Title

Enhancing End-of-Life Care Registration Using an Automated Robotic Process with Clinician Validation: A Prospective Cohort Study in Wolverhampton

Running Head

Digital system improves end-of-life registration

Authors

1. Emily Heyting, MSc, Specialist Registrar in General Practice, emily.heyting1@nhs.net, ORCID: 0009-0006-2681-2877, 1
2. Baldev Singh, Consultant Physician, baldev.singh@nhs.net, ORCID: 0000-0003-3460-6759. 2, 7
3. Vijay Klaire; Digital Innovation & Integration Lead, vijay.klaire@nhs.net, ORCID 0009-0001-4361-9685. 2
4. Nisha Kumari, Clinical Digital Healthcare Nurse, nisha.kumari@nhs.net, ORCID 0009-0008-3030-006X. 2
5. Kam Ahmed, General Practitioner, ORCID 0009-0006-9767-2971, kamahmed@nhs.net. 3
6. John Burrell, General Practitioner; 0009-0000-5551-9561, john.burrell@nhs.net. 4
7. Elizabeth Guest; General Practitioner, elizabethest@nhs.net. 4
8. Abdool Koodaruth, General Practitioner, a.koodaruth1@nhs.net. 4
9. Prasadika Labutale, General Practitioner, prasadika.labutale@nhs.net. 4
10. Khalid Mahmood, General Practitioner, khalid.mahmood6@nhs.net. 4
11. Gillian Pickavance, General Practitioner, gpickavance@nhs.net.5
12. Mona Sidhu, General Practitioner, mona.sidhu@nhs.net, ORCID : 0009-0007-2110-3411, 4
13. Gurjeet Malhi, General Practitioner, gurjeet.malhi@nhs.net. 6
14. Emma Parry, NIHR Clinical Lecturer in Primary Care, MRCGP, PhD, e.parry@keele.ac.uk, ORCID: 0000-0003-0278-6898. 1,7

Institutions

1. Academic Unit of Primary Care, Institute of Digital Health, The Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust, Wednesfield Rd, Wolverhampton, UK, WV10 0QP.
2. Digital Innovation Unit, The Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust, Wednesfield Rd, Wolverhampton, UK, WV10 0QP.
3. Pennfields Medical Centre, Upper Zoar St, Wolverhampton, UK, WV3 0JH.
4. Directorate of Primary Care, The Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust, Wednesfield Rd, Wolverhampton, UK, WV10 0QP.
5. Newbridge Surgery, 255 Tettenhall Rd, Wolverhampton, UK, WV6 0DE.
6. Tettenhall Medical Practice, Lower Street, Wolverhampton, UK, WV6 9LL.
7. NIHR School for Primary Care Research, School of Medicine, Keele University, University Road, Keele, Staffordshire, UK, ST5 5BG

Author contributions

Principal authors EH, EP, BMS.

Wolverhampton Digital Health Care Primary Care Research Network KA, JB, EG, AK, PL, GM, KM, GP, MS.

Data systems VK, NK, JL.

Authors with full access to data BMS VK EP.

Statistical Analysis BMS.

Manuscript development, all.

Corresponding author

PARRY Emma, NIHR Clinical Lecturer in Primary Care, e.parry@keele.ac.uk,

Abstract

Background

End-of-life (EOL) care is associated with high unscheduled hospital admissions rates and avoidable deaths in hospital, which can be improved with EOL registration (EOL_R).

Aim

To develop an informatics-based system that supports the accuracy and uptake of primary care EOL_R.

Design and Setting

A primary care based prospective cohort study in the urban, deprived, multi-ethnic City, Wolverhampton.

Method

All adults (aged > 18 years, n=39, 079) from participating practices were included. Using data integrated from hospital, community, and primary care, a robotic process tool (BOT) identified those not on the existing EOL_R who had if any of five EOL process markers. BOT positive patients were assessed by their GP for EOL_R inclusion. Performance metrics for prediction of subsequent mortality were determined.

Results

546 patients were BOT positive. Of these, GPs added 131 (24%) to the EOL_R. This group had the highest morality rate (48.1%) compared to those who were already on the EOL_R at baseline (37.2%); BOT positive but not added to the register (19.5%); those who were non-registered and BOT negative (0.8%) ($p<0.001$). The new combined EOL_R captured 220 (35.5% (sensitivity)) of 619 deaths, compared to 25.4% in the originally registered group. Analysis revealed a 'digital safety net' group, comprising those initially on the EOL_R and all BOT positive patients, which accounted for 48.6% of deaths.

Conclusion

In support of earlier identification and care planning, a robotic process technique combined with GP review yielded higher uptake and accuracy of the EOL_R, and identified others at-risk for ongoing surveillance.

Keywords

Advance Care Planning (D032722)

Algorithms (D000465)

Health informatics (D008490)

Mortality (D009026)

Palliative care (D010166)

General Practice (D058006)

How this fits in

End-of-life care registration is an essential step in providing good palliative care. Previous methods have relied on opportunistic identification and many people who die expectedly are not included on registers. Our new method demonstrates an automated, electronic data driven system with clinician validation. This system improved the uptake and accuracy of end-of-life registration in our cohort.

Abbreviations Used

BOT, automated robotic process

EOL, End of life

EOL_R, End of life register

GP, General Practitioner

OR, Odds Ratios

PRADA, Proactive Risk-Based and Data-Driven Assessment of Patients at the End of Life

SD, Standard deviation

Main Text

Introduction

The growing complexities associated with caring for aging populations places additional strain on health services (1). End-of-life (EOL) care is typified by escalating rates of non-elective admissions and avoidable death-in-hospital (2). Amongst extensive guidance for better EOL care, key targets are early identification and EOL registration (1,3,4). EOL Registers (EOL_R) were introduced as part of the UK NHS primary care Quality and Outcome Framework (QOF) in 2006. Inclusion on the EOL_R has been shown to improve coordination of care, increase advanced care planning and improve the likelihood of dying in a preferred place (5). According to QOF, 99·5% of English, Welsh and Northern Irish practices have established and maintained an EOL_R (6). It is estimated that 75% of deaths are potentially predictable, however less than 30% of those who die are captured by EOL_R (5,7). Once established, maintaining such a register is advised to be by regular multi-disciplinary team surveillance (8).

Whilst General practitioners (GPs) find the workload of maintaining EOL_Rs valuable, it is time consuming and demands new, more efficient, ways of working (9). For early identification, the Surprise Question for clinician defined EOL prognosis, is of uncertain validity and does not consistently perform well at predicting death, particularly in those without cancer, possibly due to less predictable patterns of decline (10). Several tools have been developed to aide identification of patients for EOL care, but have been developed in small populations in disease specific cohorts (11–14), and are not automated for application at scale. Addressing the failure of the current pathway to EOL registration requires new, systematic, well governed, and properly commissioned approaches utilising modern-day digital heath techniques (15) with effective clinical prediction engines. Methodologies for advanced data engines are still emergent (16) and complexity in algorithmic approaches with “big data” and machine learning may not confer improved metrics in health prediction or outcomes(17). Thus, an uncomplicated digital mechanism that supports establishing, maintaining, and reviewing the EOL_R which provides standardised performance metrics and evidenced outcomes might be valuable.

In our local health economy, we have integrated data from hospital, community and primary care sources and deployed this into direct care to promote early identification for anticipatory care, capturing required processes for structured care and ascertaining prospective events to determine effectiveness. We have termed the specific EOL digital care pathway ‘The Proactive Risk-Based and Data-Driven Assessment of Patients at the End of Life’ (PRADA). Our preliminary evidence has outlined our general methodology and its potential for benefit (18–20). We next aimed to improve EOL register accuracy and uptake, and developed an automated digital tool that utilises EOL process markers to identify those that might need EOL registration, which we combined with clinical judgement. This was deployed to direct clinical care as a clinical governance, quality improvement system, and clinical decision support aid. Here, our specific objective is to investigate the system’s performance metrics in improving the quality of EOL_R measured against prospective events, in a large population level cohort study.

Methods

Study setting

Eight general practices in Wolverhampton, UK, a multiethnic, high deprivation, industrial city.

Study design

At baseline, we selected the whole live adult population aged 18 years and over (n=39, 079) of the project's eight primary care practices. No other inclusion or exclusion criteria were applied. All patients were characterised according to their baseline EOL_R status. Five process markers of EOL care were ascertained from our electronic integrated hospital, community, and primary care records: the Surprise Question outcome "No", Electronic Palliative Care Coordinating System documentation, Recommended Summary Plan for Emergency Treatment and Care documentation, any EOL care plans and any coded contact with the hospital Specialist Palliative Care team. These processes were combined using the operand "OR" in a simple robotic process assessment "BOT". The presence of any single EOL process was termed "BOT positive" or if none were present was termed "BOT negative". All BOT positive patients who were not on the EOL_R at baseline were highlighted to a GP at the participating practice. The GP then validated each case for inclusion or exclusion from the EOL_R with a binary "yes" or "no" decision. All further clinical considerations arising from that GP clinical judgment, such as contact with the patient or care planning were a matter for the GP under their routine clinical care. Under no circumstances was any patient added to the EOL_R on the outcome of the BOT categorisation alone. All patients were followed for their mortality status until study end. The study ran for 15 months to achieve a minimum of 6 months follow-up after the last recorded GP review.

Outcomes

Performance metrics and predictive power for prospective mortality to assess whether the described digital process and clinical review protocol improved the accuracy and uptake of EOL registration.

Research checklists

Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology for cohort studies was applied to the study protocol (21).

Data

The Wolverhampton Integrated Clinical Data Set links demographic, clinical and emergency activity data from primary care, hospital, and community services data under General Data Protection Regulation (22,23). The 5 process markers of an end-of-life pathway described above were ascertained from that integrated data resource. Frailty was assessed by the Rockwood score, or in its absence the Electronic Frailty Index, and then risk categorised to binary variable of 'moderate / severe frailty' versus "non-frail". Mortality was determined from hospital mortality statistics and rolling NHS Strategic Tracing Service checks.

Statistical method

All data were analysed on IBM SPPS version 29. When comparing independent groups, multiple group means were tested by one way analysis of variance, and the Chi-square test were used for the difference between proportions. Performance metrics were determined by receiver operating characterisation and the c-statistic given with its 95%

confidence intervals. Binary logistic regression was used to consider the association of independent variables with any categorical dependent variable and resultant Odd's Ratios (OR) are given with their 95% confidence intervals. Survival analysis was by Cox's regression. Results are presented as the mean ± standard deviation (SD) or as numbers with percentages. Statistical significance of all tests applied was taken at $p<0.05$.

Patient consent

Not applicable

Patient and Public involvement

For this proof-of-concept phase, preliminary dialogue on the intended use of integrated clinical data in digital heath care methodologies occurred with the patient advisory and liaison group of our hospital, with full support.

Results

Figure 1 shows the dispersion of the studied population (n=39,079) by initial EOL registration category, EOL marker driven BOT negative and BOT positive status, and then GP assessment. This yielded 4 final groups as also shown in **Table 1** with their demographic, clinical and unscheduled care activity characteristics: Firstly, those not on the EOL_R and BOT negative (n= 38,111, 97.5%). Secondly, those not on the EOL_R but BOT positive and not considered for the EOL_R after GP review (n=415, 76% of category). Thirdly, those not on the EOL_R but BOT positive and determined by GP review as requiring addition to the EOL_R (n=131, 24% of category). And finally, those already on the EOL_R at baseline (n=422, 1.1%).

Figure 2 shows their Cox survival regression. There were 610 deaths over the study duration. Final mortality outcomes differed significantly between the groups. In unadjusted binary logistic regression (X^2 = 1,534.4,$p<0.001$) of vital status with these groupings, those previously not on the EOL_R who were "BOT positive" and GP reviewed to join the register had the highest mortality rate and the highest Ors, compared to those who were not on the register and BOT negative (X^2 = 2,955.8, $p<0.001$), and also higher than the original EOL_R (X^2 = 4.9, $p<0.05$). Those who were not on the register and "BOT positive", but were not considered for EOL registration by their GP still had a higher mortality rate than the BOT negative group (X^2 = 1,398.2, $p<0.001$), but were lower than the original EOL_R (X^2 = 32.2, $p<0.001$). Unadjusted ORs are given in **Table 1**. An adjusted binary logistic regression model of vital status and these groupings, including age ($p<0.001$), gender ($p<0.001$), ethnicity (ns), deprivation ($p<0.01$), unscheduled care ($p<0.001$), multi-morbidity ($p<0.001$), frailty (ns) and nursing home residence ($p<0.001$) remained highly significant (X^2 = 2,458.6, $p<0.001$) as did the independent 4 group EOL risk categorisation variable ($p<0.001$). These adjusted ORs are shown in **Table 1,** showing the differences are independent of demographic and clinical variables.

ROC curves **(Figure 3)** show the association of mortality with the original EOL_R group (group 4), the final EOL_R group (combining groups 4 and 3) and a novel digitally derived EOL tracker grouping which combined all 3 higher risk groups (2, 3, and 4). The original EOL_R captured 157 (32%) of all deaths, the updated revised EOL_R captured 220 (35.5%) whilst the digital EOL_R tracker identified 301 (48.6%) deaths. The performance metrics of these varying

EOL_R constructs are given in **Table 2.** The ROC c-statistics showed sequential improvement which significantly differed from each other (all p<0.001), with particularly marked improvements seen in sensitivity and the positive predictive value.

Discussion

Summary

Care at the end of life is manifestly a high-stakes and important issue, with limited time to get care planning and delivery right. Whilst increasing numbers of deaths are taking place in the community, there is a dearth of evidence about the quality of care provided (24), and there remain many patients whose deaths are deemed expected but are missing from end-of-life registers. The evidence for currently recommended strategies for identifying patients for EOL registration is scant (25).

The accuracy of identifying patients for EOL registration requires the accuracy of the processes to predict mortality. This straightforward digital methodology demonstrates a novel, replicable and whole population approach which improves identification of people approaching the end of life. The incorporation of GP clinical judgment significantly improved uptake and accuracy of EOL registration and created a live clinical governance and quality improvement tool for oversight of the EOL pathway. Our findings strongly allay reservations about clinical judgment in EOL care (26). GP clinical judgment was captured within the digital system as a crucial process measure of its own right, and it was used as a Bayesian (binary) probability adjustment, in a hierarchical sequence (27), with clear benefit to cohort definition as validated by prospective mortality prediction.

The performance metrics of the final EOL_R were significantly improved, capturing more deaths at 1 year. Those in the group that were not on an EOL_R at baseline but were reviewed by their GP to be included were older, male, of white ethnicity, had >3 non-elective admissions and were frailer than the other groups. Of note, fewer of the patients identified by BOT process were nursing home residents (26%) compared to those on the original EOL_R (54.7), suggesting the system may be identifying patients with less clinical oversite who may me more likely to 'slip through the net'.

Additionally, a group was identified digitally for EOL_R assessment but was not accepted for EOL_R inclusion by GPs, but that group still had a high mortality rate (19.5%). The reasons for this were not recorded and are unknown to us but they are likely to be multiple and complex since inclusion to the EOL_R is a difficult judgement, fundamentally requiring much greater consideration than an expectation of mortality (4). Including these patients lead to capturing 48% of deaths at 1 year and had the strongest prediction metrics. We termed this group the 'Digital EOL_R tracker' and discuss this further below.

Strengths and limitations

The strengths are a simple methodology, deployed systematically at large scale, in real-life general practice setting which incorporates clinical judgement and utilises existing recorded process markers. A crucial difference compared

to other methodologies, which we consider an important strength, is that this system is disease agnostic. This is of huge benefit in the new healthcare climate of increasing multimorbidity. Regarding weaknesses, it was not intended, at this stage, to show that this process of early identification, clinical review and EOL registration improved crucial other outcomes, including reduced inappropriate emergency care and higher rates of death in preferred place, but this is the imperative and our intended next step research, noting we have shown clear EOL benefits to clinical outcomes in other settings (19,20).

Comparison with existing literature

We are unaware of any prior publications of digital methodologies to specifically improve EOL registration. Nor are we aware of any studies of EOL_R processes that incorporate sequential digital triage followed by validation by clinical review improves accuracy yield performance metrics (11). "EARLY Identification and Personalised Care Planning" toolkit uses similar digital screening followed by clinician validation but has no published metrics and does not use an integrated data source . and strong statistical evidence of the benefit of incorporating clinical review in the further stated objective of. However, we are uncertain yet if improving EOL registration impacts on better care outcomes, but evidence to date suggest they will (25).

We emphasise that the PRADA system, is not solely a mortality prediction engine, but a comprehensive digitised care pathway. Current mortality prediction engines supporting early EOL identification have been developed in small, often disease specific cohorts and their performance metrics are uncertain. They are generally not automated or generalisable and they have not been deployed or studied at a whole population scale (17,28). We note that the proposed NHS EARLY Programme(14) adopts the key strategies outlined here: informatics-based risk identification (albeit utilising different variables for the prediction purpose), the incorporation of the Surprise Question to capture clinical judgment, care planning and EOL registration but also that it's prediction metrics and impact on outcomes are unknown. None of these systems extend to incorporate the outcome of actual EOL registration, track prospective outcomes, or have built in rolling review, which we believe makes the PRADA system unique.

Implications for research and practice

Continuous improvement methodology, based on the count of EOL care pathway processes, as described here, can be applied at scale, using rudimentary digital techniques, within primary care electronic healthcare records, in a manner that is easily amenable to quality measurement and clinical governance to ensure EOL_R are kept up-to-date. This could be actioned now with rolling assessment of outcomes and learned system improvements, rather than deferring to the ambition for the machine learning, algorithmic approach for early identification, already 20 years and more in gestation, as a reason for continued systematic inertia. There is nothing in the intended practice or theory of EOL care that conflicts with our approach, findings, and strategic intent, but there is a very pressing need for clarity in policy for adoption and implementation of evidence-based innovation. Health systems leadership, from policy makers, through commissioners, to care providers must be challenged to adopt innovation early into practice whilst those commissioning and funding research must enable the research community to verify, refute or enhance this first ever demonstration of a digital health function to transform the quality and uptake of EOL-R.

Uniquely to our method, the 'Digital EOL_R tracker' will keep high risk patients sighted to their GPs within the system for systematic review, either on a fixed time basis or as driven by clinical events. The system is not static, so any individual with a new recording of an EOL process will be automatically escalated to review. Thus, the system might not only improve EOL _R quality by identifying those who should have been registered but have been missed but also provide a digital safety net for "grey cases". This allows us to get past the targeted 1% EOL registration concept, since our original EOL_R was already 1.1% (422, capturing 157(25.5%) deaths), whereas the tracker encompassed 2.5% (968, 48% of deaths). We emphasize that under no circumstances do we propose this as a digital replacement for the EOL_R, and that no automated interventions must arise out of this clinical decision support aid and surveillance tool.

In the round, this is a completely novel development in which the global sighting of those on EOL_R, those potentially requiring EOL registration, those in whom registration is not timely but remain at a higher mortality risk, and those newly developing risk escalation criteria, will all be sighted to services and clinicians in single live front-line care overview. This would enable a shift away from opportunistic intervention towards proactive identification and care planning, and we proffer it as a much-needed step change in care at the end of life.

Additional Information

Funding

We acknowledge general funding for our programme of digital health care research by the South Staffordshire Medical Centre Charitable Trust Rotha Abraham Bequest (Charity number 509324) and the Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust Charity (Charity number 1059467). The project was in receipt of a research network support grant from the NIHR West Midland Clinical Research Network. EP is funded by a National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Academic Clinical Lectureship CL-2020-10-001. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Ethical Approval

The study did not involve selection criteria, randomisation, nor any intervention that ought not to have otherwise happened. Ethics approval and informed consent was not deemed necessary for this study according to our Institutional Review Board (Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust Research and Development Department). The study was considered a clinical governance driven quality improvement project using innovative digital healthcare methodologies.

Competing Interest

None

Acknowledgements

None.

Data Sharing

The corresponding author will share anonymised study data upon reasonable request, subject to approval of any proposal by the authors and our research governance body.

Copyright

The corresponding author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors, the license to permit this article to be published.

Tables and figures

Table 1

Showing the demographic, clinical and urgent activity characteristics, and prospective mortality outcomes of the 4 groupings derived from the whole population alive at baseline. EOL, end of life; A/E, Accident an Emergency; non-elective admissions, non-elective admission; OR, Odds ratio.

	Derived groupings				p value
Cohort derivation	1	2	3	4	
On original EOL_R	No	No	No	Yes	
Any EOL process marker	None	Present	Present	-	
GP review for addition to EOL_R	Not reviewed	Reviewed "No"	Reviewed "Yes"	-	
Number (total cohort 39,079)	38,111 (98.9%)	415 (1.1%)	131 (0.3%)	422 (1.1%)	
Age (years)	47.1 ± 18.0	77.0 ± 13.9	83.4 ± 12.6	80.7 ± 13.2	p<0.001
Gender (male)	19,503 (51.2%)	179 (43.1%)	53 (40.5%)	181 (42.9%)	p<0.001
Ethnicity (white)	21,031 (55.2%)	354 (85.3%)	118 (90.1%)	358 (84.8%)	p<0.001
Index of multiple deprivation	28.6 ± 16.3	23.3 ± 14.0	21.0 ± 14.0	19.1 ± 11.0	p<0.001
>=3 A/E attendances in prior 12 months	437 (1.1%)	20 (4.8%)	7 (5.3%)	30 (7.1%)	p<0.001

>=3 non-elective admissions in 12 prior months	200 (0.5%)	35 (8.4%)	14 (10.7%)	42 (10%)	p<0.001
>=3 co-morbidities	3,811 (10.0%)	297 (71.6%)	92 (70.2%)	316 (74.9%)	p<0.001
Frailty (moderate or severe)	3,863 (10.1%)	323 (77.8%)	108 (82.4%)	349 (82.7%)	p<0.001
Nursing home resident	104 (0.3%)	129 (31.1%)	34 (26.0%)	231 (54.7%)	p<0.001
Mortality (total deaths 619)	318 (0.8%)	81 (19.5%)	63 (48.1%)	157 (37.2%)	p<0.001
Mortality OR (95% CI)- unadjusted	1.0 (comparator)	28.8 (22.1-37.6)	110.1 (76.8-88.3)	70.4 (56.2-88.2)	p<0.001
Mortality OR (95% CI) - adjusted	1.0 (comparator)	3.2 (2.3 – 4.3),	10.1 (6.7 – 15.3)	6.2 (4.5 – 8.5)	p<0.001

Table 2

Performance metrics of the differing described end-of-life register categories for their association with prospective mortality (see Figure 3).

End of Life (EOL) register cohort	Original EOL_R	Final EOL_R	Digital tracker and Final EOL_R
Number (% population)	422 (1.1%)	553 (1.4%)	968 (2.5%)
Number of deaths (% total, n = 619)	157 (25.4%)	220 (35.5%)	301 (48.6%)
Unadjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI) (all p<0.001)	49.0 (39.4 - 60.9)	63.1 (51.9 – 76.9)	53.6 (45.0 – 63.9)

C-statistic (95% CI)	0.62 (0.61-0.64)	0.67 (0.66-0.69)	0.73 (0.72-0.75)
Sensitivity - % of those who died identified	25.4%	35.5%	48.6%
Specificity	99.3%	99.1%	98.2%
Positive predictive value	29.1%	36.8%	41.8%
Negative predictive value	99.2%	99.1%	98.6%
Accuracy	98.1%	98.1%	97.5%

Figure 1

Sequential dispersion of the cohort by initial end-of-life registration, the presence of end-of-life processes and clinician review for end-of-life registration.



Figure 2

Cox survival regression for the 4 groups as defined in **Table 1**.



Figure 3

Receiver Operating Curves for the binary association of various EOL registration categories with prospectively ascertained morality.



±Supplementary Data

References

1. Normand C, May P, Johnston B, Cylus J. Health and Social Care Near the End of Life: Can policies reduce costs and improve outcomes? 2021 [cited 2024 Aug 8]; Available from: https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/349803/Policy-brief-1997-8073-2021-1-eng.pdf

2. Makwana A, Pring A, Botwell N, Verne J. Emergency admissions in the 3 months before death [Internet]. 2020 Mar [cited 2024 Aug 8]. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/emergency-admissions-in-the-3-months-before-death/emergency-admissions-in-the-3-months-before-death

3. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. End of life care for adults: service delivery. 2019.

4. National Palliative and End of Life Care Partnership. Ambitions for Palliative and End of Life Care: A national framework for local action 2021-2026 [Internet]. 2021 May [cited 2024 Aug 8]. Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/ambitions-for-palliative-and-end-of-life-care-2nd-edition.pdf

5. Thomas K, Clifford CM, de Silva D. National snapshot study of end of life care in the community for cancer and non-cancer patients. BMJ Support Palliat Care [Internet]. 2011 Apr 1 [cited 2024 Apr 12];1(Suppl_1):A5–A5. Available from: https://spcare.bmj.com/content/1/Suppl_1/A5.1

6. QOF 2021-2022 Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) Disease prevalence and care quality achievement rates. [Internet]. [cited 2024 Aug 8]. Available from: https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-tools-and-services/data-services/general-practice-data-hub/quality-outcomes-framework-qof#what-the-report-can-t-tell-you

7. Blackmore S, Verne J, Pring A. Predicting deaths - estimating the proportion of deaths that are 'unexpected'. BMJ Support Palliat Care [Internet]. 2011 Jun 1 [cited 2024 Apr 12];1(1):106–106. Available from: https://spcare.bmj.com/content/1/1/106.2

8. NHS England. Quality and outcomes framework guidance for 2024/25 [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 May 1]. Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/PRN01104-Quality-and-outcomes-framework-guidance-for-2024-25.pdf

9. King N, Thomas K, Martin N, Bell D, Farrell S. 'Now nobody falls through the net': practitioners' perspectives on the Gold Standards Framework for community palliative care. Palliat Med. 2005 Dec 1;19(8):619–27.

10. Gupta A, Burgess R, Drozd M, Gierula J, Witte K, Straw S. The Surprise Question and clinician-predicted prognosis: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Support Palliat Care. 2025 Jan;15(1):12–35.

11. Walsh RI, Mitchell G, Francis L, van Driel ML. What Diagnostic Tools Exist for the Early Identification of Palliative Care Patients in General Practice? A systematic Review. J Palliat Care [Internet]. 2015 Jun 13 [cited 2024 Apr 12];31(2):118–23. Available from: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.1177/082585971503100208

12. De Bock R, Van Den Noortgate N, Piers R. Validation of the Supportive and Palliative Care Indicators Tool in a Geriatric Population. J Palliat Med. 2018 Feb;21(2):220–4.

13. Wang L, Sha L, Lakin JR, Bynum J, Bates DW, Hong P, et al. Development and Validation of a Deep Learning Algorithm for Mortality Prediction in Selecting Patients With Dementia for Earlier Palliative Care Interventions. JAMA Netw Open. 2019 Jul 12;2(7):e196972.

14. NHS England - North West. EARLY Identification in Primary Care (EARLY toolkit) [Internet]. [cited 2024 May 17]. Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/north-west/north-west-coast-strategic-clinical-networks/our-networks/palliative-and-end-of-life-care/for-professionals/early-toolkit-for-primary-care

15. Department of Health & Social Care. A plan for digital health and social care [Internet]. 2022 Jun [cited 2024 Aug 8]. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a-plan-for-digital-health-and-social-care/a-plan-for-digital-health-and-social-care#foreword-by-sajid-javid-secretary-of-state-for-health-and-social-care

16. Collins GS, Dhiman P, Ma J, Schlussel MM, Archer L, Van Calster B, et al. Evaluation of clinical prediction models (part 1): from development to external validation. BMJ. 2024 Jan 8;e074819.

17. Tsui A, Tudosiu PD, Brudfors M, Jha A, Cardoso J, Ourselin S, et al. Predicting mortality in acutely hospitalised older patients: the impact of model dimensionality. BMC Med. 2023 Jan 8;21(1):10.

18. Singh BM, Kumari-Dewat N, Ryder A, Parry E, Klaire V, Matthews D, et al. Digital health and inpatient palliative care: a cohort-controlled study. BMJ Support Palliat Care. 2024 May;14(e1):e545–8.

19. Parry E, Ahmed K, Evans S, Guest E, Klaire V, Koodaruth A, et al. GP assessment of unmet need in a complex multimorbid population using a data-driven and clinical triage system: a prospective cohort study. BJGP Open. 2023 Dec;7(4):BJGPO.2023.0078.

20. Singh B, Kumari-Dewat N, Klaire V, Ryder A, Bennion G, Jennens H, et al. A prediction algorithm to improve the accuracy of the Gold Standard Framework Surprise Question end-of-life prognostic categories in an acute hospital admission cohort-controlled study. The Proactive Risk-Based and Data-Driven Assessment of Patients at the End of Life (PRADA). 2023 [cited 2024 Aug 8]; Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2025.105682

21. STROBE. STROBE Checklists [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Aug 8]. Available from: https://www.strobe-statement.org/checklists/

22. Singh BM, Bateman J, Viswanath A, Klaire V, Mahmud S, Nevill A, et al. Risk of COVID-19 hospital admission and COVID-19 mortality during the first COVID-19 wave with a special emphasis on ethnic minorities: an observational study of a single, deprived, multiethnic UK health economy. BMJ Open. 2021 Feb 17;11(2):e046556.

23. Philp F, Faux-Nightingale A, Bateman J, Clark H, Johnson O, Klaire V, et al. Observational cross-sectional study of the association of poor broadband provision with demographic and health outcomes: the Wolverhampton Digital ENablement (WODEN) programme. BMJ Open. 2022 Nov 1;12(11):e065709.

24. Clark C, Fenning S, Haynes W, Clay S, Maddicks J, Bowden J. Lived experiences of end-of-life care at home in the UK: a scoping review of qualitative research. British Journal of General Practice. 2024 Dec;74(749):e839–44.

25. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. End of life care for adults: service delivery [A] Evidence review: What are the best service models to support identification of people who may be entering the last year of life? [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2024 Apr 10]. Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng142/evidence/a-identifying-people-who-may-be-entering-the-last-year-of-life-pdf-6955526990

26. Mitchell GK, Senior HE, Rhee JJ, Ware RS, Young S, Teo PC, et al. Using intuition or a formal palliative care needs assessment screening process in general practice to predict death within 12 months: A randomised controlled trial. Palliat Med. 2018 Feb 28;32(2):384–94.

27. Gill CJ, Sabin L, Schmid CH. Why clinicians are natural bayesians. BMJ [Internet]. 2005 May 7 [cited 2024 Aug 8];330(7499):1080–3. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC557240/

28. Krasowski A, Krois J, Kuhlmey A, Meyer-Lueckel H, Schwendicke F. Predicting mortality in the very old: a machine learning analysis on claims data. Sci Rep [Internet]. 2022 Oct 19 [cited 2024 Aug 8];12(1):17464. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-022-21373-3