

# Comorbidity and dementia: a mixed-method study on improving health care for people with dementia (CoDem)

Frances Bunn,<sup>1\*</sup> Anne-Marie Burn,<sup>1</sup> Claire Goodman,<sup>1</sup>  
Louise Robinson,<sup>2</sup> Greta Rait,<sup>3</sup> Sam Norton,<sup>4</sup>  
Holly Bennett,<sup>5</sup> Marie Poole,<sup>2</sup> Johan Schoeman<sup>6</sup>  
and Carol Brayne<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centre for Research in Primary and Community Care, University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, UK

<sup>2</sup>Institute for Health and Society, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

<sup>3</sup>PRIMENT Clinical Trials Unit, Research Department of Primary Care and Population Health, University College London Medical School, London, UK

<sup>4</sup>Department of Psychology, Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London, London, UK

<sup>5</sup>Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

<sup>6</sup>East London Foundation Trust, London, UK

\*Corresponding author

**Declared competing interests of authors:** Professor Goodman reports grants from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) during the course of the study. Dr Norton reports grants from the NIHR Health Services and Delivery Research programme during the course of the study and grants from the NIHR Research for Patient Benefit programme and the Multiple Sclerosis Society, outside the submitted work.

Published February 2016

DOI: 10.3310/hsdr04080

## Scientific summary

### Improving health care for people with dementia

Health Services and Delivery Research 2016; Vol. 4: No. 8

DOI: 10.3310/hsdr04080

NIHR Journals Library [www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk](http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk)

# Scientific summary

## Background

Dementia is a significant public health problem with far-reaching health, social and economic impacts and the prevalence of dementia in the UK is set to rise significantly. Evidence suggests that among people with dementia there is a high prevalence of comorbid medical conditions and complaints, but little is known about the effects of comorbidity on processes and quality of care and patient needs or how services are adapting to address the particular needs of this population. Dementia is often viewed as an isolated condition with little understanding of how other complex health needs might impact on patient and carer experiences or service use and provision.

## Aims

The overall aims of this study were to explore the impact of comorbidities for a person living with dementia (PLWD) on access to non-dementia services and identify ways of improving integration of services for this population. We focused specifically on three conditions: diabetes, stroke and vision impairment (VI).

## Methods

We used a mixed-methods approach informed by theories of continuity and access to care. This included:

- (a) a scoping review of relevant literature to map what is currently known about comorbidity and dementia
- (b) a cross-sectional analysis of the Cognitive Function and Ageing Studies (CFAS) population cohort database to explore health and social service use in people with a diagnosis of dementia and a comorbid medication condition
- (c) a qualitative study exploring the views and experiences of people with dementia and comorbidity, their family carers and health-care professionals (HCPs)
- (d) consensus methods to help develop ideas/recommendations for practice.

## Results

### *Scoping review*

We included 76 studies or reports that addressed issues around dementia and comorbidity, focusing on diabetes, stroke and VI. There was evidence of a lack of continuity in health-care systems and structures for people with dementia and comorbidity, with little integration or communication between different teams and specialities. Thirty-one studies reported prevalence data, either for one of our three target comorbidities in people with dementia or for dementia in people with stroke, diabetes or VI. Although heterogeneity in the populations and differences in the way that conditions were ascertained make comparisons across studies difficult, the data do suggest that the rate of diabetes in people with dementia may be between 13% and 20% and of stroke may be between 16% and 29%. Of the 11 studies that compared access to treatment or receipt of services in groups with and without dementia, 10 found some evidence that people with dementia were less likely to receive the same quality of care or access to services than those without dementia.

### **Cognitive Function and Ageing Studies**

The CFAS I and CFAS II are longitudinal multicentre population studies conducted in the UK. In CFAS II the prevalence of dementia, in those living in the community was 5.3%. Of these people with dementia, 17% had diabetes, 18% had had a stroke and 17% had a VI. The aim of the CFAS II-only analysis was to see whether or not there was any difference in service use between those with dementia and a target health condition and those with either dementia alone or the health condition alone. Unpaid care was the most commonly used service in CFAS II. When comparing unpaid care use by those with dementia and a target health condition with unpaid care use by those with only the health condition, in every case unpaid care was used considerably more by those with dementia and a target health condition. As well as unpaid care, those with dementia and a target health condition also used a home care assistant, day centre and care worker more than those with the health condition alone. When comparing hospital service use by those with dementia and a target health condition with hospital service use by those with dementia alone, inpatient services were used more by those with dementia and a target health condition.

The comparison analysis between CFAS I and CFAS II looked at whether or not there were any differences in service use over the last decade. The main difference seen was in hospital service use, which increased dramatically over this time because of the increase in use of day patient and outpatient services. There was also a marked increase in the use of unpaid care by those with dementia and either diabetes or VI. However, the number of people with dementia and a target health condition was not large enough in the CFAS I 10-year follow-up wave to test this formally.

### **Interviews and focus groups**

We conducted interviews with 28 people with dementia and 33 family carers and focus groups or interviews with 56 HCPs specialising in primary care or one of our three target comorbidities (diabetes, stroke or VI). Of the PLWD, > 50% had diabetes, 45% had some form of VI and 28% had had a stroke. Our two overarching themes were:

1. negotiating continuity, including relationship, management and informational continuity
2. negotiating access to care, including appropriateness, comprehensiveness and equity.

### **Negotiating continuity**

The personal characteristics of HCPs and the communication of information in a timely and sensitive manner appeared to be key to developing a trusting relationship with a HCP. The absence of a standardised approach to sharing information about a person's dementia and how it might affect the management of other conditions was a recurrent issue. This had implications for how appointments were planned and organised and how carers were involved. HCPs involved in delivering care for people with our target comorbidities commented that they were often unaware that someone had dementia. Instead, informational continuity was often provided by family carers attending appointments and transferring information between specialities. We found little evidence of services developing processes to support informational continuity or using tools such as 'This is me' [see <http://alzheimers.org.uk/thisisme> (accessed 7 January 2016)] to support continuity of information.

Family carers often played a significant role in managing and co-ordinating the care of their relative; this sometimes involved having to learn new skills such as checking blood sugar or giving insulin injections. The transition from self-management to dependency could be gradual or sudden and was often unpredictable or understood only in hindsight. HCPs who we spoke to acknowledged the vital role that family carers play but, from carers' accounts, it was clear that this recognition did not translate into routine involvement or engagement of family carers in appointments or decision-making about their family member.

## Negotiating access

We found many examples in which systems or environments had unintentionally blocked access to care for PLWD, for example appointments made over the telephone, long waits in busy clinic environments, tests that were not appropriate for PLWD, new technology introduced without proper explanation, lack of involvement of family carers and a failure to engage with social care as the main source of support for PLWD at home. Despite evidence of awareness among staff that PLWD could need more time for consultations, clinic structures and pressures of patient numbers meant that there was generally little capacity to achieve this for PLWD. Pathways and guidelines for our three target conditions did not address the possibility of a dementia diagnosis or provide decision-making support for practitioners trying to weigh up the risks and benefits of treatment for PLWD. Moreover, many HCPs in our study reported that they felt underprepared to care for PLWD. There were examples of good practice but this tended to be about the behaviour of individual practitioners rather than system-based approaches. Decisions about treatment for PLWD were made in the context of clinicians' attitudes and perceptions of dementia, and concerns about polypharmacy, consent, multimorbidity and concordance.

## Conclusions

Significant numbers of PLWD have comorbid conditions such as stroke, diabetes and VI, and many of them have multimorbidities. The presence of dementia complicates the delivery of health care and magnifies the known difficulties that people with long-term conditions experience when navigating health and social care. The situation is further complicated as some people will develop comorbidity in the presence of already diagnosed dementia and others will develop dementia subsequent to a comorbidity such as diabetes, stroke or VI.

The delivery of high-quality care to patients with dementia demands a particularly high standard of care across multiple domains, including communication, multidisciplinary care, clinical decision-making and engagement with families and carers. Effective care for older patients with dementia will help set a standard of care of universal relevance to vulnerable adults. Good care for PLWD and comorbidity may vary according to the type of condition(s) that they have. However, key elements include having the PLWD and the family carer at the centre, flexibility around processes, good communication between services, ensuring that all services are aware when someone has a diagnosis of dementia, taking into account the impact of a diagnosis of dementia on pre-existing conditions and incorporating this into guidelines and care planning.

There is already a great deal of descriptive work on the experiences of PLWD and their family carers. This study adds to that by providing information about the prevalence of comorbidities, service use among PLWD and comorbidity and how having dementia impacts on the management of comorbid health conditions in PLWD. In the following sections we discuss the implications for practice and provide a number of recommendations for research. We suggest that future work needs to focus on the development and evaluation of interventions rather than on further descriptive studies. PLWD should be included in the debate about the management of comorbidities in older populations and there needs to be greater consideration given to including them in studies that focus on age-related health-care issues.

## Implications for practice

- The evidence suggests that the use of tools such as the triangle of care model may be helpful in ensuring that the input of family carers is properly recognised. This should include the identification of family carers, appropriate training in carer engagement for staff, and policy and practice protocols regarding confidentiality and information sharing.
- Our study suggests that systems for booking appointments need to be made more 'dementia friendly', for example, sending reminders, including nominated family carers in all correspondence (this may not be the primary carer if the primary carer is a spouse with memory problems) and not booking appointments by telephone.

- The evidence suggests that staff at all levels, including more senior staff, need appropriate training on dementia. Some training may need to be tailored to specific conditions, for example identifying the best strategies for the rehabilitation of PLWD who have had a stroke.
- Professional bodies for HCPs may need to consider how the current provision of dementia training on undergraduate programmes can be improved.
- HCPs in specialist areas are often unaware that someone has dementia. Our evidence suggests that a diagnosis of dementia should be flagged up on medical/electronic records. This should include systems for automatic updates of a dementia diagnosis to be transferred to health-care services that a PLWD is already attending.
- PLWD who live alone or who do not have family support may be particularly disadvantaged and may need additional help to navigate systems and access care.
- PLWD are likely to benefit from longer appointments, in both primary and secondary care.
- PLWD may need a suitably trained member to help them navigate clinic environments; they may also benefit from assessments carried out by specialists in their own home or at their local general practice surgery.
- HCPs caring for people with cognitive impairment and long-term conditions, such as diabetes, need to regularly assess patients' ability to self-manage and identify when they may need additional support.
- Evidence suggests that there is a need for better integration of physical and mental health-care systems, that is, old-age psychiatry teams and geriatric teams working together and community-based geriatric teams having specialist mental health care as an integral part of the team.
- Our study suggests that, for PLWD and diabetes, who need support from health and social care, there is a need to link medication and monitoring of diabetes with the provision of meals.
- The evidence suggests that PLWD and diabetes may not be getting regular eye and foot checks.

### Recommendations for future research

Potential areas for future research identified by the study include the following:

- What makes a 'good' dementia Quality and Outcomes Framework, for example what components should be routinely included and should they include physical health checks?
- What is the impact of providing PLWD and their family carers with support, either from a professional or from a trained lay person, to help navigate health-care systems?
- What are the impacts on PLWD, family carers and other HCPs of specialist dementia nurses, such as Admiral Nurses, working in hospital and community settings?
- Is a collaborative care approach, with a case manager to provide integrated physical and psychological care, an effective approach to the provision of dementia care for PLWD and comorbidity and which populations of PLWD are most likely to benefit from collaborative care and at what stage?
- What is the impact of dementia case finding for older people with stroke, diabetes and VI, for example the use of case finding on admission to hospital or at the first clinic appointment?
- What is the impact of expanding the 'This is me' document to include health-related information?
- How can patients, carers and HCPs be encouraged to use the 'This is me' document?
- What interventions can be used to improve medication management in PLWD; for example, what is the impact of pharmacists carrying out short cognitive screening of older patients with multiple medications?
- Diabetes – how can HCPs caring for people with long-term conditions and dementia be helped to recognise when a person is no longer able to self-manage?
- Diabetes – what is the impact of self-management interventions for diabetes that involve family carers of adults with diabetes and cognitive impairment?
- Diabetes – what is the impact of personalised glycaemic targets for PLWD on outcomes such as hypoglycaemic attacks, hospital admissions and falls?
- Stroke – what are the most effective and cost-effective approaches to stroke rehabilitation for people with dementia?
- VI – how can tests for VI be made appropriate or adapted for PLWD?

- VI – is it possible to fast track PLWD for treatment such as surgery for cataracts and, if so, what are the impacts of this?
- VI – how can ophthalmology clinics and other health-care environments be made to be more dementia friendly so that they are suitable for people with VI or sight loss as well as dementias?

## Funding

Funding for this study was provided by the Health Services and Delivery Research programme of the National Institute for Health Research.

# Health Services and Delivery Research

ISSN 2050-4349 (Print)

ISSN 2050-4357 (Online)

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) ([www.publicationethics.org/](http://www.publicationethics.org/)).

Editorial contact: [nihredit@southampton.ac.uk](mailto:nihredit@southampton.ac.uk)

The full HS&DR archive is freely available to view online at [www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hsdr](http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hsdr). Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: [www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk](http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk)

## Criteria for inclusion in the *Health Services and Delivery Research* journal

Reports are published in *Health Services and Delivery Research* (HS&DR) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HS&DR programme or programmes which preceded the HS&DR programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

## HS&DR programme

The Health Services and Delivery Research (HS&DR) programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was established to fund a broad range of research. It combines the strengths and contributions of two previous NIHR research programmes: the Health Services Research (HSR) programme and the Service Delivery and Organisation (SDO) programme, which were merged in January 2012.

The HS&DR programme aims to produce rigorous and relevant evidence on the quality, access and organisation of health services including costs and outcomes, as well as research on implementation. The programme will enhance the strategic focus on research that matters to the NHS and is keen to support ambitious evaluative research to improve health services.

For more information about the HS&DR programme please visit the website: <http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hsdr>

## This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HS&DR programme or one of its preceding programmes as project number 11/1017/07. The contractual start date was in September 2012. The final report began editorial review in June 2015 and was accepted for publication in October 2015. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HS&DR editors and production house have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the final report document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HS&DR programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HS&DR programme or the Department of Health.

**© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2016. This work was produced by Bunn *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.**

Published by the NIHR Journals Library ([www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk](http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk)), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland ([www.prepress-projects.co.uk](http://www.prepress-projects.co.uk)).

## **Health Services and Delivery Research Editor-in-Chief**

**Professor Jo Rycroft-Malone** Professor of Health Services and Implementation Research, Bangor University, UK

## **NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief**

**Professor Tom Walley** Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the HTA Programme, UK

## **NIHR Journals Library Editors**

**Professor Ken Stein** Chair of HTA Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

**Professor Andree Le May** Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (EME, HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

**Dr Martin Ashton-Key** Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

**Professor Matthias Beck** Chair in Public Sector Management and Subject Leader (Management Group), Queen's University Management School, Queen's University Belfast, UK

**Professor Aileen Clarke** Professor of Public Health and Health Services Research, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

**Dr Tessa Crilly** Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

**Dr Peter Davidson** Director of NETSCC, HTA, UK

**Ms Tara Lamont** Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

**Professor Elaine McColl** Director, Newcastle Clinical Trials Unit, Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, UK

**Professor William McGuire** Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

**Professor Geoffrey Meads** Professor of Health Sciences Research, Health and Wellbeing Research and Development Group, University of Winchester, UK

**Professor John Norrie** Health Services Research Unit, University of Aberdeen, UK

**Professor John Powell** Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

**Professor James Raftery** Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

**Dr Rob Riemsma** Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

**Professor Helen Roberts** Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Institute of Child Health, UK

**Professor Jonathan Ross** Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

**Professor Helen Snooks** Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

**Professor Jim Thornton** Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board:  
[www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors](http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors)

**Editorial contact:** [nihredit@southampton.ac.uk](mailto:nihredit@southampton.ac.uk)