

Supplementary material to article by A. Rosenvall et al. et al. "Potential cost savings for selected non-pharmacological treatment strategies for patients with Alzheimer's disease in Finland"

**Table SII.** Risk of bias in the studies considered relevant to provide information regarding the effectiveness of feasible interventions

Author	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	Total
Eloniemi-Sulkava U 2006, Finland (10)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	UC	UC	Yes	7/12 (RCT)
Andren S, 2008, Sweden (12)	No	No	No	No	No	UC	Yes	Yes	Yes	UC	UC	Yes	4/12 (BCT)
Pitkälä K, 2013, Finland (11)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	7/12 (RCT)

RCT: randomized controlled trial; BCT: ; Yes: criterion was met; No: criterion was not met; UC: unclear.

A. Was randomization adequate?

B. Was treatment allocation concealed?

C. Was the patient and caregiver blinded to the intervention?

D. Was the care provider blinded to the intervention?

E. Was the outcome assessor blinded to the intervention?

F. Was the drop-out rate described and acceptable?

G. Was intention-to-treat analysis carried out?

H. Were all reports of the study free of suggestion of selective outcome reporting?

I. Were the groups similar at baseline regarding the most important prognostic indicators?

J. Were co-interventions avoided in all groups?

K. Was the compliance acceptable in all groups?

L. Was the timing of the outcome assessment similar in all groups?