Preservation of the medial temporal lobe in DLB has emerged as the most robust structural imaging marker separating DLB from AD and has been confirmed in studies with autopsy verification (Burton et al., 2009). DLB is associated with hypoperfusion and hypometabolism of posterior parietal and occipital areas on SPECT and FDG PET respectively (Colloby et al., 2008). A blinded study comparing FDG-PET with hexamethylpropylene amine oxime (HMPAO) SPECT in the diagnosis of degenerative (AD or DLB) dementia from controls found a clear (20%) superiority for FDG-PET over HMPAO SPECT in diagnostic accuracy (O’Brien et al., 2014). Dopaminergic SPECT or PET can distinguish DLB from AD with 80% sensitivity and 90% specificity (McKeith et al., 2007; O’Brien et al., 2014). Decreased cardiac sympathetic uptake, as indicated by decreased metaiodobenzylguanidine (MIBG) SPECT binding has been found in Parkinson’s disease and DLB. MIBG imaging has now been shown in single and now multi-centre studies to distinguish DLB from AD with 70% sensitivity and 90% specificity (Yoshita et al., 2015).

Amyloid PET imaging can be undertaken with C11-Pittsburgh Compound B (C11-PIB) and, since the last guideline, three fluorinated compounds which have all received a licence for demonstrating increased brain amyloid as an adjunct to diagnosing AD (florbetapir, flurbetaben and flutemetamol). These have all been subject to autopsy validation studies, where a
positive amyloid scan predicts significant plaque pathology at autopsy with >90% certainty, and clinical studies indicating good diagnostic accuracy for AD (O’Brien and Herholz, 2015). Whilst a positive amyloid scan would be expected in both early and late onset AD, some caution is necessary when interpreting results as increased brain amyloid occurs with advancing age (present in 40% of over 80 year olds) and possession of the apolipoprotein (Apo) E4 genotype (Jansen et al., 2015), and is seen in around 50% subjects with DLB and in older subjects with other dementias (Ossenkoppele et al., 2015).

Raised levels of CSF tau (both total and phosphorylated tau) and reduced levels of Aβ1-42 have proved, when combined in a ratio, to have reasonable diagnostic accuracy for separating AD from other dementias (mean sensitivity 72%, mean specificity 78% when comparing AD to other dementias) (Mitchell, 2009). However, multi-centre studies have shown substantial intercentre variation in biomarker levels, especially for Aβ and the N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor (NMDA) receptor antagonist, memantine. Many other trials of putative disease-modifying agents are in progress. Donepezil, rivastigmine and galantamine are licensed for mild to moderate AD, memantine for moderate to severe AD, and several randomised controlled trials (RCTs) demonstrate their efficacy in these situations. The drugs were originally marketed as Aricept tablets (donepezil), Exelon capsules and later skin patches (rivastigmine), Reminyl tablets and later Reminyl XL capsules (galantamine) and Ebixa tablets (memantine); all are now available as generic or other marketed versions. A higher dose (13.3 mg/24 h) rivastigmine patch is now available (Cummings et al., 2012).

The basic evidence to support the use of these drugs remains unchanged and, in general, the costs of the drugs are now significantly lower, particularly for donepezil. Combination therapy using a ChEI initially with the later addition of memantine is now considered optimal treatment in many countries particularly as the dementia advances. A European guideline based on systematic assessment of the quality of the evidence has been published and is the first such review (Schmidt et al., 2015). It suggests using a combination rather than a ChEI alone in patients with moderate to severe AD, but the strength of the recommendation is weak (see Figure 2).

In some countries, it is recommended that ChEI treatment should stop when AD becomes severe and reimbursement may depend on this. There have been little data to guide the clinician and potential concerns have been raised that continuing treatment is associated with an increase in adverse outcomes (Gill et al., 2009). The UK Donepezil and Memantine in Moderate to Severe AD (DOMINO) study (Howard et al., 2012), which randomised those on stable donepezil with moderate to severe dementia (Standardised Mini-Mental State Examination (SMMSE) score 5–13) to continuation donepezil, discontinuation, a change to memantine or adding memantine, clearly showed that continued donepezil treatment (or a switch to memantine or combination therapy) was associated with cognitive and functional benefits over the following 12 months, compared to placebo (see Figure 3). Previous data from observational studies as well as a more recent analysis from the DOMINO study suggest that treatment with anti-dementia drugs may delay admission to residential and nursing home care (Howard et al., 2015).

No new comparative trials between the three ChEIs, or of trials switching between the ChEIs, have been published in the last

---

**Table 2. Summary box: assessment and diagnosis.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making a diagnosis of dementia subtype</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of structural brain imaging for diagnosis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of SPECT or PET imaging</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF biomarkers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSF: cerebrospinal fluid; CT: computed tomography; FDG: fluoro-deoxy glucose; HMPAO: hexamethylpropylene amine oxime; MIBG: metaiodobenzylguanidine; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging; PET: positron emission tomography; SPECT: single photon emission computerised tomography.
previous comparative trials failed to consistently demonstrate any significant differences in efficacy between the three ChEIs, the main differences found being in frequency and type of adverse events (O'Brien and Burns, 2011). Similarly, our previous recommendation that a significant proportion (up to 50%) appear to both tolerate and benefit from switching between ChEIs if they cannot tolerate one, remains valid. Table 3 provides a summary of AD recommendation strengths.

Drugs for dementia with Lewy bodies
Pharmacological management of DLB remains one of the most challenging issues facing neurologists, psychiatrists, geriatricians, primary care physicians and others. The combination of cognitive, neuropsychiatric, autonomic and motor features in DLB is, when compared with AD, much more likely to lead to greater functional impairment and poorer quality of life. Moreover, the balance between these features varies, both between individuals and as the disease progresses. Treatments for one aspect of the disease may exacerbate other symptoms. In particular, treatment for neuropsychiatric features may exacerbate parkinsonism, while L-dopa and other anti-parkinsonian medications may exacerbate psychosis. Careful, individualised and patient-centred approaches are required to control individual symptoms, depending on the severity of symptoms and the wishes of patients and carers. Comprehensive reviews of the treatment of DLB (Boot, 2015) and Parkinson’s Disease Dementia (PDD) (Goldman and Weintraub, 2015) and meta-analysis of trials (Stinton et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2015;) are now available. No substantial new data regarding the use of antipsychotic or anti-parkinsonian drugs have been published since the previous DLB Consensus report (McKeith et al., 2005) and the recommendations made in these areas remain unchanged. Early RCTs of the ChEI rivastigmine demonstrated benefit in cognition in DLB (McKeith et al., 2000) and PDD (Emre et al., 2004) and also showed effects upon neuropsychiatric symptoms including hallucinations, apathy, anxiety and sleep disorders. New data have become available regarding donepezil in DLB.

Figure 2. Evidence base supporting benefits of co-prescription of a cholinesterase inhibitor and memantine.
(Ikeda et al., 2015; Mori et al., 2015) since the last BAP statement and as a result donepezil now has a marketing authorisation for DLB in Japan and the Philippines. All other ChEI prescribing in DLB remains off-label, whereas rivastigmine is licensed for use in PDD in Europe, Canada and the USA. Turning to memantine, two 24-week RCTs in people with mixed DLB or PDD populations (Aarsland et al., 2009; Emre et al., 2010) both showed a significant benefit on clinical global impression of change, but the subtype effects were inconsistent between the two studies, with PDD but not DLB patients benefitting in one (Aarsland et al., 2009) and DLB but not PDD in the other (Emre et al., 2010). Significant cognitive benefit (a 1.9 difference in MMSE) of memantine compared with placebo was observed in the total population at 24 weeks in the former, but with no significant benefit on non-cognitive symptoms. By contrast the latter study found cognitive improvements in only two sub-tests out of a 16-item battery in DLB, and none in PDD at 24 weeks. There were some significant improvements on the Neuropsychiatric Inventory (NPI), in DLB at 24 weeks but not in PDD patients (Emre et al., 2010). Memantine was well tolerated in both studies. Taken collectively these results do not show a consistent pattern of treatment response which highlights the considerable variation in sensitivity to treatment effects positive and negative, in this population which is also reported by clinicians who use ChEIs. Group mean scores in trials do not fully capture this variability.

After a long period without any novel pharmacological studies in patients with DLB there appears to be a resurgence in interest in trialling symptomatic neurotransmitter-based compounds and it is possible that new agents will be entering the DLB armamentarium during the life of this guideline. Table 4 provides a summary of DLB recommendation strengths.

**Drugs for vascular and mixed dementia**

Cerebrovascular disease remains the second most common pathological cause of dementia. The pathologies underlying...
VaD are heterogeneous, ranging from large multiple infarcts caused by emboli to diffuse white matter changes associated with chronic hypoperfusion (O’Brien and Thomas, 2015; O’Brien et al., 2003). There are no currently licensed treatments for VaD within the UK, so treatment strategies have largely focused on control of underlying cardiovascular and cerebrovascular risk factors and treatment of associated symptoms. There has been a suggestion that cholinergic dysfunction occurs in VaD, prompting interest in the use of ChEIs for this disorder. However, an autopsy-based study showed that loss of cholinergic function was only evident in VaD patients with concurrent AD and that cholinergic activity may actually be increased in those with multi-infarct dementia (Sharp et al., 2009), confirming an earlier report of no cholinergic loss in ‘pure’ VaD (Perry et al., 2005). Cerebrovascular risk factors should be identified in all patients with VaD. Where prevention of recurrent stroke is necessary, use of antihypertensive therapy in the case of haemorrhagic stroke and use of antiplatelets or anticoagulants, antihypertensive and lipid-lowering strategies after ischaemic stroke according to national guidelines should be implemented. Specific pharmacological interventions have involved donepezil, galantamine, rivastigmine and memantine. There is also a literature on the use of nimodipine, *Ginkgo biloba* and naftidrofuryl that is discussed below.

Since publication of the previous guideline, there have been no new studies with donepezil, galantamine, rivastigmine or memantine. The previous studies have been reviewed by Baskys and Hou (2007), Bocti et al. (2007) and Rojas-Fernandez and Moorhouse (2009). The studies with ChEIs show an improvement in cognition, apart from one study with galantamine (Erkinjuntti et al., 2002), but no overall effects in other measures. In one 24-week study with galantamine there were also significant improvements in executive function (EXIT25) (Auchus et al., 2007). One review showed that donepezil produced similar changes in cognition and global function in VaD and AD but that the changes in VaD were inconsistent (Passmore et al., 2005). The effects of memantine in VaD have been reviewed by Bocti et al. (2007), Kavirajan and Schneider (2007), McShane et al. (2006) and Thomas and Grossberg (2009). A meta-analysis (Kavirajan and Schneider, 2007) included all trials with donepezil, galantamine, rivastigmine and memantine compared with placebo in VaD. Post-hoc analyses of the initial two donepezil studies and the galantamine trial suggested greater improvement in patients with cortical and multiple territorial lesions, respectively, compared with those with predominantly subcortical lesions. The authors commented that the clinical heterogeneity of VaD patients limited generalisability of the trials’ outcomes because the effect of treatment on specific patients or subgroups could not be defined. The conclusion from the meta-analysis was that ChEIs and memantine produced small benefits in cognition of uncertain clinical significance in patients with mild to moderate VaD. Data are insufficient to support widespread use of these drugs in VaD. Individual patient analyses are needed to identify subgroups of patients with VaD who might benefit.

Nimodipine has some short-term benefits in VaD (López-Arrieta and Birks, 2002) and can beneficially affect MMSE, executive function measures and global rating in subcortical ischaemic vascular dementia (SIVD) (Pantoni et al., 2005). However, there has been no update on the original Cochrane review of nimodipine (López-Arrieta and Birks, 2002) and there remains a need for longer duration studies. In this context, rivastigmine (up to 6 mg daily) was compared with nimodipine in a single-blinded study of 14 months duration. Patients were subdivided according to whether they had multi-infarct dementia (MID) or SIVD. In the SIVD group rivastigmine did not improve MMSE but had beneficial effects upon measures of executive function, neuropsychiatric features, depression and Clinical Dementia Rating. In the MID group, rivastigmine had no effect on MMSE, but had beneficial effects on neuropsychiatric features and depression. All patients in the rivastigmine groups completed the study (Moretti et al., 2008).

Cerebral autosomal dominant arteriopathy with subcortical infarcts and leukoencephalopathy (CADASIL) is a rare monoegenetic form of SIVD. In an 18-week, placebo-controlled double-blind, randomised parallel-group trial, 10 mg donepezil daily had no effect on Vascular Version of the Alzheimer’s Disease Assessment Scale - Cognitive Test (V-ADAS-Cog) (the primary outcome measure) but there was a significant treatment effect favouring donepezil on some measures of executive function, the clinical relevance of which was unclear (Dichgans et al., 2008).

There have been further studies with EGb761, an extract of *Ginkgo biloba*. These have been reviewed by Baskys and Cheng (2012) and Gauthier and Schlaefke (2014) and studies included patients with AD, VaD or mixed dementia (Wang et al., 2010; Weinmann et al., 2010) but no data related to VaD alone has been provided. One RCT separately analysed the efficacy of EGb761 on 71 patients with VaD (Ihl et al., 2012). EGb761 treatment was superior to placebo in patients with VaD with respect to the Short Cognitive Performance Test and NPI scores. In a systematic review (Von Gunten et al., 2015) of patients with dementia and mild to moderate behavioural symptoms, it was reported that EGb761 at a dose of 240 mg had significant benefits on cognition, activities of daily living, behavioural symptoms, clinical global impression but not quality of life in the VaD subgroup. Further studies are recommended.

A Cochrane review of huperzine A (a naturally occurring ChEI derived from the Chinese herb *Huperzia serrata*) concluded that there is no convincing evidence that huperzine A is of value in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cholinesterase inhibitors</td>
<td>There is type I evidence to support treatment with rivastigmine and donepezil in Lewy body dementias, both in dementia with Lewy bodies and Parkinson’s disease dementia.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memantine</td>
<td>There is type I evidence that memantine produces global improvements in Lewy body dementias, both dementia with Lewy bodies and Parkinson’s disease dementia, but the pattern of cognitive and neuropsychiatric responsiveness remains uncertain.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VaD. This was based on one small trial and further research is needed (Hao et al., 2009).

In a recent Cochrane review of nafldrofuryl (Lu et al., 2011), the conclusion was that in patients with VaD or mixed dementia there were significant benefits on a number of outcomes. However the numbers were very small and did not permit an overall recommendation apart from the need for further trials in specific groups.

It is widely recognised that a good number of people diagnosed with dementia have mixed brain pathology which is predominantly due to Alzheimer’s and cerebrovascular changes. One RCT with galantamine (Erkinjuntti et al., 2002) included VaD and AD patients showing radiological and historical evidence of cerebrovascular disease. A combined analysis of VaD and AD patients showed a significant treatment effect on cognition, function, behavioural symptoms and clinical global impression. The systematic review of EGb761 reported significant benefits in all outcomes tested in patients with mixed dementia. Further studies are necessary in well defined groups.

There is a rationale for study of vascular risk factor control in established mixed dementia. In a recent RCT, multi-component vascular care that combined pharmacological and nonpharmacological interventions did not slow functional or cognitive decline in 130 patients with AD and CVD (Richard et al., 2009). However it is worth noting that some of the vascular factors, for example blood pressure, were no different between the intervention and control group. Table 5 provides a summary of vascular dementia recommendation strengths.

**Table 5. Summary box: vascular dementia.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment with cholinesterase inhibitors and memantine</td>
<td>There is type I evidence showing small cognitive improvements with both cholinesterase inhibitors and memantine in vascular dementia. However, benefits in terms of global outcome are not seen and adverse events for cholinesterase inhibitors (but not memantine) are significantly greater than placebo. Evidence indicates that neither cholinesterase inhibitors nor memantine should be prescribed to people with vascular dementia, though those with mixed vascular dementia and Alzheimer's disease may benefit.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other dementias**

This group of disorders is used here to include FTD, the primary progressive aphasia, progressive supranuclear palsy (PSP), corticobasal degeneration (CBD) and prion dementias amongst others, and the overlap between some of these conditions is illustrated in Figure 4. No new evidence regarding the use of ChEIs in FTD has become available since the last BAP statement. The existing evidence does not support the use of these drugs in FTD although rates of off-label use remain high, despite increased agitation having been reported with their use in FTD (O’Brien et al., 2011). There have been no new trials of antidepressants in FTD, as before, evidence for the use of these drugs is mixed and largely rests on small open label studies. New RCTs of memantine in FTD report a lack of efficacy with this drug (Boxer et al., 2013; Vercelletto et al., 2011). A small trial of Souvenaid reported beneficial effects in behaviour and social cognition measures over a short time period (Pardini et al., 2015), but more studies are needed. Oxytocin administered intranasally in FTD appears safe and tolerable; larger studies are needed to assess its efficacy (Finger et al., 2015).

There are no adequately powered treatment studies in primary progressive aphasia upon which to make firm recommendations. Since the last BAP statement there has been no new trial evidence for ChEIs or coenzyme Q10 in treating PSP. Existing evidence does not support their use. The largest PSP trial to date found that davunetide (proposed to decrease tau phosphorylation and stabilise microtubules) was not an effective treatment (Boxer et al., 2014). Since the last BAP statement a trial demonstrated no survival benefit in Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (CJD) patients treated with quinacrine (an antimalarial drug that reduces abnormal prion protein deposits in vitro) (Geschwind et al., 2013). Doxycycline was not effective in treating CJD (Haïk et al., 2014). There are no adequately powered studies of ChEIs to support the use of these drugs for cognitive impairment in Huntington’s disease. There is no evidence to support the use of other medications to treat dementia associated with Huntington’s disease though several disease-modifying avenues are being pursued, including compounds to reduce metal-induced aggregation of the Huntington protein (Angus et al., 2015). Tables 6 and 7 provide a summary of FTD and PSP recommendation strengths, respectively.
Mild cognitive impairment (MCI) due to AD and prodromal AD

There have been no new positive studies to inform prescribing in prodromal conditions such as MCI. Cochrane and other reviews show lack of efficacy of ChEIs (Birks and Flicker, 2006; Loy and Schneider, 2006), equivocal findings with piracetam (Flicker and Grimley Evans, 2001) and there is no other evidence to support nootropics. There have been no studies of memantine in MCI. Other studies including RCTs of vitamin E and anti-inflammatory drugs (rofecoxib) have been negative. There have been numerous trials conducted and ongoing in MCI due to AD or prodromal AD though none have been successful and progressed beyond Phase 3. Table 8 provides a summary of MCI recommendation strengths.

Other relevant issues in management

The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) process

In the UK, within England and Wales, recommendations on the use of licensed drugs are made by NICE. NICE was established in 1999 as a National Health Service (NHS) Special Health Authority and changed in 2013 to an arm’s length non-departmental government body. This reflected an extension of its remit to also include social care. It is contained within the Department of Health but outside the NHS and it is accountable to parliament through the Secretary of State for Health. It has several remits, including the production of focussed technology appraisal, mostly on drugs, and broader guidelines which can cover clinical care, public health and social care. With regard to dementia, there have been several technology appraisals on anti-dementia drugs, the most recent (TA 217) on ChEIs and memantine for AD, published in 2011 and updated 2016. Unlike earlier technology appraisals of these drugs, which had limited use of these agents to either those who were deemed to respond to the drug or to those with moderate disease, TA 217 recommends the use of donepezil, galantamine and rivastigmine as treatment options for all patients with mild to moderate AD, and memantine for moderate to severe AD. No recommendations are made either for or against combined therapy. Recommendations for severe disease or for non-Alzheimer dementia are not contained within TA 217, since technology appraisals are limited to the licence of the drug.

There is also a NICE dementia guideline, GD42 (NICE, 2006), which was in the process of being fully revised at the time of the publication of this BAP guideline. The current guideline recommends the use of ChEIs for Lewy body dementia, but not for FTD, VaD or MCI.

Perspective from a person with dementia

Many people with dementia and their carers have been important advocates for the clinical use of anti-dementia drugs and this should be an essential part of any decision making process. As with previous guidelines, for this revision we invited Peter Mittler as a person with dementia to join the meeting. His insights were invaluable and very much accorded with experience of the clinicians on the panel. Peter reflected on the wider contexts in which the first prescription can be considered. These range from the patient’s initial interpretation of the significance of medication to the ethical imperative for professionals to strike a balance between the global quest for cure and the fundamental human rights of people with dementia for care and support. This is consistent with the bio-psychosocial model of impairment which includes quality of life indicators.

Accounts provided by people living with dementia reflect strong dissatisfaction with the complex journey to diagnosis and also with the lack of post-diagnostic support (Schalock et al., 2016). These suggest that the time is ripe for clear guidance on good and bad practice in diagnosis and its aftermath.
profession carries the main responsibility for timely diagnosis and for maintaining the health and well-being of each person in their own homes for as long as possible. It is well placed to use its prestige with the public to emphasise that disability is part of the human experience and that it is possible to live well with dementia. It could also influence public opinion, politicians and the media by avoiding the use of degrading language involving time-bombs and tsunamis. In our quest for prevention and cure, we have lost sight of the uniqueness of the individual highlighted by Tom Kitwood and more recently by Steven Sabat who focuses on the maintenance of a sense of self and personal identity from first diagnosis to the end of life (Schalock et al., 2016). We need to provide services based on the needs and wishes of the individual and their principal care partner by providing tailor-made support and rehabilitation comparable to that received by people who sustain brain injury as a result of stroke or road traffic accident. A visiting dementia adviser should be able to access the additional supports that are or may become necessary, e.g. an occupational therapist to suggest adaptations to the home and to appliances such as personal computers. A dementia-friendly community should include children, young people and students, who as future leaders need to be aware that each person with dementia is a unique individual with the right to be supported as a member of their local community.

The role of primary care in the management of dementia

Primary care general practitioners (GPs) increasingly work in larger multidisciplinary teams. This expansion has been influenced by a national policy of care closer to home, greater focus on preventative care and the transfer of primary clinical responsibility for chronic disease management from secondary to primary care. Most common chronic illnesses (e.g. diabetes, asthma, hypertension) are largely managed by the GP with the aid of shared care pathways, prescribing protocols and specialist nurses. A new General Medical Services (GMS) contract in 2004 fundamentally changed the way GPs in England work through the introduction of ‘core services’ with ‘optional enhanced services’. The contract links achievements in care quality, with a major focus on chronic illness care, properly funded through an evidence-based Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF). QOF criteria for dementia exist and comprise: (a) establishing and maintaining a register of patients with diagnosed dementia and (b) undertaking an annual review on patients on the register.

The majority of people with dementia live in the community with their GP as the primary healthcare provider most of the time. The GP can have an extensive range of post-diagnostic responsibilities including: information provision; access to other services; carer support; management of co-morbid conditions and behavioural problems; future care planning and end of life care (Robinson et al., 2010). As our populations rapidly age and the demand on specialist old age psychiatry services increases, primary care may need to undertake a more formalised shared care approach to dementia care as has existed in diabetic care for the last twenty years. A recent RCT comparing the effectiveness of memory clinics and GPs for delivery of post diagnostic care found no significant differences between the two services (Meeuwsen et al., 2012).

In some European countries, GPs can initiate anti-dementia drugs; the current evidence base for the initiation, and review, of anti-dementia drugs by non-specialists is very limited and restricted to low quality, observational studies (Aupperle and Coyne, 2000; Aupperle et al., 2003; Watanabe et al., 2012). In the UK, existing NICE guidelines (2006) stipulate drug initiation should be on the advice of a specialist, with shared care prescribing supported for maintenance treatment. A UK pilot trial of a GP educational prescription to support dementia diagnosis and improve quality of care found that GPs had little knowledge of shared care protocols for anti-dementia drugs, with specialists still largely responsible for monitoring (Wilcock et al., 2013). However a US-based trial of a care manager intervention, combined with a quality improvement/professional education component, found increased anti-dementia drug prescribing in primary care (Vickrey et al., 2006). With specialist disease nurses, key to the success in chronic illness management in primary care, the role of a nurse dementia case manager affords considerable potential for person-centred post-diagnostic care. The evidence base however is mixed with a recent UK pilot trial struggling to successfully integrate dementia case managers into existing NHS primary and community care services (Bamford et al., 2014). New alternative primary care models with GP-led memory clinics and attached nurse facilitators have been established in some areas.

In summary, the current system of shared care prescribing of anti-dementia drugs in the UK requires further evaluation in order to identify facilitators to improve care quality. With regard to GP-led prescribing, this will be influenced by the revised NICE guidelines (due 2017); such a change in practice would however require upskilling of GPs, prescribing protocols and the development of a shared care, integrated system co-ordinated by possibly specialist nurses. Table 9 summarises recommendation strengths for primary care.

End of life care

One-third of older people will die with some form of cognitive impairment or dementia (Brayne et al., 2006). There are two populations of people with dementia for whom end of life care needs to be considered, those who have dementia in the in early/moderate stages but are dying from other disease such as cancer or organ failure or those who have advanced dementia where the commonest cause of death is pneumonia or other infection. They may experience poor end of life care because they are often not perceived to have a terminal illness and health and social care services may not be optimally configured to meet their complex needs (Sampson et al., 2011).

In people with advanced dementia the main prescribing decisions are related to considering the ‘ceiling of care’. Thus stopping medications which may have no longer term benefit i.e. statins, low-dose aspirin or antihypertensives may be appropriate (Holmes et al., 2008).

There is little evidence available on how best to prescribe for people with severe dementia, particularly when to stop drugs which are no longer necessary or beneficial. There is a lack of RCT data for anti-dementia drugs in this population. Trials tend to be for short periods of 3–12 months with open-label extension studies after this and there is little evidence for continuing treatment when people reach this stage. It has been argued that the
There is type II evidence to support the current practice of non-specialist initiation of these drugs, following a specialist diagnosis. There is type II evidence indicating no significance differences between the ongoing prescription and monitoring of the drugs between memory clinic and GP-led services.

**Table 9. Summary box: primary care.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation and prescription of anti-dementia drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10. Summary box: end of life care.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal of anti-dementia drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gingko biloba**

Early trials were small, of poor quality and raised concerns about publication bias but two large well designed RCTs in dementia subjects (McCarney et al., 2008; Schneider et al., 2005) showed no benefits from *Gingko biloba* on cognition. A primary prevention feasibility study (Dodge et al., 2008) over 42 months in 118 people over 85 at baseline found *Gingko biloba* did not prevent the development of dementia or decline in memory but found an increase in stroke and TIA cases in the gingko group and the GEM study (DeKosky et al., 2008) assessed 3069 volunteers who had MCI or were cognitively normal randomised to placebo or *Ginkgo biloba* over a median follow-up of 6.1 years. Gingko had no effect on reducing incident AD or all-cause dementia but was associated with a non-significant doubling in haemorrhagic stroke (16 vs 8). However, a meta-analysis (n=1985, mainly people with dementia) of the effect of gingko on coagulation found only small and clinically insignificant changes (Kellermann and Kloft, 2011).

**Hormone replacement therapy (HRT)**

A large primary prevention trial, the Women’s Health Initiative Memory Study (WHIMS) trial examined the possible benefit of HRT or estrogen replacement therapy (ERT) in reducing dementia in post-menopausal women (participants were 65–79 years at entry). Adverse outcomes led to both arms being terminated early. The use of unopposed oestrogen (n=1464 vs n=1483 on placebo) for about seven years was associated with a non-significant increased risk of dementia, hazard ratio 1.49 (95% confidence interval (CI) 0.83–2.66; Shumaker et al., 2004), and treatment with combined oestrogen and progesterin for about four years (n=2229 vs 2303 on placebo) led to a doubling of dementia risk, hazard ratio 2.05 (95% CI 1.21–3.48; Shumaker et al., 2003). Combining these two groups, there was a highly clinically and statistically significant increase in dementia in women taking HRT, hazard ratio 1.76 (95% CI 1.19–2.60; Shumaker et al., 2004). Following WHIMS the critical window hypothesis emerged claiming use of ERT in younger women might be beneficial but a recent review has questioned this and there is no good quality data to support this (Maki and Henderson, 2012).

**Folate and vitamin B12**

Dietary supplementation using folic acid (synthetic analogue of folate) and vitamin B12, which reduce homocysteine levels, have
been proposed for preventing and treating dementia. Whilst cross-sectional studies have generally supported this view (Ho et al., 2011), prospective studies have not found a relationship between dementia and high homocysteine (Ho et al., 2011) and a systematic review of RCTs of B vitamin and folate supplementation found no beneficial effects on cognition in people with or without cognitive impairment (Ford and Almeida, 2012).

**Statins and dementia**

No new RCTs in relation to dementia prevention have been published since the last guideline. Neither of the previous two large studies (heart protection study and PROSPER) found an effect of statins on ameliorating cognitive decline or dementia.

**Souvenaid**

Three double-blind RCTs with a medical food (nutritional combination Fortasyn Connect) in AD have been reported. Souvenir I and II were in people with mild AD (MMSE ≥20) not on AD medication. Souvenir I (Scheltens et al., 2010), in 212 subjects randomised to active drink or control drink, found a small improvement in a categorical analysis of the WMS-R delayed recall at 12 weeks but not in overall change in WMS-R delayed recall or in ADAS-Cog or other outcomes or in any measures at 24 week extension. Souvenir II (Scheltens et al., 2012) found a small improvement at 24 weeks in the Neuropsychological Test Battery memory composite score in 209 subjects but not in overall score or in any other outcome measures. The S-Connect study (Shah et al., 2013b) in 527 people with mild to moderate AD (MMSE≥14) on AD medication found no improvements in the active group in the primary outcome (ADAS-Cog) at 24 weeks or in any other clinical measures. The drink was well tolerated in all studies. The absence of any evidence of benefits on global outcomes and only patchy modest effects on memory scores do not provide evidence to support its use in AD.

**Therapeutic non-invasive brain stimulation**

Interest in the use of non-invasive stimulation approaches such as transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) and rapid rate transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) has gained significant traction over the past number of years. The use of such approaches is appealing in dementia given their low predilection to side effects and evidence across multiple investigative platforms (e.g. young healthy controls, ageing studies, pathological groups etc.) has suggested that non-invasive stimulation techniques can have effects which are sustained beyond the period of the stimulation and this clearly has important therapeutic ramifications (Elder and Taylor, 2014; Hsu et al., 2015; Kuo et al., 2014).

rTMS, in particular, is now used for a wide array of neurological and mental health symptoms; for example rTMS is now a US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved treatment for major depressive disorder in patients who have not responded to prior antidepressants (US FDA, 2011) and guidance on its use for conditions such as depression and migraine have been issued by NICE in the UK (NICE, 2014, 2015).

Mechanistically both tDCS and rTMS modulate cortical activity non-invasively. rTMS does so by the delivery, through the scalp, of a high intensity time-varying magnetic pulse which causes current flow within the brain. By varying the stimulation parameters such as the stimulation intensity, frequency of pulsing and duration, rTMS can either enhance or suppress cortical activity in target brain regions. tDCS delivers a low intensity electrical current, typically between two scalp pads (positive polarity=anode; negative polarity=cathode) and has been postulated to modulate neuronal transmembrane potential toward hyperpolarisation or depolarisation in brain tissues underlying the anode or cathode scalp pads, respectively.

Non-invasive brain stimulation techniques have been applied in healthy older adults to enhance cognition and importantly, also in patients with dementia (Boggio et al., 2011; Hsu et al., 2015) but the data are not as comprehensive as that for the treatment of depression with rTMS. A recent systematic review and meta-analysis identified 11 studies with a total of 200 AD patients and found a significant effect size of 1.35 for cognitive outcomes with subgroup analyses suggesting more pronounced effects for studies applying the stimulation during the execution of a cognitive task compared with studies delivering the stimulation before the task (Hsu et al., 2015). However, there was very little data to indicate whether any cognitive benefits are sustained. In addition, it was noted in the meta-analysis by Hsu et al. (2015) that individual trial sizes were small and protocol designs heterogeneous; furthermore in the studies examined there was also evidence of positive publication although notably across the dementia studies which examined rTMS or tDCS there was a lack of any serious adverse events.

Quality trial data for the use of rTMS or tDCS in other dementias is even more scant (Elder and Taylor, 2014). Similarly extension of the use of these non-invasive approaches to ameliorate neuropsychiatric symptoms in dementia is very limited and positive outcomes uncertain; for example, one double blind RCT of tDCS for the treatment of apathy in 40 AD subjects did not demonstrate any positive effect (Suemoto et al., 2014).

There are also controversies about the efficacy of tDCS and general issues of concerning the design of tDCS protocols which have hampered development of robust and well powered trials (Elder and Taylor, 2014; Horvath et al., 2014, 2015).

Therefore, it is too soon to formally recommend these approaches in their application to the treatment of dementia and its associated symptoms although the existing data may suggest that there may be a potential future role for these agents but further larger scale and well-designed trials are needed. Table 11 summarises recommendation strengths for other treatments for dementia.

**Disease-modifying therapies**

There are several strategies currently being investigated for possible disease-modifying effects in people at high risk of progression to dementia, though most studies focus on AD and include subjects with prodromal AD or preclinical AD. These include the use of drugs that may modulate amyloid and/or tau processing, e.g. to decrease production of beta amyloid or to increase its breakdown or removal, and other approaches which try to reduce the likelihood of amyloid monomers binding to produce oligomers and insoluble sheets. There have also been anti-inflammatory and neurotrophic strategies.
The success of mouse vaccine studies led to the first human trials of an active Aβ 1-42 vaccine (AN1792) in people with AD. Neuropathological examination of subjects from a phase I RPCT of AN1792 showed variable removal of amyloid plaques and no impact on long term clinical outcomes. A large phase II RPCT also failed to show clinical efficacy. In addition, 6% subjects developed meningo-encephalitis. More recently, the development of another active immunisation approach, CAD106 (Aβ 1-6), has shown sustained Aβ response and long term safety in AD but clinical data have not been fully reported.

A number of passive immunisation approaches have been tried in AD (see Figure 5). Bapineuzumab (anti-Aβ 1-5) showed no evidence of clinical efficacy in phase II studies and around 10% subjects developed vasogenic oedema. An exploratory analysis showed better clinical outcomes in patients who did not carry the APOE e4 allele which led to two large RPCTs of bapineuzumab in APOE e4 positive and negative AD subjects (Salloway et al., 2014). Neither study showed beneficial clinical effects. Solanezumab (anti-Aβ 13-28), aimed at soluble monomeric Aβ, failed to show overall clinical benefit in two large phase III studies of AD. Likewise, crenezumab (anti-Aβ 12-23), aimed at aggregated Aβ, failed to show clinical benefit in a large phase II study. Retrospective analysis of the solanezumab and crenezumab data has led to larger studies aimed at the mild AD cohort. Aducanumab (anti-Aβ 3-6) has shown effective amyloid removal but with mixed clinical outcomes and marked side effects with increasing dose. Gantenerumab (anti-Aβ 1-11), has specifically a priori examined very early AD (cognitively normal but amyloid positive PET). Unfortunately, this two-year RPCT study showed no efficacy on primary or secondary outcomes.

A number of these active or passive immunisation approaches are now being tested in long-term preventative RPCT studies of APOE e4 positive, cognitively normal subjects (CAD106) or presymptomatic carriers of early onset AD mutations (solanezumab, crenezumab and gantenerumab). Finally the use of pooled human plasma antibodies Gammagard has been examined in a phase III RPCT trial of AD patients with no differences found on primary outcomes. It is worth noting that of the other anti-amyloid approaches the use of β secretase inhibitors are still in active development and there is increasing interest in immunisation approaches aimed at the prevention of tangle propagation.

### Anti-inflammatory approaches

A large number of RCTs of anti-inflammatory agents in AD have failed to reach primary outcomes (Heneka et al., 2015). Large
Currently trials of drugs for disease modification in AD use different outcomes e.g. magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) brain volume change or change in cognition or function. They also use differing measures of the same outcome. Use of an agreed set of the most valid trials’ outcome measures for disease modification studies would improve efficiency and enhance interpretation of data across studies (Ghezzi et al., 2013). This would allow the comparison of the efficacy of both drugs and non-pharmacological interventions, for example, exercise, cognitive stimulation and new drugs. Standardised core outcomes would also aid meta-analysis and enable small data sets to be combined and inform practice. These may include quality of life and related outcomes, that people with dementia and their families report as being important to them, and can also inform cost-effectiveness analysis.

In the HTA funded Core Outcomes in Dementia study (COD dementia), we have brought together a wide body of National Institute for Health Research dementia researchers to debate and agree on the best outcome measures for future clinical trials in mild and moderate dementia and expect our conclusions will have international impact and shape and optimise the design of future dementia trials.

**Prospects for prevention**

Prevention is typically considered in three main subdivisions. Primary prevention is where the onset of disease is prevented. Secondary prevention is where clinical symptoms are prevented in people with evidence of disease, and tertiary prevention is where a later stage of clinical progression is prevented in people with both disease and symptoms. As can be seen from this general description, the terms are dependent upon the definitions of ‘disease’ and ‘symptoms’. When we refer this to the case of AD, it is therefore critical to draw a distinction between AD and AD dementia.

In this regard, the secondary prevention is ‘of’ a clinical condition so – for instance in the European Prevention of Alzheimer’s Dementia (EPAD) project (Ritchie et al., 2015), the title implies that the project is seeking to prevent dementia and hence encompasses (in the case of secondary prevention) intervening in populations who have evidence of AD and are either preclinical (disease and no symptoms) or prodromal (disease and symptoms but not satisfying criteria for dementia).

Despite billions of dollars of effort, there are no drugs available that achieve secondary prevention of dementia (Schneider et al., 2014). Non-pharmacological, multi-modal interventions have shown better evidence of success than any drug to date e.g. the FINGER study (Ngandu et al., 2015). Pharmaceutical interventions have been hampered by poor definitions of the target population with inadequate stratification of risk and sample heterogeneity, inadequate psychometric properties of outcome measures, interventions being applied at a very late stage of the disease process, absence of surrogate biomarker changes for clinical changes and sub-optimal study prosecution. Moreover, in a complex disorder like Alzheimer’s disease, specific interventions against single disease processes are unlikely to yield benefit if multiple pathological processes contribute to the clinical phenotype.

The basis therefore for successful secondary prevention of Alzheimer’s dementia therefore needs all these historical shortcomings to be addressed. That is we need to develop much better

**Table 12. Summary box: disease-modifying therapies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gamma secretase inhibition</td>
<td>There is type I evidence that gamma secretase inhibitors are not effective in Alzheimer’s disease.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccination and immunisation studies</td>
<td>There is preliminary type II evidence of their effect in Alzheimer’s disease on some endpoints, but also type II evidence that amyloid lowering does not affect clinical course. Amyloid-lowering agents should not be prescribed until the optimal disease stage, safety and efficacy data are available.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

scale studies of NSAIDs including indomethacin, naproxen and rofecoxib in AD have been unsuccessful. RPCTs with a range of other anti-inflammatory drugs, including prednisone, hydroxychloroquine, simvastatin, atorvastatin, aspirin and rosiglitazone have also shown no clinically significant changes in primary cognitive outcomes in patients with AD. A small RPCT of etanercept showed some evidence of a reduction of clinical decline but it has yet to be replicated in a large scale study (Butchart et al., 2015). Epidemiological studies of the protective effects of NSAIDs are generally more positive. However, RPCTs examining the possible protective effects seen in these studies are mixed. Thus a large trial of rofecoxib found an increased risk of conversion to AD in the MCI-treated group (Thal et al., 2005). Likewise a large randomised study of the NSAIDs naproxen and celecoxib in asymptomatic individuals with a family history of AD initially reported an increased risk of increased cognitive decline for both drugs. However, a longer-term follow-up of these patients suggests that the early detrimental effects were mostly in a small group of patients with early cognitive impairment and naproxen seemed to be protective in patients for up to four years in those who had been asymptomatic at baseline (Alzheimer’s Disease Anti-Inflammatory Prevention Trial Research Group, 2013). Table 12 summarises recommendation strengths for disease-modifying therapies.

**Optimising outcome measures for trials**

Following the expansion of NHS Memory Services, the number of people diagnosed with dementia in the UK has increased hugely (Mukadam et al., 2014), so that around 100,000 people per year receive a diagnosis of AD within the NHS. There have been huge strides forward in managing dementia. These include early diagnosis, information, advance decision making, cognitive stimulation therapy, management of neuropsychiatric symptoms, strategies for family carers, ChEIs in AD, and changes in attitudes, including highlighting personhood and living well with dementia, but there is no cure or disease-modifying treatment for the common dementias (Prince et al., 2011).
disease models in preclinical and prodromal dementia that will underpin stratification of populations into more predictable groups for progression and we need to map onto this population clinical outcomes. These outcomes need to reflect changes to the underlying disease process from an experimental neuropsychology perspective forwards rather than a dementia outcomes foundation backwards. We need to intervene as early as possible on the basis of these disease models and accept outcomes that are surrogates for incident dementia. We also need mechanisms to undertake combinatorial trials of agents with different pathological or mechanistic targets. Finally, the trials themselves need to be conducted in a limited number of centres with access to the target populations to run at scale and maintain data quality and reduce sample heterogeneity. The EPAD programme concurrently addresses all these elements.

In conclusion, the secondary prevention of dementia is reliant heavily on a more complete understanding of the neurodegenerative disease processes, which lead to clinical symptoms and eventually dementia. This means we need to undertake projects (e.g. EPAD and PREVENT (Ritchie and Ritchie, 2012) which can measure brain changes through biomarker development of disease processes in mid-life beyond amyloid and tau pathology to be able to incorporate (for example) inflammatory, cerebrovascular, hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis and other protein mis-folding (e.g. prion and α-synuclein disease). Until such models are developed and used, we will be continuing to run trials that are making too many assumptions and therefore taking too much risk and may only succeed through serendipity rather than by design. Thus, it may be that multimodal interventions that include interventions that target broad risk factor modification e.g. diet and optimised cardiovascular health may prove more successful.

Currently, there is no evidence for pharmacological intervention to prevent dementia. There is Level 1 evidence from an RCT that met its primary outcome that a combination of diet, cognitive training, cardiovascular health optimisation and exercise can slow cognitive decline in an at-risk elderly population (Ngandu et al., 2015), though the contribution of each factor within the FINGER multi-modal intervention to benefit is not known. Table 13 summarises recommendation strengths for prevention of dementia, and Table 14 summarises all recommendation strengths in this statement.

### Table 13. Summary box: prevention of dementia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of dementia</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of vascular risk factors</td>
<td>III and IV</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14. Summary box: all recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a diagnosis of dementia subtype</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of structural brain imaging for diagnosis</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of SPECT or PET imaging</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF biomarkers</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alzheimer’s disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment with cholinesterase inhibitors and memantine</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently, there is no evidence for pharmacological intervention to prevent dementia. There is Level 1 evidence from an RCT that met its primary outcome that a combination of diet, cognitive training, cardiovascular health optimisation and exercise can slow cognitive decline in an at-risk elderly population (Ngandu et al., 2015), though the contribution of each factor within the FINGER multi-modal intervention to benefit is not known. Table 13 summarises recommendation strengths for prevention of dementia, and Table 14 summarises all recommendation strengths in this statement.
### Table 14. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Switching between cholinesterase inhibitors</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence for memantine in moderate to severe Alzheimer’s disease. There is type I evidence that cholinesterase inhibitors should not be stopped just because the point of severe dementia has been reached.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combination therapy</strong></td>
<td>There is type II evidence to support the switching of one cholinesterase inhibitor to another if the first is not tolerated or effective.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dementia with Lewy bodies</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence for adding memantine to a cholinesterase inhibitor.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cholinesterase inhibitors</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence to support treatment with rivastigmine and donepezil in Lewy body dementia, both dementia with Lewy bodies and Parkinson’s disease dementia.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memantine</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence that memantine produces global improvements in Lewy body dementia, both dementia with Lewy bodies and Parkinson’s disease dementia, but the pattern of cognitive and neuropsychiatric responsiveness remains uncertain.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vascular dementia</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence showing small cognitive improvements with both cholinesterase inhibitors and memantine in vascular dementia. However, benefits in terms of global outcome are not seen and adverse events for cholinesterase inhibitors (but not memantine) are significantly greater than placebo. Evidence indicates that neither cholinesterase inhibitors nor memantine should be prescribed to people with vascular dementia, though those with mixed vascular dementia and Alzheimer’s disease may benefit.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frontotemporal dementia</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence that cholinesterase inhibitors are not recommended for the treatment of frontotemporal dementia.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SSRIs</strong></td>
<td>There is type II evidence that SSRIs may help some behavioural aspects of frontotemporal dementia, but do not improve cognition. Studies are mixed and further evidence is needed.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memantine</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence that memantine is not recommended for frontotemporal dementia.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progressive supranuclear palsy</strong></td>
<td>Type II evidence indicates that no treatments can be recommended at the current time.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mild cognitive impairment</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence that cholinesterase inhibitors are not effective in reducing the risk of developing Alzheimer’s disease and type I evidence that vitamin E is not effective in reducing the risk of Alzheimer’s disease.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary care</strong></td>
<td>There is type IV evidence to support the current practice of non-specialist initiation of these drugs.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of life care</strong></td>
<td>There is type II evidence indicating no significance differences between the ongoing prescription and monitoring of the drugs between memory clinic and GP-led services.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Withdrawal of anti-dementia drugs</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence that continuing donepezil may decrease the rate of functional decline in moderate/severe dementia. There is type III evidence that it may be inappropriate to prescribe memantine and cholinesterase inhibitors in advanced dementia towards the end of life.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other treatments for dementia</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence that HRT is not effective either in treating cognition in Alzheimer’s disease, or for the primary prevention of all-cause dementia or Alzheimer’s disease.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRT in prevention and treatment of Alzheimer’s disease in post-menopausal women</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence that HRT is harmful. HRT should not be prescribed either as a prevention or treatment for dementia, including Alzheimer’s disease.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folate and vitamin B12 for dementia</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence that supplementation with folic acid with or without vitamin B12 does not benefit cognition in people with dementia. On current evidence, neither vitamin B12 nor folate, either singly or in combination, can be recommended as treatments for dementia, or for dementia prevention.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statins for the treatment or prevention of dementia</strong></td>
<td>There is type I evidence that statins do not prevent dementia.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Souvenaid</td>
<td>There is type II evidence that statins do not produce cognitive benefits in Alzheimer’s disease.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rTMS and tDCS</td>
<td>There is type II evidence indicating possible benefits of Souvenaid on cognition but effects are variable between studies and no effect on global outcomes has been shown. Souvenaid is not recommended until further evidence becomes available.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease-modifying therapies</td>
<td>There is type II evidence indicating benefit of rTMS and tDCS on cognition but effects may not be sustained. These treatments are not recommended until further evidence becomes available.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma secretase inhibition</td>
<td>There is type I evidence that gamma secretase inhibitors are not effective in Alzheimer’s disease.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccination and immunisation studies</td>
<td>There is type I evidence that tarenflurbil is not effective in Alzheimer’s disease.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of dementia</td>
<td>There is preliminary type II evidence of their effect in Alzheimer’s disease on some endpoints, but also type II evidence that amyloid lowering does not affect clinical course. Amyloid-lowering agents should not be prescribed until the optimal disease stage, safety and efficacy data are available.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of dementia</td>
<td>There is no evidence at present to support any drug intervention to prevent dementia.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of dementia</td>
<td>There is type II evidence that antihypertensive therapy may be helpful, but further studies are required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of vascular risk factors</td>
<td>There is type III and IV evidence that vascular risk factors are inadequately recognised and managed in people with dementia, and that recognition and management should be as active as in those without dementia.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strength of recommendation. A: directly based on category I evidence; B: directly based on category II evidence or extrapolated recommendation from category I evidence; C: directly based on category III evidence or extrapolated recommendation from category I or II evidence; D: directly based on category IV evidence or extrapolated recommendation from category I, II or III evidence.
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