

12 **Recording of intellectual disability in general hospitals 2006-2019: cohort study using linked** 13 **datasets**

14

15 **Abstract**

16

17 **Background**

18 Accurate recognition and recording of intellectual disability in those who are admitted to general
19 hospitals is necessary for making reasonable adjustments, ensuring equitable access, and monitoring
20 quality of care. In this study we determined the rate of recording of intellectual disability in those
21 with the condition who were admitted to hospital, and factors associated with the condition being
22 unrecorded.

23 **Methods and Findings**

24 Retrospective cohort study using two linked datasets of routinely collected clinical data. We
25 identified adults with diagnosed intellectual disability in a large secondary mental healthcare
26 database and used general hospital records to investigate recording of intellectual disability when
27 people were admitted to general hospitals between 2006 and 2019. Trends over time and factors
28 associated with intellectual disability being unrecorded were investigated. We obtained data on
29 2,477 adults with intellectual disability who were admitted to a general hospital in England at least
30 once during the study period (total number of admissions=27,314; median number of admissions=5).
31 People with intellectual disability were accurately recorded as having the condition during 2.9%
32 (95%CI 2.7-3.1%) of their admissions. Broadening the criteria to include a non-specific code of
33 learning difficulty increased recording to 27.7% (95%CI 27.2-28.3%) of all admissions. Having a mild
34 intellectual disability and being married were associated with increased odds of the intellectual
35 disability being unrecorded in hospital records. We had no measure of quality of hospital care
36 received and could not relate this to the presence or absence of a record of intellectual disability in
37 the patient record.

38 **Conclusions**

39 Recognition and recording of intellectual disability in adults admitted to English general hospitals
40 needs to be improved. Staff awareness training, screening at the point of admission, and data
41 sharing between health and social care services could improve care for people with intellectual
42 disability.

43 **Recording of intellectual disability in general hospitals 2006-2019: cohort study using linked**
44 **datasets**

45 **Manuscript**

46

47 **Introduction**

48

49 Intellectual disability is a lifelong disorder characterised by deficits in general cognitive ability and
50 impaired functional skills [1]. People with intellectual disability constitute between 1 and 2% of the
51 population, equating to approximately one million people in England alone [2]. Adults with
52 intellectual disability have worse physical and mental health than those without intellectual
53 disability, including higher rates of long-term conditions and complex multi-morbidity [3, 4, 5], and
54 die up to 20 years younger than the general population [6, 7]. This mortality gap is consistent across
55 high-income countries [8]. Furthermore, roughly one-third of deaths of people with intellectual
56 disability are potentially avoidable with the provision of good quality healthcare [6, 9, 10, 11].
57 Addressing the health inequalities experienced by this group is a priority for governments in the
58 United Kingdom (UK) and beyond [12, 13].

59

60 People with intellectual disability are more likely to be admitted to general hospitals, where they
61 stay longer than those without intellectual disability [14, 15]. They are at risk of receiving poor
62 quality care and of their needs not being met for reasons that include; lack of knowledge and
63 understanding amongst health professionals, diagnostic overshadowing, and institutional
64 discrimination [16, 17, 18]. People with intellectual disability and their carers frequently report poor
65 experiences of general hospital care, including inadequate communication and failure to
66 acknowledge carers' expertise [19, 20, 21].

67

68 Recognition of intellectual disability is essential to allow additional support needs to be identified
69 and reasonable adjustments for these. *Healthcare for All*, a UK government-funded inquiry into
70 access to healthcare for people with intellectual disability, highlighted the need to identify people
71 with intellectual disability at all points of healthcare delivery, including hospital admission [17].
72 However, little information exists on how well intellectual disability is recognised and recorded in
73 general hospital settings. One existing study suggests poor recording of intellectual disability in
74 people who are admitted to hospital, but was based on ecological data which is at risk of bias [22].

75

76 In this study, we sought to:

- 77 1. investigate the recording of intellectual disability in adults with a confirmed intellectual
78 disability diagnosis who were admitted to general hospitals
- 79 2. analyse changes in recording of intellectual disability in those admitted to hospital over
80 time
- 81 3. identify clinical and socio-demographic factors associated with intellectual disability
82 being unrecorded in those with the condition

83

84 **Methods**

85

86 *Study setting*

87 This study was conducted in England where most healthcare is provided by the National Health
88 Service (NHS), a state-funded provider. Secondary (specialist) healthcare is delivered by
89 organisations known as Trusts. Acute Trusts provide general hospital services for physical health
90 problems, including in-patient and out-patient facilities, emergency departments, and surgical care.
91 Mental health Trusts provide secondary mental healthcare including services for the assessment,
92 diagnosis, and psychiatric management of people with intellectual disability.

93

94 The South London and Maudsley (SLaM) NHS Trust is one of the largest providers of secondary
95 mental healthcare in Europe, serving a population of approximately 1.2 million people distributed
96 between four demographically diverse south London boroughs. SLaM’s comprehensive mental
97 healthcare services include those for diagnosis and psychiatric management of people with
98 intellectual disability, which are provided by dedicated multi-disciplinary community learning
99 disability teams (CLDTs) in each borough.

100

101 *Study design and data source*

102 This is a retrospective cohort study using data from two linked clinical datasets, the SLaM Biomedical
103 Research Centre (BRC) case register, and the English Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) database.

104

105 *South London and Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre Case Register*

106 The SLaM BRC case register contains de-identified electronic health records (EHRs) of over 500,000
107 patients who have received care from any SLaM service since April 2006 [23]. Data are recorded
108 either in structured fields (e.g. age, ethnicity, diagnosis) or as part of the unstructured free text
109 record consisting of correspondence and other clinical case notes. The Clinical Record Interactive
110 Search (CRIS) software was created to enable users to extract demographic and clinical information
111 from the EHR for scientific research [23]. CRIS deploys over 100 natural language processing (NLP)
112 algorithms developed on General Architecture for Text Engineering (GATE) software [24], developed
113 over the last 10+ years, to extract relevant information from the free text record [25], in addition to
114 data from structured fields.

115

116 *Hospital Episode Statistics database*

117 Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) is a national dataset compiled by NHS general hospital providers,
118 and curated by NHS Digital, that includes details of all admissions, out-patient appointments, and
119 attendances to emergency departments in England [26]. HES data are used to monitor activity and

120 as the basis for remunerating hospitals for the care they provide; they can also be used for
121 secondary research in a fully anonymised format. We used HES inpatient admission data which
122 include diagnoses identified during the hospital contact, recorded using codes of the International
123 Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 10th edition (ICD-10) [27]. Up to 20
124 diagnostic codes can be added for each patient's HES record. We also obtained admission and
125 discharge dates, and admission route (elective/planned or non-elective/emergency).

126

127 *Study participants*

128 We retrieved records of all adults (≥ 18 years) in the SLaM BRC case register with a diagnosis of
129 intellectual disability who had received care from SLaM NHS Trust between 2006 and 2019. A
130 diagnosis of intellectual disability and was taken as either a record of an ICD-10 code within the
131 mental retardation subchapter (ICD-10 code F70 to F79) or a diagnosis of intellectual disability in the
132 free text, extracted using the relevant NLP algorithm. These individuals' patient records were linked
133 with HES data over the same period using approved secure processes via the SLaM Clinical Data
134 Linkage Service [28], to identify all general hospital admissions during the study period and
135 diagnoses recorded within the general hospital setting during each admission.

136

137 *Co-variables*

138 The following data were extracted from the structured fields of the SLaM BRC case register for each
139 participant using the recording closest to their first general hospital admission: age, sex, ethnicity
140 (white, Asian, Black, mixed, other), marital status (married, civil partnership, co-habiting, single,
141 divorced, separated, widowed). Degree of intellectual disability (mild, moderate, severe, profound)
142 was extracted first from the patient's latest ICD-10 diagnostic code (where the second character
143 denotes level of disability) or, if this was not specified, using the Health of the Nation Outcome
144 Scales for People with Learning Disabilities (HONOS-LD), an outcome measure recommended for
145 routine clinical use with this population [29], or from free text records. Socio-economic status of

146 participants was estimated using the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), a widely used
147 neighbourhood-level (each area comprising approximately 1500 individuals) measure of relative
148 deprivation based on 37 indicators related to the patient's address [30].

149

150 *Analysis*

151 The BRC Case Register record of intellectual disability was used as the 'gold standard' diagnosis
152 against which recording of intellectual disability in general hospitals was tested. The intellectual
153 disability services within SLAM that contribute to the BRC register specialise in diagnosis and
154 management of people with intellectual disability. It is standard procedure to add these diagnoses to
155 the record using a structured electronic form. Diagnosis of intellectual disability is by trained
156 professionals who are experienced in using standard classification systems and is expected to be
157 made following a combination of formal cognitive testing, assessment of adaptive functioning, and
158 evidence that deficits have been present since at least childhood, so we judged that the specialist
159 secondary mental health service would be an appropriate gold-standard.

160

161 Summary statistics were used to describe the sample. We calculated sensitivity of recording of
162 intellectual disability in general hospital records (HES) after the first recorded diagnosis in the BRC

163 Case Register:

- 164 a. for each admission (proportion of all admissions of people with intellectual disability
165 during which intellectual disability is recorded) (admission sensitivity)
- 166 b. for each patient (proportion of people with intellectual disability who have the diagnosis
167 recorded in any hospital admission) (patient-level sensitivity)
- 168 c. for emergency admissions only (proportion of all emergency (non-elective) admissions
169 of people with intellectual disability in which intellectual disability is recorded), as the
170 majority of elective admissions are only brief and recurrent admissions e.g. for renal

171 dialysis or wound dressing during which we judged full diagnostic assessment may not
172 be appropriate or customary.

173

174 For each of these we investigated intellectual disability recording in the HES data using:

175 i. ICD-10 intellectual disability codes (F70-F79)

176 ii. ICD-10 intellectual disability codes (F70-F79) and a single additional code, F81.9

177 (developmental disorder of scholastic skills, unspecified), which we noted during initial
178 exploration of the data was used in a significant proportion of people with a BRC case
179 register diagnosis

180

181 We investigated time trends in recording of intellectual disability in general hospitals by reporting
182 the proportion of each individual's first emergency hospital admission between 2006 and 2019 in
183 which intellectual disability was recorded. We reported on the trend using chi-squared test for
184 trend.

185

186 We used logistic regression to identify factors associated with intellectual disability (F70-F79) being
187 unrecorded in HES data. Univariate regression was conducted for each variable followed by
188 multivariable analysis adjusted for each co-variate and number of hospital admissions in the study
189 period. Marital status was collapsed into a binary variable for this stage of the analysis (married or
190 unmarried) in response to small numbers in some response categories. In a sensitivity analysis, we
191 used multiple imputation by chained equations to impute missing values for all variables that
192 contained missing data [31] and conducted logistic regression on each of twenty imputed datasets,
193 combining coefficients using Rubin's rules [32]. All analysis was performed using STATA v14.

194

195 *Ethics*

196 The SLaM BRC Case Register and CRIS have received ethical approval from the Oxfordshire Research
 197 Ethics Committee C (18/SC/0372) for secondary analysis of deidentified health data. Researchers did
 198 not have access to patient-identifiable information.

199

200 **Results**

201

202 *Sample characteristics*

203 The sample comprised 2,477 adults with intellectual disability who were admitted a general hospital
 204 in England at least once over the course of the study period. Details of the sample are provided in
 205 table 1. There was a slight preponderance of males (53.9%) and the majority had mild intellectual
 206 disability (59.1% with data available). The average age at first general hospital admission was 44
 207 years. The largest ethnic group was white. Most (83.5%) were unmarried.

208

209 **Table 1** Demographics of adults with diagnosed intellectual disability admitted to an English general
 210 hospital during the study period ($n=2,477$)

		n	%
Age	Mean (SD)	44.0 (16.1)	-
Degree of intellectual disability	Mild	928	37.5
	Moderate	420	17.0
	Severe	208	8.4
	Profound	13	0.5
	Missing	908	36.7
Sex	Male	1,335	53.9
	Female	1,142	46.1
Ethnicity	White	1,517	61.2
	Asian	114	4.6
	Black	539	21.8
	Mixed	73	3.0
	Other	56	2.3

	Missing	178	7.2
Marital status*	Married	112	4.5
	Unmarried	2,068	83.5
	Missing	297	12.0
Deprivation score**	Mean (SD)	29.1 (10.7)	-
	Missing	71	-
Number of admissions	Range	1-740	-
	Median (IQR)	5 (3-10)	-

211 *married includes civil partner, co-habiting; unmarried includes single, widowed, divorced

212 **deprivation score is the Index of Multiple Deprivation. Higher scores indicate a greater degree of
213 deprivation.

214

215 There were 27,314 discrete admissions to general hospitals over the study period; 16,270 were non-
216 elective admissions and the remainder (11,044) were elective admissions (e.g. for planned surgery,
217 routine dialysis, or change of wound dressing). The median number of total admissions per patient
218 was 5.

219

220 *Sensitivity of general hospital recording of intellectual disability*

221 Taking each of the 27,314 admissions independently, 788 had a HES record of intellectual disability
222 (F70-79) (admission-level sensitivity = 2.9%, 95%CI = 2.7, 3.1). Of each emergency admission (n=
223 16,270), 319 had a record of intellectual disability (sensitivity = 2.0%, 95%CI 1.8, 2.2). Of the 2,477
224 people who were admitted to hospital, 445 had a record of intellectual disability defined using
225 intellectual disability codes (F70-79) at any time in their general hospital record (patient-level
226 sensitivity = 18.0%, 95%CI = 16.5, 19.5).

227

228 Including the ICD-10 code F81.9 (developmental disorder of scholastic skills, unspecified) in addition
229 to the F70-79 codes resulted in a notable increase in those with intellectual disability who were

230 recorded in the general hospital record (admission-level sensitivity = 27.7% (27.2, 28.3); patient-level
 231 sensitivity = 66.3% (64.4, 68.1) (table 2).

232

233 **Table 2** Sensitivity of recording of intellectual disability in English general hospital records 2006-2019
 234 for individual admissions and for individual patients by ICD-10 code group

	Sensitivity (95% CI)	
ICD-10 descriptor	Intellectual disability	Intellectual disability Developmental disorder of scholastic skills, unspecified
ICD-10 codes	F70-79	F70-79 and F81.9
For each admission (admission sensitivity)	2.9 (2.7, 3.1)	27.7 (27.2, 28.3)
For each patient (patient-level sensitivity)	18.0 (16.5, 19.5)	66.3 (64.4, 68.1)
For each admission (emergency admissions only)	2.0 (1.8, 2.2)	32.7 (32.0, 33.4)

235


236

237 *Time trends in recording intellectual disability in general hospital records*

238 Data for recording of intellectual disability stratified by year for the first emergency admission of
 239 each patient are shown in Fig 1. Strict recording of intellectual disability using F70-79 codes showed
 240 little overall change over the study period. Including the F81.9 code with F70-F79 codes showed a
 241 consistent increase in those who were identified, from 17.5% (95% CI = 13.8, 21.7) in 2005 to 62.5%
 242 (40.6, 81.2) in 2019 (χ^2 for trend = 138.7, $p < 0.0001$). Raw data and proportions are given in
 243 supporting information (table S1).

244

245 **Fig 1** Time trends in recording of intellectual disability in those admitted to a general hospital in
246 England, 2005-2019



247

248

249 *Associations with intellectual disability being unrecorded in hospital records*

250 Factors associated with a person with intellectual disability never having this accurately recorded (as
251 ICD-10 codes F70-F79) in their general hospital record were investigated (table 3). In the adjusted
252 analysis, having more severe intellectual disability was associated with lower odds of intellectual
253 disability being unrecorded (adjusted odds ratio (aOR) for severe vs mild intellectual disability 0.30
254 (0.20, 0.46), $p < 0.001$), and being married was associated with higher odds of intellectual disability
255 being unrecorded (aOR 3.12, 95%CI 1.10, 8.81, $p = 0.03$). Regression results with imputed values were
256 similar and are given in supporting information (table S2).

257

258

259

260

261 **Table 3** Odds of intellectual disability being unrecorded in the general hospital record of adults with
262 intellectual disability attending hospital

		Univariate analysis		Adjusted analysis*	
		Odds Ratio (95%CI)	p-value	Odds Ratio (95%CI)	p-value
Age	(OR per 10 years older age)	1.13 (1.05, 1.20)	<0.001	1.08 (0.98, 1.18)	0.11
Sex	Female (reference)	1	-	1	-
	Male	1.05 (0.86, 1.30)	0.61	1.28 (0.95, 1.73)	0.11
Degree of learning disability	Mild (reference)	1	-	1	-
	Moderate	0.68 (0.50, 0.93)	0.02	0.59 (0.42, 0.83)	0.03
	Severe	0.39 (0.27, 0.55)	<0.001	0.30 (0.20, 0.46)	<0.001
	Profound	0.49 (0.13, 1.79)	0.28	0.71 (0.14, 3.54)	0.67
Ethnicity	White (reference)	1	-	1	-
	Asian	1.13 (0.67, 1.90)	0.65	1.23 (0.60, 2.49)	0.57
	Black	0.85 (0.67, 1.10)	0.22	1.04 (0.72, 1.50)	0.86
	Mixed	0.98 (0.53, 1.81)	0.94	1.85 (0.63, 5.42)	0.26
	Other	0.58 (0.32, 1.96)	0.88	0.79 (0.32, 1.93)	0.60
Marital status	Unmarried (reference)	1	-	1	-
	Married	2.12 (1.13, 3.99)	0.02	3.12 (1.10, 8.81)	0.03
Deprivation index	(OR per decile higher deprivation)	1.01 (0.91, 1.11)	0.92	0.96 (0.84, 1.10)	0.59

263 *Adjustment for all variables in the table and for number of general hospital admissions during study
264 period

265

266

267

268

269 **Discussion**

270

271 Accurate recognition and recording of intellectual disability in people who are admitted to general
272 hospitals is important so that additional support needs can be identified and the necessary
273 adaptations to care and processes can be provided. These might include communication support,
274 use of the Mental Capacity Act [33], involving family or paid carers, and addressing issues around
275 planning safe discharge [34]. Collecting and recording accurate data is also important on a
276 population level to allow healthcare providers and commissioners to understand their patient group,
277 allocate adequate resource, and plan services [17].

278

279 Using large, linked datasets of real-world clinical data, we found that intellectual disability was
280 poorly recorded in people who were admitted to general hospitals. Taking each admission
281 individually, intellectual disability was accurately recorded in under 3% of all general hospital
282 admissions and just under one-fifth of those with a confirmed diagnosis of intellectual disability (as
283 recorded by specialist intellectual disability and mental health services) ever had the condition
284 accurately recorded in their general hospital records, despite them having several admissions on
285 average. These findings may reflect poor knowledge and recognition of intellectual disability
286 amongst general hospital staff, a reluctance to label patients with disabilities, or a lack of
287 understanding of why this is necessary.

288

289 Low rates of recording may also reflect clinical coding errors. We observed a proportion of adults
290 with intellectual disability who were coded as having learning *difficulty* using the ICD-10 descriptor
291 ‘developmental disorder of scholastic skills, unspecified’. This diagnostic category is ill-defined, and
292 use is discouraged [27] but it might be applied when there are specific deficits in language and
293 speech development, motor co-ordination, or the development of arithmetic, reading, or spelling
294 proficiency without global intellectual impairment. Regular use of this code suggests that some form

295 of cognitive impairment was more frequently recognised during the admission; in practice, this code
296 seems to be used as a proxy for intellectual disability. However, even including the additional code,
297 one third of people with intellectual disability never had a relevant diagnosis recorded, and these
298 diagnoses were unrecorded in around three-quarters of admissions. These codes are also likely to be
299 missed in national administrative returns, leading to under-reporting of healthcare use by people
300 with intellectual disability. From a research perspective, using a strict definition of intellectual
301 disability (F70-F79) in future studies using HES will miss a substantial proportion of people who likely
302 should be included.

303

304 There is no benchmark against which the results of this study can be directly compared, but our
305 figures show that recording of intellectual disability within general hospitals is lower than recording
306 of other mental disorders. Similar methodology has reported recording rates of 78% for dementia
307 [35] and 56% for schizophrenia [36]. Missed recording of intellectual disability is also not only a
308 problem in secondary care; far fewer people than would be expected are included on intellectual
309 disability registers held by primary care in England [37].

310

311 Our data indicate that recording of intellectual disability has improved over time only if the related
312 (but technically incorrect) code of learning difficulty (ICD-10 F81.9) is included. Several factors may
313 have contributed to this increased recording, including the presence of learning disability liaison
314 nurses in general hospitals and generally increased awareness of the health needs of people with
315 intellectual disability [38, 39]. This trend may also reflect overall improvements in diagnostic coding
316 in HES data that has been observed over time [40].

317

318 Analysis of factors associated with unrecorded diagnosis showed that having a less severe
319 intellectual disability was independently associated with increased likelihood of intellectual disability
320 never being recorded in general hospital data. Mild intellectual disability may not be immediately

321 obvious on meeting a person with the condition and specific enquiry may not be included in
322 standard medical admission assessments. People with intellectual disability who were married,
323 cohabiting, or in a civil partnership were also more likely *not* to have their intellectual disability
324 recorded; it may be that assumptions about the lives of people with intellectual disability
325 contributed to this finding, or that these people had milder intellectual disability which was more
326 easily missed, even though we adjusted for intellectual disability severity.

327

328 Recording of intellectual disability was similar in non-elective (emergency) admissions as in elective
329 (planned) admissions. Other studies have shown the recording of dementia and severe mental
330 illness to be better in non-elective admissions [35, 36]; the universally low rate of recording of
331 intellectual disability demonstrates further awareness of the condition in general hospitals is
332 needed.

333

334 *Strengths and limitations*

335 In this study we were able to identify a large representative cohort using a local specialist mental
336 health and community intellectual disability team case register and link this to a hospital admissions
337 database with national coverage. The results add to the very limited existing data on the recognition
338 and recording of intellectual disability in general hospitals in England and will provide impetus for
339 improvements.

340

341 Our study has some limitations. We used diagnosis of intellectual disability made by a secondary
342 mental health care service (which includes specialist intellectual disability teams) as the gold-
343 standard meaning that only individuals with intellectual disability living in the catchment area who
344 have accessed secondary mental health and intellectual disability services have been included.
345 However, our use of specialist service data, interrogation of structured fields and free-text records
346 using natural language processing improves confidence in the diagnosis and this approach has been

347 validated in other mental disorders showing high precision [28]. Our approach allowed the
348 construction of a large cohort representative of people with clinically diagnosed intellectual
349 disability, which would not have been possible had we assessed all participants with a standardised
350 assessment.

351

352 It is possible that some people with intellectual disability, particularly those with specific genetic
353 conditions such as Down syndrome, were accurately recorded with codes outside the generic ICD-10
354 intellectual disability codes of F70-F79. This may have caused an under-estimate of the sensitivity of
355 hospital recording, although only a minority (roughly one-quarter) of people with intellectual
356 disability have a recognised genetic cause that is eligible to be coded separately, so this would not
357 account for the degree of under-recording we observed. Furthermore, not all people with genetic
358 conditions associated with intellectual disability do in fact have intellectual disability, therefore a
359 code for intellectual disability should still be used where it is relevant.

360

361 This study looks only at recording of intellectual disability in hospital records, using the patient
362 discharge summary as the source of HES data. Whilst helpful as a first step in contemplating and
363 instituting reasonable adjustments, recording does not guarantee that adapted person-centred care
364 will be provided, and we have no measure of the quality of care that was provided. Similarly, it is
365 possible that in some cases where intellectual disability was not recorded, this was due to a failure
366 of the administrative process alone, and that intellectual disability was indeed recognised and
367 managed appropriately during the admission. Even in these cases, however, it is still necessary from
368 a service-level and surveillance perspective that intellectual disability is documented.

369

370 *Clinical and research implications*

371 There is a need for improved recognition and recording of intellectual disability in general hospitals
372 to improve hospital outcomes and care experiences. An active approach to identification has been

373 suggested, with routine screening questions being asked at entry points to care [41]. Pre-admission
374 assessments and learning disability identification checklists are recommended to ensure that people
375 with intellectual disability receive the support they require in hospital and to give advance notice to
376 staff [42, 43] but are only possible in the case of planned admissions. People with intellectual
377 disability are more likely than the general population to present to emergency care [44, 45];
378 automatic flagging of people with intellectual disability attending hospital could be achieved with
379 better integration of health records between statutory services, underpinned by stringent data
380 sharing protocols.

381

382 It is important that recognition of intellectual disability is supplemented by staff understanding of
383 the range of health and communication needs that people with intellectual disability may have.

384 Interventions that have been shown to be effective then need to be implemented, such as
385 involvement of learning disability liaison nurses and adapted communication approaches. A
386 programme of mandatory training in autism and learning disability for all staff will soon be
387 introduced across the UK National Health Service [46] and is hoped will contribute to improvements
388 in care.

389

390 **Conclusions**

391

392 This study demonstrates that, currently, HES data alone cannot be used to identify a cohort of
393 people with intellectual disability attending hospital, as a significant proportion would be missed.

394 Using a range of sources with health database linkage can increase coverage and provide a powerful
395 tool for epidemiological research to drive improvements in care in this group.

396

397 Future studies could investigate the experience and outcomes of care between those who were
398 recorded as having intellectual disability during their admission and those who are not. Similar work

399 could investigate recording of intellectual disability in out-patient clinics. Hospital recognition of
400 other developmental disorders in whom health inequalities also exist, such as autism and borderline
401 intellectual functioning, could also be investigated [47, 48].

402

403 **References**

- 404 1. World Health Organization. The ICD-11: International classification of diseases 11th revision.
405 Geneva: World Health Organization; 2019.
- 406 2. Public Health England. People with learning disabilities in England 2015: Main Report.
407 London: Public Health England; 2016.
- 408 3. Emerson E, Hatton C, Baines S, Robertson J. (2016). The physical health of British adults with
409 intellectual disability: cross sectional study. *Int J Equity Health*. 2016;15:11.
- 410 4. Liao P, Vajdic C, Trollor J, Reppermund S. Prevalence and incidence of physical health
411 conditions in people with intellectual disability – a systematic review. *PLOS One*.
412 2021;16(8):e0256294.
- 413 5. Cooper S-A, McLean G, Guthrie B, McConnachie A, Mercer S, Sullivan F, Morrison J. Multiple
414 physical and mental health comorbidity in adults with intellectual disabilities: population-
415 based cross-sectional analysis. *BMC Fam Pract*. 2015;16:110.
- 416 6. Heslop P, Blair PS, Fleming P, Hoghton M, Marriott A, Russ L. The Confidential Inquiry into
417 premature deaths of people with intellectual disabilities in the UK: a population-based study.
418 *Lancet*. 2014;383:889–95.
- 419 7. Glover G, Williams R, Heslop P, Oyinlola J, Grey J. Mortality in people with intellectual
420 disabilities in England. *J Intellect Disabil Res*. 2017;61(1):62-74.
- 421 8. O’Leary L, Cooper S-A, Hughes-McCormack L. Early death and causes of death of people with
422 intellectual disabilities: a systematic review. *J Appl Res Intellect Disabil*. 2018;31:325-342.

- 423 9. Hosking FJ, Carey IM, Shah SM, Harris T, DeWilde S, Beighton C., Cook DG. Mortality among
424 adults with intellectual disability in England: comparisons with the general population. *Am J*
425 *Public Health*. 2016;106(8):1483-1491.
- 426 10. Trollor J, Srasuebkuul P, Xu H, Howlett S. Cause of death and potentially avoidable deaths in
427 Australian adults with intellectual disability using retrospective linked data. *BMJ Open*.
428 2017;7:e013489.
- 429 11. Hirvikoski T, Boman M, Tideman M, Lichenstein P, Butwicka A. Association of intellectual
430 disability with all-cause and cause-specific mortality in Sweden. *JAMA Network Open*.
431 2021;4(6):e2113014.
- 432 12. National Health Service England. The NHS Long Term Plan. NHS England; 2019.
- 433 13. Australian Government Department of Health. National roadmap for improving the health of
434 people with intellectual disability. Department of Health; 2021.
- 435 14. Dunn K, Hughes-McCormack L, Cooper S-A. Hospital admissions for physical health
436 conditions for people with intellectual disabilities: systematic review. *J Appl Res Intellect*
437 *Disabil*. 2018;31(S1):1-10.
- 438 15. Glover G, Williams R, Tompkins G, Oyinlola J. An observational study of the use of acute
439 hospital care by people with intellectual disabilities in England. *J Intellect Disabil Res*. 2019
440 63(2):85-99.
- 441 16. Mencap. Death by Indifference. London: Mencap; 2007.
- 442 17. Michael, J. Healthcare for all: report of The Independent inquiry into access for healthcare
443 for people with learning disabilities: independent inquiry into access to healthcare for
444 people with learning disabilities. London: Department of Health; 2008.
- 445 18. National Patient Safety Agency. Understanding the patient safety issues for people with
446 learning disabilities. London: National Health Service. National Patient Safety Agency; 2004.
- 447 19. Iacono T, Bigby C, Unsworth C, Douglas J, Fitzpatrick P. A systematic review of hospital
448 experiences of people with intellectual disability. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2015;14:505.

- 449 20. Hart SL. Learning-disabled people's experience of general hospitals. Br Journal of Nurs.
450 1998;7(8):470-477.
- 451 21. Dinsmore AP. A small-scale investigation of hospital experiences among people with a
452 learning disability on Merseyside: speaking with patients and their carers. Br J Learn Disabil.
453 2012;40:201-212.
- 454 22. Glover G, Fox S, Hatton C. General hospital care for people with intellectual disabilities.
455 Tizard Learn Disabil Rev. 2016;21(1):43-49.
- 456 23. Stewart R, Soremekun M, Perera G, Broadbent M, Callard F, Denis M, et al. The South
457 London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust Biomedical Research Centre (SLaM BRC) case
458 register: development and descriptive data. BMC Psychiatry. 2009;9:51.
- 459 24. Cunningham H. GATE, a General Architecture for Text Engineering. Comput Hum.
460 2002;36(2):223-254.
- 461 25. Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre. Natural Language Processing (NLP) Service.
462 [https://maudsleybrc.nihr.ac.uk/facilities/clinical-record-interactive-search-cris/cris-natural-](https://maudsleybrc.nihr.ac.uk/facilities/clinical-record-interactive-search-cris/cris-natural-language-processing/)
463 [language-processing/](https://maudsleybrc.nihr.ac.uk/facilities/clinical-record-interactive-search-cris/cris-natural-language-processing/). Accessed 17 August 2022.
- 464 26. NHS Digital. Hospital Episode Statistics (HES). [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-tools-and-services/data-services/hospital-episode-statistics)
465 [information/data-tools-and-services/data-services/hospital-episode-statistics](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-tools-and-services/data-services/hospital-episode-statistics). Accessed 17
466 August 2022.
- 467 27. World Health Organization. The ICD-10 classification of mental and behavioural disorders:
468 clinical descriptions and diagnostic guidelines. Geneva: World Health Organization; 1993.
- 469 28. Perera G, Broadbent M, Callard F, Chang C-K, Downs J, Dutta R, et al. Cohort profile of the
470 South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust Biomedical Research Centre (SLaM BRC)
471 case register: current status and recent enhancement of an electronic mental health record-
472 derived data resource. BMJ Open. 2016;6:e008721.
- 473 29. Roy A, Matthews H, Clifford P, Fowler V, Martin DM. Health of the Nation Outcome Scales
474 for People with Learning Disabilities (HoNOS-LD). Br J Psychiatry. 2002;180:61-66.

- 475 30. Smith T, Noble M, Noble S, Wright G, McLennan D, Plunkett E. *The English indices of*
476 *deprivation 2015*. London: Department for Communities and Local Government; 2015.
- 477 31. White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: issues and
478 guidance for practice. *Stat Med*. 2010;30(4):377-399.
- 479 32. Rubin DB. *Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons;
480 2004.
- 481 33. *Mental Capacity Act*. London: Stationery Office; 2005.
- 482 34. Blair J. Care adjustments for people with learning disabilities in hospitals. *Nursing*
483 *Management*. 2011;18(8):1-24.
- 484 35. Sommerlad A, Perera G, Singh-Manous A, Lewis G, Stewart R, Livingston G. Accuracy of
485 general hospital dementia diagnoses in England: sensitivity, specificity, and predictors of
486 diagnostic accuracy 2008-2016. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2018;14:933-943.
- 487 36. Mansour H, Mueller C, Davis KAS, Burton A, Shetty H, Hotopf M, et al. Severe mental illness
488 diagnosis in English general hospitals 2006-2017: a registry linkage study. *PLOS Med*
489 2020;17(9):e1003306.
- 490 37. NHS Digital. Health and care of people with learning disabilities experimental statistics 2019-
491 2020. [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-and-care-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-and-care-of-people-with-learning-disabilities/experimental-statistics-2019-to-2020/data-coverage)
492 [of-people-with-learning-disabilities/experimental-statistics-2019-to-2020/data-coverage](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-and-care-of-people-with-learning-disabilities/experimental-statistics-2019-to-2020/data-coverage).
493 Accessed 17 August 2022.
- 494 38. Sheehan R, Gandesha A, Hassiotis A, Gallagher P, Burnell M, Jones G, et al. An audit of the
495 quality of inpatient care for adults with learning disability in the UK. *BMJ Open*. 2015;6(4):
496 e0101480.
- 497 39. MacArthur J, Brown M, McKeachie A, Mack S, Hayes M, Fletcher J. Making reasonable and
498 achievable adjustments: the contributions of learning disability liaison nurses in 'Getting it
499 right' for people with learning disabilities receiving general hospital care. *Journal of Applied*
500 *Nursing* 2015;71(7):1552-2563.

- 501 40. Burns EM, Rigby E, Mamidanna R, Bottle A, Aylin P, Ziprin P, Faiz OD. Systematic review of
502 discharge coding accuracy. *J Public Health*. 2012;34(1):138-148.
- 503 41. Glover G, Emerson E. Have you got a learning disability? Asking the question and recording
504 the answer for NHS healthcare providers *Improving Health and Lives. Learning Disabilities
505 Observatory*; 2012.
- 506 42. Hannon L. Better preadmission assessment improves learning disability care. *Nurs Times*.
507 2004;100(25):44-47.
- 508 43. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Learning disability: care and support of
509 people growing older. Quality standard [QS187]. London: National Institute for Health and
510 Care Excellence; 2019.
- 511 44. Walker C, Beck CR, Eccles R, Weston C. Health inequalities and access to health care for
512 adults with learning disabilities in Lincolnshire. *Br J Learn Disabil*. 2014;44:16-23.
- 513 45. Hosking FJ, Carey IM, DeWilde S, Harris T, Beighton C, Cook DG. Preventable emergency
514 hospital admissions among adults with intellectual disability in England. *Ann Fam Med*.
515 2017;15(5):462-470.
- 516 46. Walker C. Mandatory learning disability training for all NHS nurses. *Learning Disabil Pract*.
517 2019;22(6):6.
- 518 47. Sharpe RA, Curry W, Brown R, Shankar R. A public health approach to reducing health
519 inequalities among adults with autism. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2019;69(688):534-535.
- 520 48. McManus S, Ali A, Bebbington PE, Brugha T, Cooper C, Rai D, et al. Inequalities in Health and
521 Service Use among People with Borderline Intellectual Impairment. London: NatCen; 2018.

522 **Supporting information**

523

524 **S1 Table** Time trends in recording intellectual disability in adults admitted to English general
525 hospitals, 2005-2019

526

527 A) number with intellectual disability recorded with F70-79 (intellectual disability) and F70-79 or F81
528 (intellectual disability or disorder of scholastic skills not otherwise specified) (first emergency
529 admission during cohort)

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
F70-F79																
No (FN)	375	274	205	203	222	139	141	141	111	116	82	78	79	64	23	2253
Yes (TP)	7	1	9	3	0	3	1	0	0	1	3	1	7	3	1	40
Total	382	275	214	206	222	142	142	141	111	117	85	79	86	67	24	2293
F70-79 and F81																
No (FN)	315	234	167	161	179	99	91	84	77	74	49	42	51	35	9	1667
Yes (TP)	67	41	47	45	43	43	51	57	34	43	36	37	35	32	15	626
Total	382	275	214	206	222	142	142	141	111	117	85	79	86	67	24	2293

530 FN, false negative; TP, true positive

531

532 B) proportion with intellectual disability recorded with F70-79 (intellectual disability) and F70-79 or
533 F81 (intellectual disability or disorder of scholastic skills not otherwise specified) (first emergency
534 admission during cohort)

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
F70-F79															
Proportion recorded (95%CI)	1.8 (0.7, 3.7)	0.4 (0.0, 2.0)	4.2 (1.9, 7.8)	1.5 (0.3, 4.2)	0.0 (0.0, 1.7)	2.1 (0.4, 6.1)	0.7 (0.0, 3.9)	0.0 (0.0, 2.6)	0.0 (0.0, 3.3)	0.9 (0.0, 4.7)	3.5 (0.7, 10.0)	1.3 (0.0, 6.9)	8.1 (3.3, 16.1)	4.5 (0.9, 12.5)	4.2 (0.1, 21.1)
F70-79 and F81															
Proportion recorded (95%CI)	17.5 (13.8, 21.7)	14.9 (10.9, 19.7)	22.0 (16.6, 28.1)	21.8 (16.4, 28.1)	19.4 (14.4, 25.2)	30.3 (22.9, 38.6)	35.9 (28.0, 44.4)	40.4 (32.3, 49.0)	30.6 (22.2, 40.1)	36.8 (28.0, 46.2)	42.4 (31.7, 53.6)	46.8 (35.5, 58.4)	40.7 (30.2, 51.8)	36.8 (26.7, 47.8)	62.5 (40.6, 81.2)

535 CI, confidence interval

536 **S2 Table** Odds of intellectual disability being unrecorded in the general hospital record of adults with
 537 intellectual disability attending hospital (with multiple imputation for missing data)

		Adjusted analysis*	
		Odds Ratio (95%CI)	p-value
Age	(OR per 10 years older age)	1.12 (1.05, 1.20)	0.001
Sex	Female (reference)	1	-
	Male	1.06 (0.85, 1.31)	0.62
Degree of intellectual disability**		0.61 (0.51, 0.73)	<0.001
Ethnicity	White (reference)	1	-
	Asian	1.26 (0.73, 2.18)	0.41
	Black	1.90 (0.68, 1.20)	0.48
	Mixed	1.09 (0.58, 2.06)	0.78
	Other	0.69 (0.36, 1.32)	0.26
Marital status	Unmarried (reference)	1	-
	Married	2.09 (1.09, 4.00)	0.03
Deprivation index	(OR per decile higher deprivation)	0.97 (0.87, 1.07)	0.53

538 *Adjustment for all variables in the table and for number of general hospital admissions during study
 539 period

540 **In the imputed analysis degree of intellectual disability was considered a continuous variable