



Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials on the Efficacy and Safety of Donepezil, Galantamine, Rivastigmine, and Memantine for the Treatment of Alzheimer's Disease

Dan-Dan Li¹, Ya-Hong Zhang¹, Wei Zhang^{2*} and Pu Zhao^{1*}

¹ College of Life and Health Sciences, Northeastern University, Shenyang, China, ² Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery, General Hospital of Northern Theater Command, Shenyang, China

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Peter K. Giese, King's College London, United Kingdom

Reviewed by:

E. Lezi, Duke University, United States Stefano Barlati, University of Brescia, Italy

*Correspondence: Wei Zhang zhang_wei_1980@163.com Pu Zhao zhaopu6687700@mail.neu.edu.cn

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Neurodegeneration, a section of the journal Frontiers in Neuroscience

Received: 02 August 2018 Accepted: 26 April 2019 Published: 15 May 2019

Citation:

Li D-D, Zhang Y-H, Zhang W and Zhao P (2019) Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials on the Efficacy and Safety of Donepezil, Galantamine, Rivastigmine, and Memantine for the Treatment of Alzheimer's Disease. Front. Neurosci. 13:472. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2019.00472 To study the impact of donepezil, rivastigmine, galantamine, and memantine on cognitive, functional, behavioral, global changes and adverse effects in patients with mild, moderate and severe Alzheimer's disease (AD), we screened the literature published before September 2017 in the Pubmed, Embase, Cochrane library and Web of Science Electronic databases according to the inclusion criteria. Thirty-six studies were finally determined from 1560 preliminary screened articles. The AD Assessment Scale-cognitive Subscale (ADAS-cog), AD Cooperative Study-Activities of Daily Living (ADCS-ADL), Neuropsychiatric Inventory (NPI), and Clinician's Interview-Based Impression of Change Plus Caregiver Input scale (CIBIC+) were used as valid endpoints. Of the 36 trials included, meta-analyses of these placebo-control trials showed that there were significant differences between the donepezil, rivastigmine and placebo groups using ADAS-cog, ADCS-ADL, and CIBIC+. Meta-analyses of these placebo-controlled trials showed that there were significant differences between the galantamine and placebo groups using ADAS-cog, ADCS-ADL, NPI, and CIBIC+. These observations suggest that memantine is beneficial for stabilizing or slowing the decline in ADAS-cog and ADCS-ADL₁₉ changes in AD patients. However, there was no significant effect according to the ADCS-ADL₂₃, NPI, and CIBIC+ tests, which indicated that memantine treatment has no significant effect on these cognitive aspects of AD patients. Different effects of donepezil, rivastigmine, galantamine, or memantine on AD were found in this study. According to the results, we conclude that galantamine is effective in treating all aspects of AD and is the first choice for the treatment of AD. However, due to limited data, we should consider additional data to obtain more stable results.

Keywords: Alzheimer's disease, donepezil, galantamine, memantine, rivastigmine, meta-analysis

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between cognitive dysfunction or impairment and Alzheimer's disease AD has been reported in the literature (Stern et al., 1990; Chen et al., 1998; Perry and Hodges, 2000; Caro et al., 2002; Pereira et al., 2008). Meanwhile, cholesterol esterase inhibitors (ChEs) and memantine (**Supplementary Table 1**), which is a non-competitive *N*-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA)

receptor antagonist, can normalize dysfunctional glutamatergic neurotransmission (Parsons et al., 2013), which has shown effective efficacy in the treatment of AD. Since the intrinsic mechanism of acetylcholinesterase inhibitors (AChE-Is) requires a sufficient amount of residual endogenous acetylcholine, which is available, the therapeutic efficacy is expected to decrease with the severity of dementia. Cholinesterase inhibitors, which can reduce acetylcholine breakdown in the brain, are widely considered as a treatment options for AD (Doody et al., 2001). Therefore, greater atrophy in the brain regions that are responsible for the cholinergic pathway was found in those patients who had no response to donepezil (Bottini et al., 2012). It has been reported that donepezil is a type of AChE-I that improves cerebral blood flow (CBF), as well as its primary effect on memory function (Kogure et al., 2017). Galantamine is a newly available cholinergic drug that counteracts AD by specifically and reversibly inhibiting acetylcholinesterase (AChE) and altering the nicotinic cholinergic receptors, thereby subsequently reducing central cholinergic neurotransmission (Tariot, 2001). The deterioration of cognitive function in patients with AD appears to be mediated by the use of cholinergic drugs such as rivastigmine (Birks, 2006). Rivastigmine is a novel brain-selective inhibitor of "pseudo-irreversible" AChE, whose metabolism is almost completely independent of the cytochrome P450 system (Sramek et al., 1996). Memantine protects neurons against the overstimulation of NMDA receptors, which occurs in AD and thus causes glutamate- and calcium-mediated neurotoxicity (Jiang and Jiang, 2015). Evidence of the efficacy of memantine has been shown primarily in patients with moderate or severe AD (Areosa et al., 2005). The etiology and pathogenesis of AD are not well understood, but central cholinergic neurons are found to be impaired in AD patients with low choline intake and reduced choline synthesis (Inestrosa et al., 2005). The central cholinergic system plays a key role in regulating learning, memory and attention. AChE-Is is a major drug in the clinical management of AD (Tan et al., 2014), which can improve cognitive function by prolonging the duration of action of acetylcholine (Ach) in the CNS to improve cholinergic function and slow down memory loss. AchE-Is such as donepezil and galantamine show a significant effect on mild-to-moderate AD (Winblad et al., 2001; Raskind et al., 2004). Donepezil, rivastigmine and galantamine, which belong to the group of ChE inhibitors (ChE-Is), are capable of cognitive, functional and behavioral improvement; however, none of them has been shown to be effective in the progression of AD (Zemek et al., 2014). Currently, AchE-Is, including donepezil, rivastigmine, and galantamine, are standard treatments for slowing disease progression (Li et al., 2015). In addition, high dropout rates and adverse-effectinduced dropouts were observed in randomized clinical trials of these drugs. Therefore, the safety of ChE-Is and memantine has been proposed.

We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of donepezil, galantamine, rivastigmine and memantine in AD to elucidate the efficacy and safety of these drugs. We sought to elaborate on previous reviews and include a broad range of outcome measures to determine the extent to which these drugs have varying degrees of effects on cognitive, behavioral and functional impairment in AD patients at different stages of severity.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Search Strategy

PubMed (from 1966 to September 2017), EMBASE (from 1980 to September 2017), Web of science (from 1986 to September 2017) and the Cochrane Library (September 2017) were searched. The following search terms were used: "Alzheimer Disease" or "AD," "Donepezil," "Galantamine," "Memantine," "Rivastigmine," or combination of these words.

Selection Criteria

The inclusion criteria for the meta-analyses were as follows: (1) full-text publications written in English; (2) double-blind, parallel-group, placebo-controlled, with random assignment to donepezil, rivastigmine, galantamine, or memantine; (2) inclusion of patients with or probably with AD diagnosis, according to the fourth edition of the Mental Disorders Diagnostics and Statistics Manual (DSM-IV) and the National Association of Nervous and Communicative Disorders and Stroke/Alzheimer's Disease Institute of Standards (NINCDS-ADRDA) (McKhann et al., 1984; American Psychiatric Association, 2000); (3) includes treatment duration for at least 52 weeks and at least one measure that reflects changes in cognitive, functional, behavioral or global assessment of change, as well as the number of adverse events (AEs) that led to dropout, and AE changes; (4) drug dosage and dosage form specifications. Studies with fatal defects in research design or data analysis were excluded, and trials with no readily available data were also excluded.

Studies were excluded for the following reasons: (1) not randomized controlled trials, such as case reports, reviews, and meta-analysis; (2) family-based studies; (3) lack of original data, such as meeting abstracts, and case reports/series; (4) non-human studies; and (5) publication in a language other than English.

Search Strategy and Selection Criteria

Data abstraction was performed as a collaboration between two researchers using standard data extraction by discussing with other team members or by asking for the exact data from the original investigators. For missing data, we sought missing information and essential clarification from the authors. For measure variables, there is an approximate or direct algebraic relationship with standard deviation (SD), which we obtained from the standard error, confidence interval, *t*-value, or *p*-value related to the differences between the two sets of means.

We obtained the following baseline variables from each study: sample size, age, sex, race, design, dosing, blinding, duration of the trial, baseline cognitive score (Mini-Mental State Examination, MMSE), random numbers, secondary outcomes, and AEs that led to dropouts during the double-blind trials.

Types of Outcome Measures

The measurement scales used in the tests varied. Therefore, we recorded measurement scales based on the general areas being assessed, namely, cognition, function, behavior and global assessment of change. Next, we attempted to determine a single measurement scale, which is the most commonly used key outcome measure in each area. We engaged the ADAScog, Alzheimer's Disease Cooperative Research-Activities of Daily Living (ADCS-ADL), NPI and Clinician's Interview-Based Impression of Change Plus Caregiver Input scale (CIBIC+) as primary measurements to assess the effects of different drugs on the cognition, function, behavior, and global assessment of change (Supplementary Table 2). The Alzheimer's Disease Cooperative Study Activities of Daily Living 19- or 23-item scale (ADCS-ADL 19/23), which is based on interviews with caregivers or others close to the patients, was used as a scale to assess how the patients cope with daily activities. The 19-item subset was used for patients with moderate to severe AD, and the 23-item subset was used for patients with mild to moderate AD. In addition, to assess the efficacy and safety of these drugs, we recorded discontinuations of the trials due to AEs and dropouts due to adverse effects and other reasons.

Statistical Analysis

Meta-analysis was performed using the Review Manager 5.3 software. For continuous data collected using the same measurement scale (e.g., cognition and behavior), we calculated the mean difference (MD) or standardized mean differences (SMD) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for changes from the baseline or final values. For dichotomous clinical outcomes, dropouts, and AEs, we performed odds ratios (ORs), absolute risk differences, 95% CI and p values to assess the efficacy and safety of the studied drugs. Heterogeneity was assessed using the Cochran Q-statistic and I^2 tests (Doody et al., 2001). I^2 approximates the ratio of the total variance in effect estimates due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error. Heterogeneity of the index is considered when p < 0.10 and $I^2 > 50\%$. The latent retrieval bias was evaluated by the MD or SMD funnel plot in the main results of each test.

RESULTS

Literature Search Findings

The search strategy yielded 1,560 citations in PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, and the Cochrane Library of Systematic Reviews. **Figure 1** shows the results of the literature search and study selection. A total of 573 potentially relevant articles were identified in the original search, but only 36 were ultimately selected for meta-analysis. Of these, fifteen donepezil trials (Feldman et al., 2001; Tariot et al., 2001; Krishnan et al., 2003; Tune et al., 2003; Seltzer et al., 2004; Johannsen et al., 2006; Winblad et al., 2006; Black et al., 2007; Homma et al., 2008; Frölich et al., 2011; Maher-Edwards et al., 2011; Haig et al., 2014; Gault et al., 2015, 2016; Jia et al., 2017), seven galantamine trials (Raskind et al., 2000; Tariot et al., 2000; Wilcock et al., 2000; Rockwood et al., 2001; Wilkinson and Murray, 2001; Brodaty et al., 2005; Burns et al., 2009), four rivastigmine trials (Forette et al., 1999; Rosler et al., 1999; Feldman and Lane, 2007; Winblad et al., 2007), and ten memantine trials (Reisberg et al., 2003; Tariot et al., 2004; Peskind et al., 2006; van Dyck et al., 2007; Bakchine and Loft, 2008; Porsteinsson et al., 2008; Fox et al., 2012; Grossberg et al., 2013; Herrmann et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2013) were included in the review. The design and population characteristics of the ChE-Is and memantine tests are shown in **Table 1** and **Supplementary Tables 3** – **5**.

Effects of Interventions Cognitive Function

Donepezil

Nine studies (Tariot et al., 2001; Krishnan et al., 2003; Seltzer et al., 2004; Johannsen et al., 2006; Frölich et al., 2011; Maher-Edwards et al., 2011; Haig et al., 2014; Gault et al., 2015, 2016) assessed changes in cognition by using the ADAS-cog (Figure 2A). Significant cognition changes were found via meta-analysis in the available data, when compared with placebo. The SMD in the changes between the donepezil and placebo groups varied [SMD = -0.28, 95% CI (-0.39, -0.16); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.18, $I^2 = 32\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, indicating a hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Johannsen et al., 2006), the size of the merger effect was statistically significant [SMD = -0.33, 95% CI (-0.45, -0.20); p < 0.00001].The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low $(p = 0.41, I^2 = 2\%).$

When we deleted the most positive outlier (Gault et al., 2016), the size of the merger effect was statistically significant [SMD = -0.26, 95% CI (-0.38, -0.14); p < 0.0001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.14, $I^2 = 37\%$).

Galantamine

Six articles (Raskind et al., 2000; Tariot et al., 2000; Wilcock et al., 2000; Rockwood et al., 2001; Wilkinson and Murray, 2001; Brodaty et al., 2005) used ADAS-cog to assess cognitive changes, and eleven studies reported the changes (Figure 2B). Among the available data, the cognitive effects of all drugs were displayed by meta-analysis, and the pooled SMDs between galantamine and placebo in ADAS-cog was significant [SMD = -0.49, 95% CI (-0.56, -0.43); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.66, $I^2 = 0\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, indicating a hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Wilkinson and Murray, 2001), the size of the merger effect was significant [SMD = -0.50, 95% CI (-0.57, -0.44); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.78, $I^2 = 0\%$). When we deleted the most positive outlier (Raskind et al., 2000), the size of the merger effect was statistically significant [SMD = -0.47, 95% CI (-0.54, -0.41); p < 0.00001].



The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low $(p = 0.88, I^2 = 0\%)$.

The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low $(p = 0.32, I^2 = 13\%)$.

Rivastigmine

Four articles (Forette et al., 1999; Rosler et al., 1999; Feldman and Lane, 2007; Winblad et al., 2007) used ADAS-cog to assess cognitive changes (Figure 2C). Significant differences were found between all drugs and the placebo when cognitive effects were calculated by meta-analysis from the available data. The pooled SMDs in the changes between the rivastigmine and placebo groups was significant in ADAS-cog [SMD = -0.65, 95% CI (-1.06, -0.23); p = 0.002]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was high (p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 92\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Rosler et al., 1999), the size of the merger effect was significant [SMD = -0.96, 95% CI (-1.62, -0.31); p = 0.004]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was high (p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 95\%$). When we deleted the most positive outlier (Forette et al., 1999), the size of the merger effect was statistically significant [SMD = -0.29, 95% CI (-0.40, -0.19); p < 0.00001].

Memantine

Four articles (Peskind et al., 2006; Bakchine and Loft, 2008; Porsteinsson et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2013) used ADAS-cog to assess cognitive changes (Figure 2D). No significant difference was found between all drugs and placebo when cognitive effects were calculated by meta-analysis from the available data. The pooled, SMDs between memantine and placebo varied in ADAS- $\cos [SMD = -0.12, 95\% CI (-0.24, -0.01); p = 0.03].$ The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.20, $I^2 = 35\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Wang et al., 2013), the size of the merger effect was significant [SMD = -0.14, 95% CI (-0.25, -0.02); p = 0.02]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.38, $I^2 = 0\%$). When we deleted the most positive outlier (Peskind et al., 2006), the size of the merger effect was not statistically significant [SMD = -0.07, 95% CI (-0.21, 0.07); p = 0.33]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low ($p = 0.27, I^2 = 23\%$).

ŋ.
dr
nepezil
юр
udy
y st
0
vsis
anal
neta-
her
L L
0
nde
incl
dies
stu
the
of
stics
teri
arac
Ч,
eline
Jase
Ш
T
ABLE
ì

Frontiers in Neuroscience | www.frontiersin.org

Study	Country	Dose (number of patient)	Gender (%men)	Age years (SD)	Disease Severity	Type of Drug dosing	Duration (weeks)	Baseline MMSE (SD)		Outc	omes		Dropout rate (%)	Number of adverse events caused dropout	Number of any adverse events
									Cognition	Function	Behavior	Global			
Feldman et al., 2001	Canada	Placebo (146)	ĝ	74.0 ± 11	Moderate to severe	Flexible	24	11.9 ± 4.11	1	1	IdN	1	13.7	o	117
		10 mg daily (144)	38.9	73.3 ± 10				11.7 ± 4.2					16.0	12	120
Tariot et al., 2001	United States	Placebo (105)	18	85.9 ± 9.25	Mild to moderate	Fixed	24	14.4 ± 5.8	I	I	NPI	I	I	I	102
		10 mg daily (103)	17	85.4 ± 8.5				14.4 ± 5.4					I	I	66
Krishnan et al., 2003	United States	Placebo (33)	30	72.4 ± 10.1	Mild to moderate	Flexible	24	19.0 ± 4.6	ADAS- cog	I	I	I	30.3		I
		10 mg daily (34)	26	74.4 ± 7.0				19.5 ± 4.8					17.6	0	I
Tune et al., 2003	United States	Placebo (14)	28.6	72.2 ± 9.57	Mild to moderate	Fixed	24	21.4 土 4.1	ADAS- cog	I	IdN	I	I	I	I
		10 mg daily (14)	21.4	73.7 ± 5.25				20.8 ± 3.7)				I	I	I
Seltzer et al., 2004	United States	Placebo (57)	50	73.3±8.8	Mild to moderate	Fixed	24	24.3 ± 1.3	ADAS- cog	I	I	I	19.3	Q	37
		10 mg daily (96)	40	73.3 ± 9.6				24.1 ± 1.7					27.1	15	67
Johannsen et al., 2006	Denmark	Placebo (103)	36.9	71.4 ± 9.3	Mild to moderate	Fixed	12	18.5 ± 4.8	ADAS- cog	I	NPI	I	19.4	I	33
		10 mg daily (99)	40.4	74.1 ± 7.6				18.8 ± 4.8					11.1	I	27
Winblad et al., 2006	Sweden	Placebo (120)	26	85.3 ± 5.9	Severe	Fixed	24	5.8 ± 3.1	I	ADCS- ADL	IdN	I	17.5	ω	I
		10 mg daily (128)	21	84.5 ± 6.0				6.3 ± 3.0					25.8	20	I
Black et al., 2007	Canada	Placebo (167)	27.3	78.0 ± 8.04	Severe	Fixed	24	7.4 ± 3.57	I	ADCS- ADL	IdN	CIBIC+	24.7	18	117
		10 mg daily (176)	32.3	78.0±8.20				7.5 ± 3.25					34.9	34	140
														9	Continued)

study	Country	Dose (number of patient)	Gender (%men)	Age years (SD)	Severity	of Drug dosing	(weeks)	MMSE (SD)					rate (%)	of of adverse events caused dropout	of any adverse events
									Cognitior	Function	Behavior	Global			
Homma et al., 2008	Japan	Placebo (102)	17.6	79.7 土 7.5	Severe	Flexible	24	8.0 ± 3.3	1	ADCS- ADL	1	CIBIC+	20.0	.	1
ų		5 mg daily (96)	20.8	78.0 ± 8.90				7.9 ± 3.3					12.9	ω	I
0		10 mg daily (92)	20.7	76.9 ± 7.9				7.4 ± 3.4					12.9	13	I
Vlaher- Edwards et al., 2011	United Kingdom	Placebo (61)	30	71.6 ± 6.72	Mild to moderate	Fixed	24	18.3 ± 3.36	ADAS- cog	I		CIBIC+	23.8	4	6
		10 mg daily (67)	37	71.1 ± 8.39				19.2 土 3.20					14.9	-	26
⁻rölich ∋t al., 2011	Germany	Placebo (163)	44.8	73.5±6.42	Mild to moderate	Flexible	12	20.7 ± 3.96	ADAS- cog	I	I	I	11.6	I	60
0		5/10 mg daily (158)	34.2	73.9 ± 6.48				20.6 ± 3.90					13.7	I	60
⊣aig et al., 2014	United States	Placebo (63)	38.1	70.3 ± 7.84	Mild to moderate	Fixed	12	18.2 ± 3.9	ADAS- Cog	ADCS- ADL	IdN		39.7	ო	25
		10 mg daily (60)	40.0	70.5 ± 8.31				18.1 土 4.1					31.7	4	30
Bault et al., 2015	United States	Placebo (68)	38.2	73.6±8.23	Mild to moderate	Fixed	12	19.7 ± 3.95	ADAS- cog	ADCS- ADL	IdN	I	4.4	0	26
		10 mg daily (68)	54.4	73.9 ± 7.92				19.6 ± 3.82					8.8	Q	29
⊇ault st al., 2016	United States	Placebo (104)	37.5	73.2 ± 7.39	Mild to moderate	Fixed	24	19.1 ± 4.00	ADAS- cog	ADCS- ADL	IdN	I	14.4	<i>с</i> у	56
		10 mg daily (76)	46.7	75.1 ± 7.75				18.4 ± 4.42					19.7	7	47
lia et al., 2017	China	Placebo (156)	37.8	70.0±9.57	Severe	Flexible	24	7.0 ± 3.40	I	I	I	CIBIC+	19.2	10	I
		10 mg daily (157)	32.5	71.6 ± 8.56				7.6 ± 3.36					18.4	14	I

6

		Do	nepezi		C	ontro			Std. Mean	Difference		Std. Mean	Difference		
	Study or Subaroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weigh	t IV. Fi	xed, 95% CI		IV. Fixe	d, 95% CI		
	1.1.1 Effect of donenezil on	ADAS-	coa in i	mild to	o mode	rate	roun								
	Frolich et al 2011	_1 1	541	158	_0 3	5 36	162	27 10	.0 15	-0.37 0.071			+		
	Coult of al. 2015	2 27	5.02	64	0.3	5.07	103	10.90	0.13						
	Coult et al. 2015	-3.27	0.92	50	-0.76	6.00	00	11.07	/0.42[·	0.77, -0.07]					
	Gault et al.,2016	-3.50	0.09	59	-0.76	0.99	66	11.9%	% -0.41[·	0.74, -0.07]	_				
	Haig et al.,2014	-4.32	5.81	54	-1.6	5.69	56	9.2%	% -0.47 [·	0.85, -0.09]					
	Johannsen et al.,2006	0.65	3.5	94	0.7	6.93	98	16.4%	6 -0.01	[-0.29, 0.27]			1		
	Krishnan et al.,2003	0.2	0	34	3.2	0	32		N	ot estimable					
	Maher-Edwards et al.,2011	-1.5	5.89	65	-0.3	5.99	56	10.3%	% -0.20	[-0.56, 0.16]					
	Seltzer et al.,2004	-1.68	4.03	96	0.58	4.03	57	11.8%	6 -0.56 -0.56	0.89, -0.22]		-			
	Tune et al.,2003	-3.65	5.03	14	-1.56	2.07	13	2.2%	6 -0.52	[-1.29, 0.25]					
	Subtotal (95% CI)			638			628	100.0%	% -0.28 [-	0.39, -0.16]		•			
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 10.23,	df = 7 (P	= 0.18); ² =	32%										
	Test for overall effect: Z = 4.7	72 (P < 0	.00001)											
										-	-1	-0.5	0 0.5		
											Favours [e	xperimental]	Favours [c	control]	
			Galant	amine		Co	ntrol		Std. Me	an Difference		Std. Mea	an Differenc	е	
-	Study or Subgroup		lean .cog in	SD T	<u>otal M</u>	ean trate c	SD T	otal We	eight IV	. Fixed, 95% C		IV, Fix	(ed. 95% Cl		
	Brodaty et al. 2005	M ADAS	-cog in _1.6	6.2	296	12	5 68	296 1	4.7% _0.4	7 [-0 63 -0 21]					
	Reskind et al. 2000		-1.0	12	202	1.2	5.00	207 0		7 [-0.03, -0.31]		-			
	Raskind et al. 2000a		-14 6	18	197	2	5.47	207 10	0.0% -0.0	4 [-0.73 -0.47]					
	Rockwood et al. 2000		-11	5.1	239	06	1.93	120	8.1% _0.3	4 [-0.56 -0.12]					
	Tariot et al.,2000a		-1.4 5	.57	253	1.7	5.23	255 13	2.6% -0.5	2 [-0.70 -0.35]					
	Tariot et al.,2000b		-1.4	6.2	253	1.7	5.23	255 12	2.6% -0.5	0 [-0.67 -0.32]					
	Wilcock et al. 2000a		-0.5 5	.64	220	2.4	5.01	215 10	0.8% -0.5	0 [-0.690.31]					
	Wilcock et al.,2000b		-0.8 6	.33	217	2.4	5.01	215 10	0.7% -0.5	2 [-0.710.33]					
	Wilkinson and Murray et al. 20	001a	-0.1	6.3	81	1.6	5.34	82 4	4.1% -0.	27 [-0.58. 0.04]			+		
	Wilkinson and Murray et al. 20	001b	-1.4 6	.67	55	1.6	5.34	82 3	3.3% -0.4	6 [-0.810.11]		. 			
	Wilkinson and Murrav et al. 20	001c	-0.7	5	51	1.6	5.34	82 3	3.2% -0.3	9 [-0.74, -0.04]			-		
	Subtotal (95% CI)			2	064	-	2	016 10	0.0% -0.4	9 [-0.56, -0.43]					
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 7.69. df	= 10 (P =	= 0.66):	l² = 0%	6										
	Test for overall effect: Z = 15.3	38 (P < 0.	.00001)												
			,										1		
												5 -0.25	0 0 25	0.5	
											-0 Favours	5 -0.25 [experimenta	0 0.25] Favours [0.5 [control]	
	R	Rivastion	nine		Contr	ol		SI	td. Mean Dif	ference	-0 -0 Favours	5 -0.25 [experimenta	0 0.25 I] Favours [Difference	0.5 [control]	
	R <u>Study or Subaroup</u> Me	Rivastign an <u>S</u> E	nine <u>) Tot</u> a	al Me	Contr an SI	ol D To	tal W	St eight	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Rand</u> on	ference n. 95% Cl	-0. Favours	5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25] Favours Difference m. 95% Cl	0.5 [control]	
_	R <u>Study or Subgroup Me</u> 1.1.1 Effect of rivastiamin	Rivastign an SE ne on AD	nine <u>) Tota</u>)AS-co	al Me	Contr an SI nild to	ol <u>) To</u> mode	tal We	Si eight roup	td. Mean Dif IV. Randon	ference n. 95% Cl	-0. Favours	5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25] Favours Difference m. 95% Cl	0.5 [control]	
_	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al 2007	Rivastign an SE ne on AD	nine <u>) Tota</u>)AS-co	al Me gin n	Contr an SI nild to	ol <u>) Tot</u> mode	tal Werate g	St eight proup 9 2%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u>	ference n. 95% Cl		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25] Favours Difference m. 95% Cl	l 0.5 [control]	
_	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 (Foratto et al. 2000 (Rivastign an SE le on AD 0.2 7.3	nine <u>D Tota</u> DAS-co 3 22	al Me gin n 7 :	Contr an SE nild to 2.8 7.2	ol <u>) Tot</u> mode 2 2	tal We erate g	Si eight proup 9.2% 2.0%	td. Mean Diff <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6	ference n. 95% Cl 50, -0.23]		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25 I] Favours [Difference m. 95% Cl	l 0.5 [control]	
	R <u>Study or Subgroup Me</u> 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 Forette et al.,1999 Durling 410-000	Rivastign an <u>SE</u> ie on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4	nine <u>D Tota</u> DAS-co 3 22 4 2	al Me og in n 7 : 3	Contr an SI nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4	rol <u>) Tot</u> mode 2 2:	tal Werate g 20 2 19 1	Si eight proup 9.2% 2.0%	td. Mean Diff <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1	ference n. 95% Cl 60, -0.23] 7, -2.28]		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% Cl	l 0.5 [control]	
_	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 -2 Rosler et al.,1999 -0.	Rivastign an SE ie on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 .26 6.3	nine <u>) Tota</u>)AS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24	a <u>l Me</u> ginn 7 : 3 2 1.	Contr an SI nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3	ol <u>7 Tot</u> mode 2 2: 1 3 2:	tal We erate g 20 2 19 1 38 2	Si eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4	ference n. 95% Cl 50, -0.23] 7, -2.28] 1, -0.05]		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% Cl	l 0.5 [control]	
	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 -C Forette et al.,1999 -O. Winblad et al.,2007 -C	Rivastign an SE ne on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 .26 6.3 0.6 6.2	nine <u>) Tota</u>)AS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25	a <u>l Me</u> oginn 7 : 3 2 1. 3	Contr an SI nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8	ol <u>D Toi</u> mode 2 22 4 3 23 3 23	tal We prate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2	St eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4	ference n. 95% CI 50, -0.23] 7, -2.28] -1, -0.05] -2, -0.07] -0.07]	 -0 Favours	5 -0.25 (experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% CI	l 0.5 [control]	
_	R <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 -0 Rosler et al.,1999 -0. Winblad et al.,2007 -0 Subtotal (95% CI)	Rivastign an SE ae on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 2.6 6.3 0.6 6.2	nine D Tota DAS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25 74	al Me og in n 7 : 3 2 1. 3 5	Contr an SI nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8	ol <u>D Tot</u> mode 2 2: 4 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 7:	tal Wei Prate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 58 10	St roup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0%	td. Mean Diff <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0	ference n. 95% Cl 50, -0.23] 7, -2.28] 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23]	 Favours	5 -0.25 (experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% CI	l 0.5 [control]	
	R <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 -2 Forette et al.,1999 -2 Rosler et al.,1999 -0. Winblad et al.,2007 -0 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15	Rivastign an <u>SE</u> be on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 26 6.3 0.6 6.2 ; Chi ² = 3	nine D Tota DAS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25 74 38.79, 0	al Me og in n 7 2 3 2 1. 3 5 5 df = 3	Contr an <u>SE</u> nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.1	rol <u>D Tot</u> mode 2 2: 4 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 000001	tal We rrate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 58 10); I ² =	St roup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0	ference n. 95% Cl 7, -2.28] 7 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23]	 Favours	5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% Cl	0.5 [control]	
	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 -C Forette et al.,1999 -C Rosler et al.,1999 -C Winblad et al.,2007 -C Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3	Rivastign an SE le on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 26 6.3 0.6 6.2 ; Chi ² = 3 3.04 (P =	nine <u>) Tota</u>)AS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25 74 38.79, 6 0.002	al Me oginn 7 : 3 2 1. 3 5 5 df = 3	Contr an <u>SE</u> nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.1	ol mode 2 2: 4 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 7: 00001	tal Wa erate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 58 10); l ² =	St eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 00.0% 92%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0	ference n. 95% Cl 7, -2.28] 7 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23]	 Favours	5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25 0 72 0] Favours Difference m. 95% CI	control]	
_	R <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 -0 Rosler et al.,1999 -0. Winblad et al.,2007 -0 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3	Rivastign an SE ie on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 226 6.3 0.6 6.2 3.04 (P =	nine D Tota DAS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25 74 38.79, 0 5 0.002	al Me og in n 3 2 1. 3 5 5 df = 3	Contr an <u>SI</u> nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.4	rol D Tot mode 2 22 4 23 3 2	tal We rate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 58 10); I ² =	Si eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0	ference n. 95% Cl 50, -0.23] 7, -2.28] 7, -2.28] 7, -2.28] 7, -2.28] 6, -0.23] 		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% CI	(control)	
-	R <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 -(Forette et al.,1999 -0. Winblad et al.,2007 -(Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3	Rivastign an SE ie on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 2.26 6.3 0.6 6.2 3.04 (P =	mine D Tota DAS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25 74 38.79, 0 0.002	al Me og in n 3 22 1. 3 5 5 df = 3	Contr an SE nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.4	ol <u>D Tot</u> mode 2 2: 4 2: 3 2: 4 7: 9 00001	tal We rrate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 58 10); I ² =	Sf eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0	ference n. 95% CI 50, -0.23] - 11, -0.05] 12, -0.07] 6, -0.23] - -4	-0 Favours	5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% Cl	l 0.5 [control]	
	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 -0 Forette et al.,1999 -0 Winblad et al.,2007 -0 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3	Rivastign an SE le on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 26 6.3 0.6 6.2 3.04 (P =	nine D Tota DAS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25 74 38.79, 6 0.002	al Me g in n 3 2 1. 3 5 5 5 5 5 0	Contr an SI nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.2 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.1	ol <u>) To</u> mode 2 2: 4 3 2: 3 2: 7! 00001	tal We rrate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 58 10); I ² =	Sf eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0	ference n. 95% CI 10, -0.23] 7, -2.28] 11, -0.05] 12, -0.07] 6, -0.23] -4		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% CI Favours [ca	l 0.5 [control]	1 4
	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 Forette et al.,1999 Rosler et al.,1999 Winblad et al.,2007 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study of Subgroup	Rivastign an SE ie on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 26 6.3 0.6 6.2 ; Chi ² = 3 3.04 (P = Memai	mine <u>) Tota</u>)AS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25 74 38.79, 0 0.002 0.002 mtine	al Me g in n 7 : 3 2 1. 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Contr an SI nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.4 (P < 0.4) Co	ntrol	tal Wr rrate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 38 10); I ² =	St eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0	ference n. 95% Cl 7, -2.28] -1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] 4 Difference red 95% Cl		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25 I] Favours [Difference m. 95% CI Favours [ca Difference d 95% CI	control]	
	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 Forette et al.,19990. Winblad et al.,2007(Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of	Rivastign an SE ie on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 26 6.3 0.6 6.2 ; Chi ² = 3 3.04 (P = Memai lean	mine <u>D Tota</u> DAS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25 74 38.79, (0.002) mine <u>SD Tr</u> -cog in	al Me gginn 3 2 1. 3 5 5 5 5 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Contr an SI nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.1 (P < 0.1) (P < 0.1)	rol <u>mode</u> 2 2 4 3 2 3 2 7 3 2 7 9 000001 mtrol <u>SD</u>	tal W/ parate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 38 10 38 10); ² = <u>Total</u> group	St eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92% Weight	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean I t IV. Fi;	ference n. 95% Cl 7, -2.28] -1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] 		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	0 0.25 I] Favours [Difference m. 95% CI Favours [ca Difference d. 95% CI	L 0.5 [control]	
_	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007(Forette et al.,19990. Winblad et al.,2007(Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine G Bakchine et al. 2008	Rivastign an SE le on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 26 6.3 0.6 6.2 3.04 (P = Memar lean on ADAS 1.93 6	nine <u>) Tota</u> AS-cc 3 22 4 2 2 25 74 2 25 74 38.79, (0.002) mine <u>SD Tot</u> -cog ir -cog ir	al Me gginn 7 : 3 2 1. 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 0 ff = 3)	Contr an <u>SF</u> nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.1 (P < 0.1 (P < 0.1) Co lean to moc	ol <u>7</u> 2 2: 4 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 7: 00001	tal W/ arate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 38 10 38 10 135 Total group 135	St eight po.p 9.2% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92% Weight 30.2%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean D <u>V. Fib</u> -0.13 [-	ference n. 95% CI 10, -0.23] 7, -2.28] 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] 	-0 Favours	5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% CI Favours [ca Difference d. 95% CI	l 0.5 [control]	
	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 -(Forette et al.,1999 -0. Winblad et al.,2007 -(Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al.,2008 - Peskind et al 2006	Rivastign an SE le on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 2.6 6.3 0.6 6.2 3.04 (P = Memai lean on ADAS 1.93 6 -0.8 7	nine <u>) Tota</u> DAS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25 74: 38.79, (0.002) ntine <u>SD To</u> -cog ir 71 2 82	al Me g in n 7 : 3 2 1. 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 0 1 9 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Contri an <u>SI</u> nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.) (P < 0.) Co lean to moc 1.08	ol <u>) To</u> mode 2 2: 4 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 1 000001 introl <u>SD</u> lerate 6.27 7.88	tal Wr rate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 58 10 58 10); ² = Total group 135 198	St eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 00.0% 92% Weight 30.2% 32.5%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean I t IV. Fip -0.13 [- -0.24 [-	ference n. 95% CI 7, -2.28] 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] 		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando = = = = = C erimental] Std. Mean IV. Fixe	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% CI Favours [cr Difference d. 95% CI	l 0.5 [control]	1 4
	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 - Forette et al.,1999 -2 Rosler et al.,1999 -0. Winblad et al.,2007 - Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al.,2008 - Peskind et al.,2008	Rivastign an SE e on AD 2.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 226 6.3 0.6 6.2 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = Memai bon ADAS 1.93 6 -0.8 7 0.6 12	nine <u>) Tota</u> DAS-cc 3 22 2 25 74: 38.79, (0.002) ntine <u>SD To</u> -cog ir .22 .23 .24 .25 .25 .24 .25 .25 .25 .25 .25 .25 .25 .25	al Me ggin n 3 2 1. 3 5 5 5 df = 3) btal N n mild 277 - 195 214	Contr an SI nild to 2.8 7.2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.) (P < 0.) (P < 0.) to moc 1.08 1.1 1 2 12	ol <u>) To</u> mode 2 2: 4 3 2: 3 2: 7: 3 2: 7: 000001 Introl SD Ierate 6.27 7.88 2.07	tal W/ rate g 20 2 2 31 2 31 2 58 10 58 10 58 10 58 10 9 7 9 7 9 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 212	Si eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 00.0% 92% Weight 30.2% 32.5% 32.5%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean I t IV. Fib -0.24 [- -0.24 [- -0.24 [- -0.24 [- -0.25 [- -0.05 [- -0.24 [- -0.24 [- -0.25 [-	ference n. 95% CI 7, -2.28] 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] -4 Difference (ed. 95% CI 0.34, 0.08] 0.44, -0.04] 0.24, 0.04] 0.24, 0.04]		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando erimental] Std. Mean IV. Fixe	0 0.25 I] Favours [Difference m. 95% CI Favours [cd Difference d. 95% CI	L 0.5 [control]	
	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 -(Forette et al.,1999 -2 Rosler et al.,1999 -0. Winblad et al.,2007 -(Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al.,2008 - Peskind et al.,2008 Porsteinssonet al.,2008	Rivastign an SE ie on AD 2.6 1.4 26 6.3 2.6 1.4 26 6.3 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = Memai lean Dan ADAS 1.93 6 -0.8 7 0.6 13	nine <u>) Tota</u> <u>2 Tota</u> <u>3 24</u> <u>2 25</u> <u>74</u> <u>38.79</u> <u>0.002</u> ntine <u>SD Tot</u> <u>50 Tot</u> <u>50</u>	al Me ggin m 7 : 3 2 1. 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Contr an <u>SI</u> nild to 2.8 7.2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0. (P < 0. Co lean 1.08 1.1 1.2 1	rol <u>D Tor</u> mode 2 2: 4 2: 7: 3 2: 7: 000001 introl <u>SD</u> lerate 6.27 7.88 2.07	tal W/ rate g 20 2 19 38 2 31 2 58 10 58 10 58 10 198 213 546	St eight proup 9.2% 9.3% 9.5% 00.0% 92% Weight 0 30.2% 32.5% 35.6% 98.3%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean I <u>IV. Fib</u> -0.13 [- -0.24 [-0.45 -0.05 [- -0.14 [- -0.05 [- -0.14	ference n. 95% CI 7, -2.28] 7, -2.28] -1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] -4 Difference (xed, 95% CI -4 0.34, 0.08] 0.44, -0.04] 0.24, -0.04] 0.24, -0.04] 0.24, -0.04]		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	0 0.25 I] Favours [Difference m. 95% CI Favours [ca Difference d. 95% CI	2 ontrol]	
	Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al., 2007 -(Forette et al., 1999 -0. Winblad et al., 2007 -(Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al., 2008 - Peskind et al., 2008 - Peskind et al., 2008 - Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93, cf -	Rivastign an SE ie on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 26 6.3 0.6 6.2 ; Chi ² = 3 3.04 (P = Memai lean 5 1.93 6 -0.8 7 0.6 13 if = 2 (P -	nine <u>D Tota</u> AS-cco 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25 74 38.79, (0.002) ntine SD Tc (6 cog ir .11 2 (6 cog ir .22 .23 .24 .24 .25 .25 .24 .25 .24 .25 .25 .25 .25 .25 .25 .25 .25	al Me gg in n 3 2 1. 3 3 5 5 6 df = 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Contr an <u>SI</u> nild to 2 2 1.2 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.1 (P < 0.1 Co lean 1.08 1.1 1.2 1 %	rol <u>D Tor</u> mode 2 2: 4 3 2: 7: 000001 introl <u>SD</u> lerate 6.27 7.88 2.07	tal W/ errate g 20 2 31 2 33 2 31 2 33 10 33 10 33 10 33 10 33 10 33 10 34 10 35 10 36 10 37 10	St eight po.p 9.2% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92% 92% 0.0% 92% 30.2% 32.5% 35.6% 98.3%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean I t IV. Fiz -0.13 [- -0.24 [-0 -0.05] -0.14 [-0	ference n. 95% Cl i0, -0.23] 7, -2.28] 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] 	-0 Favours	5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando 	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% CI Favours [cd Difference d. 95% CI	l 0.5 [control]	
	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 - Forette et al.,1999 -2 Rosler et al.,1999 -0 Winblad et al.,2007 - Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al.,2008 - Peskind et al.,2006 - Porsteinssonet al.,2008 - Subtotal (95% CI) - Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93, of Test for overall effect: Z = 2.5	Rivastign an SI e on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 226 6.3 0.6 6.2 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = Memai 193 6 -0.8 7 0.6 13 if = 2 (P = 0	mine D_Tota D_Tota AS-co 3 22 4 2 2 25 74: 3 0.002; 0.002; ntine SD_Tr SD_Tr 2. :-cog ir	al Me ginn 3 2 1. 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Contr an <u>SI</u> nild to 2.8 7.2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0. (P < 0. (P < 0. <u>to moc</u> 1.08 1.1 1.2 1 %	ol mode 2 2: 3 2: 3 2: 7: 000001 mtrol SD lerate 6.27 7.88 2.07	tal W// rate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 58 10); ² = Total group 135 198 213 546	Si eight proup 9.2% 9.3% 9.5% 00.0% 92% 92% 92% 30.2% 30.2% 35.6% 98.3%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean D t IV. Fiz -0.13 [- -0.24 [-0.5 -0.14 [-0]	ference n. 95% CI 7, -2.28] 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] -4 Difference (cd. 95% CI 0.34, 0.08] 0.44, -0.04] 0.24, 0.14] 1,25, -0.02]		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando erimental] Std. Mean IV. Fixe	0 0.25 I] Favours [Difference m. 95% CI Favours [cd Difference d. 95% CI	L 0.5 [control]	
	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 - Forette et al.,1999 -2 Rosler et al.,1999 -0. Winblad et al.,2007 - Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al.,2008 - Perskind et al.,2008 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93, of Test for overall effect: Z = 2.3 1.1.2 Effect of memantine of	Rivastign an SI e on ADS 2.6 1.4 2.6 6.2 2.6 6.2 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = 0 ADAS 3.05 (P = 0 0 ADAS	mine D Tota AS-co 3 22 4 2 2 3 74: 38.79, (0.002;	al Me g g in r 7 : 3 2 1. 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Contr an <u>SI</u> nild to 2.8 7.2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 10 1.08 1.1 1.2 1 % %	ol mode 2 2: 3 2: 4 5: 5 0: 5	tal W rate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 58 10 57 198 198 198 546 re gro	St eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 00.0% 92% 92% 30.2% 30.2% 30.2% 32.5% 35.5% 98.3%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean I t IV. Fiz -0.13 [- -0.24 [-0. -0.05 [- -0.05 [- -0.14 [-0]	ference n. 95% CI 7, -2.28] 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] 4 Difference ked. 95% CI 		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando erimental] Std. Mean IV. Fixe	0 0.25 I] Favours [Difference m. 95% CI Favours [cd Difference d. 95% CI	2 ontrol]	
	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al., 2007 -(Forette et al., 1999 -0. Winblad et al., 2007 -(Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al., 2008 - Peskind et al., 2008 - Posteinssonet al., 2008 - Subtotal (95% CI) - Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93, of Test for overall effect: Z = 2.3 1.1.2 Effect of memantine of Wang et al. 2013	Rivastign an SI ie on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 226 6.3 0.6 6.2 ; Chi ² = 3 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = 100 ADAS 1.93 6 -0.8 7 0.6 13 aff = 2 (P = 0 35 (P = 0 0 ADAS	nine 0 Tota 0 Tota 0 Tota 3 22 4 2 2 25 74: 38.79,4 0.002; 0.002; ntine 50 Tc Secogir 7.11 2 (e) (e) (e) (e) (e) (e) (e) (e) (f) (e) (f) (f) (f) (f)	al Me g in n 7 : 3 2 1. 3 5 5 5 5 6 6 7 9 5 2 14 886 1 ² = 0 11	Contr an SI 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.) (P < 0.) Co lean 1.08 1.1 1.2 1 % erate to	ol <u>) Tor</u> mode 2 2: 4 2: 3 2: 3 2: 7: 000001 entrol <u>SD</u> entrol <u>SD</u> seve 5 5	tal W/ varate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 58 10); ² = Total group 135 198 213 546 vre groo 11	St eight poup 9.2% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92% 92% 30.2% 32.5% 32.5% 35.6% 98.3%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean I <u>V. Fib</u> -0.13 [- -0.24 [-0 -0.05 [- -0.14 [-0 -0.14 [-0	ference n. 95% Cl 7, -2.28] - 7, -2.28] - 2, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] 		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando erimental]	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% CI Favours [cd Difference d. 95% CI	L 0.5 [control]	4
-	Study or Subgroup Re 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 -(Forette et al.,1999 -0 Winblad et al.,2007 -(Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al.,2008 - Peskind et al.,2016 - Porsteinssonet al.,2008 - Subtotal (95% CI) - Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93, d - Test for overall effect: Z = 2.3 - 1.1.2 Effect of memantine of Wang et al.,2013 - Subtotal (95% CI) -	Rivastign an SE le on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 26 6.3 0.6 6.2 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = 0n ADAS 1.93 6 6 -0.8 7 0.6 13 iff = 2 (P = 35 (P = 0 0n ADAS 1.2	nine <u>D Tota</u> DAS-co	al Me gin n 7 : 3 2 1. 3 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 6 f = 3) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Contr an <u>SI</u> nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.1 (P < 0.1 (P < 0.1 1.08 1.1 1.08 1.1 1.2 1 % erate to	ol 2 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 7: 000001 Introl SD Ierate 6.27 7.88 2.07	tal W/ errate g 20 2 1 19 1 38 2 31 2 38 10 38 10 19 1 135 198 213 546 erre gro 11 14	St eight poup 9.2% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92% 92% 30.2% 32.5% 35.6% 98.3% up 1.7% 1.7%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean II <u>IV. Fib</u> -0.13 [- -0.24 [-1 -0.05 [- -0.14 [-0 -0.58 [- -0.58	ference n. 95% Cl i0, -0.23]		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando erimental] Std. Mean IV. Fixe	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% CI Favours [ca Difference d. 95% CI	l control]	4
-	Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 -0 Forette et al.,1999 -0 Winblad et al.,2007 -0 Subtotal (95% CI) -1 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 -15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 -2 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al.,2006 -0 Porsteinssonet al.,2008 -0.5 Subtotal (95% CI) -0.5 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93, of Test for overall effect: Z = 2.3 1.1.2 Effect of memantine of Wang et al.,2013 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93, of Test for overall effect: Z = 2.5	Rivastign an SE le on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 26 6.3 0.6 6.2 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = 100 Memai 100 Memai	nine <u>D Tota</u> DAS-co DAS-co 3 22 4 2 2 25 74: 38.79; 0 0.002; ntine <u>SD Tir</u> (6 = 0.38); .02) G-cog ir 4.7	al Me al Me ginn 7 3 2 2 1. 3 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 214 886 1² = 0 1 11	Contri an SI nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.6 (P < 0.1 (P < 0.1 to moc 1.08 1.1 1.2 1 % erate to -1.9	ol mode 2 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 7: 00001 1 ntrol SD lerate 6.27 7.88 2.07	tal W/ errate g 20 2 2 38 2 38 10 38 10	St eight po.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92% 30.2% 32.5% 98.3% 98.3% up 1.7%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-4. -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean I t IV. Fiz -0.24 [-4 -0.05 [- -0.24 [-4 -0.05 [- -0.24 [-4 -0.05 [- -0.24 [-4 -0.05 [- -0.24 [-4] -0.05 [- -0.58 [-	ference n. 95% CI 7, -2.28] 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] 0:fference (ed. 95% CI 		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando erimental] Std. Mean IV. Fixe	0 0.25 I] Favours Difference m. 95% Cl Favours [cr Difference d. 95% Cl	l 0.5 [control]	
_	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al., 2007 -(Forette et al., 1999 -2 Rosler et al., 1999 -0 Winblad et al., 2007 -(Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al., 2008 - Peskind et al., 2006 - Porsteinssonet al., 2008 - Subtotal (95% CI) - Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93, of Test for overall effect: Z = 2.3 1.1.2 Effect of memantine of Wang et al., 2013 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not applicablicablic test for overall effect. Z = 2.3	Rivastign an SI e on AD 2.6 1.4 2.6 1.2 2.6 1.2 2.6 1.2 2.6 1.2 3.0.4 (P = 3.0.4 (P = 0.0.8 7 0.6 13 3.04 (P = 0 0.8 7 0.6 13 3.05 (P = 0 0.0 ADAS 1.2 2.5 (P = 0 0.0 ADAS 1.2 2.5 (P = 0 0.0 ADAS 1.2	mine <u>) Tota</u> AS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25 74 38.79, (0.002) mine <u>SD Tr</u> 	al Me g g in r 7 : 3 2 1. 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Contr an SI 2 1.4 2 1.4 34 7.2 1 6.8 (P < 0.) (P < 0.) to moot 1.08 1.1 1.2 1 % erate to -1.9	ol <u>) To</u> mode 2 22 3 22 73 200001 mtrol <u>SD</u> lerate 6.27 7.88 2.07 	tal W/ rate g 20 2 2 31 2 38 2 31 2 58 10 35 10 37 12 37 2 37 2 37 2 37 2 37 2 37 2 37 2 37	St eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.5% 0.0% 92% 92% 30.2% 32.5% 32.5% 35.6% 98.3% up 1.7%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean I <u>IV. Fib</u> -0.13 [- -0.24 [-0 -0.24 [-0 -0.24 [-0 -0.24 [-0 -0.25 [- -0.05 [- -0.05 [- -0.58 [- -0.58 [-	ference n. 95% CI 7, -2.28] 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] 4 Difference ked. 95% CI 		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando erimental] Std. Mean IV. Fixe	0 0.25 I] Favours [Difference m. 95% CI Favours [cd Difference d. 95% CI	l 0.5 [control]	
-	R Study or Subgroup Met 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 - Forette et al.,1999 -2 Rosler et al.,1999 -0 Winblad et al.,2007 - Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al.,2008 Porsteinssonet al.,2008 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93, of Test for overall effect: Z = 2.3 1.1.2 Effect of memantine of Wang et al.,2013 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not applicabli Test for overall effect: Z = 1.3	Rivastign an SI e on AD 2.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 226 6.3 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = 1.93 6 -0.8 7 0.6 13 if = 2 (P = 3.5 (P = 0 0 n ADAS 1.2 e 3.3 (P = 0	mine <u>) Tota</u> AS-co 3 22 4 2 3 24 2 25 74 88.79, (0.002) mine <u>SD Tr</u> (-cog ir (-cog ir)) -cog ir (-cog ir (-cog ir)) -cog ir)) -cog ir (-cog ir)) -cog ir)) -cog ir (-cog ir)) -cog ir)) -cog ir (-cog ir)) -cog ir)) -co	al Me g g in r 3 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Contr an <u>SI</u> nild to 2.8 7.2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0. (P < 0. (P < 0. 108 1.1 1.2 1 % werate to -1.9	ol <u>) To</u> mode 2 22 3 22 7 3 22 7 3 22 7 9 200001 mtrol <u>SD</u> lerate 6.27 7.88 2.07 	tal W/ rate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 58 10); ² = Total group 135 198 213 546 re gro 11 11	St eight proup 9.2% 2.0% 9.3% 9.5% 00.0% 92% 92% 30.2% 30.2% 30.2% 32.5% 35.6% 98.3% 1.7%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean I t IV. Fiz -0.13 [- -0.24 [-0. -0.24 [-0. -0.24 [-0. -0.25 [- -0.25 [- -0.25 [- -0.58 [- -0.58 [-	ference n. 95% CI 7, -2.28] 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] 4 Difference ked. 95% CI 		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando erimental] Std. Mean IV. Fixe	0 0.25 I] Favours [Difference m. 95% CI Favours [cd Difference d. 95% CI	l 0.5 [control]	-
	R Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al.,2007 - (Forette et al.,1999 - 2 Rosler et al.,1999 - 0 Winblad et al.,2007 - (Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al.,2008 - Porsteinssonet al.,2008 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93, of Test for overall effect: Z = 2.3 1.1.2 Effect of memantine of Wang et al.,2013 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 1.3	Rivastign an SE ie on AD 2.6 1.4 2.6 1.4 2.6 6.2 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = 1.93 6 -0.8 7 0.6 13 3f = 2 (P = 0 0 0 ADAS 1.2 33 (P = 0	mine <u>D Tota</u> <u>D Tota</u> <u>D Tota</u> <u>A 22</u> <u>A 22</u> <u>A 24</u> <u>2 25</u> 74: <u>3 24</u> <u>2 25</u> 74: <u>3 24</u> <u>0 0002</u>	al Me g in r 7 : 3 2 1. 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Contr an <u>SI</u> nild to 2.8 7.2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0. (P < 0.) Co lean 1.08 1.1 1.2 1 % erate to -1.9	ol <u>) To</u> mode 2 2: 4 2: 3 2: 7: 000001 erate 6.27 7.88 2.07 5.5	tal W/ varate g 20 2 19 1 38 2 31 2 58 10 38 2 31 2 58 10 38 2 38 2 38 10 38 2 38 10 38 2 38 10 38 2 38 2 3	St eight poup 9.2% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92% 92% 30.2% 32.5% 32.5% 32.5% 35.6% 98.3% 1.7%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean D t IV. Fib -0.65 [-1.0 -0.13 [- -0.24 [-0 -0.05 [- -0.14 [-0 -0.58 [- -0.58 [- -0.58 [- -0.58 [-	ference n. 95% CI 7, -2.28] 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] -4 Difference (ed. 95% CI 0.34, 0.08] 0.44, -0.04] 0.24, -0.02] -0.27, 1.44] 0.27, 1.44] 0.24, -0.01]		5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando erimental] Std. Mean IV. Fixe	0 0.25 I] Favours [Difference m. 95% CI Favours [cd Difference d. 95% CI	L 0.5 [control]	
	Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al., 2007 -C Forette et al., 1999 -2 Rosler et al., 1999 -0 Winblad et al., 2007 -C Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al., 2008 Posteinssonet al., 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93, of Test for overall effect: Z = 2.3 1.1.2 Effect of memantine of Wang et al., 2013 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not applicabil Test for overall effect: Z = 1.3 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not applicabil Test for overall effect: Z = 1.3 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not applicabil Test for overall effect: Z = 1.3	Rivastign an SI ie on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.2 26 6.3 0.6 6.2 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = 3.04 (P = 1.93 6 -0.8 7 0.6 13 if = 2 (P = 3.5 (P = 0 0 ADAS 1.2 if = 3 (P =	nine <u>D Tota</u> AS 20 AS 20 A 2 A 2 A 2 A 2 A 2 A 2 A 2 A 2	al Me al Me gin n 7 $\frac{2}{3}$ 2 1. 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Contr an <u>SI</u> nild to 2 1.2 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.) (P < 0.) Co lean 1.08 1.1 1.2 1 % erate to -1.9	ol <u>) To</u> mode 2 2: 4 3 2: 3 2: 7: 000001 entrol <u>SD</u> 6.27 7.88 2.07 5.5	tal W/ prate g 20 2 31 2 38 10 38 10 38 10 38 10 38 10 135 198 213 546 re groo 11 11 11	St eight po.p 9.2% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92% 92% 30.2% 30.2% 32.5% 32.5% 98.3% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean I <u>V. Fib</u> -0.13 [- -0.24 [-0 -0.14 [-0 -0.14 [-0 -0.58 [- -0.58 [ference n. 95% CI 1, -0.05] 2, -0.07] 6, -0.23] 	-0 Favours	5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando erimental] Std. Mean IV. Fixe	Favours [cd Difference m. 95% CI Favours [cd Difference d. 95% CI	L 0.5 [control]	4
	Study or Subgroup Me 1.1.1 Effect of rivastigmin Feldman et al., 2007 - Forette et al., 1999 -0. Winblad et al., 2007 - Rosler et al., 1999 -0. Winblad et al., 2007 - C Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 3 S Study or Subgroup M M 1.1.1 Effect of memantine of Bakchine et al., 2008 - Peskind et al., 2006 Porsteinssonet al., 2008 - Peskind et al., 2008 - Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93, of Test for overall effect: Z = 2.3 1.1.2 Effect of memantine of Wang et al., 2013 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not applicablic Test for overall effect: Z = 1.3 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.59, of Test for overall effect: Z = 2.4 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.59, of Test for overall effect: Z = 2.4	Rivastign an SE le on AD 0.2 7.3 2.6 1.4 26 6.3 0.6 6.2 3.04 (P = Memai Ban Son ADAS 1.93 6 13 iff = 2 (P = 335 (P = 0 on ADAS 1.2 e 33 (P = 0 51 (P = 0) 51 (P = 0)	nine <u>D Tota</u> DAS-co	al Me gin n 7 : 2 1. 3 2 1. 3 5 5 5 5 5 6 f = 3) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Contr an <u>SI</u> nild to 2.8 7.2 2 1.4 34 7.3 1 6.8 (P < 0.1 (P < 0.1 to moc 1.08 1.1 1.02 1.0 8 .1.1 1.2 1 % erate to -1.9	ol 2 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 3 2: 4 00001 Introl SD Ierate 6.27 7.88 2.07 5.5	tal W/ state group 19 1 38 20 31 2 38 10 38 10 38 10 38 10 19 1 135 198 213 546 re gro 11 11 557	St eight poup 9.2% 9.3% 9.5% 0.0% 92% 92% 30.2% 30.2% 32.5% 32.5% 98.3% 1.7% 1.7%	td. Mean Dif <u>IV. Randon</u> -0.41 [-0.6 -3.22 [-4.1 -0.23 [-0.4 -0.24 [-0.4 -0.65 [-1.0 Std. Mean I <u>IV. Fib</u> -0.13 [- -0.05 [- -0.14 [-0 -0.14 [-0 -0.58 [- -0.58 [ference n. 95% Cl i0, -0.23]	-0 Favours	5 -0.25 [experimenta Std. Mean IV. Rando erimental] Std. Mean IV. Fixe 	0 0.25 [] Favours Difference m. 95% Cl Difference d. 95% Cl 0 0.5	1 2 ontrol]	

FIGURE 2 | Cognitive outcomes on the ADAS-cog subscale (change from baseline) in AD patients in trials of cholinesterase inhibitors (A, Donepezil; B, Galantamine; C, Rivastigmine) and memantine (D), according to drug and dose.



B, Galantamine; C, Rivastigmine) to drug and dose.

Functional Outcome

Donepezil

We pooled the data of AD Cooperative Study Activities of Daily Living Inventory from six articles (Winblad et al., 2006; Black et al., 2007; Homma et al., 2008; Haig et al., 2014; Gault et al., 2015, 2016) (**Figure 3A**), and significant benefit was found with donepezil treatment [SMD = 0.22, 95% CI (0.12, 0.33); p < 0.0001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.54, $I^2 = 0$ %). The funnel plots

(data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we deleted the most positive outlier (Gault et al., 2016), the merged effect size was also statistically significant [SMD = 0.19, 95% CI (0.07, 0.30); p = 0.001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.94, $I^2 = 0$ %). When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Black et al., 2007), the merged effect size was significant [SMD = 0.26, 95% CI (0.14, 0.38); p < 0.0001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.59, $I^2 = 0$ %).

Galantamine

We pooled the data of AD Cooperative Study Activities of Daily Living Inventory from three articles (Tariot et al., 2000; Brodaty et al., 2005; Burns et al., 2009) (Figure 3B), and significant benefit was found with galantamine treatment [SMD = 0.19, 95% CI (0.01, 0.37); p = 0.04]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was high (p = 0.006, $I^2 = 76\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we deleted the most positive outlier (Tariot et al., 2000), the merged effect size was not significant [SMD = 0.14, 95% CI (-0.08, 0.36); p = 0.21]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was high $(p = 0.01, I^2 = 77\%)$. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Burns et al., 2009), the merged effect size was also statistically significant [SMD = 2.21, 95% CI (1.42, 2.99); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low $(p = 0.34, I^2 = 6\%).$

Rivastigmine

We pooled the data of AD Cooperative Study Activities of Daily Living Inventory from one studies (Winblad et al., 2007) (**Figure 3C**), and significant benefit was found with rivastigmine treatment [MD = 1.80, 95% CI (0.20, 3.40); p = 0.03].

Memantine

We pooled the data of AD Cooperative Study Activities of Daily Living Inventory 19 (ADCS-ADL₁₉) from four studies (Reisberg et al., 2003; Tariot et al., 2004; van Dyck et al., 2007; Grossberg et al., 2013) (Supplementary Figure S1A) and significant benefit was found with memantine treatment [SMD = 0.15, 95% CI (0.05, 0.24); p = 0.003]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.39, $I^2 = 7\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show a fairly symmetric distribution, which indicated no hint of publication bias. When we deleted the most positive outlier (Reisberg et al., 2003), the merged effect size was significant [SMD = 0.12, 95% CI (0.01, 0.22); p = 0.03]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.64, $I^2 = 0\%$). When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Grossberg et al., 2013), the merged effect size was significant [SMD = 0.19, 95% CI (0.06, 0.32); p = 0.003]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low $(p = 0.39, I^2 = 0\%).$

In a pooled study of Activities of Daily Living Inventory 23 (ADCS-ADL₂₃), the pooled analysis of both studies showed that no significant benefit was found with memantine treatment [SMD = 0.00, 95% CI (-0.11, 0.12); p = 0.93] (**Supplementary Figure S1B**). The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.99, $I^2 = 0\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show a symmetric distribution, which indicated no hint of publication bias.

Behavioral Outcome

Donepezil

We pooled NPI data from nine studies (Feldman et al., 2001; Tariot et al., 2001; Tune et al., 2003; Johannsen et al., 2006; Winblad et al., 2006; Black et al., 2007; Haig et al., 2014;

Gault et al., 2015, 2016) (Figure 4A), which contained detailed information on the baseline and final observation times for donepezil and placebo. Donepezil treatment showed no significant effect on the behavioral outcome of NPI assessment [SMD = -0.14, 95% CI (-0.29, 0.01); p = 0.06]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.03, $I^2 = 54\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we deleted the most positive outlier (Gault et al., 2016), the merged effect size was not significant [SMD = -0.11, 95% CI (-0.26, 0.04); p = 0.15]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.04, $I^2 = 51\%$). When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Tune et al., 2003), the merged effect size was not significant [SMD = -0.15, 95% CI (-0.31, 0.00); p = 0.05]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate $(p = 0.02, I^2 = 58\%).$

Galantamine

We pooled NPI data from three articles (Tariot et al., 2000; Rockwood et al., 2001; Brodaty et al., 2005) (Figure 4B), which contained detailed information on the baseline and final observation times for galantamine and placebo. Galantamine treatment showed a significant effect on the behavioral outcome when assessed by NPI [SMD = -0.15, 95% CI (-0.24, -0.06); p = 0.001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.91, $I^2 = 0$ %). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show a symmetric distribution, which indicated no hint of publication bias.

Rivastigmine

We pooled NPI data from one study (Winblad et al., 2007) (**Figure 4C**), which contained detailed information on the baseline and final observation times for rivastigmine and placebo. Rivastigmine treatment showed no significant effect on behavioral outcome when assessed by NPI [MD = -0.50, 95% CI (-2.68, 1.68); p = 0.65].

Memantine

We pooled NPI data from nine studies (Reisberg et al., 2003; Tariot et al., 2004; Peskind et al., 2006; van Dyck et al., 2007; Bakchine and Loft, 2008; Porsteinsson et al., 2008; Fox et al., 2012; Grossberg et al., 2013; Herrmann et al., 2013), which contained detailed information on the baseline and final observation times for memantine and placebo (Figure 4D). Memantine treatment showed no significant effect on the behavioral outcomes when assessed by NPI [SMD = -0.11, 95% CI (-0.22, 0.01); p = 0.06]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate $(p = 0.01, I^2 = 60\%)$. The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, indicating hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Herrmann et al., 2013), the size of the merged effect is an important influence size [SMD = -0.13, 95% CI (-0.25, -0.01); p = 0.03]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate $(p = 0.02, I^2 = 59\%)$. When we deleted the most positive outlier (Fox et al., 2012), the merged effect size was not significant [SMD = -0.08, 95% CI (-0.19, -0.03); p = 0.14]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate $(p = 0.02, I^2 = 57\%).$



FIGURE 4 | Behavior outcomes on the NPI scale (change from baseline) in AD patients in trials on cholinesterase inhibitors (A, Donepezil; B, Galantamine; C, Rivastigmine) and memantine (D), according to drug and dose.

А		Donepezil	Control		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
-	Study or Subgroup	Events Total	Events To	tal Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	<u>I M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl</u>
	4.1.1 Effect of donepezil on the		o moderate	group	4 00 10 00 0 501	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	28 65	17	55 10.9%	1.69 [0.80, 3.59]	
		28	17	55 10.570	1.03 [0.00, 0.03]	•
	Heterogeneity: Not applicable	20	17			
	Test for overall effect: $7 = 1.37$	7 (P = 0.17)				
		(
	4.1.2 Effect of donepezil on	CIBIC+ in mode	rate to seve	re group		
	Black et al.,2007	46 167	36 1	57 27.9%	1.28 [0.77, 2.11]	
	Homma et al.,2008a	23 96	24 1	02 18.3%	1.02 [0.53, 1.97]	_
	Homma et al.,2008b	43 92	24 1	02 12.6%	2.85 [1.54, 5.27]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	355	3	61 58.7%	1.54 [1.10, 2.14]	\bullet
	Total events	112	84			
	Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 5.89$, df	= 2 (P = 0.05); I ²	= 66%			
	Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.54$	4 (P = 0.01)				
	4.1.3 Effect of donenezil on (CIBIC+ in sever	aroup			
	lia et al 2017	54 150	46 1	51 30.4%	1 28 [0 79 2 08]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	150	1	51 30.4%	1.28 [0.79, 2.08]	◆
	Total events	54	46			
	Heterogeneity: Not applicable					
	Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02	2 (P = 0.31)				
	Total (95% CI)	570	5	67 100.0%	1.48 [1.14, 1.91]	◆
	Total events	194	147			
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.38, df	= 4 (P = 0.17); l ²	= 37%			0.01 0.1 1 10 100
	Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.98$	3 (P = 0.003)				Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
	lest for subaroup differences:	$Chi^2 = 0.50. df =$	2(P = 0.78)	$ ^2 = 0\%$		
в	Gal	antamine	Control		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
-	Study or Subgroup Eve	ents Total Ev	ents Tota	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
	4.1.1 Effect of donepezil on	CIBIC+ in mild	to moderat	e group		
	Brodaty et al.,2005	64 302	62 301	19.2%	1.04 [0.70, 1.54]	+
	Raskind et al.,2000a	37 186	27 196	8.3%	1.55 [0.90, 2.67]	
	Raskind et al.,2000b	27 171	27 196	8.3%	1.17 [0.66, 2.09]	- -
	Rockwood et al.,2001	61 240	24 123	9.3%	1.41 [0.83, 2.39]	+
	Tariot et al.,2000a	169 253	128 255	16.6%	2.00 [1.39, 2.86]	
	Tariot et al.,2000b	162 253	128 255	18.0%	1.77 [1.24, 2.52]	-
	Wilcock et al.,2000a	36 206	33 203	10.8%	1.09 [0.65, 1.83]	
	Wilcock et al.,2000b	48 198	33 203	9.7%	1.65 [1.01, 2.70]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	1809	1/32	100.0%	1.48 [1.26, 1.73]	
	Lotar events	604	462			
	Test for overall effect: $7 = 4.8$	I = 7 (P = 0.25), I	22%			
	Test for overall effect. Z = 4.0	(F < 0.00001)				
					I	
						0.01 0.1 1 10 100
						Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
С	Riva	stiamine (Control		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
_	Study or Subgroup Ever	nts Total Ev	ents Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
	4.1.1 Effect of rivastigmine	on CIBIC+ in m	ild to mode	erate group		
	Feldman et al.,2007	66 220	40 213	50.0%	1.85 [1.18, 2.90]	-∎-
	Rosler et al.,1999	80 219	46 230	50.0%	2.30 [1.51, 3.52]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	439	443	100.0%	2.08 [1.53, 2.83]	
	Total events 1	46	86			
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.47, d	f = 1 (P = 0.49);	l² = 0%			
	Test for overall effect: Z = 4.6	65 (P < 0.00001)				
					-	
						0.05 0.2 1 5 20
						Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

FIGURE 5 | Global change outcomes in AD patients in cholinesterase inhibitors (A, Donepezil; B, Galantamine; C, Rivastigmine) trials based on CIBIC+ versus no change or worsening compared to the baseline according to drug and dose.

Study or Subaroup	Events 1	otal E	vents -	Total V	Weight M	I-H. Fixed, 95% CI	M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl
5.1.1 The pool results of an	v adverse e	effects f	or all su	Ibgrou	ps in mild	to moderate group	
Frolich et al. 2011	60	158	60	163	17.6%	1 05 10 67 1 651	_
Gault at al. 2015	20	68	26	68	7.2%	1 20 [0.61, 2 39]	
Cault et al. 2016	25	75	20	104	0 40/	1.20 [0.01, 2.30]	
Gault et al.,2016	47	/5	56	104	8.4%	1.44 [0.78, 2.64]	
Haig et al.,2014	30	60	25	63	5.9%	1.52 [0.74, 3.11]	
Johannsen et al.,2006	27	99	33	102	11.4%	0.78 [0.43, 1.44]	
Maher-Edwards et al.,2011	26	67	18	61	5.5%	1.51 [0.72, 3.17]	
Seltzer et al.,2004	67	96	37	57	6.7%	1.25 [0.62, 2.51]	
Tariot et al.,2001	99	103	102	105	1.9%	0.73 [0.16, 3.34]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		726		723	64.5%	1.16 [0.93, 1.47]	◆
Total events	385		357				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 3.73$, d Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.3$	lf = 7 (P = 0. 30 (P = 0.19	81); l² =)	0%				
5.1.2 The pool results of an	y adverse e	effects f	or all su	ubgrou	ps in mod	erate to severe group	
Feldman et al2001	120	144	117	146	9.3%	1.24 [0.68, 2.25]	- -
Subtotal (95% CI)		144		146	9.3%	1.24 [0.68, 2.25]	
Total overts	120		117		01070		
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.7$	e 70 (P = 0.48)	117				
5.1.3 The pool results of an	ny adverse e	effects f	or all su	ubgrou	ps in seve	re group	
Black et al.,2007	140	176	117	167	11.8%	1.66 [1.01, 2.72]	⊢ •−−
Jia et al.,2017	53	157	45	156	14.4%	1.26 [0.78. 2.03]	-+
Subtotal (95% CI)		333		323	26.2%	1.44 [1.02, 2.03]	\bullet
Total events	102		162	•			-
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.63$, d Test for overall effect: Z = 2.0	lf = 1 (P = 0. 08 (P = 0.04	43); l² =)	0%				
Total (95% CI)	1	203		1192	100.0%	1.24 [1.04, 1.49]	◆
Total events	698		636				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 5.37$ d	f = 10 (P = 0)) 87)· I² =	= 0%				+ + + + +
Test for overall effect: $7 = 2.2$	P = 0.02	, .o <i>r</i>), r	070				0.05 0.2 1 5 20
	Donep	ezil	Cont	rol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Donep Events	ezil Total	Cont Events	rol Tota	Weight	Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% CI</u>	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
<u>Study or Subgroup</u> 6.1.1 The pool results of a	Donep Events ny reason	ezil <u>Total</u> caused	Cont <u>Events</u> dropou	rol <u>Tota</u> ıts in n	Weight	Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl</u> derate group	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
<u>Study or Subgroup</u> 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015	Donep Events iny reason 6	ezil <u>Total</u> caused 68	Cont <u>Events</u> dropou 3	rol <u>Tota</u> ıts in n 68	Weight nild to mo 1.5%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% CI</u> derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
<u>Study or Subgroup</u> 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016	Donep Events ny reason 6 15	ezil <u>Total</u> caused 68 76	Cont Events dropou 3 15	rol <u>Tota</u> its in n 68 104	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 5.7%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haic et al.,2014	Donep Events Iny reason 6 15 19	ezil Total caused 68 76 60	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25	rol <u>Tota</u> its in n 68 104 63	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 5.7% 9.3%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% CI</u> derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34 1 48]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al. 2003	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25	rol <u>Tota</u> its in n 68 104 63	Weight nild to mo 5.7% 9.3%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% CI</u> derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.6, 1.56]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10	rol <u>Tota</u> its in n 68 104 63 33	Weight nild to mo 5.7% 9.3% 4.7%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34 67	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15	rol Tota uts in n 68 104 63 33 63	Weight nild to mo 5.7% 9.3% 4.7%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004	Donep Events ny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34 67 96	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 25 10 15 11	rol Total its in n 68 104 63 33 63 57	Weight nild to mo 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% C1</u> derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI)	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11	rol <u>Tota</u> uts in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388	Weight nild to mo 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 7.4% 5.6% 34.2%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79	rol 5 Tota 1ts in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388	Weight nild to mo 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 7.4% 5.6% 34.2%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 1 .15 (P = 0.8	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8)	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28%	rol Tota its in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388	Weight nild to mo 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 7.4% 5.6% 34.2%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a	Donep Events Iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 1 .15 (P = 0.8 .15 (P = 0.8	ezil <u>Total</u> caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou	rol <u>Total</u> uts in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 uts in n	Weight nild to mo 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 1 .15 (P = 0.8 iny reason 23	ezil <u>Total</u> caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20	rrol <u>Total</u> uts in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 uts in n 146	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI)	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 1 .15 (P = 0.8 iny reason 23	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20	rrol <u>Total</u> its in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 uts in n 146 146	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	Donep Events Iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 1 .15 (P = 0.8 Iny reason 23 23	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20	rol <u>Total</u> its in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 its in n 146 146	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 0.8 .15 (P = 0.8 23 23 ble .54 (P = 0.5	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); l ² 8) caused 144 144 9)	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20	rol <u>Tota</u> its in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 146 146	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a	Donep Events Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 0.8) iny reason 23 23 23 54 (P = 0.5) iny reason	ezil <u>Total</u> caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); l ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20	rol <u>Total</u> 104 63 33 63 63 63 63 63 63 63 63	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Plack et al. 2007	Donep Events Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 0.8 iny reason 23 23 23 24 (P = $0.5iny reason$	ezil Total Caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 160	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20 dropou	rol <u>Total</u> its in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 146 146 146 146	Weight. nild to mo 1.5% 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2% noderate t 9.3% 9.3%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Black et al.,2007	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 1 .15 (P = 0.8 .15 (P = 0.8 .23 .54 (P = 0.5 .54 (P = 0.5) .54 (P = 0.5) .54 (P = 0.5)	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34 67 9401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 169	Cont Events dropou 315 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20 dropou 40	rol <u>Total</u> its in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 uts in n 146 146 146	Weight. nild to mo 1.5% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2% noderate t 9.3% 9.3% 9.3%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Black et al.,2007 Homma et al.,2008a	Donep Events Events iny reason 6 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 0.8) iny reason 23 23 23 24 54 (P = 0.5) iny reason 59 13	ezil <u>Total</u> caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); l ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 169 101	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20 dropou 40 21	rol Total its in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 146 146 146 146	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2% noderate t 9.3% 9.3%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Black et al.,2007 Homma et al.,2008a Homma et al.,2008b	Donep Events Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 1) .15 (P = 0.8) .15 (P = 0.8) .23 23 ole .54 (P = 0.5) iny reason 59 13 20	ezil Total 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 169 101 96	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20 dropou 20 20 20 20 20	rol <u>Total</u> its in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 105 105 105	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 34.2% 34.2%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29]	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Black et al.,2007 Homma et al.,2008a Homma et al.,2008b Jia et al.,2017	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 1) .15 (P = 0.8) iny reason 23 23 ole .54 (P = 0.5) iny reason 59 13 20 29	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 169 101 96 157	Cont Events dropol 315 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropol 20 20 dropol 40 21 21 30	rol <u>Total</u> its in n 68 104 63 33 63 33 88 104 63 33 388 uts in n 146 146 146 146 146 146 162 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105	Weight. nild to mo 1.5% 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2% noderate t 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 14.9% 10.0% 8.8% 13.7%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.53, 2.09] 0.95 [0.54, 1.68]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Black et al.,2007 Homma et al.,2008a Homma et al.,2008b Jia et al.,2017 Winblad et al.,2006	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 0.8) .15 (P = 0.8) .23 23 23 23 .54 (P = 0.5) iny reason 59 13 20 29 33 29 33	ezil Total Caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 169 101 96 157 128	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20 dropou 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	rol <u>Total</u> its in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 uts in n 146 146 146 146 146 146 155 165 156 120	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2% noderate t 9.3% 9.3%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.53, 2.09] 0.59 [0.28, 1.26] 1.64 [1.02, 2.64] 0.59 [0.28, 1.26] 1.65 [0.54, 1.68] 1.64 [.64, 9.3, 0.31	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Black et al.,2007 Homma et al.,2008a Homma et al.,2008b Jia et al.,2017 Winblad et al.,2006 Subtotal (95% CI)	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 0.8) .15 (P = 0.8) .15 (P = 0.5) .54 (P = 0.5) iny reason 59 13 20 29 33	ezil Total Caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 169 101 96 157 128 651	Cont Events dropou 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20 dropou 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 30 21	rol <u>Total</u> <u>tts in n</u> 68 104 63 33 33 33 388 uts in n 146 146 146 146 165 105 166 120 648	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 14.9% 10.0% 8.9% 13.7% 9.0% 56.5%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.0] 0.95 [0.54, 1.68] 1.64 [0.92, 1.55]	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Black et al.,2007 Homma et al.,2008a Jia et al.,2017 Winblad et al.,2006 Subtotal (95% CI)	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 1) .15 (P = 0.8) iny reason 23 23 ble .54 (P = 0.5) iny reason 59 13 20 29 33 20 29 33 454	ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 169 101 96 157 128 651	Cont Events dropol 315 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropol 20 20 dropol 20 20 dropol 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	rol <u>Total</u> its in n 68 104 63 33 63 33 88 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105	Weight. nild to mo 1.5% 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 7.4% 5.6% 34.2% noderate t 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 14.9% 14.9% 14.9% 13.7% 9.0% 56.5%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.0] 1.05 [0.54, 1.68] 1.64 [0.89, 3.03] 1.19 [0.92, 1.55]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Black et al.,2007 Homma et al.,2008a Homma et al.,2008b Jia et al.,2017 Winblad et al.,2006 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.78, Test for overall effect: Z = 1	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P =) .15 (P = 0.8 iny reason 23 23 23 23 23 24 .54 (P = 0.5 13 20 29 33 154 df = 4 (P =) .31 (P = 0.1	ezil Total Caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 169 101 96 157 128 651 0.15); I ² 9)	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20 dropou 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 21 30 21 33 3 = 41%	rol <u>Total</u> <u>1ts in n</u> 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 uts in n 146 146 146 146 165 165 105 166 120 648	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2% noderate t 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 14.9% 10.0% 8.9% 13.7% 9.0% 56.5%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.53, 2.09] 0.95 [0.54, 1.68] 1.64 [0.89, 3.03] 1.19 [0.92, 1.55]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Black et al.,2007 Homma et al.,2008a Homma et al.,2008b Jia et al.,2017 Winblad et al.,2006 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.78, Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI)	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 0.15) (P = 0.8) 15 (P = 0.8) 23 23 23 23 23 23 54 (P = 0.5) 13 20 29 33 154 df = 4 (P = 0.1) 31 (P = 0.1)	ezil Total Caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 169 101 96 157 128 651 0.15); I ² 9) 1196	Cont Events dropou 3 15 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20 dropou 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 30 21 33 = 41%	rol <u>Total</u> <u>tts in n</u> 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 uts in n 146 146 146 146 146 105 105 166 120 648 1182	Weight. nild to mo 1.5% 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2% noderate t 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 14.9% 14.9% 10.0% 8.9% 56.5% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.54, 1.68] 1.64 [0.89, 3.03] 1.19 [0.92, 1.55] 1.12 [0.91, 1.37]	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Black et al.,2007 Homma et al.,2008a Homma et al.,2008b Jia et al.,2017 Winblad et al.,2006 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.78, Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI)	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P =) .15 (P = 0.8 iny reason 23 23 23 23 23 24 .54 (P = 0.5 59 13 20 29 33 154 df = 4 (P =) .31 (P = 0.1	ezil Total Caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 169 101 96 157 128 651 0.15); I ² 9) 1196	Cont Events dropou 3 5 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20 dropou 20 20 dropou 20 20 20 21 21 30 21 33 = 41%	rol <u>Total</u> 104 103 104 103 105 105 166 105 166 120 648 1182	Weight. nild to mo 1.5% 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2% noderate t 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 14.9% 14.9% 14.9% 56.5% 10.0% 8.9% 56.5%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.54, 1.68] 1.19 [0.92, 1.55]	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Black et al.,2007 Homma et al.,2008a Homma et al.,2008b Jia et al.,2017 Winblad et al.,2006 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.78, Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 14.64	Donep Events iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 0.15) (P = 0.8) iny reason 23 23 24 23 23 24 23 24 23 23 24 23 23 24 23 23 24 23 23 24 23 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 24 23 254 (P = 0.5) 33 20 29 33 154 df = 4 (P = 0.1) 259 34 415 (P = 0.1) 259 415 (P = 0.1) 415 (ezil Total caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 169 101 96 157 128 651 0.15); I ² 9) 1196 = 0.201 ²	Cont Events dropol 315 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropol 20 20 dropol 20 20 dropol 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 21 21 21 22 212 222 22	rol <u>Total</u> its in n 68 104 63 33 63 33 88 104 63 33 88 104 63 33 388 146 146 146 146 146 146 146 146	Weight. nild to mo 1.5% 5.7% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2% noderate t 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 14.9% 10.0% 56.5% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.54, 1.68] 1.05 [0.53, 2.09] 0.95 [0.54, 1.68] 1.64 [0.89, 3.03] 1.19 [0.92, 1.55] 1.12 [0.91, 1.37]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 The pool results of a Gault et al.,2015 Gault et al.,2016 Haig et al.,2014 Krishnan et al.,2003 Maher-Edwards et al.,2011 Seltzer et al.,2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.2 The pool results of a Feldman et al.,2001 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not applicab Test for overall effect: Z = 0 6.1.3 The pool results of a Black et al.,2007 Homma et al.,2008a Homma et al.,2008b Jia et al.,2007 Homma et al.,2008 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.78, Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 14.64	Donep Events Iny reason 6 15 19 6 10 26 82 df = 5 (P = 0.8) .15 (P = 0.8) .23 23 .54 (P = 0.5) iny reason 59 13 20 29 33 154 df = 4 (P = 0.1) .31 (P = 0.1) .259 .31 .9 .9 .9 .31 (P = 0.1) .9 .9 .9 .9 .9 .31 (P = 0.2) .9 .9 .9 .9 .9 .9 .9 .9 .9 .9 .31 (P = 0.1) .9	ezil Total Caused 68 76 60 34 67 96 401 0.22); I ² 8) caused 144 144 9) caused 169 101 96 101 96 101 95 128 651 0.15); I ² 9) 1196 = 0.20); 8)	Cont Events dropou 3 55 25 10 15 11 79 = 28% dropou 20 20 dropou 20 20 dropou 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 21 33 = 41%	rol Total its in n 68 104 63 33 63 57 388 uts in n 146 146 146 146 146 146 146 146	Weight nild to mo 1.5% 9.3% 4.7% 5.6% 34.2% noderate t 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 10.0% 56.5%	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI derate group 2.10 [0.50, 8.75] 1.46 [0.66, 3.20] 0.70 [0.34, 1.48] 0.49 [0.16, 1.56] 0.56 [0.23, 1.36] 1.55 [0.70, 3.45] 0.97 [0.68, 1.39] o severe group 1.20 [0.63, 2.29] 1.20 [0.63, 2.20] 1.20 [0.	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl

FIGURE 6 | Safety and tolerability outcome comparison for any adverse effect (A) and any reason that caused dropouts (B) in the donepezil group versus the placebo group.

Global Assessment

Donepezil

Four articles (Black et al., 2007; Homma et al., 2008; Maher-Edwards et al., 2011; Jia et al., 2017) based on interviews and CIBIC+ used the clinician's impression of change to evaluate the clinician's global impression (Figure 5A). We pooled the results from the studies and found a significant difference in the donepezil group [OR = 1.48, 95% CI (1.14, 1.91); p = 0.003]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.17, $I^2 = 37\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Homma et al., 2008), the merged effect size was a significant OR = 1.58, 95% CI (1.19, 2.09); p = 0.001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.17, $I^2 = 40\%$). When we deleted the most positive outlier (Homma et al., 2008), the merged effect size was not significant [OR = 1.28, 95% CI (0.96, 1.28)]1.70); p = 0.09]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low $(p = 0.81, I^2 = 0\%)$.

Galantamine

Five articles (Raskind et al., 2000; Tariot et al., 2000; Wilcock et al., 2000; Rockwood et al., 2001; Brodaty et al., 2005) based on interviews and CIBIC+ used the clinician's impression of change to evaluate the clinician's global impression (Figure 5B). We pooled the results from the studies and found a significant difference in the galantamine group [OR = 1.48, 95% CI (1.26, 1.73); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.25, $I^2 = 22\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, indicating a hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Brodaty et al., 2005), the merged effect size was also statistically significant [OR = 1.59, 95% CI (1.33, 1.88); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.52, $I^2 = 0\%$). When we deleted the most positive outlier (Tariot et al., 2000), the merged effect size was significant [OR = 1.38, 95% CI](1.16, 1.64); p = 0.0004]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low ($p = 0.46, I^2 = 0\%$).

Rivastigmine

Two articles (Rosler et al., 1999; Feldman and Lane, 2007) based on interviews and CIBIC+ used the clinician's impression of change to evaluate the clinician's global impression (**Figure 5C**). We pooled the results of studies and found a significant difference in the rivastigmine group [OR = 2.08, 95% CI (1.53, 2.83); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.49, $I^2 = 0$ %). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show a symmetric distribution, indicating no hint of publication bias.

Memantine

Two articles (Tariot et al., 2004; Bakchine and Loft, 2008) based on interviews and CIBIC+ used the clinician's impression of change to evaluate the clinician's global impression (**Supplementary Figure S1C**). We pooled the results from the studies, and no significant difference was found in the memantine group [OR = 1.23, 95% CI (0.85, 1.78); p = 0.28]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.70, $I^2 = 0$ %). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show a symmetric distribution, which indicated no hint of publication bias.

Safety and Tolerability Donepezil

When any AE was considered, there was a statistically significant association between the donepezil group and the placebo group [OR = 1.24, 95% CI (1.04, 1.49); p = 0.02] (Figure 6A). The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.87, $I^2 = 0\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show a symmetric distribution, indicating no hint of publication bias. Overall, when considering the number of dropouts caused by any reason, no difference was found between patients treated with donepezil and placebo [OR = 1.12, 95% CI (0.91, 1.37); p = 0.28] (Figure 6B). The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.20, $I^2 = 25\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we deleted the greatest positive outlier (Gault et al., 2015), the merged effect size was not statistically significant [OR = 1.10, 95% CI (0.90, 1.35);p = 0.35]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low $(p = 0.18, I^2 = 28\%)$. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Krishnan et al., 2003), the merged effect size was not significant [OR = 1.15, 95% CI (0.94, 1.41); p = 0.19]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.24, $I^2 = 21\%$). When the number of dropouts was caused by adverse effects, a significant difference was found between the donepezil group and the placebo group [OR = 1.58, 95% CI (1.22, 2.05); p = 0.0006] (Supplementary Figure S2). The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.80, $I^2 = 0\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show a fairly symmetric distribution, which indicated no hint of publication bias.

Galantamine

When any AE was considered, there was a statistically significant association between the galantamine group and the placebo group [OR = 1.84, 95% CI (1.41, 2.41); p < 0.00001] (Supplementary Figure S3A). The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was high (p = 0.0001, $I^2 = 70\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Burns et al., 2009), the merged effect size was significant [OR = 1.94, 95% CI (1.47, 2.55); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was high $(p = 0.0002, I^2 = 70\%)$. When we deleted the greatest positive outlier (Rockwood et al., 2001), the merged effect size was significant [OR = 1.71, 95% CI (1.33, 2.20); p < 0.0001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.003, $I^2 = 63\%$). Overall, when the number of dropouts caused by any reason was considered, significant difference was found between patients treated with galantamine and placebo [OR = 1.95, 95% CI (1.52, 2.50); p < 0.00001] (Supplementary Figure S3B). The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.002, $I^2 = 63\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Burns et al., 2009), the merged effect size was significant [OR = 2.08, 95% CI (1.64, 2.63); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.01, $I^2 = 55\%$). When we deleted the greatest positive outlier (Wilkinson and Murray, 2001), the merged effect size was significant [OR = 1.84, 95% CI (1.45, 2.33); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.008, $I^2 = 58\%$). When the number of dropouts caused by adverse effects was considered, a significant difference was found between the galantamine group and the placebo group [OR = 2.48, 95% CI (1.64, 3.75); p < 0.0001] (Supplementary Figure S4). The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was high $(p < 0.00001, I^2 = 77\%)$. The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we deleted the greatest positive outlier (Rockwood et al., 2001), the merged effect size was significant [OR = 2.26, 95% CI (1.50, 3.40); p < 0.0001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was high $(p < 0.0001, I^2 = 76\%)$. When we eliminate the most unfavorable point (Burns et al., 2009), the merged effect size was significant [OR = 2.73, 95% CI (1.83, 4.09); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was high $(p < 0.0001, I^2 = 73\%).$

Rivastigmine

Overall, when the number of dropouts caused by any reason was considered, a difference between patients treated with rivastigmine and placebo was found [OR = 2.24, 95% CI (1.29, (3.88); p = 0.004] (Supplementary Figure S5A). The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.03, $I^2 = 66\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Feldman and Lane, 2007), the merged effect size was significant [OR = 2.64, 95%CI (1.93, 3.62); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.13, $I^2 = 51\%$). When we deleted the greatest positive outlier (Forette et al., 1999), the effect size was significant [OR = 2.04, 95% CI (1.20, 3.45); p = 0.008]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.04, $I^2 = 69\%$). When the number of dropouts caused by adverse effects was concerned, a significant difference was found between the rivastigmine group and the placebo group [OR = 2.38, 95% CI (1.12, 5.02); p = 0.02] (Supplementary Figure S5B). The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was high (p = 0.01, $I^2 = 72\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Feldman and Lane, 2007), the merged effect size was significant [OR = 3.04, 95% CI (1.99, 4.65); p < 0.00001]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.07, $I^2 = 63\%$). When we deleted the greatest positive outlier (Forette et al., 1999), the effect size was not significant [OR = 2.03, 95% CI (0.97, 4.27);p = 0.06]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was high $(p = 0.01, I^2 = 76\%).$

Memantine

When any AE was considered, no statistically significant association was found between the memantine group and the placebo group [OR = 0.97, 95% CI (0.92, 1.02); p = 0.28] (Supplementary Figure S6A). The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate ($p = 0.02, I^2 = 64\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Peskind et al., 2006), the merged effect size was not significant [OR = 0.96, 95% CI (0.91, 1.01); p = 0.09]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.02, $I^2 = 66\%$). When we deleted the greatest positive outlier (Porsteinsson et al., 2008), the merged effect size was not significant [OR = 1.01, 95% CI (0.96, 1.07); p = 0.62]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.77, $I^2 = 0\%$). Overall, when the number of dropouts caused by any reason was concerned, no difference was found between patients treated with memantine and placebo [OR = 0.93, 95% CI (0.79, 1.11); p = 0.44] (Supplementary Figure S6B). The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.13, $I^2 = 35\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show a fairly symmetric distribution, which indicated no hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Bakchine and Loft, 2008), the merged effect size was not significant [OR = 0.88, 95% CI (0.74, 1.06); p = 0.18]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.26, $I^2 = 21\%$). When we deleted the greatest positive outlier (Tariot et al., 2004), the effect size was not significant [OR = 1.02], 95% CI (0.85, 1.22); p = 0.86]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.48, $I^2 = 0\%$). When the number of dropouts caused by adverse effects was concerned, no significant difference was found between the memantine group and the placebo group [OR = 1.24, 95% CI (0.97, 1.58); p = 0.08] (Supplementary Figure S7). The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate (p = 0.07, $I^2 = 44\%$). The funnel plots (data not shown) did not show symmetric distribution, which indicated a hint of publication bias. When we eliminated the most unfavorable point (Tariot et al., 2004), the merged effect size was significant [OR = 1.40, 95% CI (1.08, 1.83); p = 0.01]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was low (p = 0.31, $I^2 = 16\%$). When we deleted the greatest positive outlier (Bakchine and Loft, 2008), the merged effect size was not significant [OR = 1.17, 95% CI (0.91, 1.50); p = 0.23]. The heterogeneity among most pooled studies was moderate $(p = 0.09, I^2 = 43\%).$

Among these side effects, some gastrointestinal and nervous system side effects such as nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, anorexia, dizziness, depression and headache were observed. Since some studies did not report these events in detail, we did not separately compare the incidence of AEs.

DISCUSSION

Different methods of measurement were used in assessing treatment outcomes. We divided the impact into four parts, cognitive function, functional outcome, behavioral outcome, and global assessment. In this article, we presented a metaanalysis of the effects of donepezil, galantamine, rivastigmine, and memantine (Supplementary Table 1) on mild-to-moderate, moderate-to-severe, and severe AD using the ADAS-cog (cognitive function), ADCS-ADL (functional outcome), NPI (behavioral outcome) and CIBIC+ scores (global assessment). We obtained data from 6611 AD patients across 36 trials. Meta-analyses of these placebo-controlled trials showed that there were significant differences between the donepezil and placebo groups using ADAS-cog, ADCS-ADL, and CIBIC+, between the galantamine and placebo groups using ADAS-cog, ADCS-ADL, NPI, and CIBIC+, between the rivastigmine and placebo groups using ADAS-cog, ADCS-ADL, and CIBIC+, and between the memantine and placebo groups using ADAS-cog, and ADCS-ADL₁₉ (Supplementary Table 6). This observation suggests that donepezil is beneficial for stabilizing or slowing the decline in cognitive function, functional outcome, and global assessment change in AD patients. Analysis of the entire database showed consistent results, which indicated positive results with the donepezil treatment and improvement in the condition of mild-to-moderate, moderate-to-severe, and severe AD patients. To our knowledge, this is the first meta-analysis to reveal the favorable performance of donepezil with mild-tomoderate, moderate-to-severe, and severe AD. This observation suggests that galantamine is beneficial for stabilizing or slowing the decline in cognitive function, functional outcome, behavior outcome and global assessment change in AD patients. To our knowledge, this is the first meta-analysis to reveal the favorable performance of galantamine with mild-to-moderate, moderate-to-severe, and severe AD. This observation suggests that rivastigmine is beneficial for stabilizing or slowing the decline in cognitive function, functional outcome, and global assessment change in AD patients. Analysis of the entire database showed consistent results, which indicated positive results with rivastigmine treatment and improvement in the condition of mild-to-moderate, moderate-to-severe, and severe AD patients. There was no significant effect on the outcome of NPI-assessed behavioral therapy, except galantamine. This observation suggests that memantine is beneficial for stabilizing or slowing the decline in cognitive function, and functional outcome change in AD patients. However, there was no significant effect according to the ADCS-ADL23, NPI, and CIBIC+ tests, which indicated that memantine treatment has no significant effect on these cognitive aspects of AD patients.

Safety and tolerability are as important as the effectiveness of the interventions in clinical research. In the current metaanalysis, when any AE, dropout caused by any reason, or adverse effect was considered in all patients or subgroups, significant differences were found between the galantamine or rivastigmine groups and the placebo group, which indicated that donepezil and galantamine were not sufficiently safe and tolerable for AD treatment. However, no significant difference was found in all patients or subgroups when the donepezil group and the placebo group were compared, which indicates that donepezil is safe and tolerable enough for AD treatment. When any AE, dropout caused by any reason, or adverse effect was considered, no significant difference was found between the memantine group and the placebo group in all patients or subgroups, which indicates that memantine is safe and tolerable enough for AD treatment. Doody et al. (2007) reported a lower rate of discontinuation due to AEs in the memantine group and a lower discontinuation rate than the placebo group. On the other hand, Yang et al. (2013) and Jiang and Jiang (2015) did not find the differences.

Compared with the published meta-analysis (Loveman et al., 2006; Raina et al., 2008; Bond et al., 2012; Di Santo et al., 2013), galantamine has potent therapeutic effects on all aspects of the treatment of AD, but the other three drugs do not have effective therapeutic effects on some aspects (**Supplementary Table 6**). Therefore, based on the current statistical conclusion, we have determined that we prefer galantamine for the treatment of AD. However, due to limited data, we should also consider additional data to obtain more stable results.

This analysis is subject to the number of limitations. First, although all studies are short-lived, the duration of the study is still a variable and may be a factor to consider. Second, the results of neuropsychiatric symptoms are based on a relatively small number of trials. This can affect the wider range of estimates. Third, meta-analysis data come only from published scientific literature, and some negative results and non-statistical data are difficult to publish; therefore, there is publication bias. Fourth, the genetic backgrounds of these patients involved in our analysis were different, which could potentially influence the rivastigmine treatment. Finally, some of our trials used flexible drug doses. Overall, the results indicate benefits in cognition but the efficacy on functional, behavioral, and global change symptoms is questionable in patients with mild to moderate to severe AD. Our results might suggest a possible perspective for anti-dementia drug trials, such as increasing placebo effects over time and heterogeneity of neuropsychiatric symptoms in AD. The results of this study still need to be confirmed by further studies.

CONCLUSION

Our analysis is the first attempt to incorporate available direct or indirect evidence to evaluate the efficacy and safety of 4 drugs in the treatment of AD. The results suggest that donepezil exhibited a significant positive efficacy with respect to cognition, function, behavior, and global change. However, the efficacy of rivastigmine or galantamine in behavioral outcome is questionable in patients with mild to moderate to severe AD. The efficacy of memantine on global assessment is questionable in patients with mild-to-moderate and moderate-to-severe AD. This review shows that donepezil, galantamine, rivastigmine, and memantine can delay cognitive impairment in patients with mild-to-moderate-to-severe AD for at least 52 weeks. Based on the current statistical conclusions, galantamine is effective in treating all aspects of AD and may be the first choice in the treatment of AD. However, due to limited data, we should also consider additional data to obtain more stable results.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

WZ and PZ designed the study. D-DL performed the experiments and data analysis with the help of Y-HZ, WZ, and PZ. D-DL, WZ, and PZ wrote the manuscript.

FUNDING

This work was supported in part or in whole by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31301108) and (31401215), the Fundamental Research Funds for the

REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association (2000). DSM-IV-TR: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th Edn. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Areosa, S. A., Sherriff, F., and McShane, R. (2005). Memantine for dementia. Cochrane Database Syst. Rev. CD003154.
- Bakchine, S., and Loft, H. (2008). Memantine treatment in patients with mild to moderate Alzheimer's disease: results of a randomised, double-blind, placebocontrolled 6-month study. J. Alzheimers Dis. 13, 97–107. doi: 10.3233/jad-2008-13110
- Birks, J. (2006). Cholinesterase inhibitors for Alzheimer's disease. Cochrane Database Syst. Rev. CD005593.
- Black, S. E., Doody, R., Li, H., McRae, T., Jambor, K. M., Xu, Y., et al. (2007). Donepezil preserves cognition and global function in patients with severe Alzheimer disease. *Neurology* 69, 459–469. doi: 10.1212/01.wnl.0000266627. 96040.5a
- Bond, M., Rogers, G., Peters, J., Anderson, R., Hoyle, M., Miners, A., et al. (2012). The effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of donepezil, galantamine, rivastigmine and memantine for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease (review of Technology Appraisal No. 111): a systematic review and economic model. *Health Technol. Assess.* 16, 1–470. doi: 10.3310/hta16210
- Bottini, G., Berlingeri, M., Basilico, S., Passoni, S., Danelli, L., Colombo, N., et al. (2012). GOOD or BAD responder? Behavioural and neuroanatomical markers of clinical response to donepezil in dementia. *Behav. Neurol.* 25, 61–72. doi: 10.1155/2012/538542
- Brodaty, H., Corey-Bloom, J., Potocnik, F. C., Truyen, L., Gold, M., and Damaraju, C. R. (2005). Galantamine prolonged-release formulation in the treatment of mild to moderate Alzheimer's disease. *Dement. Geriatr. Cogn. Disord.* 20, 120–132. doi: 10.1159/000086613
- Burns, A., Bemabei, R., Bullock, R., Cruz Jentoft, A. J., Froelich, L., Hock, C., et al. (2009). Safety and efficacy of galantamine (Reminyl) in severe Alzheimer's disease (the SERAD study): a randomised, placebo-controlled, double-blind trial. *Lancet Neurol.* 8, 39–47. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(08) 70261-8
- Caro, J., Ward, A., Ishak, K., Migliaccio-Walle, K., Getsios, D., Papadopoulos, G., et al. (2002). To what degree does cognitive impairment in Alzheimer's disease predict dependence of patients on caregivers? *BMC Neurol.* 2:6. doi: 10.1186/1471-2377-2-6
- Chen, S. T., Sultzer, D. L., Hinkin, C. H., Mahler, M. E., and Cummings, J. L. (1998). Executive dysfunction in Alzheimer's disease: association with neuropsychiatric symptoms and functional impairment. J. Neuropsychiatry Clin. Neurosci. 10, 426–432. doi: 10.1176/jnp.10.4.426
- Di Santo, S. G., Prinelli, F., Adorni, F., Caltagirone, C., and Musicco, M. (2013). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of donepezil, rivastigmine, galantamine, and memantine in relation to severity of Alzheimer's disease. J. Alzheimers Dis. 35, 349–361. doi: 10.3233/JAD-122140
- Doody, R. S., Stevens, J. C., Beck, C., Dubinsky, R. M., Kaye, J. A., Gwyther, L., et al. (2001). Practice parameter: management of dementia (an evidencebased review). Report of the quality standards subcommittee of the american academy of neurology. *Neurology* 56, 1154–1166. doi: 10.1212/wnl.56. 9.1154

Central Universities of China (N130520002, N141008001/7, N130320001), the General Financial Grant from the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2015M582884), and the Natural Science Foundation of Liaoning Province (2015020401).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnins. 2019.00472/full#supplementary-material

- Doody, R. S., Tariot, P. N., Pfeiffer, E., Olin, J. T., and Graham, S. M. (2007). Meta-analysis of six-month memantine trials in Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement.* 3, 7–17. doi: 10.1016/j.jalz.2006.10.004
- Feldman, H., Gauthier, S., Hecker, J., Vellas, B., Subbiah, P., and Whalen, E. (2001). A 24-week, randomized, double-blind study of donepezil in moderate to severe Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology* 57, 613–620. doi: 10.1212/wnl.57.4.613
- Feldman, H. H., and Lane, R. (2007). Rivastigmine: a placebo controlled trial of twice daily and three times daily regimens in patients with Alzheimer's disease. J. Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiatry 78, 1056–1063. doi: 10.1136/jnnp.2006. 099424
- Forette, F., Anand, R., and Gharabawi, G. (1999). A phase II study in patients with Alzheimer's disease to assess the preliminary efficacy and maximum tolerated dose of rivastigmine (Exelon). *Eur. J. Neurol.* 6, 423–429. doi: 10.1046/j.1468-1331.1999.640423.x
- Fox, C., Crugel, M., Maidment, I., Auestad, B. H., Coulton, S., Treloar, A., et al. (2012). Efficacy of memantine for agitation in Alzheimer's dementia: a randomised double-blind placebo controlled trial. *PLoS One* 7:e35185. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0035185
- Frölich, L., Ashwood, T., Nilsson, J., and Eckerwall, G. (2011). Effects of AZD3480 on cognition in patients with mild-to-moderate alzheimer's disease: a phase IIb dose-finding study. J. Alzheimers Dis. 24, 363–374. doi: 10.3233/JAD-2011-101554
- Gault, L. M., Lenz, R. A., Ritchie, C. W., Meier, A., Othman, A. A., Tang, Q., et al. (2016). ABT-126 monotherapy in mild-to-moderate Alzheimer's dementia: randomized double-blind, placebo and active controlled adaptive trial and open-label extension. *Alzheimers Res. Ther.* 8:44.
- Gault, L. M., Ritchie, C. W., Robieson, W. Z., Pritchett, Y., Othman, A. A., and Lenz, R. A. (2015). A phase 2 randomized, controlled trial of the α7 agonist ABT-126 in mild-to-moderate Alzheimer's dementia. *Alzheimers Dement.* 1, 81–90. doi: 10.1016/j.trci.2015.06.001
- Grossberg, G. T., Manes, F., Allegri, R. F., Gutiérrez-Robledo, L. M., Gloger, S., Xie, L., et al. (2013). The safety, tolerability, and efficacy of once-daily memantine (28 mg): a multinational, randomized, double-blind, placebocontrolled trial in patients with moderate-to-severe Alzheimer's disease taking cholinesterase inhibitors. CNS Drugs 27, 469–478. doi: 10.1007/s40263-01 3-0077-7
- Haig, G. M., Pritchett, Y., Meier, A., Othman, A. A., Hall, C., Gault, L. M., et al. (2014). A randomized study of H3 antagonist ABT-288 in mild-to-moderate Alzheimer's dementia. J. Alzheimers Dis. 42, 959–971. doi: 10.3233/JAD-140291
- Herrmann, N., Gauthier, S., Boneva, N., and Lemming, O. M. (2013). A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of memantine in a behaviorally enriched sample of patients with moderate-to-severe Alzheimer's disease. *Int. Psychogeriatr.* 25, 919–927. doi: 10.1017/S1041610213 000239
- Homma, A., Imai, Y., Tago, H., Asada, T., Shigeta, M., Iwamoto, T., et al. (2008). Donepezil treatment of patients with severe Alzheimer's disease in a Japanese population: results from a 24-week, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized trial. *Dement. Geriatr. Cogn. Disord.* 25, 399–407. doi: 10.1159/ 000122961
- Inestrosa, N. C., Sagal, J. P., and Colombres, M. (2005). Acetylcholinesterase interaction with Alzheimer amyloid beta. *Subcell. Biochem.* 38, 299–317. doi: 10.1007/0-387-23226-5_15

- Jia, J., Wei, C., Jia, L., Tang, Y., Liang, J., Zhou, A., et al. (2017). Efficacy and safety of donepezil in chinese patients with severe Alzheimer's disease: a randomized controlled trial. *J. Alzheimers Dis.* 56, 1495–1504. doi: 10.3233/jad-16 1117
- Jiang, J., and Jiang, H. (2015). Efficacy and adverse effects of memantine treatment for Alzheimer's disease from randomized controlled trials. *Neurol. Sci.* 36, 1633–1641. doi: 10.1007/s10072-015-2221-2
- Johannsen, P., Salmon, E., Hampel, H., Xu, Y., Richardson, S., Qvitzau, S., et al. (2006). Assessing therapeutic efficacy in a progressive disease: a study of donepezil in Alzheimer's disease. CNS Drugs 20, 311–325. doi: 10.2165/ 00023210-200620040-00005
- Kogure, T., Sumitani, M., Ikegami, K., Abe, H., Hozumi, J., Inoue, R., et al. (2017). Donepezil, an acetylcholinesterase inhibitor, can attenuate gabapentinoidinduced somnolence in patients with neuropathic pain: a retrospective chart review. *J. Pain Palliat. Care Pharmacother.* 31, 4–9. doi: 10.1080/15360288.2017. 1279500
- Krishnan, K. R., Charles, H. C., Doraiswamy, P. M., Mintzer, J., Weisler, R., Yu, X., et al. (2003). Randomized, placebo-controlled trial of the effects of donepezil on neuronal markers and hippocampal volumes in Alzheimer's disease. Am. J. Psychiatry 160, 2003–2011. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.160. 11.2003
- Li, Y., Hai, S., Zhou, Y., and Dong, B. R. (2015). Cholinesterase inhibitors for rarer dementias associated with neurological conditions. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* CD009444. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD009 444.pub3
- Loveman, E., Green, C., Kirby, J., Takeda, A., Picot, J., Payne, E., et al. (2006). The clinical and cost-effectiveness of donepezil, rivastigmine, galantamine and memantine for Alzheimer's disease. *Health Technol. Assess.* 10, iii-iv, ix-xi.
- Maher-Edwards, G., Dixon, R., Hunter, J., Gold, M., Hopton, G., Jacobs, G., et al. (2011). SB-742457 and donepezil in Alzheimer disease: a randomized, placebo-controlled study. *Int. J. Geriatr. Psychiatry* 26, 536–544. doi: 10.1002/ gps.2562
- McKhann, G., Drachman, D., Folstein, M., Katzman, R., Price, D., and Stadlan, E. M. (1984). Clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: report of the NINCDS-ADRDA work group under the auspices of department of health and human services task force on Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology* 34, 939–944.
- Parsons, C. G., Danysz, W., Dekundy, A., and Pulte, I. (2013). Memantine and cholinesterase inhibitors: complementary mechanisms in the treatment of Alzheimer's disease. *Neurotox. Res.* 24, 358–369. doi: 10.1007/s12640-013-9398-z
- Pereira, F. S., Yassuda, M. S., Oliveira, A. M., and Forlenza, O. V. (2008). Executive dysfunction correlates with impaired functional status in older adults with varying degrees of cognitive impairment. *Int. Psychogeriatr.* 20, 1104–1115. doi: 10.1017/S1041610208007631
- Perry, R. J., and Hodges, J. R. (2000). Relationship between functional and neuropsychological performance in early Alzheimer disease. *Alzheimer Dis. Assoc. Disord.* 14, 1–10. doi: 10.1097/00002093-20000100 0-00001
- Peskind, E. R., Potkin, S. G., Pomara, N., Ott, B. R., Graham, S. M., Olin, J. T., et al. (2006). Memantine treatment in mild to moderate Alzheimer disease: a 24-week randomized, controlled trial. *Am. J. Geriatr. Psychiatry* 14, 704–715. doi: 10.1097/01.jgp.0000224350.82719.83
- Porsteinsson, A. P., Grossberg, G. T., Mintzer, J., and Olin, J. T. (2008). Memantine treatment in patients with mild to moderate Alzheimer's disease already receiving a cholinesterase inhibitor: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Curr. Alzheimer Res.* 5, 83–89. doi: 10.2174/ 156720508783884576
- Raina, P., Santaguida, P., Ismaila, A., Patterson, C., Cowan, D., Levine, M., et al. (2008). Effectiveness of cholinesterase inhibitors and memantine for treating dementia: evidence review for a clinical practice guideline. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 148, 379–397.
- Raskind, M. A., Peskind, E. R., Truyen, L., Kershaw, P., and Damaraju, C. V. (2004). The cognitive benefits of galantamine are sustained for at least 36 months: a long-term extension trial. *Arch. Neurol.* 61, 252–256.
- Raskind, M. A., Peskind, E. R., Wessel, T., and Yuan, W. (2000). Galantamine in AD: a 6-month randomized, placebo-controlled trial with a 6-month extension. The Galantamine USA-1 study group. *Neurology* 54, 2261–2268. doi: 10.1212/ wnl.54.12.2261

- Reisberg, B., Doody, R., Stoffler, A., Schmitt, F., Ferris, S., and Mobius, H. J. (2003). Memantine in moderate-to-severe Alzheimer's disease. *New Engl. J. Med.* 348, 1333–1341.
- Rockwood, K., Mintzer, J., Truyen, L., Wessel, T., and Wilkinson, D. (2001). Effects of a flexible galantamine dose in Alzheimer's disease: a randomised, controlled trial. J. Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiatry 71, 589–595.
- Rosler, M., Anand, R., Cicin-Sain, A., Gauthier, S., Agid, Y., Dal-Bianco, P., et al. (1999). Efficacy and safety of rivastigmine in patients with Alzheimer's disease: international randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 318, 633–638.
- Seltzer, B., Zolnouni, P., Nunez, M., Goldman, R., Kumar, D., Ieni, J., et al. (2004). Efficacy of donepezil in early-stage Alzheimer disease: a randomized placebo-controlled trial. Arch. Neurol. 61, 1852–1856.
- Sramek, J. J., Anand, R., Wardle, T. S., Irwin, P., Hartman, R. D., and Cutler, N. R. (1996). Safety/tolerability trial of SDZ ENA 713 in patients with probable Alzheimer's disease. *Life Sci.* 58, 1201–1207. doi: 10.1016/0024-3205(96)00081-1
- Stern, Y., Hesdorffer, D., Sano, M., and Mayeux, R. (1990). Measurement and prediction of functional capacity in Alzheimer's disease. *Neurology* 40, 8–14.
- Tan, C. C., Yu, J. T., Wang, H. F., Tan, M. S., Meng, X. F., Wang, C., et al. (2014).
 Efficacy and safety of donepezil, galantamine, rivastigmine, and memantine for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J. Alzheimers Dis. 41, 615–631. doi: 10.3233/jad-132690
- Tariot, P. (2001). Current status and new developments with galantamine in the treatment of Alzheimer's disease. *Expert Opin. Pharmacother.* 2, 2027–2049. doi: 10.1517/14656566.2.12.2027
- Tariot, P. N., Cummings, J. L., Katz, I. R., Mintzer, J., Perdomo, C. A., and Schwam, E. M. (2001). A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of the efficacy and safety of donepezil in patients with Alzheimer's disease in the nursing home setting. J. Am. Geriatr. Soc. 49, 1590–1599. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2001.49266.x
- Tariot, P. N., Farlow, M. R., Grossberg, G. T., Graham, S. M., McDonald, S., and Gergel, I. (2004). Memantine treatment in patients with moderate to severe Alzheimer disease already receiving donepezil: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 291, 317–324.
- Tariot, P. N., Solomon, P. R., Morris, J. C., Kershaw, P., Lilienfeld, S., and Ding, C. (2000). A 5-month, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of galantamine in AD. *Neurology* 54, 2269–2276. doi: 10.1212/wnl.54.12.2269
- Tune, L., Tiseo, P. J., Ieni, J., Perdomo, C., Pratt, R. D., Votaw, J. R., et al. (2003). Donepezil HCl (E2020) maintains functional brain activity in patients with Alzheimer disease: results of a 24-week, double-blind, placebocontrolled study. Am. J. Geriatr. Psychiatry 11, 169–177. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajgp. 11.2.169
- van Dyck, C. H., Tariot, P. N., Meyers, B., and Malca Resnick, E. (2007). A 24-week randomized, controlled trial of memantine in patients with moderate-to-severe Alzheimer disease. *Alzheimer Dis. Assoc. Disord.* 21, 136–143. doi: 10.1097/wad. 0b013e318065c495
- Wang, T., Huang, Q., Reiman, E. M., Chen, K., Li, X., Li, G., et al. (2013). Effects of memantine on clinical ratings, fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography measurements, and cerebrospinal fluid assays in patients with moderate to severe Alzheimer dementia: a 24-week, randomized, clinical trial. J. Clin. Psychopharmacol. 33, 636–642. doi: 10.1097/JCP.0b013e31829 a876a
- Wilcock, G. K., Lilienfeld, S., and Gaens, E. (2000). Efficacy and safety of galantamine in patients with mild to moderate Alzheimer's disease: multicentre randomised controlled trial. Galantamine International-1 Study Group. *BMJ* 321, 1445–1449.
- Wilkinson, D., and Murray, J. (2001). Galantamine: a randomized, double-blind, dose comparison in patients with Alzheimer's disease. *Int. J. Geriatr. Psychiatry* 16, 852–857. doi: 10.1002/gps.409
- Winblad, B., Engedal, K., Soininen, H., Verhey, F., Waldemar, G., Wimo, A., et al. (2001). A 1-year, randomized, placebo-controlled study of donepezil in patients with mild to moderate AD. *Neurology* 57, 489–495. doi: 10.1212/wnl.57. 3.489
- Winblad, B., Grossberg, G., Frolich, L., Farlow, M., Zechner, S., Nagel, J., et al. (2007). IDEAL: a 6-month, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of the first skin patch for Alzheimer disease. *Neurology* 69, S14–S22.
- Winblad, B., Kilander, L., Eriksson, S., Minthon, L., Batsman, S., Wetterholm, A. L., et al. (2006). Donepezil in patients with

severe Alzheimer's disease: double-blind, parallel-group, placebocontrolled study. *Lancet* 367, 1057–1065. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(06) 68350-5

- Yang, Z., Zhou, X., and Zhang, Q. (2013). Effectiveness and safety of memantine treatment for Alzheimer's disease. J. Alzheimers Dis. 36, 445–458. doi: 10.3233/ JAD-130395
- Zemek, F., Drtinova, L., Nepovimova, E., Sepsova, V., Korabecny, J., Klimes, J., et al. (2014). Outcomes of Alzheimer's disease therapy with acetylcholinesterase inhibitors and memantine. *Expert Opin. Drug Saf.* 13, 759–774. doi: 10.1517/14740338.2014.914168

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2019 Li, Zhang, Zhang and Zhao. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.