

1 **Association between frailty assessed by the Clinical Frailty Scale 2.0 and outcomes of acute stroke in**
2 **older patients**

3

4 Paola Forti, MD, PhD, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences (DIMEC) University of Bologna,
5 Bologna; IRCCS Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Bologna

6 Marianna Ciani, MD, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences (DIMEC) University of Bologna,
7 Bologna

8 Fabiola Maioli, MD, Geriatric Unit, Department of Integrated Care, Ospedale Maggiore, Bologna

9

10 **Heading:** Frailty and outcomes of acute stroke

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

28 **Abstract**

29 **Background:** Frailty is a geriatric syndrome characterized by an increased vulnerability to stressors and
30 increased risk of adverse clinical outcomes. While older patients with acute stroke are routinely screened for
31 prestroke disability using the modified Rankin Scale (mRS), because of its known association with stroke
32 outcomes, prestroke frailty is still rarely assessed. The Clinical Frailty Scale (CFS) is a popular tool for
33 retrospective frailty assessment in the acute setting. The study hypothesis was that prestroke frailty measured
34 with CFS was associated with stroke outcome of older patients independent of prestroke disability assessed
35 with mRS.

36 **Methods:** We recruited 4086 individuals aged ≥ 65 years consecutively admitted with acute stroke to an
37 Italian hospital. Prestroke disability (mRS ≥ 3) was assessed at admission. Prestroke CFS was retrospectively
38 assessed using information from the medical records. Logistic models determined the association of CFS
39 with poor functional outcome, prolonged discharge, unfavorable discharge setting, and poor rehabilitation
40 potential. Cox models determined the association of CFS with 30-day and 1-month mortality. All models
41 were adjusted for prestroke disability and other major confounders.

42 **Results:** Participants were median age 81 years (25th-75th percentile, 75-87 years), 55.0% female, 82.6%
43 with ischemic stroke, and 26.3% with prestroke disability. Overall prevalence of prestroke frailty (CFS ≥ 4)
44 was 41.6%. Multivariable-adjusted logistic models showed that CFS was associated with increasing risk of
45 all outcomes except prolonged discharge. In severe frailty (CFS 7-8), OR (95%CI) was 3.44 (2.33-5.07) for
46 poor functional outcome, 0.53 (0.38-0.75) for prolonged discharge, 1.89 (0.36-263) for unfavourable
47 discharge, and 6.24 (3.80-10.26) for poor rehabilitation potential (reference CFS 1-3). In multivariable
48 adjusted- Cox models, CFS was unrelated to 30-day mortality but HR (95%CI) of 1-year mortality was
49 significant for both CFS 4-6 (1.70, 1.36-2.11) and CFS 7-8 (1.69, 1.25-2.30).

50 **Conclusions:** Prestroke frailty measured with CFS was associated with higher risk of several adverse
51 outcomes even after adjustment for prestroke disability and other major confounders.

52

53 **Key Words:** frailty, stroke, disability, aged

54

55

56 **Introduction**

57 Frailty is a geriatric syndrome characterized by an increased vulnerability to stressors that is caused by a
58 cumulative decline across multiple physiological systems.¹ Frailty can explain the heterogeneity in overall
59 health of older persons, it is associated with several adverse clinical outcomes, and its assessment can
60 provide useful prognostic information to guide clinical decision-making and therapeutic interventions in
61 older patients.² Although frail older persons are often disabled and with multiple chronic conditions, frailty is
62 considered a distinct entity from both disability and comorbidity.¹

63 Stroke is a prototypical stressor event but frailty is rarely mentioned in best practice guidelines on stroke and
64 not yet routinely measured in stroke patients.^{3,4} In current clinical practice and research, prestroke disability
65 retrospectively assessed with the modified Rankin Scale (mRS)⁵ is acknowledged as a robust prognostic
66 predictor of stroke outcomes^{6,7} and, therefore, a commonly used criterion to assist in determining eligibility
67 for hyperacute reperfusion therapies.^{8,9} The mRS is easy to use in a time-pressured setting but was actually
68 designed for assessment of post-stroke functional outcome, with an emphasis on mobility over cognitive
69 disability and comorbidity.^{6,9} Therefore, it may not be a valid measure of pre-stroke global function and
70 overall health, in older persons.¹⁰ A variety of frailty tools have been developed that widely differ on types of
71 measurements and clinical feasibility.¹¹ There is still no standard assessment tool for frailty.¹² In clinical
72 practice, the choice of a frailty tool depends on the purpose, setting, time availability, and assessor skills.¹³

73 The Clinical Frailty Scale (CFS)¹⁴ is one of the most popular tools for retrospective frailty assessment in the
74 acute^{15,16} and hyperacute care setting.¹⁷ Advantages of CFS include: the tool is based on clinical judgement
75 and does not require performance tests; it focuses on mobility, function, cognition, and comorbidity; it
76 involves a nine-point pictorial scale paired with corresponding text describing classifications of frailty; and it
77 can be readily used by a health care professional without specialist training.¹⁴ CFS seems a pragmatic and
78 easy choice to assess prestroke frailty in older individuals with acute stroke⁴ but available information about
79 this topic is limited.¹⁸⁻²²

80 The primary hypothesis of this study is that prestroke frailty assessed with CFS is associated with stroke
81 outcomes of older patients independent of prestroke disability assessed with mRS. A secondary hypothesis
82 tested in this study is that prestroke CFS and mRS have low agreement and different predictive ability for
83 stroke outcomes.

85 **Methods**

86 *Study cohort*

87 This is a retrospective observational study based on a single-center cohort of 4094 patients aged ≥ 65 years
88 who, between January 2006 and December 2018, were consecutively admitted to the Emergency Department
89 (ED) of the Maggiore Hospital (Bologna, Italy) within 24 hours after onset of acute stroke and subsequently
90 transferred to the local Stroke Unit (SU). All patients had at least one CT-head scan at ED admission. Only
91 patients with a final diagnosis of ischemic stroke (IS) and primary intracerebral hemorrhage (ICH) were
92 considered eligible. Patients with transient ischemic attack, subarachnoid hemorrhage, and secondary ICH due
93 to underlying vascular malformations and intracranial tumors were excluded. Stroke severity at admission was
94 assessed using the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) score,²³ categorized as <6 , 6-15, and
95 >15 .²⁴ Patients were treated according to standard guidelines for management of acute stroke.²⁵ In IS patients,
96 the decision to perform reperfusion therapies (intravenous thrombolysis using the fibrinolytic agent alteplase
97 or endovascular thrombectomy) was based on clinical judgment.

98

99 *Prestroke frailty and disability*

100 At the time of ED admission, the stroke consultant on duty retrospectively assessed mRS in the two preceding
101 weeks (pre-mRS) based on an unstructured direct interview with the patient and, whenever possible, a
102 knowledgeable proxy (relatives and usual caretakers). Prestroke disability was defined as pre-mRS ≥ 3 .²⁶
103 Concurrent frailty level according to CFS version 2.0²⁷ (**Figure 1**) was retrospectively assessed by two authors
104 (P.F. and M.C.) based on any available information on premorbid mobility, function, cognition, and medical
105 history as documented in the patient chart. Prestroke frailty was defined as CFS ≥ 4 and further graded as mild-
106 to-moderate (CFS 4 to 6) and severe-to-terminal (CFS 7 to 8).²⁷ Patients with CFS 9 were excluded from
107 further analyses because this level identifies persons whose life expectancy is shorter than six months but are
108 not otherwise living with frailty, which disrupts the progression of frailty from CFS 1 to 8.²⁸ Similarly to what
109 would happen in real clinical practice, CFS raters were not blind to pre-mRS. Retrospective CFS scoring using
110 information not primarily intended for this goal has been validated with good reliability and accuracy.^{29,30}

111

112 *Other prestroke variables*

113 Baseline demographic and clinical data were extracted from the patient charts. Comorbidity was defined using
114 the Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI)³¹, which takes into account the number and severity of 19 pre-defined
115 comorbid conditions. CCI score was categorized as 0, 1, 2-3, and ≥ 4 .³²

116

117 *Outcomes*

118 SU attending physicians re-assessed mRS at discharge (discharge-mRS). Poor functional outcome was
119 defined as discharge-mRS >1 for patients with pre-stroke mRS <2 and as discharge-mRS greater than pre-
120 mRS for patients with pre-mRS 2-4; patients with pre-mRS 5 were excluded because they would have a
121 favourable outcome just surviving.¹⁰ Prolonged discharge was defined as length of SU stay >7 days.³³

122 Discharge destination was defined “favorable” (home or rehabilitation facility) or “unfavourable” (long-term
123 care facility, another acute hospital setting, or in-hospital death).³⁴ In a subgroup analysis, poor rehabilitation
124 potential, defined as discharge to long-term care, was contrasted to discharge to rehabilitation facilities.

125 All-cause mortality at 30-day and 1-year after stroke onset was ascertained from the Italian Regional
126 Mortality Registry. In IS patients treated with reperfusion therapies, percentage improvement in NIHSS after
127 treatment was calculated as (admission NIHSS score minus discharge NIHSS score) $\times 100$ /admission NIHSS
128 score.

129

130 *Statistical analysis*

131 Data are reported as count (percentages) for categorical variables or median (25th-75th percentile) for
132 continuous variables. Univariate comparisons between groups were performed using chi-square test or
133 Kruskal-Wallis test as appropriate. Agreement between CFS and pre-mRS was assessed using weighted
134 kappa³⁵. Predictive ability of both scales for the study outcomes was estimated using the Area under the
135 Receiver Operating Characteristic curves (AuROC). Confidence intervals were calculated according to
136 binomial exact formula. DeLong’s method was used for AuROC comparison.³⁶

137 The association of CFS categories with all study outcomes excepting mortality was assessed using Odds Ratios
138 (OR) and their 95% confidence intervals (95%CI) from logistic models. The association of CFS categories
139 with mortality was assessed using Hazard Ratios (HR) and their corresponding 95%CI from Cox proportional

140 hazard models. A priori chosen confounders for adjusted models included: age, sex, CCI score, stroke subtype,
141 admission NIHSS, and prestroke disability. Effect modification of CFS by model confounders was
142 systematically assessed and interactions were considered significant for p-value < 0.010. In subanalyses of
143 treated IS patients, confounders for adjusted models included age, sex, CCI score and prestroke disability. The
144 association of CFS categories with NIHSS improvement was assessed using linear regression. For the other
145 study outcomes, treated IS patients were classified as frail vs non-frail because of insufficient sample size.
146 Analyses were performed with R software version 3.5.3. Significance for P value was set at the 0.050 (two-
147 tailed).

148

149 *Standard Protocol Approvals, Registrations, and Patient Consents*

150 At SU admission, written informed consent for research use of their medical records was sought from patients
151 or their legally authorized representatives according to the Declaration of Helsinki. The Maggiore Hospital
152 Ethics Committee approved the study (approval number CE16092).

153

154 *Data Availability*

155 Data for this study will be made available by request from any qualified investigator.

156

157 **Results**

158 *Clinical and demographic factors*

159 After exclusion of eight persons with CFS 9, the final cohort included 4086 patients; 2249 were women
160 (55.0%) and median age was 81 years (25th-75th percentile, 75-87 years). Overall prevalence of prestroke
161 frailty was 41.6% (29.4% for CFS 4-6 and 12.2% for CFS 7-8). Only twelve patients were classified as CFS
162 1 (“very fit”). **Supplemental Figure F1** shows how frailty prevalence increased from 14.7% at age 65-69 to
163 78.7% at age ≥ 90 years.

164 **Table 1** shows how increasing CFS was associated with age, female sex, living in nursing home before
165 admission, prestroke disability, and comorbidity. IS was the most frequent stroke subtype in all CFS categories
166 and stroke severity increased with increasing frailty. Occurrence of all study outcomes increased across
167 increasing CFS categories excepting prolonged discharge, which was lowest for CFS 7-8. **Supplemental Table**

168 *TI* provides information about the number of patients for each outcome by CFS category. **Supplemental**
169 **Figure F2** provides information about the distribution of pre- and discharge-mRS across CFS categories.

170

171 *Agreement between CFS and pre-mRS*

172 Overall prevalence of prestroke disability was 26.3%. Prestroke frailty was identified in 21.3% of those
173 without prestroke disability. Prestroke disability was recorded only in 0.7% of non-frail patients. **Figure 2**
174 shows how pre-mRS levels 0 to 2 and CFS levels 1 to 3 tended overlap while there was a noticeable
175 dispersion of pre-mRS levels across CSF levels above 3, even with some patients classified as totally
176 independent according to pre-mRS but moderately to severely frail according to CFS. Weighted kappa for
177 CFS and pre-mRS was 0.56, suggestive of only moderate agreement.³⁵

178

179 *Predictive ability of CFS and pre-mRS for the study outcomes*

180 Comparison of AuROCs (**Table 2**) showed that CFS was statistically superior to pre-mRS for prediction of
181 poor functional outcome, unfavorable discharge, and poor rehabilitation potential while no difference was
182 found for the other study outcomes. However, AuROCs for both scales were below the traditional 0.80
183 threshold for clinical usefulness.³⁷

184

185 *Multivariable-adjusted association of CFS with the study outcomes*

186 **Figure 3** summarizes the results from adjusted logistic (Panel A) and Cox models for the association of CFS
187 with the study outcomes. Likelihood of poor functional outcome, unfavorable discharge, and poor
188 rehabilitation potential increased with increasing frailty level while likelihood of prolonged discharge was
189 almost halved for CFS 7-8 compared to CFS 1-3. Results for unfavorable discharge did not change when
190 excluding 222 patients already living in institution before hospital admission (CFS 4-6: adjusted-OR, 1.46,
191 95%CI 1.17-1.82; CFS 7-8: adjusted-OR 2.66, 95%CI 1.85-3.81). There was no significant association of
192 CFS with 30-day mortality but 1-year mortality risk was significantly increased for both CFS 4-6 and 7-8
193 compared to CFS 1-3. In all models, both the independent effect of prestroke disability on outcome
194 prediction and its interaction with CFS categories were not significant (p-value > 0.200 for all).

195 *IS patients treated with reperfusion therapies*

196 There were 3374 patients with IS (82.6%). Cardioembolism was the most frequent etiology (35.2%),
197 followed by cryptogenic (33.4%), small vessel occlusion (19.9%), large artery atherosclerosis (9.9%),
198 multiple causes (1.0%) and other causes (0.6%). Reperfusion therapies were performed in 498 patients
199 (14.8%): 83.5% received intravenous thrombolysis, 4.2% mechanical thrombectomy, and 12.2% both. Only
200 25.9% of treated patients were frail compared to 44.5% of non-treated patients but adjusted-OR was not
201 significant (1.00, 95%CI 0.74-1.34). Among treated patients, overall prevalence of prestroke disability was
202 only 12% but the proportion was much higher in frail (45.7%) compared to non-frail patients (just one case,
203 0.3%). **Figure 4** shows the results from adjusted logistic (Panel A) and Cox models (Panel B) for the
204 association of frailty with the study outcomes in treated IS patients. Significant associations were found for
205 poor functional outcome (74% of 127 frail vs 43.6% of 369 non-frail patients) and poor rehabilitation
206 potential (40.9% of 66 frail vs 8.6% of 139 non-frail patients) but not for prolonged (42.3% of 97 frail vs
207 34.9 of 278 non-frail patients) and unfavorable discharge (45.4% of 129 frail vs 27.9% of 369 non-frail
208 patients). Because of the small number of cases (n=77) , only the association of frailty with overall mortality
209 during a 1-year follow-up could be estimated. Mortality rate was higher in frail compared to non-frail
210 patients (36.1% vs 8.4%) and the corresponding adjusted-HR was 2.36, 95%CI 1.24-4.50.
211 Among treated patients, stroke severity was higher in frail than non-frail persons (31.0% vs 19% with
212 admission NIHSS >15, p-value = 0.012). However, median percentage improvement in NIHSS after
213 reperfusion therapy had a U-shaped relationship with CFS score (*Supplemental Figure F3*). The adjusted
214 linear model confirmed that median NIHSS improvement for CFS 1-3 (71%, 35%-100%) was higher
215 compared to CFS 4-6 (59%, 12%-79%, p-value = 0.003) but did not differ compared to CFS 7-8 (78%, 49-
216 84%, p-value = 0.708).
217 In all of the above reported models, both the independent effect of prestroke disability on outcome prediction
218 and its interaction with frailty were not significant (p-value > 0.200 for all).

219

220 Discussion

221 This cohort study of older patients with acute stroke showed that prestroke frailty retrospectively assessed
222 using CFS version 2.0 was highly prevalent and may convey additional prognostic information for several
223 stroke outcomes with respect to prestroke disability assessed using mRS.

224 Previous studies of frailty occurrence in older stroke patients produced inconsistent results, mainly because
225 of the great heterogeneity in the operational definition of frailty (estimates ranging from 2% to 68%).^{3,38}
226 Most of these studies are not comparable with ours because they used variations of the physical frailty
227 phenotype, which is based on motor and activity measures, or frailty cumulative indexes, which variably
228 incorporate measures of function, cognition, comorbidities, and social factors.² Two studies of IS patients
229 using CFS reported frailty prevalence estimates ranging between 38%²⁰ and 54%,¹⁸ which agree with our
230 findings. However, comparability is limited because these studies used an older version of CFS, in which
231 level 5 is the first including the term frail in its description¹⁴ and, accordingly, frailty was defined as CFS ≥ 5 .
232 The association of CFS with age, female gender, and comorbidity found in our cohort is not surprising
233 because it reflects known general features of frailty.² In this older cohort, we also found no difference in
234 frailty prevalence by stroke type. A metaanalysis of 24 studies reported that frailty was more prevalent in IS
235 than ICH,³⁸ but this result may derive from the inclusion of studies involving patients aged less than 65 years,
236 with data for ICH mostly coming from younger cohorts.

237 Our investigation provided evidence of unfavourable associations between increasing CFS and all of the
238 study outcomes excepting prolonged discharge. The associations of CFS with outcomes related to discharge
239 setting, functional status at SU discharge, and mortality can have several explanations: acute stroke and
240 frailty can exacerbate each other and trigger a self-propagating cycle; frailty can also influence several
241 physical and non-physical aspects of stroke recovery, including acute complications (in particular delirium
242 and infections), malnutrition, post-stroke cognitive impairment, and effectiveness of rehabilitation and
243 psychosocial interventions.^{4,39} Our frailest patients also had a shorter SU stay, but our study design does not
244 allow to understand whether this happened because frailest patients were correctly spared futile diagnostic
245 and therapeutic procedures or actually received suboptimal care.

246 Existing evidence that frailty can provide prognostic information additional to major stroke predictors such
247 as age, stroke severity, and pre-mRS is still weak. A metaanalysis of 14 stroke studies³ reported associations
248 of frailty with longer hospital stay, poor functional outcome, discharge destination, and long-term mortality.
249 However, the authors stressed the low number of eligible studies for the individual outcomes and the
250 heterogeneity of the tools employed for frailty identification (only one study used CFS¹⁸).

251 Available information about the agreement of prestroke frailty measures with pre-mRS is also scant and their
252 correlation appears to be, at the best, only moderate, with no clear dose-response patterns.^{3,4}

253 There are only four previous studies of CFS in older stroke patients admitted to SU, all of them using the
254 older version of CFS scale.¹⁴ In a study of 433 IS patients aged ≥ 75 years,¹⁸ CFS had no significant
255 correlation with pre-mRS; it was associated with 28-day mortality in the main cohort but unrelated to NIHSS
256 improvement after 24 hours in 63 patients undergoing reperfusion therapy. Another study²⁰ investigated 472
257 IS patients aged ≥ 65 years admitted to a stroke center able to provide only intravenous thrombolysis (patients
258 with CFS 9 were excluded). CFS was weakly correlated with pre-mRS and predicted 28-day and 1-yr
259 mortality but did not predict either discharge setting in the main cohort and NIHSS improvement in 178
260 patients undergoing thrombolysis. AuROC comparisons of CFS and pre-mRS showed that CFS offered a
261 slight predictive advantage for mortality but not for discharge setting. Similarly to our results, all AuROC
262 estimates were below the 0.80 threshold. Noticeably, both the above mentioned studies tested that the
263 association of CFS with stroke outcomes was independent of age, stroke severity and comorbidities but did
264 not include pre-mRS as a confounder.

265 Two other studies using CFS focused on select subsets of IS older patients without prestroke disability who
266 underwent mechanical thrombectomy. In 159 patients aged ≥ 80 years, frailty was associated with poor
267 functional outcome at 3 months (mRS >3) and 1-year mortality.²² In 198 patients aged ≥ 70 years, there was
268 low agreement between CFS and pre-mRS and frailty (here defined as CFS ≥ 4) was associated with mRS at
269 90-day but not with length of hospital stay.²¹

270 In our stroke cohort, AuROC curves showed that CFS had a slightly better prognostic ability than pre-mRS
271 for some study outcomes but neither scale attained clinical meaningfulness for any. However, agreement
272 between the scales was low and multivariable analyses confirmed that CFS provided prognostic information
273 independent of prestroke disability measured with mRS. Additionally, the study showed that prestroke
274 frailty, independent of prestroke disability, was associated with several adverse outcomes of IS patients
275 treated with reperfusion therapies. This agrees with results from a metaanalysis of nine studies⁴⁰ (including all
276 the above mentioned four studies using CFS) that reported an association of frailty with poor functional
277 outcome and 1-year, but not 1-month, mortality in IS treated patients.

278 The U-shaped association we found between CFS and NIHSS improvement after reperfusion therapies is
279 particularly interesting. While it can be reasonable to expect that persons with mild-to-moderate frailty are
280 more susceptible to acute ischemic damage, the potential for neurologic improvement in patients with severe
281 frailty may appear counterintuitive. However, several, not mutually exclusive explanations can be proposed.
282 First, in patients with severe frailty, pre-existent motor and cognitive impairment may interfere with a
283 reliable estimation of neurological impairment on hospital admission,³⁹ especially when using NIHSS that is
284 not intended to distinguish prestroke and acute deficits.²³ Second, patients with severe frailty might present
285 with greater neurological severity at IS onset independent of their actual structural ischemic damage because
286 of a lower brain reserve, concurrent confusional states, and comorbidities adding their confounding
287 effects.⁴¹⁻⁴³

288 There is a strong evidence that patients with pre-stroke disability have a higher risk of unfavourable stroke
289 outcomes and may derive less benefit from hyperacute reperfusion therapies.^{6,7} However, mRS was not
290 designed to measure prestroke disability; the wording of its grades is not suited to pre-stroke assessment; and
291 the tool may misestimate a patient's ability to recover because it overvalues physical disability with respect
292 to cognition and general health.^{6,9} At present, both European⁸ and US⁹ stroke guidelines on reperfusion
293 therapies acknowledge that exclusion of patients on the sole ground of prestroke disability may not be
294 justified.

295 The main strength of this study is the use of CFS version 2.0 for frailty identification in a large elderly cohort
296 taken from a "real world" pool of consecutive, unselected stroke admissions.

297 This study has also several limitations. First, the retrospective design does not allow for establishing causal
298 links. Second, a single-center cohort limits generalizability of results. Third, pre-mRS scoring occurred at the
299 time of ED setting, while evaluating whether the patient was eligible for reperfusion therapy, and it was
300 performed by multiple observers. By contrast, CFS was scored post hoc, by two raters with similar
301 background who were spared the time pressure often occurring during hyperacute management of stroke.
302 Moreover, CFS scoring was based on information from the whole medical chart and some data may have not
303 been available when pre-mRS was scored. A fourth limitation is that, since analyses were based on
304 observational data, we had to adjust for baseline differences and many important confounders may have been
305 left out. The relatively small size of the IS treated subset is another drawback that limits generalization of the

306 study findings. Moreover, as reperfusion treatment decisions for patients with prestroke disability were not
307 standardized, no conclusion can be drawn about the efficacy and safety of these procedures in our cohort.
308 However, as the use of reperfusion therapy in elderly persons with prestroke disability is still generally
309 low,^{8,9} we believe that our data may be of interest and promote further investigations. A final limitation is the
310 lack of information on death causes and post-discharge functional outcome. Moreover, we used discharge
311 destination as a surrogate measure of post-stroke function and rehabilitation potential. Although we
312 ascertained that results for these outcomes did not change after exclusion of patients with pre-existing
313 disability already living in nursing homes prior to admission, the potential for misclassification must be
314 acknowledged.

315 In conclusion, our data suggest that CFS and pre-mRS are not a substitute for each other and CFS may help
316 to inform decisions in elderly patients admitted with acute stroke. CFS has several advantages over other
317 frailty tools: it encompasses a broad assessment of frailty based on clinical judgement, is quick, and does not
318 rely on direct measurement of specific items, specialized equipment, or extra staff.⁴ Further work exploring
319 the relevant prognostic properties of CFS in acute stroke patients is necessary, particularly with respect to
320 treatment decisions.

321

322 **Study Funding**

323 Basic Research Grant Ricerca Fondamentale Orientata from University of Bologna Grant #2021

324

325 **Disclosures**

326 None

327

328 **Supplemental Material**

329 Tables T1

330 Figures F1-F3

331

332

333

334 **References**

- 335 1. Fried LP, Ferrucci L, Darer J, Williamson JD, Anderson G. Untangling the concepts of disability,
336 frailty, and comorbidity: implications for improved targeting and care. *J. Gerontol. A Biol. Sci. Med.*
337 *Sci.* 2004;59:255–263.
- 338 2. Hoogendijk EO, Afilalo J, Ensrud KE, Kowal P, Onder G, Fried LP. Frailty: implications for clinical
339 practice and public health. *Lancet.* 2019;394:1365–1375.
- 340 3. Burton JK, Stewart J, Blair M, Oxley S, Wass A, Taylor-Rowan M, Quinn TJ. Prevalence and
341 implications of frailty in acute stroke: systematic review & meta-analysis. *Age Ageing.*
342 2022;51:afac064.
- 343 4. Evans NR, Todd OM, Minhas JS, Fearon P, Harston GW, Mant J, Mead G, Hewitt J, Quinn TJ,
344 Warburton EA. Frailty and cerebrovascular disease: Concepts and clinical implications for stroke
345 medicine. *Int J Stroke.* 2022;17:251–259.
- 346 5. van Swieten JC, Koudstaal PJ, Visser MC, Schouten HJ, van Gijn J. Interobserver agreement for the
347 assessment of handicap in stroke patients. *Stroke.* 1988;19:604–607.
- 348 6. Harrison JK, McArthur KS, Quinn TJ. Assessment scales in stroke: clinimetric and clinical
349 considerations. *Clin Interv Aging.* 2013;8:201–211.
- 350 7. Quinn TJ, Singh S, Lees KR, Bath PM, Myint PK, VISTA Collaborators. Validating and comparing
351 stroke prognosis scales. *Neurology.* 2017;89:997–1002.
- 352 8. Berge E, Whiteley W, Audebert H, De Marchis GM, Fonseca AC, Padiglioni C, de la Ossa NP, Strbian
353 D, Tsivgoulis G, Turc G. European Stroke Organisation (ESO) guidelines on intravenous thrombolysis
354 for acute ischaemic stroke. *Eur Stroke J.* 2021;6:1–62.
- 355 9. Ganesh A, Fraser JF, Gordon Perue GL, Amin-Hanjani S, Leslie-Mazwi TM, Greenberg SM, Couillard
356 P, Asdaghi N, Goyal M, American Heart Association Stroke Council. Endovascular treatment and
357 thrombolysis for acute ischemic stroke in patients with premorbid disability or dementia: a scientific
358 statement from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke.* 2022;53:e204–
359 e217.

- 360 10. Gumbinger C, Ringleb P, Ippen F, Ungerer M, Reuter B, Bruder I, Daffertshofer M, Stock C, Stroke
361 Working Group of Baden-Württemberg. Outcomes of patients with stroke treated with thrombolysis
362 according to prestroke Rankin Scale scores. *Neurology*. 2019;93:e1834–e1843.
- 363 11. Ambagtsheer RC, Archibald MM, Lawless M, Kitson A, Beilby J. Feasibility and acceptability of
364 commonly used screening instruments to identify frailty among community-dwelling older people: a
365 mixed methods study. *BMC Geriatrics*. 2020;20:152.
- 366 12. Dent E, Martin FC, Bergman H, Woo J, Romero-Ortuno R, Walston JD. Management of frailty:
367 opportunities, challenges, and future directions. *Lancet*. 2019;394:1376–1386.
- 368 13. Buta BJ, Walston JD, Godino JG, Park M, Kalyani RR, Xue Q-L, Bandeen-Roche K, Varadhan R.
369 Frailty assessment instruments: Systematic characterization of the uses and contexts of highly-cited
370 instruments. *Ageing Res Rev*. 2016;26:53–61.
- 371 14. Rockwood K, Song X, MacKnight C, Bergman H, Hogan DB, McDowell I, Mitnitski A. A global
372 clinical measure of fitness and frailty in elderly people. *CMAJ*. 2005;173:489–495.
- 373 15. Daly RM, Iuliano S, Fyfe JJ, Scott D, Kirk B, Thompson MQ, Dent E, Fetterplace K, Wright ORL,
374 Lynch GS, et al. Screening, diagnosis and management of sarcopenia and frailty in hospitalized older
375 adults: recommendations from the Australian and New Zealand Society for Sarcopenia and Frailty
376 Research (ANZSSFR) Expert Working Group. *J Nutr Health Aging*. 2022;26:637–651.
- 377 16. Dent E, Morley JE, Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Woodhouse L, Rodríguez-Mañas L, Fried LP, Woo J,
378 Aprahamian I, Sanford A, Lundy J, et al. Physical Frailty: ICFSR International Clinical Practice
379 Guidelines for Identification and Management. *J Nutr Health Aging*. 2019;23:771–787.
- 380 17. Fehlmann CA, Nickel CH, Cino E, Al-Najjar Z, Langlois N, Eagles D. Frailty assessment in
381 emergency medicine using the Clinical Frailty Scale: a scoping review. *Intern Emerg Med*.
382 2022;17:2407–2418.
- 383 18. Evans NR, Wall J, To B, Wallis SJ, Romero-Ortuno R, Warburton EA. Clinical frailty independently
384 predicts early mortality after ischaemic stroke. *Age Ageing*. 2020;49:588–591.
- 385 19. Ng CC, Lim WC, Tan KM, Wong KY, Kanagarajah RR, Singh HSAK, Tan WG. Is pre-stroke frailty
386 as determined by the Clinical Frailty Scale version 2.0 associated with stroke outcomes? *Singapore*
387 *Med J*. 2023;

- 388 20. Patel K, Shrier WEJ, Sengupta N, Hunt DCE, Hodgson LE. Frailty, assessed by the Rockwood Clinical
389 Frailty Scale and 1-year outcomes following ischaemic stroke in a non-specialist UK stroke centre. *J*
390 *Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis.* 2022;31:106451.
- 391 21. Tan BYQ, Ho JSY, Leow AS, Chia MLJ, Sia CH, Koh YY, Seetharaman SK, Yang C, Gopinathan A,
392 Teoh HL, et al. Effect of frailty on outcomes of endovascular treatment for acute ischaemic stroke in
393 older patients. *Age Ageing.* 2022;51:afac096.
- 394 22. Tiainen M, Martinez-Majander N, Virtanen P, Rätty S, Strbian D. Clinical frailty and outcome after
395 mechanical thrombectomy for stroke in patients aged ≥ 80 years. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis.*
396 2022;31:106816.
- 397 23. Lyden P. Using the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale: a cautionary tale. *Stroke.* 2017;48:513–
398 519.
- 399 24. Lindley RI, Wardlaw JM, Whiteley WN, Cohen G, Blackwell L, Murray GD, Sandercock PAG, Trial
400 Steering Committee, Baigent C, Chadwick D, et al. Alteplase for Acute Ischemic Stroke: Outcomes by
401 Clinically Important Subgroups in the Third International Stroke Trial. *Stroke.* 2015;46:746–756.
- 402 25. Fuentes B, Ntaios G, Putaala J, Thomas B, Turc G, Díez-Tejedor E. European Stroke Organisation
403 (ESO) guidelines on glycaemia management in acute stroke. *European Stroke Journal.* 2018;3:5–21.
- 404 26. Saver JL, Chaisinanunkul N, Campbell BCV, Grotta JC, Hill MD, Khatri P, Landen J, Lansberg MG,
405 Venkatasubramanian C, Albers GW, et al. Standardized Nomenclature for Modified Rankin Scale
406 Global Disability Outcomes: Consensus Recommendations From Stroke Therapy Academic Industry
407 Roundtable XI. *Stroke.* 2021;52:3054–3062.
- 408 27. Rockwood K, Theou O. Using the Clinical Frailty Scale in Allocating Scarce Health Care Resources.
409 *Can Geriatr J.* 2020;23:210–215.
- 410 28. Kabell Nissen S, Rueegg M, Carpenter CR, Kaeppli T, Busch J-M, Fournaise A, Dreher-Hummel T,
411 Bingisser R, Brabrand M, Nickel CH. Prognosis for older people at presentation to emergency
412 department based on frailty and aggregated vital signs. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2023;71:1250–1258.
- 413 29. Davies J, Whitlock J, Gutmanis I, Kane S-L. Inter-Rater Reliability of the Retrospectively Assigned
414 Clinical Frailty Scale Score in a Geriatric Outreach Population. *Can Geriatr J.* 2018;21:1–5.

- 415 30. Stille K, Temmel N, Hepp J, Herget-Rosenthal S. Validation of the Clinical Frailty Scale for
416 retrospective use in acute care. *Eur Geriatr Med.* 2020;11:1009–1015.
- 417 31. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic
418 comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J Chronic Dis.* 1987;40:373–383.
- 419 32. Corraini P, Szépligeti SK, Henderson VW, Ording AG, Horváth-Puhó E, Sørensen HT. Comorbidity
420 and the increased mortality after hospitalization for stroke: a population-based cohort study. *JTH.*
421 2018;16:242–252.
- 422 33. Fisher RJ, Byrne A, Chouliara N, Lewis S, Paley L, Hoffman A, Rudd A, Robinson T, Langhorne P,
423 Walker M. Effect of stroke early supported discharge on length of hospital stay: analysis from a
424 national stroke registry. *BMJ Open.* 2021;11:e043480.
- 425 34. Busl KM, Nogueira RG, Yoo AJ, Hirsch JA, Schwamm LH, Rost NS. Prestroke dementia is associated
426 with poor outcomes after reperfusion therapy among elderly stroke patients. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis.*
427 2013;22:718–724.
- 428 35. Watson PF, Petrie A. Method agreement analysis: A review of correct methodology. *Theriogenology.*
429 2010;73:1167–1179.
- 430 36. DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the areas under two or more correlated
431 receiver operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric approach. *Biometrics.* 1988;44:837–845.
- 432 37. Hond AAH de, Steyerberg EW, Calster B van. Interpreting area under the receiver operating
433 characteristic curve. *Lancet Digit Health.* 2022;4:e853–e855.
- 434 38. Huang YN, Yan FH, Wang XY, Chen XL, Chong HY, Su WL, Chen YR, Han L, Ma YX. Prevalence
435 and Risk Factors of Frailty in Stroke Patients: A Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review. *J Nutr Health*
436 *Aging.* 2023;27:96–102.
- 437 39. Smithard DG. Stroke in Frail Older People. *Geriatrics (Basel).* 2017;2:24.
- 438 40. Bao Q, Huang X, Wu X, Chen S, Yang J, Zhang J, Li J, Yang M. Implications of frailty in acute
439 ischemic stroke receiving endovascular treatment: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Aging Clin*
440 *Exp Res.* 2023;

- 441 41. Pinguet V, Duloquin G, Thibault T, Devilliers H, Comby P-O, Crespy V, Ricolfi F, Vergely C, Giroud
442 M, Béjot Y. Pre-existing brain damage and association between severity and prior cognitive
443 impairment in ischemic stroke patients. *J Neuroradiol.* 2022;S0150-9861(22)00097-9.
- 444 42. Chen R-L, Balami JS, Esiri MM, Chen L-K, Buchan AM. Ischemic stroke in the elderly: an overview
445 of evidence. *Nat Rev Neurol.* 2010;6:256-265.
- 446 43. Oldenbeuving AW, de Kort PLM, Jansen BPW, Roks G, Kappelle LJ. Delirium in Acute Stroke: A
447 Review. *Int J Stroke.* 2007;2:270-275.
- 448 44. Powers WJ, Rabinstein AA, Ackerson T, Adeoye OM, Bambakidis NC, Becker K, Biller J, Brown M,
449 Demaerschalk BM, Hoh B, et al. Guidelines for the Early Management of Patients With Acute
450 Ischemic Stroke: 2019 Update to the 2018 Guidelines for the Early Management of Acute Ischemic
451 Stroke: A Guideline for Healthcare Professionals From the American Heart Association/American
452 Stroke Association. *Stroke.* 2019;50:e344-e418.
- 453 45. United Nations. World Population Prospects 2019: Data Booklet [Internet]. UN; 2019 [cited 2021 Jul
454 2]. Available from: <https://www.un-ilibrary.org/content/books/9789210042475>
- 455 46. Cruise C, Mfoafo M'Carthy N, Ganesh A, Lashewicz B. Imperfect Patients: Disparities in Treatment of
456 Stroke Patients with Premorbid Disability. *Can J Neurol Sci.* 2022;1-12.

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470 **Table 1. Population characteristics by Clinical Frailty Score (CFS)**

	CFS			P-value
	1-3 (n = 2385)	4-6 (n = 1203)	7-8 (n = 498)	
Age, yr	78 (72-83)	85 (80-89)	86 (82-91)	< 0.001
Female sex	1104 (46.3)	776 (64.5)	369 (74.1)	< 0.001
Prestroke disability	16 (0.7)	595 (49.5)	464 (93.2)	< 0.001
Living in institution before admission	7 (0.3)	70 (5.8)	145 (29.1)	< 0.001
Charlson Comorbidity Index				< 0.001
0	873 (36.6)	200 (16.6)	25 (5.0)	
1	752 (31.6)	356 (29.6)	124 (24.9)	
2-3	602 (25.2)	454 (37.7)	211 (42.4)	
≥4	158 (6.6)	193 (16.1)	138 (27.7)	
Ischemic stroke	1966 (82.4)	982 (81.6)	426 (85.5)	0.147
Admission NIHSS score				< 0.001
0-5	1197 (50.2)	449 (37.3)	95 (19.1)	
6-15	662 (27.8)	389 (32.3)	155 (31.1)	
>15	526 (22.0)	365 (30.4)	248 (49.8)	
Poor functional outcome ^a	1409 (59.1)	921 (76.7)	327 (78.0)	< 0.001
Prolonged discharge ^b	1062 (53.7)	583 (60.4)	178 (48.0)	< 0.001
Unfavorable discharge	574 (24.1)	496 (41.2)	286 (57.4)	< 0.001
Poor rehabilitation potential ^c	168 (15.0)	259 (37.0)	159 (72.6)	< 0.001
30-day mortality	279 (11.7)	249 (20.7)	169 (33.9)	< 0.001
1-year mortality ^d	236 (11.4)	297 (31.9)	17 (47.6)	< 0.001

471
472 Data are reported as median (25-75th percentile) or number (percentage)

473 Abbreviations: NIHSS, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484 **Table 2.** Comparison of Clinical Frailty Scale (CFS) and preadmission modified Rankin scale (pre-mRS) for
485 prediction of the study outcomes.

	CFS	pre-mRS	P-value
Poor functional outcome	0.605 (0.588-0.621)*	0.581 (0.564-0.597)	< 0.001
Prolonged discharge	0.502 (0.483 – 0.520)	0.506 (0.488 – 0.524)	0.289
Unfavorable discharge	0.648 (0.630-0.666)	0.635 (0.618-0.652)	0.003
Poor rehabilitation potential	0.737 (0.713-0.761)	0.721 (0.697-0.745)	0.013
30-day mortality	0.639 (0.617-0.662)	0.637 (0.616-0.659)	0.710
1-year mortality	0.703 (0.681-0.725)	0.700 (0.678-0.723)	0.537

486

487 Data are areas under the curve (95% Confidence Intervals). P-values are for non-parametric comparison of
488 CFS and pre-mRS estimates.

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510 **Legends for figures**

511 **Figure 1.** The Clinical Frailty Scale version 2.0. Printed with permission from copyright holder.

512 **Figure 2.** Mosaic plot representing the study patients stratified by levels of Clinical Frailty Scale (CFS,
513 horizontal axis) and prestroke modified Rankin Scale (pre-mRS, vertical axis). The width of the columns
514 represents the number of observation for each CFS level. The height of each bar represent the number of
515 observations for individual pre-mRS levels within each CFS level.

516 **Figure 3.** Multivariable-adjusted associations of Clinical Frailty Scale (CFS) with the study outcomes from
517 multivariable-adjusted models. CFS was categorized as no frailty (score 1-3), mild to moderate frailty (score
518 4-6) and severe frailty (score 7-8). Panel A shows odds ratios (OR) and their 95% confidence intervals (95%
519 CI); panel B, hazard ratios (HR) and their 95% CI. All models included age, sex, Charlson Comorbidity
520 Index score, stroke subtype, admission NIHSS, and prestroke disability.

521 **Figure 4.** Multivariable-adjusted associations of frailty with the study outcomes in patients with ischemic
522 stroke treated with reperfusion therapies. Frailty was defined as Clinical Frailty Scale ≥ 4 . Panel A shows
523 odds ratios (OR) and their 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). Panel B shows the adjusted survival
524 probability curves for frail and non-frail patients. All models included age, sex, Charlson Comorbidity Index
525 score, admission NIHSS, and prestroke disability.

526

CLINICAL FRAILITY SCALE

	1	VERY FIT	People who are robust, active, energetic and motivated. They tend to exercise regularly and are among the fittest for their age.
	2	FIT	People who have no active disease symptoms but are less fit than category 1. Often, they exercise or are very active occasionally , e.g., seasonally.
	3	MANAGING WELL	People whose medical problems are well controlled , even if occasionally symptomatic, but often are not regularly active beyond routine walking.
	4	LIVING WITH VERY MILD FRAILITY	Previously "vulnerable," this category marks early transition from complete independence. While not dependent on others for daily help, often symptoms limit activities . A common complaint is being "slowed up" and/or being tired during the day.
	5	LIVING WITH MILD FRAILITY	People who often have more evident slowing , and need help with high order instrumental activities of daily living (finances, transportation, heavy housework). Typically, mild frailty progressively impairs shopping and walking outside alone, meal preparation, medications and begins to restrict light housework.

	6	LIVING WITH MODERATE FRAILITY	People who need help with all outside activities and with keeping house . Inside, they often have problems with stairs and need help with bathing and might need minimal assistance (cuing, standby) with dressing.
	7	LIVING WITH SEVERE FRAILITY	Completely dependent for personal care , from whatever cause (physical or cognitive). Even so, they seem stable and not at high risk of dying (within ~6 months).
	8	LIVING WITH VERY SEVERE FRAILITY	Completely dependent for personal care and approaching end of life. Typically, they could not recover even from a minor illness.
	9	TERMINALLY ILL	Approaching the end of life. This category applies to people with a life expectancy <6 months , who are not otherwise living with severe frailty . (Many terminally ill people can still exercise until very close to death.)

SCORING FRAILITY IN PEOPLE WITH DEMENTIA

The degree of frailty generally corresponds to the degree of dementia. Common **symptoms in mild dementia** include forgetting the details of a recent event, though still remembering the event itself, repeating the same question/story and social withdrawal.

In **moderate dementia**, recent memory is very impaired, even though they seemingly can remember their past life events well. They can do personal care with prompting.

In **severe dementia**, they cannot do personal care without help.


In **very severe dementia** they are often bedfast. Many are virtually mute.




**DALHOUSIE
UNIVERSITY**

Clinical Frailty Scale ©2005–2020 Rockwood, Version 2.0 (EN). All rights reserved. For permission: www.geriatricmedicineresearch.ca
Rockwood K et al. A global clinical measure of fitness and frailty in elderly people. CMAJ 2005;173:489–495.


A



B



A



B

