Assessment of Predictive Validity and Feasibility of Edmonton Frailty Scale in Identifying Postoperative Complications among Asian Elderly Patients A Prospective Observational Study

Yingke He

Singapore General Hospital

Lydia Weiling Li

Singapore General Hospital

Hao Ying

Singapore General Hospital

Eileen Yilin Sim

Singapore General Hospital

Kai Lee Ng

Singapore General Hospital

Rui Lee

Singapore General Hospital

Mattheaus Lim

Singapore General Hospital

Ruban Poopalalingam

Singapore General Hospital

Hairil Rizal Abdullah (✉ hairil.rizal.abdullah@singhealth.com.sg)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1916-0832>

Research article

Keywords: Edmonton Frail Scale, Preoperative frailty assessment, prediction of postoperative complications

Posted Date: October 18th, 2019

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.2.16291/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background Frailty is defined as diminished physiological reserve predisposing one to adverse outcomes when exposed to stressors. Currently, there is no standardized frailty assessment tool used perioperatively. Edmonton Frail Scale (EFS), which is validated for use by non-geriatricians and in selected surgical populations, is a candidate for this role. Scores ranging from “non-frail” (≤ 5 points), “vulnerable” ($6 \leq n \leq 7$ points) and “frail” (≥ 8 points). However, little evaluation of its use has been carried out in the Asians so far. The primary aim of this study is to assess if frailty measured by EFS is predictive of postoperative complications in elderly Asian patients undergoing elective major abdominal surgery. We also aim to assess the feasibility of implementing EFS as a standard tool in the outpatient preoperative assessment clinic setting. Methods This is a prospective observational study done among patients aged 70 years and above attended PAC in Singapore General Hospital prior to major abdominal surgery from December 2017 to September 2018. The Comprehensive Complication Index (CCI) and Postoperative Morbidity Survey (POMS) were used to assess their postoperative morbidity respectively. Patient’s acceptability of EFS was measured using the QQ-10 questionnaire and the inter-rater variability of EFS was also assessed using Bland Altman plot. Results EFS score was found to be a significant predictor of postoperative morbidity. (OR 1.35, $p < 0.001$) Each point increase in EFS score was associated with a 3 point increase in CCI score. (Coefficient b 2.944, $p < 0.001$) EFS score more than 4 has a fair predictability of early and 30-day postoperative complications. Feasibility study demonstrated an overall acceptance of the EFS among our patients with good inter-rater agreement. Conclusion These results show that EFS is able to predict postoperative complications in elderly Asian patients undergoing elective major abdominal surgery. It is also feasible to be incorporated as a standard assessment in the outpatient preoperative clinic setting.

Background

Frailty is defined as the biologic syndrome of a decreased physiological reserve, resulting from the cumulative declines of multiple organ systems, which predisposes one to adverse outcomes when exposed to stressors such as surgery.^{1,2} As frailty is the composite effect of multiple organ deficiencies, it has been shown to be better in predicting hospitalization stay, complications and morbidity among the elderly patients when compared to individual assessment of medical comorbidity or functional status.^{1,3}

There is an increasing number of non-cardiac surgeries done among elderly people worldwide.⁴ The prevalence of frailty is estimated to be at 10-15% among those between 65 to 75 years old. This frequency increases to more than 40% among those beyond 85 years old.^{3,5-7} However, despite several frailty assessment tools being available, routine assessment is not commonly done prior to elective surgery.⁸⁻¹⁰ Furthermore, a patient's preoperative optimization strategy rarely incorporates the formal diagnosis of frailty.^{8,11,12} This is an important observation as frailty is associated with poorer outcomes among surgical patients, such as the increased risk of infection, postoperative delirium, postoperative mortality, prolonged hospital stay and healthcare-related cost.^{4,13-16} While multiple implementation

barriers may contribute to this, the choice of the assessment tool is an important consideration.⁸ In the perioperative setting, a frailty assessment tool should be highly predictive of postoperative outcomes, and able to highlight areas amenable for optimization before surgery. Moreover, it should be both feasible and simple to administer by the non-geriatricians in the busy preoperative assessment setting.

The current frailty assessment tools can be divided into the phenotype model such as frailty phenotype which focuses on functional assessment or the cumulative deficit model such as frailty index giving deficits in the domains of comorbidities.¹⁴ However, both tests are time-consuming when incorporated into routine pre-operative assessment and they provide clinicians little information regarding areas for modification.^{2,17} The Edmonton Frail Scale (EFS), being a performance-based multidimensional frailty assessment tool, is designed to aid in the assessment and screening of frail elderly patients in the primary care setting, as well as at bedside, by non-geriatricians in the western population.¹⁸

EFS consists of 11 questions over nine different domains such as cognition, social support, mood, nutrition, and functional performance. The EFS was found to be a valid measure of frailty as the result was well correlated with the clinical impression of geriatricians through detailed history and physical examination.^{18,19} EFS has also been shown to be able to predict operative risk when used as a screening tool in the Caucasian population.¹¹ However, little evaluation of its use has been carried out in the Asians so far, which has one of the fastest aging populations in the world.

The primary aim of this study is to assess if frailty measured by EFS is predictive of postoperative complications in elderly Asian patients undergoing elective major abdominal surgery. Furthermore, we aim to assess the feasibility of implementing EFS as a standard tool in the outpatient preoperative assessment clinic setting.

Methods

Study design

This is a single-center, prospective observational study conducted in Singapore General Hospital (SGH), which is the largest tertiary public hospital in Singapore with over 1700 beds. This study consisted of two separate parts, namely assessment of predictive validity of EFS for postoperative complications and assessment of the feasibility of EFS in the preoperative outpatient setting.

Patients aged 70 years and above, who attended SGH Preoperative Assessment Clinic (PAC) prior to elective major abdominal surgery between December 2017 and September 2018 were enrolled in this study. Major abdominal surgery is defined as an intra-peritoneal surgery, expected to last more than 2 hours, or with an anticipated blood loss greater than 500 mL including surgeries in the disciplines of general surgery (upper gastrointestinal and hepatobiliary surgery), colorectal surgery, urological and gynecological surgery.

Assessment of predictive validity of EFS

Five trained nurses in the PAC who are blinded to other details related to the patient's planned surgery (type of surgery, patient's medical comorbidities, surgical plan etc) administered the questionnaire to patients who met the recruitment criteria in English, Chinese, Malay or Tamil in the same standard manner. The total EFS score was calculated by the nurses at the end of the assessment. Patient's demographic data, clinical laboratory data, comorbidities as well as 30-day postoperative complications were searched from the institution's clinical information system (Sunrise Clinical Manager, Allscripts, Illinois, USA) by two assessors (HYK and LWL).

Assessment of the feasibility of EFS in the preoperative setting

We define the feasibility of EFS based on patients' acceptability, duration of time taken to complete the questionnaire and inter-rater variability. Patients' acceptability of EFS was evaluated using the QQ-10 questionnaire. The time taken for those patients to complete EFS was also recorded.

Measurement

Assessment of frailty

Edmonton Frail Scale (EFS)

The EFS is an 11 question questionnaire which analyses nine domains of frailty (cognition, general health status, functional independence, social support, medication use, nutrition, mood, continence, functional performance), with the maximum score being 17, representing the highest level of frailty. The patients were then classified into three categories based on their EFS scores, ranging from non-frail (≤ 5 points), vulnerable ($6 \leq n \leq 7$ points) and frail (≥ 8 points).

Assessment of predictive validity of EFS

Postoperative morbidity data were analyzed using the Comprehensive Complication Index (CCI)²⁰ and Postoperative Morbidity Survey (POMS)²¹ to assess the predictive validity of EFS in the preoperative setting:

Comprehensive Complication Index (CCI)

The Comprehensive Complication Index (CCI) is a measure currently widely adopted to assess postoperative complications.²⁰ Based on the widely established Clavien-Dindo classification (CDC), it integrates into a single formula all complications of varying severity, ranging from 0 (uneventful) to 100 (death). Compared to CDC, which includes only the most severe complications, it captures all postoperative morbidity by severity over time, producing a continuous scoring variable.²² 1-month follow-up was selected to allow better capture of all postoperative complications.

Postoperative Morbidity Survey (POMS)

Postoperative Morbidity Survey (POMS) is a method used to describe short-term morbidity after major surgery. It is a nine domain tool based on organ systems. POMS was assessed on postoperative days 3, 5, 7, 14, 21, 28. For each domain, the presence or absence of morbidity is recorded based on objective criteria. A score of 0 will be given if no complication is present and 1 for any complication present under each domain on that particular postoperative day.²¹

Assessment of the feasibility of EFS in the perioperative setting

QQ-10 questionnaire

QQ-10 is a 10-item questionnaire, developed to assess the face validity, feasibility and utility of other healthcare questionnaires.[16, 17] 6 out of 10 questions assess how patients value the healthcare questionnaire (helped me communicate about my condition, relevant to my condition, easy to complete, included all the aspects of my condition I am concerned about, was enjoyable, would be happy to complete as part of routine care), while 4 out of 10 assess the burden of the questionnaire to the patient (too long, embarrassing, complicated, upset me). The patient scores each question from a scale of 0 to 4, with 0 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". The mean value score is calculated as an average score of the 6 questions assessing the value of the questionnaire from all patients, while the mean burden score is calculated from the four burden questions.

Time taken to complete EFS

Time taken to complete the EFS (in seconds) in PAC was recorded for patients recruited in the feasibility study by five clinic nurses.

Inter-rater variability of EFS

The inter-rater variability of EFS was assessed by differences in EFS scores given by two different nurses for the same patient. Bland Altman plot was used to demonstrate any difference present.

Sample size calculation

Assessment of predictive validity of EFS

The mean difference of CCI across the groups of frailty (non-frail, vulnerable and frail) was about 11-12 in our pilot study. Based on the effect size obtained, an estimated sample size of at least 14 patients in each group will allow us to significantly detect the mean difference of CCI across the groups of frailty with Type 1 error of 0.05 and Type II error of 0.2 using ANOVA analysis, assuming a dropout rate of around 20%.

Assessment of the feasibility of EFS in the perioperative setting

Based on our prior clinical experience, we estimated the mean value score obtained from QQ-10 questionnaire to be around 80%. 30 patients' data will allow us to have an interval estimate (confidence level 95%) of mean value score with precision of 15%.

Statistical analyses

Data collected were analyzed using R 3.5.1 (R Core Team (2018). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>). Descriptive data are expressed as mean with standard deviations for continuous variables and frequencies (percentages) for categorical variables.

One way ANOVA was performed to assess the differences in continuous variables including age, BMI as well as CCI scores among the three categories of frailty groups. Mann Whitney U test was done for discrete variables such as length of stay. Chi-square test was performed to investigate the correlation between categorical variables, e.g. gender, race, surgical disciplines, types of surgery, POMS score, level of frailty and discharge destinations.

A multivariable linear regression model was applied to assess the correlation of EFS score with CCI adjusted by patients' demography and surgical characteristics. A multivariable generalized linear mix model was applied to estimate adjusted odds ratio of EFS score in predicting the presence of 30-day postoperative complications (measured by total POMS score more than 0). The area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve which is plotted by the true positive rate (sensitivity) against the false positive rate (1-specificity) was used to quantify the cut-off EFS score that can predict the presence of early and 30-day complication. Bland Altman plot was constructed to assess the inter-rater variability of EFS.

A p value of < 0.05 was used to determine statistical significance.

Results

Demographics

A total of 142 patients who met our inclusion criteria were recruited into the validity study. Eight of them were excluded from the data analysis as the operation was either cancelled by the surgeon or by the patients themselves. (Figure 1) The remaining 134 patients undergoing major abdominal surgery were included in the analysis of the validity study and 30 patients out of this cohort into the feasibility study, as none of them refused to participate. Based on their EFS scores, 95 of them are non-frail ($EFS \leq 5$) (70.9%), 14 of them are vulnerable ($EFS 6-7$) (10.4%) and 25 patients (18.7%) are frail ($EFS \geq 8$). (Table 1) Patients in the frail group are older but there is no significant difference in terms of BMI, gender and race

between the three groups of patients. However, significantly less patients in the frail group underwent urology or gynecology surgery and a higher percentage of frail patients underwent General Surgery ($p = 0.021$). In addition, frail patients underwent more open surgery (58.3% in the frail group) compared to the non-frail group (30.2%), who had more laparoscopic procedures done for similar surgical conditions ($p = 0.006$). (Table 1) One patient in the frail group passed away within the 30 day follow up period.

-

Validity of EFS to predict postoperative risk

Both CCI scores and POMS were used to study short-term postoperative morbidity. A statistically significant difference in mean CCI score was found between non-frail, vulnerable and frail group. (12.84 vs 24.47 vs 35.63; $p < 0.001$) (Table 2) A similar result was demonstrated when POMS analysis was performed at postoperative day 3, 5 and 7. ($p < 0.005$) (Table 2) Frail patients also have a longer length of hospital stay compared to non-frail or vulnerable elderly patients and they are less likely to be discharged back home upon recovery.

Regression models were then constructed to assess the performance of EFS in predicting postoperative complications as measured by both CCI and POMS. Total POMS score more than 0 was used as a surrogate marker for the presence of any postoperative complications within 30 days. EFS score was found to be a significant predictor of postoperative morbidity in both models after adjusting for other confounders including age, gender, race, surgical disciplines and surgical technique (open or laparoscopic surgery). (OR 1.35, $p < 0.001$) (Table 3) Each point increase in EFS score was associated with a 3 point increase in CCI score. (Coefficient b 2.944, $p < 0.001$) (Table 4)

ROC curve was plotted to find an optimal cut-off value that can help to predict both early (measured by POMS score > 0 at postoperative day 3) and 30-day (measured by total POMS score > 0) postoperative complication. In both ROC curves, EFS score more than 4 was found to have a fair predictability demonstrated by the area under the curve (AUC) of 67.7% and 69.4% respectively. (Figure 2)

Feasibility analysis of EFS in the outpatient preoperative clinic setting

30 patients with a mean age of 76 years old took part in the QQ-10 questionnaire to understand their acceptability of EFS. The overall mean value score was 72% (SD 11.9) with a mean burden score of 12% (SD 17.1). The exact distribution of patients' answers to each question is shown in Figure 3. The high value score and low burden score show an overall acceptance of the EFS among our patients.

The average time taken for those 30 patients to complete EFS was 225 seconds (SD 57). Bland Altman plot which described inter-rater variability of EFS between 2 nurses assessing the same patient demonstrated good agreement with a mean difference of 0.07 (95% CI -1.1, 0.97). (Figure 4)

Discussion

Our data, from a single-center study, support that EFS is able to predict operative risk in elderly patients undergoing major abdominal surgery. We demonstrated that frail patients measured by higher EFS scores have greater postoperative complications risk as measured by both higher POMS and CCI scores (OR 1.35). Secondly, we propose the use of EFS cut-off score in Asian surgical patients. With a cut off score of 4, the ROC of 67.7% and 69.4% shows a fair performance in predicting both early and 30-days postoperative complications. Furthermore, we have demonstrated that the use of EFS in the outpatient preoperative assessment clinic is feasible and well accepted by elderly patients. It can be completed quickly and has minimal inter-rater variability. These features suggest that it is feasible and appropriate for EFS to be incorporated into the routine workflow of a busy preoperative assessment clinic.

Frailty is recognized as one of the strongest preoperative predictors of postoperative complications in one of meta-analysis study recently.²⁵ Having a clear understanding of postoperative recovery trajectories is essential to help clinicians conduct appropriate discussions about treatment plans with patients and family.²⁶ The value of Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment (CGA), the current gold standard for frailty assessment among geriatricians, in predicting frailty in colorectal cancer patients was shown by a study conducted by Kristjansson *et al*, but its applicability in the busy preoperative clinic setting is questionable.²⁷ In another retrospective observational study, Saxton *et al* demonstrated the predictive role of frailty measured by Frailty Index in identifying high risk patients planning for abdominal surgery.²⁸ However, as the items in Frailty Index were obtained through either history or physical examination, it provides little information on the specific deficit domain which the clinicians need to work on. The absence of a universally accepted measurement tool prevents frailty assessment from being incorporated into routine preoperative practice.

An assessment tool for use in the clinical setting should consider the two main purposes of preoperative identification of frailty: risk stratification, and identification of factors for potential modification.¹⁰ In the acute care hospital population, multidimensional frailty assessment tools like EFS provide more information on the severity and the types of deficits experienced by a patient.¹⁰ Previous studies have shown that EFS captures appropriately every area of frailty, with a high degree of correlation between EFS scores and CGA as well as other frailty scales.^{18,29} Our results in the preoperative setting of patients planning for major abdominal surgery are consistent with findings by Dasgupta *et al* that increasing EFS scores were associated with increased length of hospital stay and postoperative complications independent of age in orthopedic patients.¹¹ Similar results have also been reported in urological, cardiac as well as colorectal surgery patients in North America and Europe.²⁹⁻³¹

Previous work on the perioperative use of EFS has been focused on its predictability of postoperative mortality and length of hospital stay, but little attention has been given to the exact EFS score that could help with risk stratification in the surgical patients.^{11,32,33} Since EFS was developed and assessed by a group of Canadian geriatricians, the standard cut off value used to define frail and non-frail patients may

not be fully applicable when applying to the surgical patients in Asia when predicting postoperative outcomes.¹⁹ Our work demonstrated for the first time that EFS score of 4 and above could give perioperative clinicians fair predictability of increased postoperative complication risk in the Asian patients. This will facilitate clinical decision making and proper risk counselling when encountering frail patients in the preoperative clinic. Furthermore, by identifying factors that place those patients at risk for postoperative complications, clinicians could tailor treatment decisions to the need of individual patients. For example, nutritional supplements can be prescribed to patients deficient in the nutritional domain. For those patients who score poorly in social support and functional dependence domain, multidisciplinary discharge planning can be initiated early to facilitate their return to the community postoperatively. The cut off value from the result of this study differs from the traditional cut off value used for EFS (< 5 for non-frail, ≥5 for vulnerable and frail). This may reflect genetic differences between Asian population and Caucasian population, which is further contributed by differences in diet, functional level of the elderly and age-related functional decline. Further studies are needed in larger patient populations to confirm this finding.

A good assessment tool in a clinical setting should be acceptable to the elderly surgical patients, easy to use by non-geriatricians and not burdensome to the healthcare system. Compared to other multidimensional tools such as CGA and Comprehensive Assessment of Frailty (CAF) score which are either too complex or too lengthy restricted for research use, EFS can be completed within 5 minutes and easily followed by non-geriatricians. The study by McIsaac *et al* have suggested that almost all elderly patients are willing to participate in a frailty assessment before going for major surgery.³³ The high value score and low burden score obtained from the QQ-10 data suggested that our patients had a pleasant experience with EFS questionnaire during their preoperative visit and found it as making a positive impact on their health care. This makes EFS an ideal tool to be incorporated into routine preoperative frailty assessment.

The strength of the study includes the prospective study design with a complete follow up. The one-month follow up period includes some of the subacute post-operative complications, allowing us to better validate the use of EFS in the preoperative setting. The use of two different postoperative morbidity measurements (CCI and POMS) with different grading systems helped to reduce the potential assessor bias making the conclusions more objective. The use of a separate patient's acceptability measurement tool (QQ-10) further enhanced our knowledge about the clinical usefulness of EFS.

This study has several limitations. The single-center study design and the relatively small number of sample size may restrict its generalizability. Secondly, the outcome assessors were not blinded to the EFS score of the recruited patients. However, since the postoperative outcome data were entered into the electronic medical system by the surgical team who were unaware of the EFS score, this is unlikely to result in any observer bias. Further studies should be conducted to validate the ability of the EFS cut off score proposed in predicting postoperative complications in larger patient populations, as well investigating the frailty domains or type of surgery that are particularly associated with poor outcomes to facilitate preoperative rehabilitation programs.

Conclusions

Our study has demonstrated that frailty measured by EFS is able to predict postoperative complications in elderly Asian patients undergoing elective major abdominal surgery. EFS scores are closely correlated with postoperative morbidity as measured by POMS and CCI scores. A cut off EFS score of 4 gives clinicians a fair predictability of an increase in operative risk. We have also shown that EFS is a feasible tool to be incorporated as a standard assessment in the outpatient preoperative clinic setting, with high patients' acceptance and low inter-rater variability.

Abbreviations

Edmonton Frailty Scale (EFS), Comprehensive Complication Index (CCI), Postoperative Morbidity Survey (POMS), Preoperative Assessment Clinic (PAC), Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment (CGA), Comprehensive Assessment of Frailty (CAF)

Declarations

Ethical approval and consent to participate: The study protocol and written informed consent were approved by the Institutional Review Board (SingHealth Centralized Institutional Review Board 2018/2548, Singapore health service group).

Consent for publication: Written informed consent was obtained from all patients.

Availability of data and materials: The dataset analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Funding: There is no funding to be declared.

Competing interests: There is no competing interest to be declared.

Authors' contribution: HYK and LWL helped with patient recruitment, data collection, data analysis and manuscript preparation. RL and ML helped with patient recruitment and data collection. HY helped with statistical analysis of the data. HY, EYS, NKL and RP helped to edit the manuscript. HRA conceived the idea and critically revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements: We thank the assistance of all the nurses in PAC, SGH. Special thanks to research nurses Ms. Thin Thiri Naing and Ms. Brenda Tan Pei Yi for their assistance during patient recruitment.

References

1. Griffiths R, Mehta M: Frailty and anaesthesia: what we need to know. Continuing Education in Anaesthesia Critical Care & Pain 2014; 14:273–7

2. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, Newman AB, Hirsch C, Gottdiener J, Seeman T, Tracy R, Kop WJ, Burke G, McBurnie MA, Cardiovascular Health Study Collaborative Research Group: Frailty in older adults: evidence for a phenotype. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2001; 56:M146-156
3. Lin H-S, McBride RL, Hubbard RE: Frailty and anesthesia – risks during and post-surgery. *Local Reg Anesth* 2018; 11:61–73
4. Buigues C, Juarros-Folgado P, Fernández-Garrido J, Navarro-Martínez R, Cauli O: Frailty syndrome and pre-operative risk evaluation: A systematic review. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2015; 61:309–21
5. Siriwardhana DD, Haroon S, Rait G, Weerasinghe MC, Walters KR: Prevalence of frailty and prefrailty among community-dwelling older adults in low-income and middle-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2018; 8:e018195
6. Lee L, Heckman G, Molnar FJ: Frailty. *Can Fam Physician* 2015; 61:227–31
7. Chan SP, Ip KY, Irwin MG: Peri-operative optimisation of elderly and frail patients: a narrative review. *Anaesthesia* 2019; 74:80–9
8. Eamer G, Gibson JA, Gillis C, Hsu AT, Krawczyk M, MacDonald E, Whitlock R, Khadaroo RG: Surgical frailty assessment: a missed opportunity. *BMC Anesthesiology* 2017; 17
9. Eamer G, Al-Amoodi MJH, Holroyd-Leduc J, Rolfson DB, Warkentin LM, Khadaroo RG: Review of risk assessment tools to predict morbidity and mortality in elderly surgical patients. *The American Journal of Surgery* 2018; 216:585–94
10. Partridge JSL, Harari D, Dhesi JK: Frailty in the older surgical patient: a review. *Age Ageing* 2012; 41:142–7
11. Dasgupta M, Rolfson DB, Stolee P, Borrie MJ, Speechley M: Frailty is associated with postoperative complications in older adults with medical problems. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics* 2009; 48:78–83
12. Makary MA, Segev DL, Pronovost PJ, Syin D, Bandeen-Roche K, Patel P, Takenaga R, Devgan L, Holzmüller CG, Tian J, Fried LP: Frailty as a Predictor of Surgical Outcomes in Older Patients. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons* 2010; 210:901–8
13. Li JL, Henderson MA, Revenig LM, Sweeney JF, Kooby DA, Maithel SK, Master VA, Ogan K: Frailty and one-year mortality in major intra-abdominal operations. *Journal of Surgical Research* 2016; 203:507-512.e1
14. Robinson TN, Walston JD, Brummel NE, Deiner S, Brown CH, Kennedy M, Hurria A: Frailty for Surgeons: Review of a National Institute on Aging Conference on Frailty for Specialists. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons* 2015; 221:1083–92
15. Stoicea N, Baddigam R, Wajahn J, Sipes AC, Arias-Morales CE, Gastaldo N, Bergese SD: The Gap Between Clinical Research and Standard of Care: A Review of Frailty Assessment Scales in Perioperative Surgical Settings. *Frontiers in Public Health* 2016; 4
16. Robinson TN, Wu DS, Stiegmann GV, Moss M: Frailty predicts increased hospital and six-month healthcare cost following colorectal surgery in older adults. *Am J Surg* 2011; 202:511–4

17. Rockwood K, Song X, MacKnight C, Bergman H, Hogan DB, McDowell I, Mitnitski A: A global clinical measure of fitness and frailty in elderly people. *CMAJ* 2005; 173:489–95
18. Perna S, Francis MD, Bologna C, Moncaglieri F, Riva A, Morazzoni P, Allegrini P, Isu A, Vigo B, Guerriero F, Rondanelli M: Performance of Edmonton Frail Scale on frailty assessment: its association with multi-dimensional geriatric conditions assessed with specific screening tools. *BMC Geriatrics* 2017; 17:2
19. Rolfson DB, Majumdar SR, Tsuyuki RT, Tahir A, Rockwood K: Validity and reliability of the Edmonton Frail Scale. *Age Ageing* 2006; 35:526–9
20. Slankamenac K, Graf R, Barkun J, Puhan MA, Clavien P: The Comprehensive Complication Index: A Novel Continuous Scale to Measure Surgical Morbidity. *Annals of Surgery* 2013; 258:1–7
21. Grocott MPW, Browne JP, Van der Meulen J, Matejowsky C, Mutch M, Hamilton MA, Levett DZH, Emberton M, Haddad FS, Mythen MG: The Postoperative Morbidity Survey was validated and used to describe morbidity after major surgery. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2007; 60:919–28
22. Kim T-H, Suh Y-S, Huh Y-J, Son Y-G, Park J-H, Yang J-Y, Kong S-H, Ahn HS, Lee H-J, Slankamenac K, Clavien PA, Yang H-K: The comprehensive complication index (CCI) is a more sensitive complication index than the conventional Clavien–Dindo classification in radical gastric cancer surgery. *Gastric Cancer* 2018; 21:171–81
23. Moores KL, Jones GL, Radley SC: Development of an instrument to measure face validity, feasibility and utility of patient questionnaire use during health care: the QQ-10. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 2012; 24:517–24
24. Twohig H, Jones G, Mackie S, Mallen C, Mitchell C: Assessment of the face validity, feasibility and utility of a patient-completed questionnaire for polymyalgia rheumatica: a postal survey using the QQ-10 questionnaire. *Pilot and Feasibility Studies* 2018; 4
25. Watt J, Tricco AC, Talbot-Hamon C, Pham B, Rios P, Grudniewicz A, Wong C, Sinclair D, Straus SE: Identifying older adults at risk of harm following elective surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Medicine* 2018; 16
26. Kim S, Brooks AK, Groban L: Preoperative assessment of the older surgical patient: honing in on geriatric syndromes. *Clin Interv Aging* 2015; 10:13–27
27. Krishnan M, Beck S, Havelock W, Eeles E, Hubbard RE, Johansen A: Predicting outcome after hip fracture: using a frailty index to integrate comprehensive geriatric assessment results. *Age and Ageing* 2014; 43:122–6
28. Saxton A, Velanovich V: Preoperative frailty and quality of life as predictors of postoperative complications. *Ann Surg* 2011; 253:1223–9
29. Meyers BM, Al-Shamsi HO, Rask S, Yelamanchili R, Phillips CM, Papaioannou A, Pond GR, Jeyabalan N, Zbuk KM, Dhesy-Thind SK: Utility of the Edmonton Frail Scale in identifying frail elderly patients during treatment of colorectal cancer. *J Gastrointest Oncol* 2017; 8:32–8
30. Moro FD, Morlacco A, Motterle G, Barbieri L, Zattoni F: Frailty and elderly in urology: Is there an impact on post-operative complications? *Cent European J Urol* 2017; 70:197–205

31. Koizia L, Khan S, Frame A, Mikhail GW, Sen S, Ruparelia N, Hadjiloizou N, Malik IS, Fertleman MB: Use of the reported Edmonton frail scale in the assessment of patients for transcatheter aortic valve replacement: a possible selection tool in very high-risk patients? J Geriatr Cardiol 2018; 15:463–6
32. Amabili P, Wozolek A, Noiroi I, Roediger L, Senard M, Donneau A-F, Hubert MB, Brichant J-F, Hans GA: The Edmonton Frail Scale Improves the Prediction of 30-Day Mortality in Elderly Patients Undergoing Cardiac Surgery: A Prospective Observational Study. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth 2019; 33:945–52
33. McIsaac DI, Taljaard M, Bryson GL, Beaulé PE, Gagné S, Hamilton G, Hladkiewicz E, Huang A, Joannis JA, Lavallée LT, MacDonald D, Moloo H, Thavorn K, Walraven C van, Yang H, Forster AJ: Frailty as a Predictor of Death or New Disability After Surgery: A Prospective Cohort Study. Annals of Surgery 2018; 210:901–8

Tables

Table 1 Comparison of demographics among patients with different degrees of frailty

	Non Frail	Vulnerable	Frail	P value
Number of patients	95 (70.9%)	14 (10.4%)	25 (18.7%)	
Age (years) (mean(SD))	75.07 (4.56)	77.50 (6.21)	78.29 (6.21)	0.022
BMI (Kg/m ²) (mean (SD))	23.50 (5.1)	23.70 (3.74)	25.37 (4.0)	0.413
Gender				0.091
Male (Freq (percent))	53 (55.2%)	6 (42.9%)	8 (33.3%)	
Female (Freq (percent))	43 (44.8%)	8 (57.1%)	16 (66.7%)	
Race				0.371
Chinese (Freq (percent))	89 (92.7%)	12 (85.7%)	22 (91.7%)	
Malay (Freq (percent))	4 (4.2%)	0	1 (4.2%)	
Indian (Freq (percent))	1 (1%)	1 (7.1%)	0	
Others (Freq (percent))	2 (2.1%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (4.2%)	
Surgical Disciplines (Freq (percent))				0.021
Urology/gynaecology	40 (42.1%)	4 (28.6%)	3 (12%)	
Colorectal	28 (29.5%)	4 (28.6%)	7 (28%)	
General Surgery	27 (28.4%)	6 (42.9%)	15 (60%)	
Type of Surgery (Freq (percent))				0.006
Open	29 (30.2%)	8 (57.1%)	14 (58.3%)	
Laparoscopic	67 (69.8%)	6 (42.9%)	10 (41.7%)	

Table 2 Comparison of postoperative complications among patients with different degrees of frailty

	Non frail	Vulnerable	Frail	P value
No. of patients	95 (70.9%)	14 (10.4%)	25 (18.7%)	
CCI (Mean (SD))	12.84 (12.22)	24.47 (16.41)	35.63 (23.60)	<0.001
POMS day 3 (Median (IQR))	1 (2)	2 (2)	3 (2.5)	0.002
POMS day 5 (Median (IQR))	0 (1)	1 (1)	2 (3.5)	0.000
POMS day 7 (Median (IQR))	0 (0)	0 (2)	1 (3.5)	0.000
LOS (days) (Median (IQR))	6 (4)	9 (13.25)	11 (8.5)	<0.001
Discharge Destination (Freq/(percent))				0.029
Community Hospital	4 (4.2%)	1 (7.1%)	2 (8%)	
Home	91 (95.8%)	12 (85.7%)	21 (84%)	
Nursing Home	0	0	1 (4%)	
Others	0	1 (7.1%)	0	
Death	0	0	1 (4%)	

Table 3. Variables associated with presence of 30-day postoperative complications (measured by Total POMS.Score > 0 within 30 postoperative days) using generalized linear mix model (Age was excluded due to small number range resulting in convergence issue in model fitting)

	Odds.Ratio (95% CI)	p.value
EFS.SCORE	1.35 (1.18, 1.57)	< 0.001
Gender		
Male	Ref	
Female	0.42 (0.2, 0.83)	0.015
Race		
Chinese	Ref	
Non-Chinese	4.21 (1.2, 17.6)	0.031
BMI	0.95 (0.88, 1.01)	0.121
Surgical Discipline		
General Surgery	Ref	
Urology/Gynaecology	0.31 (0.13, 0.7)	0.006
Colorectal	0.45 (0.19, 1.03)	0.061
Type of Surgery		
Lap	Ref	
Open	1.63 (0.77, 3.57)	0.18

Table 4 Variables associated with presence of 30-day postoperative complications (measured by CCI score) using linear regression model

		Coefficient b (95% CI)	P value
EFS.SCORE		2.944 (2.012, 3.877)	< 0.001
Age		-0.047 (-0.541, 0.448)	0.852
Gender	Male	Ref	< 0.001
	Female	-9.53 (-14.471, -4.588)	
Race	Chinese	Ref	0.991
	Non-Chinese	0.053 (-8.864, 8.971)	
BMI		-0.179 (-0.686, 0.328)	0.485
Surgical Discipline	General Surgery	Ref	< 0.001
	Urology/Gynaecology	-12.268 (-18.268, -6.267)	
	Colorectal	-8.229 (-14.231, -2.228)	
Type of Surgery	Lap	Ref	0.15
	Open	3.98 (-1.463, 9.422)	

Figures

Figure 1

Study flowchart

	Total POMS Score@POD3 > 0	Total POMS Score@POD3 = 0
EFS Score ≥ 4	61	11
EFS Score < 4	36	25

	Total POMS score > 0 within 30 days postop	Total POMS score = 0 within 30 days postop
EFS Score ≥ 4	61	10
EFS Score < 4	36	25

Figure 2

Cutoff of EFS score for predicting presence of postoperative complications (A) Table showing choice of EFS cut off value to predict early postoperative complications (measured by POMS > 0 @ postoperative day3) (B) ROC curve of choice of EFS cut off value to predict early postoperative complications (measured by POMS > 0 @ postoperative day3) (C) Table showing choice of EFS cut off value to predict 30-day postoperative complications (measured by Total POMS Score > 0 in within 30 postoperative days) (D) ROC curve of choice of EFS cut off value to predict 30-day postoperative complications (measured by Total POMS Score > 0 in within 30 postoperative days)

Figure 3

QQ-10 questionnaire result. X axis shows the content of each question (value questions in blue colour and burden questions in red colour) and Y axis shows the number of patients giving a particular score for that question. (0-strongly disagree, 1-mostly disagree, 2-neither agree nor disagree, 3-mostly agree, 4-strongly agree)

Bland Altman plot

Figure 4

Bland Altman plot showing inter-rater agreement of EFS