

### Supplementary file 3: Inclusion and assessment criteria

#### Inclusion and exclusion criteria for formal search:

<b>Inclusion criteria</b> Types of intervention for inclusion should:	<b>Exclusion criteria</b> Interventions will be excluded if they:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target people with mild to moderate dementia (whether exclusively or among others without dementia, but either way there is dementia-specific support)</li> <li>• Serve people living in the community, whether in their own homes or in extra-care housing</li> <li>• Are voluntary attendance (i.e. members have chosen to attend, not been told they must as part of treatment or respite care)</li> <li>• Are social and place-based (bringing people together physically) in a community setting (open to members of the public to attend)</li> <li>• Are designed as an intervention with meaningful activity aiming to improve quality of life for people with dementia and family carers, or to help them manage or lessen the challenging effects dementia</li> <li>• Meet at regular, pre-fixed times, at least weekly and for a substantial amount of time (i.e. a morning or afternoon)</li> <li>• Meet continuously, on an ongoing basis, or aim to do so</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are only for those with severe dementia</li> <li>• Do not target, and have no plan to cater for, people with dementia</li> <li>• Are only for care home residents, hospital patients or those in a closed institutional setting</li> <li>• Are an online or at-a-distance networking scheme that does not involve meeting physically</li> <li>• Only involve individual participants alone (e.g. occupational therapy, counselling or medical)</li> <li>• Are only functional meetings solely for the purpose of administering medical treatment or carry out case management</li> <li>• Are focussed mainly upon respite for carers or nursing care only (i.e. not focussed upon social, meaningful and quality-of-life-raising activities for those attending)</li> <li>• Only take place monthly; or for a very short duration (e.g. one hour); or intermittently with no specified or timetabled meetings</li> <li>• Are fixed-term courses with a time/goal/session limit (e.g. an 8 week course)</li> </ul>

#### Relevance and rigour assessment guidance:

<p><b>Relevance</b></p> <p>An article should comply with the inclusion/exclusion criteria in the first instance, except where agreed by the team for inclusion for a specific reason e.g. containing data that is broadly transferable and of use to the programme theory.</p>	<p><b>Rigour</b></p> <p>This is an assessment of the likely validity and reliability only of the <i>relevant</i> data contained in an article, <i>not</i> an assessment of the rigour of a study or intervention programme as a whole. Useful questions might include: <i>Is this data likely to be biased? Is it dealt with critically? Is it from a real-world example or theoretical speculation? Was the data gathered in some depth over time or in a quick "snapshot"? Is it safe to generalise from this data?</i></p>
--	---

Reasons for rating must be recorded. For example:	Reasons for rating must be recorded. For example:
<p>A <b>low rating</b> might mean the article only contains a few relevant lines, with the bulk of the text focused on other, non-relevant matters</p> <p>A <b>medium rating</b> might mean an article has a lot of detail on one relevant issue (e.g. engaging people and keeping them engaged) which is pertinent to sustainability, but otherwise little on other important factors</p> <p>A <b>high rating</b> will mean an article has a direct focus on keeping an intervention sustainable long term, with a good level of detail</p>	<p>A <b>low rating</b> might mean data appears uncritically treated and at a high risk of bias (e.g. from a promotional article for a service) or simply descriptive and superficial in its reporting of basic facts from an intervention programme (e.g. from a short news article)</p> <p>A <b>medium rating</b> might mean data appears with some attempt at critical evaluation and is from a real-world example, but is limited in scope and generalisability, or in depth and detail</p> <p>A <b>high rating</b> might mean data is of good depth and detail and is from a critical evaluation of at least one real world example, gathered over a sustained period using range of robust measures and an appropriate sample of participants</p>