



This is a repository copy of *What is the prevalence of loneliness amongst older people living in residential and nursing care homes? A systematic review and meta-analysis.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/160982/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Gardiner, C. [orcid.org/0000-0003-1785-7054](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1785-7054), Laud, P., Heaton, T. et al. (1 more author) (2020) What is the prevalence of loneliness amongst older people living in residential and nursing care homes? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Age And Ageing*, 49 (5). pp. 748-757. ISSN 0002-0729

<https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afaa049>

---

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced version of an article accepted for publication in *Age and Ageing* following peer review. The version of record [Clare Gardiner, Pete Laud, Tim Heaton, Merryn Gott, What is the prevalence of loneliness amongst older people living in residential and nursing care homes? A systematic review and meta-analysis, *Age and Ageing*, , afaa049, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afaa049>] is available online at: <https://academic.oup.com/ageing/advance-article-abstract/doi/10.1093/ageing/afaa049/5827763>.

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

## **What is the prevalence of loneliness among older people living in residential and nursing care homes? A systematic review and meta-analysis.**

Clare Gardiner  
The University of Sheffield, UK

Pete Laud  
The University of Sheffield, UK

Tim Heaton  
The University of Sheffield, UK

Merryn Gott  
The University of Auckland, New Zealand

Corresponding author:  
Dr Clare Gardiner  
Senior Research Fellow  
School of Nursing & Midwifery  
The University of Sheffield  
Barber House Annexe  
3a Clarkehouse Road  
Sheffield S10 2LA  
0114 222 2038

## **ABSTRACT**

**Background:** The number of older people living in residential and nursing care homes is rising. Loneliness is a major problem for older people, but little is known about the prevalence of loneliness amongst older people living in care homes.

**Aim:** To undertake a systematic review of literature on the prevalence of moderate and severe loneliness amongst older people living in residential and nursing care homes.

**Design:** We systematically reviewed the databases CINAHL, Medline, PsycINFO, Embase, Scopus, Cochrane and AMED from inception to Jan 2019. We included all studies reporting data on the prevalence of loneliness amongst older people living in care homes. A random effects meta-analysis was conducted on all eligible data.

**Results:** A total of 13 articles were included, representing 5,115 participants (age range of 55 – 102 years, mean age 83.5 years, 68% female). There was significant variation between studies in estimates of prevalence. The prevalence of moderate loneliness ranged from 31% - 100%, and the prevalence of severe loneliness ranged from 9% - 81%. The estimated mean prevalence of “moderate loneliness” was 61% (95% confidence interval (CI): 0.41, 0.80). The estimated mean prevalence of “severe loneliness” was 35%, (95% CI: 0.14, 0.60).

**Conclusion:** The prevalence of both moderate loneliness and severe loneliness amongst care home residents is high enough to warrant concern. However, the significant variation in prevalence estimates warrants further research. Nonetheless, addressing loneliness and promoting meaningful social engagement has significant potential for enhancing quality of life in care homes.

**KEYWORDS:** Older people, ageing, care home, nursing home, loneliness

**WORDCOUNT:** 3120

## **KEY POINTS**

- Little is known about the prevalence of loneliness amongst older people living in care homes.
- Our meta-analysis estimates the mean prevalence of moderate and severe loneliness at 61% and 35 % respectively.
- We found substantial variation between different studies in estimates of the prevalence of loneliness.
- Addressing loneliness has significant potential for enhancing quality of life in care homes.

## **BACKGROUND**

Across the developed world it is estimated that between 2-5% of the older population reside in care homes [1]. Population ageing and the associated increase in care needs means that we are likely to see a substantial increase in demand for care home services globally, over coming years [2].

Care homes play a key role in maintaining physical health, managing health conditions and providing personal care. Whilst care homes are well placed to meet these physical and safety requirements, evidence suggests they are less well equipped to meet the more complex social needs of residents, including social engagement and the prevention of loneliness [3]. Loneliness is a major health problem for older people and is associated with a range of negative health consequences including depression, dementia, cardiovascular disease, malnutrition, poor quality of life and mortality [4,5,6]. Evidence from a number of countries on the prevalence of loneliness amongst community dwelling older adults suggests that rates are concerningly high. Across Australia, Northern Europe, and North America the prevalence of severe loneliness is estimated at between 5-10%, in Southern Europe rates of 10-18% are reported [7,8] and studies from Asia have reported rates of around 25 - 30% [9].

There is ongoing debate about optimum strategies to promote wellbeing, safety and efficacy among care home residents. Studies from the United States (U.S), Canada, Japan, and Korea show that older adults living in care homes report lower quality of life and less happiness than community dwelling adults [10,11,12]. Despite the established link between loneliness and health, the evidence base on loneliness among older people living in care homes is limited. Nonetheless, a 2015 study suggested loss of family and friends, lack of meaningful communication with fellow residents, and staff members lacking time for conversations can lead to sadness and loneliness, despite the apparent social nature of care home life [13]. Loneliness in care homes is therefore an important area for research as living in a care home may exacerbate loneliness and related health issues. In 2012 Victor published an overview of the state of the evidence on loneliness in care homes, and highlighted the lack of “research focusing exclusively on loneliness in care homes either from a qualitative or quantitative perspective” (p642). She concluded that whilst loneliness levels in care home populations are probably higher than in the community, this conclusion is based on a weak evidence base and there is a need for greater research attention. [8]

The aim of our research is therefore to systematically review the literature on the prevalence of moderate and severe loneliness amongst older people living in residential and nursing care homes, and synthesise the evidence in a meta-analysis.

## **METHODS**

This systematic review was conducted within the Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement [14]. The full review protocol is available from the authors on request. We used the following definitions of terms. ‘Loneliness’ is a subjective feeling state of being alone, separated or apart from others and is an imbalance between desired social contacts and actual social contacts [15]. ‘Residential and nursing care homes’ are settings providing 24 hour residential accommodation and personal and/or nursing care to older people [16].

### *Search strategy*

The electronic databases: CINAHL (via EBSCO), Medline, PsycINFO, Embase, Scopus, Cochrane and AMED (via OVID) were searched from 2000 to January 2019. Grey literature was searched using internet search engines Google and Google Scholar. Following scoping, a search strategy was devised by MG, CG and LS in consultation with an Information Specialist. Search terms included MeSH headings and keywords which are presented as supplementary data available on-line. We conducted citation searching of reference lists of included articles and forward citation searching. Relevant review papers were also considered to identify potentially omitted articles.

### *Eligibility criteria*

Studies were eligible if they met the following inclusion criteria: (i) English language papers (scoping identified that the majority of literature in this field was in the English language); (ii) papers reporting data on older people (we did not specify a minimum age but only included papers where the sample was described as older/elderly people and data on ages was provided); (iii) papers presenting data from residential or nursing care homes (see definitions); (iv) papers reporting on the prevalence or incidence of loneliness (see definitions); (v) articles published between 2000 and Jan 2019.

If we encountered studies which presented data as a mean score on a scale rather than as a prevalence or incidence, we contacted the authors to acquire the raw data. If we encountered multiple publications from the same cohort, we used the data from the first paper in the series. Whilst there is an established evidence base which shows differences between world regions in prevalence of loneliness amongst community dwelling older people, there are no comparable data on regional differences in loneliness among care home populations. Therefore we included studies from all countries and world regions.

### *Study Identification*

LS reviewed the titles and abstracts of all papers identified through the searches and CG double reviewed 10% of these articles. The full texts of potentially eligible papers were then reviewed independently by LS, CG and MG before making a final decision on eligibility. Any disagreements were resolved through discussion between the authors.

### *Outcome measures*

The outcomes of interest were prevalence of moderate loneliness and prevalence of severe loneliness. Moderate loneliness was defined as those who are moderately lonely *or worse* and therefore included all of those who were severely lonely.

The measurement of loneliness varies considerably but broadly speaking two methods are used: (i) self-rating scales where respondents report the frequency of loneliness in response to a single item question such as “Do you ever feel lonely?” and; (ii) validated loneliness scales that measure the intensity of loneliness rather than the frequency. Where self-rating scales are used, responses are recorded on an ordinal scale with usually three or four response options. The number of response options and the label descriptors vary; some studies use ‘lonely vs not lonely’ whereas others use up to four response options ‘never lonely/sometimes lonely/often lonely/always lonely’. In order to convert these different

response options into ‘moderately lonely’ and ‘severely lonely’ we used the categorisation presented in table 1. This process was guided by the classification of loneliness measures developed by Valtorta in 2016 [17].




Various response options from self-rated measures of loneliness	Response options to be included in meta-analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Always lonely</li> <li>- Often lonely</li> <li>- Severe loneliness</li> <li>- High degree of loneliness</li> <li>- Lonely most of the time</li> </ul>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>SEVERELY LONELY</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lonely half of the time</li> <li>- Moderate degree of loneliness</li> <li>- Sometimes lonely</li> <li>- Where a dichotomous variable was used [lonely vs not lonely] those who responded ‘lonely’ were coded moderately lonely</li> </ul>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>MODERATELY LONELY</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Never lonely</li> <li>- Rarely lonely</li> <li>- Seldom lonely</li> <li>- Low degree of loneliness</li> <li>- Not lonely</li> </ul>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOT LONELY</b></p>

Table 1: Conversion of response options from self-rated measures of loneliness into *severely lonely*, *moderately lonely* and *not lonely*, for inclusion in the meta-analysis.

Where loneliness is measured using a validated instrument, there are established thresholds for identifying moderate and severe loneliness using values from the scales (e.g. Russell 1996 [18] for the University of California Loneliness Assessment (UCLA), Victor 2012 [8] for De Jong Gierveld; Hawthorn 2006 [19] and Casey 2015 [20] for the Friendship Scale).. Whilst the range of different approaches to measuring loneliness means that comparisons between different studies should be treated with caution, Victor et al. (2000) [21] report that the various scales show good comparability in terms of identifying the ‘never lonely’ and the ‘significantly lonely’.

#### *Quality appraisal*

Each paper was appraised using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal Checklist for studies reporting prevalence data [22]. This is a tool for assessing methodological quality and estimating the extent to which a study has addressed the possibility of bias in its design, conduct and analysis. No studies were excluded on the basis of quality appraisal, rather this was used to assess bias and the quality of the overall state of evidence. Quality appraisal is detailed in on-line supplementary material.

#### *Data analysis*

We used random effects meta-analyses to pool studies for moderate loneliness and severe loneliness separately. Such a model allows estimation of the variability in prevalence across studies, as well as the pooled mean. In the presence of significant between-study

heterogeneity, such that a “common effect” assumption is not reasonable, the estimate of mean prevalence (with its associated confidence interval) is an insufficient summary of the data [23]. The random-effects confidence interval for the estimated mean does not represent the true range seen across studies. We therefore present both the confidence interval and the prediction interval, which represents an interval for the expected prevalence to be observed in a hypothetical future study. Results for each analysis are displayed in a forest plot (figures 2 and 3), showing the prediction interval along with confidence intervals for the estimated prevalence from each study.

Potential risk factors for loneliness were entered into separate meta-regression models (there were insufficient studies to consider the simultaneous effects of multiple covariates). The risk factors included in the meta-regression models were as follows:

- Gender: proportion of sample that were female
- Mean age of sample
- Minimum age of sample
- Gross Domestic Product (GDP): Approximate GDP of country in which the research took place [24]
- Dementia: whether or not those with dementia were included


Assessment of publication bias was not considered to be relevant in this setting as there were no group comparisons or hypothesis tests of “treatment effect”. Confidence intervals for individual study prevalence estimates use the Skewness-Corrected Asymptotic Score method [25], using the `scoreci` function in the R ‘`ratesci`’ package. Random-effects meta-analysis (including prediction intervals) uses the Hartung-Knapp method [26] applied to the Freeman-Tukey transformed proportions [27], using the `metaprop` function in the R ‘`meta`’ package.

*[Table 2 about here]*

## RESULTS

A total of 578 articles were identified, from these 13 articles were included in the final review (see figure 1).

**Figure 1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) diagram: Summary of search results [14]**





### Characteristics of included studies

Study characteristics are noted in table 2 and in online supplementary material. A total of 5,115 participants were included in the 13 papers, with an age range of 55 – 102 years and a mean age of 83.5 years. 68% of participants were female. Three papers did not provide a mean age, one paper did not provide an age range, and one paper did not provide a gender breakdown. There were two studies each from Finland and Malaysia and one study from each of the following countries: Norway, Cyprus, Malta, Australia, Egypt, Spain, The Netherlands, China. One study collected data from both Sweden and Finland. The majority of studies excluded people with dementia or severe cognitive impairment, only four studies included those with cognitive impairment or dementia.

A range of different methods were used to measure loneliness in the included studies. The majority (n = 7) used single item self-rating scales e.g. “Do you ever feel lonely?” or similar. Other studies used validated tools; the UCLA (n=1), the De Jong Gierveld loneliness scale (n = 2) and The Friendship Scale (n =2). One study did not state the method used. Data on moderate loneliness was available from 11 articles and data on severe loneliness was available from 9 articles.




Figure 2: Forest plot for meta-analysis of the prevalence of “moderately lonely or worse”




Figure 3: Forest plot for meta-analysis of the prevalence of “severely lonely”

The prevalence of moderate loneliness ranged from 31% - 100%, with the majority of studies ( $n=9$ ) reporting rates of over 40%. The prevalence of severe loneliness ranged from 9% - 81%, with over half ( $n=5$ ) reporting rates of over 20%. Four studies (Liu 2012, Nvquist 2013, Prieto-Flores 2011, Savikko 2005) also reported the prevalence of loneliness amongst a comparable population living in the community. All four studies found that rates of loneliness were significantly higher among care home residents than those living in the community (significance ranging from  $p < 0.05$  –  $p < 0.001$ ).

The pooled estimate for the prevalence of “moderate loneliness” across 11 studies (3,933 participants) among older people living in care homes is 61%, with a random-effects 95% confidence interval of (0.41, 0.80). The pooled estimate for “severe loneliness” across 9 studies (4,232 participants) is 35%, (95% CI: 0.14, 0.60). However, as there is a very large amount of heterogeneity between studies, the prediction interval for the expected “moderate loneliness” proportion to be observed in a hypothetical future study is (0.09, 1.00). The prediction interval for the “severely lonely” data is (0.01, 0.91) (figures 2&3).

Five potential risk factors for loneliness were entered as single covariates in separate meta-regression models (gender, mean age, minimum age, GDP of country, inclusion or not of dementia residents). The results of the meta-regression are displayed in the bubble plots in the supplementary data on-line. Studies with missing values were excluded from the meta-regression.

No significant associations were observed between any risk factor and severe loneliness. There was some evidence of an association of moderate loneliness with gender (with the

highest loneliness prevalence reported in studies with an equal gender split), and to a lesser extent, mean age (with higher loneliness prevalence reported in studies with lower mean age). However, there was some confounding between these two factors, and also with country: the effect of both of these covariates was mainly due to the results from the two studies conducted in Malaysia. Without further data, it is impossible to determine which of these 3 risk factors (gender, age, country) is independently associated with “moderate loneliness”.

One must be careful not to interpret from these meta-regressions that younger individuals have a higher prevalence of loneliness; or that females are less likely to feel lonely. We only have summary information on the overall study and no individual level information. Hence we do not know which individuals in a particular study reported loneliness. We can only say that those studies with a younger overall mean age, or a more even gender split, appeared to report higher rates of loneliness. In particular, it should be noted that the studies with the most evenly matched gender balance had the highest reported loneliness rates (almost 100% moderately lonely or worse, see figure in SI) suggesting it is not simply a consequence of females in general feeling less lonely. Instead, increasing the gender balance seemed to increase the overall loneliness).

## **DISCUSSION**

Our findings indicate that around 61% of older people living in care homes may be moderately lonely, and around 35% may be severely lonely. The significant heterogeneity between studies means that these findings should be interpreted with caution. Nonetheless, the findings are suggestive that loneliness is a significant problem amongst older people living in residential and nursing care homes and the prevalence of loneliness in this population is at least comparable to, if not greater than, among community dwelling older adults [28]. Of the four studies that provided a direct comparison between care home residents and those living in their own homes, all reported significantly higher rates of loneliness in the care home populations. In addition, studies in our review reported higher rates of loneliness than previous studies of community dwelling older people, from the same countries. For example, in Northern Europe rates of severe loneliness among community dwelling older people are mostly below 6% [7]. The studies in our review from Northern Europe reported rates of severe loneliness among care home residents at between 9% and 22%. Similarly rates of loneliness among Southern European community dwelling older people have been reported between 10-18% [7,8] yet studies in our review report rates of up to 63% for care home residents from this region.

High rates of loneliness in care homes may seem counter to what is an inherently social living arrangement, where residents are surrounded by staff, other residents and visitors. However, research suggests that superficial relationships with other residents and staff, a feeling of ‘not belonging’, and difficulty connecting with residents of differing mental capacity are all factors underpinning loss of social connectedness [29]. Residents in care homes may have few opportunities to make personal decisions or exercise control over their life. This lack of control in combination with time spent in passive activities, such as doing nothing, sleeping, and waiting, can lead to feelings of boredom and loneliness [30]. High levels of loneliness may also precede entry into a care home. The loss of a partner,

increased frailty and dependency, and loneliness are all predictive of admission into a care home [30]. Consequently, a high proportion of older people enter care homes with reduced social networks and with high levels of loneliness already established [31]. The evidence base on interventions to address loneliness in care homes is mixed [32] and there is little compelling evidence for the effectiveness of interventions [8]. A key challenge for care homes is therefore to determine ways of developing and nurturing social relationships in the care home setting, and to engage residents in activities which can help alleviate loneliness.

As noted above, there was considerable variation between studies in terms of prevalence estimates. This variability may be due to differences in study design or bias (i.e. differences in sample, measurement tool, response rate, sample bias), or relate to unreported factors such as time from admission to care home, and reason for admission. These data are rarely reported in prevalence studies yet may be important for understanding variation in loneliness estimates. Variability in estimates may also reflect genuine differences in loneliness between care homes and/or different countries. It seems likely that all of these factors have contributed somewhat to the variability. There is a well-established evidence base which demonstrates differences in loneliness among community dwelling older people by country [7]. However, it is not known to what extent this between-country variability exists in the care home population, or if it exists at all. Our meta-regressions did not identify any significant associations between country GDP and loneliness, nonetheless other country specific factors (geographical, cultural, economic) should be considered as potentially influencing loneliness in the care home setting.

It is also probable that differences between individual care homes contribute to variability in loneliness. The term 'care home' encompasses a wide range of residential accommodation types, and care homes differ widely in what opportunities they offer for social engagement and social activities [33]. In turn this may depend on local/national policy, the funding model of the care home (public vs private), size, location, and proportion of residents with dementia. Further research should seek to explore in more detail those care homes which report low levels of loneliness, to identify how they maintain social engagement and highlight examples of good practice, so that successful interventions can be shared and implemented more widely. A clearer assessment of what works well, for whom and under what circumstances is necessary to gain insights into how loneliness may be addressed more consistently in this setting.

Few of the studies in this review included older people with dementia, in most cases this was due to concerns that people with cognitive impairment would struggle to complete the loneliness assessment measures. Nonetheless, people with dementia comprise a large proportion of the resident population of care homes; in the UK around two thirds of people living in care homes have dementia [33]. There are suggestions that dementia confers additional risk of loneliness [34] and compounds related problems such as apathy [35]. Assessing loneliness in people with communication impairments is challenging and may require alternative methods such as observation or proxy report, rather than relying on self-report scales. Relatively little research exists which focuses on assessing loneliness in people with dementia, and this is an important area for future research if we are to establish a more complete understanding of loneliness in care homes.

## CONCLUSION

According to our estimates, the prevalence of both moderate loneliness and severe loneliness amongst care home residents are high enough to warrant concern. However, the significant variation in prevalence estimates warrants further research to establish why loneliness rates vary so widely. Addressing loneliness and promoting meaningful social engagement has significant potential for enhancing quality of life in care homes, and therefore priority should be given to acknowledging and further exploring loneliness in this setting.

## LIMITATIONS

A range of different instruments were used to measure loneliness in the included studies and whilst attempts were made to standardise responses between studies, we acknowledge a direct comparison is likely to be subject to some error. As a consequence, it is probable that the process of standardisation contributed to the significant variability in prevalence rates between studies. Studies were included in a single meta-analysis regardless of country or world region but we acknowledge that cultural, economic and demographic factors may point to a need for country specific research. Future work should seek to establish whether differences in loneliness in care homes reflect between-country differences in loneliness which have been observed among community dwelling older people.

**Funding:** The review was funded through a Vice-Chancellor's Fellowship at The University of Sheffield

## References

1. Ribbe M, Ljunggren G, Steel K, Topinkova E, Hawes C, Ikegami N, Henrard J, Jonsson P. Nursing homes in 10 nations: a comparison between countries and settings *Age and Ageing* 1997; 26-S2: 3-12
2. Office for National Statistics (ONS). Living longer: how our population is changing and why it matters. 2018, Office for National Statistics, London, UK.
3. Residents & Relatives Association (R&RA). Together But Alone. The R&RA's report on social isolation among older care home residents, following a two-year national survey completed in 2010. 2010. R&RA, London, UK.
4. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Baker M, Harris T, Stephenson D. Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: a meta-analytic review. *Perspect Psychol Sci* 2015, 10(2):227-37.
5. Theeke LA. Sociodemographic and health-related risks for loneliness and outcome differences by loneliness status in a sample of US older adults. *Research in Gerontological Nursing* 2010, 3(2), 113-125
6. BAPEN. Malnutrition remains significant problem in care homes. *Nursing Times*, 2015 <https://www.nursingtimes.net/clinical-archive/nutrition/malnutrition-remains-significant-problem-in-care-homes-16-12-2015/> (accessed 12.11.19)
7. Yang, K., & Victor, C. (2011). Age and loneliness in 25 European nations. *Ageing and Society*, 31(8), 1368-1388. doi:10.1017/S0144686X1000139X
8. Victor C. Loneliness in care homes: a neglected area of research. *Ageing Health* 2012, 8(6): 637-646.

9. Chen Y, Hicks A, While AE. Loneliness and social support of older people in China: a systematic literature review *Health and Social Care in the Community* 2014, 22 (2), 113–123
10. Borowiak, E., & Kostka, T. Predictors of quality of life in older people living at home and institutions. *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research* 2004, 16, 212e220.
11. Chappell, N., & Penning, M. The trend away from institutionalization. *Research on Aging*. 1979, 3, 361e387.
12. Ho, H. K., Matsubayashi, K., Wada, T., Kimura, M., Yano, S., Otsuka, K., et al. What determines the life satisfaction of the elderly? Comparative study of residential care home and community in Japan. *Geriatrics and Gerontology International* 2003, 3, 79e85.
13. Iden, K. R., et al. "Residents' perceptions of their own sadness - a qualitative study in Norwegian nursing homes." *BMC Geriatrics* 2015, 15(1): 21.
14. Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., Altman, D., Antes, G., Group, P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Medicine* 2009, 6(7), e1000097.
15. Ernst JM, Cacioppo JT. Lonely hearts: Psychological perspectives on loneliness. *Applied and Preventive Psychology* 1999, 8 (1): 1–22
16. NHS 2019. Care Homes. <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/social-care-and-support-guide/care-services-equipment-and-care-homes/care-homes/> (accessed 17.4.19)
17. Valtorta NK, Kanaan M, Gilbody S, et al. Loneliness, social isolation and social relationships: what are we measuring? A novel framework for classifying and comparing tools. *BMJ Open* 2016; 6:e010799. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010799
18. Russell, D. W. UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): Reliability, validity, and factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 1996, 66(1), 20-40.
19. Hawthorne, G. (2006). Measuring social isolation in older adults: Development and initial validation of the Friendship Scale. *Social Indicators Research*, 77, 521–548. doi:10.1007/s11205-005-7746-y
20. Casey, A. N. S., Low, L. F., Jeon, Y. H., & Brodaty, H. (2015). Residents perceptions of friendship and positive social networks within a nursing home. *The Gerontologist*, 56(5), 855-867.
21. Victor, C. R., Scambler, S. J., Bond, J. and Bowling, A. Being alone in later life: loneliness, isolation and living alone in later life. *Reviews in Clinical Gerontology*, 2000, 10 (4) 407–17.
22. Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D, Tufanaru C. Methodological guidance for systematic reviews of observational epidemiological studies reporting prevalence and incidence data. *Int J Evid Based Healthc*. 2015; 13(3):147–153.
23. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG and Spiegelhalter DJ. A re-evaluation of random-effects meta-analysis. *J. R. Statist. Soc. A* 2009; 172:137–159.
24. World Economic Outlook Database. International Monetary Fund. 1 October 2018.
25. Laud PJ. Equal-tailed confidence intervals for comparison of rates. *Pharmaceutical Statistics* 2017; 16:334–348. doi:10.1002/pst.1813.
26. IntHout J, Ioannidis JPA, Borm GF. The Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman method for random effects meta-analysis is straightforward and considerably outperforms the standard DerSimonian-Laird method. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 2014; 14:25.

27. Barendregt JJ, Doi SA, Lee YY, et al. Meta-analysis of prevalence. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2013;67:974–978.
28. Victor C, Scambler S, Bowling A, Bond J. (2005). The prevalence of, and risk factors for, loneliness in later life: A survey of older people in Great Britain. *Ageing and Society* 2005, 25(6), 357-375. doi:10.1017/S0144686X04003332
29. Buckley C, McCarthy G. An Exploration of Social Connectedness as Perceived by Older Adults in a Long-Term Care Setting in Ireland. *Geriatric Nursing* 2009, 30 (6) 390-396
30. Brownie S, Horstmanshof L. The Management of Loneliness in Aged Care Residents: An Important Therapeutic Target for Gerontological Nursing, *Geriatric Nursing*, 2011, 32 (5) 318-325
31. Russell DW, Cutrona CE, de la Mora A, Wallace RB. Loneliness and nursing home admission among rural older adults. *Psychol Aging* 1997, 12 (4) pp. 574-589
32. Gardiner C, Geldenhuys G, Gott M. Interventions to reduce social isolation and loneliness amongst older people: an integrative review. *Health & Social Care in the Community* 2018, Vol 26, Issue 2, p147–157
33. Alzheimer’s Society. Home from home: A report highlighting opportunities for improving standards of dementia care in care homes. 2007 London: Alzheimer’s Society.
34. Holwerda TJ, Deeg DJH, Beekman ATF, et al. Feelings of loneliness, but not social isolation, predict dementia onset: results from the Amsterdam Study of the Elderly (AMSTEL). *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2014; 85:135-142.
35. Nijsten JMH, Leontjevas R, Pat-El R, Smalbrugge M, Koopmans R, Gerritsen D. Apathy: Risk Factor for Mortality in Nursing Home Patients. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2017, 65. 10.1111/jgs.15007.

Table 2: Details of included studies (n=13)

Author, year, country	Aim	Design	Sample characteristics	Measurement tool	Findings
Ahmed 2014, Egypt	To determine the prevalence and predictors of depression, anxiety and mixed form (i.e. depression and anxiety) in the elderly living at geriatric homes.	Quantitative cross sectional	240 older people aged 60 – 74 years from four geriatric homes, free from dementia. Mean age 64.8 years, 65% female.	Three item loneliness scale: 1 = hardly ever 2 = some of the time 3 = often	n = 188 (78.3%) were moderately lonely or worse n = 123 (51.3%) were severely lonely
Aung 2017 Malaysia	The aim of this study was to explore the level of loneliness among elderly in nursing homes using UCLA loneliness scale	Quantitative cross-sectional	80 older people from nursing homes in Malaysia, aged 61 -100 years. No mean age given. 54% female. Does not state any exclusion criteria relating to dementia.	UCLA 20 item loneliness scale, scores summed: 20-34 = low degree of loneliness; 35-49 = moderate degree of loneliness; 50-80 = moderately high degree of loneliness.	n = 80 (100%) were moderately lonely or worse n = 60 (75%) were severely lonely or worse
Casey 2016, Australia	To investigate co-resident social networks in three units of a 94-bed Australian nursing home.	Quantitative cross-sectional	36 residents of a single nursing home, age range 63 – 94 yrs. Mean age 81.8 years. 61% female. Excluding those who were acutely ill but including those with dementia.	The Friendship Scale	n = 11 (31%) were moderately lonely or worse n = 4 (11%) were severely lonely
Dragset 2011, Norway	To examine the frequency of contact and loneliness and the association between loneliness and social support dimensions	Cross-sectional, descriptive, correlational design	227 residents of 30 nursing homes. 65 – 102 years, mean age 85.4 years. 72% female. Excluded those with cognitive impairment.	Single question “Do you sometimes feel lonely?” [1=often, 2=sometimes, 3=rarely, 4=never]. Dichotomized into 1&2 = lonely, 3&4 = not lonely	n = 125 (56%) were moderately lonely or worse n = 50 (22%) were severely lonely
Georgiades 2008, Cyprus	What are life satisfaction levels of nursing home residents in Cyprus?	Quantitative, cross-sectional, descriptive design	73 residents from four nursing homes. Age range: 65-100 years, mean age 83 yrs. 77% female. Those with severe communication deficits excluded.	One-item question: “I often feel lonely here” [yes/no]	Number of moderately lonely or worse not stated. n = 46 (63%) were severely lonely.
Jansson, 2017	To examine the prevalence,	Quantitative	2070 residents from 61 nursing	Single question “Do you suffer	n = 723 (35%) were moderately



Finland	associated factors and prognosis of loneliness among older people in institutional settings.	cross-sectional	homes. No data on age range. Mean age 84 years, 75% female. Those with dementia excluded.	from loneliness?" [seldom or never, sometimes, often or always].	lonely or worse n = 187 (9%) were severely lonely.
Jongenelis 2004, Netherlands	To investigate the prevalence of depression, measured with a rating scale and a diagnostic instrument, and to identify risk indicators of depression in the nursing home population.	Quantitative cross-sectional surveys	350 nursing home residents, age range 55 – 99 years Mean age 79.4 years, 69% female. Significant cognitive impairment excluded.	11 item De Jong Gierveld used to measure loneliness. "As recommended by the authors, a cut-off score of 3 was used to distinguish between lonely and not lonely."	n = 147 (42%) were moderately lonely or worse. Number of severely lonely not stated.
Liu, 2012, China	Explores the role of children in differences in psychological well-being between institutionalized and community-residing oldest-old adults in China.	Data from longitudinal health survey, collected in the 1998, 2000 and 2002 waves	1109 older adults aged 80 - > 100 years living in a residential setting. Mean age 89.4%, 55% female. Including those with cognitive impairment.	Single item question: "Do you often feel lonely and isolated?" Responses dichotomized so responses to feeling lonely and isolated (always/often) are coded 1	Number of moderately lonely or worse not stated. n = 151 (13.6%) were severely lonely.
Nikmat 2015, Malaysia	To determine the prevalence of loneliness/ social isolation and late-life depression among older adults with cognitive impairment living in institutional care.	Cross-sectional, quantitative, survey design	110 residents of four nursing homes. Aged 60 – 89 years. Mean age 71.6 years, 50% female. All cognitively impaired, but excluded if extremely cognitively impaired	The Friendship Scale	n = 105 (95.5%) were moderately lonely or worse n = 89 (80.9%) were severely lonely
Nvquist 2013, Finland & Sweden	To investigate the links between social capital and loneliness among the very old living either at home or in institutional settings.	Quantitative, cross-sectional	149 people aged 85 - >95 years living in institutional settings. 80% female. No mean age given. No exclusion based on dementia but those with communication difficulties "unlikely to have responded".	One-item question : "Do you ever feel lonely?" [1=often, 2=sometimes, 3=seldom, 4=never]. Dichotomized into 1&2 = lonely, 3&4 = not lonely	n = 82 (55%) were moderately lonely or worse. Number of severely lonely not stated.
Prieto-Flores 2011, Spain	To seek if sociodemographic and health factors contribute differentially to the explanation of loneliness in institutionalized and noninstitutionalized older adults.	Quantitative cross-sectional surveys	234 nursing home residents aged 60 – 97 years, mean age 81 years. 65% female. Excluding those with severe cognitive impairment.	Six-item De Jong Gierveld Loneliness Scale used and then transformed into a dichotomous variable 'lonely' vs 'not lonely'	n = 154 (71.6%) were moderately lonely or worse. Number of severely lonely not stated.

Savikko 2005, Finland	To examine the prevalence and self-reported causes of loneliness among Finnish older population	Quantitative, cross-sectional design. Postal survey	287 older nursing home residents > 75 years. No data on age range, mean age or gender of the residential sample (only on combined sample). No exclusion criteria stated relating to dementia.	One-item question "Do you suffer from loneliness?" [1= seldom or never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often or always)	n = 155 (54%) were moderately lonely or worse. n = 37 (13%) were severely lonely
Zammit, 2015, Malta	What is the prevalence of depression in older persons living in nursing homes in Malta, and what factors are associated with depression in nursing home residents in Malta?	Cross-sectional, quantitative design	150 patients from two nursing homes. Age range 60 – 96 years, mean age 80.3 years. 75% female. Excluded from study if cognitively impaired.	Not stated.	n = 46 (31.7%) were moderately lonely or worse. Number of severely lonely not stated.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY ON-LINE MATERIAL**

### **Supplementary (full) reference list:**

Ahmed, D., El, S. I., Taher, E., & Zyada, F. Prevalence and predictors of depression and anxiety among the elderly population living in geriatric homes in Cairo, Egypt. *The journal of egyptian public health association*. 2014; 89(3), 127-135

Aung KT, Nurumal MS, Syakirah WN, Bukhari W. Loneliness among elderly in nursing homes. *International Journal for Studies on Children, Women, Elderly And Disabled*. 2007; 2: 72-28.

Casey, A., Lee-Fay Low, Yun-Hee Jeon & Brodaty, H. (2016). Residents' positive and negative relationship networks in a nursing home. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing* 2016; 42 (11). 9-13.

Drageset, J., Kirkevold, M., & Espehaug, B. (2011). 'Loneliness and social support among nursing home residents without cognitive impairment: A questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 2011; 48(5): 611-619.

Georgiades S. Quality of nursing home care in Cyprus: are elder residents content with their treatment? *J. Gerontol. Soc. Work* 2008; 50(3-4), 3-24

Jansson AH, Muurinen S, Savikko N, Soini H, Suominen MM, Kautiainen H, Pitkälä KH. Finland 2017. Loneliness in nursing homes and assisted living facilities: prevalence, associated factors and prognosis. *Jour Nursing Home Res* 2017; 3:43-49

Jongenelis K, Pot AM, Eisses AMH, Beekman ATF, Kluiters H, Ribbe MW. Prevalence and risk indicators of depression in elderly nursing home patients: the AGED study. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 2004; 83: 135–142

Liu G, Dupre ME, Gu D, Mair CA, Chen F. Psychological well-being of the institutionalized and community-residing oldest old in China: The role of children. *Social Science & Medicine* 2012; 75: 1874 -1882.

Nikmat, A.W., Hashim, N. A., Omar, S. A., & Razali, S. Depression and loneliness/social isolation among patients with cognitive impairment in nursing home. *ASEAN Journal of Psychiatry* 2015; 16: 22-231

Nyqvist F, Cattan M, Andersson L, et al. Social capital and loneliness among the very old living at home and in institutional settings: A comparative study. *J Aging Health* 2013; 25: 1013 – 1035

Prieto-Flores, M. E., Forjaz, M. J., Fernandez-Mayoralas, G., Rojo-Perez, F., & Martinez-Martin, P. Factors associated with loneliness of noninstitutionalized and institutionalized older adults. *Journal of Aging and Health* 2011; 23(1): 177-194.

Savikko, N., Routasalo, P., Tilvis, R. S., Strandbeger, T.E., & Pitkälä, K. H. Predictors and subjective causes of loneliness in an aged population. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 2005; 41(3): 223-233.

Zammit, P., & Fiorini, A. Depressive illness in institutionalised older people in Malta. *Malta Medical Journal* 2015; 27(3): 22-25

**Search Terms (MeSH headings where available and keywords where no MeSH heading)**

Loneliness search terms	Loneliness Loneli*.mp Social Isolation Social isolat*.mp
Aged care residential facilities search terms	Nursing Home Skilled Nursing Facilites Long Term Care Residential Care Residential Home Homes for the aged.mp Nursing home*.mp Skilled nursing facilit*.mp Residential care institution*.mp Aged care facilit*.mp Residential care.mp Aged care home*.mp Retirement home*.mp Long Term Care.mp Home for the aged.mp Home for the elderly.mp Intermediate care.mp Residential home*.mp Old age home*.mp
Older people search terms (required for some databases without age limit option)	Aged.mp Elder*.mp Geriatric*.mp Older*.mp. Senior*.mp Pensioner*.mp
Extent search terms	Extent.mp Breadth.mp Scope.mp Quantit*.mp Size.mp Prevalen* Incidence

Limits applied to database searches:

2000-2017 publication dates.

English language only

Database Searches:

CINAHL (via EBSCO)

Medline (via OVID)

PsycINFO (via OVID)

Embase (via OVID)

Scopus

Cochrane

AMED (via OVID)

Definitions of care homes in the various countries included in the review:

*Australia:* Residential accommodation for those no longer able to live independently at home, may also be referred to as nursing home, aged care facility or residential aged care.

*China:* Assisted-living facilities and other types of residential environments outside of the home that provide professional or assisted care for older people. Also called institutional care, nursing homes.

*Cyprus:* Residential care for older people with high level needs, used only when other solutions are not sufficient to meet individual needs on a 24-hour basis. Also called community nursing homes.

*Egypt:* Residential homes where the elderly live with their peers and are helped in their Activities of Daily Living (ADL) and instrumental ADL by trained workers. Also called geriatric homes.

*Finland:* Nursing homes and assisted living facilities provide round-the-clock care for older people with a registered nurse in charge of a ward. However, the environment in assisted living units is more home-like than in traditional nursing homes. Also called long term care

*Netherlands:* Institutions that provide facilities for older people which are difficult to fulfil at home: 24 h unplanned care, continuous supervision to ensure a safe, clean and organized place, specialized care concerning ADL, instrumental ADL or chronic diseases, and company of other people. Also called long term care.

*Norway:* Residential institutions for older people, including 24hr skilled nursing facilities. Also called nursing homes, nursing facility, care facility.



*Malta:* No concrete definition of long-term care, but various residential services are provided for older people who can no longer live in their own homes. Also called care in institutions/residential homes, long term care.



*Malaysia:* A collective living place for elderly who do not require hospital service but cannot be cared for adequately and safely at home. Also called nursing home.


*Spain:* Provides assistance, most typically to older people, with some of the most fundamental activities of daily living, including eating, washing, and dressing. Also called long term care

*Sweden:* Institutional settings with access to staff and/or nurses at all hours. Also called institutional care, institutional settings, nursing care.

**Bubble plots of meta-regression analysis**











standard, reliable way for all participants?													
Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	x	✓	✓
Comments	Response rate not reported	High risk of bias due to poor reporting	Small sample, purposive sampling may weaken generalisability		Insufficient detail on sampling, non-valid measurement of condition	No data given on number of care homes included		Only used single item question for measurement of condition	No response rate. Insufficient detail on sampling	No data on number of care homes included	No response rate. Lack detail on sample frame	Lacks detail on sampling and nursing homes	Loneliness measurement tool not stated.
OVERALL METHODOLOGICAL QUALITY low (0-3 points), moderate (4-6 points), high (7-9 points)	8	4	7	9	5	8	9	8	5	8	6	6	5