



HAL
open science

COSTS OF DEMENTIA IN LOW-AND MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Angeladine Kenne Malaha, Clémence Thébaut, Dayna Achille, Pierre-Marie
Preux, Maëlen Guerchet

► **To cite this version:**

Angeladine Kenne Malaha, Clémence Thébaut, Dayna Achille, Pierre-Marie Preux, Maëlen Guerchet.
COSTS OF DEMENTIA IN LOW-AND MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES: A SYSTEMATIC RE-
VIEW. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, 2022, pp.1-14. 10.3233/JAD-220239 . ird-03869701

HAL Id: ird-03869701

<https://ird.hal.science/ird-03869701>

Submitted on 24 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **COSTS OF DEMENTIA IN LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES: A**
2 **SYSTEMATIC REVIEW**

3 Angeladine **Kenne Malaha**^a, Clémence **Thébaut**^{a,b}, Dayna **Achille**^a, Pierre-Marie
4 **Preux**^{a,c}, Maëlen **Guerchet**^{a*}

5
6 (a) Inserm U1094, IRD UMR270, Univ. Limoges, CHU Limoges, EpiMaCT -
7 Epidemiology of chronic diseases in tropical zone, Institute of Epidemiology and
8 Tropical Neurology, Omega Health, Limoges, France

9 (b) Leda-Legos, PSL Research University, Paris Dauphine University, Paris, France

10 (c) CHU, Centre d'Epidémiologie de Biostatistique et de Méthodologie de la
11 Recherche, Limoges, France

12
13 Running title: Dementia costs in low/middle-income countries

14
15 *Corresponding author:

16 Maëlen **Guerchet**, PhD

17 Inserm U1094, IRD UMR270 – EpiMaCT

18 Faculty of Medicine

19 2 rue du Dr Marcland, 87025 Limoges Cedex

20 Tél. : 05 55 43 58 20 - Fax : 05 55 43 58 21

21 Email : maelenn.guerchet@ird.fr

22 **ABSTRACT**

23 *Background*

24 The proportion of people living with dementia in low- and middle-income countries
25 (LMICs) is expected to reach 71% by 2050. Appraising the economic burden of the
26 disease may contribute to strategic policy planning.

27 *Objective*

28 To review studies conducted on the costs of dementia in LMICs, describe their
29 methodology and summarize available costs estimates.

30 *Methods*

31 Systematic review, including a search of health, economics and social science
32 bibliographic databases. No date or language restrictions were applied. All studies with
33 a direct measure of the costs of dementia care were included.

34 *Results*

35 Of the 6,843 publications reviewed, 17 studies from 11 LMICs were included. Costs of
36 dementia tended to increase with the severity of the disease. Medical costs were
37 greater in the mild stage, while social and informal care costs were highest in the
38 moderate and severe stages. Annual cost estimates per patient ranged from
39 PPP\$131.0 to PPP\$31,188.8 for medical costs; from PPP\$16.1 to PPP\$10,581.7 for
40 social care services and from PPP\$140.0 to PPP\$25,798 for informal care. Overall,
41 dementia care can cost from PPP\$479.0 to PPP\$66,143.6 per year for a single patient.

42 *Conclusion*

43 Few studies have been conducted on the costs of dementia in LMICs, and none so far
44 in Africa. There seems to be a need to provide accurate data on the burden of disease
45 in these countries to guide public health policies in the coming decades.

46 **Keywords:** Dementia; Alzheimer's disease; Cost of illness; Disease Burden;
47 Systematic review; Low-Income; Middle-Income.

48 INTRODUCTION

49 An estimated 57.4 million people worldwide were living with dementia in 2019. This
50 number is expected to increase to 152.8 million by 2050, mainly due to population
51 growth and ageing [1]. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), much of
52 this increase will be in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) where 60% of people
53 with dementia (PWD) already live. This figure could rise to 71% in 2050 [1,2].

54 In the latest Global status report on the public health response to dementia, the annual
55 global cost of dementia has been estimated at US\$ 1.3 trillion in 2019, up from US\$818
56 billion in 2015. This figure is expected to reach US\$1.7 trillion by 2050 [3,4]. In LMICs,
57 these costs amount to about US\$341.0 billion, divided into US\$59.4 billion for direct
58 medical costs, US\$61.0 billion for direct social sector costs and US\$220.6 billion for
59 informal care. For high-income countries (HICs), these costs are US\$972.3 billion,
60 US\$153.9 billion, US\$387.7 billion and US\$430.8 billion respectively [3]. Therefore,
61 informal care costs account for half (49.6%) of the total cost of dementia worldwide,
62 with 64.7% in LMICs and 44.3% in HICs, while evidence show that about 84% of PWD
63 worldwide live with their families [3,5].

64 Cost-of-illness (COI) studies aim to assess the economic burden of health problems
65 on the whole population [6–8]. They are useful for determining the current status of a
66 disease care system and its costs, as well as for assessing changes over time or
67 between diseases, to assist in public health decision-making [8,9]. However,
68 evaluating the costs of dementia remains a complex exercise. It requires distinguishing
69 between costs categories, identifying costs attributable to the disease, managing
70 different data sources, and conducting accurate analyses [10,11]. A few studies have
71 estimated the global costs of dementia [4,5,10–12]. The 2010 and 2015 reports on the
72 economic impact of Alzheimer's disease [4,12] used the annual cost of dementia per

73 person in each country, where available, computed with the projected number of PWD
74 living in the country. Analyses also included imputations and a set of assumptions for
75 countries with missing or insufficient data. For LMICs with very little primary data,
76 authors reported using data from neighboring or comparable countries, gross domestic
77 product, and health care expenditure per capita [4,12], which led to less reliable or
78 accurate estimates for these regions.

79 As mentioned in the Alzheimer's Disease International report on dementia in sub-
80 Saharan Africa, the lack of original cost data remains the weakest link in assessing the
81 burden of dementia in the region [13]. Therefore, this review was conducted to identify
82 costs of dementia studies conducted to date in LMICs with the aim of describing their
83 methods, summarizing the available data and identifying the challenges of such
84 studies in resource-limited settings.

85 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

86 We conducted a systematic review on the costs of dementia in LMICs and the
87 methodologies used for their evaluation. All original research articles from studies
88 conducted in LMICs (according to World Bank classification on January 1st 2020) and
89 presenting a cost evaluation of any aspect of dementia care were considered. Disease
90 cost categories are generally related to direct medical (i.e related to the medical care
91 system), social care (i.e formal services provided outside of the medical care system)
92 and informal care (related to the time spent by non-paid relatives on care) [12].

93 *Search strategy*

94 Bibliographic databases on health, health economics and social sciences were
95 searched: Pubmed/Medline, Embase, Global health, PsycINFO, PsycARTICLES (via
96 OVID), Web of science and Econlit. The main grey literature resources in the health

97 field were also searched (GreyLit, ProQuest, Georgetown University resource and
98 Google scholar). No language or date restrictions were applied. Search strategies
99 consisted of combinations of different keywords related to the disease (dementia,
100 Alzheimer's, cognitive disorder / impairment), costs (cost, valuation, expenses, and
101 burden) and settings (low-income, middle-income, resource limited, developing
102 country and, the list of the 137 LMICs countries (according to the World Bank on
103 January 1st, 2020 [14])). Specific equations for each database as searched on March
104 2nd 2020 are presented in Supplementary material 1. An updated search using the
105 same strategy was conducted on December 28th 2021 to identify potential new studies
106 of interest.

107 *Studies selection*

108 Results obtained from the searches on the different bibliographic databases were
109 imported and processed using the Rayyan QCRI tool [15]. In a first step, duplicates
110 were removed. Then, following a blind selection method, two investigators (AKM and
111 DA) assessed the eligibility of the selected articles based on titles and abstracts. The
112 proportion of agreement between the two investigators was measured; conflicting
113 articles at this stage were all retained for the next stage. Full texts of selected
114 references were retrieved, and the corresponding authors were contacted to request
115 the manuscript when those were not available. Full-texts were then evaluated by the
116 same two investigators (AKM and DA) for the final inclusion decision. Conflicting
117 articles were discussed and the inclusion decision was made with a third investigator
118 (MG or CT).

119 Protocols, reviews and meta-analyses were not included, but were examined to identify
120 any relevant study for consideration. In addition, references of selected articles were
121 checked. For publications in languages other than English and French (those in

122 Spanish, Portuguese and Chinese), collaborators were asked to provide a translation
123 and/or description of the studies in order to make a decision on eligibility and to extract
124 the data of interest.

125 During the selection process, articles were excluded according to the Population,
126 Intervention, Comparator and Outcome (PICO) framework. Laboratory experiments
127 (i.e fundamental research on Alzheimer's Disease / dementia, including in-vitro studies
128 and studies in non-human populations), studies not addressing dementia care, and
129 studies conducted outside LMICs were considered as wrong population. Wrong
130 publication types included narrative review, meta-analysis, overview article, letter to
131 the editor and commentaries. Studies without a direct measure of dementia cost were
132 accounted as wrong outcomes. Studies for which the full-text was not retrieved despite
133 multiple searches and contact with the authors were also excluded.

134 *Quality assessment*

135 Although various guidelines have been published for assessing the quality of economic
136 evaluation in health care [16,17], they mainly focus on cost-effectiveness analyses. In
137 the absence of a standard instrument to evaluate cost-of-illness studies, we assessed
138 the quality of articles using a checklist, derived from the guide proposed by Larg and
139 Moss [7] and the checklist developed by Kline-Budde et al. [18] for their review on
140 bipolar disorders. Full description of the quality assessment criteria used is provided in
141 Supplementary material 2.

142 *Data processing and analysis*

143 Full-texts were reviewed and data extracted using a standardized extraction grid
144 developed in Epi Info 7 and Microsoft Excel®. Data were collected on study design,
145 population characteristics and costing methods. Particular attention was paid to the

146 costing perspective (i.e the point of view from which costs are considered). Studies
147 may measure costs to a health care system, a third-party payers, commercial sectors,
148 government or participants and their families [19]. In this review, the perspective was
149 collected as specified in the original article. Instruments used to collect and valuate
150 health resource utilization were also explored, to check the use of standard validated
151 tools such as the Resource Utilization in Dementia (RUD) instrument [20] or
152 questionnaires specifically designed by researchers for the purpose of their study.
153 Costing approaches used to value informal care time were also assessed. Various
154 methods for the valuation of informal care are available in the literature. On the one
155 hand, there are revealed preference methods that are based on real-life decision data:
156 1) the opportunity cost method, which aims to estimate the cost of the opportunity to
157 earn income or partake in leisure activities that an individual forgoes when engaging
158 in informal care; 2) the replacement cost, or proxy good method, which assigns costs
159 based on the market value that the care services would cost if they were provided by
160 a professional provider. On the other hand, stated preference studies obtain value by
161 asking respondents directly what economic value they attach to informal care through
162 contingent valuation or conjoint analysis [21,22].

163 When information was not presented in the original article as required for extraction,
164 available data were converted to the accurate value and unit. For example, all sex
165 ratios and gender figures were converted to male percentage. When data was not
166 available or presented in a non-transformable format, it was considered missing. When
167 summarizing data, weighting was done using the representativeness of each category
168 in the total sample. For example, to calculate the total medical costs of a given study
169 presented by disease severity, the proportion of participants in each stage was taken
170 into account. Monetary data were converted into local currency unit (LCU) using the

171 exchange rate provided by the authors. Where these were not available, we used
172 exchange rates provided by the World Bank for the country in the year of the study
173 cost [23]. Costs were then updated to their 2020 value using country-specific deflators
174 provided by the World Bank [24], and converted to 2020 dollar purchasing power
175 parities (PPP) using official conversion factors [25].

176 All costs were collected under the original items as provided by studies. They were
177 then grouped into a dozen of health resource services and finally into the three main
178 cost-of-illness categories (i.e. direct medical care, social care and informal care). Some
179 studies presented costs results directly in the three main categories which does not
180 allow for a desegregated presentation; these are presented only in total costs
181 descriptions.

182 The protocol of this systematic review was registered in PROSPERO (registration
183 number CRD42020169898) before data extraction began.

184 **RESULTS**

185 From the initial search, 11,168 publications were identified and extracted from the
186 databases. Details are presented in Supplementary material 3. Figure 1 shows the
187 articles selection flow chart according to updated PRISMA guidelines [26]. After
188 eliminating duplicates, 6,843 publications were assessed for eligibility. Of the 91
189 eligible articles, 74 full-text were retrieved and evaluated for final inclusion. Of these,
190 56 were excluded for the following reasons: not a cost-of-illness study (n = 10); not an
191 original research (n = 13); modelling studies (n= 8) and study conducted in high-income
192 countries (n = 25). The latest updated search identified two recent studies that were
193 included in the analyses.

194 Finally, 20 articles representing 17 individual studies were selected for this review.
195 Butman et al. [27] presented preliminary results of a study subsequently published by

196 Allegri et al. [28] ; similarly, the pilot study conducted by Ferretti et al. [29] in Brazil was
197 completed and final results published by the same authors [30]. In both cases, only the
198 final publications [28,30] were considered for the analyses. Jia et al. [31] and Yan et
199 al. [32] presented different costs for the same cluster-randomized observational study
200 in China, so their characteristics and results were merged.

201 *Characteristics of included studies*

202 Characteristics of the 17 included studies are summarized in Table 1. Out of 137 low-
203 and middle-income countries, only 11 were represented in this review, including six
204 studies in China [31–37]; 2 in Brazil [30,38]; and one in each of the following countries:
205 Argentina [28], Colombia [39], India [40], Iran [41], Peru [42], Philippines [43], Romania
206 [44], Thailand [45] and Turkey [46]. Our dataset covered all epidemiological regions of
207 the Global Burden of Disease, with the exception of Africa. Regional coverage was as
208 follow: 1 from Eastern Mediterranean [41]; 2 from South-East Asia [40,45]; 2 from
209 Europe [44,46]; 5 from the Americas [28,30,38,39,42] and 7 from Western Pacific [31–
210 37,43]. Studies were conducted between 2003 and 2020. All studies performed a
211 retrospective collection of data in the previous 1-12 months, except studies from
212 Turkey [46] and Philippines [43], which added a 15-day and 5-year prospective data
213 collection period on time spent in informal care, respectively.

214 The majority of studies focused on Alzheimer's Disease only (12/20), 5 studies
215 included all types of dementia and the remaining four did not specify dementia
216 subtypes in their study population. In almost all studies, case identification was based
217 on a previous dementia diagnosis. A few updated or verified the diagnosis before
218 inclusion in the studies. Disease definition followed standard criteria including ICD-10,
219 DSM-IV-TR and/or NINCDS – ADRDA, plus various clinical or imaging investigations.
220 Some studies excluded patients with mild cognitive impairment [29,30], early onset

221 dementia [41] or limited functional independence [42]. Only four studies reported the
222 mean disease duration: 2.7 years, 51.0 months, 60.1 months and 5.1 years in China
223 [34], Romania [44], Brazil [30] and Thailand [45] respectively.

224 The majority of studies examined all three categories of costs (direct medical, social
225 and informal care costs). Three studies [36,38,39] investigated only medical costs,
226 while Wang et al. [35] only looked at informal care costs. Zencir et al. [46] and Mould-
227 Quevedo et al. [33] did not collect data on social and informal care costs respectively.

228 Items included in each cost category varied widely. For direct medical costs, most
229 studies included outpatient, inpatient and medication costs. Some reported only
230 medication [30,38,39] or hospitalization [36] costs. Regarding medication costs for
231 instance, Soares et al. [38] in Brazil reported the costs of dementia-specific drugs
232 dispensed by a government dispensing center. Meanwhile in Colombia, Prada et al.
233 [39] considered direct insurance reimbursement for all-condition drugs of dementia
234 patients. In one study from China, Wang et al. [34] included the costs of official
235 dementia drugs, but also those of traditional medicine. Social care costs included travel
236 expenses and formal care services where appropriate, but also food expenses [31,41].

237 With regard to informal care costs, most studies reported estimates of time spent on
238 care, without much detail on the activities considered. Two studies considered the
239 patient loss-of-productivity [30,44] and one included the costs of health services for the
240 treatment of the caregiver [30]. Although the majority of studies valued caregiver time
241 by the replacement cost methods (which assigns a monetary value to caregiver's time
242 based on what it would cost to replace informal care activities with formal care), the
243 proxy used varied considerably, ranging from national minimum or average wage, to
244 the salary of a nurse in a public institution, or to the caregivers' salary. Table 2 provides
245 more details on the design characteristics of the included studies.

246 Results from the quality assessment of the studies are presented in Table 3. Almost
247 all studies provided basic information on the study design and population
248 characteristics, such as objectives, sample size and demographics. Eight out of the 17
249 studies clearly indicated the cost estimate perspective. Only Allegri et al. [28] and
250 Custodio et al. [42] included a group of healthy participants in their sample, although
251 they did not use this information to calculate disease-specific net costs. Only the
252 cluster-randomized study in China presented the results of a sensitivity analysis
253 [31,32]. Most studies (9/17) failed to present separate information on the number of
254 services used before getting in their valuation. Very few studies performed sensitivity
255 analyses to account for uncertainties in key indicators. Onetiu et al. [44] for instance
256 estimated the cost of time spent on informal care by a replacement cost approach
257 using the national minimum wage, the average national wage and the caregiver's
258 salary. Finally, all studies presented and discussed methodological limitations.

259 *Costs estimates*

260 Annual costs of dementia per patient according to disease severity are summarized in
261 Table 4. Annual domestic government health expenditures in 2020 for each country
262 are also shown in this table. Overall, in all costs categories, dementia costs tend to
263 increase with disease severity. Prada et al. [39] calculated the ratio of direct insurer
264 expense to mild stage at 1.62 for moderate and 4.87 for severe stages; i.e. compared
265 to a mild patient, a moderate stage patient will use 62% more resources and a severe
266 stage patient 387% more resources. Medical costs are generally highest in the mild
267 stage, while social costs (including institution fees) and informal care costs become
268 more important in the moderate and severe stages. Regardless of the disease stage,
269 we found a wide range of estimates of annual per patient costs in the studies. Medical
270 costs ranged from PPP\$131.0 in India [40] to PPP\$31,188.8 in China [45]; social costs

271 from PPP\$16.1 in Philippines [43] to PPP\$10,581.7 in China [31,32]; and informal care
272 costs from PPP\$140.0 in India [40] to PPP\$25,798 in China [45]. Overall, dementia
273 care can cost from PPP\$479.0 in India [40] to PPP\$66,143.6 in China [31,32] per year
274 for a single patient.

275 **DISCUSSION**

276 *Findings*

277 Studies included in this systematic review comprised 17 cost-of-illness studies on
278 dementia in 11 LMICs across all GDB regions except Africa. These studies were
279 conducted from 2003 to 2020 and focused mostly on Alzheimer's disease. All
280 estimates of dementia costs increase with disease severity and informal care costs
281 tend to exceed medical costs.

282 Globally, very few studies have been conducted to assess dementia costs worldwide.
283 About 10 years ago, Quentin et al. [47] reviewed cost-of-illness (COI) studies in Europe
284 and North America, including 28 studies. A review published in 2012 by Knapp et al.
285 [48] on the economic evaluation of dementia care identified only 29 individual studies.
286 Similarly, the international review of COI studies on dementia, by Schaller et al. in 2014
287 [49] found 27 individual studies for the period 2003 to 2012. Our review focusing on
288 LMICs included 17 studies. As reported by Hendriks et al. [50], beyond the complexity
289 of COI studies, the overriding constraint in LMICs is data availability, including lack of
290 accurate financial records and incomplete patient disease registers, as well as lack of
291 expertise to conduct cost studies.

292 Costs of dementia are high and highly variable. They range from PPP\$479.0 to
293 PPP\$66,143.6 per year for a single patient. These costs are colossal as families
294 remain the main bearers of the burden. Indeed, according to the WHO, in 2016, half of
295 the world's countries spent less than US\$350 per person annually on health-related

296 expenses, including most LMICs [51]. In 2018, the mean per capita general
297 government domestic health expenditure was US\$134.7 in LMICs and US\$5,562.3 in
298 HICs [52]. In this study, the per-patient costs of dementia reached fifty times these
299 public expenditures.

300 Dementia costs increase with disease severity; similar results have been reported in
301 other studies and can be explained by the rise in care needs as dependence and
302 impairment increase [47,53,54]. Evidence from the United States suggests that
303 informal care costs decrease with disease severity as patients need more attention
304 and are therefore institutionalized [55]. This was not observed in this review, where
305 informal care costs remained the highest in most studies. Actually, in LMICs, about
306 95% of patients with dementia live with their families, compared to 69% in HICs [5].
307 Thus, in these countries where universal health coverage is not achieved, families bear
308 the burden [56].

309 *Limitations*

310 The majority of included studies reported convenience sampling and/or small sample
311 size as a study limitation in their publications. Unfortunately, these two limitations
312 restrict further use of the results as they are difficult to generalize. Half of the included
313 studies (9/17) focused on Alzheimer's Disease only, as this is the main pathology of
314 dementia. It should be noted that, the disease considered for cost evaluation and its
315 definition criteria strongly influence costs estimates. In fact, Custodio et al. reported
316 that fronto-temporal dementia costs were higher than Alzheimer's Disease or vascular
317 dementia ones [42].

318 Considering there is no standard methodology for cost-of-illness studies and no
319 reference tool for quality assessment, available checklists [7,18] were adapted to
320 assess the studies included in this review, which appeared to be of satisfactory quality.

321 However, very few studies included a detailed description of service utilization and a
322 clear definition of items considered in each cost category. The way in which services
323 are defined and valued is of crucial value in understanding and comparing the
324 resulting estimates, particularly in the context of LMICs where health care and health
325 financing systems vary. The lack of methodological standard in COI studies is a
326 common and challenging issue to address, as described in other reviews on dementia
327 [6,47,53]. It has also been described in other diseases, including colorectal cancer [8]
328 and diabetes [57].

329 Collection and valuation of time spent by caregivers on care is rather difficult. First,
330 many activities and services (activities of daily living and instrumental activities of daily
331 living) are done for the older people regardless of their health status and are not
332 considered by caregivers as an additional workload, even when the person can no
333 longer perform them themselves. This is reinforced by the fact that many people still
334 consider dementia to be a normal part of ageing [58]. Secondly, a joint effect should
335 be considered, that of achieving many activities simultaneously, such as shopping for
336 the PWD and caregiver themselves or supervising the PWD while cooking for the entire
337 household. According to monetary valuation, a good number of methods exist, with the
338 difficulties of disaggregating time spent (paid work time, domestic work and leisure
339 time) and defining the unit cost to be applied to each category [22,59]. In the included
340 studies, both opportunity cost and proxy good approaches were used, but were not
341 sufficiently robust and/or their methods not well described. The quality of disease-
342 specific costs estimates strongly rely on the accuracy of data collected and therefore
343 of the collection tools. Therefore, harmonizing the costs items definition and collection
344 is strongly recommended to ensure accuracy and comparability with other studies.
345 Standard collection tools exist, including the Resource Utilization in Dementia (RUD)

346 Instrument [20]. This is a dementia-specific tool that has been widely used and
347 validated in global settings [60]. Otherwise, a minimum set of items should be collected,
348 such as outpatient, inpatient and medication for medical costs, transport and
349 accommodation for social costs. Attention should be paid to informal care time too,
350 specifying which ADL, IADL or supervision activities were carried out, and how
351 caregiving time was valued in money.

352 In addition, it was not always clearly stated in all studies which perspective was
353 considered for the costs or whether these were dementia-specific or total patient costs.
354 Key distinctions that may affect the interpretation and use of costs. The majority of
355 studies presented estimates directly in US\$ or local currency. It was therefore
356 necessary to know the precise cost reference date, exchange rate, country-specific
357 inflators and purchasing power parities to convert all estimates into international
358 dollars. This process allowed relevant comparisons of dementia costs between the
359 studies included in this review. However, it limits comparisons with studies from other
360 settings or global estimates which usually present the results in US dollars. Due to the
361 wide heterogeneity of study designs, methodological and costing-related limitations
362 cited above, disease costs summaries provided in this review should be taken with
363 caution.

364 In this review, modelling studies were excluded. Modelling is a good way to appraise
365 the reality without investing huge resources in complex field surveys. However, the
366 likelihood of a model relies on the proxies used, for example, utilization of health
367 services, market price of health services or reference wage for workers. These data
368 are often neither standardized in resource-limited settings nor available [50]. As a
369 result, many modelling studies may not provide an accurate picture of reality. Thus, in
370 order to identify accurate methods for calculating dementia costs in LMICs, and to

371 summarize primary costs estimates, we considered only studies with field collection of
372 health services use and costs. Similarly, studies with a top-down cost approach were
373 excluded as they did not include a direct measurement of dementia costs. Although
374 top-down studies are highly valuable, they mainly capture disease-specific medical
375 costs from the state or third party payer perspective, with very little information on
376 social and informal care costs. They also require a number of indicators like the number
377 of dementia cases or health resource utilization, which may not be available in the
378 countries of interest, leading to the use of additional proxies and imputations.
379 Our search strategy included the most plausible sources of publications for the topic.
380 The high rate of duplicates bears out the exhaustiveness of this review. In addition, no
381 language or date restrictions were applied to the searches or results. Moreover, all
382 studies that included cost estimation of any component of dementia care were included
383 and all the costs estimates were converted from US dollars or local currency to
384 purchasing power parity dollars to allow for cost comparisons between studies.

385 **CONCLUSION**

386 To the best of our knowledge, this is among the first reviews to focus on the cost of
387 dementia in LMICs. It is valuable regarding appraisal of methodological constraints
388 when evaluating the costs of dementia in resource-limited settings. Findings
389 highlighted once more the scarcity of valuable cost-of-illness studies in these countries,
390 particularly in Africa where original research for primary data collection is essential.
391 The costs of dementia were found to be high, placing an enormous burden on families.
392 These results should serve to raise the alarm on the urgency of dementia and to
393 advocate for dementia-oriented programs and policies.

394 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

395 The authors would like to thank fellow colleagues from the Global Brain Health Institute
396 (Fernando Aguzzoli-Peres, Naiara Demnitz and Yaohua Chen) and the Inserm U1094,
397 IRD U270 – EpiMaCT research unit (Daniells Erazo) for their help in translating
398 abstracts and articles in Portuguese, Chinese and Spanish identified during this
399 systematic review.

400 No funds were received for this study.

401 **DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

402 All the authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

403 **REFERENCES**

- 404 [1] Nichols E, Steinmetz JD, Vollset SE, Fukutaki K, Chalek J, Abd-Allah F, Abdoli
405 A, Abualhasan A, Abu-Gharbieh E, Akram TT, Al Hamad H, Alahdab F, Alanezi
406 FM, Alipour V, Almustanyir S, Amu H, Ansari I, Arabloo J, Ashraf T, Astell-Burt
407 T, Ayano G, Ayuso-Mateos JL, Baig AA, Barnett A, Barrow A, Baune BT, Béjot
408 Y, Bezabhe WMM, Bezabih YM, Bhagavathula AS, Bhaskar S, Bhattacharyya K,
409 Bijani A, Biswas A, Bolla SR, Boloor A, Brayne C, Brenner H, Burkart K, Burns
410 RA, Cámara LA, Cao C, Carvalho F, Castro-de-Araujo LFS, Catalá-López F,
411 Cerin E, Chavan PP, Cherbuin N, Chu D-T, Costa VM, Couto RAS, Dadras O,
412 Dai X, Dandona L, Dandona R, De la Cruz-Góngora V, Dhamnetiya D, Dias da
413 Silva D, Diaz D, Douiri A, Edvardsson D, Ekholuenetale M, El Sayed I, El-Jaafary
414 SI, Eskandari K, Eskandarieh S, Esmailnejad S, Fares J, Faro A, Farooque U,
415 Feigin VL, Feng X, Fereshtehnejad S-M, Fernandes E, Ferrara P, Filip I, Fillit H,
416 Fischer F, Gaidhane S, Galluzzo L, Ghashghaee A, Ghith N, Gialluisi A, Gilani
417 SA, Glavan I-R, Gnedovskaya EV, Golechha M, Gupta R, Gupta VB, Gupta VK,
418 Haider MR, Hall BJ, Hamidi S, Hanif A, Hankey GJ, Haque S, Hartono RK,
419 Hasaballah AI, Hasan MT, Hassan A, Hay SI, Hayat K, Hegazy MI, Heidari G,
420 Heidari-Soureshjani R, Herteliu C, Househ M, Hussain R, Hwang B-F, Iacoviello
421 L, Iavicoli I, Ilesanmi OS, Ilic IM, Ilic MD, Irvani SSN, Iso H, Iwagami M,
422 Jabbarinejad R, Jacob L, Jain V, Jayapal SK, Jayawardena R, Jha RP, Jonas
423 JB, Joseph N, Kalani R, Kandel A, Kandel H, Karch A, Kasa AS, Kassie GM,
424 Keshavarz P, Khan MA, Khatib MN, Khoja TAM, Khubchandani J, Kim MS, Kim
425 YJ, Kisa A, Kisa S, Kivimäki M, Koroshetz WJ, Koyanagi A, Kumar GA, Kumar
426 M, Lak HM, Leonardi M, Li B, Lim SS, Liu X, Liu Y, Logroscino G, Lorkowski S,
427 Lucchetti G, Lutzky Saute R, Magnani FG, Malik AA, Massano J, Mehndiratta

428 MM, Menezes RG, Meretoja A, Mohajer B, Mohamed Ibrahim N, Mohammad Y,
429 Mohammed A, Mokdad AH, Mondello S, Moni MAA, Moniruzzaman M, Mossie
430 TB, Nagel G, Naveed M, Nayak VC, Neupane Kandel S, Nguyen TH, Oancea B,
431 Otstavnov N, Otstavnov SS, Owolabi MO, Panda-Jonas S, Pashazadeh Kan F,
432 Pasovic M, Patel UK, Pathak M, Peres MFP, Perianayagam A, Peterson CB,
433 Phillips MR, Pinheiro M, Piradov MA, Pond CD, Potashman MH, Pottoo FH,
434 Prada SI, Radfar A, Raggi A, Rahim F, Rahman M, Ram P, Ranasinghe P, Rawaf
435 DL, Rawaf S, Rezaei N, Rezapour A, Robinson SR, Romoli M, Roshandel G,
436 Sahathevan R, Sahebkar A, Sahraian MA, Sathian B, Sattin D, Sawhney M,
437 Saylan M, Schiavolin S, Seylani A, Sha F, Shaikh MA, Shaji K, Shannawaz M,
438 Shetty JK, Shigematsu M, Shin JI, Shiri R, Silva DAS, Silva JP, Silva R, Singh
439 JA, Skryabin VY, Skryabina AA, Smith AE, Soshnikov S, Spurlock EE, Stein DJ,
440 Sun J, Tabarés-Seisdedos R, Thakur B, Timalcina B, Tovani-Palone MR, Tran
441 BX, Tsegaye GW, Valadan Tahbaz S, Valdez PR, Venketasubramanian N,
442 Vlassov V, Vu GT, Vu LG, Wang Y-P, Wimo A, Winkler AS, Yadav L,
443 Yahyazadeh Jabbari SH, Yamagishi K, Yang L, Yano Y, Yonemoto N, Yu C,
444 Yunusa I, Zadey S, Zastrozhin MS, Zastrozhina A, Zhang Z-J, Murray CJL, Vos
445 T (2022) Estimation of the global prevalence of dementia in 2019 and forecasted
446 prevalence in 2050: an analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019.
447 *Lancet Public Health* 7, e105–e125.

448 [2] World Health Organization, Dementia statistics, Last updated 20 September
449 2022, <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/dementia>, Accessed on
450 2022-10-27.

451 [3] World Health Organization (2021) *Global status report on the public health*
452 *response to dementia*, World Health Organisation, Geneva, Switzerland.

- 453 [4] Wimo A, Ali G-C, Guerchet M, Prince M, Prina M, Wu Y-T, Alzheimer's Disease
454 International (2015) World Alzheimer Report 2015: The global impact of
455 dementia: An analysis of prevalence, incidence, cost and trends, Alzheimer's
456 Disease International (ADI), London.
- 457 [5] Wimo A, Gauthier S, Prince M (2018) *Global estimates of informal care*,
458 Alzheimer's Disease International (ADI), London.
- 459 [6] Bloom BS, de Pouvourville N, Straus WL (2003) Cost of illness of Alzheimer's
460 disease: how useful are current estimates? *The Gerontologist* **43**, 158–164.
- 461 [7] Larg A, Moss JR (2011) Cost-of-illness studies: a guide to critical evaluation.
462 *Pharmacoeconomics* **29**, 653–671.
- 463 [8] Ó Céilleachair AJ, Hanly P, Skally M, O'Neill C, Fitzpatrick P, Kapur K, Staines
464 A, Sharp L (2013) Cost comparisons and methodological heterogeneity in cost-
465 of-illness studies: the example of colorectal cancer. *Med Care* **51**, 339–350.
- 466 [9] Bloom BS, Bruno DJ, Maman DY, Jayadevappa R (2001) Usefulness of US cost-
467 of-illness studies in healthcare decision making. *Pharmacoeconomics* **19**, 207–
468 213.
- 469 [10] Kenigsberg P-A, Ersek K, Gulácsi L, Karpati K, Jacques A, Gustavsson A,
470 Jönsson L, Mcdaid D, Valtonen H, Wimo A (2009) Impact socio-économique de
471 la maladie d'Alzheimer et des maladies apparentées en Europe. *Gerontol Soc*
472 **32 / n° 128-129**, 297–318.
- 473 [11] Colucci L, Bosco M, Fasanaro AM, Gaeta GL, Ricci G, Amenta F (2014)
474 Alzheimer's disease costs: what we know and what we should take into account.
475 *J Alzheimers Dis JAD* **42**, 1311–1324.

- 476 [12] Wimo A, Prince M (2010) *World Alzheimer Report 2010: The Global Economic*
477 *Impact of Dementia*, Published by Alzheimer's Disease International (ADI) 21
478 September 2010, Reprinted June 2011, London.
- 479 [13] Guerchet M, Mayston R, Lloyd-Sherlock P, Prince M, Aboderin I, Akinyemi R,
480 Paddick S-M, Wimo A, Amoakoh-Coleman M, Uwakwe R, Ezeah P (2017)
481 *Dementia in sub-Saharan Africa: Challenges and opportunities*, Alzheimer
482 Disease International, London.
- 483 [14] World Bank, Low & middle income countries | Data.
484 [https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups)
485 [bank-country-and-lending-groups](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups). Accessed on 2022-01-18.
- 486 [15] Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A (2016) Rayyan-a web
487 and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* **5**, 210.
- 488 [16] Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW (2015)
489 *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes*, Oxford
490 University Press.
- 491 [17] Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, Carswell C, Moher D, Greenberg D,
492 Augustovski F, Briggs AH, Mauskopf J, Loder E, CHEERS Task Force (2013)
493 Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS)
494 statement. *Value Health J Int Soc Pharmacoeconomics Outcomes Res* **16**, e1-
495 5.
- 496 [18] Kleine-Budde K, Touil E, Moock J, Bramesfeld A, Kawohl W, Rössler W (2014)
497 Cost of illness for bipolar disorder: a systematic review of the economic burden.
498 *Bipolar Disord* **16**, 337–353.
- 499 [19] Jo C (2014) Cost-of-illness studies: concepts, scopes, and methods. *Clin Mol*
500 *Hepatol* **20**, 327–337.

- 501 [20] Wimo A, Wetterholm AL, Mastey V, Winblad B (1998) Evaluation of the resource
502 utilization and caregiver time in Anti-dementia drug trials – a quantitative battery.
503 In *The Health Economics of Dementia* John Wiley & Sons, London, p. 576.
- 504 [21] Koopmanschap MA, van Exel NJA, van den Berg B, Brouwer WBF (2008) An
505 Overview of Methods and Applications to Value Informal Care in Economic
506 Evaluations of Healthcare. *Pharmacoeconomics* **26**, 269–280.
- 507 [22] Oliva-Moreno J, Trapero-Bertran M, Peña-Longobardo LM, Del Pozo-Rubio R
508 (2017) The Valuation of Informal Care in Cost-of-Illness Studies: A Systematic
509 Review. *Pharmacoeconomics* **35**, 331–345.
- 510 [23] World Bank, Official exchange rate (LCU per US\$, period average) | Data.
511 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/PA.NUS.FCRF>, Accessed on 2022-01-18.
- 512 [24] World Bank, Inflation, GDP deflator (annual %) | Data.
513 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.DEFL.KD.ZG>. Accessed on 2022-
514 01-18.
- 515 [25] World Bank, PPP conversion factor, GDP (LCU per international \$) | Data.
516 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/PA.NUS.PPP>. Accessed on 2022-01-18.
- 517 [26] Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD,
518 Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, Chou R, Glanville J, Grimshaw
519 JM, Hróbjartsson A, Lalu MM, Li T, Loder EW, Mayo-Wilson E, McDonald S,
520 McGuinness LA, Stewart LA, Thomas J, Tricco AC, Welch VA, Whiting P, Moher
521 D (2021) The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting
522 systematic reviews. *BMJ* **372**, n71.
- 523 [27] Butman J, Sarasola D, Lon L, Serrano C, Arizaga R, Taragano FE, Manes F,
524 Casanuovo A, Machnicki G, Allegri RF (2003) Impacto económico de la

- 525 enfermedad de Alzheimer: Resultados preliminares en Buenos Aires. *Rev*
526 *Neurol Argent* **28**, 16–23.
- 527 [28] Allegri RF, Butman J, Arizaga RL, Machnicki G, Serrano C, Taragano F, E o,
528 Sarasola D, Lon L, ro (2007) Economic impact of dementia in developing
529 countries: an evaluation of costs of Alzheimer-type dementia in Argentina. *Int*
530 *Psychogeriatr* **19**, 705–718.
- 531 [29] Ferretti CEL, Nitrini R, Brucki SMD (2015) Indirect cost with dementia: A Brazilian
532 study. *Dement Neuropsychol* **9**, 42–50.
- 533 [30] Ferretti C, Sarti FM, Nitrini R, Ferreira FF, Brucki SMD (2018) An assessment of
534 direct and indirect costs of dementia in Brazil. *PloS One* **13**, e0193209.
- 535 [31] Jia J, Wei C, Chen S, Li F, Tang Y, Qin W, Zhao L, Jin H, Xu H, Wang F, Zhou
536 A, Zuo X, Wu L, Han Y, Han Y, Huang L, Wang Q, Li D, Chu C, Shi L, Gong M,
537 Du Y, Zhang J, Zhang J, Zhou C, Lv J, Lv Y, Xie H, Ji Y, Li F, Yu E, Luo B, Wang
538 Y, Yang S, Qu Q, Guo Q, Liang F, Zhang J, Tan L, Shen L, Zhang K, Zhang J,
539 Peng D, Tang M, Lv P, Fang B, Chu L, Jia L, Gauthier S (2018) The cost of
540 Alzheimer’s disease in China and re-estimation of costs worldwide. *Alzheimers*
541 *Dement J Alzheimers Assoc* **14**, 483–491.
- 542 [32] Yan X, Li F, Chen S, Jia J (2019) Associated Factors of Total Costs of
543 Alzheimer’s Disease: A Cluster-Randomized Observational Study in China. *J*
544 *Alzheimers Dis JAD* **69**, 795–806.
- 545 [33] Mould-Quevedo JF, Tang B, Harary E, Kurzman R, Pan S, Yang J, Qiao J (2013)
546 The burden of caring for dementia patients: caregiver reports from a cross-
547 sectional hospital-based study in China. *Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes*
548 *Res* **13**, 663–673.


- 549 [34] Wang G, Cheng Q, Zhang S, Bai L, Zeng J, Cui P-J, Zhang T, Sun Z-K, Ren R-
550 J, Deng Y-L, Xu W, Wang Y, Chen S-D (2008) Economic impact of dementia in
551 developing countries: an evaluation of Alzheimer-type dementia in Shanghai,
552 China. *J Alzheimers Dis JAD* **15**, 109–115.
- 553 [35] Wang H, Gao T, Wimo A, Yu X (2010) Caregiver Time and Cost of Home Care
554 for Alzheimer’s Disease: A Clinic-based Observational Study in Beijing, China.
555 *Ageing Int* **35**, 153–165.
- 556 [36] Zhang H, Zhang D, Yin Y, Zhang C, Huang Y (2019) Costs of Hospitalization for
557 Dementia in Urban China: Estimates from Two Urban Health Insurance Scheme
558 Claims Data in Guangzhou City. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* **16**,2781.
- 559 [37] XiaoJuan G, Yan Q, SuHang S, QiuMin Q (2019) Investigation on the economic
560 burden and its influencing factors of Alzheimer’s disease in Xi’an. *Pract Geriatr*
561 **33**, 449–452.
- 562 [38] Soares NM, Pereira GM, Figueiredo RI da N, Soares NM, Almeida RMM de,
563 Portela A da S (2017) Economic impact and prevalence of Alzheimer’s Disease
564 in a Brazilian capital. *Impacto Econ E Prevalencia Doenca Alzheimer Em Uma*
565 *Cap Bras* **10**, 133–138.
- 566 [39] Prada SI, Takeuchi Y, Merchán-Galvis AM, Ariza-Araújo Y (2017) Actual
567 expense associated with patients with Alzheimer’s disease in Colombia. *Int*
568 *Psychogeriatr* **29**, 1835–1840.
- 569 [40] Malapur PU, Kumar N, Khandelwal SK, Tripathi M (2021) Cost of Illness of Major
570 Neurocognitive Disorders in India. *Neurol India* **69**, 1265.
- 571 [41] Aajami Z, Kebriaeezadeh A, Nikfar S (2019) Direct and indirect cost of managing
572 Alzheimer’s disease in the Islamic Republic of Iran. *Iran J Neurol* **18**, 7–12.

- 573 [42] Custodio N, Lira D, Herrera-Perez E, Del Prado LN, Parodi J, Guevara-Silva E,
574 Castro-Suarez S, Montesinos R (2015) Cost-of-illness study in a retrospective
575 cohort of patients with dementia in Lima, Peru. *Dement Neuropsychol* **9**, 32–41.
- 576 [43] Dominguez J, Jiloca L, Fowler KC, De Guzman MF, Dominguez-Awao JK,
577 Natividad B, Domingo J, Dominguez JD, Reandelar M, Ligsay A, Yu JR, Aichele
578 S, Phung TKT (2021) Dementia Incidence, Burden and Cost of Care: A Filipino
579 Community-Based Study. *Front Public Health* **9**, 628700.
- 580 [44] Onetiu V, Aurelian SM, Capisizu A, Cristescu F, Zus IC, Kissimova-Skarbek K
581 (2016) Cost of dementia in Romania: a cross-sectional Cost-of-Illness study
582 undertaken in Bucharest. *Zdr Publiczne Zarządzanie* **2016**, 204–226.
- 583 [45] Kongpakwattana K, Dejthevaporn C, Krairit O, Dilokthornsakul P, Mohan D,
584 Chaiyakunapruk N (2019) A Real-World Evidence Analysis of Associations
585 Among Costs, Quality of Life, and Disease-Severity Indicators of Alzheimer’s
586 Disease in Thailand. *Value Health J Int Soc Pharmacoeconomics Outcomes Res*
587 **22**, 1137–1145.
- 588 [46] Zencir M, Kuzu N, Beşer NG, Ergin A, Catak B, Sahiner T (2005) Cost of
589 Alzheimer’s disease in a developing country setting. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* **20**,
590 616–622.
- 591 [47] Quentin W, Riedel-Heller SG, Luppá M, Rudolph A, König H-H (2010) Cost-of-
592 illness studies of dementia: a systematic review focusing on stage dependency
593 of costs. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* **121**, 243–259.
- 594 [48] Knapp M, Lemmi V, Romeo R (2013) Dementia care costs and outcomes: a
595 systematic review. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* **28**, 551–561.

- 596 [49] Schaller S, Mauskopf J, Kriza C, Wahlster P, Kolominsky-Rabas PL (2015) The
597 main cost drivers in dementia: a systematic review. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* **30**,
598 111–129.
- 599 [50] Hendriks ME, Kundu P, Boers AC, Bolarinwa OA, te Pas MJ, Akande TM,
600 Agbede K, Gomez GB, Redekop WK, Schultsz C, Tan SS (2014) Step-by-step
601 guideline for disease-specific costing studies in low- and middle-income
602 countries: a mixed methodology. *Glob Health Action* **7**,.
- 603 [51] Xu K, Soucat A, Kutzin J, Brindley C, Vande Maele N, Touré H, Aranguren Garcia
604 M, Li D, Barroy H, Flores G, Roubal T, Indikadahena C, Cherilova V (2018) *Public*
605 *Spending on Health: A Closer Look at Global Trends*, World Health Organisation,
606 Geneva.
- 607 [52] World Bank, Domestic general government health expenditure per capita, Last
608 updated 2020, Accessed on 18 January 2022.
- 609 [53] Jönsson L, Wimo A (2009) The cost of dementia in Europe: a review of the
610 evidence, and methodological considerations. *Pharmacoeconomics* **27**, 391–
611 403.
- 612 [54] Luppá M, Heinrich S, Matschinger H, Hensel A, Luck T, Riedel-Heller SG, König
613 H-H (2008) Direct costs associated with mild cognitive impairment in primary
614 care. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* **23**, 963–971.
- 615 [55] Yaffe K, Fox P, Newcomer R, Sands L, Lindquist K, Dane K, Covinsky KE (2002)
616 Patient and caregiver characteristics and nursing home placement in patients
617 with dementia. *JAMA* **287**, 2090–2097.
- 618 [56] Ferri CP, Jacob KS (2017) Dementia in low-income and middle-income
619 countries: Different realities mandate tailored solutions. *PLoS Med* **14**,
620 e1002271.

- 621 [57] Pagano E, Brunetti M, Tediosi F, Garattini L (1999) Costs of diabetes. A
622 methodological analysis of the literature. *Pharmacoeconomics* **15**, 583–595.
- 623 [58] Cations M, Radisic G, Crotty M, Laver KE (2018) What does the general public
624 understand about prevention and treatment of dementia? A systematic review of
625 population-based surveys. *PloS One* **13**, e0196085.
- 626 [59] Oliva-Moreno J, Peña-Longobardo LM, García-Mochón L, Del Río Lozano M,
627 Mosquera Metcalfe I, García-Calvente MDM (2019) The economic value of time
628 of informal care and its determinants (The CUIDARSE Study). *PloS One* **14**,
629 e0217016.
- 630 [60] Wimo A, Gustavsson A, Jönsson L, Winblad B, Hsu M-A, Gannon B (2013)
631 Application of Resource Utilization in Dementia (RUD) instrument in a global
632 setting. *Alzheimers Dement* **9**, 429-435.e17.

Figure 1: Articles selection flow diagram



Adapted from: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

Table 1: General characteristics of included studies

Study	Country	Study period	Settings	Dementia subtype	Sample size	Mean age (years)	Male percentage	Disease severity criteria	Disease severity stages (%)		
									Mild	Moderate	Severe
Aajami et al., [41]	Iran	2017	Urban only	Alzheimer's disease	300	80.0	48.0	MMSE	33.3	33.3	33.3
Allegri et al., [28]	Argentina	NS	Urban only	Alzheimer's disease	125	74.6	19.2	MMSE	48.0	30.0	22
Custodio et al., [42]	Peru	2012 - 2013	Urban only	All types of dementia	106	70.0	39.7	None		NA	
Dominguez et al., [43]	Philippines	2015-2016	Urban & rural	All types of dementia	81	73.8	25.9	None		NA	
Ferretti et al., [30]	Brazil	2011 - 2015	Urban only	Dementia not specified	156	72.9	41.7	FAST Scale	29.1	47.5	13.4
Kongpakwattana et al., [45]	Thailand	2017 - 2018	Urban only	Alzheimer's disease	148	80.1	29.1	MMSE	23.6	39.9	36.5
Malapur et al., [40]	India	NS	Urban & rural	Major Neurocognitive Disorders	50	68.6	60.0	CDR		46	54
Mould-Quevedo et al., [33]	China	2009	Urban only	Dementia not specified	1,387	67.6	52.0	None		NA	
Onetiu et al., [44]	Romania	2013 - 2014	Urban only	Dementia not specified	31	NS	NS	NS	29.0	45.2	25.8
Prada et al., [39]	Colombia	2011 - 2013	Urban & rural	All types of dementia	340	NS	43.0	Drug dispensed	36.1**	44.5**	12.9**
Soares et al., [38]	Brazil	2014	Urban only	Alzheimer's disease	855	78.7	30.6	None		NA	
Wang et al., [34]	China	2005-2006	Urban only	Alzheimer's disease	66	74.0	34.8	MMSE	19.7	56.1	24.2
Wang et al., [35]	China	2008 - 2009	Urban only	Alzheimer's disease	79	NS	21.5	MMSE	25.4	60.6	14.0
XiaoJuan et al., [37]	China	2016 - 2018	Urban & rural	Alzheimer's disease	119	70.8	38.1	MMSE	7.6	67.23	25.2
Jia et al., Yan et al., [31,32]	China	2015 - 2016	Urban & rural	Alzheimer's disease	3,046	75.3	45.8	MMSE	18.7	49.3	32.0
Zencir et al., [46]	Turkey	2003	Urban only	Alzheimer's disease	42	70.5	38.1	MMSE	42.9	16.7	40.4
Zhang et al., [36]	China	2008 - 2013	Urban only	All types of dementia	5,747	77.4	42.8	None		NA	

**Study reported 6.5% of the population with an undefined disease severity stage; CDR: clinical dementia rating scale; FAST: Functional Assessment Staging Tool; MMSE: Mini Mental State Examination; NA: not applicable; NS: not specified.

Table 2: Design characteristics of costs estimations

Study	Data source			Perspective	Type of costs	Costs categories considered	Costs collection tools	Caregiver time valuation
	MR	PI	HI					
Aajami et al., [41]	+	+	-	Societal	UN	Medical – Social – Informal	DQ; self-report checklist	Human capital approach
Allegri et al., [28]	-	+	-	UN	Gross	Medical – Social – Informal	Adapted 10/66 group questionnaire	Replacement costs; MW
Custodio et al., [42]	+	+	-	UN	Gross	Medical – Social – Informal	ZBI; DQ	Replacement costs; MW
Dominguez et al.,[43]	-	+	-	UN	Gross	Medical – Social – Informal	NS	Opportunity costs
Ferretti et al., [30]	-	+	-	Societal	Net	Medical – Social – Informal	ZBI; RUD instrument; DQ	Replacement costs; MW
Kongpakwattana et al., [45]	+	+	-	Societal	Gross	Medical – Social – Informal	RUD Instrument	Opportunity costs
Malapur et al., [40]	-	+	-	UN	Gross	Medical – Social – Informal	DQ	Human capital approach
Mould-Quevedo et al., [33]	-	+	-	UN	UN	Medical - Social	ZBI; DQ	NA
Onetiu et al., [44]	+	+	+	Societal	Gross	Medical – Social – Informal	Modified RUD Instrument	Opportunity costs
Prada et al., [39]	-	-	+	Third party	Net	Medical	None	NA
Soares et al., [38]	+	-	-	UN	Net	Medical	None	NA
Wang et al., [34]	-	+	-	UN	UN	Medical – Social – Informal	DQ	Replacement costs; MW
Wang et al., [35]	-	+	-	UN	Gross	Informal	RUD Instrument	Replacement costs; average employment income
XiaoJuan et al., [37]	-	+	-	Societal	Gross	Medical – Social – Informal	DQ	NS
Jia et al, Yan et al., [31,32]	+	+	-	UN	Gross	Medical – Social – Informal	DQ	NS
Zencir et al., [46]	-	+	-	Societal	Gross	Medical - Informal	DQ; daily time sheets	Replacement costs; wage of a nurse in a public institution
Zhang et al., [36]	-	-	+	Healthcare system	Gross	Medical	None	NA

DQ: designed questionnaire; HI: health insurance; MR: medical records; MW: minimum wage; NA: not applicable; NS: not specified; PI: patient interview; RUD: Resource utilization in dementia questionnaire; UN: unclear; ZBI: Zarit burden interview; +: yes; -: no

Table 3: Quality assessment of included studies

Criteria	Aajami et al, [41]	Allegri et al [28]	Custodio et al, [42]	Dominguez et al., [43]	Ferretti et al, [30]	Kongpakwattana et al, [45]	Malapur et al., [40]	Mould-Quevedo et al, [33]	Onetiu et al, [44]	Prada et al, [39]	Soares et al, [38]	Wang et al, [34]	Wang et al, [35]	XiaoJuan et al [37]	Jia et al, Yan et al, [31,32]	Zencir et al, [46]	Zhang et al, [36]
Aims and methods of the study																	
Study objective	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Inclusion and exclusion	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Non-diseased comparison group or disease-related costs	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Matching or regression analysis	na	-	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Sensitivity analysis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Costs calculation																	
Data source	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Perspective	+	(+)	-	-	+	+	(+)	(+)	+	+	(+)	(+)	(+)	+	(+)	+	(+)
Cost calculation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cost categories	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Reference (price) year	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Currency	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Exchange rate	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	+
Inflation and/or discount rates	na	-	-	-	-	-	na	na	-	+	na	-	-	-	-	na	-
Monetary valuation of resource utilisation	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-
Valuation method	na	na	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	na	na	+	+	na	-	+	na
Presentation of results																	
Sample size	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Demographics	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Arithmetic mean costs	+	+	+*	+*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Standard deviations	+	-	+*	+*	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+
Separate information number of services used	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+
Discussion																	
Discussion with respect to other results	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Uncertainties	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+
Limitations	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+

+: yes, clearly presented in the article; (+): not clearly presented; -: no, not described; na: not applicable; *median and interquartile range

Table 4: Annual costs of dementia per patient according to the disease severity stage (PPP\$ 2020)

Study	Mild disease			Moderate disease			Severe disease			Overall			Expenditure#
	Medical	social	Informal	Medical	Social	Informal	Medical	Social	Informal	Medical	Social	Informal	
Aajami et al., [41]	498.6	766.9	0	638.6	1869.1	1320.9	2046.9	3665.2	1519.2	1060.3	2098.3	945.7	222.4
Allegri et al., [28]	8146.8	664.6	4792.1	7993.3	3813.7	5281.4	10113.9	14765.4	4082.5	8533.5	4711.5	4782.5	1,221.8
Custodio et al., [42]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8216.7	-	4878.1	551.2
Dominguez et al.,[43]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	582.7	16.1	8958.9	128.6
Ferretti et al., [30]	1798.6	392.4	12115.5	1828.2	173.6	23588.2	2209.6	0.0	13198.9	1688.1	196.5	16492.5	637.9
Kongpakwattana et al., [45]	24730.5	3998.0	16860.9	33423.0	8690.8	22276.8	32933.6	13008.2	35440.2	31188.8	9156.3	25798.5	480.0
Malapur et al.,[40]	-	-	-	63.6	32.4	200.4	188.4	357.8	89.2	131.0	208.0	140.0	74.2
Mould-Quevedo et al., [33]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8844.0	4129.0	-	527.6
Onetiu et al., [44]	3868.8	4748.5	5108.6	2126.2	6387.0	6293.9	5658.3	12132.0	7199.3	3542.8	7394.0	6183.7	1,256.2
Prada et al., [39]	2061.7	-	-	3336.2	-	-	10049.2	-	-	4210.0	-	-	827.4
Soares et al., [38]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	448.9	-	-	637.9
Wang et al., [34]	1562.8	829.1	1363.5	1614.6	781.5	2733.8	1814.3	893.8	5344.6	1652.7	818.1	3095.7	427.6
Wang et al., [35]	-	-	13107.8	-	-	19998.7	-	-	45254.1	-	-	21808.8	427.6
XiaoJuan et al., [37]	4062.7	2272.6	-	4618.1	3569.5	-	4226.8	7305.2	-	4477.5	4413.2	-	427.6
Jia et al, Yan et al., [31,32]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26339.0	10581.7	20865.8	427.6
Zencir et al., [46]	5280.9	-	472.7	7738.8	-	4785.4	7794.2	-	8084.3	6706.8	-	4268.0	906.0
Zhang et al., [36]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2944.6	-	-	427.6

Public expenditure on health from domestic sources per capita expressed in international dollars at purchasing power parity (PPP time series based on ICP2011 PPP). Source: World Bank <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SH.XPD.GHED.PP.CD>

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Supplementary material 1: Search strategy

(performed: 2nd March, 2020; updated: December 28th 2021)

EconLit; Ovidsp (Pubmed/Medline, Embase, global Health, PsycInfo, PsycARTICLES); Scopus (search in abstract field); Web of science; ProQuest (search in abstract field).

(dement* OR Alzhem* OR "cognitive impairment" OR "cognitive dysfunction" OR "cognitive decline" OR "cognitive disorder" OR "memory loss" OR "memory disorder") AND (cost* OR econom* OR "cost of illness" OR "cost analysis" OR "valuation" OR "expenditure" OR "budget" OR financ* OR fund* OR "payment") AND ("Afghanistan" OR "Albania" OR "Algeria" OR "American Samoa" OR "Angola" OR "Armenia" OR "Azerbaijan" OR "Bangladesh" OR "Belarus" OR "Belize" OR "Benin" OR "Bhutan" OR "Bolivia" OR "Bosnia and Herzegovina" OR "Botswana" OR "Brazil" OR "Bulgaria" OR "Burkina Faso" OR "Burundi" OR "Cape Verde" OR "Cambodia" OR "Cameroon" OR "Central African Republic" OR "Chad" OR "China" OR "Colombia" OR "Comoros" OR "Congo Democratic" OR "Congo" OR "Costa Rica" OR "Cuba" OR "Djibouti" OR "Dominica" OR "Dominican Republic" OR "Ecuador" OR "Egypt" OR "El Salvador" OR "Equatorial Guinea" OR "Eritrea" OR "Ethiopia" OR "Fiji" OR "Gabon" OR "Gambia" OR "Georgia" OR "Ghana" OR "Grenada" OR "Guatemala" OR "Guinea" OR "Guinea Bissau" OR "Guyana" OR "Haiti" OR "Honduras" OR "Ivory Coast" OR "India" OR "Indonesia" OR "Iran" OR "Iraq" OR "Jamaica" OR "Jordan" OR "Kazakhstan" OR "Kenya" OR "Kiribati" OR "Korea" OR "Kosovo" OR "Kyrgyz Republic" OR "Lao PDR" OR "Lebanon" OR "Lesotho" OR "Liberia" OR "Libya" OR "Macedonia" OR "Madagascar" OR "Malawi" OR "Malaysia" OR "Maldives" OR "Mali" OR "Marshall

Islands" OR "Mauritania" OR "Mauritius" OR "Mexico" OR "Micronesia" OR "Moldova"
OR "Mongolia" OR "Montenegro" OR "Morocco" OR "Mozambique" OR "Myanmar"
OR "Namibia" OR "Nauru" OR "Nepal" OR "Nicaragua" OR "Niger" OR "Nigeria" OR
"Pakistan" OR "Papua New Guinea" OR "Paraguay" OR "Peru" OR "Philippines" OR
"Romania" OR "Russian Federation" OR "Rwanda" OR "Samoa" OR "Sao Tome and
Principe" OR "Senegal" OR "Serbia" OR "Sierra Leone" OR "Solomon Islands" OR
"Somalia" OR "South Africa" OR "South Sudan" OR "Sri Lanka" OR "St Lucia" OR "St
Vincent and the Grenadines" OR "Sudan" OR "Suriname" OR "Swaziland" OR "Syrian
Arab Republic" OR "Tajikistan" OR "Tanzania" OR "Thailand" OR "Timor-Leste" OR
"Togo" OR "Tonga" OR "Tunisia" OR "Turkey" OR "Turkmenistan" OR "Tuvalu" OR
"Uganda" OR "Ukraine" OR "Uzbekistan" OR "Vanuatu" OR "Venezuela" OR
"Vietnam" OR "West Bank and Gaza" OR "Yemen" OR "Zambia" OR "Zimbabwe" OR
"developing" OR "low income" OR "middle income" OR "intermediate income" OR
"resource limited")

Google scholar (first 200 results only)

(dementia OR Alzheimer OR "cognitive impairment" OR "cognitive disorder" OR
"memory disorder") AND (cost OR economy OR "valuation" OR "expenditure") AND
("low income" OR "middle income" OR "intermediate income" OR "resource limited")

Greylit, Georgetown resources

Keywords: dementia, Alzheimer, cognitive impairment, cost of illness, cost of care, low
and middle income countries

List of all 137 countries considered as LMICs by World Bank on January 1st, 2020

Supplementary material 2: Explanation of quality criteria

Criterion	Description
Aims and methods	
Study objective	The objective(s) and research question(s) of the study was (were) described clearly
Inclusion and exclusion	At least the objective diagnostic criteria (e.g., ICD code and DSM-IV) used to identify eligible patients were reported. The study population was specified
Non-diseased comparison group or disease-related costs	The study included a non-diseased control group in order to calculate excess costs or, if no control group was involved, the costs were due to the disease of interest
Matching or regression analysis	If comparison groups were used: a) they were matched, at least in terms of age and/or gender, to allow a direct comparison between equally dispersed groups with regard to their characteristics or b) regression analysis was carried out in order to control for differences
Sensitivity analyses	Relevant parameters were varied in univariate and/or probabilistic sensitivity analyses in order to address parameter uncertainties (e.g., different unit costs)
Calculation of costs	
Data source	The source of information on healthcare utilization or costs was reported and mentioned specifically
Perspective	The perspective of the cost calculation was reported (e.g., from payer, employer, or societal perspective)
Cost calculation	The method of cost calculation was clearly documented
Cost categories	The study estimated costs from the utilization of different kinds of healthcare services or areas, which meant that more than one category was given, in order to consider, at best, all costs that accrued from the disease under study
Reference year (price)	All costs were valued at the price level of a stated base year
Currency	The currency in which the costs were calculated was reported

Inflation rate and/or discount rate	If data were collected from or estimated for a period longer than one year, costs were adjusted for differential timing and the inflation rate/discount rate was mentioned
Monetary valuing of resource utilization	If data on resource utilization were collected that were valued with unit costs, the latter were reported; if cost data were used, these reflected actual charges
Presentation of results	
Sample size	The sample size was reported
Demographics	The characteristics of the sample were described; at least (mean) age and gender were reported
Arithmetic mean costs	The cost estimates were (partly) presented as arithmetic means
Standard deviations	Standard deviations of cost estimates were (partly) reported as a measure of variability
Separate information of used number of services and costs	Separate information about the number of (health) services and cost were given for all cost categories that were described
Discussion	
Discussion with respect to other studies	The results were discussed in relation to other studies on the same topic
Uncertainties	Was uncertainty around the estimates and its implications adequately discussed
Limitations	The limitations regarding the calculation of costs and the representativeness of the study population, in particular, were discussed in detail

Source: Larg A, Moss JR (2011) Cost-of-illness studies: a guide to critical evaluation. *Pharmacoeconomics* **29**, 653–671. & Kleine-Budde K, Touil E, Moock J, Bramesfeld A, Kawohl W, Rössler W (2014) Cost of illness for bipolar disorder: a systematic review of the economic burden. *Bipolar Disord* **16**, 337–353.

Supplementary material 3: search results

Sources	Number of results
Indexed databases	
Econlit	25
Embase (via ovidsp)	2,708
Global health (via ovidsp)	283
PsycARTICLES (via ovidsp)	2,475
PsycInfo (via ovidsp)	809
PubMed/Medline (via ovidsp)	1,340
Scopus (search in abstract field)	1,387
Web of science (via Insermbiblio)	1,471
Grey literature	
Georgetown University resources	0
Google scholar (first 200 results)	200
Greylit	0
ProQuest (search in abstract field)	470
Overall	11,168