

Understanding Health Service Utilisation Patterns for Care Home Residents During the COVID-19 Pandemic using Routinely Collected Healthcare Data

Authors:

Alex Garner¹, Nancy Preston³, Camila Caiado⁴, Emma Stubington¹, Barbara Hanratty⁵, James Limb⁶, and Suzanne Mason², Jo Knight¹

Acknowledgements:

Rachel Stocker – PPIE facilitation,

PPIE Group – Helpful Input

Graham King, Catherine McShane, Del Jones, Ian Dove – Assistance of understanding the HealthCall data

¹ Lancaster Medical School – Lancaster University

² School of Health and Related Research – The University of Sheffield

³ Division of Health Research – Lancaster University

⁴ Department of Mathematical Sciences – Durham University

⁵ Population Health Sciences Institute – Newcastle University

⁶ County Durham and Darlington NHS Foundation Trust

Abstract

Background

Healthcare in care homes during the COVID-19 pandemic required a balance, providing treatment while minimising exposure risk. Policy for how residents should receive care changed rapidly throughout the pandemic. A lack of accessible data on care home residents over this time meant policy decisions were difficult to make and verify. This study investigates common patterns of healthcare utilisation for care home residents in relation to COVID-19 testing events, and associations between utilisation patterns and resident characteristics.

Methods

Linked datasets including secondary care, community care and a care home telehealth app are used to define daily healthcare utilisation sequences for care home residents. We derive four 10-day sets of sequences related to Pillar 1 COVID-19 testing; before [1] and after [2] a resident's first positive test and before [3] and after [4] a resident's first test. These sequences are clustered, grouping residents with similar healthcare patterns in each set. Association of individual characteristics (e.g. health conditions such as diabetes and dementia) with healthcare patterns are investigated.

Results

We demonstrate how routinely collected health data can be used to produce longitudinal descriptions of patient care. Clustered sequences [1,2,3,4] are produced for 3,471 care home residents tested between 01/03/2020–01/09/2021. Clusters characterised by higher levels of utilisation were significantly associated with higher prevalence of diabetes. Dementia is associated with higher levels of care after a testing event, and appears to be correlated with a hospital discharge after a first test. Residents discharged from inpatient care within 10 days of their first test had the same mortality rate as those who stayed in hospital.

Conclusion

We provide longitudinal, resident-level data on care home resident healthcare during the COVID-19 pandemic. We find that vulnerable residents were associated with higher levels of healthcare usage despite the additional risks. Implications of findings are limited by the challenges of routinely collected data. However, this study demonstrates the potential for further research into healthcare pathways using linked, routinely collected datasets.

Funding

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Jointly funded by NIHR/UKRI [COV0466&MR/V028502/1.]

49 **Data Access Statement**

50 Data was collected from CDDFT and stored in a Trusted Research Environment (TRE) managed by
51 Durham University. Informed consent was not possible as the data was anonymised. The Trust shared
52 anonymised data after undertaking a Data Privacy Impact Assessment and a Data Transfer Agreement.
53 Data supporting this study is not publicly available due to ethical considerations around accessing linked
54 patient level healthcare data. The authors can no longer access the data used in this analysis. Please
55 contact the main author for more information (a.garner2@lancaster.ac.uk).

56 **Ethical Approval**

57 The project was approved by Lancaster University Faculty of Health and Medicine Research Ethics
58 committee, reference FHM-2022-3318-RECR-2.

59

60 **Introduction**

61 The COVID-19 pandemic had a major impact on adult social care. There was substantial excess
62 mortality in care homes during the first phase of the COVID-19 pandemic, deaths were estimated 20%
63 higher than previous years, a large portion of which are not registered as due to COVID-19^{1,2}. The
64 highest proportion of deaths involving COVID-19 of care home residents in wave one was in the North
65 East (30% of deaths involved COVID-19)². Best policy for care homes was uncertain at the beginning
66 of the pandemic. Studies have shown long-term decline in health related quality of life and functional
67 decline in older patients who were hospitalised for COVID-19³. Healthcare for vulnerable people
68 required a fine balance, to ensure necessary healthcare was maintained while minimising exposure to
69 COVID-19 which was particularly pertinent in care homes⁴.

70 During the early stages of the pandemic, policy recommendations for care homes were updated and
71 revised rapidly. Between the initial COVID-19 guidance on 25th February 2020 and £850m social care
72 grant to councils on 16th April 2020, Public Health England and the Department of Health and Social
73 Care provided numerous additional frameworks and guidance documents⁵. These were often vague and
74 difficult to follow⁶. Criticisms have described the UK's policy response in adult social care as 'slow,
75 late and inadequate'⁷.

76 On 17th March 2020 NHS England advised that all non-urgent elective operations should be postponed,
77 and for all medically fit inpatients to be discharged to free-up capacity⁸. Grimm et al found that care
78 home residents' use of inpatient care decreased in the early stages of the pandemic and suggest these

79 reductions may result in substantial unmet healthcare need ⁹. In a global survey in the early stages of
80 the pandemic, two-thirds of health care professionals for chronic diseases stated moderate or severe
81 effects on their patients due to changes in healthcare services¹⁰.

82 Care home residents have high levels of physical dependency, cognitive impairment, multiple
83 morbidity, and polypharmacy¹¹. Comorbidities such as diabetes and dementia are prevalent in the
84 population and require ongoing high levels of care from staff and specialists^{12,13}. Dementia was the most
85 common pre-existing condition for residents who died of COVID-19 before the end of 2021 and
86 diabetes was a common comorbidity for male residents who died of COVID-19 in the same period ².

87 There is a lack of patient-level data from care homes themselves and it is difficult to identify care home
88 residents from administrative hospital data¹⁴. This limits studies using routinely collected hospital data
89 on care home residents and reduces the possible evidence base for policymakers ¹⁵.

90 Using a unique dataset of linked, routinely collected care home and hospital data, we built a description
91 of healthcare of care home residents during the pandemic. We investigate how specific circumstances
92 such as positive COVID-19 impacted care patterns between care homes and the healthcare system to
93 find common groups of longitudinal healthcare utilisation leading to COVID-19 cases, or in response
94 to COVID-19 tests. We provide an investigation into patterns of care and possible associations with
95 resident characteristics and outcomes.

96 **Methods**

97 **Data Source**

98 We utilised data from the *HealthCall Digital Care Homes* app that began rollout in the North East of
99 England 3rd August 2018. HealthCall is a digital referrals app used by care home staff to gather
100 information and request review from a clinician. Three care home datasets from HealthCall covering
101 resident enrolment, home enrolment, and app uploads are linked via pseudonymised NHS number to
102 eight routinely collected datasets from County Durham and Darlington NHS Foundation Trust hospitals
103 (CDDFT), including A&E, inpatient, outpatient, and community data (primary care data is not
104 included). Pillar 1 COVID-19 testing in the region is also included. In total eight of the datasets refer to

105 patient healthcare events. Three datasets include additional information about residents and homes. A
106 description of each dataset is contained in the supplementary materials.

107 The COVID-19 testing data used for this analysis is Pillar 1 PCR test results. Pillar 1 testing is classed
108 as ‘swab testing in Public Health England (PHE) labs and NHS hospitals for those with a clinical need,
109 and health and care workers’¹⁶. The testing data consists of tests when a resident is an inpatient, or when
110 a resident is symptomatic or believed to have been exposed to someone with suspected COVID-19.

111 **Dataset Descriptive Statistics**

112 Monthly numbers of observations are calculated for each of the datasets. Locations of COVID-19 tests
113 and rates of test results at the different location types were calculated and independence of these two
114 factors was tested with a chi-squared test (see supplementary material).

115 **Defining Cohort and Trajectories**

116 Since the data contains the healthcare interactions of all CDDFT service patients, a cohort of care home
117 residents was defined. Presence of individuals’ NHS numbers in the HealthCall enrolment (activation)
118 dataset indicate care home residency. Observations in other datasets referring to a resident living in the
119 set of HealthCall care homes are used to identify additional care home residents. Residents are included
120 in the study from the identified timepoints at which they became a care home resident to when they died
121 or moved out of the home. All individuals identified as care home residents are included in the cohort.
122 Resident characteristics such as age, gender and comorbidities are also drawn from the available
123 datasets (see supplementary material for methods and limitations).

124 We define a resident’s healthcare trajectory as the sequence of care they received each day. To ensure
125 only one state per day, we prioritise more ‘significant’ types of care. The possible states (in order of
126 significance) are:

- 127 • A&E attendance
- 128 • Inpatient stay in hospital
- 129 • Outpatient attendance
- 130 • Appointment in the community

- 131 • Care home visit by community healthcare staff
- 132 • Care Home – no actions in the datasets

133 **Sequence Analysis**

134 Four different 10-day sub-sequences of resident trajectories were investigated using index events
135 defined by the available COVID-19 tests. The two index events used are a resident's *first COVID-19*
136 *test* and a resident's *first positive COVID-19 test*. The sequence length of 10 days corresponds to the
137 UK government recommended isolation period for individuals who test positive for the majority of the
138 study period. Residents without a COVID-19 test were not included. Sequences exceeding the
139 boundaries of the study period or a resident's time in the cohort were excluded from the analysis.

140 Pairwise distances were calculated between sub-sequences in each of the four sets using the Optimal
141 Matching distance algorithm¹⁷. Insertion and deletion costs of 1 were used, and substitution costs were
142 based on the transition rate between the two states (see supplementary materials for more information).
143 The sequences were clustered based on the calculated dissimilarity between them using hierarchical
144 clustering and Ward's criterion. State Sequence Analysis was implemented in *R* using the *TraMineR*
145 package¹⁸.

146 Potential associations between cluster assignment and resident characteristics were investigated to
147 provide insight into which factors are associated with the care a resident received. Specific
148 characteristics were investigated: 28-day mortality after the COVID-19 test and Charlson Comorbidity
149 Index, as well as the prevalent comorbidities: diabetes and dementia. Additional associations with wave
150 of the pandemic and COVID-19 test result are included in the supplementary materials.

151 Chi-squared tests for independence were used for each of the characteristics separately (or Fisher's
152 exact test when counts in the elements of the table are ≤ 5)¹⁹, with an adjusted significance level
153 $\alpha=0.00143$ as a simple Bonferroni multiple testing correction from $\alpha = 0.05$ (total number of tests
154 presented in the main paper and supplementary materials = 45, 16 are included in the main paper).

155 **Cluster Transitions**

156 Since the sequences defined lead to, and follow on from, index events we use Sankey diagrams to
 157 visualise the movement between clusters.

158 **Results**

159 8,702 care home residents were identified from 122 care homes. *Table 1* provides a summary of the
 160 cohort demographic information.

Table 1: Formatted summary table. Includes characteristics of 8,702 identified care home residents

	Median		IQR	
Age *	85		79-90	
Number of Observations	58		29-109	
Months in the cohort	19		11-31	
	Male		Female	
Gender	3,086 (35%)		5,616 (65%)	
	True		False	
Died (within the study period)	2,549 (29%)		6,153 (71%)	
	0	1-2	3-4	≥5
Charlson Comorbidity Index **	324 (8%)	2,111 (52%)	1,292 (32%)	3-4 (8%)

161 **Table 1 Legend:** * We do not have age information for 1,394 of the residents. ** We could not calculate
 162 a Charlson Comorbidity Index for 4,671 residents due to them not having registered ICD-10 codes from
 163 their inpatient stay. Percentages are of those calculated.

164 *Table 2* summarises 11 datasets, consisting of routinely collected data. The data comes from the
 165 CDDFT’s secondary care, community database, observations taken inside the care home on the
 166 HealthCall app, and COVID-19 testing data. This data includes residents in the study cohort.

167 *Table 2: Counts of observations and individuals in each data set, filtered for the cohort of care home residents.*


Data Set	No. of Observations	No. of Individuals	Proportion of Cohort
<i>A&E</i>	25,399	6,608	76%
<i>Inpatient</i>	33,676	5,898	68%
<i>Inpatient Observations</i>	527,771	5,501	63%
<i>Outpatient</i>	32,707	5,013	58%
<i>Ward Episodes</i>	38,849	5,948	68%
<i>Community</i>	848,495	8,494	98%
<i>HealthCall</i>	72,261	6,318	73%
<i>COVID-19 Testing (PI)</i>	24,272	4,767	55%
Additional Data Sets			
<i>Discharges</i>	13,736	4,297	49%

<i>HealthCall Referrals</i>	15,936	8,702	100%
<i>HealthCall Implementation</i>	125	-	-
Total	743,163	8,702	-

168

169 **Table 2 Legend:** * Individuals can be in more than one dataset hence the sums do not equal the total.

170 Trajectories were defined from the set of healthcare interactions included in the dataset. Figure 1
 171 visualises a resident's care trajectory throughout their time in the study cohort. The longer blue periods
 172 represent an inpatient stay.




173

174 *Figure 1: A 5-month sample of a single resident's care trajectory, with coloured blocks for each day representing the care*
 175 *the resident received each day.*

176 Sequences for clustering were specified based on the COVID-19 testing index events. 4,767 residents
 177 have a recorded Pillar 1 COVID-19 PCR test in the dataset, and are therefore included in the analysis,
 178 3,938 were ineligible for analysis due to no testing events. Of these, 1,049 residents test positive for
 179 COVID-19 at some point in time and their first tests are used as the index events for the pair of
 180 sequences before and after a first *positive* COVID-19 test.

181 Sequences before the test are not included when a resident moves into the home in the 10 days before
 182 the test (198 removed before first positive test, 1,296 removed before a first test). Sequences after the
 183 test are not included when the resident dies in the 10-days after the test, or their test is less than 10 days
 184 before the end of the study period (316 removed after a first positive test, 1,547 removed after a first
 185 test). The number of residents included for each sequence specification is [1] before a first positive test
 186 - 851, [2] after a first positive test - 733, [3] before a first test - 3,345, [4] after a first test - 3,220. The
 187 total number of individual residents that appear in the analysis is 3,471.

188 A visualisation of the four 10-day sequences in their assigned clusters can be seen in *Figure 2*. The
 189 clusters are generally characterised by a single state. Sequences both before and after the first positive
 190 test [1,2] are demonstrated by two clusters: an *inpatient* cluster, and a *home* cluster. The before and
 191 after first test sequences [3,4] are characterised by three clusters each, *home*, *community*, and *inpatient*
 192 states and *home*, *inpatient to home transfer* and *inpatient* sequences respectively. The large number of
 193 residents in the *inpatient* cluster after the first test is likely due to testing upon hospital admission. The
 194 inclusion of an *inpatient to home transfer* cluster after a first test may indicate that these tests were
 195 testing on discharge from the hospital.



196

197 *Figure 2: Sequence cluster assignments representing types of care received in the 10 days before (1) and after (2) a*
 198 *resident's first positive COVID-19 test, and the 10 days before (3) and after (4) a resident's first COVID-19 test (of any*
 199 *result). The clusters represent the groups of similar sequences, where each sequence represents one resident's care over the*
 200 *10 days.*

201 *Table 3: Table of associations between cluster assignments for each of the sub-sequence groups and resident*
 202 *characteristics/sequence outcomes.*

		28 Day Mortality		Diabetes		Dementia		N*	Charlson CI (Those with a calculated CCI)			
		T (%)	F (%)	T (%)	F (%)	T (%)	F (%)		0 (%)	1-2 (%)	3-4 (%)	≥5 (%)
[1] 10 Day Before First Positive	Cluster 1 (Inpatient) n = 142	22	78	35	65	27	73	n = 136	07	45	35	13
	Cluster 2 (Home) n = 709	23	77	21	79	21	79	n = 386	08	52	32	08
[2] 10 Day After First Positive	Cluster 1 (Inpatient) n = 195	14	86	37	63	31	69	n = 187	06	49	34	11
	Cluster 2 (Home) n = 538	10	90	17	83	19	81	n = 253	08	51	32	09
[3] 10 Day Before All First Tests	Cluster 1 (Home) n = 3,159	12	88	21	79	22	78	n = 2025	08	51	32	09
	Cluster 2 (Community) n = 140	11	89	82	18	29	71	n = 121	03	24	56	17
	Cluster 3 (Inpatient) n = 172	14	86	35	65	20	80	n = 161	07	50	34	09
[4] 10 Day After All First Tests	Cluster 1 (Inpatient) n = 810	08	92	32	68	25	75	n = 748	08	47	35	10
	Cluster 2 (Inpatient/Home) n = 578	08	92	33	67	33	67	n = 492	06	50	33	12
	Cluster 3 (Home) n = 1,832	03	97	17	83	17	83	n = 875	09	53	32	07

203 **Table 3 Legend:** *Since a Charlson Comorbidity index could not be calculated, we did not include those residents
204 in the proportions and association calculations. The number of residents with a calculated Charlson Comorbidity
205 Coefficient in each group can be seen in the ‘N’ column.
206 Characteristics of the residents in these clusters were assessed. The relative frequencies of the
207 characteristics within each of the clusters can be found in *Table 3*. The combinations found to be non-
208 independent through the chi-squared test are highlighted in grey. All p-values for these tests can be
209 found in the supplementary materials. A higher proportion of residents with diabetes are found in
210 clusters indicating a higher level of care for all four sequences ([1] p=0.00026, [2,3,4] p<0.0001). For
211 example in the 10 days before a resident’s first positive test 35% are diabetic of 142 in the *inpatient*
212 cluster compared to 21% of 709 in the *home* cluster. A similar pattern is found after both all and positive
213 tests for dementia patients ([2] p=0.00036, [4] p<0.0001). Before all first tests a higher proportion of
214 those in the *community* cluster have frailty scores of 3 and above (73% of 140 versus 41% and 43% for
215 3,159 in the home and 172 in the inpatient cluster respectively).

216 Twenty-eight-day mortality is only associated with clusters 10 days after all tests ([4] $p < 0.0001$);
217 residents in the *inpatient* and *inpatient transfer* cluster have a slightly higher 28-day mortality than
218 those in the *home* cluster (8% of 810 and 8% of 578 versus 3% of 1,832). The two clusters with inpatient
219 stays have the same 28-day mortality rate, despite one of the clusters demonstrating a discharge from
220 hospital around halfway through the 10-day period ([4] $p < 0.0001$).

221 Flow between clusters before and after the positive test were displayed in a Sankey diagram (*Figure 3*).
222 Transitions between these clusters may indicate changes in care based on the positive test. The ‘*Died*’
223 after test group here is not the same as presented in the cluster associations previously. Here we identify
224 whether they died within 10 days of their test and were therefore not included in any of the clusters.



225

226 *Figure 3: Sankey diagram demonstrating flow between states before and after a resident's first COVID-19 positive test.*

227 The majority of residents both start and end in the care home cluster. More die within 10 days than are
228 transferred to a stay in hospital. A similar proportion from inpatient care and care homes died within 10
229 days. This finding could also be an artefact of the usage of Pillar 1 testing data, providing a sample of
230 positive tests that are more likely to be symptomatic in care homes and more routine in hospitals.
231 Alternatively, it may suggest that more residents in the care home should receive hospital care, but also
232 could suggest that the level of care in hospital is not an improvement. We do not account for how ill a
233 resident is, so this could play a part in increasing inpatient mortality rates.

234 Discussion

235 For care home residents the common patterns of healthcare before and after a positive Pillar 1 COVID-
236 19 test generally consisted of residents who stayed in the care home for the whole sequence duration,
237 and those who had the entire duration in hospital. The clusters of healthcare before any first COVID-
238 19 test contain an additional group of residents receiving regular community care across the 10-days
239 before. Clusters after first COVID-19 tests included an additional group of residents who were
240 discharged halfway through the sequence.

241 Diabetes was always associated with clusters representing higher levels of care. Dementia is associated
242 with inpatient care after a testing event and appears to be highly correlated with a short-term discharge
243 from hospital. Residents who were discharged from inpatient care during the 10-days after their first
244 test appeared to have a similar 28-day mortality rate than those who stayed in hospital.

245 NHS secondary care use fell during the pandemic. However, the cluster assignments for all of the
246 sequences of care before and after COVID-19 tests and positive COVID-19 tests contain a substantial
247 specific inpatient cluster. There was still a group of residents in hospital, despite the decrease in
248 secondary care use for care home residents at the start of the pandemic²⁰.

249 Dementia is associated with the cluster assignments in the ‘*after*’ event cluster assignments. After the
250 tests there are more residents with dementia in the clusters characterised by the inpatient state, in both
251 the ‘positive tests’ and ‘all tests’ cases, indicating as significant proportion of residents with dementia
252 have transferred into hospital after their test. Residents with dementia are most often in the *inpatient to*
253 *home transfer* cluster after a first test, which implies that residents with dementia may be more likely
254 to have a shorter stay in hospital. Deciding whether to send residents with dementia for an inpatient stay
255 may be difficult; studies indicate that hospitalisations can be detrimental for individuals with dementia
256 as evidence suggests they are linked with advanced stage of dementia and deterioration of active daily
257 living, among other factors ^{21,22}. Evidence suggests that residents with dementia were challenging to
258 care for during the pandemic due to difficulties in adhering to social distancing in both the care home

259 and hospital setting, this may have led to increased hospitalisation as well as high levels of discharge
260 back into homes ²³.

261 We provide, to our knowledge, the first in-depth investigation into healthcare patterns of care home
262 residents during the COVID-19 pandemic. Other research provides information on care in the homes
263 during the pandemic, such as that done by Shallcross et al investigating care home-level risk factors
264 among other work²⁴. Our findings can be used in context with research on other aspects of residents’
265 care during the pandemic, to provide thorough policy guidelines for caring for this vulnerable group of
266 residents.

267 One of the strengths of this study is the unique dataset allowing visualisation and analysis of healthcare
268 for care home residents during the COVID-19 pandemic. Data from community care captures much
269 home-based care, but the absence of primary care data means that some information is absent. We have
270 derived some resident characteristics from secondary and community care history and our record of age
271 and gender is incomplete. Diabetes and dementia are drawn from diagnosis codes for hospital stays and
272 community procedures, hence we are likely to identify the residents who have more advanced disease
273 or who have accessed external care. This is particularly pertinent in the case of dementia, as hospital
274 admission is more likely to be for management of co-occurring conditions ²⁵.

275 A further limitation is that the COVID-19 testing data contains only Pillar 1 tests processed in the
276 Trust’s hospital labs. This may bias the sequences we define (relating to a resident’s first positive
277 COVID-19 test and first COVID-19 test in general), since a large portion of Pillar 1 testing was testing
278 on admission to hospital. Testing outside of hospitals was for those with a clinical need, and are
279 therefore more likely to be tests for symptomatic residents¹⁶. This is the case when looking at test result
280 rates for the different testing locations, with tests in care homes much more often positive than those in
281 hospital settings (see supplementary materials for breakdown). We find a large portion of the residents
282 in inpatient care before their first positive test, remain in inpatient care afterwards – suggesting COVID-
283 19 may not have been the reason for their admission, but tested positive on arrival. The location of
284 testing differs between wave 1 and wave 2 of the pandemic, we investigated breaking down the
285 clustering analysis into the two waves and found it did not significantly impact the results (both in

286 supplementary materials). The use of Pillar 1 COVID-19 testing allows a consistent level of testing
287 throughout the pandemic, since Pillar 1 testing was introduced first and was conducted over the whole
288 pandemic period. However, a more complete – routine set of COVID-19 tests would give a more
289 accurate description of how residents were treated in general and would allow us to identify residents’
290 first test and positive test more reliably.

291 Health services such as the National Health Service of the United Kingdom have large pools of untapped
292 data that can be used for large scale, impactful analyses²⁶. Research such as this work is needed to
293 demonstrate the work that can be done going forward using linked, routinely collected datasets.
294 Implications from this study are limited by the nature of Pillar 1 COVID-19 testing. However, this study
295 demonstrates the potential for large scale linkage of routinely collected healthcare data to investigate
296 longitudinal pathways of care for future studies going forward.

297 **Declaration:**

298 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

299 The project was approved by Lancaster University Faculty of Health and Medicine Research Ethics
300 committee, reference FHM-2022-3318-RECR-2. Data was collected from CDDFT and stored in a
301 Trusted Research Environment (TRE) managed by Durham University. Informed consent was not
302 possible as the data was anonymised. The Trust shared anonymised data after undertaking a Data
303 Privacy Impact Assessment and a Data Transfer Agreement. There are no specific methodological
304 guidelines for the exploratory work presented in this manuscript.

305 **Consent for publication**

306 Not applicable.

307 **Availability of data and materials**

308 Data was collected from CDDFT and stored in a Trusted Research Environment (TRE) managed by
309 Durham University. Informed consent was not possible as the data was anonymised. The Trust shared
310 anonymised data after undertaking a Data Privacy Impact Assessment and a Data Transfer Agreement.
311 Data supporting this study is not publicly available due to ethical considerations around accessing linked

312 patient level healthcare data. The authors can no longer access the data used in this analysis. Please
313 contact the main author for more information (a.garner2@lancaster.ac.uk).

314 **Competing interest**

315 The authors declare no competing interests.

316 **Funding**

317 Jointly funded by NIHR/UKRI [COV0466&MR/V028502/1.]

318 **Authors' contributions**

319 J.K. and S.M. acquired the funding.

320 A.G., J.K, S.M. conceptualised the project.

321 A.G. cleaned the data.

322 A.G. performed the analysis with supervision from J.K., N.P., S.M., C.C..

323 B.H., E.S. and J.L. provided input on analysis and results.

324 All authors reviewed the manuscript.

325 **Acknowledgements**

326 Rachel Stocker – PPIE facilitation,

327 PPIE Group – Helpful Input

328 Graham King, Catherine McShane, Del Jones, Ian Dove – Assistance of understanding the HealthCall
329 data

330 **References**

- 331 1. Hollinghurst J, Lyons J, Fry R, et al. The impact of COVID-19 on adjusted mortality risk in care
332 homes for older adults in Wales, UK: a retrospective population-based cohort study for mortality
333 in 2016–2020. *Age and Ageing*. 2021;50(1):25-31. doi:10.1093/ageing/afaa207
- 334 2. Deaths involving COVID-19 in the care sector, England and Wales - Office for National Statistics.
335 Accessed July 21, 2021.
336 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/articles/deathsinvolvingcovid19inthecaresectorenglandandwales/deathsregisteredbetweenweekending20march2020andweekending2april2021>
337
338

- 339 3. Walle-Hansen MM, Ranhoff AH, Mellingsæter M, Wang-Hansen MS, Myrstad M. Health-related
340 quality of life, functional decline, and long-term mortality in older patients following
341 hospitalisation due to COVID-19. *BMC Geriatrics*. 2021;21(1):199. doi:10.1186/s12877-021-
342 02140-x
- 343 4. The Health Foundation. Adult social care and COVID-19 after the first wave: assessing the policy
344 response in England - The Health Foundation. Accessed February 2, 2022.
345 [https://www.health.org.uk/publications/reports/adult-social-care-and-covid-19-after-the-first-](https://www.health.org.uk/publications/reports/adult-social-care-and-covid-19-after-the-first-wave)
346 [wave](https://www.health.org.uk/publications/reports/adult-social-care-and-covid-19-after-the-first-wave)
- 347 5. The Health Foundation. COVID-19 Policy Tracker. Accessed June 2, 2022.
348 <https://covid19.health.org.uk/home>
- 349 6. Spilsbury K, Devi R, Griffiths A, et al. SEeking AnsweRs for Care Homes during the COVID-19
350 pandemic (COVID SEARCH). *Age and Ageing*. 2021;50(2):335-340.
351 doi:10.1093/ageing/afaa201
- 352 7. Daly M. COVID-19 and care homes in England: What happened and why? *Social Policy &*
353 *Administration*. 2020;54(7):985-998. doi:10.1111/spol.12645
- 354 8. NHS England and NHS Improvement. NEXT STEPS ON NHS RESPONSE TO COVID-19.
355 Published online March 17, 2020.
- 356 9. Grimm F, Hodgson K, Brine R, Deeny SR. Hospital admissions from care homes in England
357 during the COVID-19 pandemic: a retrospective, cross-sectional analysis using linked
358 administrative data. *Int J Popul Data Sci*. 5(4):1663. doi:10.23889/ijpds.v5i4.1663
- 359 10. Chudasama YV, Gillies CL, Zaccardi F, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on routine care for chronic
360 diseases: A global survey of views from healthcare professionals. *Diabetes Metab Syndr*.
361 2020;14(5):965-967. doi:10.1016/j.dsx.2020.06.042
- 362 11. Gordon AL, Franklin M, Bradshaw L, Logan P, Elliott R, Gladman JRF. Health status of UK care
363 home residents: a cohort study. *Age and Ageing*. 2014;43(1):97-103. doi:10.1093/ageing/aft077
- 364 12. Diabetes UK. *Good Clinical Practice Guidelines for Care Home Residents with Diabetes.*; 2010.
365 Accessed June 14, 2022. [https://www.diabetes.org.uk/resources-s3/2017-09/Care-homes-](https://www.diabetes.org.uk/resources-s3/2017-09/Care-homes-0110_0.pdf)
366 [0110_0.pdf](https://www.diabetes.org.uk/resources-s3/2017-09/Care-homes-0110_0.pdf)
- 367 13. Alzheimer's Society. Home from home: A report highlighting opportunities for improving
368 standards of dementia care in care homes. Published online 2007.
369 [https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/sites/default/files/migrate/downloads/home_from_home_full_re](https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/sites/default/files/migrate/downloads/home_from_home_full_report.pdf)
370 [port.pdf](https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/sites/default/files/migrate/downloads/home_from_home_full_report.pdf)
- 371 14. Schultze A, Bates C, Cockburn J, et al. Identifying Care Home Residents in Electronic Health
372 Records - An OpenSAFELY Short Data Report. Published online April 27, 2021.
373 doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16737.1
- 374 15. Hanratty B, Burton JK, Goodman C, Gordon AL, Spilsbury K. Covid-19 and lack of linked
375 datasets for care homes. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m2463. doi:10.1136/bmj.m2463
- 376 16. Department of Health and Social Care. Coronavirus (COVID-19) - Scaling up our testing
377 programmes. Published online April 4, 2020.
378 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/fil](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/e/878121/coronavirus-covid-19-testing-strategy.pdf)
379 [e/878121/coronavirus-covid-19-testing-strategy.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/e/878121/coronavirus-covid-19-testing-strategy.pdf)

- 380 17. Abbott A, Forrest J. Optimal Matching Methods for Historical Sequences. *The Journal of*
381 *Interdisciplinary History*. 1986;16(3):471-494. doi:10.2307/204500
- 382 18. Gabadinho A, Ritschard G, Müller NS, Studer M. Analyzing and Visualizing State Sequences in
383 R with TraMineR. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2011;40(1):1-37. doi:10.18637/jss.v040.i04
- 384 19. McHugh ML. The Chi-square test of independence. *Biochemia Medica*. 2013;23(2):143-149.
385 doi:10.11613/BM.2013.018
- 386 20. Grimm F, Hodgson K, Brine R, Deeny SR. Hospital Admissions From Care Homes in England
387 During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Retrospective, Cross-Sectional Analysis Using Linked
388 Administrative Data. Published online February 25, 2021. doi:10.20944/preprints202102.0593.v1
- 389 21. Lehmann J, Michalowsky B, Kaczynski A, et al. The Impact of Hospitalization on Readmission,
390 Institutionalization, and Mortality of People with Dementia: A Systematic Review and Meta-
391 Analysis. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*. 2018;64(3):735-749. doi:10.3233/JAD-171128
- 392 22. Wolf D, Rhein C, Geschke K, Fellgiebel A. Preventable hospitalizations among older patients
393 with cognitive impairments and dementia. *International Psychogeriatrics*. 2019;31(3):383-391.
394 doi:10.1017/S1041610218000960
- 395 23. Scerri A, Borg Xuereb C, Scerri C. Nurses' Experiences of Caring for Long-Term Care Residents
396 With Dementia During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Gerontology and Geriatric Medicine*.
397 2022;8:23337214221077790. doi:10.1177/23337214221077793
- 398 24. Shallcross L, Burke D, Abbott O, et al. Factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection and
399 outbreaks in long-term care facilities in England: a national cross-sectional survey. *The Lancet*
400 *Healthy Longevity*. 2021;2(3):e129-e142. doi:10.1016/S2666-7568(20)30065-9
- 401 25. Sommerlad A, Perera G, Singh-Manoux A, Lewis G, Stewart R, Livingston G. Accuracy of
402 general hospital dementia diagnoses in England: Sensitivity, specificity, and predictors of
403 diagnostic accuracy 2008–2016. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*. 2018;14(7):933-943.
404 doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2018.02.012
- 405 26. Goldacre B, Morely J. Better, broader, safer: using health data for research and analysis.
406