Measuring Frailty: A Comparison of the Cumulative Deficit Model of Frailty in Survey and Routine Data

Authors: Lara Johnson1, Bruce Guthrie1, Atul Anand1,2, Alan Marshall1, Sohan Seth1,3

Provenance: 1. Advanced Care Research Centre, University of Edinburgh; 2. Centre for Cardiovascular Science, University of Edinburgh, 3. School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh

Corresponding Author: Dr Sohan Seth, School of Informatics, Informatics Forum, 10 Crichton St, Edinburgh EH8 9AB. Sohan.seth@ed.ac.uk

Acknowledgements: We thank Professor Andrew Clegg, who generously shared the eFI codelists.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Frailty, a state of increased vulnerability to adverse health outcomes, impacts individuals and healthcare systems. The cumulative deficit model provides a flexible frailty measure but its application across diverse data remains underexplored. This study compares frailty indices derived from survey and routine data.

Methods: Frailty indices in the Clinical Practice Research Datalink (CPRD) Aurum (N = 1,625,677) and the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) (N = 5190) were compared for adults aged 65+ in England. Deficits were categorised as "one-to-one", "one-to-many", and "one-to-none". Age-sex-standardised deficit prevalence, frailty distribution and associations with demographics were analysed using summary statistics and regression.

Results: Mean frailty index scores were similar (CPRD: 0.13 ± 0.10; ELSA: 0.13 ± 0.12) but differences were observed in the capture of specific deficits. The majority of deficits had a “one-to-none” or “one-to-many” mapping. Among 14 comparable deficits, visual impairment, fractures and heart failure were more common in CPRD, while falls, sleep disturbance and arthritis were more frequent in ELSA. Severe frailty and greater fitness were more prevalent in ELSA than CPRD. Sex and age influenced frailty similarly in both datasets, with frailty index scores increasing more rapidly with age in CPRD.

Conclusion: Differences in the number and types of deficits measured offset each other overall, supporting the cumulative deficit model’s premise that including a sufficient range of deficits does not significantly alter population-level frailty measures. This interchangeability may alleviate concerns about deficit selection, supporting more flexible approaches to population frailty assessment across both survey and routine data.

KEY SUMMARY POINTS

Aim: We assess whether similar frailty prevalence is observed in survey and routine data despite differences in the number, types and prevalence of the individual deficits measured in frailty indices.

Findings: Frailty index calculations using established principles showed strong comparability between survey and routine data. Including a sufficient range of deficits does not significantly alter population-level frailty measures.

Message: The cumulative deficit model's robustness to deficit selection supports flexible approaches to population frailty assessment across diverse data sources, such as survey and routine data.

Keywords: Geriatrics, Health, Morbidity, Frailty, Ageing

STATEMENTS AND DECLARATIONS

Competing Interests and Funding: This research was funded by the Legal & General Group (research grant to establish the independent Advanced Care Research Centre at University of Edinburgh). The funder had no role in conduct of the study, interpretation or the decision to submit for publication. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Legal & General. The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

INTRODUCTION

Frailty is defined as a state of heightened vulnerability to adverse health outcomes compared to peers of the same age [1]. It is a significant concern for both healthcare systems and society, as it is associated with various negative outcomes, including accelerated functional decline, higher mortality, increased hospital admissions and need for long-term care [2,3,4]. Frailty's impact extends beyond the individual, because people with frailty often require care and support which can strain personal, community and formal care resources. Frailty contributes to increased healthcare utilisation and costs, presenting challenges to health and social care systems in delivering equitable and effective care [5]. Where needs are met through informal care from family, friends and neighbours, the wellbeing and capacity of carers can be heavily impacted [6].

There are several approaches to frailty assessment, including the phenotype model (defined by the presence of clinical features) [7] and the Rockwood Clinical Frailty Scale (based on functional ability) [8]. Based on a set of physical characteristics, the phenotype model performs well but requires manual assessment and specialised equipment, making it resource-intensive and difficult to implement for entire populations. Tools like Rockwood's Clinical Frailty Scale depend on clinicians recognising signs of frailty such as physical weakness or slowed movement. While these scores have good validity and predictive power, studies show low consistency and accuracy, and determining inter-rater reliability is challenging [9].

A difficulty of these approaches is that they rely on de novo collection of specific data, which is not feasible to do routinely or at scale. An alternative approach that can be deployed at scale using routine data is the cumulative deficit model [10]. This model quantifies frailty by counting the accumulation of "deficits" which are defined as signs, symptoms, diseases, disabilities or abnormal laboratory values [11]. A frailty index is the proportion of measured deficits present in an individual [12], facilitating population-level frailty screening using existing data. Frailty scores range from 0 to 1, where higher scores indicate greater frailty, reflecting a continuum rather than a binary state. The value of the frailty index lies in its ability to be used across different data sources, despite any differences in which deficits are measured in each source [11].

The two main sources of data for frailty indices are community surveys or consented research cohorts, and linked routine data (most commonly, linked healthcare data). Surveys and research cohorts usually have the advantage of better ascertainment of psychosocial and cognitive domains, and of function, measured for example in terms of activities of daily living. Linked routine data usually has larger size, but data collection requires use of health services which may vary, and the data collected has better coverage for medically-diagnosed conditions than for social circumstances and physical and mental function.

Our study has three aims. First, we explore whether the prevalence of individual self-reported deficits in survey data and clinically identified deficits in routine data is different. Surveys may capture more self-reported deficits by systematically asking about a wide range of potential health issues, while clinical data captures only the issues that lead someone to seek medical attention. However, an overabundance of self-reported deficits and an underrepresentation in clinical data could potentially balance each other out. Second, we assess whether similar frailty prevalence is observed across both data types despite differences in the individual deficits measured and the methods of data collection. According to the cumulative deficit model of frailty, the specific nature of the deficits is less important as long as a sufficient number of them are captured [13]. Third, we

examine whether demographic factors such as age and sex influence frailty scores differently in survey versus routine data.

METHODS

Data Source

This study utilised two data sources in England: Clinical Practice Research Datalink (CPRD) Aurum and the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA). Although it is not possible to link individuals between these datasets directly, both sources cover the same geographic region and age group. However, a key difference is that ELSA excludes individuals in institutional settings, such as care homes, while GP registration and CPRD retain this population, potentially capturing higher levels of frailty.

CPRD Aurum is a longitudinal database of electronic health records from general practices in the UK [14]. The study population is people aged 65+ years and with 1+ years of permanent registration with a CPRD up-to-standard practice on 1 January 2018 (N = 1,625,677).

ELSA is a nationally representative, longitudinal survey of community-dwelling adults aged 50 years and over living in England, designed to capture the health, social, and economic circumstances of the ageing population [15]. For this analysis, we used data from 7,223 Wave 8 participants, collected between June 2016 and May 2017, of whom 5,190 were aged 65 years and over and had data available for at least 38 (out of 58) deficits.

Measures

In each dataset, we developed a frailty index matching the measure used in published research: the electronic Frailty Index (eFI) in CPRD [16] and the frailty index in ELSA [17], each of which uses a distinct list of deficits appropriate to the data available.

The eFI, developed by Clegg et al, 2016, is one of the most widely used tools to measure frailty using EHRs data [18] and is automatically calculated in English GP EHRs [19]. It comprises 36 deficits [20]. Codelists containing a total of 1553 Read v2 codes [21] were used to define 35 out of the 36 eFI deficits. Read codes were mapped to medcodes, which are used for coding diagnoses in CPRD, using the EMIS Medical Dictionary. The presence of a health deficit was defined as the recording of any corresponding codes for that deficit before 1st January 2018 (1 = present; 0 = absent if not recorded). The 36th deficit is polypharmacy, which was defined as the prescription in the 84 days since baseline (1 January to 26 March 2010) of drugs from five or more British National Formulary (BNF) paragraphs (which define drug classes) from BNF chapters 1 to 15. Non-medications (e.g. nutritional supplements, bandages) were excluded, and missing BNF codes were imputed where necessary.

The frailty index for ELSA included 58 deficits across various domains spanning chronic diseases (e.g., hypertension), general health (e.g., vision impairment), mobility (e.g., getting up from a chair), activities of daily living (e.g., ability to get dressed), psychological wellbeing (e.g., sadness) and memory.

Statistical Analysis

To compare the prevalence of individual deficits between CPRD and ELSA, we computed age- and sex-standardised deficit prevalences. Individual deficits in the two frailty indices were manually

mapped and categorised into three groups: "one-to-one" (directly comparable deficits), "one-to-many" (single deficits in one dataset corresponding to multiple deficits in the other), and "one-to-none" (deficits present in only one dataset). For further analysis, we selected all deficits in the "one-to-one" category. To evaluate the effect of data source on deficit prevalence, we fitted a logistic regression model for each selected deficit with age, sex (0 = male, 1 = female), and data source (0 = ELSA, 1 = CPRD) as independent variables. Based on this model, we calculated age-sex-adjusted odds ratios for the data source. The model was specified as:

$$\text{logit}\left(\text{p(deficit)}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_{(\text{age}-65)} + \beta_{\text{sex}} + \beta_{\text{datasource}}$$

To assess population differences in the prevalence of frailty, we inspected the distribution of frailty scores in CPRD and ELSA. Frailty scores were calculated and stratified by age group, and we initially compared the distributions using histograms and summary statistics. To statistically evaluate any differences, we used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test to compare the overall distributions, and calculated the median and interquartile ranges.

To explore associations between demographic factors and frailty scores we used summary statistics and employed a linear regression model with age, sex and data source as independent variables. The regression equation used was:

$$\text{Frailty Score} = \beta_0 + \beta_{(\text{age}-65)} + \beta_{\text{sex}} + \beta_{\text{datasource}} + \beta_{(\text{age}-65)*\text{sex}} + \beta_{(\text{age}-65)*\text{datasource}} + \beta_{\text{sex}*\text{datasource}} + \epsilon$$

Analysis was performed using Python (version 3.11.3) and the *statsmodels* and *scikit-learn* libraries.

RESULTS

The study population comprised 1,625,677 individuals from the CPRD 2018 Cohort and 5190 from ELSA Wave 8, all aged 65 years and older (Table 1). The proportion of women was 53.6% in CPRD and 56.3% in ELSA. The mean age was 75.5 years in CPRD (SD = 7.7) and 75.0 years (SD = 7.1) in ELSA. 48.3% of individuals in CPRD had mild, moderate or severe frailty (defined as an eFI score >= 0.12), compared to 42.8% in ELSA.

To compare the individual deficits in CPRD and ELSA, we inspected standardised deficit prevalence by sex and age group (Table 1, Supplementary Materials). Overall, the standardised deficit prevalence was similar in CPRD (mean = 13.7; SD = 12.9) and ELSA (mean = 13.1; SD = 11.8). Prevalence ranged from 0.7% (activity limitation) to 51.4% (hypertension) in CPRD and 0.6% (Alzheimer's) to 48.9% (arthritis) in ELSA.

The deficits included in the two indices can be broadly categorised in three groups (Figure 1):

1. **Deficits with similar definitions (one-to-one)**: 14 deficits were directly comparable between the datasets. For example, "Diabetes or high blood sugar" in ELSA maps to "diabetes" in CPRD. This category comprised morbidities, falls and fractures.
2. **Deficits corresponding to multiple deficits (one to many)**: In some cases, a single deficit in one dataset corresponded to multiple deficits in the other. 6 broader deficits in CPRD mapped to 29 more detailed deficits in ELSA. For example, the "mobility and transfer problems" deficit in CPRD was related to several specific mobility deficits in ELSA, such as "difficulty walking 100m" and "difficulty climbing one flight of stairs without resting". Similarly, the "requirement for care" deficit in CPRD was related to several activities of daily

living deficits in ELSA, including "difficulty dressing" and "difficulty eating". This category predominantly included mobility impairments, physical limitations and memory problems, which were recorded in more granular detail in ELSA than in CPRD. However, some morbidities also fell into this category. For example, "lung disease" and "asthma" in ELSA mapped to the broader "respiratory disease" deficit in CPRD.

3. **Unique deficits (one to none)**: Some deficits were unique to each dataset. 15 deficits were found only in ELSA, while 16 deficits were unique to CPRD. ELSA included several mental health deficits not captured in CPRD, such as "sadness". Conversely, CPRD included the polypharmacy deficit, which was absent in ELSA.

For the 14 deficits that had similar definitions in both datasets, we inspected the age-sex adjusted odds ratios (ORs) (Figure 2). 8 deficits were more likely in CPRD than ELSA, including visual impairment (13.50), fragility fracture (10.38), heart failure (3.77), social vulnerability (2.07), diabetes (1.26), hypertension (1.22), cerebrovascular disease (1.15) and osteoporosis (1.10). 5 deficits were less likely in CPRD than ELSA, including falls (0.16), sleep disturbance (0.17), arthritis (0.32), atrial fibrillation (0.78) and hearing impairment (0.86). Only "Parkinsonism & tremor" did not have a statistically significant difference at a threshold of $p < 0.05$.

To assess population differences in the prevalence of frailty, we visualised the frailty score distributions per data source using a histogram (Figure 3) and a plot of frailty scores by age group (Figure 4), along with summary statistics. ELSA values were more skewed in all age groups than CPRD. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test produced a statistic of 0.176 ($p < 0.001$), indicating a statistically significant difference in the overall distributions. We expect this since ELSA contains more individuals at either spectrum of the frailty values compared to CPRD. The median frailty score in ELSA was 0.086 (IQR 0.052-0.190) vs 0.138 (IQR 0.056-0.194) in CPRD, $p < 0.001$. These findings confirm that the distributions of frailty scores between the datasets are statistically distinct, although the mean frailty score in both datasets was 0.13, indicating the compatibility of average frailty in both datasets, despite them being different at the edges.

The linear regression model predicting frailty index scores (Table 3 and Figure 3, Supplementary Materials) showed that both age ($\beta_{(\mathrm{age}-65)}$=0.0046, p<0.001) and female sex (β_{sex}=0.0241, p<0.001) were positively associated with frailty scores. The CPRD data source was not significant on its own ($\beta_{\mathrm{datasource}}$=-0.0029, $p < 0.245$). Interaction terms further reveal that the relationship between age and frailty is moderated by both sex and data source; specifically, frailty increases more steeply with age for women ($\beta_{(\mathrm{age}-65)*\mathrm{sex}}$ = 0.0002, $p < 0.001$) and within CPRD ($\beta_{(\mathrm{age}-65)*\mathrm{datasource}}$ = 0.0009, $p < 0.001$). Additionally, the difference in average frailty between men and women are less pronounced in CPRD than in ELSA ($\beta_{\mathrm{sex}*\mathrm{datasource}}$ = -0.0163, $p < 0.001$). The model explained approximately 19.8% of the variance in frailty index scores ($R^2 = 0.198$, $p < 0.001$).

DISCUSSION

We have compared the application of established frailty indices to ELSA survey and CPRD routine GP records, noting that while mean index scores were similar across these cohorts, important differences were observed in the capture of specific deficits. The CPRD cohort included more adults in the oldest age group compared to ELSA, but the frailty index in ELSA identified more people as severely frail. Among 14 directly comparable deficits, visual impairment, fractures and heart failure were more commonly seen in routine GP data, while falls, sleep disturbance and arthritis were

more often reported by survey participants. The majority of deficits either did not map between CPRD and ELSA or had a one-to-many mapping. Overall frailty index scores appeared to increase more steeply with age in the CPRD dataset, but with a smaller difference between men and women than observed in ELSA.

A key advantage of the frailty index is its flexibility. Established guidelines for constructing a frailty index are grounded in principles designed to capture age-related declines across various body systems, incorporating robustness checks on their distributions [11] but do not predetermine specific deficits. This flexibility has led to a wide range of indices with varying items and item counts based on data availability [22,23]. While systematic reviews have examined population-level frailty prevalence [24] and frailty-outcome relationships [25], detailed comparisons of individual deficits across indices are still lacking, leaving a gap in understanding how specific deficit choices impact frailty measurement.

Differences in individual deficit prevalence between routine and survey data may arise from several factors. Routine data, capturing individuals who interact with healthcare services, may have a disease-predominant coding bias, reflecting the role of the GP and coding practices, as opposed to more activity-based measures. Differences in treatment-seeking behaviour also play a role; for example, arthritis was reported twice as often in ELSA, likely reflecting self-reported joint pain as "arthritis" without a formal diagnosis. Medical data may underreport disabilities [26], sleep issues, or falls. Varying definitions also contribute; for instance, it is clear from the prevalence of visual impairment in CPRD that it lacks specificity for significant sight loss and is likely to include large numbers with minimal issues such as needing glasses. ELSA defines eyesight impairment more narrowly as difficulty seeing even with glasses. Within routine data, prevalence differences can also occur; for example, myocardial infarction rates in CPRD were underestimated by 25-50% using one source compared to using GP and HES data [27], showing a need for both to truly capture morbidity in routine data [28].

The eFI in CPRD and the frailty index in ELSA produce comparable population-level frailty estimates, both with distributions resembling a gamma distribution and a natural upper limit of < 0.7 based on visual inspection of the histograms. However, there are subtle differences in distribution, with a higher proportion of people with both very low and high frailty scores in ELSA compared to CPRD. The higher proportion of very low scores could be attributed to the absolute differences in total deficits available (58 in ELSA vs 36 in CPRD). This means that for any given frailty index score, more absolute deficits are required in ELSA than CPRD, which might increase the proportion of the ELSA population with low scores. Conversely, ELSA's higher rate of severe frailty scores may result from a wider range of assessed deficits, including social and environmental factors absent in clinical records. This pattern persists even though ELSA excludes care home residents, who typically exhibit higher frailty levels, and includes fewer people in the oldest age groups.

This study benefits from the use of established frailty indices applied to representative samples of the English population [27,29]. Comparing the eFI in CPRD with the frailty index in ELSA allows for meaningful insights into the variability of frailty measures across two distinct data types at the population level. However, a key limitation is the lack of linked data, that would enable calculating both the frailty index and eFI for the same individuals, preventing direct, individual-level comparisons between the two measures. Additionally, while ELSA has agreements with NHS Digital to link mortality data and Hospital Episodes Statistics, this data is not yet accessible to external researchers, limiting the potential for evaluating frailty measures against health outcomes [30].

Finally, the lack of socioeconomic or multiple deprivation index data in CPRD GP data restricts the ability to contextualise frailty within broader social determinants.

Our findings suggest that, despite variations in the number and types of deficits measured, these differences offset each other overall, supporting the cumulative deficit model's premise that including a sufficient range of deficits does not substantially alter the frailty measure [13]. This interchangeability may alleviate concerns about deficit selection, supporting more flexible, holistic approaches to frailty assessment across varied health domains. Such flexibility is valuable, as focusing solely on medical conditions may overlook critical cognitive, social, and psychological aspects [31, 32].

In conclusion, while comparison of individual items is problematic across ELSA and CPRD, where frailty index statistics are calculated using established principles there is a high level of comparability at a population level. This finding is in line with the theory and principles that underpin the frailty index construction and so researchers can have some confidence in comparing results across datasets. This might stimulate research on frailty that draws on both social survey and routine data (and encourages linkages between them) given complementarities in strengths and weaknesses.

Table 1. *Study population characteristics of individuals over age 65 years*

Variable	**CPRD 2018 Cohort**		**ELSA Wave 8**	
	N	%	N	%
Subjects	1,625,677		5190	
Age in Years (Mean ± SD)	75.5 ± 7.7		75.0 ± 7.1	
65-69	420,506	25.9%	1407	27.1%
70-74	425,675	26.2%	1397	26.9%
75-79	305,879	18.8%	980	18.9%
80-84	237,565	14.6%	853	16.4%
85-89	148,817	9.2%	368	7.1%
90+	87,235	5.4%	185	3.6%
Sex				
Men	754,427	46.4%	2270	43.7%
Women	871,250	53.6%	2920	56.3%
Frailty index score (Mean ± SD)	0.13 ± 0.10		0.13 ± 0.12	
Fit (< 0.12)	840,443	51.7%	2971	57.2%
Mildly frail (>= 0.12 and < 0.24)	531,961	32.7%	1300	25.0%
Moderately frail (>= 0.24 and < 0.36)	197,668	12.2%	580	11.2%
Severely frail (>= 0.36)	55,605	3.4%	339	6.5%

Figure 1. *Deficit Prevalence Comparison between CPRD and ELSA. Each point represents a health deficit, with prevalence in CPRD (left) and ELSA (right). Blues line indicate a one-to-one mapping, purple lines one-to-many and pink points a one-to-none.*



Figure 2. *Forest Plot of Age-Sex Adjusted Odds Ratios for Deficits with Similar Definitions in ELSA and CPRD. Deficits plotted to the left of the vertical line (OR = 1) are more prevalent in ELSA, while those to the right are more prevalent in CPRD.*



Figure 3. *Histogram and Empirical Cumulative Distribution Function (ECDF) Plots of Frailty Scores, with 36 bins for CPRD and 58 bins for ELSA. The histogram was normalised to account for differences in bin counts across data sources.*



Figure 4. *Frailty Scores by Age Group and Data Source*.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

[1] Rockwood, K., & Howlett, S. E. (2018). Fifteen years of progress in under- standing frailty and health in aging. BMC medicine, 16(1), 1-4.

[2] Hoogendijk, E, O., Afilalo, J., Ensrund, K, R., Kowal, P., Onder, G., Fried, L, P. 2019. Frailty: implications for clinical practice and public health. The Lancet. 394, 1365-1375

[3] Devereux, N., Ellis, G., Dobie, L., Baughan, P., Monaghan, T. 2019. Testing a proactive approach to frailty identification: the electronic frailty index. BMJ Open Quality. 8(3)

[4] Kojima, G., Iliffe, S., Jivraj, S., & Walters, K. (2016). Association between frailty and quality of life among community-dwelling older people: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Epidemiol Community Health, 70(7), 716-721.

[5] Huisingh-Scheetz, M., Muramatsu, N., Konetzka, R. T., & Chin, M. H. (2024). Leveraging Health Services Research to Address Aging Health Equity. *Generations*, *48*(2), 1-13.

[6] Chen, L., Fan, H., & Chu, L. (2019). The hidden cost of informal care: An empirical study on female caregivers' subjective well-being. *Social Science & Medicine*, *224*, 85-93.

[7] Fried, L. P., Tangen, C. M., Walston, J., Newman, A. B., Hirsch, C., Gottdiener, J., ... & McBurnie, M. A. (2001). Frailty in older adults: evidence for a phenotype. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, *56*(3), M146-M157.

[8] Rockwood, K., Song, X., MacKnight, C., Bergman, H., Hogan, D. B., McDowell, I., & Mitnitski, A. (2005). A global clinical measure of fitness and frailty in elderly people. *Cmaj*, *173*(5), 489-495.

[9] Pugh, R. J., Ellison, A., Pye, K., Subbe, C. P., Thorpe, C. M., Lone, N. I., & Clegg, A. (2018). Feasibility and reliability of frailty assessment in the critically ill: a systematic review. *Critical care*, *22*, 1-11.

[10] Dent, E., Kowal, P., & Hoogendijk, E. O. (2016). Frailty measurement in research and clinical practice: a review. *European journal of internal medicine*, *31*, 3-10.

[11] Searle, S. D., Mitnitski, A., Gahbauer, E. A., Gill, T. M., & Rockwood, K. (2008). A standard procedure for creating a frailty index. *BMC geriatrics*, *8*, 1-10.

[12] Mitnitski, A. B., Mogilner, A. J., & Rockwood, K. (2001). Accumulation of deficits as a proxy measure of aging. TheScientificWorldJournal, 1, 323-336.

[13] Mitnitski, A., & Rockwood, K. (2015). Aging as a process of deficit accumulation: its utility and origin. *Interdiscip Top Gerontol*, *40*, 85-98.

[14] Clinical Practice Research Datalink. (2022). CPRD Aurum May 2022 (Version 2022.05.001) [Data set]. Clinical Practice Research Datalink. https://doi.org/10.48329/t89s-kf12

[15] Banks, J., Batty, G. D., Breedvelt, J., Coughlin, K., Crawford, R., Marmot, M., ... & Zaninotto, P. (2022). English longitudinal study of ageing: waves 0-9, 1998-2019.

[16] Clegg, A., Bates, C., Young, J., Ryan, R., Nichols, L., Ann Teale, E., ... & Marshall, T. (2016). Development and validation of an electronic frailty index using routine primary care electronic health record data. Age and ageing, 45(3), 353-360.

[17] Marshall, A., Nazroo, J., Tampubolon, G., & Vanhoutte, B. (2015). Cohort differences in the levels and trajectories of frailty among older people in England. J Epidemiol Community Health, 69(4), 316-321.

[18] Lim, A., Choi, J., Ji, H., & Lee, H. (2022). Frailty assessment using routine clinical data: an integrative review. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, *99*, 104612.

[19] NHS England. Updated guidance on supporting routine frailty identification and frailty care through the GP contract 2017/2018, 2017. Available: https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/supporting-routine-frailty-identification-and-frailty-through-the-gp-contract-20172018/ [Accessed 13 April 2022].

[20] Han, L., Clegg, A., Doran, T., & Fraser, L. (2019). The impact of frailty on healthcare resource use: a longitudinal analysis using the Clinical Practice Research Datalink in England. *Age and ageing*, *48*(5), 665-671.

[21] Clegg, A., (2023). Re: eFI deficits. Personal communication.

[22] Bouillon, K., Kivimaki, M., Hamer, M., Sabia, S., Fransson, E. I., Singh-Manoux, A., ... & Batty, G. D. (2013). Measures of frailty in population-based studies: an overview. *BMC geriatrics*, *13*, 1-11.

[23] Kaskirbayeva, D., West, R., Jaafari, H., King, N., Howdon, D., Shuweihdi, F., ... & Nikolova, S. (2023). Progression of frailty as measured by a cumulative deficit index: a systematic review. *Ageing Research Reviews*, *84*, 101789.

[24] O'Caoimh, R., Sezgin, D., O'Donovan, M. R., Molloy, D. W., Clegg, A., Rockwood, K., & Liew, A. (2021). Prevalence of frailty in 62 countries across the world: a systematic review and meta-analysis of population-level studies. *Age and ageing*, *50*(1), 96-104.

[25] Kojima, G. (2018). Frailty defined by FRAIL scale as a predictor of mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, *19*(6), 480-483.

[26] van Doorn, C., Bogardus, S. T., Williams, C. S., Concato, J., Towle, V. R., & Inouye, S. K. (2001). Risk adjustment for older hospitalized persons: a comparison of two methods of data collection for the Charlson index. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, *54*(7), 694-701.

[27] Herrett, E., Shah, A. D., Boggon, R., Denaxas, S., Smeeth, L., van Staa, T., ... & Hemingway, H. (2013). Completeness and diagnostic validity of recording acute myocardial infarction events in primary care, hospital care, disease registry, and national mortality records: cohort study. *Bmj*, *346*.

[28] MacRae, C., Morales, D., Mercer, S. W., Lone, N., Lawson, A., Jefferson, E., ... & Guthrie, B. (2023). Impact of data source choice on multimorbidity measurement: a comparison study of 2.3 million individuals in the Welsh National Health Service. BMC medicine, 21(1), 309.

[29] Steptoe, A., Breeze, E., Banks, J., & Nazroo, J. (2013). Cohort profile: the English longitudinal study of ageing. International journal of epidemiology, 42(6), 1640-1648.

[30] CLOSER. (n.d.). *English Longitudinal Study of Ageing*. Retrieved 07/11/2024 from https://closer.ac.uk/study/english-longitudinal-study-of-ageing/

[31] Shippee, N. D., Shah, N. D., May, C. R., Mair, F. S., & Montori, V. M. (2012). Cumulative complexity: a functional, patient-centered model of patient complexity can improve research and practice. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, *65*(10), 1041-1051.

[32] Hale, M., Shah, S., & Clegg, A. (2019). Frailty, inequality and resilience. Clinical Medicine, 19(3), 219.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Table 1. *Prevalence of Deficits in ELSA and CPRD, standardised by age and sex*

eFI Item (CPRD)	CPRD (N)	CPRD (%)	ELSA Variable Description	ELSA (N)	ELSA (%)
Deficits with similar definitions					
Arthritis	10,929	24.20%	Arthritis (hedibar)	2536	48.90%
Atrial fibrillation	181,824	11.20%	Abnormal heart rhythm (hedimar)	673	13.00%
Cerebrovascular disease	137,754	8.5%	Stroke (hedimst)	369	7.10%
Diabetes	293,810	18.10%	Diabetes or high blood sugar (hedimdi)	760	14.70%
Falls	118,752	7.30%	Whether fallen down since last interview (hefla)	1517	29.30%
Fragility fracture	137,300	8.40%	Whether has fractured hip (hefrac)	46	0.90%
Hearing impairment	380,415	23.40%	Self-reported hearing (while using hearing aid if appropriate) (hehear*)	1307	25.20%
Heart failure	72,672	4.50%	Congestive heart failure (hedimhf)	60	1.20%
Hypertension	835,123	51.40%	High blood pressure (hedimbp)	2380	45.90%
Osteoporosis	201,745	12.40%	Osteoporosis (hedibos)	595	11.50%
Parkinsonism & tremor	22,606	1.40%	Parkinson's (hedibpd)	61	1.20%
Sleep disturbance	135,783	8.40%	Whether felt their sleep was restless during the past week (pscedc)	1815	35.20%
Social vulnerability	107,327	6.60%	Difficulty managing money, eg paying bills, keeping track of expenses (headlmo)	164	3.20%
Visual impairment	751,984	35.70%	Self-reported eyesight (while using lenses if appropriate) (heeye*)	222	4.30%
Deficits corresponding to multiple deficits					
Mobility & transfer problems	98,861	6.10%	Difficulty walking 100m (hemobwa)	836	16.10%
			Difficulty climbing several flights of stairs without resting (hemobcs)	1937	37.30%
			Difficulty getting up from chair after sitting long periods (hemobch)	1368	26.40%
			Difficulty climbing one flight of stairs without resting (hemobcl)	894	17.20%
			Difficulty bathing (headlba)	507	9.80%
			Timed walk: whether had pain whilst walking (mmpain)	419	9.10%

			Difficulty getting in and out of bed (headlbe)	293	5.60%
			Difficulty walking across a room (headlwa)	200	3.90%
Activity limitation	10,929	0.70%	Difficulty reaching or extending arms above shoulder level (hemobre)	606	11.70%
			Difficulty stooping, kneeling or crouching (hemobst)	2288	44.10%
			Difficulty lifting or carrying weights over 10 pounds (4.54kg) (hemobli)	1328	25.60%
			Difficulty pulling or pushing large objects (hemobpu)	1035	20.00%
			Difficulty picking up a 5p coin from a table (hemobpi)	361	7.00%
Requirement for care	26,790	1.6%	Difficulty doing work around the house or garden (headlhg)	946	18.20%
			Difficulty dressing, including putting on shoes and socks (headldr)	715	13.80%
			Difficulty shopping for groceries (headlsh)	527	10.20%
			Difficulty preparing a hot meal (headlpr)	269	5.20%
			Difficulty using the toilet including getting up or down(headlwc)	199	3.80%
			Difficulty eating, such as cutting up food (headlea)	129	2.50%
			Difficulty making telephone calls (headlph)	128	2.50%
			Difficulty taking medications (headlme)	120	2.30%
Memory & cognitive problems	99,716	6.10%	Whether correct day of month given (cfdatd)	902	17.70%
			Whether correct month given (cfdatm)	158	3.10%
			Whether correct year given (cfdaty)	162	3.20%
			Whether correct day given (cfday)	139	2.70%
Ischaemic heart disease	441,930	27.2%	Angina (hediman)	214	4.10%
			Heart attack (hedimmi)	351	6.80%
Respiratory disease	527,120	32.40%	Asthma (hedibas)	602	11.60%
			Lung disease (hediblu)	347	6.70%

Unique deficits

Anaemia / haematinic deficiency	248,562	15.30%	---
Chronic kidney disease	294,341	18.10%	---
Dizziness	259,648	16.00%	---
Dyspnoea	263,729	16.20%	---
Foot problems	18,997	1.20%	---
Heart valve disease	28,389	1.70%	---
Housebound	37,953	2.30%	---

Hypotension/syncope	160,480	9.90%	---		
Peptic ulcer	63,609	3.90%	---		
Peripheral vascular disease	68,055	4.20%	---		
Skin ulcer	111,345	6.80%	---		
Thyroid disease	114,001	7.00%	---		
Polypharmacy	751,984	46.30%	---		
Urinary incontinence	120,755	7.40%	---		
Urinary system disease	598,479	36.80%	---		
Weight loss & anorexia	84,047	5.20%	---		
---			Difficulty sitting 2 hrs (hemobsi)	673	13 .0%
---			Cancer (hedibca)	413	8.00%
---			Psychiatric condition (hedibps)	507	9.80%
---			Alzheimer's (hedibad)	31	0.60%
---			Dementia (hedibde)	80	1.50%
---			Whether felt depressed much of the time during the past week (psceda)	619	12.00%
---			Whether felt everything they did during the past week was an effort (pscedb)	1044	20.20%
---			Whether was happy much of the time during the past week (pscedd)	426	8.30%
---			Whether felt lonely much of the time during the past week (pscede)	619	12.00%
---			Whether enjoyed life much of the time during the past week (pscedf)	394	7.60%
---			Whether felt sad much of the time duing the past week (pscedg)	997	19.30%
---			Whether could not get going much of the time during the past week (pscedh)	1039	20.10%
---			Self-reported general health (hehelf*)	1519	29.30%
---			Whether had joint replacement (heji)	241	4.60%
---			Difficulty using map to figure out how to get around strange place (headlma)	228	4.40%

* Unless otherwise indicated, ELSA deficits were binary (0 = no deficit is reported; 1 = deficit is reported).

*Ordinal variables were dichotomised from the reported 5-point Likert scale (Excellent, Very good, Good, Fair, Poor), where Fair or Poor were treated as deficit present.

Table 2. *Age-Sex Adjusted Odds Ratios for Deficits with Similar Definitions in ELSA and CPRD*

eFI Deficit (CPRD)	ELSA Frailty Index Deficit	Age-Sex Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p-value
Arthritis	Arthritis	0.320 (0.303-0.338)	0.000
Atrial fibrillation	Abnormal heart rhythm	0.775 (0.713-0.842)	0.000
Cerebrovascular disease	Stroke	1.148 (1.031-1.278)	0.012
Diabetes	Diabetes or high blood sugar	1.259 (1.165-1.360)	0.000
Falls	Whether fallen down since last interview	0.155 (0.146-0.165)	0.000
Fragility fracture	Whether has fractured hip	10.382 (7.760-13.889)	0.000
Hearing impairment	Self-reported hearing (while using hearing aid if appropriate)	0.857 (0.803-0.914)	0.000
Heart failure	Congestive heart failure	3.773 (2.923-4.871)	0.000
Hypertension	High blood pressure	1.218 (1.152-1.288)	0.000
Osteoporosis	Osteoporosis	1.103 (1.010-1.205)	0.030
Parkinsonism & tremor	Parkinson's	1.137 (0.883-1.465)	0.319
Sleep disturbance	Whether felt their sleep was restless during the past week	0.165 (0.156-0.175)	0.000
Social vulnerability	Difficulty managing money, eg paying bills, keeping track of expenses	2.065 (1.764-2.418)	0.000
Visual impairment	Self-reported eyesight (while using lenses if appropriate)	13.499 (11.784-15.463)	0.000

Table 3. *Results of logistic regression model predicting frailty values by age, sex and datasource, with interaction terms, with age at 65 as the intercept*

	Coef	Std err	t	P value	95% CI
Intercept	0.0712	0.002	28.713	0.000	[0.066, 0.076]

Age	0.0046	0.000	26.791	0.000	[0.004, 0.005]
Sex	0.0241	0.002	9.818	0.000	[0.019, 0.029]
Datasource_cprd	0.0029	0.002	1.162	0.245	[-0.002, -0.008]
Age * Sex	0.0002	0.000	12.448	0.000	[0.000, 0.000]
Age * Datasource_cprd	0.0009	0.000	5.303	0.000	[0.001, 0.001]
Sex * Datasource_cprd	-0.0163	0.002	-6.628	0.000	[-0.021, -0.011]

Figure 1. *Frailty Scores by Age Group and Data Source*.



Figure 2. *Violin Plots of Frailty Index Scores by Sex, Age Group and Data Source*





Figure 3. *Predicted frailty values by age, sex and datasource, with interaction terms*