

The effect of anti-dementia drugs on Alzheimer disease-induced cognitive impairment

A network meta-analysis

Cui-Cui Cui, MD, Yong Sun, MD, Xin-Yi Wang, MD, Yuan Zhang, MD, Ying Xing, PhD st

Abstract

Background: Cognitive impairment is a principal manifestation of Alzheimer disease (AD). To provide a clinical reference for the treatment of AD, a network meta-analysis (NMA) was performed to evaluate the effects of different anti-dementia drugs on the cognitive impairment exhibited by patients with AD.

Methods: Relevant randomized controlled trials are found through the Pubmed database, Web of Science, Clinical Trials, Embase, Cohranne library, Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure database, CBM databases, and Wanfang among others. A total of 33 articles were collected, with the earliest document collected having been published in February 2017. The included reports were screened for quality of papers by using strict inclusion and exclusion criteria. All analyses were based on previously published studies reporting de-identified data; thus, no ethical approval or patient consent were required. The Mini-Mental State Examination scores informed the classification of the 33 articles into a mild subgroup, which featured 11 articles, and 12 drugs (besides a placebo); a moderate subgroup, which featured 17 articles and 15 drugs (besides a placebo); and a severe subgroup, which featured 5 articles and 3 drugs (besides a placebo).

Results: While donepezil, galanthamine, and huperzine demonstrated the highest efficacy in the mild cognitive dysfunction subgroup (mean difference = 5.2, 2.5, and 2.4, respectively). Donepezil, huperzine A, and rivastigmine achieved the most significant effects in the moderate cognitive dysfunction subgroup (MD=3.8, 2.9, and 3.0 respectively). In the severe subgroup, donepezil was demonstrably superior to memantine. Donepezil was thus found to effectively address cognitive impairment in patients with AD regardless of the degrees of cognitive decline.

Conclusions: Evaluation of the clinically common anti-dementia drugs using NMA affirmed the utility of cholinesterase inhibitors, especially donepezil, in alleviating cognitive dysfunction of patients with AD. This study may therefore help to inform the clinical selection of pharmacotherapeutic interventions addressing cognitive dysfunction in patients with AD.

Abbreviations: AD = Alzheimer disease, MCMC= Markov chain-Monte-Carlo, MD = mean difference, MMSE = mini mental state examination, NMA = network meta-analysis, RCT = randomized controlled trial.

Keywords: Alzheimer disease, cognitive disorders, dementia, MMSE, network meta-analysis

1. Introduction

Cognitive impairment is one of the main manifestations of Alzheimer disease (AD), and the efficacy of anti-dementia drugs is directly related to its therapeutic attenuation of the cognitive impairments and prognosis of patients with AD. The present study evaluated the outcomes of different anti-dementia drugs on the cognitive function of patients with AD through network meta-analysis (NMA).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.000000000016091

Pubmed databases, Web of Science, Clinicaltrials, Embase, the Cohranne library, the Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure database (CNKI), CBM databases, and Wanfang databases among others were systematically searched for eligible randomized controlled trials (RCTs). The retrieved reports were screened for quality according to our strict inclusion and exclusion criteria, yielding a total of 33 articles. The MMSE scale informed the classification of the 33 articles into a mild subgroup, which featured 11 articles and 12 drugs (besides a placebo); a moderate subgroup, which featured 17 articles and 15 drugs (besides a placebo); and a severe subgroup, which featured 5 articles and 3 drugs (besides a placebo). We found that donepezil, galanthamine, and huperzine achieved the most significant effects in the mild cognitive dysfunction subgroup (mean difference (MD) = 5.2, 2.5, 2.4, respectively). In the moderate cognitive dysfunction subgroup, donepezil, huperzine A, and rivastigmine achieved the most significant effects (mean difference = 3.8, 2.9, 3.0, respectively). In the severe subgroup, donepezil was demonstrably superior to memantine. This analysis therefore demonstrated the cognitive impairment-independent efficacy of donepezil in treating patients with AD.

AD is a degenerative disease of the central nervous system that occurs in presenium. The clinical manifestations of AD include memory disorders, aphasia, apraxia, agnosia, visuospatial

Editor: Marco Onofrj.

C-C C and YS should be regarded as co-first authors.

The authors have no funding or conflicts of interest to disclose.

China-Japan Union Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun, China.

^{*} Correspondence: Ying Xing, China-Japan Union Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun 130000, Jilin Province, China (e-mail: xingying1970@163.com).

Copyright © 2019 the Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CCBY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. Medicine (2019) 98:27(e16091)

Received: 12 September 2018 / Received in final form: 27 March 2019 / Accepted: 26 May 2019

disability, compromised abstract thinking, and computational power, as well as personality and behavioral disorders. These symptoms deteriorate progressively, eventually causing the complete loss of motor function.^[1] Although there is no specific treatment to reverse or prevent the progression of AD, treatment strategies that provide early support and symptomatic relief can mitigate the rapid decline in the patients' quality of daily life. In order to provide a clinical reference for the clinical treatment of AD, the present study performed a network meta-analysis (NMA) to evaluate the effect of different anti-dementia drugs on the attenuation of cognitive function impairment of patients with AD.

2. Data and methods

2.1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria 2.1.1. Inclusion criteria.

- 1. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of AD.
- 2. Inclusion of patients with different degrees of AD.
- 3. Experimental interventions included different anti-dementia drugs, and a placebo was administered to the control group.
- 4. Inclusion of a merge-control group: experimental intervention administered at different doses.
- 5. Average Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) scores were used to evaluate study outcomes.

2.1.2. Exclusion criteria.

- 1. The reports were either a non-RCT, letter, editorial, commentary, or case report.
- 2. No definite curative effect was assessed, or curative effects were assessed for less than 3 months.
- 3. Inclusion of subjects with vascular dementia; Parkinson disease-induced dementia; delirium; depression and other mental disorders; congenital brain function hypoplasia, such as Down syndrome; or subarachnoid hemorrhage.

2.2. Data sources and retrieval method

All relevant RCTs were selected through the Pubmed database, Web of Science, Clinical Trials, Embase, Cohranne library, Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure database, CBM databases, and Wanfang databases among others.AD, cognitive impairment, or dementia were used in all databases - except Embase - as keywords for retrieval. Terms from the MESH subject word list provided by Medline were used to retrieve studies from foreign databases. In addition to using Disorder, Cognition, Disorders, Dysfunction, and Huperzine A, Donepezil, Rivastigmine, Galantamine, Idebenone, Vitamin E, N-Acetylcysteine, Estrogen, Melatonin, Folic Acid, and Statins were used as keywords or uncontrolled terms in both Chinese and English to retrieve suitable studies. In order to comprehensively collect information relevant to our study objective, we did not exclude studies based on their language or their date of publication so long as they were randomized controlled trials. The earliest retrieved study was performed in February 2017.

2.3. Quality evaluation

All following data was extracted from the eligible studies by 2 independent reviewers using a standard data collection form:

- 1. general information, title, author, and age of the participants;
- the general circumstances of the subjects, baseline information of each group, and intervention measures administered to each group;
- 3. clinical outcomes.

Any discrepancies between reviewers were resolved by means of discussion with a third independent researcher. The quality of included studies was assessed according to the improved Jadad scale.

2.4. Statistical analysis

We used a Bayesian random effect model to compare all the intervention measures in the NMA directly. A comprehensive evaluation was concurrently performed using the Markov chain Monte Carlo method, which simulates the posterior distribution of the parameters according to the following steps: the model logic and grammar are checked after establishing a model, and data is imported and compiled. During simulation, iteration and annealing were 2000 and 10,000 times, respectively. For the NMA, a Bayesian random effects model was used for analysis, and R software (version 3.3.2) was used to draw graphics to evaluate the model of the convergence. Intervention measures of the network diagram and the node analysis method were applied for consistency identification. In the analysis, 2 groups of events with 0 events were corrected by 0.5.

3. Results

3.1. Document retrieval

A total of 1621 RCTs were initially retrieved; according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria, a total of 33 RCTs and 8309 patients with AD were selected for further analysis. The MMSE was used as the primary outcome observation index in all the included literature; of the 33 included studies, 30 performed double-arm tests and 3 conducted 3-arm experiments.

3.2. The basic features in the study

The basic features included intervention measures, MMSE scores before and after treatment, and the duration of observation (Table 1).

3.3. Quality evaluation

The baselines of the 33 RCTs were comparable. All reports used MMSE scores to evaluate patient outcomes and, with JADAD scores of 4 to 7, were deemed to be of sufficient quality. The number of individuals and reasons for the loss of visits or shedding were mentioned in all 28 articles. The results of specific evaluations are presented in Table 1.

3.4. Evaluation of the effect of anti-dementia drugs for AD patients

3.4.1. NMA. The relationship among the interventions administered in the mild, moderate, and severe cognitive impairment subgroups are shown in Figures 1–3, respectively. (Note that lines in the figures denote that there is evidence for a link between 2 interventions. Two interventions that are not directly connected can be indirectly compared by using NMA. The size of a line represents the number of studies.) The results show that, in the

Table 1

Basic features of the incorporated literature.

| Invention project | Country | Age | Ν | Interventions | Evaluation standard | Follow-up time | Improved JADAD score | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|------|--|---------------------|----------------|----------------------|--|
| Zhenxin ^[2] | China | 71±7 | 197 | Huperzine A vs Placebo | MMSE | 12 weeks | 5 points | |
| Santoro [3] | Italy | 75.9 ± 7.3 | 980 | Doniperetti vs Galantamine vs rivastin | MMSE | 36 weeks | 5 points | |
| Ewards ^[4] | United States | 70.5±8.83 | 357 | SB-742457vs Placebo | MMSE | 24 weeks | 5 points | |
| Hampd ^[5] | United States | 68.2 ± 7.2 | 71 | Lithium vs Placebo | MMSE | 10 weeks | 4 points | |
| Reisberg ^[6] | United States | 75.8±7.15 | 186 | Memantine vs Placebo | MMSE | 28 weeks | 5 points | |
| Wade ^[7] | United States | 69 ± 7.8 | 61 | Melatonin vs placebo | MMSE | 24 weeks | 6 points | |
| Mintzer ^[8] | United States | 82.2±10 | 474 | Aripiprazole vs placebo | MMSE | 12 weeks | 4 points | |
| Johannsen ^[9] | United States | 44.1 ± 7.6 | 169 | Donepitzer vs Placebo | MMSE | 12 weeks | 5 points | |
| Mulnard ^[10] | United States | 74.1 ± 16.6 | 120 | Estrogen vs Placebo | MMSE | 1 year | 6 points | |
| si-sun ^[11] | China | 67 ± 11 | 103 | Huperzine A vs Placebo | MMSE | 18 weeks | 3 points | |
| Rogers ^[12] | United States | 72.6 ± 0.6 | 253 | Donepezil vs placebo | MMSE | 30 weeks | 5 points | |
| Likitjaroen ^[13] | United States | 74.9 ± 7.6 | 15 | Galantamine vs placebo | MMSE | 30 weeks | 4 points | |
| Xu ^[14] | China | 72 ± 10 | 60 | Huperzine A vs Placebo | MMSE | 4 months | 3 points | |
| Adair ^[15] | United States | 72±8 | 43 | N-acetylcysteine vs Placebo | MMSE | 6 months | 6 points | |
| Thal ^[16] | United States | 74.9 ± 6.8 | 263 | Idebenone vs placebo | MMSE | 1 year | 6 points | |
| Petersen ^[17] | United States | 72.9 ± 7.6 | 769 | Donepizide vs Vitamin Evs Placebo | MMSE | 36 months | 5 points | |
| Winblad ^[18] | United States | 84.5 ± 6.0 | 248 | Donepezil vs placebo | MMSE | 6 months | 4 points | |
| Black [19] | United States | 78.0 ± 8.4 | 343 | Donepezil vs placebo | MMSE | 24 weeks | 5 points | |
| Connelly ^[20] | United States | 75.65 ± 5.94 | 43 | Folic acid vs placebo | MMSE | 6 months | 4 points | |
| Doody ^[21] | United States | 68.1 ± 9.3 | 183 | Dimebon vs Placebo | MMSE | 26 weeks | 4 points | |
| Dysken ^[22] | United States | 78.6 ± 7.2 | 459 | Vitamin Evs Memantine vs Placebo | MMSE | 12 weeks | 6 points | |
| Yong ^[23] | China | 72.5 ± 8.95 | 95 | Simvastatin vs placebo | MMSE | 24 weeks | 5 points | |
| Aiming ^[24] | China | 66.5 ± 7.5 | 113 | Fluvastatin vs placebo | MMSE | 12 weeks | 4 points | |
| Zhao ^[25] | China | 69.13±8.68 | 66 | Atorvastatin vs placebo | MMSE | 24 weeks | 4 points | |
| Ping ^[26] | China | 69.56 ± 6.37 | 52 | Atorvastatin vs placebo | MMSE | 6 months | 5 points | |
| Sano ^[27] | United States | 74.0 ± 9.6 | 406 | Simvastatin vs placebo | MMSE | 18 months | 4 points | |
| Simons ^[28] | United States | 68.0 ± 9 | 37 | Simvastatin vs placebo | MMSE | 26 weeks | 5 points | |
| Sparks ^[29] | United States | 78.15±1.3 | 2068 | Atorvastatin vs placebo | MMSE | 12 months | 6 points | |
| Wang ^[30] | China | 70.3 ± 6.7 | 50 | Estrogen vs placebo | MMSE | 24 months | 5 points | |
| Nakamura ^[31] | Japan | 73.2 ± 2.7 | 73 | Memantine vs Placebo | MMSE | 24 months | 4 points | |
| Yao ^[32] | China | 69±2.5 | 75 | Memantine vs Donepezil | MMSE | 18 months | 4 points | |
| Reisberg ^[33] | United States | 75.5±8.16 | 252 | Memantine vs Placebo | MMSE | 4 months | 5 points | |
| Asthana [34] | United Kingdom | 79.5 ± 7.9 | 12 | Estrogen vs placebo | MMSE | 12 months | 4 points | |



Figure 1. The relationship among interventions to address mild AD-induced cognitive impairment.

subgroup of patients with mild cognitive impairment, the most effective of the 12 drugs administered were donepezil, galantamine, and huperzine A: the mean-difference values were 5.2, 2.5, and 2.4, respectively. There was a direct connection among A, D, E and A, G, H, and an indirect connection among the remaining drugs. In the moderate cognitive impairment subgroups, the most efficacious drugs were found to be donepezil, huperzine A, and rivastigmine: the mean-difference values were 3.8, 2.9, and 3.0, respectively; donepezil was the most effective. A direct connection was found among C, D, and E, while only indirect connections were found among the other drugs. In the subgroup of severe cognitive impairment, donepezil induced greater relief of severe cognitive impairment in patients with AD than did memantine. Our results showed that A, B, and C were indirectly connected.

3.4.2. Convergence rate of NMA for patients with AD treated with anti-dementia drugs. We used Gemtc software to build models and draw pictures to detect the convergence of the model. The results showed that the subgroups featured good convergence and that the model was reliable (Figs. 4–6).

3.4.3. Conformance analysis of the NMA. According to the network relation figure, a closed loop could be formed. The



Figure 2. The relationship among interventions to address moderate ADinduced cognitive impairment.

Figure 3. The relationship between interventions to address severe AD-

3.5. Donepezil achieved better efficacy in the treatment of patients AD and mild-to-moderate cognitive impairment

conformance test of the network meta-analysis in each subgroup of cognitive dysfunction showed that the line length represents the confidence interval. *P*-values of > .05 indicate good consistency among the reports (Fig. 7).

Donepezil was more effective in treating patients with mild or moderate cognitive impairment than the other drugs (Figs. 8 and 9).



B

induced cognitive impairment.



3.6. No publication bias assessment is found

exists in the use of other drugs to treat patients with AD and mildto-moderate cognitive impairment (Fig. 11). Figure 10 shows that all scattered points were found within the

4. Discussion

funnel plot and formed symmetric distributions at both ends of the dotted line, indicating no publication bias favoring effect of donepezil on alleviating mild-to-moderate cognitive impairment in patients with AD. However, publication bias was found to

Controlling progressive cognitive impairment is an important objective in research on AD treatment. To evaluate the





| Study or Subgroup | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | IV. Random, 95% CI | IV. Random, 9 | 5% CI |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|--------|--------|--------------------|--------|--------------------|---------------|-------|
| Donepezil 2006 | 1.62 | 0.35 | 85 | 0.49 | 0.36 | 84 | 31.2% | 3.17 [2.71, 3.62] | | |
| Donepezil 2011 | 0.9 | 0.28 | 138 | -0.1 | 0.28 | 145 | 35.7% | 3.56 [3.19, 3.94] | | - |
| Donepezil 2015 | 1.2 | 0.29 | 120 | 0.1 | 0.27 | 135 | 33.1% | 3.92 [3.50, 4.34] | | - |
| Total (95% CI) | | | 343 | | | 364 | 100.0% | 3.56 [3.15, 3.96] | 10 N. 10 | + |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² = | 0.08; Ch | ni² = 5.0 | 66, df = | 2 (P = | 0.06); | ² = 65° | % | | | |

Figure 8. Forest map of the effect of donepezil on patients with AD mild-to-moderate cognitive impairment.

| | Experimental | | | Control | | | Std. Mean Difference | | Std. Mean Difference |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------|---------|--------|----------|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Study or Subgroup | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | IV, Random, 95% CI | IV. Random, 95% CI |
| 5-HT6 Receptor 2010 | 0.06 | 0.38 | 54 | -0.13 | 0.27 | 104 | 8.2% | 0.61 [0.27, 0.94] | - |
| Aripiprazole 2007 | -0.9 | 3.1 | 92 | -0.3 | 3.1 | 100 | 8.4% | -0.19 [-0.48, 0.09] | - |
| Atomoxetine 2009 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 30 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 28 | 7.1% | 1.81 [1.19, 2.43] | |
| Atorvastatin 2010 | 1.36 | 0.49 | 28 | -0.5 | 0.59 | 24 | 6.0% | 3.40 [2.53, 4.27] | |
| Eptastigmine 2000 | -0.21 | 3.34 | 228 | -1.45 | 3.54 | 114 | 8.5% | 0.36 [0.14, 0.59] | - |
| huperzine A 2002 | 2.7 | 2.85 | 98 | 0.19 | 2.66 | 99 | 8.4% | 0.91 [0.61, 1.20] | - |
| buprofen 2008 | 2.7 | 0.5 | 66 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 66 | 8.1% | 1.19 [0.82, 1.56] | |
| masitinib 2011 | 0.1 | 2.5 | 17 | -2.1 | 2.5 | 7 | 5.8% | 0.85 [-0.07, 1.77] | |
| Memantine 2002 | 1.75 | 3.38 | 111 | 0.52 | 4.07 | 114 | 8.4% | 0.33 [0.06, 0.59] | - |
| Sertraline 2004 | 0 | 0.3 | 121 | -0.6 | 0.3 | 119 | 8.3% | 1.99 [1.68, 2.30] | - |
| simvastatin 2011 | -0.1 | 1.04 | 204 | -0.21 | 0.83 | 202 | 8.6% | 0.12 [-0.08, 0.31] | - |
| Statins 2002 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 113 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 542 | 8.6% | 0.63 [0.42, 0.83] | - |
| tideglusib 2005 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 10 | -1.1 | 2.4 | 8 | 5.6% | 0.60 [-0.35, 1.56] | |
| Total (95% CI) | | | 1172 | | | 1527 | 100.0% | 0.91 [0.53, 1.28] | • |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (| 0.41; Chi | ² = 208 | 16, df | = 12 (P | < 0.00 | 0001); 1 | ² = 94% | | |
| Test for overall effect: 2 | z = 4.76 (| (P < 0.0 | 00001) | | | | | | -4 -2 0 2 4 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] |

Figure 9. Forest map of the effect of non-donepezil drugs on patients with AD and mild-to-moderate cognitive impairment.

02

0.5

0.1

01

SE(SMD)

and galantamine, which are acetylcholinesterase inhibitors, demonstrating the highest efficacy. Kishi [37] also confirmed that

2



0

Figure 10. Funnel plot of the effect of donepezil on patients with AD and mild-to-moderate cognitive impairment.

-2

differential effect of anti-dementia drugs according to the degree of cognitive decline exhibited by patients with AD, this NMA divided patients with AD from previous reports into 3 groups according to their respective degrees of cognitive decline as evinced by their MMSE scores: mild, moderate, and severe. Our results indicated that donepezil, galantamine, and huperzine A achieved outstanding efficacy in the mild cognitive functiondecline group; this finding agreed with the 2010 European Neurology Union (EFNS)and 2007 American Psychiatric Association (APA)guidelines.^[35,36] In the moderate cognitive function-decline group, donepezil, huperzine A, rivastigmine,

4



cholinesterase inhibitors could effectively treat mild-to-moderate cognitive impairment in AD patients, and EFNS and APA guidelines recommend acetylcholinesterase inhibitors as a firstline treatment for AD patients with cognitive impairment. Furthermore, we found that donepezil was superior to memantine in slowing severe cognitive impairment in patients with AD. However, Santo et al^[38] and Nakamura et al^[39] observed memantine was more effective than donepezil in treating non-cognitive symptoms in patients with severe AD and

SMD

improving their daily behavioral aberrations, such as agitation and delusion. Therefore, while both donepezil and memantine can effectively treat AD with severe cognitive impairment, they address different clinical goals.

In conclusion, this report employed a comprehensive NMA to provide a more intuitive and concise comparison of the efficacies of anti-dementia drugs in the treatment of cognitive impairment. Our review encompassed a total of 18 drugs, including cholinesterase inhibitors, N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor antagonists, anti-oxidation and free radical scavenger drugs, brain metabolism activators, statins, lipid-lowering drugs, and estrogens and among others. We affirmed the superiority of cholinesterase inhibitors, especially donepezil, in the alleviation of cognitive dysfunction in patients with AD irrespective of the degree of impairment. This study therefore may help to inform the clinical choice of anti-dementia drug.

Author contributions

Data curation: Cui-cui CUI, Yong Sun. Supervision: Ying Xing. Writing – review & editing: Xinyi Wang, Yuan Zhang.

References

- Lumley T. Network meta-analysis for indirect treatment comparisons. Stat Med 2010;21:2313–24.
- [2] Zhang Z, Wang X, Chen Q, et al. Clinical efficacy and safety of huperzine Alpha in treatment of mild to moderate Alzheimer disease, a placebocontrolled, double-blind, randomized trial. Zhonghua Yi Xue Za Zhi 2002;82:941–4.
- [3] Santoro A, Siviero P, Minicuci N, et al. Effects of donepezil, galantamine and rivastigmine in 938 Italian patients with Alzheimer's disease: a prospective, observational study. CNS Drugs 2010;24:163–76.
- [4] Maher-Edwards G, Zvartau-Hind M, Hunter AJ, et al. Double-blind, controlled phase II study of a 5-HT6 receptor antagonist, SB-742457, in Alzheimer's disease. Curr Alzheimer Res 2010;7:374–85.
- [5] Hampel H, Ewers M, Bürger K, et al. Lithium trial in Alzheimer's disease: a randomized, single-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter 10-week study. J Clin Psychiatry 2009;70:922–31.
- [6] Reisberg B, Doody R, Stöffler A, et al. A 24-week open-label extension study of memantine in moderate to severe Alzheimer disease. Arch Neurol 2006;63:49–54.
- [7] Wade AG, Farmer M, Harari G, et al. Add-on prolonged-release melatonin for cognitive function and sleep in mild to moderate Alzheimer's disease: a 6-month, randomized, placebo-controlled, multicenter trial. Clin Interv Aging 2014;9:947–61.
- [8] Mintzer JE, Tune LE, Breder CD. Aripiprazole for the treatment of psychoses in institutionalized patients with Alzheimer dementia: a multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled assessment of three fixed doses. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 2007;15:918–31.
- [9] Johannsen P, Salmon E, Hampel H, et al. Assessing therapeutic efficacy in a progressive disease: a study of donepezil in Alzheimer's disease. CNS Drugs 2006;20:311–25.
- [10] Mulnard RA, Cotman CW, Kawas C, et al. Estrogen replacement therapy for treatment of mild to moderate Alzheimer disease: a randomized controlled trial. Alzheimer's Disease Cooperative Study. JAMA 2000;283:1007–15.
- [11] Xu SS, Gao ZX, Weng Z, et al. Efficacy of tablet huperzine-A on memory, cognition, and behavior in Alzheimer's disease. Zhongguo Yao Li Xue Bao 1995;16:391–5.
- [12] Rogers SL, Farlow MR, Doody RS, et al. A 24-week, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of donepezil in patients with Alzheimer's disease. Donepezil Study Group. Neurology 1998;50:136–45.
- [13] Likitjaroen Y, Meindl T, Friese U, et al. Longitudinal changes of fractional anisotropy in Alzheimer's disease patients treated with galantamine: a 12-month randomized, placebo-controlled, doubleblinded study. Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci 2012;262:341–50.

- [14] Xu SS, Cai ZY, Qu ZW, et al. Huperzine-A in capsules and tablets for treating patients with Alzheimer disease. Zhongguo Yao Li Xue Bao 1999;20:486–90.
- [15] Adair JC, Knoefel JE, Morgan N. Controlled trial of N-acetylcysteine for patients with probable Alzheimer's disease. Neurology 2001;57:1515–7.
- [16] Thal LJ, Grundman M, Berg J, et al. Idebenone treatment fails to slow cognitive decline in Alzheimer's disease. Neurology 2003;61:1498–502.
- [17] Petersen RC, Thomas RG, Grundman M, et al. Vitamin E and donepezil for the treatment of mild cognitive impairment. N Engl J Med 2005;352:2379–88.
- [18] Winblad B, Kilander L, Eriksson S, et al. Donepezil in patients with severe Alzheimer's disease: double-blind, parallel-group, placebo-controlled study. Lancet 2006;367:1057–65.
- [19] Black SE, Doody R, Li H, et al. Donepezil preserves cognition and global function in patients with severe Alzheimer disease. Neurology 2007;69:459–69.
- [20] Connelly PJ, Prentice NP, Cousland G, et al. A randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial of folic acid supplementation of cholinesterase inhibitors in Alzheimer's disease. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry 2008;23:155–60.
- [21] Doody RS, Gavrilova SI, Sano M, et al. Effect of dimebon on cognition, activities of daily living, behaviour, and global function in patients with mild-to-moderate Alzheimer's disease: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Lancet 2008;372:207–15.
- [22] Dysken MW, Sano M, Asthana S, et al. Effect of vitamin E and memantine on functional decline in Alzheimer disease: the TEAM-AD VA cooperative randomized trial. JAMA 2014;311:33–44.
- [23] Yong L, Yong Z, Ting L, et al. The rapeutic effect of simvastatin on cognitive dysfunction in patients with vascular dementia: a report of 49 cases. J New Medicine 2010;41:25–7.
- [24] Huang A, Xie L, Qin S. Clinical observation of fluvastatin in the treatment of mild to moderate Alzheimer's disease. Pract Geriatr 2010;48–50.
- [25] Zhao XL, Liu Y, Li N, et al. Efficacy and safety of atorvastatin calcium in the treatment of vascular dementia. Med J West China 2011;3:476–7.
- [26] Gu P, Du H, Shao JQ, et al. Effects of atorvastatin on cognitive function and blood lipids in patients with vascular cognitive impairment at different stages. Chin J Geriatr Heart Brain Vessel Dis 2010;12–4.
- [27] Sano M, Bell KL, Galasko D, et al. A randomized, double-blind, placebocontrolled trial of simvastatin to treat Alzheimer disease. Neurology 2011;77:556–63.
- [28] Simons M, Schwärzler F, Lütjohann D, et al. Treatment with simvastatin in normocholesterolemic patients with Alzheimer's disease: A 26-week randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind trial. Ann Neurol 2002;52:346–50.
- [29] Sparks DL, Sabbagh M, Connor D, et al. Statin therapy in Alzheimer's disease. Acta Neurol Scand Suppl 2006;185:78–86.
- [30] Wang PN, Liao SQ, Liu RS, et al. Effects of estrogen on cognition, mood, and cerebral blood flow in AD: a controlled study. Neurology 2000;54:2061–6.
- [31] Nakamura Y, Kitamura S, Homma A, et al. Efficacy and safety of memantine in patients with moderate-to-severe Alzheimer's disease: results of a pooled analysis of two randomized, double-blind, placebocontrolled trials in Japan. Expert Opin Pharmacother 2014;15:913–25.
- [32] Shan Yao. To observe the clinical effect of memantine hydrochloride in the treatment with dementia caused by Parkinson. Chin J Clin Ration Drug Use 2017;23–4.
- [33] Reisberg B, Doody R, Stöffler A, et al. Memantine in moderate-to-severe Alzheimer's disease. N Engl J Med 2003;348:1333–41.
- [34] Asthana S, Gibson AJ, Parsons EM. The geography of fundholding in southwest England: implications for the evolution of primary care groups. Health Place 1999;5:271–8.
- [35] Horta J. EFNS guidelines for the diagnosis and management of Alzheimer's disease. Chin J Geriatr 2011;89–95.
- [36] Hort J, O'Brien JT, Gainotti G, et al. EFNS guidelines for the diagnosis and management of Alzeheimer disease. Chin J Geriatr 2010.
- [37] Matsunaga S, Kishi T, Annas P, et al. Lithium as a treatment for Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Alzheimer's Dis 2015;48:403–10.
- [38] Zissimopoulos JM, Barthold D, Brinton RD, et al. Sex and race differences in the association between statin use and the incidence of Alzheimer Disease. JAMA Neurol 2017;74:225–32.
- [39] Sterzer P, Meintzschel F, Rösler A, et al. Pravastatin improves cerebral vasomotor reactivity in patients with subcortical small-vessel disease. Stroke 2001;32:2817–20.