Geriatric Syndromes and Atrial Fibrillation: Prevalence and Association with Anticoagulant use in a National Cohort of Older Americans

Sachin J. Shah, MD, MPH (1); Margaret C. Fang, MD, MPH (1); Sun Y. Jeon, MS, PhD (2); Steven E. Gregorich, PhD (3); Kenneth E. Covinsky, MD, MPH (2)

1. Division of Hospital Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA
2. Division of Geriatrics, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA
3. Division of General Internal Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

Corresponding Author:
Sachin J Shah, MD, MPH
533 Parnassus Avenue, UC 130
San Francisco, CA 94143
sachin.shah@ucsf.edu
Phone 415-862-8616

Main text word count: 2471

Abstract word count 289

Abstract

Background: While guidelines recommend focusing primarily on stroke risk to recommend anticoagulants in atrial fibrillation (AF), physicians report that geriatric syndromes (e.g., falls, disability) are important when considering anticoagulants. Little is known about the prevalence of geriatric syndromes in older adults with AF or the association with anticoagulant use.

Methods: We performed a cross-sectional analysis of the 2014 Health and Retirement Study, a nationally representative study of older Americans. Participants were asked questions to assess domains of aging, including function, cognition, and medical conditions. We included participants ≥65 years with two years of continuous Medicare enrollment who met AF diagnosis criteria by claims codes. We examined five geriatric syndromes: one or more falls within the last two years, receiving help with activities of daily living (ADL) or instrumental activities of daily living (IADL), experienced incontinence, and cognitive impairment. We determined the prevalence of geriatric syndromes and their association with anticoagulant use adjusting for ischemic stroke risk (i.e., CHA2DS2-VASc score).

Results: In this study of 779 participants with AF (median age 80 years, median CHA2DS2-VASc score 4), 82% had ≥1 geriatric syndrome. Geriatric syndromes were common: 49% reported falls, 38% had ADL impairments, 42% had IADL impairment, 37% had cognitive impairments, and 43% reported incontinence. Overall, 65% reported anticoagulant use; guidelines recommend anticoagulant use for 97% of participants. Anticoagulant use rate decreased for each additional geriatric syndrome (average marginal effect -3.7%; 95% CI -1.4% to -5.9%). Lower rates of anticoagulant use were reported in participants with ADL dependency, IADL dependency, and dementia.

Conclusion: Most older adults with AF had at least one geriatric syndrome, and geriatric syndromes were associated with reduced anticoagulant use. The high prevalence of geriatric syndromes may explain the lower than expected anticoagulant use in older adults.

Introduction

The burden of atrial fibrillation (AF) is concentrated in older adults – 80% of adults with AF are 65 and older, many with comorbid conditions that affect functioning and quality of life.[1,2] While clinical guidelines recommend clinicians focus primarily on stroke risk when considering anticoagulants for thromboprophylaxis, physicians report that geriatric syndromes are important when considering anticoagulants for older adults.[3–8]

Geriatric syndromes result from accumulated impairments in multiple domains and are common among older adults.[9–11] Geriatric syndromes have a substantial impact on the wellbeing of older adults; they are dominant determinants of death, disability, and quality of life.[12,13] Examples of geriatric syndromes include falls, impairments in activities of daily living (ADLs) and instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs), cognitive impairment, and incontinence. Given their significance, geriatric syndromes are increasingly acknowledged and incorporated into clinical guidelines that inform both common and complex clinical decisions ranging from diabetes management to cancer treatment to cardiac ICU care.[14–16]

In the context of anticoagulant use, geriatric syndromes can both limit the therapeutic benefit and increase patients' and caregivers' workload. Geriatric syndromes may magnify harm by both increasing the risk of anticoagulant-associated hemorrhage and limiting patient's ability to recover from major bleeding. This risk of harm has been most clearly and consistently demonstrated in patients who use anticoagulant and have a history of falls.[17,18] Additionally, geriatric syndromes reduce life expectancy, thereby limiting the potential benefit of anticoagulant.[12,19] Further, anticoagulant use can trigger additional clinic visits, lab testing, medication interactions, dietary restrictions, so-called nuisance bleeding, and out-of-pocket expenses—each of which may be particularly burdensome to frail older adults.

Despite their importance to the treatment context, little is known about the prevalence of geriatric syndromes in older adults with AF. Geriatric characteristics were not collected during the randomized trials that inform current practice, and these features are rarely ascertained in prospective cohort studies. In this study, we describe the prevalence of geriatric syndromes among participants with AF in a nationally representative cohort of older Americans and then estimate the associations between geriatric syndromes and anticoagulant use.

Methods

Design and Cohort

We performed a cross-sectional analysis to examine the prevalence of geriatric syndromes among older adults with AF. We used data from the 2014 wave of the Health and Retirement Study (HRS), a nationally representative, longitudinal study of older Americans.[20] HRS participants are aged 50 and older and interviewed every two years to measure changes in disability, health, and wealth as they transition from work to retirement. HRS interviews are conducted by phone or in person. If a participant is unable to complete an interview because of physical or cognitive impairment, the interview is conducted with a proxy, usually a family member.

To create the study cohort, we included participants who completed the 2014 interview, were 65 years or older at the time of the interview, agreed to Medicare claims linkage, and were continuously enrolled in Medicare fee-for-service (Part A and B) in the 24 months before their 2014 interview (Appendix Figure 1). We included participants who had one inpatient or two outpatient claims for atrial fibrillation (427.31 from the *International Classification of Diseases Ninth revision, Clinical Modification*) in the 24 months before their 2014 interview.[21] The 2014 wave is the most contemporary wave for which claims data are available.

Measures: Sociodemographics and clinical comorbidities

We used HRS interview data to characterize participants' age, gender, race, ethnicity, education, marital status, whether they lived alone, and nursing home residence. Health status was obtained through self-report. We report clinical comorbidities routinely considered in the treatment of patients with AF and those associated with significant morbidity and mortality in older adults. Specifically, we classified participants as having congestive heart failure, hypertension, prior stroke, diabetes mellitus, prior myocardial infarction, angina, lung disease, or cancer (excluding skin cancer), if the participant reported that a physician had ever told them they had that condition. Prior studies have examined the validity of self-reported cardiovascular comorbidities, such as those used in the CHA_2DS_2-VASc score, finding self-reported diagnoses to accurately reflect medical charts and population-level estimates.[22–24] We classified participants as having depressive symptoms if they scored ≥4 on the Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression scale.[25,26]

We calculated ischemic stroke risk for each participant via a CHA_2DS_2-VASc score (congestive heart failure, hypertension, age, diabetes, stroke, vascular disease, and sex).[27] Current U.S. consensus guidelines recommend anticoagulation treatment for patients with CHA_2DS_2-VASc scores of ≥ 2 for men and ≥3 for women.[3]

Measures: Geriatric Syndromes

We evaluated the following geriatric syndromes: falls, impairment in activities of daily living (ADL), impairment in instrumental activities of daily living (IADL), cognitive impairment, and incontinence. We chose these syndromes based on a review of the literature to identify syndromes relevant in the clinical management of atrial fibrillation[5–8] and those associated with death and disability in older adults.[12,28]

Participants were classified as having experienced no falls, noninjurious falls, or injurious falls. Falls were assessed by asking, “Have you fallen down in the last two years?” Those who answered “yes” were then asked, “In that fall (or any of these falls), did you injure yourself seriously enough to need medical treatment?” If they answered “yes,” we classified them as having had an injurious fall, and if “no” to have had only noninjurious falls.

Functional impairment was assessed by inquiring if participants had difficulty with or received help with ADLs (bathing, getting out of bed, dressing, eating, toileting, and walking) and IADLS (shopping for groceries, preparing hot meals, taking medications, making phone calls, managing money). For both ADLs and IADLs, participants were classified in hierarchical and mutually exclusive categories: no impairment (i.e., no difficulty or help), difficulty with one or more activities, dependency (i.e., receiving help with one or more activities).

Cognitive impairment was assessed using the Langa-Weir score that has been validated against neuropsychiatric testing.[29] For non-proxy interviews, the score is based on tasks of memory, working memory, and mental processing speed. For proxy interviews, the Langa-Weir score is based on the proxy’s assessment of the participant's memory, impairments in instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs), and the interviewer’s assessment of cognitive impairment. The Langa-Weir score classifies participants as intact; having cognitive impairment, but not dementia; and having dementia.

Incontinence was assessed by asking, “This might not be easy to talk about, but during the last 12 months, have you lost any amount of urine beyond your control?”

Measures: Anticoagulant use

To determine if they used anticoagulants, participants were asked, “Do you regularly take prescription medications other than aspirin to thin your blood or to prevent blood clots?”. We relied on self-report data because prescription claims are not universally available and do

not necessarily reflect ongoing use. In the subset of HRS participants with 12 months of continuous enrollment in Medicare Part D before their interview date, we performed a sensitivity analysis to examine the concordance of self-reported anticoagulant use with anticoagulant claims. We detail the results of this sensitivity analysis in the Appendix (Appendix Table 2).

Analysis

We estimated the prevalence of baseline sociodemographics, clinical characteristics, and geriatric syndromes having accounted for the complex survey design of the Health and Retirement study (i.e., sampling strata, clusters, and weights). Separate log-binomial models regressed anticoagulant use onto each geriatric syndrome indicator as well as the count of geriatric syndromes. All models adjusted for stroke risk using the CHA_2DS_2-VASc score. From these results, we report the predicted population rates of anticoagulant use and the average marginal effect (AME).[30] We excluded <1% of participants missing data on individual geriatric syndromes or anticoagulant use (Appendix Figure 1). We did not use significance testing to determine which confounders to include in the regression models, consistent with epidemiologic best practices.[31] We report all results with 95% confidence intervals. We performed analyses using SAS 9.4 (Cary, NC) and R 3.4.4 (Vienna, Austria).

Results

Participants

Among the 779 participants, the median age was 80 years, 50% were women, 93% identified as white and 4% as black (Table 1). 9% of interviews were conducted with the aid of a proxy. Cardiovascular comorbidities were common – 76% reported hypertension, 32% reported congestive heart failure, and 25% reported a prior stroke. 45% of participants reported their health as fair or poor.

The median CHA_2DS_2-VASc score in the cohort was 4 (IQR 3, 5). Based on the 2019 AHA/ACC/HRS guidelines, anticoagulation therapy would be recommended for 97% (CI 95-98%) of study participants. Among study participants, 65% (CI 61-70%) reported using anticoagulants.

Geriatric syndromes

Most participants had one or more geriatric syndromes; 18% (CI 14-21%) had no geriatric syndromes (Table 2). Many participants fell in the preceding two years: 29% (CI 25-33%) reported a noninjurious fall, and 20% (CI 17-24%) reported an injurious fall. Functional impairments were common: 15% (CI 13-18%) reported difficulty with ADLs, and 23% (CI 20-27%) reported receiving help with ADLs. Similarly, 14% (CI 12-17%) reported difficulty with IADLs, and 28% (CI 25-31%) reported receiving help with IADLs. Regarding cognition, 23% (CI 19-27%) were classified as cognitively impaired but without dementia, and 14% (CI 11-17%) were classified as having dementia. Finally, 43% (CI 39-47%) of participants reported urinary incontinence.

Geriatric syndromes and use of anticoagulants

Participants with more geriatric syndromes were less likely to report anticoagulant use (Figure 1). For each additional geriatric syndrome, reported anticoagulant use decreased (average marginal effect [AME] -3.7%; CI -5.9% to -1.4%).

Anticoagulant use was significantly associated with some, but not all, geriatric syndromes (Figure 2). ADL dependent participants were less likely to report anticoagulant use compared to those without ADL impairment (predicted population anticoagulant use 61% vs. 70%, respectively; AME -9.1%; CI -17.1% to -1.2%). Similarly, IADL dependent participants were less likely to report anticoagulant use relative to those unimpaired (predicted population

anticoagulant use 60% vs. 69%, respectively; AME -9.0%; CI -16.6% to -1.4%). The largest effect was seen in participants with dementia; participants with dementia were the least likely to report anticoagulant use when compared to those cognitively intact (predicted population anticoagulant use 51% vs. 71%, respectively; AME -20.3%; CI -30.1% to -10.5%). While participants who reported injurious falls and incontinence were also less likely to report anticoagulant use, these differences were not statistically significant (Appendix table 1).

Discussion

In a nationally representative cohort of older adults with atrial fibrillation (AF), we find geriatric syndromes are common and are associated with lower rates of anticoagulant use. Among older adults with AF, 82% had one or more geriatric syndromes—this includes 49% with a fall, 38% with ADL impairment, 42% with IADL impairment, 37% with cognitive impairment, and 43% with incontinence. With each additional geriatric syndrome, the rate of anticoagulant use decreased by 3.7%. We observed variation in the associations between specific geriatric syndromes and anticoagulant use. While clinicians cite falls as a concern when prescribing anticoagulants, we did not find a significant association with anticoagulant use. Among the 1 in 7 participants with dementia, anticoagulation rates were the lowest.

These findings add to a growing literature on the prevalence of geriatric syndromes in older adults with atrial fibrillation and their association with anticoagulant use. Some prior studies examined one specific geriatric syndrome – frailty – often finding lower rates of anticoagulant use.[32,33] Recent studies have examined a broader set of geriatric syndromes. Saczynski et al. found that geriatric syndromes are common among older adults with AF but were not statistically associated with anticoagulant use.[34] While this important study sheds light on the burden of geriatric syndromes, the investigators recruited participants exclusively from cardiology clinics, and therefore, the population may not reflect the experience of typical older

adults with AF. For instance, that study reported 86% anticoagulant use even among frail and cognitively impaired patients. Kapoor et al. examined geriatric syndromes among adults with AF in long-term care facilities.[35] In that population, they found geriatric syndromes were common and associated with higher rates of anticoagulant discontinuation. Like the results presented here, they found ADL dependency and cognitive impairment are associated with lower rates of anticoagulant use. Kapoor et al. also found a statistically significant association with falls, whereas the corresponding effect in this cohort was not statistically significant.

The results of this study make clear that in older adults with AF, complex geriatric comorbidities are the rule rather than the exception. While geriatric syndromes have a substantial effect on quality of life and play a significant role in clinical decision making, their impact on the care of persons with AF has seldom been considered. Though many randomized trials have shown anticoagulants are effective at preventing thromboembolic events in patients with AF,[36,37] patients with geriatric syndromes were often excluded or under-represented in those trials. The high prevalence of geriatric syndromes found in the current investigation call into question whether those trial results are generalizable to most older adults with AF. The randomized trials establishing the efficacy of warfarin did not report the presence of geriatric syndromes let alone examine their impact on outcomes; in fact, geriatric syndromes were often criteria for exclusion. For instance, trials routinely excluded patients with dementia and often excluded patients with falls or unsteady gait, syndromes experience by 14% and 49% of this nationally representative cohort, respectively.[38–41] While recent randomized trials of direct-acting anticoagulants did not exclude patients with geriatric syndromes, such patients were dramatically underrepresented. For example, among those enrolled in the randomized trial comparing apixaban and warfarin, 4% reported falling in the last year.[42] Even after considering the different retrospective time periods, it is materially different from the 49% reporting a fall in the last two years in this national cohort.

The study design and data have limitations that are important to consider when interpreting the results. We relied on self-report data to identify geriatric syndromes. Some older adults may not report difficulty because of cognitive impairment or social desirability. To that end, the prevalence measures may be an underestimate. Notably, we designed this study as a cross-sectional analysis to measure the prevalence of geriatric syndromes; this design may underestimate the association of geriatric syndromes and anticoagulant use because of survivor bias.[43–45] Specifically, within levels of a geriatric syndrome, those who are healthier may be both more likely to use anticoagulants and to survive long enough to be included in a prevalent cohort. In this situation, the net effect would be to bias the effect estimate towards the null; that is to diminish the association between a geriatric syndrome and anticoagulant use.

In conclusion, in a nationally representative cohort of older adults, we determined that most older adults with AF have one or more geriatric syndromes. Additionally, the presence of geriatric syndromes was associated with lower rates of anticoagulant use. The high prevalence of geriatric syndromes may explain the lower than expected anticoagulant use in older adults. Since the trials that established the efficacy of anticoagulants did not examine the impact of geriatric syndromes on effectiveness, or report whether subjects had geriatric syndromes, it is unclear if the lower anticoagulant use is appropriate.

Contributors: SJS, MCF, and KEC were responsible for the study concept and design. SJS and KEC obtained funding and supervised the study. All authors were involved in the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of the data. SJS and SJY performed the statistical analyses. SJS drafted the manuscript, and all authors critically revised it for important intellectual content. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted. SJS had full access to all the data in the study and are the guarantors.

Funding: This study was supported by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (KL2TR001870), the National Institute on Aging (P30AG044281 and P30AG015272), and the National Heart Lung and Blood Institute (K24HL141354). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing interests: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf (available on request from the corresponding author). MCF reports grants from NIH/NHLBI, during the conduct of the study. SEG and KEC report grants from NIH/NIA, during the conduct of the study. SJS reports grants from NIH/NCATS, during the conduct of the study. No financial relationships with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Ethical approval: The Human Research Protection Program Institutional Review Board at the University of California, San Francisco, approved this study (IRB# 16-19185).

Data sharing: Researchers can apply to use the Health and Retirement Study (hrs.isr.umich.edu/) for access to the data use in this study. Code used to generate the cohort and perform the analyses can be found on Dryad

Transparency statement: The lead authors (the manuscript's guarantors) affirm that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

References

1. Wilke T, Groth A, Mueller S, et al. Incidence and prevalence of atrial fibrillation: an analysis based on 8.3 million patients. *Europace*. 2013;15(4):486-493. doi:10.1093/europace/eus333

2. Go AS, Hylek EM, Phillips KA, et al. Prevalence of Diagnosed Atrial Fibrillation in Adults: National Implications for Rhythm Management and Stroke Prevention: the AnTicoagulation and Risk Factors In Atrial Fibrillation (ATRIA) Study. *JAMA*. 2001;285(18):2370-2375. doi:10.1001/jama.285.18.2370

3. January Craig T., Wann L. Samuel, Calkins Hugh, et al. 2019 AHA/ACC/HRS Focused Update of the 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS Guideline for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society in Collaboration With the Society of Thoracic Surgeons. *Circulation*. 2019;140(2):e125-e151. doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000665

4. January CT, Wann LS, Alpert JS, et al. 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS Guideline for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2014;64(21):e1-e76. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2014.03.022

5. McGrath ER, Go AS, Chang Y, et al. Use of Oral Anticoagulant Therapy in Older Adults with Atrial Fibrillation After Acute Ischemic Stroke. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2017;65(2):241-248. doi:10.1111/jgs.14688

6. Ashburner JM, Atlas SJ, Khurshid S, et al. Electronic physician notifications to improve guideline-based anticoagulation in atrial fibrillation: a randomized controlled trial. *J GEN INTERN MED*. August 2018. doi:10.1007/s11606-018-4612-6

7. O'Brien EC, Holmes DN, Ansell JE, et al. Physician practices regarding contraindications to oral anticoagulation in atrial fibrillation: Findings from the Outcomes Registry for Better Informed Treatment of Atrial Fibrillation (ORBIT-AF) registry. *American Heart Journal*. 2014;167(4):601-609.e1. doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2013.12.014

8. Madhavan M, Holmes DN, Piccini JP, et al. Association of frailty and cognitive impairment with benefits of oral anticoagulation in patients with atrial fibrillation. *American Heart Journal*. 2019;211:77-89. doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2019.01.005

9. Tinetti ME, Williams CS, Gill TM. Dizziness among Older Adults: A Possible Geriatric Syndrome. *Ann Intern Med*. 2000;132(5):337. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-132-5-200003070-00002

10. Tinetti ME, Inouye SK, Gill TM, Doucette JT. Shared Risk Factors for Falls, Incontinence, and Functional Dependence: Unifying the Approach to Geriatric Syndromes. *JAMA*. 1995;273(17):1348-1353. doi:10.1001/jama.1995.03520410042024

11. Flacker JM. What Is A Geriatric Syndrome Anyway? *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2003;51(4):574-576. doi:10.1046/j.1532-5415.2003.51174.x

12. Kane RL, Shamliyan T, Talley K, Pacala J. The Association Between Geriatric Syndromes and Survival. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2012;60(5):896-904. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2012.03942.x

13. Inouye SK, Studenski S, Tinetti ME, Kuchel GA. Geriatric Syndromes: Clinical, Research, and Policy Implications of a Core Geriatric Concept. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2007;55(5):780-791. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2007.01156.x

14. Durso SC. Using Clinical Guidelines Designed for Older Adults With Diabetes Mellitus and Complex Health Status. *JAMA*. 2006;295(16):1935-1940. doi:10.1001/jama.295.16.1935

15. Mohile SG, Dale W, Somerfield MR, et al. Practical Assessment and Management of Vulnerabilities in Older Patients Receiving Chemotherapy: ASCO Guideline for Geriatric Oncology. *J Clin Oncol*. 2018;36(22):2326-2347. doi:10.1200/JCO.2018.78.8687

16. Damluji Abdulla A., Forman Daniel E., van Diepen Sean, et al. Older Adults in the Cardiac Intensive Care Unit: Factoring Geriatric Syndromes in the Management, Prognosis, and Process of Care: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2020;141(2):e6-e32. doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000741

17. Gage BF, Birman-Deych E, Kerzner R, Radford MJ, Nilasena DS, Rich MW. Incidence of intracranial hemorrhage in patients with atrial fibrillation who are prone to fall. *The American Journal of Medicine*. 2005;118(6):612-617. doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2005.02.022

18. Rao MP, Vinereanu D, Wojdyla DM, et al. Clinical Outcomes and History of Fall in Patients with Atrial Fibrillation Treated with Oral Anticoagulation: Insights From the ARISTOTLE Trial. *The American Journal of Medicine*. 2018;131(3):269-275.e2. doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2017.10.036

19. Shah Sachin J., Singer Daniel E., Fang Margaret C., Reynolds Kristi, Go Alan S., Eckman Mark H. Net Clinical Benefit of Oral Anticoagulation Among Older Adults With Atrial Fibrillation. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*. 2019;12(11):e006212. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.119.006212

20. Juster FT, Suzman R. An Overview of the Health and Retirement Study. *The Journal of Human Resources*. 1995;30:S7. doi:10.2307/146277

21. Borzecki AM, Wong AT, Hickey EC, Ash AS, Berlowitz DR. Identifying Hypertension-Related Comorbidities From Administrative Data: What's the Optimal Approach? *Am J Med Qual*. 2004;19(5):201-206. doi:10.1177/106286060401900504

22. Glymour MM, Avendano M. Can Self-Reported Strokes Be Used to Study Stroke Incidence and Risk Factors?: Evidence From the Health and Retirement Study. *Stroke*. 2009;40(3):873-879. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.108.529479

23. Bush TL, Miller SR, Golden AL, Hale WE. Self-report and medical record report agreement of selected medical conditions in the elderly. *Am J Public Health*. 1989;79(11):1554-1556. doi:10.2105/AJPH.79.11.1554

24. Okura Y, Urban LH, Mahoney DW, Jacobsen SJ, Rodeheffer RJ. Agreement between self-report questionnaires and medical record data was substantial for diabetes, hypertension,

myocardial infarction and stroke but not for heart failure. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2004;57(10):1096-1103. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2004.04.005

25. Steffick D. *Documentation of Affective Functioning Measures in the Health and Retirement Study*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan; 2000. https://hrs.isr.umich.edu/publications/biblio/5411. Accessed August 13, 2019.

26. Zivin K, Llewellyn DJ, Lang IA, et al. Depression among older adults in the United States and England. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2010;18(11):1036-1044. doi:10.1097/JGP.0b013e3181dba6d2

27. Lip GYH, Nieuwlaat R, Pisters R, Lane DA, Crijns HJGM. Refining clinical risk stratification for predicting stroke and thromboembolism in atrial fibrillation using a novel risk factor-based approach: the euro heart survey on atrial fibrillation. *Chest*. 2010;137(2):263-272. doi:10.1378/chest.09-1584

28. Cigolle CT, Langa KM, Kabeto MU, Tian Z, Blaum CS. Geriatric Conditions and Disability: The Health and Retirement Study. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2007;147(3):156. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-147-3-200708070-00004

29. Crimmins EM, Kim JK, Langa KM, Weir DR. Assessment of Cognition Using Surveys and Neuropsychological Assessment: The Health and Retirement Study and the Aging, Demographics, and Memory Study. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2011;66B(suppl_1):i162-i171. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbr048

30. Norton EC, Dowd BE, Maciejewski ML. Marginal Effects—Quantifying the Effect of Changes in Risk Factors in Logistic Regression Models. *JAMA*. March 2019. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.1954

31. Sun G-W, Shook TL, Kay GL. Inappropriate use of bivariable analysis to screen risk factors for use in multivariable analysis. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 1996;49(8):907-916. doi:10.1016/0895-4356(96)00025-X

32. Lefebvre M-CD, St-Onge M, Glazer-Cavanagh M, et al. The Effect of Bleeding Risk and Frailty Status on Anticoagulation Patterns in Octogenarians With Atrial Fibrillation: The FRAIL-AF Study. *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*. 2016;32(2):169-176. doi:10.1016/j.cjca.2015.05.012

33. Papakonstantinou PE, Asimakopoulou NI, Papadakis JA, et al. Frailty Status Affects the Decision for Long-Term Anticoagulation Therapy in Elderly Patients with Atrial Fibrillation. *Drugs Aging*. 2018;35(10):897-905. doi:10.1007/s40266-018-0587-6

34. Saczynski JS, Sanghai SR, Kiefe CI, et al. Geriatric Elements and Oral Anticoagulant Prescribing in Older Atrial Fibrillation Patients: SAGE-AF. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2020;68(1):147-154. doi:10.1111/jgs.16178

35. Kapoor A, Foley G, Zhang N, et al. Geriatric Conditions Predict Discontinuation of Anticoagulation in Long-Term Care Residents With Atrial Fibrillation. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. n/a(n/a). doi:10.1111/jgs.16335

36. Hart RG, Pearce LA, Aguilar MI. Meta-analysis: Antithrombotic Therapy to Prevent Stroke in Patients Who Have Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2007;146(12):857-867. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-146-12-200706190-00007

37. van Walraven C, Hart RG, Singer DE, et al. Oral Anticoagulants vs Aspirin in Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation: An Individual Patient Meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2002;288(19):2441-2448. doi:10.1001/jama.288.19.2441

38. Mant J, Hobbs FR, Fletcher K, et al. Warfarin versus aspirin for stroke prevention in an elderly community population with atrial fibrillation (the Birmingham Atrial Fibrillation Treatment of the Aged Study, BAFTA): a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2007;370(9586):493-503. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61233-1

39. Mant JW, Richards SH, Hobbs FR, et al. Protocol for Birmingham Atrial Fibrillation Treatment of the Aged study (BAFTA): a randomised controlled trial of warfarin versus aspirin for stroke prevention in the management of atrial fibrillation in an elderly primary care population [ISRCTN89345269]. *BMC Cardiovascular Disorders*. 2003;3(1):9. doi:10.1186/1471-2261-3-9

40. Design of a multicenter randomized trial for the Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation Study. The Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation Investigators. *Stroke*. 1990;21(4):538-545. doi:10.1161/01.STR.21.4.538

41. Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation Study. Final results. *Circulation*. 1991;84(2):527-539. doi:10.1161/01.CIR.84.2.527

42. Granger CB, Alexander JH, McMurray JJV, et al. Apixaban versus Warfarin in Patients with Atrial Fibrillation. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2011;365(11):981-992. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1107039

43. Feinstein AR. XI. Sources of ‘chronology bias’ in cohort statistics. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*. 1971;12(5):864-879. doi:10.1002/cpt1971125864

44. Ray WA. Evaluating Medication Effects Outside of Clinical Trials: New-User Designs. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2003;158(9):915-920. doi:10.1093/aje/kwg231

45. Lund JL, Richardson DB, Stürmer T. The active comparator, new user study design in pharmacoepidemiology: historical foundations and contemporary application. *Curr Epidemiol Rep*. 2015;2(4):221-228. doi:10.1007/s40471-015-0053-5

Table 1: Characteristics of adults 65 and older with atrial fibrillation weighted to estimate national prevalence, 2014

	Prevalence (95% CI) (n=779)
SOCIODEMOGRAPHICS	
Age, median (IQR)	80 (74, 86)
Women	50% (46-54%)
Married or partnered	51% (47-55%)
Lives alone	35% (31-39%)
Education	
Less than high school	17% (13-20%)
Completed high school	54% (50-59%)
More than high school	29% (25-33%)
Race	
White	93% (91-95%)
Black	4% (2-5%)
Other	4% (2-5%)
Hispanic ethnicity	2% (1-5%)
Proxy interview	9% (7-12%)
MEDICAL COMORBIDITIES	
Self-reported health (fair or poor)	45% (41-48%)
Depressive symptoms	14% (11-17%)
Congestive heart failure	32% (29-36%)
Hypertension	76% (72-80%)
Stroke	25% (21-29%)
Diabetes mellitus	33% (29-38%)
Myocardial infarction	30% (26-33%)
Angina	29% (26-33%)
Lung disease	19% (16-22%)
Cancer, excluding skin cancer	28% (25-32%)
ATRIAL FIBRILLATION	
CHA_2DS_2-VASc SCORE*	
1	1% (0-3%)
2	8% (6-11%)
3	19% (16-22%)
4	21% (17-25%)
5	21% (18-24%)
6	16% (14-19%)
7	9% (6-11%)
8	4% (2-5%)
9	1% (0-2%)
CHA_2DS_2-VASc score, median (IQR)	4 (3, 5)
Guidelines recommend anticoagulant use**	97% (96-99%)

Anticoagulant use	65% (61-70%)

Legend
IQR – interquartile range; CHA_2DS_2-VASc score - congestive heart failure/hypertension/age/diabetes/stroke/vascular disease

* none with CHA_2DS_2-VASc score of 0

** Based on 2019 AHA/ACC/HRS consensus guidelines – recommended anticoagulation for men with CHA_2DS_2-VASc score ≥ 2 and women with CHA_2DS_2-VASc score ≥ 3

Percentages shown are weighted using the HRS-RAND survey weights to estimate prevalence among adults ≥65 years with atrial fibrillation in the United States

Table 2: Prevalence of geriatric syndromes in adults 65 years and older with atrial fibrillation in a nationally representative sample, 2014

	Prevalence (95% CI)
Falls in last two years*	
No falls	51% (45-56%)
Noninjurious fall	29% (25-33%)
Injurious fall	20% (17-24%)
Activities of daily living**	
No impairment (neither difficulty nor help with ADLs)	62% (58-65%)
Difficulty (difficulty with 1+ ADLs, does not require help with any ADLs)	15% (13-18%)
Dependency (help with 1+ ADLs)	23% (20-27%)
Instrumental activities of daily living†	
No impairment (neither difficulty nor help with IADLs)	58% (55-62%)
Difficulty (difficulty with 1+ IADLs, does not require help with any IADLs)	14% (12-17%)
Dependency (help with 1+ IADLs)	28% (25-31%)
Cognition‡	
Intact	63% (59-68%)
Cognitive impaired, not dementia	23% (19-27%)
Dementia	14% (11-17%)
Incontinence #	43% (39-47%)
Count of geriatric syndromes§	
0	18% (14-21%)
1	23% (20-27%)
2	21% (18-25%)
3	17% (15-20%)
4	11% (8-13%)
5	9% (7-12%)

Legend

ADL – activity of daily living; IADL – instrumental activity of daily living

* Categories are hierarchical and mutually exclusive. If a participant reported multiple falls and any fall that resulted in an injury requiring medical attention, the participant was categorized as having had an injurious fall. Excludes three participants missing fall data.

** Categories are hierarchical and mutually exclusive. Difficulty defined as participant reported difficulty completing one or more ADLs and not requiring help with any ADL. Activities of daily living include bathing, getting out of bed, dressing, eating, toileting, and walking. Excludes three participants missing ADL data.

† Categories are hierarchical and mutually exclusive. Difficulty defined as participant reported difficulty completing one or more IADLs and not requiring help with any IADL. Instrumental activities of daily living include shopping for groceries, preparing hot meals, taking medications, making phone calls, managing money.

‡ Categories are hierarchical and mutually exclusive. Cognitive status defined using the Langa-Wier score[29]

Excludes three participants missing incontinence data.

§ Count of syndromes is the sum of impairment in each of the five syndromes defined in the table. Impairments defined as noninjurious fall or injurious fall, ADL difficulty or dependency, IADL difficulty or dependency, cognitive impairment or dementia, and incontinence. Excludes nine participants missing any geriatric syndrome data.

Percentages shown are weighted using the HRS-RAND survey weights to estimate prevalence among adults ≥65 years with atrial fibrillation in the United States

Figure 1: Association of anticoagulant use with count of geriatric syndromes



Legend
Count of syndromes is the sum of impairment in each of the five syndromes defined in the table. Impairments defined as noninjurious fall or injurious fall, ADL difficulty or dependency, IADL difficulty or dependency, cognitive impairment or dementia, and incontinence.

Analysis based on 768 participants; we excluded 8 with missing geriatric syndrome data, 2 with missing data on anticoagulant use, and 1 missing data on both.

The slope represented the marginal effect of one-unit change in count of geriatric syndromes on anticoagulant use, adjusting for stroke risk (CHA_2DS_2-VASc score). The shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. The slope is -3.7% 95% confidence interval -5.9 % to -1.4%.

Figure 2: Average marginal effect of individual geriatric syndromes on anticoagulant use adjusted for stroke risk



Legend

A negative marginal effect indicates lower use of anticoagulants. Models adjusted for stroke risk using CHA_2DS_2-VASc score. Gray point estimates and confidence intervals denote values that are not, statistically, different from the reference group. Blue point estimate and confidence intervals denote values that are statistically different from the reference group. All levels within a syndrome are hierarchical and mutually exclusive. We present tabular results in Appendix Table 2.

Falls: If a participant reported multiple falls and any fall that resulted in an injury requiring medical attention, the participant was categorized as having had an injurious fall. Analysis on 773 participants; excludes 3 missing falls data and 3 missing anticoagulation data.

ADL – activity of daily living: Difficulty defined as participant reported difficulty completing one or more ADLs and not requiring help with any ADL. Activities of daily living include bathing, getting out of bed, dressing, eating, toileting, and walking. Analysis on 773 participants; excludes 3 missing ADL data and 3 missing anticoagulation data.

IADL – instrumental activity of daily living: Difficulty defined as participant reported difficulty completing one or more IADLs and not requiring help with any IADL. Instrumental activities of daily living include shopping for groceries, preparing hot meals, taking medications, making phone calls, managing money. Analysis on 776 participants; excludes 3 missing anticoagulation data.

Cognitive status: defined using the Langa-Wier score.[29] Analysis on 776 participants; excludes 3 missing anticoagulation data.

Incontinence analysis on 774 participants; excludes 2 missing incontinence data, 2 missing anticoagulation data, and 1 missing both.

Appendix

1. Appendix Figure 1. Cohort flow diagram



<u>Legend</u>
HRS – Health and Retirement Study; AC – anticoagulation; ADL – activity of daily living; IADL – instrumental activity of daily living

2. Manuscript Figure 2 results as table

Appendix table 1: Average marginal effect of individual geriatric syndromes on anticoagulant use adjusted for stroke risk

Syndrome	Level	Predicted anticoagulant use (95% confidence interval)	Difference from reference level (95% confidence interval)
Falls	No falls	0.68 (0.64 to 0.73)	Ref
Falls	Noninjurious falls	0.67 (0.61 to 0.73)	-0.017 (-0.093 to 0.060)
Falls	Injurious falls	0.62 (0.54 to 0.69)	-0.067 (-0.156 to 0.022)
ADL	ADL intact	0.70 (0.66 to 0.74)	Ref
ADL	ADL difficulty	0.62 (0.53 to 0.70)	-0.084 (-0.180 to 0.012)
ADL	ADL dependent	0.61 (0.54 to 0.68)	-0.091 (-0.171 to -0.012)
IADL	IADL intact	0.69 (0.65 to 0.74)	Ref
IADL	IADL difficulty	0.68 (0.59 to 0.76)	-0.016 (-0.112 to 0.079)
IADL	IADL dependent	0.60 (0.54 to 0.67)	-0.090 (-0.166 to -0.014)
Cognitive function	Cognitively intact	0.71 (0.67 to 0.75)	Ref
Cognitive function	Cognitive impairment not dementia	0.63 (0.57 to 0.70)	-0.079 (-0.157 to -0.001)
Cognitive function	Dementia	0.51 (0.42 to 0.60)	-0.203 (-0.301 to -0.105)
Incontinence	Not incontinent	0.67 (0.63 to 0.72)	Ref
Incontinence	Incontinent	0.65 (0.60 to 0.70)	-0.023 (-0.091 to 0.045)

3. Sensitivity analysis on self-reported anticoagulant use

In this study we used a self-reported measure of anticoagulant use ("Do you regularly take prescription medications other than aspirin to thin your blood or to prevent blood clots?"). We sought to examine if self-reported use of anticoagulants mirrored Medicare Part D claims for anticoagulants. To accomplish this, we examined a subset of HRS participants with atrial fibrillation and continuous enrollment in Medicare Part D for the 12 months preceding their 2014 interview (including the month of the interview), and who answered the question about anticoagulant use. In this subset (n=505 of 771 total) we examined the concordance between self-reported anticoagulant use and claims for

oral anticoagulants including warfarin, dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban. We found 83% concordance, and Kappa of 0.63, indicating substantial agreement between the two measures of anticoagulant use.

Appendix Table 2:Concordance of self-reported anticoagulant use and claims-based anticoagulant use

		Self-report		
		No AC	AC	Total
Claims	No AC	140 (27.7%)	62 (12.3%)	202 (40.0%)
	AC	26 (5.1%)	277 (54.9%)	303 (60.0%)
	Total	166 (32.9%)	339 (67.1%)	505 (100%)

* parenthetical percent is percent of total population (n=505)

4. Appendix Table 3: STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of ***cross-sectional studies***

	Item No	Recommendation	Reported on page
Title and abstract	1	(*a*) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(*b*) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4,5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5

Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	5
Participants	6	(*a*) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	5
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6-8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7,8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	8
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Appendix
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	8
Statistical methods	12	(*a*) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8
		(*b*) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	8
		(*c*) Explain how missing data were addressed	8, appendix
		(*d*) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	8
		(*e*) Describe any sensitivity analyses	8
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	Appendix
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	Appendix
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Appendix
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	8, 9, Table 1
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	8, 9, Table 1
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9, Table 2

Main results	16	(*a*) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	8, 9, 10
		(*b*) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	n/a
		(*c*) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	9, Fig 1, Fig 2
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Appendix
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	10
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	11, 12
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	10, 11
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	12
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	13

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.