

**Does cognitive impairment and agitation in dementia influence intervention effectiveness?
Findings From a cluster-randomized controlled trial with the therapeutic robot, PARO**

Jones, Cindy; Moyle, Wendy; Murfield, Jenny; Draper, Brian; Shum, David; Beattie, Elizabeth;
Thalib, Lukman

Published in:
Journal of the American Medical Directors Association

DOI:
[10.1016/j.jamda.2018.02.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2018.02.014)

Licence:
CC BY-NC-ND

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

Recommended citation(APA):
Jones, C., Moyle, W., Murfield, J., Draper, B., Shum, D., Beattie, E., & Thalib, L. (2018). Does cognitive impairment and agitation in dementia influence intervention effectiveness? Findings From a cluster-randomized controlled trial with the therapeutic robot, PARO. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, 19(7), 623-626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2018.02.014>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

1 **Does cognitive impairment and agitation in dementia influence intervention**
2 **effectiveness? Findings from a cluster-RCT with the therapeutic robot, PARO**

3
4 *Running title: COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENT, AGITATION, AND PARO*

5
6 **Dr. Cindy Jones**^{a,b*} c.jones@griffith.edu.au; **Prof Wendy Moyle**^{a,b} w.moyle@griffith.edu.au

7 **Ms. Jenny Murfield**^a j.murfield@griffith.edu.au; **Prof Brian Draper**^c B.Draper@unsw.edu.au

8 **Prof David Shum**^{a,d,e} d.shum@griffith.edu.au; **Prof Elizabeth Beattie**^f elizabeth.beattie@qut.edu.au; **Prof**

9 **Lukman Thalib**^g Lthalib@qu.edu.qa

10 ^aMenzies Health Institute Queensland, Griffith University, Nathan, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. ^bSchool of Nursing and
11 Midwifery, Nathan Campus, Griffith University, Nathan, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. ^cSchool of Psychiatry, University
12 of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia. ^dSchool of Applied Psychology, Mt Gravatt Campus, Griffith University, Brisbane,
13 Queensland, Australia. ^eNeuropsychology and Applied Cognitive Neuroscience Laboratory, CAS Key Laboratory of Mental
14 Health, Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China. ^fSchool of Nursing, Queensland University
15 of Technology, Kelvin Grove, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. ^gDepartment of Public Health, College of Health Sciences,
16 Qatar University, Qatar.

17 ***Corresponding Author:** Dr. Cindy Jones, Menzies Health Institute QLD, Griffith University, 0.13 Health
18 Sciences (N48), 170 Kessels Road, Nathan, Brisbane, Queensland, 4111, Australia. Tel: +61 7 3735 8440;
19 Fax: +61 7 3735 3560; Email: c.jones@griffith.edu.au

20
21 **Abstract**

22 **Objectives:** To explore whether severity of cognitive impairment and agitation of older people with
23 dementia predict outcomes in engagement, mood states, and agitation after a 10-week intervention with the
24 robotic seal, PARO.

25 **Design:** Data from the PARO intervention-arm of a cluster-randomised controlled trial was used, which
26 involved individual, non-facilitated, 15-min sessions with PARO three afternoons per week for 10-weeks.

27 **Sample and participants:** One hundred and thirty-eight residents – aged ≥ 60 years, with dementia – from
28 nine long-term care facilities.

29 **Measures:** A series of stepwise multiple linear regressions were conducted. Dependent variables were
30 participants' levels of engagement, mood states, and agitation at week 10 (assessed by video observation
31 and Cohen Mansfield Agitation Inventory-Short Form [CMAI-SF]). Predictor variables were baseline
32 levels of cognitive impairment (assessed by Rowland Universal Dementia Assessment Scale [RUDAS])
33 and agitation [CMAI-SF].

34 **Results:** Five models were produced. The strongest finding was that participants with more severe
35 agitation at baseline had higher levels of agitation at week 10 ($R^2 = .82, p < 0.001$). Predictors of positive
36 response were less significant. Low levels of agitation at baseline predicted greater positive behavioural
37 engagement with PARO ($R^2 = .054, p = 0.009$) and fewer observed instances of agitation ($R^2 = .033,$
38 $p = 0.045$) at week 10, whilst greater visual engagement was predicted by both lower levels of agitation and
39 cognitive impairment ($R^2 = .082, p = 0.006$). Less severe cognitive impairment predicted greater pleasure at
40 week 10 ($R^2 = .067, p = 0.004$).

41 **Conclusions/Implications:** Participants with severe agitation had poor response to PARO. Lower levels
42 of agitation and higher cognitive functioning were associated with better responses. In clinical practice, we
43 recommend PARO should be restricted to people with low-moderate severity of agitation. Further research
44 is needed to determine the optimal participant characteristics for response to PARO.

45 **Keywords:** *Characteristics; Dementia; Long-term care; Older people; Psychosocial intervention.*

46

47 **Introduction**

48 The therapeutic pet-type robot, PARO, was developed by Japanese engineers as an alternative to animal-
49 assisted therapy. Modelled on the features of a baby harp seal and weighing approximately 2.5kg, PARO
50 has five, in-built sensors that enable the robot to respond autonomously to the user and their environment.
51 PARO is diurnally active, and can move its flippers and tail, open and close its eyes, and make sounds
52 similar to a baby harp seal (Figure 1). A number of small-scale trials¹⁻⁴ have shown the potential of PARO
53 in the management of behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia (BPSD) in long-term care
54 (LTC), typically in facilitator-led group sessions. This promise has been substantiated more rigorously in
55 our own research – the largest RCT conducted with PARO to-date – where we found that individual,
56 unfacilitated sessions with PARO encouraged verbal and visual engagement, improved expressions of

57 pleasure and neutral affect, and had some effect in reducing agitation.⁵ Building on this growing body of
58 empirical work, we now need research that explores whom PARO may work best for to aid
59 implementation in practice.

60 The importance of personal characteristics has been identified as key to maximising non-
61 pharmacological intervention effectiveness,⁶ with levels of cognitive impairment and agitation emerging as
62 particularly influential on outcome.⁷⁻¹⁰ However, the direction of this relationship remains unclear. Some
63 evidence suggests greater positive effects for those with greater cognitive impairment and more severe
64 BPSD,^{7, 10} whilst other evidence indicates the contrary.^{8, 9} In the post-hoc analyses of the early PARO
65 studies, similar conflicting findings have also been found regarding cognitive impairment,¹⁻⁴ whilst the
66 influence of agitation has yet to be explored.

67 In light of the described literature, and in response to recommendations to investigate intervention
68 effectiveness in subgroups of older people with dementia,¹⁰ this study aimed to explore whether baseline
69 levels of cognitive impairment and agitation of residents with dementia in LTC predict outcomes in
70 engagement, mood states, and agitation after a 10-week PARO intervention. As this study was secondary
71 analysis of the outcome data, we had no *a priori* hypotheses.

72

73 **Methods**

74 **Design, sample, setting, ethics**

75 We used data from the PARO intervention arm of a larger cluster-RCT, conducted between June 14, 2014,
76 and May 16, 2015, with full details published elsewhere.^{5, 11, 12} Briefly, all participants were aged 60 years
77 or older, had a diagnosis of dementia, and were permanent residents of a facility located within a 100km
78 radius of Brisbane's Central Business District (Queensland, Australia). Residents' pharmaceutical
79 treatments continued during the study, and no significant changes were found in medication usage over
80 this time, or between intervention groups.¹² Exclusion criteria extended to participants with a respite care
81 admission, dual diagnosis of a serious/persistent mental illness, terminal illness, and/or unremitting
82 pain/distressing physical symptoms. Baseline characteristics of participants are shown in Table 1.
83 Institutional ethical approval was obtained from Griffith University Human Ethics Committee
84 (NRS/03/14/HREC) and respective care organisations.

85

86 **The PARO intervention**

87 Participants in the PARO intervention group ($n=138$; $n=9$ facilities) received individual, non-facilitated,
88 15-min sessions with PARO three afternoons per week (between 13:00-17:00 Mon, Wed, and Fri) for 10
89 weeks. Each session was conducted wherever the participant was at the time within the facility (except
90 when in the bathroom), which was typically the facility communal day room or resident's bedroom. All
91 sessions began with a trained Research Assistant (RA) introducing PARO to the participant using a
92 standard script, detailed elsewhere.¹¹

93

94 **Data collection and analysis**

95 The dependent variables were participants' levels of: engagement (positive behavioural engagement with
96 the object; using the object for social engagement; positive verbal engagement with the object; and visual
97 engagement with the object); mood states (anger; anxiety/fear; neutral; pleasure; sadness); and agitation
98 after 10 weeks of the PARO intervention. Video observations were used to measure all outcomes, with a
99 trained RA recording each participant using a small, handheld GoPro Hero video camera. Each participant
100 was recorded for 30-mins, covering 15-mins immediately before the intervention (serving as each
101 participant's baseline for that observation), and then for the 15-min intervention. All video data were
102 quantitatively coded in Noldus Observer XT® by trained RAs using the Video Coding Protocol -
103 Incorporating Observed Emotion (VC-IOE) Scheme.¹³ The 14-item Cohen-Mansfield Agitation Inventory
104 – Short Form (CMAI-SF)¹⁴ was also used as an additional, proxy measure of agitation, with facility care
105 staff using a five-point scale to assess the frequency of each participant's agitated behaviour during the
106 previous two-week period (the total score possible can range from 14 to 70, with higher scores
107 representing greater agitation/behavioural disruption).

108 The predictor variables were participants' levels of cognitive impairment and agitation at baseline.
109 The Rowland Universal Dementia Assessment Scale (RUDAS)¹⁵ was used to assess cognitive impairment
110 (the total score possible can range from 0 to 30, with lower scores reflecting greater impairment). The
111 CMAI-SF¹⁴ was used to assess agitation levels at baseline.

112 We conducted a series of stepwise multiple linear regression analyses, with list wise deletion.

113 Diagnostic statistics were produced and examined for each regression analysis to check for univariate and

114 multivariate outliers and influential cases, and assumptions were tested to ensure generalizability of each
115 regression (i.e., assumption of no collinearity, independence of residuals in the model, etc.). The only
116 model where assumptions were not met was for anger, which was influenced unduly by two cases with
117 values greater than model boundaries for Cook's Distance, Centred Leverage Value, and DFBETA. These
118 cases were removed from the model to meet assumptions, resulting in $n=121$ cases included in this model.
119 For all other dependent variables, regression analyses using list wise deletion included $n=123$ cases.
120 Results were comparable in parallel sensitivity analysis using pair wise deletion. All data were analysed
121 using IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows Version 24.0 (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.).
122

123 **Results**

124 Five significant regression models were produced (Table 2). The strongest finding was that participants
125 with more severe agitation at baseline had higher levels of agitation at week 10 ($R^2=.82$, $F(1,121)=559.37$,
126 $p<0.001$). Predictors of positive response were less significant. Low levels of agitation at baseline
127 predicted greater positive behavioural engagement with PARO ($R^2=.054$, $F(1,121)=6.97$, $p=0.009$) and
128 fewer observed instances of agitation ($R^2=.033$, $F(1,121)=4.11$, $p=0.045$) at week 10, whilst greater visual
129 engagement was predicted by both lower levels of agitation and cognitive impairment ($R^2=.082$,
130 $F(2,120)=5.39$, $p=0.006$). Less severe cognitive impairment predicted greater pleasure at week 10 (R^2
131 $=.067$, $F(1,121)=8.74$, $p=0.004$).
132

133 **Discussion**

134 Our findings support the suggestion that levels of cognitive impairment and agitation of residents with
135 dementia in LTC predict effectiveness of a 10-week PARO intervention. The most important finding was
136 that participants with more severe agitation at baseline had a poor response to PARO, with the level of
137 baseline agitation being the key factor. From this result we conclude that, in clinical practice, PARO
138 should be restricted to people with low-moderate severity of agitation.

139 From a statistical perspective, lower levels of agitation, and to a lesser extent, higher levels of
140 cognitive functioning, were associated with significantly better responses to PARO in terms of behavioural
141 and visual engagement, pleasure, and agitation. However, from a clinical perspective, agitation and

142 cognitive impairment explained only a small proportion of the variance in each of these models (R^2) –
143 between 3 to 8% – indicating that other, unknown factors were also contributing a large part to these
144 outcomes. Given the heterogeneity of dementia as a syndrome, it is likely that our findings are, in part,
145 reflective of this complexity. Further, as we found during the trial, responses to PARO varied considerably
146 between individuals, as well as for the same individual on different occasions,¹⁶ and this may also go some
147 way in understanding why our two predictor variables were unable to explain a large proportion of the
148 variance (a more thorough discussion of response variation can be found elsewhere¹⁶). Further research is
149 needed to determine if the use of PARO may be optimised for those with mild-to-moderate levels of
150 agitation and cognitive impairment.

151

152 **Recommendations for Practice and Policy**

153 Drawing from our wider program of research with PARO,^{12, 16-21} we suggest that, while PARO is a feasible
154 psychosocial intervention and has some effect in managing BPSD – particularly in relation to improved
155 engagement and pleasure – it is not suitable for all LTC residents with dementia. In clinical practice, we
156 first recommend PARO should be restricted to people with low-moderate severity of agitation, whilst also
157 recognising that there can be considerable variation in response to PARO between individuals with similar
158 clinical profiles. Considerations after this should include the person’s biography, particularly their like or
159 dislike of animals, and the type of agitation displayed (i.e., restlessness and wandering can make it difficult
160 to engage some residents and doing so can actually exacerbate their agitation). When using PARO, staff
161 should uphold a person-centred approach, as just because the resident liked PARO one day, does not mean
162 that they will enjoy it the next. Further, staff need to monitor the levels of attachment residents develop
163 with PARO and ensure they do not become fatigued or over-burdened. Our economic analysis¹² found
164 that, when financial resources are limited, a soft toy animal may be used effectively with a person with
165 dementia to manage BPSD. However, we stress that the use of PARO, or any other psychosocial
166 intervention, should not replace staff time, but rather be used as an additional means of providing comfort
167 and purposeful engagement.

168

169 **References**

- 170 1. Bemelmans R, Gelderblom GJ, Jonker P, et al. Effectiveness of robot paro in intramural psychogeriatric
171 care: a multicenter quasi-experimental study. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2015;16:946-950.
- 172 2. Joranson N, Pedersen I, Rokstad AM, et al. Group activity with Paro in nursing homes: systematic
173 investigation of behaviors in participants. *Int Psychogeriatr* 2016;28:1345-1354.
- 174 3. Joranson N, Pedersen I, Rokstad AM, et al. Change in quality of life in older people with dementia
175 participating in Paro-activity: a cluster-randomized controlled trial. *J Adv Nurs* 2016;72:3020-3033.
- 176 4. Thodberg K, Sørensen LU, Videbech PB, et al. Behavioral responses of nursing home residents to visits
177 from a person with a dog, a robot seal or a toy cat. *Anthrozoös* 2016;29:107-121.
- 178 5. Moyle W, Jones C, Murfield J, et al. Use of a robotic seal as a therapeutic tool to improve dementia
179 symptoms: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2017;10.1016/j.jamda.2017.03.018:1-8.
- 180 6. Cohen-Mansfield J. Use of patient characteristics to determine nonpharmacologic interventions for
181 behavioral and psychological symptoms of dementia. *Int Psychogeriatr* 2000;12:373-380.
- 182 7. Hsu TJ, Tsai HT, Hwang AC, et al. Predictors of non-pharmacological intervention effect on cognitive
183 function and behavioral and psychological symptoms of older people with dementia. *Geriatr Gerontol Int*
184 2017;17 Suppl 1:28-35.
- 185 8. Smit D, de Lange J, Willemsse B, et al. Predictors of activity involvement in dementia care homes: a
186 cross-sectional study. *BMC Geriatr* 2017;17:175.
- 187 9. van der Ploeg ES, Eppingstall B, Camp CJ, et al. Personalized one-to-one intervention in agitated
188 individuals with dementia: responders versus non-responders. *J Gerontol Nurs* 2015;41:22-29.
- 189 10. Van Mierlo LD, Van der Roest HG, Meiland FJ, et al. Personalized dementia care: proven effectiveness
190 of psychosocial interventions in subgroups. *Ageing Res Rev* 2010;9:163-183.
- 191 11. Moyle W, Beattie E, Draper B, et al. Effect of an interactive therapeutic robotic animal on engagement,
192 mood states, agitation and psychotropic drug use in people with dementia: a cluster-randomised controlled
193 trial protocol. *BMJ Open*, 2015;5.
- 194 12. Mervin MC, Moyle W, Jones C, et al. The cost-effectiveness of using PARO, a therapeutic robotic seal,
195 to reduce agitation and medication use in dementia: findings from a cluster randomised-controlled trial. *J Am*
196 *Med Dir Assoc* 2018;<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2017.10.008>.
- 197 13. Jones C, Sung B, Moyle W. Assessing engagement in people with dementia: a new approach to
198 assessment using video analysis. *Arch Psychiatr Nurs* 2015;29:377-382.

- 199 14. Werner P, Cohen-Mansfield J, Koroknay V, et al. The impact of a restraint-reduction program on
200 nursing home residents. *Geriatric Nursing* 1994;15:142-146.
- 201 15. Rowland JT, Basic D, Storey JE, et al. The Rowland Universal Dementia Assessment Scale (RUDAS)
202 and the Folstein MMSE in a multicultural cohort of elderly persons. *Int Psychogeriatr* 2006;18:111-120.
- 203 16. Moyle W, Jones C, Murfield J, et al. Using a therapeutic companion robot for dementia symptoms in
204 long-term care: reflections from a cluster-RCT. *Aging Ment Health* Accepted for publication 15.12.17.
- 205 17. Moyle W, Beattie E, Draper B, et al. Effect of an interactive therapeutic robotic animal on engagement,
206 mood states, agitation and psychotropic drug use in people with dementia: A cluster-randomised controlled trial
207 protocol. *BMJ Open* 2015;5:e009097.
- 208 18. Moyle W, Bramble M, Jones C, et al. Care staff perceptions of a social robot called paro and a look-
209 alike plush toy: a descriptive qualitative approach. *Aging Ment Health*
210 2016;10.1080/13607863.2016.1262820:1-6.
- 211 19. Moyle W, Jones C, Murfield J, et al. Use of a robotic seal as a therapeutic tool to improve dementia
212 symptoms: A cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*,
213 accepted for publication.
- 214 20. Moyle W, Bramble M, Jones CJ, et al. "She Had a Smile on Her Face as Wide as the Great Australian
215 Bite": A Qualitative Examination of Family Perceptions of a Therapeutic Robot and a Plush Toy. *Gerontologist*
216 2017;10.1093/geront/gnx180.
- 217 21. Moyle W, Jones C, Murfield J, et al. Effect of a robotic seal on the motor activity and sleep patterns of
218 older people with dementia, as measured by wearable technology: A cluster-randomised controlled trial.
219 *Maturitas* 2018;110:10-17.

220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228

Table 1. Baseline characteristics

Characteristic	PARO intervention group
Number of facilities	(n=9)
Number of participants	(n=138)
Sex (female)	101 (73%)
Age (years)	84 (8.4)
RUDAS (total score)	6.5 (6.5)
CMAI-SF (total score)	29.0 (10.1)
Type of dementia diagnosed:	
Alzheimer's disease	49 (36%)
Vascular dementia	17 (12%)
Dementia with Lewy bodies	1 (1%)
Fronto temporal lobar degeneration	4 (3%)
Alcohol-related dementia	1 (1%)
Unspecified	66 (48%)
Taking medication (yes)*	118 (86%)
Sensory deficit (yes)†	117/134 (87%)
Facility care-type environment:‡	
Secure dementia unit	81 (59%)
Facility ward/unit	57 (41%)

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

Notes Data are n (%), mean (SD). RUDAS = The Rowland Universal Dementia Assessment Scale: A Multicultural Cognitive Assessment Scale; lower scores indicate greater cognitive impairment. CMAI – SF = The Cohen-Mansfield Agitation Inventory – Short Form; higher scores indicate more aggressive/disruptive behaviour. *Includes antidepressants; antipsychotics; anxiolytics and hypnotics; anticonvulsants; analgesics; and anticholinesterase medications. †Includes hearing; vision; olfaction; touch/pain/tingling; and other deficits. ‡Data not available for all randomised participant

Table 2. Significant stepwise multiple linear regressions

Dependent Variable (At Week 10)	Step	Predictor Variable (At baseline week 0)	B	SE B	B	p=	R ²	Adj. R ²
Visual engagement	1	CMAI-SF	-.425	.174	-.217	.016*	.047	.039
	2	CMAI-SF	-.382	.172	-.195	.029*	.082	.067
Pleasure	1	RUDAS	.627	.292	.189	.034*		
		RUDAS	.300	.101	.260	.004**	.067	.060
No agitation	1	CMAI-SF	-.323	.160	-.181	.045*	.033	.025
Agitation (CMAI-SF)	1	CMAI-SF	.929	.039	.907	.000***	.822	.821

238

239

240

241

Notes RUDAS, The Rowland Universal Dementia Assessment Scale: A Multicultural Cognitive Assessment Scale; CMAI-SF, The Cohen-Mansfield Agitation Inventory- Short Form. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < 0.0001$

Acknowledgements

Thanks are expressed to all aged care organisations, long-term care facilities, care staff, residents, and families who took part in the research. Drs Siobhan O’Dwyer and Cindy Mervin are acknowledged for their contribution to the larger PARO study, and Dr Takanori Shibata for the loan of five PAROs. We also acknowledge study personnel Dr Marguerite Bramble (project management), Dr Jasmin Grayson-Collins (project management and cluster leadership), and Ms Amanda McNiven (cluster leadership).

Funding

This work was supported by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council [APP1065320].

Conflicts of interests

Dr Takanori Shibata, the developer of PARO, provided five additional PAROs for the study. He had no role in any aspect of the study design, undertaking, analysis, and interpretation, or in the reporting of findings and manuscript preparation. The authors declare no other conflicts of interest.

Author Contributions

WM conceived and designed the larger study, in consultation and review with CJ, BD, EB, DS, and LT. As lead investigator, WM oversaw and managed the study, and coordinated and supervised all study personnel. WM, EB, and CJ trained study personnel. CJ and JM prepared the data for analysis, and CJ and JM analysed the data, in consultation with LT. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the data, assisted in manuscript preparation, and gave final approval for submission.

Sponsor’s Role

The sponsor had no role in any aspect of the study design, undertaking, analysis, and interpretation, or in the reporting of findings and preparation of the manuscript.