

Social Frailty Index: Development and Validation of an Index of Social Attributes Predictive of Mortality in Older Adults

Sachin J Shah, MD, MPH (1); Sandra Oreper, MPH (1); Sun Young Jeon, PhD (2); W. John Boscardin, PhD (2,3); Margaret Fang, MD, MPH (1); Kenneth E Covinsky, MD, MPH (2)

(1) Department of Medicine (Division of Hospital Medicine), University of California, San Francisco, California, USA

(2) Department of Medicine (Division of Geriatrics), University of California, San Francisco, California, USA

(3) Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, University of California, San Francisco, California, USA.

Corresponding Author

Sachin J Shah, MD, MPH
Division of Hospital Medicine
521 Parnassus Ave, Room 104, Box 0131
San Francisco, CA, 94143-0131
sachin.shah@ucsf.edu
415-862-8616

Word count: 2516; abstract (285/300 words)

2 **ABSTRACT**

3 **Objective:** To develop and validate the Social Frailty Index, a summary measure of
4 social risk in older adults, and determine its ability to risk stratify beyond traditional
5 medical risk models

6 **Design:** Prognostic model development and validation using demographics and a
7 comprehensive inventory of social characteristics

8 **Setting:** The Health and Retirement Study, a longitudinal, nationally representative
9 survey of U.S. adults >50 years. We developed the model using the 2010 wave and
10 validated it using the 2012 wave; there was no overlap between 2010 and 2012
11 respondents.

12 **Participants** 8250 adults aged ≥65 years who completed the Psychosocial and
13 Lifestyle Questionnaire (4302 in the 2010 development cohort, 3948 in the 2012
14 validation cohort).

15 **Main exposure:** Demographic and social characteristics

16 **Main outcome:** 4-year mortality

17 **Results:** Within 4 years of the baseline interview, 22% of study participants in both the
18 development and validation cohort had died. Drawn from 183 possible predictors, the
19 final model included age, gender, and 8 social predictors: lacking neighborhood
20 cleanliness, low perceived control over financial situation, having children and meeting
21 with them less than yearly, not working for pay, less active with children (grandchildren,
22 neighborhood, nieces/nephews), no volunteering or charity work, feeling isolated from
23 others, being treated with less courtesy or respect. In the validation cohort, the model
24 discriminated well (c-statistic 0.73) and was strongly associated with 4-year mortality

25 (7.3% in the lowest decile, 59.9% in the highest decile). Also, the Social Frailty Index
26 meaningfully risk-stratified participants beyond the Charlson score, a commonly used
27 medical comorbidity index, and the Lee Index score, a comorbidity and function model.
28 **Conclusion:** This prognostic index, which includes age, gender, and 8 social
29 characteristics, accurately risk stratifies older adults and refines the prediction of
30 commonly used comorbidity- and function-based risk models.

31 INTRODUCTION

32 Risk prediction and prognostication are core to clinical medicine, medical
33 research, and healthcare policy. For example, life expectancy informs benefits and
34 harms of cancer screening, baseline risk measurement is central to observational
35 research, and risk adjustment is crucial in quality measures.¹⁻³ Traditional approaches
36 to risk prediction rely heavily on measuring the prognostic impact of medical
37 comorbidities.³⁻⁵ These efforts have yielded widely-used summary measures of medical
38 risk.

39 However, a rich literature also demonstrates that a wide range of social factors
40 meaningfully predict health outcomes.⁶⁻⁸ For example, social support predicts reduced
41 rates of nursing home stays,⁹ loneliness portends higher rates of functional decline and
42 death,¹⁰ and social network strength is associated with lower rates of cognitive
43 decline.¹¹

44 Although social attributes are predictive of key aging outcomes, we lack an
45 efficient way to summarize the prognostic impact of social factors. Practicality is a key
46 impediment—for use in a clinical, research, or policy setting, a social risk model is more
47 likely to be implemented if it is easy to use. The few existing social risk models that
48 have been developed are expansive inventories.¹²⁻¹⁵ These models are comprehensive
49 and predictive, albeit unwieldy to implement. Some have sought to address usability by
50 relying exclusively on area-level data. Such efforts produced the Center for Disease
51 Control's Social Vulnerability Index,¹⁶ the Area Deprivation Index,¹⁷ and the English
52 Indices of Deprivation¹⁸, which are useful for area-level interventions and planning.
53 However, such measures cannot assess an individual's risk because inferences from

54 group-level analyses cannot be reliably applied to individuals within those groups, a
55 principle known as ecological fallacy.¹⁹ Codifying which social elements to include is
56 challenging; as a result, many studies exclude social risk factors altogether and, in
57 doing so, run the risk of biased measurement.^{20,21}

58 The primary aim of this study was to create the Social Frailty Index, a
59 parsimonious person-level social risk prediction model derived from a comprehensive
60 inventory of social characteristics that predicts mortality in older adults. Our goal was to
61 identify a small subset of risk factors that reflects social risk, not to identify causal
62 factors or all possible social risk factors. Our second aim was to determine if the Social
63 Frailty Index improves risk stratification beyond existing risk models.

64

65 **METHODS**

66 **Study participants**

67 We developed a longitudinal cohort of older adults from the Health and
68 Retirement Study (HRS) to develop the Social Frailty Index. The HRS is a longitudinal,
69 nationally representative survey of more than 43,000 Americans aged 50 years and
70 older.^{22,23} The goal of the HRS is to measure changes in health, wealth, social structure,
71 and function as participants age. Participants are interviewed every 2 years by phone, in
72 person or via internet surveys. We included participants who were 65 years and older
73 who completed the Psychosocial and Lifestyle Questionnaire in 2010 or 2012. The 2010
74 cohort was used to develop the model, and the 2012 cohort was used to validate the
75 model. Because the questionnaire is administered to a random half of the total HRS
76 cohort every two years, there is no overlap between 2010 and 2012 respondents.

77 **Social predictors**

78 We identified predictors using the Social Frailty in Older Adults framework
79 (**Appendix 1**), a framework articulated by sociologists and gerontologists based on
80 Social Production Function theory—it conceptualizes social frailty as “a lack of
81 resources to fulfill one’s basic social needs.”²⁴ The framework identifies 4 social
82 domains relevant to aging—General Resources, Social Resources, Social Activities,
83 Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs. Using the HRS core interview and the Psychosocial
84 and Lifestyle Questionnaire, we identified 472 potential social predictors. Two
85 investigators (SJS, SO) independently reviewed each predictor to determine if it fit
86 within the Social Frailty in Older Adults framework. Any differences were reconciled
87 through consensus discussion. This process yielded 183 candidate predictors
88 (**Appendix 2**).

89

90 **Outcome**

91 Our primary outcome was all-cause mortality 4 years after the interview,
92 mirroring the time horizon used in prior mortality prediction studies.⁴ Mortality was
93 determined using a combination of the National Death Index and HRS surviving family
94 member exit interviews. We identified 3 secondary outcomes, all assessed over 4
95 years—loss of activity of daily living (ADL) independence, prolonged nursing home stay,
96 and hospitalization. Loss of ADL independence was defined as being fully ADL
97 independent at baseline interview and requiring help with one or more ADLs at 4 years.
98 Nursing home use was defined as spending 90 nights or more in a nursing home within

99 4 years of the interview. Hospitalization was defined as self-reported hospital admission
100 lasting 2 nights or more.

101

102 **Development and validation of the primary model**

103 We used the 2010 cohort to derive the prediction model. We determined the
104 functional form of continuous predictors by assessing linear, log transformation, and
105 exponential transformation against the primary outcome (mortality at 4 years). We
106 selected the functional form with the lowest Bayesian information criterion (BIC). We
107 determined the functional form of ordinal predictors by assessing linear, categorical, and
108 manual categorization against the primary outcome selecting the functional form with
109 the lowest BIC. Missing predictors were imputed using single imputation. Categorical
110 variables were imputed with the mode value and continuous variables were imputed
111 with the median value.

112 We used a two-step procedure to derive the prediction model.²⁵ First, from the
113 set of 183 predictors, we used LASSO regression with a lambda parameter chosen by
114 10-fold cross-validation to produce the smallest subset of predictors. Then, we used the
115 selected predictors to fit a logistic regression model that estimated the 4-year risk of
116 death. In this step, we removed several additional to improve parsimony and face
117 validity and reduce collinearity. Removing these predictors improved the model BIC and
118 only marginally affected the AUC (0.74 to 0.73). This final model was then validated in
119 the 2012 cohort. In the validation cohort, we determined discrimination and calibration.
120 We also determine the model's discriminatory capacity for secondary outcomes. In the
121 2012 cohort, we determined if the Social Frailty Index could further stratify participants'

122 mortality risk beyond the Lee Index and beyond the Charlson score in the subset with
123 Medicare claims linkage.^{3,4}

124 We report all results with 95% confidence intervals or two-sided P value. The a
125 priori significance threshold was $P < .05$. We performed analyses using SAS 9.4 (Cary,
126 NC) and R 4.0.3 (Vienna, Austria). The TRIPOD checklist can be found in Appendix 3.²⁶

127

128 **RESULTS**

129 **Baseline characteristics**

130 4302 participants were included in the 2010 development cohort (**Appendix 4**).
131 The development cohort's median age was 75 years, and 57% were women (**Table 1**).
132 Regarding health and function, 27% reported fair or poor health, 56% reported ever
133 using tobacco, and 26% had a screening test consistent with cognitive impairment or
134 dementia. Within 4 years of the baseline interview, 22% of study participants in both the
135 development cohort (960/4302) and validation cohort (882/3948) had died.

136 In the domain of General Resources and Life History, 19% had less than a high
137 school education, and 27% were military veterans (**Table 2**). Regarding Social
138 Resources, 62% were married or partnered, 92% had living children, and 64% reported
139 they “often have someone they can talk to.” In Social Activities, 6% reported meeting
140 with their children less than yearly, and 65% reported writing or emailing friends monthly
141 or more frequently. Concerning Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs, 5% reported often
142 feeling isolated from others, 76% reported being rarely being treated with less courtesy
143 or respect than other people (never or less than once a year), and 12% reported not
144 having a major activity such as a job, looking after the home, or volunteer work.

145 **Model development results**

146 The model development procedure yielded a model of 10 predictors from all 4
147 domains in the Social Frailty in Older Adults Framework (**Table 3**). The 10 predictors
148 include age and gender, 2 measures of General Resources and Life Events
149 (neighborhood cleanliness; perceived control over their financial situation), 1 measure of
150 Social Resource and Social Activities (has children and meets with them less than
151 yearly), 3 measures of Social Activities (working for pay; less active with grandchildren,
152 neighborhood children, nieces/nephews; no volunteering or charity work), and 2
153 measures reflecting Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs (feeling isolated from others;
154 being treated with less courtesy or respect).

155 Beyond age and gender, which are commonly used in prediction models, in the
156 final model, the most prominent predictors of death include not working for pay (OR
157 1.74, 95% CI 1.46 to 2.01), meeting with children less than once a year (OR 1.64, 95%
158 CI 1.34 to 1.95), and often feeling isolated from others (OR 1.67, 95% CI 1.53 to 1.80).

159

160 **Validation measures**

161 The Social Frailty Index performed well in the 2012 validation cohort. The model
162 was well calibrated (**Appendix 5**), observed and expected mortality in the validation
163 data were highly correlated. In the lowest decile, the observed 4-year mortality was
164 7.3% (predicted 4.4%), and in the highest decile was 59.9% (predicted 62.2%). The
165 model discriminated well with an AUC of 0.76 to predict death in the development
166 cohort and 0.73 in the validation cohort (**Appendix 6**). The model also performed well

167 when used to predict new ADL dependence (AUC 0.72) and nursing home stays (AUC
168 0.74). The model performed modestly when used to predict hospitalization (AUC 0.64).

169

170 **Risk stratification beyond Charlson Score**

171 The Social Frailty Index meaningfully risk-stratified participants beyond the
172 Charlson score, a commonly used medical comorbidity index. The Social Frailty Index
173 and the Charlson score are weakly correlated (Pearson's correlation of 0.17, CI 0.12-
174 0.21, $p < 0.001$) in a subset of the validation cohort who have 12 months of Medicare
175 claims data before their baseline interview (2226 of 3948). **Figure 1** illustrates that the
176 Social Frailty Index risk stratifies beyond the Charlson score in all 3 tertiles of the
177 Charlson score. For example, in the validation cohort's highest tertile of Charlson score,
178 the observed mortality rate with a high Social Frailty Index score was 47% vs. 30% in
179 the low Social Frailty tertile ($p < 0.001$).

180

181 **Risk stratification beyond Lee Index**

182 The Social Frailty Index stratified participants' risk beyond the Lee Index, a
183 commonly used model that uses comorbidities and function to predict mortality. The
184 Social Frailty Index and the Lee Index were modestly correlated (Pearson's correlation
185 of 0.63, CI 0.61-0.65, $p < 0.001$). **Figure 2** illustrates that the Social Frailty Index risk
186 stratifies beyond the Lee Index, specifically those with Middle or High Lee Index scores.
187 For example, in the highest tertile of Lee score in the validation cohort, the observed
188 mortality rate with a high Social Frailty Index score was 51% vs. 29% in the low Social
189 Frailty tertile ($p < 0.001$).

190 **DISCUSSION**

191 Using a comprehensive social well-being survey of older adults, we developed
192 and validated the Social Frailty Index, which predicts the risk of death over 4 years
193 **(Figure 3)**. We demonstrate that a small subset of social predictors can meaningfully
194 stratify mortality risk in a nationally representative cohort of older adults. Further, the
195 Social Frailty Index improves risk stratification beyond the Charlson score, a commonly
196 used medical comorbidity model, and the Lee Index, a commonly used mortality
197 prediction model. Where mortality prediction is important for older adults, this study
198 demonstrates social risk factors represent an important and often unaccounted for risk
199 domain.

200 This study builds on prior work incorporating social risk factors into prediction
201 models in at least two noteworthy ways. First, we build on a wealth of studies
202 establishing that social factors predict mortality by distilling the many hundreds of known
203 social risk factors into an efficient summary index of social risk. The resulting Social
204 Frailty index is a parsimonious model drawn from a comprehensive survey that can
205 reasonably be exported. Second, we show that a comorbidity score alone is insufficient
206 for risk stratification. We found social risk and medical comorbidities risk are not well
207 correlated. Thus, when added to the Charlson model or Lee Index, the Social Frailty
208 Index meaningfully recasts the predicted risk for a substantial number of individuals.
209 Where risk stratification is important, these results support supplementation of
210 traditional prediction models with the Social Frailty Index.

211 There are several applications of the Social Frailty Index in medical research and
212 clinical care. Collection in prospective observational studies is a natural use case for the

213 index. Prognostic adjustment is central to observational research. The study of any risk
214 factor hinges on accounting for the baseline risk differential in those with and without the
215 prognostic factor in question. Current approaches rely heavily on medical comorbidities
216 for prognostic adjustment. Adding the Social Frailty Index would help account for an
217 acknowledged, but challenging to measure risk domain. In interventional studies,
218 investigators may seek to understand if the effect of intervention differs by social frailty.
219 Additionally, this instrument may be used in conjunction with existing models where
220 mortality prediction is used to guide the clinical care of older adults. For instance, the
221 Social Frailty Index may be used with legacy mortality prediction models when
222 addressing advanced care planning or assessing the risk and benefits of screening
223 procedures in older adults.

224 Additionally, the Social Frailty Index can address policymakers and health care
225 delivery organizations' need for accurate risk adjustment. For policymakers, quality
226 measurement in health care turns on accurate baseline risk measurement. In a 2017
227 report, the National Academy of Medicine detailed the importance of including social
228 risk factors in comorbidities-based risk models.²⁷ However, social factors have yet to be
229 included in quality measures, partly because it is not clear which measures to use.
230 Accountable Care Organizations commonly use claims and electronic health record
231 data to identify patients for interventions like intensive care management. However,
232 these methods do not adequately capture patients' social dimensions, resulting in
233 misidentification.^{28,29} The Social Frailty Index could address significant gaps in quality
234 measurement and population health.

235 The study design and data have limitations that are important to consider when
236 interpreting the results. First, the risk factors in the Social Frailty Index are not
237 necessarily causal; that is, it should not be taken to mean that addressing the risk
238 factors identified in the model will reduce mortality risk. Additionally, the goal of this
239 endeavor was to identify a small subset of social factors that best capture social risk.
240 Thus, the absence of a putative factor in the index does not imply it was not predictive,
241 rather that it was possible to capture the prognostic value of that risk factor across the
242 study population through the risk factors already included in the model. Finally, in this
243 study, the development and validation cohorts were separated by two years, a structure
244 that lends credibility to the generalizability of the Social Frailty Index.³⁰ Future validation
245 outside of the Health and Retirement Study will prove helpful in characterizing the
246 robustness of the Social Frailty Index. In particular, validation studies should focus on
247 populations typically underrepresented in survey studies, like seniors living in poverty or
248 racial and ethnic minorities such as Asian Americans.

249 In summary, the Social Frailty Index is a short survey that uses social risk factors
250 to estimate the 4-year mortality risk in adults 65 years and older. The 10-item index
251 obtained by patient report can be used to assess mortality risk and the risk of disability
252 and prolonged nursing home stays. The model improves upon existing risk prediction
253 tools and has clinical, population health, and research applications.

254 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

255 We would like to thank Dr. Leah Karliner and Dr. Michael Steinman for their participation
256 in the advisory panel for this study.

257

258 **Author contributions:** Dr. Shah had full access to all of the data in the study and takes
259 responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. All
260 authors listed have contributed sufficiently to the project to be included as authors, and
261 all those who are qualified to be authors are listed in the author byline.

262

263 **Conflict of Interest Disclosure:** Dr. Shah, Dr. Jeon, Mrs. Oreper, Dr. Boscardin, and
264 Dr. Covinsky reported funding from the National Institute on Aging/National Institutes of
265 Health. Mrs. Oreper also reported personal fees from EpiExcellence LLC outside the
266 submitted work. Dr. Fang reported grants from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood
267 Institute/National Institutes of Health during the conduct of the study (K24HL141354)
268 and grants from Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute outside the submitted
269 work.

270

271 **Funding:** This study was funded by the National Institute on Aging (R03AG060090,
272 P30AG044281).

273

274 **Role of the Funder/Sponsor:** The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the
275 study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation,

276 review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for
277 publication.

278

279 **Data sharing:** Researchers can apply to the Health and Retirement Study
280 (<https://hrs.isr.umich.edu/>) to access the data used in this study.

281

282 **Ethical review:** The University of California, San Francisco, Committee on Human
283 Research approved analysis for this study and waived the requirement for patient
284 consent (Institutional Review Board No. 16-19185).

285 References

- 286 1. Lee SJ, Boscardin WJ, Stijacic-Cenzer I, Conell-Price J, O'Brien S, Walter LC.
287 Time lag to benefit after screening for breast and colorectal cancer: meta-analysis
288 of survival data from the United States, Sweden, United Kingdom, and Denmark.
289 *BMJ*. 2013;346:e8441. doi:10.1136/bmj.e8441
- 290 2. Bernheim SM, Grady JN, Lin Z, et al. National Patterns of Risk-Standardized
291 Mortality and Readmission for Acute Myocardial Infarction and Heart Failure.
292 *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*. 2010;3(5):459-467.
293 doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.110.957613
- 294 3. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying
295 prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: Development and validation. *Journal*
296 *of Chronic Diseases*. 1987;40(5):373-383. doi:10.1016/0021-9681(87)90171-8
- 297 4. Lee SJ, Lindquist K, Segal MR, Covinsky KE. Development and Validation of a
298 Prognostic Index for 4-Year Mortality in Older Adults. *JAMA*. 2006;295(7):801-808.
299 doi:10.1001/jama.295.7.801
- 300 5. Schonberg MA, Davis RB, McCarthy EP, Marcantonio ER. Index to Predict 5-Year
301 Mortality of Community-Dwelling Adults Aged 65 and Older Using Data from the
302 National Health Interview Survey. *J GEN INTERN MED*. 2009;24(10):1115-1122.
303 doi:10.1007/s11606-009-1073-y
- 304 6. McGinnis JM, Williams-Russo P, Knickman JR. The Case For More Active Policy
305 Attention To Health Promotion. *Health Affairs*. 2002;21(2):78-93.
306 doi:10.1377/hlthaff.21.2.78
- 307 7. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Layton JB. Social relationships and mortality risk: a
308 meta-analytic review. *PLoS medicine*. 2010;7(7):e1000316.
- 309 8. Puterman E, Weiss J, Hives BA, et al. Predicting mortality from 57 economic,
310 behavioral, social, and psychological factors. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*.
311 2020;117(28):16273-16282. doi:10.1073/pnas.1918455117
- 312 9. Shah SJ, Fang MC, Wannier SR, Steinman MA, Covinsky KE. Association of
313 Social Support With Functional Outcomes in Older Adults Who Live Alone. *JAMA*
314 *Internal Medicine*. Published online November 15, 2021.
315 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2021.6588
- 316 10. Perissinotto CM, Cenzer IS, Covinsky KE. Loneliness in Older Persons: A Predictor
317 of Functional Decline and Death. *Arch Intern Med*. 2012;172(14):1078-1084.
318 doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2012.1993
- 319 11. Fratiglioni L, Wang HX, Ericsson K, Maytan M, Winblad B. Influence of social
320 network on occurrence of dementia: a community-based longitudinal study. *Lancet*.
321 2000;355(9212):1315-1319. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(00)02113-9

- 322 12. Andrew MK, Mitnitski AB, Rockwood K. Social Vulnerability, Frailty and Mortality in
323 Elderly People. *PLOS ONE*. 2008;3(5):e2232. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0002232
- 324 13. Andrew MK, Rockwood K. Social vulnerability predicts cognitive decline in a
325 prospective cohort of older Canadians. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*. 2010;6(4):319-
326 325.e1. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2009.11.001
- 327 14. Andrew MK, Mitnitski A, Kirkland SA, Rockwood K. The impact of social
328 vulnerability on the survival of the fittest older adults. *Age Ageing*. 2012;41(2):161-
329 165. doi:10.1093/ageing/afr176
- 330 15. Wallace LMK, Theou O, Pena F, Rockwood K, Andrew MK. Social vulnerability as
331 a predictor of mortality and disability: cross-country differences in the survey of
332 health, aging, and retirement in Europe (SHARE). *Aging Clin Exp Res*.
333 2015;27(3):365-372. doi:10.1007/s40520-014-0271-6
- 334 16. Flanagan BE, Gregory EW, Hallisey EJ, Heitgerd JL, Lewis B. A Social
335 Vulnerability Index for Disaster Management. *Journal of Homeland Security and
336 Emergency Management*. 2011;8(1). doi:10.2202/1547-7355.1792
- 337 17. Kind AJH, Jencks S, Brock J, et al. Neighborhood Socioeconomic Disadvantage
338 and 30-Day Rehospitalization. *Ann Intern Med*. 2014;161(11):765-774.
339 doi:10.7326/M13-2946
- 340 18. Noble S, McLennan D, Noble M, et al. *The English Indices of Deprivation 2019*.
341 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government; 2019:31. Accessed April
342 20, 2022.
343 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attac](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/833947/loD2019_Research_Report.pdf)
344 [hment_data/file/833947/loD2019_Research_Report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/833947/loD2019_Research_Report.pdf)
- 345 19. Piantadosi S, Byar DP, Green SB. The ecological fallacy. *Am J Epidemiol*.
346 1988;127(5):893-904.
- 347 20. Lewis GH. "Impactibility Models": Identifying the Subgroup of High-Risk Patients
348 Most Amenable to Hospital-Avoidance Programs. *Milbank Quarterly*.
349 2010;88(2):240-255. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0009.2010.00597.x
- 350 21. *Designing and Implementing Medicaid Disease and Care Management Programs*.
351 *Section 3: Selecting and Targeting Populations for a Care Management Program*.
352 Agency for Healthcare Research & Quality; 2014. Accessed October 19, 2017.
353 /professionals/systems/long-term-
354 care/resources/hcbs/medicaidmgmt/medicaidmgmt3.html
- 355 22. Juster FT, Suzman R. An Overview of the Health and Retirement Study. *The
356 Journal of Human Resources*. 1995;30:S7-S56. doi:10.2307/146277

- 357 23. Sonnega A, Faul JD, Ofstedal MB, Langa KM, Phillips JWR, Weir DR. Cohort
358 Profile: the Health and Retirement Study (HRS). *Int J Epidemiol.* 2014;43(2):576-
359 585. doi:10.1093/ije/dyu067
- 360 24. Bunt S, Steverink N, Olthof J, Schans CP van der, Hobbelen JSM. Social frailty in
361 older adults: a scoping review. *Eur J Ageing.* Published online January 31, 2017:1-
362 12. doi:10.1007/s10433-017-0414-7
- 363 25. Zhao S, Witten D, Shojaie A. In Defense of the Indefensible: A Very Naïve
364 Approach to High-Dimensional Inference. *Statistical Science.* 2021;36(4):562-577.
365 doi:10.1214/20-STS815
- 366 26. Collins GS, Reitsma JB, Altman DG, Moons KGM. Transparent Reporting of a
367 multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis (TRIPOD): the
368 TRIPOD statement. *Ann Intern Med.* 2015;162(1):55-63. doi:10.7326/M14-0697
- 369 27. Committee on Accounting for Socioeconomic Status in Medicare Payment
370 Programs, Board on Population Health and Public Health Practice, Board on
371 Health Care Services, Health and Medicine Division, National Academies of
372 Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. *Accounting for Social Risk Factors in
373 Medicare Payment.* (Kwan LY, Stratton K, Steinwachs DM, eds.). National
374 Academies Press; 2017:23635. doi:10.17226/23635
- 375 28. Garcia ME, Uratsu CS, Sandoval-Perry J, Grant RW. Which Complex Patients
376 Should Be Referred for Intensive Care Management? A Mixed-Methods Analysis. *J
377 Gen Intern Med.* 2018;33(9):1454-1460. doi:10.1007/s11606-018-4488-5
- 378 29. Obermeyer Z, Powers B, Vogeli C, Mullainathan S. Dissecting racial bias in an
379 algorithm used to manage the health of populations. Published online 2019:8.
- 380 30. Justice AC, Covinsky KE, Berlin JA. Assessing the Generalizability of Prognostic
381 Information. *Ann Intern Med.* 1999;130(6):515-524. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-130-6-
382 199903160-00016

383

384 **Tables and Figures**

385 **Table 1: Cohort characteristics, demographics, health status, and function**

	2010 Development cohort (n=4302)	2012 Validation cohort (n=3948)
Demographics		
Age, years, (median [IQR])	75 [70, 80]	75 [71, 80]
Women (%)	2444 (57)	2308 (58)
Health Status		
Fair or poor self-reported health (%)	1169 (27)	1116 (28)
Significant pain (%)	240 (6)	211 (5)
Diabetes (%)	1033 (24)	1020 (26)
Cancer (excluding minor skin cancer) (%)	907 (21)	850 (22)
Heart disease (%)	1350 (31)	1323 (34)
Stroke (%)	465 (11)	478 (12)
Arthritis (%)	2973 (69)	2797 (71)
Depression (%)	489 (12)	474 (12)
Ever tobacco use (%)	2398 (56)	2219 (57)
Function		
Help with any ADL (%)	377 (9)	375 (10)
Cognition (%)		
Dementia	266 (6)	270 (7)
Impairment, not dementia	870 (20)	813 (21)
Intact	3166 (74)	2865 (73)
Visual impairment (%)	952 (22)	917 (23)
Hearing impairment (%)	1113 (26)	1039 (26)

386

387 Legend

388 IQR – interquartile range; ADL – activities of daily living

389

390 **Table 2: Cohort social characteristics**

	2010 Development cohort (n=4302)	2012 Validation cohort (n=3948)
General Resources and Life History		
Race (%)		
Black	500 (12)	485 (12)
White	3665 (85)	3315 (84)
Hispanic ethnicity (%)	278 (6)	321 (8)
Local area is full of rubbish and litter*	733 (18)	755 (20)
Low self-reported control over financial situation** (%)	441 (10)	402 (11)
Military veteran (%)	1152 (27)	968 (25)
Satisfaction with daily life and leisure activities (1 to 5 scale) (median [IQR]) ^	2 [1, 3]	2 [1, 3]
Not at all satisfied with retirement (%)	192 (5)	181 (5)
Education (%)		
Less than high school	834 (19)	829 (21)
High school	1685 (39)	1459 (37)
Some college	897 (21)	860 (22)
College and above	885 (21)	800 (20)
Social Resources		
Married or Partnered (%)		
Married or partnered	2666 (62)	2353 (60)
Never married	107 (2)	103 (3)
Separated or divorced	374 (9)	398 (10)
Widowed	1155 (27)	1094 (28)
Living children (%)	3799 (92)	3367 (92)
Has friends (%)	3877 (93)	3481 (91)
Number of living siblings (median [IQR])	2 [1, 3]	2 [1, 4]
Often has someone they can talk to (%)	2690 (64)	2453 (63)
Social Activities		
Presently working for pay (%)	738 (18)	630 (16)
Activities with grandchildren, niece/nephews or neighborhood children (median [IQR]) ^^	5 [4, 7]	5 [4, 7]
Does no volunteering or charity work (%)	2205 (53)	2163 (56)
Goes to a sport, social, or other club (median [IQR]) \$	6 [5, 7]	6 [5, 7]
Meets with children less than once a year (%)	246 (6)	276 (7)
Writes or emails friends monthly or more frequently (%)	2581 (65)	2348 (64)
Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs		
Feel isolated from others (%)		

Often	211 (5)	194 (5)
Some of the time	1013 (24)	1018 (26)
Hardly ever or never	2948 (69)	2600 (66)
Often feel in tune with the people around you (%)	1990 (48)	1814 (47)
Feel part of a group of friends		
Often	2023 (48)	1817 (47)
Some of the time	1593 (38)	1430 (37)
Hardly ever or never	572 (14)	602 (16)
You are treated with less courtesy or respect than other people (never or less than once a year) (%)	3209 (76)	2923 (76)
People act as if they think you are not smart (never or less than once a year) (%)	3336 (79)	3068 (80)

391
392 Legend
393 IQR – interquartile range
394 Categorization in the table is reflective of the functional form most predictive of the primary outcome in the
395 development cohort.
396
397 *defined as (≥ 4 on 1 to 7 scale where 1=area is kept very clean, 7=area is always full of rubbish and
398 litter)
399 **defined as (≤ 3 on 0 to 10 scale where 1=no control at all, 10=very much control)
400 ^ on a 1 to 5 scale (1=completely satisfied, 5= not at all)
401 ^ on a 1 to 7 scale (1=daily, 7=never/not relevant)
402 \$ sport, social, or other clubs on a 1 to 7 scale (1=daily, 7=never/not relevant)

Table 3: Individual Predictors in the Social Frailty Index

Domain	Predictor	Odds Ratio (95% CI)
Demographics	Age, per 1-year increase	1.12 (1.11 - 1.13)
Demographics	Gender, male	1.74 (1.58 - 1.90)
General resources and life history	Local area is full of rubbish and litter*	1.42 (1.22 - 1.62)
General resources and life history	Low self-reported control over financial situation**	1.55 (1.31 - 1.79)
Social Resource/Social Activities	Has children and meets with children less than once a year	1.64 (1.34 - 1.95)
Social Activities	Activities with grandchildren, niece/nephews or neighborhood children^^	1.11 (1.06 - 1.16)
Social Activities	Not working for pay at the present time	1.74 (1.46 - 2.01)
Social Activities	Does no volunteering or charity work	1.62 (1.45 - 1.79)
Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs	Feeling isolated from others Some of the time vs. hardly ever or never	1.29 (1.15 - 1.43)
	Often vs. hardly ever or never	1.67 (1.53 - 1.80)
Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs	You are treated with less courtesy or respect than other people (a few times a year or more often)	1.34 (1.15 - 1.53)

Legend

* defined as (>=4 on 1 to 7 scale where 1=area is kept very clean, 7=area is always full of rubbish and litter)

**defined as (<=3 on 0 to 10 scale where 1=no control at all, 10=very much control)

^^grandchildren, neighborhood children, nieces/nephews, on a 1 to 7 scale (1=daily, 7=never/not relevant), continuous Model intercept -9.2

Figure 2: Observed mortality in 2012 Validation Cohort by Social Frailty and Charlson score



Legend

The bubble chart compares observed mortality in the validation cohort by tertile of Social Frailty within tertiles of Charlson score, a comorbidity risk model. The Charlson score cohort was completed in a subset of the study cohort where 12 months of Medicare data were available to calculate a Charlson score (2226 of 3948). Since the Charlson score does not include age, when comparing it with the Social Frailty Index, we remove age from the Social Frailty Index to provide a fair comparison.

The area of each bubble is proportional to the total validation cohort that falls the specific group (e.g., 15% of the cohort has a low Charlson score and low Social Frailty Index score). Significantly different values are highlighted by a bracket. *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$. Results presented in tabular form in Appendix 7.

Figure 2: Observed mortality in 2012 Validation Cohort by Social Frailty and Lee Index



Legend

The bubble chart compares observed mortality in the validation cohort by tertile of Social Frailty within tertiles of the Lee Index score, a comorbidity and function risk model.

The area of each bubble is proportional to the total validation cohort that falls the specific group (e.g., 21% of the cohort has a low Lee Index score and low Social Frailty Index score). Significantly different values are highlighted by a bracket. *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$. Results presented in tabular form in Appendix 7.

Figure 3: Social Frailty Index instrument

1. How old are you?

2. What is your gender?

Female Male

3. Are you currently working for pay?

Yes No

4. Do you have any living children?

Yes → Go to question 4 No → Skip to question 5

5. Thinking about all of YOUR LIVING CHILDREN. How often do you meet up (include both arranged and chance meetings)

Daily	Several times a week	Once a week	Several times a month	At least once a month	Not in the last month	Never/not relevant
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Please tell us HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH ACTIVITY. (Mark (X) one box for each line.)

	Daily	Several times a week	Once a week	Several times a month	At least once a month	Not in the last month	Never/not relevant
Do activities with grandchildren, nieces/nephews, or neighborhood children?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do any other volunteer or charity work?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. How much of the time do you feel isolated from others?

Often Some of the time Hardly ever or never

8. This next question asks how you feel about your local area, that is everywhere within a 20-minute walk or about a mile of your home. The closer your mark is to a statement the more strongly you agree with it

This area is kept very clean 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 This area is always full of rubbish and litter

9. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means “no control at all” and 10 means “very much control,” how would you rate the amount of control you have over your financial situation these days?

No control (Check one number.) Very much control

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10

10. In your day-to-day life, HOW OFTEN HAVE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS HAPPENED TO YOU?


	Almost every day	At least once a week	A few times a month	A few times a year	Less than once a year	Never/not relevant
You are treated with less courtesy or respect than other people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Legend

An online version is available at https://sachinshah.shinyapps.io/Social_Frailty_Index/

Appendix

Appendix 1: Social Frailty in Older Adults Framework



Edited reproduction of Bunt et al. Eur J Ageing. 2017 Jan 31;14(3):323-334

Appendix 2: Candidate social predictors

STEM	QUESTION	DOMAIN
These questions ask how you feel about your local area, that is everywhere within a 20 minute walk or about a mile of your home.	I really feel part of this area/I feel that I don't belong in this area	General Resources
	There is no problem with vandalism and graffiti in this area/Vandalism and graffiti are a big problem in this area	General Resources
	Most people in this area can be trusted/Most people in this area can't be trusted	General Resources
	People feel safe walking alone in this area after dark/People would be afraid to walk alone in this area after dark	General Resources
	Most people in this area are friendly/Most people in this area are unfriendly	General Resources
	This area is kept very clean/This area is always full of rubbish and litter	General Resources
	If you were in trouble, there are lots of people in this area who would help you/If you were in trouble, there is nobody in this area who would help you	General Resources
	There are no vacant houses or storefronts in this area/There are many vacant or deserted houses or storefronts in this area	General Resources
	Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means "no control at all" and 10 means "very much control," how would you rate the amount of control you have over your financial situation these days? (Mark (X) one number)	General Resources
	Has the amount of control you have over your financial situation changed in the last year?	General Resources
For each of the following events, please indicate whether the event occurred AT ANY POINT IN YOUR LIFE.	Have you ever been homeless or lived in a shelter?	General Resources
	Have you ever been an inmate in a jail, prison, juvenile detention center, or\ other correctional facility?	General Resources
	At any time in your life, have you ever been unfairly dismissed from a job? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	For unfair reasons, have you ever not been hired for a job? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Have you ever been unfairly denied a promotion? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Have you ever been unfairly prevented from moving into a neighborhood because the landlord or a realtor refused to sell or rent you a house or apartment? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Have you ever been unfairly denied a bank loan? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Have you ever been unfairly stopped, searched, questioned, physically threatened or abused by the police? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Have you ever been unfairly denied health care or treatment? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Has a child of yours ever died? If yes, what year?	General Resources

STEM	QUESTION	DOMAIN
	Have you ever been in a major fire, flood, earthquake, or other natural disaster? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Have you ever fired a weapon in combat or been fired upon in combat? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Has your spouse, partner, or child ever been addicted to drugs or alcohol? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Were you the victim of a serious physical attack or assault? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Did you ever have a life-threatening illness or accident? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Did your spouse or a child of yours ever have a life-threatening illness or accident? If yes, what year?	General Resources
For this next set of events, please think about your childhood growing up, BEFORE YOU WERE 18 YEARS OLD	Before you were 18 years old, did you have to do a year of school over again?	General Resources
	Before you were 18 years old, were you ever in trouble with the police?	General Resources
	Before you were 18 years old, did either of your parents drink or use drugs so often that it caused problems in the family?	General Resources
	Before you were 18 years old, were you ever physically abused by either of your parents?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
Now please think about the LAST 5 YEARS and indicate whether each of the events below occurred. If the event did happen, please indicate the year in which it happened MOST RECENTLY.	Have you involuntarily lost a job for reasons other than retirement at any point in the past five years? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Have you been unemployed and looking for work for longer than 3 months at some point in the past five years? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Was anyone else in your household unemployed and looking for work for longer than 3 months in the past five years? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Have you moved to a worse residence or neighborhood in the past five years? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Were you robbed or did you have your home burglarized in the past five years? If yes, what year?	General Resources
	Have you been the victim of fraud in the past five years? If yes, what year?	General Resources
Please think about your life and situation RIGHT NOW. HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH...	The condition of the place where you live (house or apartment)?	General Resources
	The city or town you live in?	General Resources
	Your daily life and leisure activities?	General Resources
	Your family life?	Social Resources
	Your present financial situation?	General Resources
	The total income of your household?	General Resources
	Are you currently working?	General resources

STEM	QUESTION	DOMAIN
Right now, would you like to leave work altogether, but plan to keep working because...	You need money	General resources
	You need health insurance	General resources
Please use the scale below to answer the next set of questions. (Mark (X) one box for each line.)	My home life keeps me from getting work done on time on my job.	General resources
	My work leaves me enough time to attend to my personal responsibilities.	General resources
Please say how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. (Mark (X) one box for each line.)	All things considered, I am satisfied with my job.	General resources
	My job is physically demanding.	General resources
	My job promotion prospects are poor.	General resources
	My job security is poor.	General resources
	I have the opportunity to develop new skills.	General resources
	The demands of my job interfere with my personal life.	General resources
	The people I work with can be relied on when I need help	Social Resources
	How difficult is it for (you/your family) to meet monthly payments on (your/your family's) bills?	General Resources
	Race	General Resources
	Whether Hispanic	General Resources
	Educational attainment	General Resources
	Receives social security	General resources
	currently receiving pension income	General Resources
	Covered by federal gov health insurance	General Resources
	covered by current or previous employer	General Resources
	labor force status	General resources
	current job requires physical effort	General resources
	current job involves lots of stress	General resources
	Think of this ladder as representing where people stand in our society. At the top of the ladder are the people who are the best off - those who have the most money, most education, and best jobs. At the bottom are the people who are the worst off - who have the least money, least education, and the worst jobs or no jobs. The higher up you are on this ladder, the closer you are to the people at the very top and the lower you are, the closer you are to the people at the very bottom.	General Resources
	Has your position on the ladder changed within the last two years?	General Resources
Please read the list below and indicate whether or not any of these are current	Ongoing physical or emotional problems (in spouse or child)	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	Ongoing problems with alcohol or drug use in family member	Social Resources

STEM	QUESTION	DOMAIN
and ongoing problems that have lasted twelve months or longer. If the problem is happening to you, indicate how upsetting it has been. Check the answer that is most like your current situation.	Ongoing difficulties at work	Social Behavior and Activities
	Ongoing financial strain	General Resources
	Ongoing housing problems	General Resources
	Ongoing problems in a close relationship	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	Helping at least one sick, limited, or frail family member or friend on a regular basis	General Resources
	Total Wealth (Including Secondary Residence)	General Resources
	Change in wealth	General Resources
	Do you have a husband, wife, or partner with whom you live?	Social Resources
	Do you have any living children?	Social resources
	How many of your children would you say you have a close relationship with?	Social Resources
	Do you have any OTHER IMMEDIATE FAMILY, for example, any brothers or sisters, parents, cousins or grandchildren?	Social Resources
The next statements are about people's relationships with their parents early in life (before age 18). Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each statement for you personally. (Mark (X) one box for each line.)	I had a good relationship with my mother before age 18.	Social Resources
	I had a good relationship with my father before age 18.	Social Resources
	Couple household?	Social Resources
	Marital Status	Social Resources
	Mother alive	Social Resources
	Father alive	Social Resources
	Number of people in household	Social Resources
	Number of children	Social Resources
	Number of living siblings	Social Resources
	How many of these family members would you say you have a close relationship with?	Social Resources
	Do you have any friends?	Social Resources
	How many of your friends would you say you have a close relationship with?	Social Resources
HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH ACTIVITY.	Care for a sick or disabled adult?	Social Behavior and Activities
	Do activities with grandchildren, nieces/nephews, or neighborhood children?	Social Behavior and Activities
	Do volunteer work with children or young people?	Social Behavior and Activities
	Do any other volunteer or charity work?	Social Behavior and Activities
	Go to a sport, social, or other club?	Social Behavior and Activities

STEM	QUESTION	DOMAIN
	Attend meetings of non-religious organizations, such as political, community, or other interest groups?	Social Behavior and Activities
On average, how often do you do each of the following with any of your children, not counting any who live with you?	Meet up (include both arranged and chance meetings)	Social Behavior and Activities
	Speak on the phone	Social Behavior and Activities
	Write or email	Social Behavior and Activities
On average, how often do you do each of the following with any of these family members, not counting any who live with you?	Meet up (include both arranged and chance meetings)	Social Behavior and Activities
	Speak on the phone	Social Behavior and Activities
	Write or email	Social Behavior and Activities
On average, how often do you do each of the following with any of your friends, not counting any who live with you?	Meet up (include both arranged and chance meetings)	Social Behavior and Activities
	Speak on the phone	Social Behavior and Activities
	Write or email	Social Behavior and Activities
	Yesterday, did you work or volunteer?	Social Behavior and Activities
	Yesterday, did you socialize with friends, neighbors, or family (not counting your spouse or partner)?	Social Behavior and Activities
	Whether health limits work	Social Behavior and Activities
	Considers self retired	Social Behavior and Activities
	Retirement satisfaction	Social Behavior and Activities
	Currently working for pay	Social Behavior and Activities
	Works second job	Social Behavior and Activities
We would now like to ask you some questions about your PARTNER OR SPOUSE.	How much do they really understand the way you feel about things?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much can you rely on them if you have a serious problem?	Social Resources
	How much can you open up to them if you need to talk about your worries?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How often do they make too many demands on you?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much do they criticize you?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much do they let you down when you are counting on them?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much do they get on your nerves?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How close is your relationship with your partner or spouse?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
Thinking about all of YOUR LIVING CHILDREN, please check the answer which best shows how you feel about each statement.	How much do they really understand the way you feel about things?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much can you rely on them if you have a serious problem?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much can you open up to them if you need to talk about your worries?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How often do they make too many demands on you?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much do they criticize you?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs

STEM	QUESTION	DOMAIN
	How much do they let you down when you are counting on them?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much do they get on your nerves?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
We would now like to ask you some questions about these family members.	How much do they really understand the way you feel about things?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much can you rely on them if you have a serious problem?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much can you open up to them if you need to talk about your worries?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How often do they make too many demands on you?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much do they criticize you?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much do they let you down when you are counting on them?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much do they get on your nerves?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
We would now like to ask you some questions about YOUR FRIENDS.	How much do they really understand the way you feel about things?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much can you rely on them if you have a serious problem?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much can you open up to them if you need to talk about your worries?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How often do they make too many demands on you?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much do they criticize you?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much do they let you down when you are counting on them?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	How much do they get on your nerves?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
The next questions are about how you feel about different aspects of your life.	You lack companionship?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	Left out?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	Isolated from others?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	That you are "in tune" with the people around you?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	Alone?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	That there are people you can talk to?	Social Resources
	That there are people you can turn to?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	That there are people who really understand you?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	That there are people you feel close to?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	Part of a group of friends?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
In your day-to-day life, HOW OFTEN HAVE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS HAPPENED TO YOU?	You are treated with less courtesy or respect than other people.	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	You receive poorer service than other people at restaurants or stores.	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	People act as if they think you are not smart.	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	People act as if they are afraid of you.	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	You are threatened or harassed.	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs

STEM	QUESTION	DOMAIN
	You receive poorer service or treatment than other people from doctors or hospitals.	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
The following statements are about people's expectations of each other. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each statement for you personally.	I have always been satisfied with the balance between what I have given my partner and what I have received in return.	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	I have always received adequate appreciation for providing help in my family.	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	In my current major activity (job, looking after home, voluntary work) I have always been satisfied with the rewards I received for my efforts.	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs
	Yesterday, did you feel lonely?	Fulfillment of Basic Social Needs

Appendix 3: TRIPOD CHECKLIST

Section/Topic		Checklist Item		Page
Title and abstract				
Title	1	D;V	Identify the study as developing and/or validating a multivariable prediction model, the target population, and the outcome to be predicted.	1
Abstract	2	D;V	Provide a summary of objectives, study design, setting, participants, sample size, predictors, outcome, statistical analysis, results, and conclusions.	2,3
Introduction				
Background and objectives	3a	D;V	Explain the medical context (including whether diagnostic or prognostic) and rationale for developing or validating the multivariable prediction model, including references to existing models.	3
	3b	D;V	Specify the objectives, including whether the study describes the development or validation of the model or both.	4
Methods				
Source of data	4a	D;V	Describe the study design or source of data (e.g., randomized trial, cohort, or registry data), separately for the development and validation data sets, if applicable.	5
	4b	D;V	Specify the key study dates, including start of accrual; end of accrual; and, if applicable, end of follow-up.	5
Participants	5a	D;V	Specify key elements of the study setting (e.g., primary care, secondary care, general population) including number and location of centres.	5
	5b	D;V	Describe eligibility criteria for participants.	5
	5c	D;V	Give details of treatments received, if relevant.	n/a
Outcome	6a	D;V	Clearly define the outcome that is predicted by the prediction model, including how and when assessed.	6
	6b	D;V	Report any actions to blind assessment of the outcome to be predicted.	n/a
Predictors	7a	D;V	Clearly define all predictors used in developing or validating the multivariable prediction model, including how and when they were measured.	6, 7
	7b	D;V	Report any actions to blind assessment of predictors for the outcome and other predictors.	n/a
Sample size	8	D;V	Explain how the study size was arrived at.	Appendix 4
Missing data	9	D;V	Describe how missing data were handled (e.g., complete-case analysis, single imputation, multiple imputation) with details of any imputation method.	6
Statistical analysis methods	10a	D	Describe how predictors were handled in the analyses.	5, 6
	10b	D	Specify type of model, all model-building procedures (including any predictor selection), and method for internal validation.	6
	10c	V	For validation, describe how the predictions were calculated.	6
	10d	D;V	Specify all measures used to assess model performance and, if relevant, to compare multiple models.	6
	10e	V	Describe any model updating (e.g., recalibration) arising from the validation, if done.	n/a
Risk groups	11	D;V	Provide details on how risk groups were created, if done.	6
Development vs. validation	12	V	For validation, identify any differences from the development data in setting, eligibility criteria, outcome, and predictors.	5, Table 1, Table 2
Results				
Participants	13a	D;V	Describe the flow of participants through the study, including the number of participants with and without the outcome and, if applicable, a summary of the follow-up time. A diagram may be helpful.	Appendix 4
	13b	D;V	Describe the characteristics of the participants (basic demographics, clinical features, available predictors), including the number of participants with missing data for predictors and outcome.	Table 1 & 2; Appendix 4
	13c	V	For validation, show a comparison with the development data of the distribution of important variables (demographics, predictors and outcome).	Table 1, 2
Model development	14a	D	Specify the number of participants and outcome events in each analysis.	Page 7
	14b	D	If done, report the unadjusted association between each candidate predictor and outcome.	n/a
Model specification	15a	D	Present the full prediction model to allow predictions for individuals (i.e., all regression coefficients, and model intercept or baseline survival at a given time point).	Table 3
	15b	D	Explain how to use the prediction model.	Figure 3
Model performance	16	D;V	Report performance measures (with CIs) for the prediction model.	8,9
Model-updating	17	V	If done, report the results from any model updating (i.e., model specification, model performance).	n/a
Discussion				
Limitations	18	D;V	Discuss any limitations of the study (such as nonrepresentative sample, few events per predictor, missing data).	13
Interpretation	19a	V	For validation, discuss the results with reference to performance in the development data, and any other validation data.	n/a
	19b	D;V	Give an overall interpretation of the results, considering objectives, limitations, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence.	11
Implications	20	D;V	Discuss the potential clinical use of the model and implications for future research.	11,12
Other information				
Supplementary information	21	D;V	Provide information about the availability of supplementary resources, such as study protocol, Web calculator, and data sets.	Figure 3, Acknowledg

				ement
Funding	22	D;V	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study.	14

Appendix 4: Cohort flow table

	Development cohort (Baseline interview 2010-2011)	Validation cohort (Baseline interview 2012-2013)
Eligible for Psychosocial and Lifestyle Questionnaire and age ≥ 65 yrs	5384	4997
Excluded: did not complete Psychosocial and Lifestyle Questionnaire	1082	1049
Baseline cohort, cohort size for death analysis (A)	4302	3948
Excluded: ADL dependent at baseline (B1)		383
Excluded: Missing ADL data in either or both follow up interviews or exit interview if deceased (B2)		279
Cohort size for ADL analysis (A – B1 – B2)		3286
Excluded: Living in NH at baseline (C1)		85
Excluded: Missing NH status in either or both follow up interviews or exit interview if deceased (C2)		394
Cohort size for NH analysis (A – C1 – C2)		3469
Excluded: Missing hospital stay data in either follow up interview or exit interview if deceased (D)		542
Cohort size for hospitalization analysis (A – D)		3406
Excluded: Does not have Medicare claims linkage (E1)		290
Excluded: Does not have 12 months of part A, B and FFS before baseline interview (E2)		1722
Cohort size for Charlson score (A – E1 – E2)		2226


Legend

ADL – activity of daily living


NH – nursing home

Exit interviews are interviews completed with next of kin if the study participant dies before the next scheduled interview

Appendix 5: Calibration of Social Frailty Model in 2012 validation cohort



Appendix 6: Figure Receiver Operator Curve for the Social Frailty Index to predict (A) Death, (B) New ADL dependence (C) Nursing home stay, and (D) Hospitalization in the 2012 Validation cohort



Appendix 7: Tabular results of Figure 1 and Figure 2

A. Charlson score by Social Frailty Index tertiles

Tertile of Charlson Score	Tertile of Social Frailty Index	N	Deaths	Death rate	Lower limit	Upper limit	Proportion of cohort
1	1	324	27	0.08	0.05	0.11	0.15
1	2	243	30	0.12	0.08	0.16	0.11
1	3	175	47	0.27	0.20	0.33	0.08
2	1	252	36	0.14	0.10	0.19	0.11
2	2	257	46	0.18	0.13	0.23	0.12
2	3	233	64	0.27	0.22	0.33	0.10
3	1	169	50	0.30	0.23	0.36	0.08
3	2	244	99	0.41	0.34	0.47	0.11
3	3	329	153	0.47	0.41	0.52	0.15

Tertile of Charlson Score	Tertile of Social Frailty Index (ref)	Tertile of Social Frailty Index (Comparison)	P value	Annotation in Figure 1
1	1	2	0.152	NS
1	2	3	<0.001	***
1	1	3	<0.001	***
2	1	2	0.323	NS
2	2	3	0.015	*
2	1	3	<0.001	***
3	1	2	0.029	*
3	2	3	0.184	NS
3	1	3	<0.001	***

B. Lee score by Social Frailty Index tertiles

Tertile of Lee Score	Tertile of Social Frailty Index	N	Deaths	Death rate	Lower limit	Upper limit	Proportion of cohort
1	1	819	38	0.05	0.03	0.06	0.21
1	2	408	28	0.07	0.04	0.09	0.10
1	3	89	8	0.09	0.03	0.15	0.02
2	1	377	43	0.11	0.08	0.15	0.10
2	2	552	93	0.17	0.14	0.20	0.14
2	3	387	86	0.22	0.18	0.26	0.10
3	1	120	35	0.29	0.21	0.37	0.03
3	2	819	38	0.05	0.03	0.06	0.21
3	3	408	28	0.07	0.04	0.09	0.10

Tertile of Lee Score	Tertile of Social Frailty Index (ref)	Tertile of Social Frailty Index (Comparison)	P value	Annotation in Figure 2
1	1	2	0.136	NS
1	2	3	0.635	NS
1	1	3	0.128	NS
2	1	2	0.027	*
2	2	3	0.048	*
2	1	3	<0.001	***
3	1	2	0.389	NS
3	2	3	<0.001	***
3	1	3	<0.001	***