Title

Enhancing Palliative Care Registration Using an Automated Robotic Process with Clinician Validation: A PRADA Prospective Cohort Study.

Running Header

Digital system improves palliative care registration

Paper metrics

Abstract 244 words

Main body 2489 words

References 30

Tables 2

Figures 3

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, The Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust, Wednesfield Rd, Wolverhampton, UK, WV10 0QP.
2. 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,

Keywords

Advance Care Planning (D032722)

Algorithms (D000465)

Health informatics (D008490)

Mortality (D009026)

Palliative care (D010166)

General Practice (D058006)

Abbreviations Used

BOT, automated robotic process

GP, General Practitioner

OR, Odds Ratios

PCR Palliative care register

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

SD, Standard deviation

Abstract

Background

Ineffective care planning at the end of life carries high rates of unscheduled hospitalisation and avoidable deaths in hospital. Palliative care registration (PCR) and crucially, care planning, helps improve adverse outcomes. However, identification for registration often occurs late or not at all.

Aim

To improve PCR accuracy and uptake by developing an automated digital tool, utilising palliative care process markers, combined with clinical judgement, to identify those with palliative care needs.

Design and Setting

A primary care based prospective cohort study in Wolverhampton.

Method

All adults (n=39,079) were included. A robotic process tool (BOT) identified those not on the PCR using any of five palliative care process markers. BOT positive patients were assessed by GPs for the PCR. Performance metrics for prediction of subsequent 1 year mortality were determined.

Results

546 patients were BOT positive. GPs added 131 patients (24%) to the PCR. This subset had the highest mortality rate (48.1%) compared to; those already on the PCR (37.2%), BOT positive patient who were not added to the PCR (19.5%) and those who were non-registered and BOT negative (0.8%) ($p<0.001$). The new combined PCR captured 220 (35.5%) of deaths, compared to 25.4% in the original PCR . A 'digital safety net' group, comprising those initially on the PCR and all BOT positive patients, accounted for 48.6% of deaths.

Conclusion

We developed a robotic process technique combined with GP assessment that yielded higher PCR uptake and accuracy, identifying individuals at-risk for ongoing surveillance.

How this fits in

Palliative care registers support the delivery of good palliative care by ensuring those who may be nearing the end of life have an assessment of their needs and supported care planning. Previous tools to support identification for palliative care registration have relied on opportunistic identification. Many people who die expectedly are not included on registers. Our new method demonstrates an automated, electronic, data driven system incorporating clinician validation. This system improved the uptake and accuracy of palliative care registration.

Main Text

Introduction

Increasing clinical complexity and aging populations strain health services (1). Patients nearing the end-of-life experience high rates of inappropriate admissions and death in hospital (2). Amongst extensive guidance for better palliative care, earlier identification of those approaching the end-of-life for palliative care registration (PCR) is paramount (1,3,4). PCR was part of the UK NHS primary care Quality and Outcome Framework (QOF) until retired in 2025, although it remains as part of NHS business processes. Inclusion on a PCR promotes care coordination, increases advanced care planning and improves the likelihood of dying in a preferred place (5) but only 55% of English practices established and maintained a palliative care register in 2024-2025 (6). It is estimated that 75% of deaths are potentially predictable, however less than 30% of those who die are captured by PCR (7,8). General practitioners (GPs) find the workload of maintaining PCR valuable but time consuming (9). This calls for new ways of working.

For early identification, the Surprise Question for clinician defined mortality prognosis is of uncertain validity and does not consistently perform well at predicting death (10). Several tools aid identification of patients with palliative care needs, but these have been developed in small populations, in disease specific cohorts or are not automated for application at scale (11–14). Addressing the failure of identification for PCR requires a systematic approach with modern day digital heath techniques (15). 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).

An uncomplicated digital system that supports establishing, maintaining, and reviewing the palliative care register, and which provides standardised performance metrics and evidenced outcomes is urgently needed. We have integrated data from hospital, community and primary care sources and deployed this into direct care as a clinical governance, quality improvement and clinical decision support tool. This tool provides early identification for anticipatory care, capturing required processes for structured care and ascertaining prospective events to determine effectiveness. We have termed this 'The Proactive Risk Based and Data Driven Assessment of Patients at the End of Life' (PRADA). Our published evidence outlines its general methodology, utility and its potential for benefit (18–20).

We have now developed an automated robotic process tool to improve PCR accuracy and uptake, utilising end of life process markers to escalate patients to their GP who makes an assessment regarding inclusion on the PCR. We emphasise the distinct but arising opportunity for needs assessment and care planning during this process, however this was not the focus of this study. Specifically, we evidence the system's ability to improve PCR accuracy and uptake, validating the assessment outcomes against 1 year mortality.

Methods

Study setting

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

Study design

We selected the whole live adult population (age ≥ 18 years, n=39, 079) of included practices. No exclusion criteria were applied. Patients were characterised according to their PCR status. Five process markers 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 advanced 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 process marker was termed "BOT positive" or, if none present, "BOT negative". No other clinical parameters were used. All BOT positive patients who were registered at baseline, were highlighted to their GP, who then validated each case for inclusion or exclusion from the PCR with a binary "yes" or "no" decision. All further clinical considerations arising from this decision, such as contact with the patient or care planning, were a matter for the GP under their routine clinical care. All patients were followed for their mortality status until study end. The study ran for 15 months and a minimum of 6 months after the last recorded GP review.

Outcomes

Performance metrics, including predictive power for prospective mortality, to assess whether the combined digital and clinical review protocol improved PCR accuracy and uptake .

Research checklists

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

Data

The data set links demographic, clinical and activity data from primary care, hospital, and community services under General Data Protection Regulation (22,23). The 5 markers were ascertained, 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. Multiple group means were tested by one way analysis of variance, and the Chi-square test was 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 Odd's Ratios (OR) are given with 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, intended use of integrated clinical data in digital heath care methodologies was discussed with the Trust's patient liaison group , receiving full support.

Results

Figure 1 shows the dispersion of the population (n=39,079) by initial PCR category, process marker driven BOT status, and GP assessment. This yielded 4 final groups, **Table 1** gives their demographic, clinical and unscheduled care activity characteristics: 1) not on the palliative care register and BOT negative (n= 38,111, 97.5%); 2) , not on the palliative care register , BOT positive, but not added to the PCF by GP review (n=415, 76% of category); 3) , not on the PCR, BOT positive, and added to the resister (n=131, 24% of category); 4) already on the PCR (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 initially not on the PCR who were "BOT positive" and GP reviewed to join the register had the highest mortality rate and the highest Odds Ratios (OR), 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 PCR (X^2 = 4.9, $p<0.05$). Those who were not on the register initially and "BOT positive", but were not added following GP review 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 PCR group (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 palliative care 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 palliative care register group (group 4), the final palliative care register group (combining groups 4 and 3) and a novel digitally derived 'digital tracker' grouping

which combined all 3 higher risk groups (2, 3, and 4). The original palliative care register captured 157 (32%) of all deaths, the updated revised palliative care register captured 220 (35.5%) whilst the digital tracker identified 301 (48.6%) deaths. The performance metrics of these varying palliative care register 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

The robotic process digital tool, combined with GP judgment, escalated 546 patients: 131 (24% with 48.1% 1-year mortality) required PCR; this improved prediction metrics for the enhanced PCR. Those not joined to the PCR (1-year mortality of 19.5%) were retained under surveillance in a "digital tracker" for rolling assessment. This enhanced early identification method is a valid platform for care planning,

Strengths and limitations

The strengths include a simple methodology, utilising recorded process markers, deployed at large scale, in real-life general practice setting, incorporating clinical judgement. Capturing deaths is important but improving care is the goal, the limitation of our study is that any resulting changes in patient outcomes were not assessed. This is now an important focus of our ongoing research.

Comparison with existing literature

We are unaware of any prior publications of digital methodologies to specifically improve PCR uptake and accuracy, nor of studies of sequential digital triage followed by clinical validation that improve PCR performance metrics (11). The 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 palliative care registration. However, NHS EARLY has not published its metrics or outcomes. Other mortality prediction engines for earlier identification have been developed in small, often disease specific cohorts, their performance metrics are uncertain, they are generally not automated, they have not been deployed or studied at a whole population scale (17,24) and none incorporate the outcome of actual PCR, or track prospective outcomes, or have built in rolling review.

General discussion

Care at the end of life affords limited time to get care planning and delivery right. Too many patients whose deaths are deemed expected remain missing from PCR (7,8) There is a dearth of evidence regarding failed ascertainment (25). Identifying patients for PCR must have accuracy in predicting mortality, but such evidence for currently recommended strategies for identifying patients for PCR is scant (26).

Our straightforward digital methodology demonstrates a replicable, whole population approach which improves PCR identification, leading to significantly improved performance metrics of the final PCR for deaths at 1 year, a strong affirmation of the selection's validity. We emphasise that identification of patients at risk of dying in the next 12 months who could benefit from end-of-life care should be seen as a distinct task. PCR inclusion is not solely about mortality but a shifting approach towards holistic needs assessment with a focus on quality of life, meaning that patients may be on a PCR for several years.

Our method is distinct in 3 key aspects. Firstly, we have extensively evaluated the variables we use (19,20). Many single variables have standalone statistical association with mortality, but in multiple variable use, they become non-significant due to collinearity, for example, counterintuitively, the electronic frailty index does not independently predict mortality in our systems, and thus the possible need for end-of-life registration. Crucially, compared to other methodologies, our system is disease agnostic, which is important when considering multimorbidity. We have published effective mortality prediction models (20,27), however they predict a future which may or may not happen. Here, we use robotic process not prediction, describing the "here and now", counting what has already been done, highlighting what has probably been missed, thus creating a live clinical governance and quality improvement tool for clinician use in direct care.

Secondly, we reaffirm(28), that GP clinical judgment improves uptake and accuracy beyond data mechanisms. Clinical judgment within the system becomes a process measure of its own right (29), clearly benefiting cohort definition, now validated by prospective mortality prediction and allaying reservations about clinician identification of those nearing end-of-life (30). Notably clinical judgement also led to exclusion from PCR of BOT-positive patients (415/546 (76%, mortality 19.5%). Register inclusion requires greater consideration than mortality expectation (4). The reasons for this were not recorded but will be multiple and complex: "grey case" uncertainty, clinical complexity, the need for difficult conversations, assessment of palliative care needs, patient choice and consent, engagement and misjudgement.

Thirdly, we address the above in two ways. The PCR excluded BOT +ve group were retained in a digital safety net, the 'digital tracker', which captured 48% of deaths at 1 year. With the use of the digital tracker, this system improves PCR quality but may also push the ambition of early detection and anticipatory care planning into this "grey zone" . Our original PCR was already 1.1% (422, capturing n=157 (25.5%) deaths), whereas the tracker encompassed 2.5% (n=968, 48% of deaths), well beyond the targeted 1% registration concept. Furthermore, PRADA is used continuously, not as a one off or at set intervals. If a patient's circumstances change, clinicians are prompted to reassess. This iterative approach also captures newly identified patients. We emphasize that under no circumstances do we propose this as a digital replacement for the palliative care register, and that no automated interventions must arise out of this clinical decision support aid and surveillance tool. It must be highlighted that even with the ability to improve early identification that outcomes will not improve unless there are effective mechanisms of needs analysis and care planning in place.

Implications for research and practice

Our future research will address this gap, exploring whether this method leads to more timely needs analysis, care planning, reduced urgent care and deaths in hospital. Critically, we will also explore the views of patients and their families including perspectives on the quality of care they receive.

Policy makers, commissioners and care providers must be challenged to adopt innovation early into practice. Our described digitised palliative care system is easily replicable, uses rudimentary digital techniques, is applicable at scale, within primary care electronic systems, in a manner that is amenable to quality measurement and clinical governance, including rolling assessment of outcomes and learned system improvements. This must be actioned now, there is an NHS opportunity with NHS EARLY (also a digital robotic process system) , to deploy these emergent methods rapidly, without the inertia of waiting for machine learning approaches, already 20 years in gestation.

Research funding 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 palliative care registers and explore the intended benefits beyond increased PCR accuracy and mortality prediction.

Conclusion

This novel digital system gives oversight of the PCR to services and clinicians in a live front-line care overview, identifying those potentially requiring PCR and those in whom registration is not timely but still of higher mortality risk. This facilitates a shift away from opportunistic interventions towards proactive identification and anticipatory care planning, and we propose it as a 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. Our methodology was discussed with our Institutional Review Board (Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust Research and Development Department) who deemed that ethical approval and informed consent was not necessary for this study. 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. A/E, Accident and Emergency OR, Odds ratio.

	Derived groupings				P value
Cohort derivation	1	2	3	4	
On original palliative care register	No	No	No	Yes	
Any palliative care process marker	None	Present	Present	-	
GP review for addition to palliative care register	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 palliative care register categories for their association with prospective mortality (see Figure 3).

Palliative care register cohort	Original palliative care register	Final palliative care register	Digital tracker and final palliative care register
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 palliative care registration, the presence of palliative care process markers and clinician review for palliative care registration (PCR).



Figure 2

Cox survival regression for the 4 groups as defined in **Table 1**. PCR, palliative care register.



Figure 3

Receiver Operating Curves for the binary association of various palliative care registration (PCR) categories with



prospectively ascertained mortality.

±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. NHS England. Quality and Outcomes Framework, 2024-25 Official statistics [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Oct 27]. Available from: https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/quality-and-outcomes-framework-achievement-prevalence-and-exceptions-data/2024-25

7. Owen RK, Bailey R, Daniels H, McBride A, Akbari A, Curnow E, et al. Health and care service utilisation in the last year of life before non-sudden death in Wales, 2014–2023, by palliative care registration: a population-based retrospective cohort study. The Lancet Regional Health - Europe. 2025 Dec;59:101479.

8. The National End of Life Care Intelligence Network, Public Health England. What we know now 2013. 2013 Nov 4 [cited 2024 Aug 8]; Available from: https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20190501131914/http://www.endoflifecare-intelligence.org.uk/resources/publications/what_we_know_now_2013

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. The accuracy of an electronic-Surprise-Question defining end-of-life cohorts in a whole adult population by algorithmic digital risk stratification: 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. 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

25. 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.

26. 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

27. Singh B, Kumari-Dewat N, Ryder A, Klaire V, Jennens H, Ahmed K, et al. Developing an electronic surprise question to predict end-of-life prognosis in a prospective cohort study of acute hospital admissions. Clinical Medicine [Internet]. 2025 Mar;25(2):100292. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1470211825000107

28. Parry E, Ahmed K, Guest E, Klaire V, Koodaruth A, Labutale P, et al. Improving event prediction using general practitioner clinical judgement in a digital risk stratification model: a pilot study. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 2024 Dec 18;24(1):382.

29. 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/

30. 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.