

## **Assessment tools and incidence of hospital-associated disability: a rapid systematic review**

### **1st Author:**

Name: Katia Giacomino

Email: [katia.giacomino@hevs.ch](mailto:katia.giacomino@hevs.ch)

Affiliation 1: School of Health Sciences, HES-SO Valais-Wallis, Leukerbad, Valais-Wallis, 3954, Switzerland,

Affiliation 2: Rehabilitation Research (RERE) Research Group, Department of Physiotherapy, Human Physiology and Anatomy, Faculty of Physical Education and Physiotherapy, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium.

Address: Rathausstrasse 25, 3954 Leukerbad

Roles: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Investigation, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Author:**

Name: Roger Hilfiker

Email: [roger.hilfiker@hevs.ch](mailto:roger.hilfiker@hevs.ch)

Affiliation 1: School of Health Sciences, HES-SO Valais-Wallis, Leukerbad, Valais-Wallis, 3954, Switzerland

Roles: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal Analysis, Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision

### **3rd Author:**

Name: David Beckwée

Email: [David.Beckwee@vub.be](mailto:David.Beckwee@vub.be)

Affiliation 1: Rehabilitation Research (RERE) Research Group, Department of Physiotherapy, Human Physiology and Anatomy, Faculty of Physical Education and Physiotherapy, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

Roles: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal Analysis, Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision

### **4th Author:**

Name: Jan Taeymans

Email: [jan.taeymans@bfh.ch](mailto:jan.taeymans@bfh.ch)

Affiliation 1: Division of Physiotherapy, Department of Health Professions, University of Applied Sciences Bern, Bern, Switzerland

Affiliation 2: Faculty of Physical Education and Physiotherapy, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium.

Roles: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision

### **Last Author:**

Name: Karl Martin Sattelmayer

Email: [martin.sattelmayer@hevs.ch](mailto:martin.sattelmayer@hevs.ch)

Affiliation 1: School of Health Sciences, HES-SO Valais-Wallis, Leukerbad, Valais-Wallis, 3954, Switzerland

Roles: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal Analysis, Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision

## **Abstract**

### **Background**

During hospitalization older people have a high risk of developing functional impairments unrelated to the reasons for their admission. This is termed hospital-associated disability. This systematic review aimed to assess the incidence of hospital-associated disability among older patients admitted to acute care, to identify the tools used to assess activities of daily living in these patients, and evaluate which functional task is most sensitive for detecting changes in disability among older hospitalized patients.

### **Methods**

A rapid systematic review was performed according to the recommendations of the Cochrane Rapid Reviews Methods Group and the PRISMA statement. A literature search was performed in Medline (via Ovid), EMBASE, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials databases on 26 August 2021. Inclusion criteria: older people, assessment of activities of daily living at baseline and discharge. Exclusion criterion: diseases affecting functional decline.

### **Results**

Eleven studies were included in the final review. Incidence of hospital-associated disability (overall score) was 37% (95% CI 0.31–0.42). Insufficient data prevented meta-analysis of the individual items. The most sensitive measure for detecting changes in disability was the overall score of assessment of activities of daily living.

### **Conclusions**

Incidence of hospital-associated disability in older patients might be overestimated, due to the combination of disease-related disability and hospital-associated disability. The tools used to assess these patients presented some limitations. These results should be interpreted with caution, as a limited number of studies reported adequate information to assess the incidence of hospital-associated disability. Risk of bias in the included studies raised some concerns.

### **Keywords**

Functional decline, hospitalization; activities of daily living; older patients

## Introduction

Functional decline in older adults during hospitalization increases the risk of a longer hospital stay [1], a nursing home placement [2], and increased mortality [3]. The main goal in older adult care is therefore to maintain function [4] and the ability to perform activities of daily living (ADL) [1, 5].

During hospitalization older adults are at risk of developing functional decline unrelated to the condition for which they were admitted [6]. The loss of independence in at least one activity of daily living is referred to as hospital-associated disability (HAD) [7]. Furthermore, HAD refers to disability acquired during hospitalization or the worsening of a pre-existing disability due to hospitalization [7].

Previous studies have highlighted methodological issues in assessing functional decline [8, 9]. However, there is currently no consensus on which tool should be used to assess functional decline in these patients, which ADL tasks should be included, how the assessment should be performed (self-reported or performance-based), and what time-frame should be considered [8]. Covinsky and others [7] recommend asking patients on admission about their ADL functioning before the onset of acute illness.

A previous study highlighted the magnitude of the HAD problem, and reported that the overall prevalence of HAD among older adults admitted to an acute care hospital is 30% [9]. To the best of our knowledge, the incidence of HAD has not been studied in a systematic review. The aim of this study was to perform a rapid systematic review to: (i) assess the incidence of HAD, (ii) to identify all tools or functional tasks used to assess ADL in hospitalized older patients, and (iii) to evaluate which ADL functional task or set of tasks is the most sensitive to detect changes in disability.

## Methods

### Study design

A rapid systematic review was performed according to the recommendations of the Cochrane Rapid Reviews Methods Group [10]. Reporting was conducted in accordance with the PRISMA statement [11].

### Search strategy and selection criteria

A literature search was performed in Medline (via Ovid), EMBASE, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) databases on 26th August 2021. The search strategy comprised five search terms related to: (i) study setting (i.e. hospital), (ii) observed disability in ADL, (iii) incidence and prevalence, sensitivity to change and responsiveness, (iv) population identification (i.e. older adults), and (v) articles that cover the aspect of disability acquired in hospitals. The search terms, combined with the Boolean operator "AND", were applied to titles and abstracts, and MeSH terms were added when available and relevant. The full search strategy is shown in Appendix 1.

The review included prospective and retrospective cohort studies. The control group of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) was eligible when performing a usual or a sham

intervention. Inclusion criteria were: studies investigating a general older population ( $\geq 65$  years) who were admitted to hospital for an acute disorder; studies had to assess the individual items of the ADL measurement tool before hospitalization (retrospectively or prospectively) and at the end of hospitalization or after hospital discharge.

Exclusion criteria were: studies investigating a specific condition that could have an effect on functional decline (e.g. stroke, brain injury, heart failure, COVID-19, and acute respiratory failure); and studies that primarily examined a population with cognitive impairment.

One reviewer (KG) independently screened all the records based on titles and abstracts (phase 1) and the full-text of the eligible studies (phase 2). A second reviewer (KMS) screened 20% of the same records. If Cohen's kappa coefficient of agreement was  $>0.80$  for both phases, only 20% of the studies were planned to be screened independently by two reviewers. Disagreements were resolved through discussion.

### **Data extraction**

Study characteristics (authors, country, study sample size, population age, type of ward, proportion of women, proportion living alone, proportion living in a nursing home, Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE II) score, Charlson Comorbidity Index, number of days of hospitalization, any scale of mental status) were extracted by one reviewer (KG), while incidence data were extracted by three reviewers (RH, KMS, KG) at the same time. Disagreements were resolved through discussion between all three reviewers. The following information was extracted: item type, response options, criteria for the response options, baseline, and discharge assessment (i.e. who performed it and how), baseline and discharge prevalence of ADL dependency, operationalization, and definition of HAD and incidence per item and for the overall score.

### **Methodological quality assessment**

Methodological quality assessment was performed using the critical appraisal checklist for Studies Reporting Prevalence Data [12] from the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI). The JBI checklist was completed independently by two reviewers (KMS, KG). Differences in rating were discussed and resolved.

A further five questions were selected from the JBI checklist that were considered to assess risk of bias (internal validity, i.e. questions 2, 5, 6, 7 and 9). Risk of bias was assessed as low if all five questions were rated 'yes', some concern if one of the questions was rated 'unclear' and high if one of the questions was rated 'no'.

### **Incidence of hospital-associated disability**

The incidence of HAD (total score) was pooled using the statistical software R [13] and its package meta [14]. A random effects model was applied based on an inverse variance model with a logit transformation.

Heterogeneity was assessed by the  $I^2$ , which is the proportion of total variability due to between-study heterogeneity [15], to estimate inter-study variability. Tau was estimated with the DerSimonian-Laird estimator [14]. Miglivaca et al. recommended avoiding the use of an arbitrary cut-off for the  $I^2$  statistics, as it may not be discriminative in incidence studies

[16]. Therefore, heterogeneity was explained by discussing the level of dependency at baseline and the method of assessment.

The data required to calculate the incidence of HAD are the number of patients who are dependent and independent at baseline and the evolution of these groups at discharge. If these values were given, the following formula was used to calculate the incidence of the individual ADL task or set of tasks (total score):

$$HAD\ incidence = \frac{a}{b}$$

where, a = number of newly dependent patients (requiring the help of someone else), and b = number of patients at risk of developing or increasing dependency.

For example, in the study by Sager et al. [17], 51 patients were newly dependent at discharge according to the overall score and 188 patients had the potential to decline in one of the ADL tasks.

$$HAD\ incidence = \frac{51}{188} = 0.27$$

If these values were not reported, an unbiased estimate of the incidence of HAD in that study could not be calculated. In this case, an estimate of the incidence was made by subtracting the percentage of dependency at discharge minus the percentage of dependency at baseline.

### **Tools used for assessment of activities of daily living in hospitalized older patients**

All ADL tools or sets of tasks used in the assessment of hospitalized older patients were reported narratively.

### **Evaluation of which measure is most sensitive to detect changes in disability**

The most sensitive task or set of tasks to detect changes in disability were ranked as follows: (i) per study all ADL tasks were ranked from the highest proportion of disability (= 1) to the lowest (=7); (ii) the mean of the ranking was calculated per item or set of scores.

If data were available only in a chart they were extracted using the software WebPlotDigitizer [18]. Due to time constraints, the authors of the included studies were not contacted in case of imprecision in the text.

### **Differences from protocol**

It was decided not to integrate the grading system of the GRADE Working Group as predefined the evaluation of the body of evidence due to the lack of a guideline for incidence studies.

### **Declaration of sources of funding**

This review received no financial support.

## Results

A total of 2,519 records were identified (Medline (via Ovid) 740 records, EMBASE 1,557, CENTRAL 222). After removing 743 duplicates, titles and abstracts of 1,776 articles were screened and 1,431 were excluded. The full text of 345 studies was screened, and a final total of 11 studies were included for further analysis [17, 19-28]. The reasons for exclusion are shown in the study flow diagram in Appendix 2.

Cohen's kappa coefficient was  $> 0.8$  in both screening phases (i.e. titles/abstracts and full texts); therefore only 20% of studies were screened by two reviewers independently, as described above.

### Study characteristics


The population characteristics of the included studies are shown in Table 1. Seven studies were performed in the USA, one in Europe, and three in other countries. Sample size ranged from 36 to 2,877 participants and the age of study participants ranged from 76 to 87 years. The proportion of women in the study samples under investigation ranged from 31% to 66%. Included studies were conducted in the medicine ward (five studies), general hospital (five studies), and one in the geriatric unit and usual unit which refers to a conventional care unit.

### Outcome results

The calculated and estimated incidences of HAD are shown in Table 2, categorized per ADL task and set of tasks. The pooled incidence of HAD for the overall score included two studies reporting the Katz Index of ADLs 1963 [23, 27] and two others used the Katz Index of ADLs 1970 [17, 21] for a total of 4,020 patients. Figure 1 presents the pooled incidence of HAD (total score) of 37% (95% CI 0.31–0.42). Heterogeneity was substantial at 90%. The risk of bias of the four studies raised some concerns.

Table 2 shows the results of the incidences at the item level. Adequate data for the incidence calculation at the item level was reported only by two studies [25, 28]. The incidence of HAD for the individual items was in the range 32–93% for bathing, 27–66% for dressing, 8–70% for toileting, 11–61% for eating, 7–59% for transferring, and 10% for walking. For the other studies, it was not possible to calculate the incidence of HAD (either total or single-item level) due to insufficient data. One RCT could not be integrated into Table 2 because the authors reported only the mean change in ADL score, and the results of this study were described narratively [22]. The control group worsened in all items of ADL, negative values indicating a decline in the Barthel mean change score. The three items with the highest mean change score from baseline to discharge were: transferring (–2.06 points; 95% CI –1.44 to –2.71), climbing stairs (–1.36 points; 95% CI –0.84 to –1.91), and toileting (–1.23 points; 95% CI –0.76 to –1.69). The score for these individual tasks ranged from 0 points (dependent) to independent with a maximum of 15 points for transferring, 10 points for climbing stairs and 10 points for using the toilet.

The risk of bias of all studies presented some concerns.



**Figure 1.** Forest plot of the pooled results of overall incidence of hospital-associated disability (HAD).

Eleven studies were included in the identification of the tools or functional tasks used to assess ADL in hospitalized older patients and in the ranking of the most sensitive task to detect changes in disability [17, 19-28]. The review identified five assessment tools, two sets of tasks, and individual items assessing ADL: Katz Index of ADLs 1963 [29], Katz Index of ADLs 1970 [30], Barthel Index [31], 8 items from the nine-item Care Needs Assessment tool [24], 7 ADL items from the Frailty Index [32] and 2 activities from the Nagi and Rosow-Breslau scales [33, 34] integrated in the Frailty Index [32], and individual items proposed by Gill [35] (bathing, dressing, transferring and walking across the room). Walking was assessed in two studies [21, 25], while one other study [23] assessed the task of grooming by referring to the Katz Index of ADLs. However, the item walking and grooming were not in the original version of the Katz Index, and were considered separately.



**Table 1.** Study characteristics

Author	Country	Sample size, <i>n</i>	Age, years, mean (SD) or (range)	Type of ward	Proportion of women, %	% Living alone	% Living in nursing home	APACHE II score mean (SD) or % of patients per category	Charlson Comorbidity Index mean (SD) or % of patients per category	Mean number of days of hospitalization (SD) or (range)	Mental status mean (SD), tool) or % of patients with cognitive impairment
Covinsky 2000 [28]	USA	2877	80.5	Medicine	64%	52%	5.1%	NR	NR	NR	1.4 (1.3), SPMSQ
Covinsky 2003 [27]	USA	2293	79.5	Medicine	63.6%	35.2%	4.9%	0–2: 32.3%, 3–5 37.1%, >6: 30.8%	0: 19.8%, 1–2: 47.0%, 3–4: 22.1%, >5: 11.1%	6.3	NR
Dharmarajan 2020 [[26]	USA	515	82.7 (5.6)	Hospital	65.6%	46.6%	0%	NR	NR	NR	17.9% <sup>b</sup> , MMSE
Hansen 1999 [25]	USA	73	80.4 (7)	Hospital	66%	45%	0%	NR	NR	7.5 (5.0)	2.1% <sup>b</sup> , MMSE
Hirsch 1990 [24]	USA	71	84 (75–95)	Medicine	59%	7.0%	5.6%	NR	NR	10.1 (2–49)	30.8% <sup>c</sup> ; last item of CNA
Inouye 1993 [23]	USA	188	78.4 (5.8)	Medicine	59%	45%	4%	13.9 (3.6)	8.5 (2.8) <sup>a</sup>	7 <sup>d</sup> (2 - 51)	23.5 (5.4), MMSE
Martinez-Velilla 2021 [22]	Spain	149	87.1 (5.2)	Hospital	59%	NR	NR	NR	NR	8 <sup>d</sup>	NR
Mudge 2010 [21]	Australia	615	80.4 (7.5)	Medicine	59%	NR	11%	NR	NR	7 (5–13)	10%, history of dementia
Park 2021 [20]	Republic of Korea	RB: 45 PF: 36 MMF: 37 SF: 58	RB: 77 (73–82) PF: 80 (74–84) MMF: 81 (77–86) SF: 81 (75–84)	Hospital	RB: 31.1% PF: 38.9% MMF: 46.0% SF: 39.7%	NR	RB: 0% PF: 2.8% MMF: 8.1% SF: 53.5%	NR	NR	NR	RB: 82.2% PF: 58.3% MMF: 70.3% SF: 82.8%
Sager 1996 [17]	USA	1279	79 (6.3)	Hospital	62%	37%	0%	NR	NR	8.6 (6.8)	17 (4.0), MMSE
Zelada 2009 [19]	Peru	GU: 68 UU: 75	GU: 79.6 (6.8) UU: 76.1 (7.2)	Geriatric, usual unit	GU: 61.8% UU: 56%	NR	NR	GU: 9 (2.87) UU: 8.4 (3.11)	GU: 3.6 (1.98) UU: 3.1 (1.6)	GU: 7.5 (4.3) UU: 9.92 (7.74)	GU: 22.4 (6.35) UU: 2.7 (1.91), MMSE

a, modified version; b, percentage of persons with a MMSE score <24; c, MMSE < 19 points; CNA, nine-item care needs assessment; d, median; GU, geriatric unit; MMF, mild-to-moderate frailty; MMS, Mini-Mental State Examination; NR, not reported; PF, pre-frail; RB, robust; SF, severe frailty; SPMSQ, Short Portable Mental Status Questionnaire; UU, usual unit.

**Table 2.** Comparison of incidence items

Study	Item	Response options	Criteria for response options	Baseline assessment (who, how & when)	Baseline prevalence of dependency*	Discharge assessment (who, how & when)	Discharge prevalence of dependency	Operationalization of HAD (item level)	Incidence HAD
Covinsky 2000 [28]	Bathing [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PR: PS: 43%, AS: 0%, PX: PS: 79%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 3 months after DC	PR: PS: 52% AS: 32% PX: PS: 90% AS: 70%	Change from I to D	PR: 32% PX: 70%
Covinsky 2003 [27]	Bathing [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0%,	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 24%, AS: 24%	Change from I to D	24% *2
Dharmarajan 2020 [26]	Bathing [35]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	R: patient at last home-based assessment before hospitalization	PS: 14%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 1 month after DC	PS: 39%, AS: 25% *1	Change from I to D	25% *1, *2
Hansen 1999 [25]	Bathing [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 93%, AS: 93%	Change from I to D	93%
Inouye 1993 [23]	Bathing [29]	I, PA, TA	PA: 1 body part assisted; D: > 1 body part	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	O: nurse at DC	PS: 10%, AS: 10% *1	+ 1 response option (I to PA or TA, or PA to TA) Change BL-DC prevalence	10% *1, *2
Mudge 2010 [21]	Bathing [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 21%, AS: 0%	O: Nurse at DC	PS: 47%, AS: 26% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	26% *1, *2
Park 2021 [20]	Bathing [32]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-30days<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	RB: PS: 0%, AS: 0% PF: PS: 3%, AS: 0% MMF: PS: 62%, AS: 0% SF: PS: 100%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 1 month after BL	RB: PS: 16%, AS: 16% *1 PF: PS: 31%, AS: 28% *1 MMF: PS: 90%, AS: 28% *1 SF: PS: 100%, AS: 0% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	RB: 16% *1, *2 PF: 28% *1, *2 MMF: 28% *1, *2 SF: 0% *1, *2
Sager 1996 [17]	Bathing [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 27%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 81%, AS: 54% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	54% *1, *2
Zelada 2009 [19]	Bathing [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: 0% Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: 12% *3 Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 21% *3	Change from I to D	Geriatric unit: 12% *3 Usual unit: 21% *3
Covinsky 2000 [28]	Dressing [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PR: PS: 32%, AS: 0% PX: PS: 70%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 3 months after DC	PR: PS: 40%, AS: 27% PX: PS: 86%, AS: 66%	Change from I to D	PR: 27% PX: 66%
Covinsky 2003 [27]	Dressing [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 24%, AS: 24%	Change from I to D	24% *2

Study	Item	Response options	Criteria for response options	Baseline assessment (who, how & when)	Baseline prevalence of dependency*	Discharge assessment (who, how & when)	Discharge prevalence of dependency	Operationalization of HAD (item level)	Incidence HAD
Dharmarajan 2020 [26]	Dressing [35]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	R: patient at last home-based assessment before hospitalization	PS: 7%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 1 month after DC	PS: 25%, AS: 18% *1	Change from I to D	18% *1, *2
Hansen 1999 [25]	Dressing [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 30%, AS: 30%	Change from I to D	30%
Inouye 1993 [23]	Dressing [29]	I, PA, TA	PA: assisted tying shoes; D: assisted to dress/undress	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	O: nurse at DC	PS: 11%, AS: 11% *1	+ 1 response option (I to PA or TA, or PA to TA)	11% *1, *2
Mudge 2010 [21]	Dressing [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 20%, AS: 0%	O: Nurse at DC	PS: 46 %, AS: 26% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	26% *1, *2
Park 2021 [20]	Dressing [32]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-30days<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	RB: PS: 0%, AS: 0% PF: PS: 0%, AS: 0% MMF: PS: 8%, AS: 0% SF: PS: 86%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 1 month after BL	RB: PS: 7%, AS: 7% *1 PF: PS: 19%, AS: 19% *1 MMF: PS: 45%, AS: 37% *1 SF: PS: 100%, AS: 14% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	RB: 7% *1, *2 PF: 19% *1, *2 MMF: 37% *1, *2 SF: 14% *1, *2
Sager 1996 [17]	Dressing [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 16%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 64%, AS: 48% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	48% *1, *2
Zelada 2009 [19]	Dressing [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: 0% Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: 5% *3 Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 23% *3	Change from I to D	Geriatric unit: 5% *3 Usual unit: 23% *3
Covinsky 2000 [28]	Toileting [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PR: PS: 36%, AS: 0% PX: PS: 71%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 3 months after DC	PR: PS: 39%, AS: 27% PX: PS: 86%, AS: 70%	Change from I to D	PR: 27% PX: 70%
Covinsky 2003 [27]	Toileting [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 16%, AS: 16%	Change from I to D	16% *2
Hansen 1999 [25]	Toileting [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 8%, AS: 8%	Change from I to D	8%
Inouye 1993 [23]	Toileting [29]	I, PA, TA	PA: assisted going to toilet or cleaning or arranging clothes or use of night bedpan/commode; D: doesn't go to toilet	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	O: nurse at DC	PS: 12%, AS: 12% *1	+ 1 response option (I to PA or TA, or PA to TA)	12% *1, *2
Hirsch	Toileting [24]	I, PA, TA	PA: slight help or	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R:	PS: 22%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy	PS: 82%, AS: 60% *1	+ 1 response	60% *1, *2

Study	Item	Response options	Criteria for response options	Baseline assessment (who, how & when)	Baseline prevalence of dependency*	Discharge assessment (who, how & when)	Discharge prevalence of dependency	Operationalization of HAD (item level)	Incidence HAD
1990 [24]			bedpan sometimes; D: lots of help or bedpan all the time	patient or proxy		at DC		option (I to PA or TA, or PA to TA)	
Mudge 2010 [21]	Toileting [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 10%, AS: 0%	O: Nurse at DC	PS: 24%, AS: 14% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	14% *1, *2
Park 2021 [20]	Toileting [32]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-30days<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	RB: PS: 0%, AS: 0% PF: PS: 0%, AS: 0% MMF: PS: 24%, AS: 0% SF: PS: 92%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 1 month after BL	RB: PS: 9%, AS: 9% *1 PF: PS: 23%, AS: 23% *1 MMF: PS: 58%, AS: 34% *1 SF: PS: 100%, AS: 8% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	RB: 9% *1, *2 PF: 23% *1, *2 MMF: 34% *1, *2 SF: 8% *1, *2
Sager 1996 [17]	Toileting [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 8%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 44%, AS: 36% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	36% *1, *2
Zelada 2009 [19]	Toileting [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: 0% Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: 4% *3 Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 19% *3	Change from I to D	Geriatric unit: 4% *3 Usual unit: 19% *3
Covinsky 2000 [28]	Eating [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PR: PS: 31%, AS: 0% PX: PS: 69%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 3 months after DC	PR: PS: 39%, AS: 30% PX: PS: 80%, AS: 61%	Change from I to D	PR: 30% PX: 61%
Covinsky 2003 [27]	Eating [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 15%, AS: 15%	Change from I to D	15% *2
Hansen 1999 [25]	Eating [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 11%, AS: 11%	Change from I to D	11%
Inouye 1993 [23]	Eating [29]	I, PA, TA	PA: assisted cutting meat or buttering bread; D: assisted feeding or fed partially/completely tube or intravenous fluids	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	O: nurse at DC	PS: 5%, AS: 5% *1	+ 1 response option (I to PA or TA, or PA to TA)	5% *1, *2
Hirsch 1990 [24]	Eating [24]	I, PA, TA	PA: assisted cutting meat, buttering bread, opening milk carton, etc; D: untidy in feeding	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 30%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 66%, AS: 36% *1	+ 1 response option (I to PA or TA, or PA to TA)	36% *1, *2
Mudge 2010 [21]	Eating [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 2%, AS: 0%	O: Nurse at DC	PS: 5%, AS: 3% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	3% *1, *2
Park 2021 [20]	Eating [32]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-30days<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	RB: PS: 0%, AS: 0% PF: PS: 0%, AS: 0% MMF: PS: 0%, AS: 0% SF: PS: 57%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 1 month after BL	RB: PS: 7%, AS: 7% *1 PF: PS: 3%, AS: 3% *1 MMF: PS: 10%, AS: 10% *1 SF: PS: 75%, AS: 18% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	RB: 7% *1, *2 PF: 3% *1, *2 MMF: 10% *1, *2 SF: 18% *1, *2

Study	Item	Response options	Criteria for response options	Baseline assessment (who, how & when)	Baseline prevalence of dependency*	Discharge assessment (who, how & when)	Discharge prevalence of dependency	Operationalization of HAD (item level)	Incidence HAD
Sager 1996 [17]	Eating [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 6%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 28%, AS: 22% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	22% *1, *2
Zelada 2009 [19]	Eating [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: 0% Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: 0% *3 Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 1% *3	Change from I to D	Geriatric unit: 0% *3 Usual unit: 1% *3
Inouye 1993 [23]	Grooming, tool unspecified	I, PA, TA	PA: assisted cutting meat or buttering bread; D: assisted feeding or fed partially/complete ly tube or intravenous fluids	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	O: nurse at DC	PS: 11%, AS: 11% *1	+ one response option (I to PA or TA, or PA to TA)	11% *1, *2
Hirsch 1990 [24]	Grooming [24]	I, PA, TA	PA: needs minor help or supervision; D: needs total grooming	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 31%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 78%, AS: 47% *1	+ 1 response option (I to PA or TA, or PA to TA)	47% *1, *2
Park 2021 [20]	Grooming, [32]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-30days<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	RB: PS: 0%, AS: 0% PF: PS: 0%, AS: 0% MMF: PS: 11%, AS: 0% SF: PS: 79%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 1 month after BL	RB: PS: 5%, AS: 5% *1 PF: PS: 14%, AS: 14% *1 MMF: PS: 29%, AS: 18% *1 SF: PS: 89%, AS: 10% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	RB: 5% *1, *2 PF: 14% *1, *2 MMF: 18% *1, *2 SF: 10% *1, *2
Covinsky 2000 [28]	Transferring [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PR: PS: 30%, AS: 0% PX: PS: 60%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 3 months after DC	PR: PS: 36%, AS: 27% PX: PS: 77%, AS: 59%	Change from I to D	PR: 27% PX: 59%
Covinsky 2003 [27]	Transferring [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 24%, AS: 24%	Change from I to D	24% *2
Dharmarajan 2020 [26]	Transferring from a chair [35]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	R: patient at last home-based assessment before hospitalization	PS: 5%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 1 month after DC	PS: 19%, AS: 14% *1	Change from I to D	14% *1, *2
Hansen 1999 [25]	Transferring [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 7%, AS: 7%	Change from I to D	7%
Hirsch 1990 [24]	Transferring [24]	I, PA, TA	PA: moves in and out of bed or chair with minor physical assistance; D: bedbound unless receives major physical help	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 27%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 83%, AS: 56% *1	+ 1 response option (I to PA or TA, or PA to TA)	56% *1, *2
Mudge 2010 [21]	Transferring [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 12%, AS: 0%	O: Nurse at DC	PS: 26%, AS: 14% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	14% *1, *2

Study	Item	Response options	Criteria for response options	Baseline assessment (who, how & when)	Baseline prevalence of dependency*	Discharge assessment (who, how & when)	Discharge prevalence of dependency	Operationalization of HAD (item level)	Incidence HAD
Park 2021 [20]	Transferring [32]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-30days<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	RB: PS: 0%, AS: 0% PF: PS: 0%, AS: 0% MMF: PS: 3%, AS: 0% SF: PS: 62%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 1 month after BL	RB: PS: 2%, AS: 2% *1 PF: PS: 8%, AS: 8% *1 MMF: PS: 20%, AS: 17% *1 SF: PS: 85%, AS: 23% *1 PS: 54%, AS: 47% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	RB: 2% *1, *2 PF: 8% *1, *2 MMF: 17% *1, *2 SF: 23% *1, *2
Sager 1996 [17]	Transferring [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 7%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 54%, AS: 47% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	47% *1, *2
Zelada 2009 [19]	Transferring [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	B<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: 0% Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: 3% *3 Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 14% *3	Change from I to D	Geriatric unit: 3% *3 Usual unit: 14% *3
Hirsch 1990 [24]	Incontinence of bowel or bladder [24]	I, PA, TA	PA: occasionally incontinent (1-4 times in last 48 hours); D: Frequently incontinent (>4 times in last 48 hours, has indwelling/condom catheter/requires intermittent catheter	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: NR, AS: 0% Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 0% PS: 48%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: NR, AS: 14% *3 PS: 52%, AS: 4% *1	+ 1 response option (I to PA or TA, or PA to TA)	4% *1, *2
Zelada 2009 [19]	Continence [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: 0% Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 0% PS: 1%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: 2% *3 Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: 6% *3 PS: 19%, AS: 18% *1	Change from I to D	Geriatric unit: 2% *3 Usual unit: 6% *3
Dharmarajan 2020 [26]	Walking [35]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	R: patient at last home-based assessment before hospitalization BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0% PS: 1%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 1 month after DC	PS: 19%, AS: 18% *1	Change from I to D	18% *1, *2
Hansen 1999 [25]	Walking, tool unspecified	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 10%, AS: 10%	Change from I to D	10%
Hirsch 1990 [24]	Mobility [24]	I, PA, TA	PA: unsteady-needs supervision or minimal support; D: needs major help to walk or must be pushed in W/C	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 30%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 88%, AS: 58% *1	+ 1 response option (I to PA or TA, or PA to TA)	58% *1, *2
Mudge 2010 [21]	Walking, tool unspecified	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 18%, AS: 0%	O: nurse at DC	PS: 37%, AS: 19% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	19% *1, *2
Park 2021	Walking [32]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help	BL<-30days<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	RB: PS: 0%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy	RB: PS: 9%, AS: 9% *1	Change BL-DC	RB: 9% *1, *2

Study	Item	Response options	Criteria for response options	Baseline assessment (who, how & when)	Baseline prevalence of dependency*	Discharge assessment (who, how & when)	Discharge prevalence of dependency	Operationalization of HAD (item level)	Incidence HAD
[20]			from person	R: patient or proxy	PF: PS: 3%, AS: 0% MMF: PS: 14%, AS: 0% SF: PS: 91%, AS: 0%	by phone 1 month after BL	PF: PS: 25%, AS: 22% *1 MMF: PS: 52%, AS: 38% *1 SF: PS: 97%, AS: 6% *1	prevalence	PF: 22% *1, *2 MMF: 38% *1, *2 SF: 6% *1, *2
Sager 1996 [17]	Walking, tool unspecified	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 8%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 53%, AS: 45% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	45% *1, *2
Park 2021 [20]	Walking 1 km from [33, 34] included in the Frailty Index [32]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-30days<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	RB: PS: 16%, AS: 0% PF: PS: 64%, AS: 0% MMF: PS: 88%, AS: 0% SF: PS: 100%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 1 month after BL	RB: PS: 40%, AS: 24% *1 PF: PS: 77%, AS: 13% *1 MMF: PS: 96%, AS: 8% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	RB: 24% *1, *2 PF: 13% *1, *2 MMF: 8% *1, *2 SF: 0% *1, *2
Park 2021 [20]	Walking up and down a flight of stairs from [33, 34] included in the Frailty Index [32]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-30days<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	RB: PS: 4%, AS: 0% PF: PS: 38%, AS: 0% MMF: PS: 71%, AS: 0% SF: PS: 100%, AS: 0%	R: patient or proxy by phone 1 month after BL	SF: PS: 100%, AS: 0% *1 RB: PS: 25%, AS: 21% *1 PF: PS: 66%, AS: 27% *1 MMF: PS: 84%, AS: 13% *1 SF: PS: 100%, AS: 0% *1	Change BL-DC prevalence	RB: 21% *1, *2 PF: 27% *1, *2 MMF: 13% *1, *2 SF: 0% *1, *2
Mudge 2010 [21]	Overall [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 28%, AS: 28% NaR: 0%	O: nurse at DC	PS: 51%, AS: 51%	Change BL-DC prevalence	40%
Sager 1996 [17]	Overall [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 27%, AS: 27%, NaR: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: NR, AS: NR	Change BL-DC prevalence	43%
Hansen 1999 [25]	Overall [30]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 0%, AS: 0%, NaR: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 100%, AS: 100%	Change from I to D	100% *4
Inouye 1993 [23]	Overall [29]	I, PA, TA	PA: assisted cutting meat or buttering bread; D: assisted feeding or fed partially/completely tube or intravenous fluids	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient	PS: 35%, AS: 35%, NaR: 0%	O: nurse at DC	PS: NR, AS: NR	+ 1 response option (I to PA or TA, or PA to TA)	27%
Zelada 2009 [19]	Overall [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	Geriatric unit: PS: 57%, AS: 57%, NaR: 0% Usual unit: PS: 49%, AS: 49%, NaR: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	Geriatric unit: PS: NR, AS: NR Usual unit: PS: NR, AS: NR	Change from I to D	Geriatric unit: 19% *3 Usual unit: 40% *3
Covinsky 2003 [27]	Overall [29]	I, D	I: ADL w/o help from person	BL<-2wk<-ADM; R: patient or proxy	PS: 33%, AS: 33%, NaR: 0%	R: patient or proxy at DC	PS: 35%, AS: 35%	Change from I to D	35%

ADM, admission; AS, analysed sample; BL<-2wk<-ADM, retrospective assessment at hospital admission on ADL ability 2 weeks before admission; BL, baseline; D, dependent; DC, discharge; HAD, hospital-associated disability; I, independent; MMF, mild-to-moderate frailty; NaR,

not at risk in the analysed sample; NR, not reported; O, observed; PA, partial assistance/or using materials (e.g. bedpan); PF, pre-frail; PR, patient reported; PX, proxy reported; R, reported; RB, robust; PS, published sample; SF, severe frailty; TA, total assistance (i.e. dependent) ; wk, weeks; w/o, without. \*Two prevalences are presented: the published sample reported by the authors and the analysis sample in our analysis; \*1 This is the difference between discharge prevalence and baseline prevalence. However, this does not correspond to HAD because some of the patients who were dependent at baseline might have improved. Hence, this estimate of HAD is a mix of two groups, (1) the increase in HAD in the group that was independent at baseline, and (2) the improvement in the group of patients who were dependent at baseline; \*2 Newly dependent was not available; \*3 Newly dependent are available, but the incidence was calculated with a denominator that included not only *N* at risk, but also people who could not develop further dependency; \*4 The authors analysed patients who were independent in all ADL at baseline and who were dependent at discharge.




Table 3 shows the number of studies that reported the tasks (items) and the ranking of the most sensitive tasks for detecting changes in disability.

**Table 3.** Ranking of the most sensitive tasks or sets of tasks for detecting change in disability

Number of sub-groups reporting this item	Item	Mean rank
7	Overall	1.57
1	Mobility	2
14	Bathing	2.5
14	Dressing	3.07
14	Toileting	3.86
1	Transferring from a chair	4
8	Walking	4
4	Walking up and down a flight of stairs	5
13	Transferring	5.15
6	Grooming	5.17
14	Eating	5.79
2	Continence	6
1	Incontinence of bowel or bladder	6
2	Walking 1 km	6.25

### Methodological quality

Figure 2 presents a summary plot of the assessment of methodological quality using the JBI checklist. All of the included studies and study sub-groups reported an adequate sample frame and recruitment procedure, and appropriately detailed the study subjects and setting. Approximately 37% of the included studies reported an adequate study sample size, and for approximately 63% it was inadequate. All of the sub-groups described the study subjects and setting well. Adequate analysis with sufficient coverage of the identified sample was conducted in approximately 25% of studies and was unclear in 75% of studies. All study sub-groups were unclear regarding the methods used for identification of the condition. The participant's condition was measured in a standard and reliable way in approximately 37% of the sub-groups and was unclear in 63%. The statistical analysis was adequate in approximately 19% and inadequate in 81% of the included studies. The response rate of the subgroups was good in 13%, unclear in 6%, and inadequate in 81% of the studies under evaluation. The rating of the individual items for each study is available in the supplementary material (Appendix 3).



**Figure 2.** Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) checklist summary plot.

## Discussion

The aims of this systematic review were to evaluate the incidence of HAD, to identify the tools or sets of tasks used in a hospital setting to assess ADL in older people, and to determine which functional task is most sensitive for detecting changes in disability.

The pooled incidence of HAD (total score) was 37%. The difference in incidence according to the two versions of the Katz Index of ADLs was 8%. This difference could be explained by the fact that patients in the studies by Sager [17] and Mudge [21] were more dependent at baseline compared with the volunteers included in the studies by Inouye [23] and Covinsky [27]. The difference could not be explained by comorbidities (e.g. with the APACHE II score or the Charlson Comorbidity Index) as the authors of the studies by Sager and Mudge did not report these values.

Loyd et al. [9] found a prevalence of HAD of 30% in older adults hospitalized for acute care. The current review focused on the number of new cases of HAD, i.e. the incidence of HAD. This latter measure considers the number of new cases of decline over the population at risk of developing a new decline. To our knowledge, no other review has investigated the overall incidence of HAD and the incidence at the item level in a population of older patients over 65 years hospitalized for acute care. In general, the incidence of HAD at the item level was higher when disability was reported by the surrogates than when it was reported by patients. Similar results were found in previous research [36].

Regarding the tools or sets of tasks used in a hospital setting to assess ADL in older people, this review identified that the Katz Index of ADLs was the most reported tool in the included studies. The Barthel Index and the Katz Index of ADLs are the oldest tools used for assessing ADL [37]. Seven studies used the Katz Index of ADLs, and none of them assessed the continence item that was included in the original version [17, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28]. In addition, the Katz Index of ADLs was modified by adding another item of walking in three studies [17, 21, 25] and adding the item grooming in one studies [23] .

This review found that the most sensitive task or set of tasks for detecting changes in disability was use of the total score, which is a composite score of several tasks. However, this composite score was based on a different set of tasks in individual studies. For example, continence was only included in the total score in Zelada et al.'s study [19]. The four next most sensitive tasks for detecting changes in disability were mobility, bathing, dressing, and toileting. It should be noted that items related to mobility and transfer from a chair appeared relatively high in the rankings and were assessed based on only one study. It was observed that the tasks that are generally considered difficult were not ranked as the most sensitive to change. For example, the item walking 1 km may be considered by many older patients as difficult, but this item did not seem very sensitive to change. This observation might be explained by the fact that many subjects were already dependent on help to perform this task and did not have the potential to decline further, hence resulting in a low incidence. The walking item was generally poorly described and was therefore categorized separately from the mobility item due to a lack of information about the similarity of these two items and their judging criteria. The item walking 1 km was considered more difficult than the walking task, which usually refers to a smaller distance; hence these functional

tasks were categorized separately. This has the disadvantage of resulting in fewer studies per functional task.

To determine which was the most sensitive task or set of tasks for detecting changes in disability, a meta-analysis of incidences would have been the preferred method. However, due to heterogeneity between studies and missing data it was not possible to pool the data. Therefore, the mean of the ranking was analysed, and this analysis should be interpreted with caution. Futures studies may change the ranking.

An overestimation of HAD might be present for two main reasons. First, differences in the execution of the ADL assessment might have resulted in overestimation of the HAD incidence. In two studies [21, 23], the baseline value for ADL ability was asked retrospectively to patients at admission, while ADL ability at discharge was assessed by an experienced healthcare professional. Older patients tend to overestimate their ADL ability [38, 39], their ability to step over an obstacle [40] and their motor performance [41]. Kawasaki and Tozawa hypothesized that the patients' overestimation of their physical or functional capacities might be explained by the absence of recognition of their decline in motor performance [41]. Observer-based assessments of ADL tasks by healthcare professionals were more accurate than patients' self-reported ADL values [42, 43].

Furthermore, this review included studies investigating pathologies that should not have a long-lasting effect on functional disability. However, it seems that there might be a combination of HAD and disease-related disability. Covinsky et al.'s study [27] was the only one to present the disability trajectories of each patient group and their development over time. These authors reported the percentage of patients whose ADL values declined between baseline (two weeks before hospitalization) and hospital admission (which is related to the condition) and those who had not recovered by discharge.

We believe that this combination of HAD and disease-related disability may also have contributed to an overestimation of HAD. In general, the studies did not separately report the numbers of persons with a disease-related disability and those with HAD, but only reported a combined total. Hence, it is unclear whether the failure to recover is due to hospitalization.

Moreover, the current ADL assessment tools present measurement properties limitations. For example, the Barthel Index showed a floor [44] and ceiling effect [44-46]. Two of the studies included in the current review reported a ceiling effect of the Katz Index of ADLs [17, 21].

A strength of the current study is that, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first review to investigate the incidence of HAD in a population of older patients over 65 years of age, hospitalized for acute care. To our knowledge, previous systematic reviews did not assess the incidence of HAD at the item level.

The study has a number of limitations. The screening process was performed independently by two reviewers for only 20% of the records. However, we believe that this has only limited negative influence, as the agreement between the reviewers was high (above the

predefined kappa coefficient of agreement of 0.8) and this procedure is accepted and suggested in rapid systematic review [10]. Another limitation is that we could not conduct a meta-analysis for the individual tasks due to insufficient data. With our reported methods, the certainty in the presented estimated incidence of HAD at the item level is very low. The estimated incidence, calculated as the difference between the discharge and baseline prevalence, should be interpreted with caution, as this does not consider the change over time of independent and dependent patients from baseline to discharge. The prevalence of disability at discharge does not distinguish between: (i) those who remain dependent between baseline and discharge, (ii) the newly dependent, and (iii) those who became independent at discharge. Therefore, these estimated incidences cannot be considered true incidence. In addition, small sample size bias cannot be totally excluded in the current review.

### **Implications and further research**

Further studies should investigate the reasons for the overestimation of HAD. As reported above, there is a need to develop a more sensitive tool that reflects the true functional status of older patients (over 65 years) before hospitalization for acute care. The systematic integration of proxies in the evaluation of functional status before hospitalization, in addition to the patient self-reported assessment, needs to be deepened. Regarding the implication for healthcare professionals, activities such as mobility, bathing, and dressing seem to be the most sensitive to detect changes in disability. The development of targeted training interventions for these ADL activities should be considered in future studies. HAD is a relevant problem, and a systematic appraisal of existing intervention studies addressing this problem is missing. Future research should consider interview methods to help patients better remember their abilities at home in order to reflect their true ability in ADL function.

### **Conclusion**

Functional decline in older patients over 65 years of age, due to hospitalization for acute care, is an important problem, with an incidence of 37% based on the overall score of ADL assessment. This incidence might be overestimated, due to a combination of disease-related disability and HAD, while measurement tools may also present some limitations. Furthermore, it is not possible to draw a definitive conclusion on the incidence of HAD at the item level, as there is insufficient data reported to enable the results of individual tasks to be pooled. This systematic review found that the most relevant ADL tasks for detecting disability are mobility, bathing, and dressing, although this result should be interpreted with caution. Further studies should investigate the overestimation of HAD and how to overcome this limitation.

### **Registration and protocol**

The protocol of this rapid systematic review has not been published in a peer-review journal. However, it is registered at OSF registries (<https://osf.io/9jez4/>) identifier: DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/9JEZ4.

### **Conflicts of interest**

None of the authors report any conflicts of interest.

## References

1. Palmer RM, Landefeld CS, Kresevic D, Kowal J. A medical unit for the acute care of the elderly. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 1994 May;42(5):545-52.
2. Fortinsky RH, Covinsky KE, Palmer RM, Landefeld CS. Effects of functional status changes before and during hospitalization on nursing home admission of older adults. *Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biomedical Sciences and Medical Sciences*. 1999 Oct;54(10):M521-6.
3. Brown CJ, Friedkin RJ, Inouye SK. Prevalence and outcomes of low mobility in hospitalized older patients. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2004 Aug;52(8):1263-70.
4. Izquierdo M, Duque G, Morley JE. Physical activity guidelines for older people: knowledge gaps and future directions. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity*. 2021;2(6):e380-e3.
5. Covinsky KE, Palmer RM, Kresevic DM, Kahana E, Counsell SR, Fortinsky RH, et al. Improving functional outcomes in older patients: lessons from an acute care for elders unit. *The Joint Commission journal on quality improvement*. 1998 Feb;24(2):63-76.
6. Creditor MC. Hazards of hospitalization of the elderly. *Annals of internal medicine*. 1993 Feb 1;118(3):219-23.
7. Covinsky KE, Pierluissi E, Johnston CB. Hospitalization-associated disability: "She was probably able to ambulate, but I'm not sure". *JAMA*. 2011 Oct 26;306(16):1782-93.
8. Buurman BM, van Munster BC, Korevaar JC, de Haan RJ, de Rooij SE. Variability in measuring (instrumental) activities of daily living functioning and functional decline in hospitalized older medical patients: a systematic review. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2011 Jun;64(6):619-27.
9. Loyd C, Markland AD, Zhang Y, Fowler M, Harper S, Wright NC, et al. Prevalence of Hospital-Associated Disability in Older Adults: A Meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*. 2020 Apr;21(4):455-61 e5.
10. Garritty C, Gartlehner G, Nussbaumer-Streit B, King VJ, Hamel C, Kamel C, et al. Cochrane Rapid Reviews Methods Group offers evidence-informed guidance to conduct rapid reviews. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2021 Feb;130(doi):13-22.
11. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *British medical journal*. 2021 Mar 29;372:n71.
12. Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D, Tufanaru C. Methodological guidance for systematic reviews of observational epidemiological studies reporting prevalence and cumulative incidence data. *International journal of evidence-based healthcare*. 2015 Sep;13(3):147-53.
13. Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2013.
14. Schwarzer G. meta: An R package for meta-analysis 2007; 7(3).
15. Deeks JJ, Higgins JPT, Altman DG. Chapter 10: Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas, J., Chandler, J., Cumpston, M., Li, T., Page, M.J., Welch, V.A., editor. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 63: Cochrane; updated February 2022.

16. Migliavaca CB, Stein C, Colpani V, Barker TH, Ziegelmann PK, Munn Z, et al. Meta-analysis of prevalence: I(2) statistic and how to deal with heterogeneity. *Research synthesis methods*. 2022 May;13(3):363-7.
17. Sager MA, Franke T, Inouye SK, Landefeld CS, Morgan TM, Rudberg MA, et al. Functional outcomes of acute medical illness and hospitalization in older persons. *Archives of internal medicine*. 1996 Mar 25;156(6):645-52.
18. A. R. WebPlotDigitizer 4.5 ed: Pacifica, California, USA; 2021.
19. Zelada MA, Salinas R, Baztan JJ. Reduction of functional deterioration during hospitalization in an acute geriatric units. *Archives of gerontology and geriatrics*. 2009 Jan-Feb;48(1):35-9.
20. Park CM, Kim W, Rhim HC, Lee ES, Kim JH, Cho KH, et al. Frailty and hospitalization-associated disability after pneumonia: A prospective cohort study. *BMC geriatrics*. 2021 Feb 5;21(1):1-8.
21. Mudge AM, O'Rourke P, Denaro CP. Timing and risk factors for functional changes associated with medical hospitalization in older patients. *Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biomedical Sciences and Medical Sciences*. 2010 Aug;65(8):866-72.
22. Martinez-Velilla N, Saez de Asteasu ML, Ramirez-Velez R, Zambom-Ferraresi F, Garcia-Hermoso A, Izquierdo M. Recovery of the Decline in Activities of Daily Living After Hospitalization Through an Individualized Exercise Program: Secondary Analysis of a Randomized Clinical Trial. *The journals of gerontology Series A, Biological sciences and medical sciences*. 2021 Jul 13;76(8):1519-23.
23. Inouye SK, Wagner DR, Acampora D, Horwitz RI, Cooney LM, Jr., Hurst LD, et al. A predictive index for functional decline in hospitalized elderly medical patients. *Journal of general internal medicine*. 1993 Dec;8(12):645-52.
24. Hirsch CH, Sommers L, Olsen A, Mullen L, Winograd CH. The natural history of functional morbidity in hospitalized older patients. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 1990 Dec;38(12):1296-303.
25. Hansen K, Mahoney J, Palta M. Risk factors for lack of recovery of ADL independence after hospital discharge. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 1999 Mar;47(3):360-5.
26. Dharmarajan K, Han L, Gahbauer EA, Leo-Summers LS, Gill TM. Disability and Recovery After Hospitalization for Medical Illness Among Community-Living Older Persons: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2020 Mar;68(3):486-95.
27. Covinsky KE, Palmer RM, Fortinsky RH, Counsell SR, Stewart AL, Kresevic D, et al. Loss of independence in activities of daily living in older adults hospitalized with medical illnesses: increased vulnerability with age. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2003 Apr;51(4):451-8.
28. Covinsky KE, Palmer RM, Counsell SR, Pine ZM, Walter LC, Chren MM. Functional status before hospitalization in acutely ill older adults: validity and clinical importance of retrospective reports. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2000 Feb;48(2):164-9.
29. Katz S, Ford AB, Moskowitz RW, Jackson BA, Jaffe MW. Studies of Illness in the Aged. The Index of Adl: A Standardized Measure of Biological and Psychosocial Function. *JAMA*. 1963 Sep 21;185:914-9.
30. Katz S, Downs TD, Cash HR, Grotz RC. Progress in development of the index of ADL. *Gerontologist*. 1970 Spring;10(1):20-30.
31. Mahoney FI, Barthel DW. Functional Evaluation: The Barthel Index. *Maryland state medical journal*. 1965 Feb;14:61-5.

32. Rockwood K, Mitnitski A. Frailty defined by deficit accumulation and geriatric medicine defined by frailty. *Clinics in geriatric medicine*. 2011 Feb;27(1):17-26.
33. Rosow I, Breslau N. A Guttman health scale for the aged. *Journal of gerontology*. 1966 Oct;21(4):556-9.
34. Nagi SZ. An epidemiology of disability among adults in the United States. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly Health and Society*. 1976:439-67.
35. Gill TM. Disentangling the disabling process: insights from the precipitating events project. *The Gerontologist*. 2014 Aug;54(4):533-49.
36. Rubenstein LZ, Schairer C, Wieland GD, Kane R. Systematic biases in functional status assessment of elderly adults: effects of different data sources. *Journal of gerontology*. 1984 Nov;39(6):686-91.
37. Hartigan I. A comparative review of the Katz ADL and the Barthel Index in assessing the activities of daily living of older people. *International journal of older people nursing*. 2007 Sep;2(3):204-12.
38. Sager MA, Dunham NC, Schwantes A, Mecum L, Halverson K, Harlowe D. Measurement of activities of daily living in hospitalized elderly: a comparison of self-report and performance-based methods. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 1992 May;40(5):457-62.
39. Kempen GI, Steverink N, Ormel J, Deeg DJ. The assessment of ADL among frail elderly in an interview survey: self-report versus performance-based tests and determinants of discrepancies. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*. 1996 Sep;51(5):P254-60.
40. Sakurai R, Fujiwara Y, Ishihara M, Higuchi T, Uchida H, Imanaka K. Age-related self-overestimation of step-over ability in healthy older adults and its relationship to fall risk. *BMC geriatrics*. 2013 May 7;13(1):1-9.
41. Kawasaki T, Tozawa R. Motor Function Relating to the Accuracy of Self-Overestimation Error in Community-Dwelling Older Adults. *Frontiers in neurology*. 2020;11:599787.
42. Elam JT, Graney MJ, Beaver T, el Derwi D, Applegate WB, Miller ST. Comparison of subjective ratings of function with observed functional ability of frail older persons. *American Journal of Public Health*. 1991 Sep;81(9):1127-30.
43. Applegate WB, Blass JP, Williams TF. Instruments for the functional assessment of older patients. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 1990 Apr 26;322(17):1207-14.
44. Dromerick AW, Edwards DF, Diringner MN. Sensitivity to changes in disability after stroke: a comparison of four scales useful in clinical trials. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. 2003 Jan-Feb;40(1):1-8.
45. de Morton NA, Keating JL, Davidson M. Rasch analysis of the barthel index in the assessment of hospitalized older patients after admission for an acute medical condition. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. 2008 Apr;89(4):641-7.
46. Nielsen LM, Kirkegaard H, Ostergaard LG, Bovbjerg K, Breinholt K, Maribo T. Comparison of self-reported and performance-based measures of functional ability in elderly patients in an emergency department: implications for selection of clinical outcome measures. *BMC geriatrics*. 2016 Nov 29;16(1):199.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1. Search strategy.

#### Appendix 1.1. Medline (via Ovid) search.

Number	Query	Results the 26 Aug 2021
1	Hospitalisation.ti,ab.	17,353
2	exp *Hospitalization/	93,562
3	hospitalization.ti,ab.	137,158
4	Hospital.ti,ab.	1,075,670
5	Hospitalized.ti,ab.	112,702
6	Hospitalised.ti,ab.	13,156
7	In-Hospital.ti,ab.	98,939
8	Inhospital.ti,ab.	1,870
9	Inpatient.ti,ab.	88,351
10	1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9	1,300,482
11	functional.ti,ab.	1,338,546
12	Disability.ti,ab.	168,863
13	disabled.ti,ab.	24,221
14	Activity of daily living.ti,ab.	2,185
15	Activities of daily living.ti,ab.	28,860
16	Activity of daily life.ti,ab.	482
17	Activities of daily life.ti,ab.	1,403
18	exp *"Activities of Daily Living"/	45,453
19	activities.ti,ab.	755,046
20	daily.ti,ab.	557,713
21	living.ti,ab.	373,448
22	19 and 20 and 21	32,687
23	Activity.ti,ab.	2,802,780
24	daily.ti,ab.	557,713
25	living.ti,ab.	373,448
26	23 and 24 and 25	8,758
27	Participation.ti,ab.	159,573
28	Activity.ti,ab.	2,802,780
29	limitation.ti,ab.	90,604
30	28 and 29	11,618
31	11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 22 or 26 or 27 or 30	1,699,597
32	prevalence.ti,ab.	683,571
33	frequency.ti,ab.	878,298
34	burden.ti,ab.	230,392
35	exp Random Allocation/	105,786
36	random*.ti,ab.	1,247,309
37	frequencies.ti,ab.	197,525



38	inciden*.ti,ab.	951,438
39	incidence.ti,ab.	805,068
40	risk.ti,ab.	2,320,682
41	hazard ratio.ti,ab.	108,340
42	hazard ratios.ti,ab.	29,363
43	odds.ti,ab.	363,083
44	chance.ti,ab.	69,946
45	percent.ti,ab.	295,410
46	percentage.ti,ab.	403,689
47	percentages.ti,ab.	66,053
48	rate.ti,ab.	2,216,830
49	rates.ti,ab.	1,158,092
50	occurrence.ti,ab.	386,376
51	responsiveness.ti,ab.	105,969
52	sensitivity to change.ti,ab.	2,604
53	32 or 33 or 34 or 35 or 36 or 37 or 38 or 39 or 40 or 41 or 42 or 43 or 44 or 45 or 46 or 47 or 48 or 49 or 50 or 51 or 52	7,901,067
54	older.ti,ab.	474,685
55	elderly.ti,ab.	259,926
56	geriatric.ti,ab.	44,737
57	exp *Aged/	26,580
58	aged.ti,ab.	623,417
59	frail.ti,ab.	13,694
60	frails.ti,ab.	13
61	exp *Frailty/	4,180
62	frailty.ti,ab.	16,886
63	frailness.ti,ab.	20
64	ageing.ti,ab.	45,000
65	senior.ti,ab.	36,394
66	elders.ti,ab.	9,003
67	54 or 55 or 56 or 57 or 58 or 59 or 60 or 61 or 62 or 63 or 64 or 65 or 66	1,256,648
68	hospital-associated.ti,ab.	1,276
69	hospital associated.ti,ab.	1,276
70	hospital-acquired.ti,ab.	10,652
71	hospital acquired.ti,ab.	10,652
72	hospital-related.ti,ab.	806
73	hospital related.ti,ab.	806
74	hospitalization-associated.ti,ab.	309
75	hospitalization associated.ti,ab.	309
76	hospitalisation-associated.ti,ab.	38
77	hospitalisation associated.ti,ab.	38
78	hospitalization-acquired.ti,ab.	3
79	hospitalization acquired.ti,ab.	3
80	hospitalisation-acquired.ti,ab.	1
81	hospitalisation acquired.ti,ab.	1
82	hospitalization-related.ti,ab.	220

83	hospitalization related.ti,ab.	220
84	hospitalisation-related.ti,ab.	28
85	hospitalisation related.ti,ab.	28
86	before hospitalisation.ti,ab.	105
87	before hospitalization.ti,ab.	1,090
88	after hospitalisation.ti,ab.	434
89	after hospitalization.ti,ab.	3,890
90	(functional deterioration adj3 hospital*).ti,ab.	20
91	(hospital* adj3 functional loss).ti,ab.	13
92	(functional status adj3 Hospital*).ti,ab.	342
93	(los* adj3 independence).ti,ab.	1,369
94	(exposure adj2 hospital*).ti,ab.	797
95	(functional decline adj4 hospital*).ti,ab.	313
96	68 or 69 or 70 or 71 or 72 or 73 or 74 or 75 or 76 or 77 or 78 or 79 or 80 or 81 or 82 or 83 or 84 or 85 or 86 or 87 or 88 or 89 or 90 or 91 or 92 or 93 or 94 or 95	21,232
97	10 and 31 and 53 and 67 and 96	740

#### Appendix 1.2. Embase search.

Number	Query	Results the 26 Aug 2021
1	hospitalisation:ti,ab	28,806
2	'hospitalization'/exp	421,223
3	hospitalization:ti,ab	230,090
4	hospital:ti,ab	1,708,899
5	hospitalized:ti,ab	175,158
6	hospitalised:ti,ab	20,314
7	'in hospital':ti,ab	159,194
8	inhospital:ti,ab	6,247
9	inpatient:ti,ab	151,612
10	#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9	2,125,565
11	functional:ti,ab	1,651,619
12	disability:ti,ab OR disabled:ti,ab	268,385
13	'activity of daily living':ti,ab	3,263
14	'activities of daily living':ti,ab	40,031
15	'activity of daily life':ti,ab	341
16	'activities of daily life':ti,ab	1,857
17	'daily life activity'/exp/mj	14,822
18	participation:ti,ab	207,496
19	activity:ti,ab	3,491,683
20	limitation:ti,ab	120,101

21	#19 AND #20	16,085
22	#11 OR #12 OR #13 OR #14 OR #15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #21	2,131,790
23	prevalence:ti,ab	964,018
24	frequency:ti,ab	1,138,741
25	burden:ti,ab	352,672
26	'randomized controlled trial'/exp/mj	11,937
27	'randomization'/exp	91,820
28	inciden*:ti,ab	1,362,309
29	incidence:ti,ab	1,157,883
30	risk:ti,ab	3,334,654
31	'hazard ratio':ti,ab	154,212
32	'hazard ratios':ti,ab	45,812
33	odds:ti,ab	460,665
34	chance:ti,ab	101,595
35	percent:ti,ab	402,184
36	percentage:ti,ab	577,947
37	percentages:ti,ab	92,283
38	rate:ti,ab	3,018,423
39	rates:ti,ab	1,571,532
40	occurrence:ti,ab	499,939
41	responsiveness:ti,ab	131,335
42	'sensitivity to change':ti,ab	3,234
43	frequencies:ti,ab	237,267
44	#23 OR #24 OR #25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28 OR #29 OR #30 OR #31 OR #32 OR #33 OR #34 OR #35 OR #36 OR #37 OR #38 OR #39 OR #40OR #41 OR #42 OR #43	10,403,809
45	older:ti,ab	653,439
46	elderly:ti,ab	367,177
47	geriatric:ti,ab	69,535
48	'aged'/exp	3,321,306
49	aged:ti,ab	854,083
50	frail:ti,ab	21,314
51	frails:ti,ab	28
52	frailty:ti,ab	25,936
53	'frailty'/exp	15,719
54	frailness:ti,ab	29
55	ageing:ti,ab	60,209
56	senior:ti,ab	51,231
57	elders:ti,ab	11,925
58	#45 OR #46 OR #47 OR #48 OR #49 OR #50 OR #51 OR #52 OR #53 OR #54 OR #55 OR #56 OR #57	5,394,076
59	'hospital associated':ti,ab	1,830

60	'hospital-associated':ti,ab	1,836
61	'hospital acquired':ti,ab	15,633
62	'hospital-acquired':ti,ab	15,725
63	'hospital related':ti,ab	1,235
64	'hospital-related':ti,ab	1,241
65	'hospitalization associated':ti,ab	442
66	'hospitalization-associated':ti,ab	444
67	'hospitalisation-associated':ti,ab	58
68	'hospitalisation associated':ti,ab	58
69	'hospitalization acquired':ti,ab	4
70	'hospitalization-acquired':ti,ab	4
71	'hospitalisation acquired':ti,ab	0
72	'hospitalisation-acquired':ti,ab	0
73	'hospitalization related':ti,ab	394
74	'hospitalization-related':ti,ab	396
75	'hospitalisation related':ti,ab	45
76	'hospitalisation-related':ti,ab	45
77	'before hospitalisation':ti,ab	202
78	'before hospitalization':ti,ab	1,692
79	'after hospitalisation':ti,ab	671
80	'after hospitalization':ti,ab	6,053
81	functional:ti,ab AND ((deterioration NEAR/3 hospital*):ti,ab)	83
82	((hospital* NEAR/3 functional):ti,ab) AND loss:ti,ab	241
83	functional:ti,ab AND ((status NEAR/3 hospital*):ti,ab)	859
84	(los* NEAR/3 independence):ti,ab	2,106
85	(exposure NEAR/2 hospital*):ti,ab	1,197
86	functional:ti,ab AND ((decline NEAR/4 hospital*):ti,ab)	582
87	#59 OR #60 OR #61 OR #62 OR #63 OR #64 OR #65 OR #66 OR #67 OR #68 OR #69 OR #70 OR #71 OR #72 OR #73 OR #74 OR #75 OR #76OR #77 OR #78 OR #79 OR #80 OR #81 OR #82 OR #83 OR #84 OR #85 OR #86	21,314
88	#10 AND #22 AND #44 AND #58 AND #87	1,557

### Appendix 1.3. Cochrane search.

ID	Search	Results the 26 Aug 2021
1	hospitalisation:ti,ab	30,002
2	MeSH descriptor: [Hospitalization] explode all trees	14,616
3	hospitalization:ti,ab	29,933
4	hospital:ti,ab	129,129

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .


5	hospitalized:ti,ab	16,701
6	hospitalised:ti,ab	16,701
7	in-hospital:ti,ab	12,291
8	inhospital:ti,ab	5,816
9	inpatient:ti,ab	12,747
10	#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9	167,548
11	functional:ti,ab	76,938
12	disability:ti,ab	31,499
13	disabled:ti,ab	1,712
14	"activity of daily living":ti,ab	711
15	"activities of daily living":ti,ab	7,311
16	"activity of daily life":ti,ab	88
17	"activities of daily life":ti,ab	338
18	MeSH descriptor: [Activities of Daily Living] explode all trees	9,739
19	participation:ti,ab	30,692
20	activity:ti,ab	132,423
21	limitation:ti,ab	7,562
22	#20 AND #21	1,315
23	#11 OR #12 OR #13 OR #14 OR #15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #19 OR #22	139,849
24	prevalence:ti,ab	33,961
25	frequency:ti,ab	79,109
26	burden:ti,ab	22,207
27	MeSH descriptor: [Random Allocation] explode all trees	20,643
28	MeSH descriptor: [Randomized Controlled Trial] explode all trees	119
29	inciden*:ti,ab	125,517
30	incidence:ti,ab	116,076
31	risk:ti,ab	219,370
32	"hazard ratio":ti,ab	22,039
33	"hazard ratios":ti,ab	3,476
34	odds:ti,ab	27,403
35	chance:ti,ab	8,943
36	percent:ti,ab	34,597
37	percentage:ti,ab	50,616
38	percentages:ti,ab	6,400
39	rate:ti,ab	282,297
40	rates:ti,ab	136,486
41	occurrence:ti,ab	27,342
42	responsiveness:ti,ab	7,597
43	"sensitivity to change":ti,ab	357

44	frequencies:ti,ab	7,361
45	#24 OR #25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28 OR #29 OR #30 OR #31 OR #32 OR #33 OR #34 OR #35 OR #36 OR #37 OR #38 OR #39 OR #40 OR #41 OR #42 OR #43 OR #44	728,891
46	older:ti,ab	59,544
47	elderly:ti,ab	45,936
48	geriatric:ti,ab	5,730
49	MeSH descriptor: [Aged] explode all trees	213,642
50	aged:ti,ab	118,657
51	frail:ti,ab	2,397
52	frails:ti,ab	4
53	frailty:ti,ab	2,066
54	MeSH descriptor: [Frailty] explode all trees	198
55	frailness:ti,ab	0
56	ageing:ti,ab	9,339
57	senior:ti,ab	3,235
58	elders:ti,ab	1,199
59	#46 OR #47 OR #48 OR #49 OR #50 OR #51 OR #52 OR #53 OR #54 OR #55 OR #56 OR #57 OR #58	381,978
60	"hospital associated":ti,ab	99
61	"hospital-associated":ti,ab	99
62	"hospital acquired":ti,ab	823
63	"hospital-acquired":ti,ab	823
64	"hospital related":ti,ab	60
65	"hospital-related":ti,ab	60
66	"hospitalization associated":ti,ab	82
67	"hospitalization-associated":ti,ab	82
68	"hospitalisation-associated":ti,ab	82
69	"hospitalisation associated":ti,ab	82
70	"hospitalization acquired":ti,ab	1
71	"hospitalization-acquired":ti,ab	1
72	"hospitalisation acquired":ti,ab	1
73	"hospitalisation-acquired":ti,ab	1
74	"hospitalization related":ti,ab	58
75	"hospitalization-related":ti,ab	58
76	"hospitalisation related":ti,ab	58
77	"hospitalisation-related":ti,ab	58
78	"before hospitalisation":ti,ab	128
79	"before hospitalization":ti,ab	128
80	"after hospitalisation":ti,ab	785
81	"after hospitalization":ti,ab	785
82	functional deterioration near/3 hospital*:ti,ab	16
83	hospital* near/3 functional loss:ti,ab	93

84	functional status near/3 hospital*:ti,ab	134
85	los* near/3 independence:ti,ab	250
86	exposure near/2 hospital*:ti,ab	74
87	functional decline near/4 hospital*:ti,ab	62
88	#60 OR #61 OR #62 OR #63 OR #64 OR #65 OR #66 OR #67 OR #68 OR #69 OR #70 OR #71 OR #72 OR #73 OR #74 OR #75 OR #76 OR #77 OR #78 OR #79 OR #80 OR #81 OR #82 OR #83 OR #84 OR #85 OR #86 OR #87	2,574
89	#10 AND #23 AND #45 AND #59 AND #88	222

## Appendix 2. Study flow diagram.

PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases and registers only



It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

### Appendix 3. Individual question rating JBI Checklist.

