medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

MORTALITY OF CARE HOME RESIDENTS AND COMMUNITY-DWELLING CONTROLS DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC IN 2020: MATCHED COHORT STUDY

Martin C Gulliford,[1,2*] Emma Rezel-Potts,[1,2]

[1]School of Population Health and Environmental Sciences, King's College London, Guy's Campus, London SE1 1UL, UK;
[2]NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at Guy's and St Thomas' Hospitals London, Great Maze Pond, London SE1 9RT, UK

Short title: **Covid-19 mortality in care homes**

Word count:	**Text**	**3,124 words**
	Abstract	**275 words**
	Tables	**1**
	Figures	**3**

Correspondence: **Prof. Martin Gulliford**
Address: SPHES, King's College London, Guy's Campus, London SE1 1UL
Email: martin.gulliford@kcl.ac.uk
Tel: 0207 848 6631
Fax: 0207 848 6620

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ABSTRACT

Objective: To estimate mortality of care home residents during the Covid-19 pandemic from primary care electronic health records.

Design: Matched cohort study

Setting: 1,421 general practices contributing to the Clinical Practice Research Datalink Aurum Database in England.

Participants: 217,987 patients aged 18 to 104 years with recorded care home residence in England in the period 2015 to 2020. There were 86,371 care home residents contributing data in 2020, with 29,662 deaths; 83,419 (97%) were matched on age, gender and general practice with 312,607 community-dwelling adults.

Main outcome measures: All-cause mortality. Analysis was by Poisson regression adjusting for age, gender, long-term conditions, region, year and calendar week.

Results: The highest first wave age-specific mortality rate was 6.02 (95% confidence interval 5.97 to 6.07) per 100 patients per week in men aged 95-104 years between 13th-19th April 2020. Compared with community-dwelling controls, the adjusted rate ratio for mortality of care home residents was 4.95 (4.62 to 5.32) in February 2020, increasing to 8.34 (7.95 to 8.74) in April 2020, declining to 3.93 (3.68 to 4.20) in December 2020. During the week of 13th to 19th April 2020, mortality of care home residents was 10.74 (9.72 to 11.85) times higher than for matched community-dwelling controls.

Conclusions: Individual-patient data from primary care electronic health records may be used to estimate mortality in care home residents. Mortality is substantially higher than for community-dwelling comparators and showed a disproportionate increase in the first wave of the Covid-19 pandemic but not the second wave. This study provides evidence to support earlier, decisive action to protect these vulnerable populations in the event of further outbreaks. Prospective investigations of care home mortality are warranted.

Key words: Covid-19, SARS-CoV-2, mortality, care home, nursing home, primary care, pandemic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

INTRODUCTION

The Covid-19 pandemic had major impacts during 2020.[1] The first wave of infections peaked between 7th-9th April 2020 in the UK, with more than 1,000 deaths per day within 28 days of a positive Covid-19 test. Transmission rates subsided during the summer months then rose again in the latter part of the year. The number of people in the UK with a positive COVID-19 test result peaked at 81,525 on 29th December 2020, while deaths reached a maximum on 19th January 2021[1] Early studies identified deprivation,[2] household overcrowding,[3] older age, male gender, obesity, comorbidity and ethnic minority status as being important risk factors for severe disease and mortality.[4] Residents of care homes and nursing homes (referred to subsequently as 'care homes') were particularly severely affected by the pandemic. At the beginning of the pandemic, there was concern that hospitals discharged patients to care homes with insufficient consideration of the risks of disease transmission, while Covid-19 testing was not widely available.[5] NHS England guidance issued in March 2020 stressed the importance of increasing critical care capacity and the urgent need for discharge of medically fit patients.[6] It was not until April 2020 that the Covid-19 action plan for adult social care was published, which included measures to test all asymptomatic care home residents.[7] There were also concerns that care homes had insufficient personal protective equipment (PPE) and limited access to Covid tests for patients and staff.[8] Data from the Office for National Statistics showed that weekly counts of deaths of care home residents in England and Wales increased from 2,799 in the last week of February to 8,476 and 9,015 in the last two weeks of April 2020.[9] Analysis of data reported to the Care Quality Commission (CQC) in England suggested that excess deaths represented about 6.5% of care home beds.[10] Care home residents typically have multiple risk markers for Covid-19 vulnerability, but the transmission of Covid-19 may also have been facilitated in the care home environment and outbreaks were frequent. However, rigorous epidemiological analysis has been limited and few studies included denominator data, case-mix variables or population controls. An editorial in the *BMJ* observed that 'the covid-19 pandemic has placed a spotlight on how little is known about this sector, and the lack of easily accessible, aggregated data on the UK

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

care home population'.[11] In order to address this gap, we aimed to explore whether primary care electronic health records could be used to evaluate care home mortality during the pandemic. Jain et al.[12] suggested that primary care electronic health records could be used to provide estimates for the living arrangement and care home residence of older adults that were comparable to those from census data. We aimed to use primary care electronic health records to estimate all-cause mortality and excess mortality for care home residents in England during 2020.

METHODS

Data source and participant selection

The study drew on data from the CPRD Aurum database, a large database of longitudinal primary care electronic health records in England.[13] CPRD Aurum includes comprehensive records for symptoms, signs, medical diagnoses, tests and referrals, with data coded using Snomed CT.[13] The CPRD Aurum database includes a total of 1,473 general practices in England with approximately 14.8 million registered patients at 1st January 2020.

This study used data from the March 2021 release of CPRD Aurum for all 215,209 patients registered in CPRD Aurum general practices in England between 1st January 2015 and 31st January 2021 who were recorded as being resident in a care home. We employed a list of 49 medical codes indicative of care home residence. The most frequently recorded index care home codes were 'lives in a nursing home [or] care home' (Supplementary Table 1). There were 28,563 (13%) patients with index codes of 'patient died in a nursing home [or] care home'. For these, patients we assumed that they were resident in the care home for 90 days before death. The median length of stay is two years for care home residents, and one year for nursing home residents,[14] but we assumed that patients with first codes for 'died in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

nursing/care home' would have lower than average lengths of stay. In sensitivity analyses, we found that varying this assumed duration between 14 and 365 days had negligible influence on estimates. For each patient, the start date was the latest of the patient's start of registration, 1st January 2015 or the first care home code. The end of the patient's record was the earliest of the end of patient registration, the death date recorded by CPRD and the last data collection date for the practice. We included patients aged 18 to 104 years of age.

For 86,371 care home residents contributing person-time during 2020, a matched comparison cohort of community-dwelling adults was sampled from the list of all patients registered in the CPRD Aurum March 2021 release after excluding care home residents. Patients were eligible as controls if they contributed person-time after 1st January 2015. Control patients were matched for general practice, gender and year of birth, and had a start date that was no later than 18 months after the start date for matched cases. Up to four community-dwelling control participants were randomly sampled with replacement[15] for each care home resident. Care home residents were omitted from this analysis where there were no matched controls. As the difference in mortality between care home residents and community-dwelling controls was found to be greater than anticipated, control selection, data extraction and data analysis were repeated to confirm the reproducibility of findings.

Main measures

The primary measure of interest was mortality from any cause based on the CPRD death date. Death records were included up to seven days after the end of record to allow for possible delayed recording into primary care records. Covariates were age, gender, region in England and multiple morbidity. Age was updated in each year and was divided into the age-groups of 18 to 64, 65 to 74, 75 to 84, 85 to 94 and 95 to 104 years. Multiple morbidity was represented by a count of conditions ever recorded in each patient's record, updated each

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

year, from the list of atrial fibrillation, cancer, chronic kidney disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, dementia, depression, diabetes mellitus, epilepsy, frailty fractures, heart failure, haemorrhagic stroke, hypertension, ischaemic heart disease, ischaemic stroke, other mental health diagnoses, peripheral arterial disease, palliative care, rheumatoid arthritis or transient ischaemic attack. Data for frailty index scores recorded into electronic health records were also evaluated but, as these were more sparsely recorded and did not add useful information after allowing for a count of morbidities, these were not considered further.

Statistical analysis

We analysed eligible patient records between 1st January 2015 and 31st January 2021. We initially divided records into calendar months, calculating the number of deaths and person time at risk for each month. We fitted a Poisson regression model, using data up to the end of 2019 as the training dataset, with counts of observed deaths as dependent variable and age-group, gender, region, multiple morbidity, calendar month and calendar year as predictors. Month was fitted as a factor, while year was fitted as a continuous predictor with a quadratic term to allow for possible non-linearity. Multiple morbidity was fitted as a factor with categories from one to nine or more morbidities, with a separate category for 'none recorded'. From the fitted Poisson model, we obtained predicted deaths by month for the period 2015 to 2020. We compared predicted and observed deaths graphically. In order to evaluate mortality in 2020 in more detail, we divided patient records into calendar weeks, analysing counts of deaths and patients resident in each week. Predicted deaths were estimated from a Poisson model fitted to data for 2015 to 2019 and excess deaths were estimated as the difference between observed and predicted deaths. An equivalent Poisson regression model was used to estimate the adjusted morality rate ratio for care home residents compared with controls, for each month of 2020. Analyses were performed using the 'statsmodels'[16] package in Python 3.8.3. The 'matplotlib'[17] package in Python and the 'ggplot2'[18] package in the R program were used for graphics.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Patient and Public Involvement

Patients and the public were not involved in the design of the study, the conduct of the analysis nor the interpretation and reporting of the results.

RESULTS

There were 217,987 patients who were registered at general practices in England, were recorded as resident in a Care Home, and contributed follow-up after 1st January 2015. (Table 1). There were 138,868 (64%) women; 98,613 (45%) were aged 85 to 94 years and 25,040 (12%) were aged 95 or older; 183,021 (84%) had two or more morbidities. There were 86,371 care home residents contributing follow-up time during 2020.

Figure 1 shows the distribution of observed deaths by month from 2015 to 2020. There was a substantial excess of observed deaths in early 2020, with a peak in April 2020. From 2015 to 2019, there were mean 1,668 deaths during April; in April 2020, there were 5,431 deaths. Predicted expected deaths in 2020 are shown in blue in Figure 1. Supplementary Table 2 shows the Poisson model fitted to data for 2015 to 2019, which was employed to estimate predicted deaths. Mortality was greater in men and increased with age. There was a graded association of mortality with number of morbidities, except for the category of patients with no morbidities recorded.

In order to investigate the pandemic peak in mortality in more detail, analyses were repeated using calendar weeks for analysis, with data presented as deaths per 100 patients per week by age-group and gender (Figure 2, upper panel). There was a peak in observed deaths between 6th April 2020 and 26th April 2020. Mortality rates were higher in men than women and increased in successive age-groups. The highest age-specific mortality rate was 6.02

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(95% confidence interval 5.97 to 6.07) per 100 patients per week in men aged 95-104 years between 13th-19th April. Excess deaths, calculated as the difference between observed and predicted deaths, were summed across all age-groups (Figure 2, lower panel). Across all ages, excess deaths peaked in men between 13th-19th April, at 2.70 per 100 per week. Analysis by region (Supplementary Figure 1) confirmed that care home residents in all regions were affected by the pandemic but there were slight variations in the timing and magnitude of first wave mortality, with London and the North East regions having the highest peak mortality rates.

There were 83,419 of the 86,371 (97%) care home residents contributing person-time in 2020 that were successfully matched on general practice, gender and year of birth with up to four community-dwelling control participants. (Supplementary Table 3). Care home residents were omitted if there were no eligible controls. There were 312,607 controls of which 240,043 were unique. Controls had a generally similar distribution of gender and age-group (Supplementary Table 3) but there was a slight deficit of controls in the oldest age-group consistent with a smaller number of eligible controls available. Care home residents generally had more long-term conditions than controls.

Figure 3 presents weekly mortality rates for care home residents and community dwelling controls during 2020. Mortality was higher for care home residents throughout the year. The first wave peak of mortality was evident in care home patients and controls but was substantially greater in the former. In the final weeks of 2020, mortality increased in community-dwelling controls, but this was less apparent in care home residents. Table 2 presents deaths and counts of persons at risk by month during 2020, together with rate ratios adjusted for age-group, gender, region and long-term conditions. In February 2020, mortality was 4.95 (4.62 to 5.32) times higher in care home residents than controls; by April

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

2020, mortality was 8.34 (7.95 to 8.74) times higher. During the week of 13th to 19th April 2020, analysis of data from Figure 3 showed adjusted mortality of care home residents was 10.74 (9.72 to 11.85) times higher than for community-dwelling controls. The rate ratio declined from May 2020 onwards, reaching 3.93 (3.68 to 4.20) in December 2020.

DISCUSSION

Main findings

The first wave of the Covid-19 pandemic is acknowledged to have had a particularly severe impact on patients living in care homes and nursing homes. However, there is a lack of patient-level data concerning the health outcomes of social care during the pandemic.[11] This analysis shows that primary care electronic health records have potential to provide timely and relevant information concerning the care home population. Analyses quantified the first wave of Covid-19 mortality in April 2020 and showed that mortality peaked between 6th and 26th April, being strongly associated with advanced age and male gender. In men aged 95 and older, our analyses estimated that there were approximately 6 deaths per 100 patients per week at the height of the first wave. Regional variations in the impact of Covid-19 were also evident. Compared with community-dwelling control patients, mortality for care home residents was four to five times higher before the onset of the pandemic. Care home residents were disproportionately affected and during the month of April 2020, after allowing for differences in case-mix, mortality of care home residents was more than eight times higher than for community-dwelling patients and more than 10 times higher at the peak of the first wave.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Strengths and Limitations

An important strength of this study was the use of longitudinal health records to estimate predicted mortality during 2020 based on data for the preceding five years, taking into account differences in age and gender distribution, morbidities, region, calendar month and secular trends over years. This enabled us to quantify excess deaths during the pandemic months. We were also able to draw on a matched population-based comparison cohort to quantify changes in the relative risk of mortality in care homes during the pandemic after adjusting for covariates. We drew on a well-described database,[13] and the quality of data offered by electronic health records has been shown to be generally high.[19] However, we acknowledge that there could be misclassification of care home status and it is possible that care home residence might be under-recorded. Misclassification might generally have the effect of reducing associations. We included a count of important long-term conditions, but we did not find records of frailty index scores to be informative. In the cumulative deficit model, frailty and multiple morbidity are closely related concepts[20] but more accurate phenotypic characterisation of patients frailty status over time would have added to the study.[21] Deprivation is associated with reduced healthy life expectancy, which could lead to care home admission. Patients were matched for general practice, so it was not possible to adjust for deprivation at the general practice-level. We did not employ individual postcode-level deprivation scores as these might have presented difficulties if the care home postcode did not reflect deprivation exposures over the life-course. We employed a Poisson model adjusting for covariates, which provided plausible estimates. A hierarchical model allowing for general practice clustering and overdispersion did not lead to convergence. It is possible that estimated confidence intervals might be slightly too narrow, but effects of interest were unequivocal. Control sampling was with replacement and duplicated controls were included to reduce bias.[15]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Comparison with other studies

Previous studies of care home mortality during the Covid-19 pandemic have mainly drawn on data from care home records.[10 22] Morciano et al.[10] analysed data for numbers of deaths reported to the care quality commission and estimated that over the first seven months of 2020, deaths accounted for 6.5% of care home beds. The estimates from our analyses are not directly comparable because we estimated the mortality rate per 100 residents per week. Dutey-Magni et al.[22] analysed data collected by care homes for incidence of Covid-19 and mortality. Their findings, like our study, suggested that deaths were frequent among residents who were probably infected with SARS-CoV-2 but were not tested. Burton et al.[23] found that outbreaks of Covid-19 between March and August 2020 in one Scottish region were frequent within care homes and most deaths occurred in the context of outbreaks.[10 23] We did not have data to identify individuals at the same care homes and the possible clustering of deaths at care homes could not be investigated in our data. Hollinghurst et al.[24] analysed linked primary care and administrative records for the population of Wales and found that care homes showed increased mortality during the first wave of the pandemic. Their estimates were generally lower than we present here. However, their analysis using the Cox model could be associated with non-proportional hazards because analysis time encompassed a period when risks were changing daily. We estimated adjusted relative risks for each week of the pandemic and showed that there was a substantial increase in the relative risk of mortality associated with care home residence during the first wave. Other studies confirm that background mortality is very high in care home residents. Vossius et al.[25] found that annual mortality of nursing home residents was 31.8%. Shah et al.[26] analysing the THIN primary care database for 2009 found that the age and sex standardised mortality ratio for nursing home residents was 419 and for residential home residents was 284, consistent with the elevated relative rates observed in the present analyses.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Implications

Despite awareness since the very early stages of the UK pandemic of evidence from other contexts that Covid-19 severity was likely to be greatest among the elderly,[27] there were delays in policy guidance which correspond with the timing of Covid-19 mortality peaks in care home observed in April 2020. In the event of future transmission increases, earlier implementation of testing and isolation strategies and greater consideration of the effects of hospital discharge to care homes may be crucial. This study has also highlighted that there is heterogeneity in the care home population, indicating that the most elderly males may require particular protection or shielding during periods of high transmission. Regional variations in mortality might also indicate that more localised approaches should be explored. Further assessment is required of longer-term issues that have may have contributed to higher rates of care home Covid-19 mortality such as decreases in local authority social care spending since 2010, increased privatisation,[28] staff shortages [29 30] and the lack of integration of health and social care services.[31] The high mortality of care home residents during non-pandemic months, even after allowing for the level of morbidity, might be accounted for by admissions for end-of-life care. Nevertheless, prospective investigations of mortality in care homes are justified.

Conclusions

Individual-patient data from primary care electronic health records may be used to estimate mortality in care home residents either in comparison with non-pandemic periods or with population controls. Analyses confirmed the disproportionate impact of the first-wave of the Covid-19 pandemic on the care home population, especially in comparison with community-living comparators. Estimation of deaths per calendar week were mapped against delays in action to isolate care home residents. In the event of further outbreaks, this study provides evidence for earlier, decisive action to protect these vulnerable populations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Ethical Approval: Scientific and ethical approval of the proposal was provided by the CPRD Independent Scientific Advisory Committee (ISAC) protocol number 20_000214. The CPRD holds over-arching research ethics committee approval for all studies conducted using CPRD data. The study was based on analysis of fully anonymised data and no participant consent was required.

Data sources: The study is based in part on data from the Clinical Practice Research Datalink obtained under license from the UK Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency. However, the interpretation and conclusions contained in this report are those of the authors alone. Requests for data sharing should be directed to the corresponding author.

Role of Funding Source: The authors were supported by the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at Guy's and St Thomas' Hospitals. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the Department of Health. The funder of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. The authors had full access to all the data in the study and both authors shared final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Conflict of Interest: Both authors declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations 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.

Contributorship: MG wrote the study protocol and conducted data analyses; ERP provided advice on study design, data analysis and interpretation. Both authors contributed to drafting the paper and approved the final draft. MG is guarantor.

Transparency: The lead author (MG) affirms that the 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 originally planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

Data sharing: Data sharing requests should be sent to martin.gulliford@kcl.ac.uk. Data release is subject to approval from CPRD.

Dissemination: We believe that these results are of wide public interest but we do not plan to disseminate the results directly to study participants and or patient organisations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

REFERENCES

1. UK Government. *Coronavirus (COVID-19) in the UK.* London: UK Government, 2021 Available from: https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/.

2. Patel AP, Paranjpe MD, Kathiresan NP, et al. Race, socioeconomic deprivation, and hospitalization for COVID-19 in English participants of a national biobank. *Int J Equity Health* 2020;**19**(1):114. doi: 10.1186/s12939-020-01227-y

3. Harris R. Exploring the neighbourhood-level correlates of Covid-19 deaths in London using a difference across spatial boundaries method. *Health Place* 2020;**66**:102446. doi: 10.1016/j.healthplace.2020.102446

4. Williamson EJ, Walker AJ, Bhaskaran K, et al. Factors associated with COVID-19-related death using OpenSAFELY. *Nature* 2020;**584**(7821):430-36. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2521-4

5. Oliver D. Let's be open and honest about covid-19 deaths in care homes. *BMJ* 2020;**369**:m2334. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m2334

6. NHS England. *Next steps on NHS response to Covid-19.* London: NHS England, 2020 Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/wp-content/uploads/sites/52/2020/03/20200317-NHS-COVID-letter-FINAL.pdf.

7. Department for Health and Social Care. *Coronavirus (COVID-19): adult social care action plan.* London: Department for Health and Social Care, 2020. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-adult-social-care-action-plan.

8. Burki T. England and Wales see 20,000 excess deaths in care homes. *The Lancet* 2020;**395**(10237):1602. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31199-5

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

9. Office for National Statistics. *Care home resident deaths registered in England and Wales, provisional.* London: Office for National Statics, 2021 Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/datasets/carehomeresidentdeathsregisteredinenglandandwalesprovisional.

10. Morciano M, Stokes J, Kontopantelis E, et al. Excess mortality for care home residents during the first 23 weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic in England: a national cohort study. *BMC Medicine* 2021;**19**(1):71. doi: 10.1186/s12916-021-01945-2

11. Hanratty B, Burton JK, Goodman C, et al. Covid-19 and lack of linked datasets for care homes. *BMJ* 2020;**369**:m2463. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m2463

12. Jain A, van Hoek AJ, Walker JL, et al. Identifying social factors amongst older individuals in linked electronic health records: An assessment in a population based study. *PLoS One* 2017;12: e0189038. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189038

13. Wolf A, Dedman D, Campbell J, et al. Data resource profile: Clinical Practice Research Datalink (CPRD) Aurum. *Int J Epidemiol* 2019; **48**: 1740–1740. doi:10.1093/ije/dyz034

14. Forder J, Fernandez JL. *Length of stay in care homes.* Report commissioned by Bupa Care Services, PSSRU Discussion Paper 2769. Canterbury: PSSRU, 2011 Available from: https://eprints.lse.ac.uk/33895/1/dp2769.pdf.

15. Heide-Jørgensen U, Adelborg K, Kahlert J, et al. Sampling strategies for selecting general population comparison cohorts. *Clin epidemiol* 2018;**10**:1325-37. doi: 10.2147/CLEP.S164456

16. Seabold SPJ. Statsmodels: Econometric and statistical modeling with python.: Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference. 2010 Available from: https://www.statsmodels.org/stable/index.html.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

17. Hunter JD. Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment. *Computing in Science & Engineering* 2007;**9**(3):90-95. doi: 10.1109/MCSE.2007.55

18. Wickham H. *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Heidelberg: Springer, 2009.

19. Herrett EL, Thomas SL, Smeeth L. Validity of diagnoses in the general practice research database. *Br J Gen Pract* 2011;**61**(588):438-9. doi: 10.3399/bjgp11X583092

20. Clegg A, Young J, Iliffe S, et al. Frailty in elderly people. *The Lancet* 2013;**381**(9868): 752-62. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)62167-9

21. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, et al. Frailty in older adults: evidence for a phenotype. *J Gerontol Series A.Biol Sci Med Sci* 2001;56A doi: 10.1093/gerona/56.3.M146

22. Dutey-Magni PF, Williams H, Jhass A, et al. COVID-19 infection and attributable mortality in UK care homes: Cohort study using active surveillance and electronic records (March-June 2020). *medRxiv* 2021:2020.07.14.20152629. doi: 10.1101/2020.07.14.20152629

23. Burton JK, Bayne G, Evans C, et al. Evolution and effects of COVID-19 outbreaks in care homes: a population analysis in 189 care homes in one geographical region of the UK. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity* 2020;**1**(1):e21-e31. doi: 10.1016/S2666-7568(20)30012-X

24. Hollinghurst J, Lyons J, Fry R, et al. The impact of COVID-19 on adjusted mortality risk in care homes for older adults in Wales, UK: a retrospective population-based cohort study for mortality in 2016–2020. *Age Ageing* 2020;**50**(1):25-31. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afaa207

25. Vossius C, Selbæk G, Šaltytė Benth J, et al. Mortality in nursing home residents: A longitudinal study over three years. *PloS One* 2018;**13**(9):e0203480-e80. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0203480

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

26. Shah SM, Carey IM, Harris T, et al. Mortality in older care home residents in England and Wales. *Age Ageing* 2013;**42**(2):209-15. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afs174

27. SPI-M-O: *Consensus Statement on 2019 Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV)* London, SPI-M-O, 2020 Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/887353/15-spi-m-o-consensus-statement-03022020.pdf.

28. National Audit Office. *Adult social care at a glance*. London: National Audit Office, 2018. Available from: https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Adult-social-care-at-a-glance.pdf.

29. The King's Fund. *International recruitment in adult social care.* London: the King's Fund, 2019. Available from: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/projects/nhs-in-a-nutshell/social-care-staffing-numbers.

30. Shallcross L, Burke D, Abbott O, et al. Factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection and outbreaks in long-term care facilities in England: a national cross-sectional survey. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity* 2021;**2**(3):e129-e42. doi: 10.1016/S2666-7568(20)30065-9

31. Pollock AM, Clements L, Harding-Edgar L. Covid-19: why we need a national health and social care service. *BMJ* 2020;**369**:m1465. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1465

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Legends to Figures

Figure 1: Monthly counts of observed deaths of care home residents between 2015 and 2020 (red) with predicted deaths from Poisson model fitted to 2015 to 2019 data (blue).

Figure 2: Total deaths per 100 patients per week during 2020 by age-group and gender (upper panel). Excess deaths (observed minus predicted) across all ages per 100 patients per week (lower panel).

Figure 3: Mortality rates per 100 per week during 2020 for care home residents (red) and age and gender matched community-dwelling controls (blue).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.24.21255968; this version posted April 27, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1: Characteristics of participants. Figures are frequencies (percent of column total).

Variable	Category	Male	Female	Total
Total		79,119	138,868	217,987
Age-group (years)	18 to 64	9,290 (11.7)	6,947 (5.0)	16,237 (7.5)
	64 to 74	10,385 (13.1)	9,624 (6.9)	20,009 (9.2)
	74 to 84	24,376 (30.8)	33,712 (24.3)	58,088 (26.7)
	84 to 94	29,990 (37.9)	68,623 (49.4)	98,613 (45.2)
	94 to 104	5,078 (6.4)	19,962 (14.4)	25,040 (11.5)
Number of LTCs	None recorded	4,592 (5.8)	5,739 (4.1)	10,331 (4.7)
	1	10,229 (12.9)	14,406 (10.4)	24,635 (11.3)
	2	13,871 (17.5)	23,886 (17.2)	37,757 (17.3)
	3	15,425 (19.5)	29,017 (20.9)	44,442 (20.4)
	4	13,876 (17.5)	26,512 (19.1)	40,388 (18.5)
	5	9,970 (12.6)	19,074 (13.7)	29,044 (13.3)
	6	6,066 (7.7)	11,280 (8.1)	17,346 (8.0)
	7	3,039 (3.8)	5,614 (4.0)	8,653 (4.0)
	8	1,384 (1.7)	2,238 (1.6)	3,622 (1.7)
	9	667 (0.8)	1,102 (0.8)	1,769 (0.8)
Number of participants contributing person-time in year[a]	2015	20,314	41,493	61,807
	2016	22,718	44,538	67,256
	2017	24,558	47,462	72,020
	2018	26,379	49,517	75,896
	2019	27,739	50,916	78,655
	2020	30,786	55,585	86,371

[a]patients may contribute person time in multiple years

Figure 1: Monthly counts of observed deaths of care home residents between 2015 and 2020 (red) with predicted deaths from Poisson model fitted to 2015 to 2019 data (blue).



Figure 2: Total deaths per 100 patients per week during 2020 by age-group and gender (upper panel). Excess deaths (observed minus predicted) across all ages per 100 patients per week (lower panel).

Figure 3: Mortality rates per 100 per week during 2020 for care home residents (red) and age and gender matched community-dwelling controls (blue).

Table 2: Deaths and person-time for care home residents and matched controls by month. RR, adjusted rate ratio; LL and UL, lower and upper bounds of 95% confidence interval.

Month	Care Home Residents		Community-dwelling controls		Adjusted rate ratio[a] (95% confidence interval)		
	Deaths	Persons at risk	Deaths	Persons at risk	RR	LL	UL
January 2020	2,160	49,866	1,907	304,721	5.29	4.96	5.64
February 2020	1,766	50,081	1,643	302,018	4.95	4.62	5.32
March 2020	2,213	50,294	1,932	298,433	5.02	4.71	5.35
April 2020	5,175	50,230	2,889	293,962	8.34	7.95	8.74
May 2020	2,583	47,806	1,617	290,084	7.66	7.18	8.18
June 2020	1,531	49,261	1,333	288,106	5.19	4.81	5.60
July 2020	1,465	51,071	1,294	285,965	4.83	4.47	5.22
August 2020	1,577	51,921	1,314	283,159	4.84	4.48	5.22
September 2020	1,571	52,292	1,329	279,904	4.78	4.43	5.16
October 2020	1,826	52,514	1,468	275,854	4.99	4.64	5.36
November 2020	1,923	52,706	1,623	273,540	4.78	4.47	5.12
December 2020	1,872	50,848	1,959	271,539	3.93	3.68	4.20
January 2021	2,372	48,343	2,290	268,222	4.50	4.24	4.77

[a]adjusted for age-group, gender, number of long-term conditions, region and log of persons at risk as offset