# Poor outcomes of even brief hospital admissions among frail older people: a role for secondary prevention of frailty crises in the community?

Corresponding Author

Eilís Keeble, The Nuffield Trust, 59 New Cavendish Street, London, W1G 7LP

Email: [eilis.keeble@nuffieldtrust.org.uk](mailto:eilis.keeble@nuffieldtrust.org.uk)

Professor Helen Roberts, University of Southampton, Southampton, Hampshire, SO17 1BJ

Dr Christopher Williams, University of Leicester, Leicester, Leicestershire, LE1 7RH

Dr James Van Oppen, University of Leicester, Leicester, Leicestershire, LE1 7RH

Professor Simon Paul Conroy, University of Leicester, Leicester, Leicestershire, LE1 7RH

# Abstract

## Background

‘Frailty crises’ are a common cause of hospital admission amongst older people and there is significant focus on admission avoidance. However, identifying frailty before a crisis occurs is challenging, making it difficult to effectively target community services. Better longer-term outcome data is needed if services are to reflect the needs of the growing population of older people with frailty.

## Aim

To determine long-term outcomes of older people discharged from hospital following short (<72h) and longer hospital admissions compared by frailty status.

## Design and Setting

Two populations aged >=70 years discharged from hospital units (i) following short ‘ambulatory’ admissions (<72h); (ii) following longer in-patient stays.

## Method

Two-year mortality and hospital use were compared using frailty measures derived from clinical and hospital data.

## Results

Mortality after two years was increased for frail compared to non-frail individuals in both cohorts. Patients in the ambulatory cohort classified as frail had increased mortality (Rockwood HR 2.3 [1.5, 3.4]) and hospital use (Rockwood RR 2.1 [1.7, 2.6]) compared to the non-frail.

## Conclusions

Individuals with frailty who are discharged from hospital experience increased mortality and resource use, even after short ‘ambulatory’ admissions. This is an easily identifiable group which is at increased risk of poor outcomes. Health and social care systems might wish to examine their current care response for frail older people discharged from hospital. There may be value in a ‘secondary prevention’ approach to frailty crises targeting individuals who are discharged from hospital.

## Keywords

Frailty; Intermediate care; Hospitalisation; Ambulatory Care; Geriatric Assessment; Primary care

## How this fits in

Primary care services have an increasing role in caring for frail older people. This study shows poor outcomes for frail older people discharged from hospital, even after just a ‘short stay’ or ‘ambulatory care’ admission. This group is easily identifiable and may benefit from a more holistic assessment and tailored community support following discharge. This could define a ‘secondary prevention’ approach to admission avoidance (targeting those identified as frail who have already been admitted to hospital) to focus resource intensive community support in a more impactful way to improve outcomes and prevent future inappropriate hospitalisation.

# Introduction

Frailty is a distinctive health state related to ageing, characterised by impaired homeostasis and decreased physiological reserve across multiple body systems, and resulting in increased vulnerability to adverse outcomes from apparently minor stressor events(1,2). Individuals are at increased risk of ‘frailty crises’ which are a common cause of acute health service use. Several scoring systems have been developed to quantify frailty and stratify risk in individuals and populations. The UK General Medical Services (GMS) contract introduced new frailty requirements in 2017/18 which require GP practices to use an appropriate tool (e.g. Electronic Frailty Index (eFI)) to identify potential frailty in their populations(3,4) and offer clinical assessments to those at risk of moderate or severe frailty.

Despite the increasing range of community-based services geared towards admission avoidance in frail older people, there has been an inexorable rise in acute hospital admissions in this group(5). Facing significant pressures, hospital services are often configured to promote early discharge(6,7) with the tacit assumption that longer-term problems will be addressed later. However, there is growing concern about the safety and effectiveness of this approach in frail older people. The risk is that in pursuit of early discharge, overall patient outcomes are not necessarily being improved, leading to a vicious cycle of readmission, functional decline, institutionalisation and death(8).

Better longer-term outcome data is needed if services are to reflect the needs of the growing population of older people with frailty. Previous studies have identified poor short-term outcomes in older people who are rapidly discharged from acute medical units, including high readmission rates(9,10). This paper provides longer term (two year) follow up data from two cohorts of older people: one discharged within 72 hours (referred to as the ‘ambulatory cohort’) and another with longer hospital admissions (the ‘in-patient cohort’).

# Method

## Settings

## The ambulatory cohort was recruited in Nottingham and Leicester. Both hospitals serve a large mixed urban and rural setting of approximately 1.1 million people with single, co-located emergency departments and acute medical services. The in-patient cohort was recruited in Southampton – a broadly similar hospital setting but with a slightly increased age profile and less ethnic diversity.

## Data sources

A clinical dataset for each cohort capturing frailty in hospitalised older people was linked to Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) and Office for National Statistics death registrations by NHS Digital to allow follow-up over two years. The first covered 674 patients (57.4% female) aged >=70 years who were discharged within 72 hours of attending large teaching hospitals in Leicester and Nottingham between January 2009 and November 2010; these patients were a subset of a cohort recruited for the Acute Medical Outcomes Study(11). The second dataset contained 246 female patients aged >= 70 years admitted for in-patient care in Medicine for Older People wards in Southampton between November 2009 and February 2012(12); recruited for a study on nutritional intervention in hospital. These datasets were used for the ‘ambulatory’ and ‘in-patient’ populations respectively. Both cohorts were carefully phenotyped for frailty according to different assessment scales using items collected by trained research assistants including height, weight, grip strength and the geriatric depression scale.

## Frailty characterisation

### As frailty assessment tools perform differently depending upon the population and setting(13), we tested four commonly used frailty tools validated in acute care settings: Fried(14), Rothman(15), Rockwood(16) and the Hospital Frailty Risk Score(17). The method used to calculate the clinical frailty measures (Fried, Rothman, Rockwood) for the ambulatory care patients has been described elsewhere(10). In this study, the Fried score is presented as a two (rather than three) category scale due to small subgroup sizes in the acute in-patient data, with those classified as ‘robust’ or ‘pre-frail’ grouped into a single category.

Full details of how the Fried and Rothman frailty measures were constructed for the acute in-patient data are presented in the appendix. Mobility and physical activity measures were adapted from data collected in the original study. Mobility was assessed by ability to walk independently according to the Barthel Activities of Daily Living Questionnaire(18), and physical activity was assessed by ability to transfer independently. The Hospital Frailty Risk Score (HFRS) was also constructed for the two cohorts. This score is based on ICD-10 diagnoses coded in an individual’s hospital admissions over the previous two years (including the index admission). Its development and construction has been described in detail elsewhere(17). Individuals were classified as ‘frail’ if they had HFRS > 5.

Missing data items prevented the calculation of clinical frailty scales for some individuals in both cohorts. Information on the inclusion and exclusion of participants is presented in the appendix. The main data item missing in the ambulatory cohort was Body Mass Index. In the in-patient cohort, grip strength measurements and the Geriatric Depression Scale were missing as only a subgroup of participants in the original study were included in the detailed frailty measurements.

## Outcome Measures

Two-year survival time was calculated as the number of whole days between the admission date on recruitment and the date of death. Where date of death was missing or was after the two-year follow up period, then full-study survival time (730 days) was recorded.

In contrast to many previous studies, we used bed-days as a measure of hospital use (rather than number of emergency admissions). This gives a better overall indication of time spent in hospital. Bed-days were calculated as the number of whole days between the admission and discharge dates. The day of admission was included to give those admitted and discharged on the same day a count of one day. Bed-days from all admissions within the two-year period were summed to give a total figure for each individual. If the discharge for an admission occurred after the follow-up period, then only the days spent in hospital within the two years were included.

## Statistical Analysis

Cox’s proportional hazards regression models were used to quantify the relationship between frailty and survival time. An overall summary of hospital use during follow-up compared mean emergency department attendances, organised outpatient appointments, and elective and non-elective admissions. Differences in descriptive characteristics and summary hospital use were tested with Kruskal-Wallis (means) as the data were non-normal, or Pearson Chi-Square (percentages). Total bed-days were modelled using negative binomial regression, as the data were over dispersed. Two versions of this model were produced; the first did not take into account differing survival times and the second included survival time as an offset term.

The models were adjusted for age and sex in the ambulatory care cohort and just age for the in-patient cohort, as all participants were female. A sensitivity analysis was conducted with the female patients from the ambulatory cohort to establish the generalisability of the in-patient cohort results.

Models were also adjusted for Charlson Comorbidity Index and number of past admissions, but as the results were similar in terms of effect size and statistical significance these data are not presented(19).

All analyses were conducted using SAS version 9.4.

# Results

## Baseline Characteristics

As might be expected, the ambulatory cohort was younger, had lower previous hospital use, Charlson Comorbidity Index and frailty measures than the in-patient cohort (Table 1). Dependent on the scale used, 23-41% of the ambulatory cohort and 48-80% of the in-patient cohort were identified as frail.

## Survival

A smaller proportion of the in-patient cohort (57%) survived the two-year follow-up period compared to the ambulatory cohort (78%). Dependent on the measure used, 32-37% of individuals classified as frail in the ambulatory cohort died during follow-up compared to 42-53% in the in-patient cohort (Table 2). Frail patients in the ambulatory cohort (classified by any scale) were around twice as likely to die within two years compared to the non-frail, even after adjustment for age and sex (HR Rockwood 2.3 [1.5,3.4], Fried 2.0 [1.3,3.0]). There was less effect when frailty in the in-patient cohort was classified by the Rothman measure (HR 1.6 [1.0,2.6]).

## Hospital Use

Frail patients in the ambulatory cohort were more likely to have emergency department attendances (Rothman, Rockwood, HFRS) and emergency admissions (all) and less likely to have elective admissions (Rothman, Rockwood, HFRS) (Table 3). In the in-patient cohort there was little evidence of differing hospital use by frailty, with the exception of outpatient attendances where frail individuals had fewer on average. After adjustment, individuals classified as frail in the ambulatory cohort had between 1.5 and 2.1 times more bed-days than those classified as non-frail, depending on the scale used (Table 4). In contrast, there was no significant difference in the amount of bed-days between the frail and non-frail groups for the in-patient cohort.

When hospital use was assessed as a percentage of survival time there was some evidence of higher hospital use for those in the in-patient cohort classified as frail by Rothman (RR 1.4 [1.0,1.9] and HFRS (RR 1.7 [1.3,2.2]). This suggests that the shorter survival times among frail people in this cohort are restricting the number of bed-days that can be accumulated relative to the longer survival times of the non-frail (Appendix).

# Discussion

## Summary

Frailty is associated with increased two-year mortality in patients discharged from hospital after both short ambulatory (<72 hours) and longer in-patient admissions. Our analysis demonstrates that frail individuals are at high risk of poor outcomes after hospital discharge and suggests that current services do not adequately meet their needs.

## Strengths and limitations

Whereas previous studies have used short follow-up periods or relied on self-reported outcomes(20–22), this study provides longer term data (two year follow-up) after hospital admission. Our analyses used ‘bed-days’ (rather than number of readmissions) to measure subsequent resource use. This is important as people with frailty typically have longer hospital admissions(23,24) and therefore the number of re-admissions only provides a partial indicator of subsequent resource use.

The cohorts were recruited in different hospitals and regional or hospital level differences are possible. Caution is therefore needed in making inter-cohort comparisons. The clinical datasets were designed for different studies so available variables from which to calculate frailty scores differed. There were missing data in some variables required to calculate frailty scores, so some patients had to be excluded. Despite this, those included for each scale had similar characteristics such as age and gender, and frailty was identified in similar proportions. The applicability of the scales for the in-patient cohort emerged as an issue during the study: those classified by Fried were mainly identified as frail and the cohort spent a lot of time in hospital including during the index admission, which directly affects the number of diagnoses recorded for the HFRS. This means that there is little differentiation in outcomes between the frail and non-frail for these scales.

Institutionalisation is an important outcome for older people and while we had data available at baseline for both cohorts, the numbers were too small to present. There was no long-term follow-up data on institutionalisation for either cohort over the study period. Overall, the in-patient cohort were a small sample and almost 50% of those identified as frail by any of the scales died in the two year follow up. Accounting for survival time increased the differentiation in hospital use between frail and non-frail particularly for the clinical frailty scales. As well as being a relatively small sample, the in-patient group was also all female which limits the generalisability of the findings from this cohort. A sensitivity analysis was conducted using female patient in the ambulatory cohort, which showed that many of the main findings from the mixed cohort remained (Appendix).

Recruitment took place some years ago, but we do not believe that this invalidates the main findings or messages of this study.

## Comparison with existing literature

Our data demonstrates poor outcomes and subsequent increased resource use even after brief (<72 hours) hospital admissions. Direct comparisons with the few previous studies that have reported mortality outcomes are difficult, as most acute hospital-based studies only look at short-term mortality (30 - 90 days). However, the two-year mortality rates of 32-53% for frail older people presented here are consistent with other studies which report in-patient mortality rates of 11-33% for older people with Clinical Frailty Scale scores of 7-9 (severely frail)(24–26). This study adds to a growing body of evidence relating to the value of frailty as a predictor of mortality risk across a range of populations and settings(23,27–32).

## Implications for research and practice

There are compelling reasons to avoid unnecessary hospitalisation in older people, including the risks of deconditioning and iatrogenic harm(8). However, our data demonstrates poor outcomes even amongst frail older people discharged from hospital after brief (<72 hours) stays, suggesting that early discharge is not (on its own) sufficient to meet the needs of these patients. Indeed, there is a danger that the current focus on ‘admission avoidance’ places too much emphasis on relieving service pressures and risks constructing frail older people as burdensome and problematic. A more positive and person-centred definition of what services are trying to achieve is perhaps needed.

Most hospital admissions in frail older people relate to actual or impending ‘frailty crises’ (e.g. sudden loss of mobility, delirium or falls). With respect to frailty crises, services can be divided into those which seek to *prevent* (e.g. proactive care), *offer increased support during* (e.g. intensive community support) or *promote recovery following* frailty crises (e.g. community rehabilitation).

‘Primary prevention’ of frailty crises is challenging because evolving frailty often goes unrecognised until a crisis occurs, making it difficult to target resource intensive community services in an impactful way. By contrast, individuals who have had a frailty crisis are easily identifiable and, with increasing evidence of poor outcomes, are likely to benefit from services such as proactive care, enhanced community support and advance care planning(33–35). This could define a ‘secondary prevention’ approach to frailty crises (targeting those identified as frail who have already been admitted to hospital or received intensive community support).

This would require a systematic and inter-organisational approach to identifying patients with frailty on hospital discharge and providing an individually tailored response. Although challenging, this is increasingly plausible with the greater (albeit still imperfect) interoperability of health care informatics and the development of Accountable Care Organisations that are responsible for managing the whole patient journey. Examples of evidence based interventions that might be used for secondary prevention include hospital at home(33), advance care planning(34) and Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment (CGA (although there is a need for CGA to be tailored to community settings(35)).

Further research is required to define and evaluate interventions which might be used as part of a ‘secondary prevention’ approach and to optimise the performance of frailty assessment tools that could be used to identify patients. Furthermore, implementation would require a ‘joined up’ approach across primary, community and acute care services so that assessments and interventions take place at the most appropriate stage of the patient journey.

# Additional Information

## Ethical Approval

## Ethical approval was provided by Essex NRES Committee (East of England), reference: 15/EE/024.

## Funding

## This research was funded by the NIHR HS&DR project 12/5003 (acute hospital care for frail older people). The funder had no role in data collection, analysis, interpretation, writing of the manuscript and the decision to submit.

## The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health.

## HCR is supported by the NIHR CLAHRC Wessex and the NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre. CW is funded by an NIHR Clinical Lectureship in Primary Care. JVO is funded by an NIHR Academic Clinical Fellowship.

## Acknowledgements

This work uses data provided by patients and collected by the NHS as part of their care and support. Read more on our website <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/about/corporate-policies#information-security-and-data>.

Hospital Episode Statistics data (year range 2006/07–2013/14) Copyright © (2018), NHS Digital. Re-used with the permission of NHS Digital. All rights reserved.

Office for National Statistics (ONS) data (year range 2008/09–2013/14) Copyright © (2018), Office for National Statistics. Re-used with the permission of the Office for National Statistics. All rights reserved. Declaration: Those who carried out the original collection and analysis of the data bear no responsibility for their further analysis or interpretation.

# References

1. Looman WM, Fabbricotti IN, Blom JW, Jansen APD, Lutomski JE, Metzelthin SF, et al. The frail older person does not exist: development of frailty profiles with latent class analysis. BMC Geriatr. 2018 04;18(1):84.

2. Clegg A, Young J, Iliffe S, Rikkert MO, Rockwood K. Frailty in elderly people. Lancet Lond Engl. 2013 Mar 2;381(9868):752–62.

3. Clegg A, Bates C, Young J, Ryan R, Nichols L, Ann Teale E, et al. Development and validation of an electronic frailty index using routine primary care electronic health record data. Age Ageing. 2016;45(3):353–60.

4. Lansbury LN, Roberts HC, Clift E, Herklots A, Robinson N, Sayer AA. Use of the electronic Frailty Index to identify vulnerable patients: a pilot study in primary care. Br J Gen Pract J R Coll Gen Pract. 2017 Nov;67(664):e751–6.

5. Roland M, Abel G. Reducing emergency admissions: are we on the right track? BMJ. 2012 Sep 18;345:e6017.

6. Percival F, Day N, Lambourne A, Ball D, Ward D. An Evaluation of Concultant Input into Acute Medical Admissions management in England, Wales and Northern Ireland [Internet]. Royal College of Physicians; 2010 [cited 2019 Feb 19]. Available from: https://i.telegraph.co.uk/multimedia/archive/01775/Royal\_College\_of\_P\_1775508a.pdf

7. Scott I, Vaughan L, Bell D. Effectiveness of acute medical units in hospitals: a systematic review. Int J Qual Health Care J Int Soc Qual Health Care. 2009 Dec;21(6):397–407.

8. Krumholz HM. Post-hospital syndrome--an acquired, transient condition of generalized risk. N Engl J Med. 2013 Jan 10;368(2):100–2.

9. Edmans J, Bradshaw L, Gladman JRF, Franklin M, Berdunov V, Elliott R, et al. The Identification of Seniors at Risk (ISAR) score to predict clinical outcomes and health service costs in older people discharged from UK acute medical units. Age Ageing. 2013 Nov;42(6):747–53.

10. Wou F, Gladman JRF, Bradshaw L, Franklin M, Edmans J, Conroy SP. The predictive properties of frailty-rating scales in the acute medical unit. Age Ageing. 2013 Nov;42(6):776–81.

11. Gladman J, Harwood R, Conroy S, Logan P, Elliott R, Jones R, et al. Medical Crises in Older People: cohort study of older people attending acute medical units, developmental work and randomised controlled trial of a specialist geriatric medical intervention for high-risk older people; cohort study of older people with mental health problems admitted to hospital, developmental work and randomised controlled trial of a specialist medical and mental health unit for general hospital patients with delirium and dementia; and cohort study of residents of care homes and interview study of health-care provision to residents of care homes [Internet]. Southampton (UK): NIHR Journals Library; 2015 [cited 2019 Feb 19]. (Programme Grants for Applied Research). Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK293738/

12. Roberts HC, Pilgrim AL, Elia M, Jackson AA, Cooper C, Sayer AA, et al. Southampton Mealtime Assistance Study: design and methods. BMC Geriatr. 2013 Jan 7;13:5.

13. Aguayo GA, Donneau A-F, Vaillant MT, Schritz A, Franco OH, Stranges S, et al. Agreement Between 35 Published Frailty Scores in the General Population. Am J Epidemiol. 2017 Aug 15;186(4):420–34.

14. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, Newman AB, Hirsch C, Gottdiener J, et al. Frailty in older adults: evidence for a phenotype. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2001 Mar;56(3):M146-156.

15. Rothman MD, Leo-Summers L, Gill TM. Prognostic significance of potential frailty criteria. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2008 Dec;56(12):2211–6.

16. Rockwood K, Song X, MacKnight C, Bergman H, Hogan DB, McDowell I, et al. A global clinical measure of fitness and frailty in elderly people. CMAJ Can Med Assoc J J Assoc Medicale Can. 2005 Aug 30;173(5):489–95.

17. Gilbert T, Neuburger J, Kraindler J, Keeble E, Smith P, Ariti C, et al. Development and validation of a Hospital Frailty Risk Score focusing on older people in acute care settings using electronic hospital records: an observational study. Lancet Lond Engl. 2018 05;391(10132):1775–82.

18. Wade DT, Collin C. The Barthel ADL Index: a standard measure of physical disability? Int Disabil Stud. 1988;10(2):64–7.

19. Quan H, Li B, Couris CM, Fushimi K, Graham P, Hider P, et al. Updating and validating the Charlson comorbidity index and score for risk adjustment in hospital discharge abstracts using data from 6 countries. Am J Epidemiol. 2011 Mar 15;173(6):676–82.

20. Avila-Funes JA, Helmer C, Amieva H, Barberger-Gateau P, Le Goff M, Ritchie K, et al. Frailty among community-dwelling elderly people in France: the three-city study. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2008 Oct;63(10):1089–96.

21. Jung H-W, Kim S-W, Ahn S, Lim J-Y, Han J-W, Kim T-H, et al. Prevalence and outcomes of frailty in Korean elderly population: comparisons of a multidimensional frailty index with two phenotype models. PloS One. 2014;9(2):e87958.

22. Coelho T, Paúl C, Gobbens RJJ, Fernandes L. Multidimensional Frailty and Pain in Community Dwelling Elderly. Pain Med Malden Mass. 2017 01;18(4):693–701.

23. Hubbard RE, Peel NM, Samanta M, Gray LC, Mitnitski A, Rockwood K. Frailty status at admission to hospital predicts multiple adverse outcomes. Age Ageing. 2017 01;46(5):801–6.

24. Wallis SJ, Wall J, Biram RWS, Romero-Ortuno R. Association of the clinical frailty scale with hospital outcomes. QJM Mon J Assoc Physicians. 2015 Dec;108(12):943–9.

25. Romero-Ortuno R, Wallis S, Biram R, Keevil V. Clinical frailty adds to acute illness severity in predicting mortality in hospitalized older adults: An observational study. Eur J Intern Med. 2016 Nov;35:24–34.

26. Conroy S, Dowsing T. The ability of frailty to predict outcomes in older people attending an acute medical unit. Acute Med. 2013;12(2):74–6.

27. Stow D, Matthews FE, Hanratty B. Frailty trajectories to identify end of life: a longitudinal population-based study. BMC Med. 2018 21;16(1):171.

28. Mousa A, Savva GM, Mitnitski A, Rockwood K, Jagger C, Brayne C, et al. Is frailty a stable predictor of mortality across time? Evidence from the Cognitive Function and Ageing Studies. Age Ageing. 2018 Sep 1;47(5):721–7.

29. Cardona M, Lewis ET, Kristensen MR, Skjøt-Arkil H, Ekmann AA, Nygaard HH, et al. Predictive validity of the CriSTAL tool for short-term mortality in older people presenting at Emergency Departments: a prospective study. Eur Geriatr Med. 2018;9(6):891–901.

30. Kodama A, Koyama A, Sugimoto M, Niimi K, Banno H, Komori K. Association Between Preoperative Frailty and Mortality in Patients With Critical Limb Ischemia Following Infrainguinal Bypass Surgery　- Usefulness of the Barthel Index. Circ J Off J Jpn Circ Soc. 2017 25;82(1):267–74.

31. Dani M, Owen LH, Jackson TA, Rockwood K, Sampson EL, Davis D. Delirium, Frailty, and Mortality: Interactions in a Prospective Study of Hospitalized Older People. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2018 Mar 2;73(3):415–8.

32. Nixon AC, Bampouras TM, Pendleton N, Woywodt A, Mitra S, Dhaygude A. Frailty and chronic kidney disease: current evidence and continuing uncertainties. Clin Kidney J. 2018 Apr;11(2):236–45.

33. Shepperd S, Doll H, Broad J, Gladman J, Iliffe S, Langhorne P, et al. Early discharge hospital at home. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2009 Jan 21;(1):CD000356.

34. Weathers E, O’Caoimh R, Cornally N, Fitzgerald C, Kearns T, Coffey A, et al. Advance care planning: A systematic review of randomised controlled trials conducted with older adults. Maturitas. 2016 Sep;91:101–9.

35. Ellis G, Gardner M, Tsiachristas A, Langhorne P, Burke O, Harwood RH, et al. Comprehensive geriatric assessment for older adults admitted to hospital. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017 12;9:CD006211.

# Tables

Table 1 Descriptive characteristics of ambulatory and acute inpatient cohorts included in analysis with differences tested using Kruskal-Wallis (Means) or Pearson Chi-Square (Percentages)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristic | Ambulatory Cohort | In-patient cohort | P value for difference |
| Location | Leicester/ Nottingham | Southampton | - |
| Recruitment date range | 21/01/2009-26/11/2010 | 29/11/2009-19/01/2012 | - |
| Number of people | 674 | 246 | - |
| Female | 57.4 % | 100.0 % | <0.001 |
| Age | 80.2 (6.7) | 85.9 (4.7) | <0.001 |
| Index admission length of stay | 1.0 (0.7) | 20.5 (18.0) | <0.001 |
| Hospital admissions‡ | 3.5 (4.1) | 4.1 (7.0) | 0.04 |
| Charlson Comorbidity Index 3+‡: | 31.9 % | 43.1 % | 0.002 |
| Frail (sample size†), by measure: |  |  | - |
| Fried | 23.7 % (494) | 80.0 % (140) | - |
| Rothman | 23.2 % (503) | 48.4 % (192) | - |
| Rockwood | 30.5 % (489) | - | - |
| HFRS | 40.2 % (674) | 67.1 % (246) | - |

Figures are % for binary variables and means with standard deviation for continuous variables.

‡Based on past two years and including present admission

†Sample sizes vary as not all individuals had the data items needed to calculated the relevant frailty measure

Table 2 Two-Year survival by frailty status in the two cohorts

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Frailty Scale (sample size) | | Mortality Percentage [95% CI] | | | | Hazard Ratios [95% CI] | | | | | |
| Non-Frail | | Frail | | Unadjusted | | Adjusted for age and sex† | | |
|  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| *Ambulatory Cohort* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fried (494) | | 14.9 %  [11.2,18.5] | | 34.2 %  [25.5,42.9] | | 2.6\*\*  [1.7,3.8] | | 2.0\*  [1.3,3.0] | | |
| Rothman (503) | | 14.3 %  [10.7,17.8] | | 36.8 %  [27.9,45.6] | | 2.9\*\*  [2.0,4.4] | | 2.3\*\*  [1.5,3.4] | | |
| Rockwood (489) | | 13.5 %  [9.9,17.2] | | 32.2 %  [24.6,38.1] | | 2.6\*\*  [1.7,3.9] | | 2.3\*\*  [1.5,3.4] | | |
| HFRS (674) | | 14.4 %  [11.0,17.8] | | 32.5 %  [26.9,38.1] | | 2.5\*\*  [1.8,3.4] | | 2.1\*\*  [1.5,3.0] | | |
| *In-patient cohort* | | | | | | | | | |
| Fried (140) | | 21.4 %  [5.2,37.6] | | 46.4 %  [37.0,55.8] | | 2.6\*  [1.1,6.1] | | 2.3  [1.0,5.4] | | |
| Rothman (192) | | 31.3 %  [22.0,54.2] | | 52.7 %  [34.8,50.0] | | 2.0\*  [1.3,3.1] | | 1.6\*  [1.0,2.6] | | |
| HFRS (246) | | 43.2 %  [32.1,54.2] | | 42.4 %  [34.8,50.0] | | 1.0  [0.7,1.6] | | 1.1  [0.7,1.6] | | |

95% CI = 95% Confidence Interval

\*Statistically significant at 5% level (p<0.05)

\*\*Statistically significant at 0.1% level (p<0.001)

†Southampton analysis adjusted for age only (women-only cohort)

Table 3 Hospital use over two-year follow up period by frailty scale and cohort with differences tested using Kruskal-Wallis

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Frailty Scale | Ambulatory Cohort | | | | In-patient cohort | | | | | | | | |
| Non- Frail | Frail | P value for difference | | Non- Frail | | | Frail | | | P value for difference | | |
|  |  |  | |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |
| Mean Number of Emergency Department (ED) Attendances Per Person (SD) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fried | 1.7 (2.2) | 2.4 (3.0) | 0.06 | | 3.5 (4.1) | | | 1.8 (2.1) | | | 0.07 | | |
| Rothman | 1.6 (2.2) | 2.4 (2.9) | 0.007 | | 2.7 (3.2) | | | 1.7 (2.2) | | | 0.02 | | |
| Rockwood | 1.5 (2.0) | 2.5 (2.9) | <0.001 | | - | | | - | | |  | | |
| HFRS | 1.3 (1.8) | 2.5 (2.8) | <0.001 | | 2.0 (2.8) | | | 2.1 (2.5) | | | 0.39 | | |
| Mean Number of Non-Elective Admissions Per Person (SD) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fried | 1.5 (2.1) | 2.2 (2.7) | 0.02 | | 2.9 (2.7) | | | 1.9 (2.1) | | | 0.08 | | |
| Rothman | 1.5 (2.1) | 2.2 (2.6) | <0.001 | | 2.5 (2.5) | | | 1.8 (2.0) | | | 0.08 | | |
| Rockwood | 1.3 (1.9) | 2.5 (2.6) | <0.001 | | - | | | - | | |  | | |
| HFRS | 1.2 (1.6) | 2.4 (2.6) | <0.001 | | 2.0 (2.3) | | | 2.2 (2.2) | | | 0.32 | | |
| Mean Number of Elective Admissions Per Person (SD) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fried | 1.0 (1.8) | 1.0 (2.0) | 0.52 | | 1.5 (2.2) | | | 0.8 (1.4) | | | 0.20 | | |
| Rothman | 1.1 (1.9) | 0.8 (1.7) | 0.02 | | 1.1 (1.8) | | | 0.7 (1.2) | | | 0.18 | | |
| Rockwood | 1.1 (2.0) | 0.8 (1.6) | 0.04 | | - | | | - | | |  | | |
| HFRS | 1.1 (1.9) | 0.8 (1.7) | 0.02 | | 0.8 (1.3) | | | 1.0 (1.6) | | | 0.2203 | | |
| Mean Number of Outpatient Appointments Per Person (SD) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fried | 11.9 (10.6) | 12.4 (12.6) | 0.94 | | 10.5 (8.2) | | | 5.7 (6.7) | | | 0.002 | | |
| Rothman | 12.2 (10.8) | 11.2 (11.9) | 0.11 | | 8.3 (8.1) | | | 4.7 (6.2) | | | <0.001 | | |
| Rockwood | 11.7 (10.4) | 12.7 (12.5) | 0.97 | | - | | | - | | |  | | |
| HFRS | 11.3 (10.1) | 12.4 (12.4) | 0.76 | | 7.6 (8.6) | | | 6.0 (6.5) | | | 0.35 | | |


SD = Standard Deviation

# Appendix


Construction of Fried and Rothman Items for the in-patient cohort

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Details** | **Construction** |
| **Fried** | | |
| **Nutritional status** | Difference between current weight to usual weight | "1" or "2" - wtscore0 = 1 current weight is lower than usual weight |
| **Strength** | Grip strength, cut offs are Fried | Max grip strength from all left and right hand measures. Below Fried cut offs = 1. Female BMI <=23 cut off <= 17, 23.1-26 cut off <= 17.3, 26.1-29 cut off <= 18, 29+ cut off <= 21. |
| **Energy** | Do you feel full of energy? "no" | "0" - GDS13 |
| **Mobility** | Can't walk independently for any distance according to Barthel Activities of daily living | 0,1,8 - walk0 = 1 |
| **Physical activity** | Can't transfer independently according to Barthel activities of daily living | 0,1,3,8 - trans0 = 1 |
| **Rothman** | | |
| **Nutritional status** | Difference between current weight to usual weight | "1" or "2" - wtscore0 = 1 current weight is lower than usual weight |
| **Mobility** | Can't walk independently for any distance according to Barthel Activities of daily living | 0, 1, 8 - walk0 = 1 |
| **Physical activity** | Can't transfer independently according to Barthel activities of daily living | 0, 1, 3, 8 - trans0 = 1 |
| **Cognition** | MMSE <24/30 indicating cognitive impairment | Sum MMSE01-11, total < 24 = 1 |

*Inclusion criteria for ambulatory cohort*

**

*Inclusion criteria for in-patient cohort*



Intensity of hospital use over remaining lifetime

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Frailty Scale (sample size) | | Mean number of days spent in hospital as percentage of remaining days alive [95% CI] | | | | Rate Ratios (standard error) for rate of use over remaining days alive | | | |
| Non-Frail | | Frail | | Unadjusted | | Adjusted for age and sex† | |
|  |  | |  | |  | |  | | |
| *Ambulatory Cohort* | | | | | | | | | |
| Fried (494) | | 4.6 %  [3.5,5.6] | | 8.3 %  [5.4,11.1] | | 1.8\*\*  [1.3,2.4] | | 1.5\*  [1.1,2.0] | |
| Rothman (503) | | 4.3 %  [3.3,5.3] | | 9.2 %  [6.3,12.2] | | 2.1\*\*  [1.6,2.8] | | 1.8\*\*  [1.4,2.4] | |
| Rockwood (489) | | 4.5 %  [3.2,5.8] | | 7.4 %  [5.6,9.3] | | 2.0\*\*  [1.5,2.6] | | 1.8\*\*  [1.4,2.3] | |
| HFRS (674) | | 4.5 %  [3.4,5.6] | | 8.3 %  [6.6,10.0] | | 2.0\*\*  [1.6,2.4] | | 1.8\*\*  [1.4,2.2] | |
| *In-patient Cohort* | | | | | | | | | |
| Fried (140) | | 12.2 %  [6.5,17.0] | | 20.0 %  [15.1,24.8] | | 1.6\*\*  [1.0,2.4] | | 1.5  [1.0,2.3] | |
| Rothman (192) | | 16.1 %  [11.4,20.8] | | 23.3 %  [17.2,29.4] | | 1.5\*  [1.1,2.0] | | 1.4\*  [1.0,1.9] | |
| HFRS (246) | | 13.3 %  [9.7,17.0] | | 23.4 %  [18.9,28.0] | | 1.7\*\*  [1.3,2.3] | | 1.7\*\*  [1.3,2.2] | |
| \*Statistically significant at 5% level (p<0.05)  \*\*Statistically significant at 0.1% level (p<0.001)  †Southampton analysis adjusted for age only (women-only cohort | | | | | | | | |

Two-Year survival by frailty status in the two cohorts (female only)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Frailty Scale (sample size) | | Mortality Percentage [95% CI] | | | | Hazard Ratios [95% CI] | | | | | |
| Non-Frail | | Frail | | Unadjusted | | Adjusted for age | | |
|  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| *Ambulatory Cohort* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fried (282) | | 14.5 %  [9.7,19.3] | | 26.2 %  [15.2, 37.1] | | 1.9\*  1.0,3.4] | | 1.4  [0.8,2.7] | | |
| Rothman (278) | | 13.9 %  [9.2, 18.6] | | 29.0 %  [18.0,40.0] | | 2.2\*  [1.3,3.9] | | 2.2\*  [1.2,3.9] | | |
| Rockwood (271) | | 11.7 %  [6.9,16.4] | | 27.5 %  [18.1,36.8] | | 2.5\*  [1.4,4.5] | | 2.2\*  [1.2,3.9] | | |
| HFRS (387) | | 14.4 %  [9.8,19.1] | | 29.1 %  [22.1,36.1] | | 2.1\*\*  [1.4,3.3] | | 1.5  [1.0,2.4] | | |
| *In-patient Cohort* | | | | | | | | | |
| Fried (140) | | 21.4 %  [5.2,37.6] | | 46.4 %  [37.0,55.8] | | 2.6\*  [1.1,6.1] | | 2.3  [1.0,5.4] | | |
| Rothman (192) | | 31.3 %  [22.0,54.2] | | 52.7 %  [34.8,50.0] | | 2.0\*  [1.3,3.1] | | 1.6\*  [1.0,2.6] | | |
| HFRS (246) | | 43.2 %  [32.1,54.2] | | 42.4 %  [34.8,50.0] | | 1.0  [0.7,1.6] | | 1.1  [0.7,1.6] | | |
| 95% CI = 95% Confidence Interval  \*Statistically significant at 5% level (p<0.05)  \*\*Statistically significant at 0.1% level (p<0.001) | | | | | | | | | | |

*Intensity of hospital use over two years measured in bed days (female only)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Frailty Scale (sample size) | | Mean bed days per person (SD) | | | | Rate Ratios for rate of use over two year period [95% CI] | | |
| Non-Frail | | Frail | | Unadjusted | | Adjusted for age and sex |
|  |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| *Ambulatory Cohort* | | | | | | | | |
| Fried (282) | | 17.5 (27.0) | | 26.8 (40.0) | | 1.7\*  [1.2,2.3] | | 1.4  [1.0,1.9] |
| Rothman (278) | | 17.2 (28.4) | | 27.3 (36.0) | | 1.7\*  [1.2,2.3] | | 1.4\*  [1.0,1.9] |
| Rockwood (271) | | 15.2 (26.4) | | 28.1 (36.6) | | 1.9\*\*  [1.4,2.6] | | 1.8\*\*  [1.4,2.4] |
| HFRS (387) | | 14.6 (25.1) | | 29.0 (33.6) | | 2.0\*\*  [1.6,2.6] | | 1.8\*\*  [1.5,2.3] |
| *In-patient Cohort* | | | | | | | | |
| Fried (140) | | 64.3 (56.6) | | 55.8 (39.4) | | 0.9  [0.6,1.2] | | 0.9  [0.6,1.2] |
| Rothman (192) | | 57.2 (50.7) | | 58.2 (35.8) | | 1.0  [0.8,1.3] | | 1.0  [0.8,1.3] |
| HFRS (246) | | 53.1 (47.2) | | 65.2 (45.3) | | 1.2\*  [1.0,1.5] | | 1.2  [1.0,1.5] |
| SD = Standard Deviation  \*Statistically significant at 5% level (p<0.05)  \*\*Statistically significant at 0.1% level (p<0.001) | | | | | | | | |