

1 Title

2 The association between the value of a statistical life and frailty in Burkina Faso

3 Author Information

4 Leila Freidoony^{1,2}, Dina Goodman-Palmer², Fred Barker³, Mamadou Bountogo⁴, Pascal Geldsetzer
5^{5,6}, Guy Harling^{7,8,9,10}, Lisa Hirschhorn¹¹, Jennifer Manne-Goehler¹², Mark Siedner¹³, Stefan
6 Trautmann^{14,15}, Yilong Xu¹⁶, Miles Witham*^{9,17,18} and Justine Davies*^{2,9,19}

7 * *Equal contribution*

8

9¹ Cancer Research UK Clinical Trials Unit, Robert Aitken Institute of Clinical Research, Institute of
10 Cancer and Genomic Sciences, College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham,
11 Birmingham, UK. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3607-9032>

12² Institute of Applied Health Research, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK.

13³ AGE Research Group, Translational and Clinical Research Institute and Biomedical Research
14 Centre, Newcastle University and Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, Cramlington, UK.

15⁴ Centre de Recherche en Sante de Nouna, Nouna, Burkina Faso.

16⁵ Division of Primary Care and Population Health, Department of Medicine, Stanford University,
17 Stanford, CA 94305, USA.

18⁶ Chan Zuckerberg Biohub organisation – San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94158, USA.

19⁷ Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, UK.

20⁸ Africa Health Research Institute, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.

21⁹ MRC/Wits Rural Public Health & Health Transitions Research Unit (Agincourt), University of the
22 Witwatersrand, South Africa.

23¹⁰ School of Nursing & Public Health, College of Health Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal,
24 Durban, South Africa.

25¹¹ Dept of Medical Social Sciences and Havey Institute of Global Health, Feinberg School of
26 Medicine, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, USA.

27¹² Division of Infectious Diseases, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, USA.

28 ¹³Department of Medicine, Harvard Medical School and Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston,
29 MA, USA.

30 ¹⁴Alfred-Weber-Institute for Economics, University of Heidelberg. Bergheimer Str. 58, 69115
31 Heidelberg, Germany.

32 ¹⁵Tilburg School of Economics, Tilburg University, Warandelaan 2, 5037 AB Tilburg, the
33 Netherlands.

34 ¹⁵Utrecht University School of Economics, Utrecht University, Kriekenpitplein 21-22, 3584 EC
35 Utrecht, the Netherlands.

36 ¹⁶AGE Research Group, Translational and Clinical Research Institute, Faculty of Medical Sciences,
37 Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK.

38 ¹⁷NIHR Newcastle Biomedical Research Centre, Newcastle upon Tyne NHS Foundation Trust,
39 Cumbria Northumberland Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust and Newcastle University,
40 Newcastle upon Tyne, UK.

41 ¹⁸Centre for Global Surgery, Department of Global Health, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch,
42 Western Cape, South Africa.

43

44 Correspondence to: Leila Freidoony: L.freidoony@bham.ac.uk

45

46 **Running heading**

47 The value of a statistical life and frailty in Burkina Faso

48 Abstract

49 **Background:** To ensure resources invested into services are commensurate with benefit, economists
50 utilise various methods to assess value of life. Understanding the performance of these methods in
51 older populations is crucial, particularly in low-and-middle-income countries (LMICs), where the
52 majority of older people will live by 2030. Value of Statistical Life Years (VSLY) is widely used in
53 cost-benefit analyses but rarely been in LMICs or in older people.

54 **Objective:** This study aimed to investigate the hypothesis that frailty would be associated with a
55 lower VSLY in participants in rural Burkina Faso, when controlling for factors found in other studies
56 likely to affect VSLY, such as socio-demographics, multimorbidity, quality of life, and disability.

57 **Methods:** The study included 3,988 adults aged 40 years and older from a population-representative
58 household survey done in Nouna, Burkina Faso. Data were collected on sociodemographic
59 characteristics, chronic medical conditions, quality of life, disability, physical performance, and
60 VSLY. Frailty status was derived using Fried's frailty phenotype. Bivariate analyses investigated the
61 association between quintiles of VSLY and frailty. To explore modification of associations by other
62 variables, we built sequential binary logistic regression models comparing each quintile of VSLY
63 with the first (lowest) quintile. Models included frailty category, age, sex, marital status, educational
64 attainment, and wealth. We sequentially added quality of life, multimorbidity, and disability.

65 **Results:** Of 2,761 survey participants included in this analysis, 51.4% were female. Average age was
66 54.5 years (with 70.0% aged 40-59 years), 24.8% of respondents reported being alone, and 84.5% had
67 not completed education. In bivariate analyses, we found a significant negative association between
68 higher VSLY and frailty, increasing age, disability, and quality of life. Conversely, being male,
69 married, and educated were positively associated with higher VSLY. The negative association
70 between VSLY and frailty remained significant after adjusting for age, gender, education, wealth,
71 quality of life, disability, and multimorbidity (odds of being frail for VSLY quintile 5 vs quintile 1
72 was 0.48, 95% CI 0.37-0.64 for the fully adjusted model). Furthermore, effect of age, education, and
73 wealth on VSLY became non-significant once frailty was included in the model.

74 **Conclusion:** There is a strong relationship between the value that older people place on their lives and
75 their frailty status. Frailty status is important to consider when assessing VSLY, especially in LMICs
76 in which there is a rapidly growing older population.

77 **Key words**

78 Frailty, value of statistical life years, older population, aging, Burkina Faso, low- and middle-income
79 countries

80 **Key Points for Decision Makers**

- 81 • This study explores the relationship between frailty and the Value of Statistical Life Years
82 (VSLY) in older adults in rural Burkina Faso, representing the first such investigation in any
83 setting.
- 84 • The research reveals a strong and significant association between frailty and lower VSLY,
85 even after adjusting for variables like age, multimorbidity, and quality of life.
- 86 • These findings emphasize the importance of considering frailty status in the application of
87 VSLY in cost-benefit analyses, particularly for interventions targeting older adults in Low-
88 and Middle-Income Countries.

89 [Declarations](#)

90 [Funding](#)

91 Funding for the study was provided by the Alexander Von Humboldt Foundation, Germany and the
92 Institute for Global Innovation, University of Birmingham, UK. G.H. is supported by a fellowship
93 from the Wellcome Trust and Royal Society [grant number 210479/Z/18/Z]. This research was funded
94 in whole, or in part, by the Wellcome Trust [Grant number 210479/Z/18/Z]. For the purpose of open
95 access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript
96 version arising from this submission.

97 [Conflicts of interest](#)

98 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

99 [Availability of data and material](#)

100 Data may be obtained from a third party and are not publicly available. Data are not publicly available
101 as consent was not given by participants for this to take place. This is in part because entire age
102 cohorts of some villages are included in the data set, potentially allowing for deductive disclosure
103 with sufficient local information. For this reason, anonymised data are available from CHAS study
104 data controllers only following signature of a data use agreement restricting onward transmission.
105 Anyone wishing to replicate the analyses presented or conduct further collaborative analyses using
106 CHAS (which are welcomed and considered based on a letter of intent), should contact Prof Justine
107 Davies (j.davies.6@bham.ac.uk) in the first instance.

108 [Ethics approval](#)

109 Ethical approval was obtained from Ethics Commission I of the medical faculty Heidelberg (S-
110 120/2018), the Burkina Faso Comité d’Ethique pour la Recherche en Santé (CERS) in Ouagadougou
111 (2018-4-045) and the Institutional Ethics Committee (CIE) of the CRSN (2018-04).

112 [Consent to participate](#)

113 Oral consent was obtained from all village elders. Written informed consent was obtained from each
114 participant and a literate witness assisted in cases of illiteracy. All participants with test results

115 indicating requirement for healthcare were contacted and provided with referral to the appropriate
116 level of care.

117 [Consent for publication](#)

118 Not applicable

119 [Code availability](#)

120 Not applicable

121 [Author contributions](#)

122 JD, MW, ST, JMG, GH, and PG conceived and designed the overall CSRN CHAS study. GH co-
123 ordinated baseline data collection and preparation. LF, DGP, FB, JID, and MDW designed the current
124 study. LF conducted the analysis, wrote, and revised the manuscript. JD, DGP, and MW supervised
125 the analysis, write up and development of the manuscript. All authors substantively reviewed
126 manuscripts, inputted into revisions and approved the final manuscript.

127 [Acknowledgements](#)

128 Not applicable

129 1. Introduction

130 To ensure that resources invested into services are commensurate with their benefit, economists have
131 utilised various methods to assess the value of life. As populations age, it is important that the
132 performance of these methods is understood in older people. This is especially the case for older
133 populations living in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), given that by 2030, the majority of
134 the world's older people are expected to be living in LMICs [1]. The Value of Statistical Life Years
135 (VSLY) approach has consistently calculated human life as being far more valuable than alternative
136 methods of cost-benefit analyses (CBAs) such as 'value of lost earnings' or the World Health
137 Organization's (WHO) cost-effectiveness threshold of multiplying national GDP per capita by three
138 [2, 3]. The economic theory underlying the higher VSL measurements raises the possibility that
139 previous methods have undervalued human life, hence its interest to health economists.

140 VSLY is a commonly used tool specific to CBAs where risk of death is considered as part of
141 evaluation. It is guided by the real-world or theoretical monetary value that individuals place on
142 accepting or reducing a small risk of death, either over their lifetime or annually [3]. The generated
143 values essentially behave as a monetary threshold beyond which additional annual expenditure is
144 considered excessive for the marginal reduced risk of death it provides. Whilst discussion continues
145 on the benefits of using it, the VSLY approach continues to be viewed as beneficial, at least in high
146 income countries [4, 5]. The few studies which have used the approach in sub-Saharan Africa or in
147 LMICs in general have also considered it to be worthwhile [6]. But, given the growing ageing
148 population in LMICs, understanding the impact of ageing on VSLY is needed [7], particularly if this
149 is to be considered an applicable method for LMICs.

150 There is reasonable evidence from high-income countries showing the relationship between VSL
151 values and increasing age [8]. However, there is a paucity of research exploring whether these
152 findings are consistent in lower-income countries where life expectancy is typically lower and the role
153 of older people in their communities is often more prominent [9, 10]. There is also little evidence on
154 the effect of frailty on VSLY as people age. Frailty is a condition describing an individual's

155 vulnerability to greatly impaired health status following relatively minor stressor events [11].
156 Moreover, frailty occurs more frequently as people age and is associated with limiting independence
157 and reduced quality of life; it is prevalent in older populations in LMICs [12-14].
158 Given the increase in older populations in LMICs, the high prevalence of frailty and its adverse
159 consequences in these populations, and that VSLY is an attractive method to understand the value of
160 life in low resourced settings, it is important to understand the relationship between frailty and VSLY
161 [9, 15, 16]. Our hypothesis was that frailty would be associated with a lower VSLY in participants in
162 rural Burkina Faso. This study aims to test our hypothesis, when controlling for factors found in other
163 studies likely to affect VSLY [17-19], such as, socio-demographics, multimorbidity, quality of life,
164 and disability.

165 2. Methods

166 2.1. Study setting/Population description

167 We enrolled older adults (aged 40 and over) living in the Nouna Health and Demographic
168 Surveillance System (HDSS) area in north-western Burkina Faso. Burkina Faso is one of the poorest
169 countries in the World, with a Gross Domestic Product of \$893.08 (2021), ranking 184th on the
170 Human Development Index.
171 The Centre de Recherche en Santé de Nouna (CRSN) led household surveys within the Nouna HDSS,
172 which consists of the town of Nouna and 59 surrounding villages, with a total population of 107,000
173 residents from multiple religious backgrounds. There are two main languages spoken in Nouna—
174 Dioula and Moore—whereas French is the national language. The main economic activity is
175 subsistence farming. Details of study design is described elsewhere [15, 20, 21].

176 2.2. Sample

177 Data for this study were collected during the baseline wave of the CRSN Heidelberg Aging Study,
178 which was conducted in 2018, using a household survey from a population-representative sample of
179 adults ≥ 40 years living in the Nouna HDSS area. To obtain a sample of 3000 older adults, we used a
180 two-part multistage random sample of 4000 individuals from the 2015 Nouna HDSS census, allowing
181 for 25% loss due to mortality, mobility, or non-response. In the six villages with fewer than 50 adults

182 aged over 40, all adults were selected to take part. In all other villages, a random sample of
183 households with at least one person over 40 was drawn, and then within each selected household one
184 age-eligible adult was randomly selected to complete the survey. Details of study design can be found
185 elsewhere [15, 20, 21].

186 2.3. Data collection

187 Trained data collectors administered the survey to participants in the local language. The household
188 survey questionnaire has been described in full in other publications [22-24]. It included questions on
189 sociodemographic characteristics, health and medical conditions, physical performance, and VSLY
190 which were used in this study.

191 2.3.1. Sociodemographic characteristics

192 We captured sociodemographic characteristics, including age in years; gender (*male or female*);
193 marital status (*never married, widowed, married but separated/divorced, currently married, or*
194 *cohabiting*); educational attainment (*no formal schooling, less than primary, primary complete, some*
195 *secondary, secondary complete, high school complete, or college/university*); and a suite of 37
196 questions on household assets and dwelling characteristics.

197 2.3.2. Chronic conditions

198 Self-reported chronic conditions collected in the study were communicable (HIV) or non-
199 communicable health conditions (cancer, chronic respiratory disease, stroke, heart disease,
200 hypertension, diabetes, and hypercholesterolaemia). Cognitive impairment was assessed using the
201 eight-question community screening interview for dementia (CSI-D), anxiety using the Generalised
202 Anxiety Disorder question (GAD-2) score, and depression using the Patient Health Questionnaire
203 (PHQ-9) [25]. Additionally, questions from the Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale
204 (CES-D) were used to ask questions related to levels of exhaustion; ‘Everything I did in the last week
205 was an effort’ or ‘I could not get going’ [26]. Quality of life was asked using the EuroHIS 8-item
206 version of the WHO Quality of Life (WHOQOL) questionnaire [27].(14). Disability was measured
207 using the 12-item WHO Disability Assessment Schedule, Version 2 (WHODAS V.2.0) disability
208 score. This score measures impairments in function, activity, and participation (mobility, self-care,

209 cognition, interaction with others, life activities, and social participation), with higher scores
210 indicating higher levels of disability [28].

211 2.3.3. Physical measurements

212 We measured weight and height using generic scales and measurement bands against a vertical and
213 horizontal smooth surface, respectively. Blood pressure of participants was measured in a seated
214 position from the left arm after 15 min rest; three measures were taken using Omron Series 7
215 portable blood pressure machines (Omron Healthcare, Kyoto, Japan). The mean of the second and
216 third measurements, taken at least 5 min apart, were used in the analysis.

217 Walk speed was measured using a digital stopwatch and recorded to the nearest tenth of a second with
218 the participant walking 4m course marked out on level ground, twice. The fastest speed in metres per
219 second (m/s), adjusted for height, was used. Hand grip strength was measured using a Jamar
220 Hydraulic Hand Dynamometer. We took measurements while the participant seated, the arm at 90°
221 elbow flexion and the shoulder and wrist in the neutral position. Two attempts were recorded from
222 each hand; the maximum was used in this analysis.

223 2.3.4. Blood tests

224 Capillary glucose levels were analysed using SD Biosure Code free point-of-care testing strips, and
225 cholesterol using the Jactron Pictus 400 machine.

226 2.3.5. VSLY

227 VSLY was assessed using four related methods; willingness to pay or willingness to accept a
228 hypothetical mortality risk reduction or increase, with each using two different ranges of payments –
229 large or small (15, 16). We elicited the annual willingness-to-pay (WTP) (or willingness-to-accept,
230 WTA) for a 2% reduction (or increase) in risk of death from a 5% to a 3% level, or from a 3% to a 5%
231 level. The 5% risk represents the typical mortality rate in Burkina Faso, as determined by life tables
232 for 2015. We calculated the VSLY directly from the questionnaire. The observed WTP/WTA was the
233 value of a 2% absolute risk reduction/increase; so, the VSLY was obtained by multiplying this elicited
234 WTP/WTA measurement by 50 to get to the annual value of a 100% reduction/increase in risk of
235 death [6].

236 After each participant was randomised to either WTP or WTA, we factorially randomized them to
237 receive either a small or large range of payment amounts as response options, both starting at zero
238 Communauté Financière Africaine franc (West African CFA franc). The small range of payments had
239 an upper limit of 400,000 CFA (about US\$ 1916) and the large range, an upper limit of 2 million CFA
240 (about US\$ 9580). For comparison, gross domestic product per capita at purchasing power parity in
241 Burkina Faso was US\$2,044 in 2017, when the experiment was designed. See Supplementary
242 Information 1 for details.

243 2.4. Definition of variables

244 2.4.1. VSLY

245 We derived the outcome variable VSLY as quintiles for each of the four methodologies (WTP-small,
246 WTP-large, WTA-small, and WTA-large), and then quintiles were harmonised across all participants.
247 The continuous values from each of the four VSLY methods were also used.

248 2.4.2. Frailty

249 Frailty was derived based on Fried's frailty score and constructed using five domains (weight loss,
250 activity levels, exhaustion, grip strength, and walk speed) that were previously validated in LMICs
251 [15, 16, 20, 29]. Variables and thresholds to create the frailty categories are summarised in
252 Supplementary Information 2. Individuals were categorised as non-frail/robust (0 points), pre-frail (1–
253 2 points) or frail (3–5 points) [30]. Frailty was then dichotomized as frail or pre-frail compared to
254 non-frail [16].

255 2.4.3. Other covariates

256 Marital status was categorised as either 'single' (*never married/widowed/married but*
257 *separated/divorced*) or 'married' (*currently married/cohabiting*). Education was categorised as 'no
258 education' or 'any education'. Wealth quintiles were derived from the questions on household assets
259 and dwelling characteristics using the Principal Component Analysis method of Filmer and Pritchett
260 [31].

261 Multimorbidity was defined as having two or more chronic conditions (HIV, cancer, chronic
262 respiratory disease, stroke, heart disease, hypertension, diabetes, hypercholesterolaemia, cognitive

263 impairment, depression, or anxiety). As is common in epidemiology studies, hypertension was
264 defined as either self-reported previous diagnosis or currently being on treatment, or as a measured
265 systolic blood pressure ≥ 140 mm/Hg, or a diastolic blood pressure ≥ 90 mm/Hg; diabetes was
266 defined as either self-reported diagnosis, being on treatment, or by blood test (a non-fasting point of
267 care capillary glucose level >200 mg/dL, HbA1c $>6.5\%$ or fasting glucose >126 mg/dL);
268 hypercholesterolaemia was defined as self-reported diagnosis; being on treatment; or by blood test (a
269 total plasma cholesterol >200 mg/dL, low density lipoprotein >160 mg/dL).
270 Quality of life was derived by summing responses to WHOQOL before normalising to a 0–100 scale,
271 with 100 denoting the best quality of life. Disability measures were also summed and then normalised
272 to a 0-100 scale, where 100 represents the worst disability [27, 28, 32]. Participants were defined as
273 having symptoms of anxiety if their GAD-2 score was ≥ 3 , those with PHQ-9 of ≥ 10 were categorised
274 as having depressive symptoms, and those with a CSI-D score of less than 7 were categorised as
275 having possible/probable cognitive impairment.

276 2.5. Statistical analysis

277 Continuous variables were described as mean and standard deviation (SD) or median and interquartile
278 range (IQR) [25th/75th centiles] if not normally distributed. Categorical variables were described as
279 count (n) and proportion (%).

280 Frailty was the primary independent variable. Other independent variables we hypothesised to be
281 associated with VSLY were included in the adjusted analyses: age, gender, marital status, education
282 level, wealth, quality of life, multimorbidity, and disability. VSLY was the primary outcome.


283 We conducted four sets of analyses to elucidate the relationship between VSLY and frailty. First, we
284 assessed the association between VSLY as a continuous variable and frailty category in each of the
285 four individual VSLY methodological arms using Mann-Whitney U tests.

286 Second, bivariate associations between VSLY quintiles and frailty categories and each individual
287 variable (age, sex, marital status, education status, wealth, quality of life, multimorbidity, and
288 disability) were tested using Pearson's chi-squared test, independent samples t-test, or one-way
289 ANOVA, depending on the data type and distribution.

290 Third, to test whether variables were independently associated with VSLY, and to explore whether
291 any associations between frailty and VSLY quintiles were modified by other variables, after
292 excluding collinearity between variables, we built sequential binary logistic regression models
293 comparing each quintile of VSLY with the first quintile. In each model, we included frailty, socio-
294 demographic and economic characteristics of age, sex, marital and education status, and wealth; to
295 these variables, we sequentially added quality of life, multimorbidity, and disability.
296 Fourth, we conducted a multinomial regression as a sensitivity analyses, with all VSLY quintiles
297 included, fully adjusted for frailty and other covariates.
298 Results of analyses were presented using tables and forest plots displaying Odds Ratios (OR) and 95%
299 confidence intervals (CI). We conducted a complete case analysis. All analyses were done using SPSS
300 V.28 (IBM Corp. Released 2021. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 28.0. Armonk, NY:
301 IBM Corp).

302 3. Results

303 We identified 3,998 individuals aged >40 and living in the HDSS site; of those, 3,027 (75.7%) were
304 located and agreed to participate and completed the baseline interview. Of those, 2761 individuals
305 were included in this analysis after excluding participants with missing variables (Figure 1). Overall,
306 696 (25.2%), 679 (24.6%), 690 (25.0%), and 696 (25.2%) participants were available for the WTP-
307 small, WTP-large, WTA-small, and WTA-large, respectively (Figure 1). Participants' characteristics
308 for variables included in the analyses are presented in Table 1 and Table 2.
309



310

311 **Figure 1 CONSORT flow diagram of participants included in final analyses. WTA, what to**
312 **accept; WTP, what to pay**

313

314

Table 1 Baseline characteristics (n=2761)

Parameter	Group	n (%), unless otherwise stated
Gender (n (%))	Male	1341 (48.6)
	Female	1420 (51.4)
Age* (Mean (SD))	-	54.5 (11.0)
Age category (n (%))	40-49	1128 (40.9)
	50-59	802 (29.1)
	60-69	518 (18.8)
	70-79	249 (9.0)
	80+	62 (2.2)
Marital status (n (%))	Widowed/divorced/single	684 (24.8)
	Married/cohabiting	2077 (75.2)
Education level (n (%))	No completed education	2334 (84.5)
	Some education	427 (15.5)
Wealth quintile (n (%))	1	542 (19.6)
	2	548 (19.8)
	3	551 (20.0)
	4	569 (20.6)
	5 (most wealthy)	551 (20.0)
Frailty (n (%))	Non-frail	1172 (42.4)
	Pre-frail	1227 (44.4)
	Frail	362 (13.1)
Multimorbidity (n (%))	No	2141 (77.5)
	Yes	620 (22.5)
Quality of life score (Mean (SD))	-	55.6 (14.3)
Disability score (Mean (SD))	-	15.0 (17.4)
VSLY arms (West African CFA franc) Median (25 th -75 th percentile)	WTP-small	5987.74 (5000.0-100000.0)
	WTP-large	11975.47 (10000.0-300000.0)
	WTA-small	16765.66 (20000.0-200000.0)
	WTA-large	59877.37 (50000.0-1000000.0)
Combined VSLY quintile (n (%))	1	563 (20.4)
	2	556 (20.1)
	3	546 (19.8)
	4	544 (19.7)
	5 (highest value)	552 (20.0)

315 * n=2759 (2 missing values). VSLY, Value of Statistical Life Years

316

317

318
319

Table 2 Baseline characteristics by VSLY category, variables are presented as n (%), unless otherwise stated

Parameter		WTP small	WTP large	WTA small	WTA large
<i>N (% of total participants)</i>					
Gender (<i>n (%)</i>)	Male	329 (11.9)	336 (12.2)	336 (12.2)	340 (12.3)
	Female	367 (13.3)	343 (12.4)	354 (12.8)	356 (12.9)
Age* (<i>Mean (SD)</i>)	-	54.8 (11.1)	54.2 (11.2)	54.7 (10.9)	54.2 (10.8)
Age category (<i>n (%)</i>)	40-49	276 (10)	299 (10.8)	259 (9.4)	294 (10.6)
	50-59	203 (7.3)	172 (6.2)	227 (8.2)	200 (7.2)
	60-69	136 (4.9)	130 (4.7)	128 (4.6)	124 (4.5)
	70-79	61 (2.2)	64 (2.3)	57 (2.1)	67 (2.4)
	80+	20 (0.7)	14 (0.5)	18 (0.6)	10 (0.4)
Marital status (<i>n (%)</i>)	Widowed/divorced /single	182 (6.6)	165 (6.0)	172 (6.2)	165 (6.0)
	Married/cohabitating	514 (18.6)	514 (18.6)	518 (18.8)	531 (19.2)
Education level (<i>n (%)</i>)	No completed education	582 (21.1)	581 (21.0)	578 (20.9)	593 (21.5)
	Some education	114 (4.1)	98 (3.5)	112 (4.0)	103 (3.7)
Wealth quintile (<i>n (%)</i>)	1	144 (5.2)	138 (5.0)	136 (4.9)	124 (4.5)
	2	140 (5.1)	138 (5.0)	132 (4.8)	138 (5.0)
	3	132 (4.8)	141 (5.1)	141 (5.1)	137 (5.0)
	4	140 (5.1)	144 (5.2)	143 (5.2)	142 (5.1)
	5 (most wealthy)	140 (5.1)	118 (4.3)	138 (5.0)	155 (5.6)
Frailty (<i>n (%)</i>)	Non-frail/Robust	285 (10.3)	270 (9.8)	321 (11.6)	296 (10.7)
	Pre-frail	310 (11.2)	322 (11.7)	283 (10.2)	312 (11.3)
	Frail	101 (3.6)	87 (3.1)	86 (3.1)	88 (3.2)
Multimorbidity (<i>n (%)</i>)	No	513 (18.6)	542 (19.6)	541 (19.6)	545 (19.7)
	Yes	183 (6.6)	137 (5.0)	149 (5.4)	151 (5.5)
Quality of life score (<i>Mean (SD)</i>)	-	55.5 (14.0)	55.3 (14.4)	55.6 (14.6)	56.0 (14.2)
Disability score (<i>Mean (SD)</i>)	-	16.1 (18.1)	14.0 (17.4)	15.6 (17.6)	14.2 (16.4)
VSL arms (West African CFA franc) (<i>Median (IQR)</i>)	-	5987.7 (22753.4)	11975.5 (69457.7)	16765.7 (95803.8)	59877.4 (227534.0)
Combined VSLY quintile (<i>n (%)</i>)	1	141	136	140	146
	2	142	139	137	138
	3	137	134	136	139
	4	137	133	140	134
	5 (highest value)	139	137	137	139

320

VSLY, Value of Statistical Life Years; WTA, what to accept; WTP, what to pay

321 Significant, negative associations were seen between VSLY and frailty when considering each VSLY
 322 arm separately as a continuous variable (See Table 3), with the median willingness to pay value being
 323 around double for people in the non-frail compared with the frail or pre frail group.


324 **Table 3 Median (IQR) and 25th/75th centiles of VSLY (West African CFA franc) as a**
 325 **continuous variable, for each of the 4 VSLY methodological arms - by frailty status**

VSLY arms	Non-frail Median (IQR) [25 th / 75 th centiles]	Pre-frail/Frail Median (IQR) (25 th / 75 th centiles)	<i>p</i> -value*
WTP-small (n=696)	8382.8 (22753.4) [5000.00 / 100000.00]	4790.2 (17963.2) [5000.00 / 80000.00]	0.006
WTP-large (n=679)	23950.9 (117359.7) [10000.00 / 500000.00]	11975.5 (58081.1) [75000.00 / 250000.00]	0.049
WTA-small (n=690)	23950.9 (38321.5) [40000.00 / 200000.00]	11975.5 (32333.8) [15000.00 / 150000.00]	<0.001
WTA-large (n=696)	107779.3 (227534.0) [50000.00 / 1000000.00]	47901.9 (161668.9) [25000.00 / 700000.00]	<0.001

326 * *p*-value comparing medians for each VSLY arm by frailty status using Mann-Whitney U test

327

328 In bivariate analyses, there were significant negative associations between the combined VSLY
 329 quintiles for the whole sample and frailty; those pre-frail/frail participants were less likely than non-
 330 frail ones to report higher VSLY (See Figure 2). Being male, married, and educated were significantly
 331 positively associated with increasing VSLY quintiles. Increasing age, disability, and quality of life,
 332 were negatively associated with increasing VSLY quintile. We saw no association between wealth
 333 and VSLY (Table 4).



334

335 **Figure 2 Association of frailty status and VSLY quintiles. Q, Quintile**

336

337 Multicollinearity between variables was excluded. Sequential binary logistic regression models
338 showed a significantly greater odds having a high VSLY in those who were non-frail compared to
339 frail or pre-frail. This became non-significant for the lower VSLY quintiles (Table 5). The inverse
340 linear relationship between frailty and VSLY wasn't substantially affected by adding socio-
341 demographic or economic variables, or quality of life, or multimorbidity, or disability to the model
342 (Table 5). Forest plots showing the relationship between frailty and VSLY for each set of quintiles
343 comparisons in each sequential model are shown in Appendix Fig. 2, Supplementary Information 3.
344 Frailty ORs from the fully adjusted sequential model (Model 5) in each comparison of VSLY
345 quintiles are shown in Figure 3.

346

347

Table 4 Bivariate associations between VSLY quintiles and covariates

Variable	Group	VSLY					p value
		Q1 (563)	Q2 (556)	Q3 (546)	Q4 (544)	Q5 (552)	
Frailty	Non-frail	197 [35.0%]	214 [38.5%]	224 [41.0%]	247 [45.4%]	290 [52.5%]	<0.001*
	Pre-frail and Frail	366 [65.0%]	342 [61.5%]	322 [59.0%]	297 [54.6%]	262 [47.5%]	
Gender	Male	241 [42.8%]	250 [45.0%]	242 [44.3%]	274 [50.4%]	60.5%	<0.001*
	Female	322 [57.2%]	306 [55.0%]	304 [55.7%]	270 [49.6%]	39.5%	
Marital Status	Married	396 [70.3%]	411 [73.9%]	398 [72.9%]	414 [76.1%]	458 [83.0%]	<0.001*
	Single	167 [29.7%]	145 [26.1%]	148 [27.1%]	130 [23.9%]	94 [17.0%]	
Education	No education	485 [86.1%]	473 [85.1%]	464 [85.0%]	470 [86.4%]	442 [80.1%]	0.025*
	Any education	78 [13.9%]	83 [14.9%]	82 [15.0%]	74 [13.6%]	110 [19.9%]	
Wealth quintiles (Q5 is the highest)	Q1	126 [22.4%]	102 [18.3%]	109 [20.0%]	106 [19.5%]	99 [17.9%]	0.855#
	Q2	116 [20.6%]	113 [20.3%]	82 [15.0%]	122 [22.4%]	115 [20.8%]	
	Q3	103 [18.3%]	96 [17.3%]	123 [22.5%]	114 [21.0%]	115 [20.8%]	
	Q4	105 [18.7%]	123 [22.1%]	120 [22.0%]	103 [18.9%]	118 [21.4%]	
	Q5	113 [20.1%]	122 [21.9%]	112 [20.5%]	99 [18.2%]	105 [19.0%]	
Multimorbidity	No	75.3%	72.8%	79.3%	78.3%	82.1%	0.003*
	Yes	27.2%	20.7%	21.7%	17.9%	17.9%	
Age	Correlation coefficient	-0.054 (-0.092,-0.016)					0.004 [^]
Quality of life (score)	Correlation coefficient	-0.036 (-0.074,-0.002)					0.058 [^]
Disability (score)	Correlation coefficient	-0.069 (-0.107_-0.030)					<0.001 [^]

348 * Pearson Chi-Square

349 [^] Spearman's correlation


350 # Kendall's tau-hb/Gamma/Spearman's correlation

351
352
353

Table 5 Sequential model adjustments for comparing the highest VSLY quintile (Q5) with the first one (Q1), investigating the association with frailty, quality of life, and multimorbidity after controlling for other confounding variables. All quartile comparisons of VSLY are shown in Appendix Table 2, Supplementary Information 3.

	Model 1 (frailty)			Model 2 (Socio-demographic variables)			Model 3 (Socio-demographic variables and QOL)			Model 4 (Socio-demographic variables, QOL, and MM)			Model 5 (Socio-demographic variables, QOL, MM, and DAS)		
	OR	CI (95%)	Sig.	OR	CI (95%)	Sig.	OR	CI (95%)	Sig.	OR	CI (95%)	Sig.	OR	CI (95%)	Sig.
VSLY Q5 vs Q1 (1113 observations included in analysis)															
Frailty (ref. Non-frail)	0.49	0.38-0.62	<0.001	0.49	0.38-0.64	<0.001	0.46	0.35-0.60	<0.001	0.47	0.36-0.62	<0.001	0.48	0.37-0.64	<0.001
Age	-	-	-	1.00	0.99-1.02	0.699	1.00	0.98-1.01	0.590	1.00	0.98-1.01	0.612	1.00	0.99-1.02	0.847
Gender (ref. Male)	-	-	-	0.55	0.43-0.72	<0.001	0.52	0.39-0.67	<0.001	0.52	0.40-0.68	<.001	0.54	0.41-0.70	<0.001
Marital Status (ref. Married)	-	-	-	0.70	0.50-0.99	0.041	0.64	0.46-0.91	0.012	0.65	0.46-0.92	0.014	0.67	0.47-0.95	0.023
Education (ref. No education)	-	-	-	1.34	0.95-1.90	0.092	1.32	0.93-1.87	0.118	1.32	0.93-1.88	0.114	1.30	0.92-1.84	0.141
Wealth Quintile (ref. Q1)	-	-	-	-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-	
Q2	-	-	-	1.06	0.72-1.55	0.775	1.14	0.77-1.69	0.504	1.15	0.78-1.69	0.493	1.16	0.78-1.71	0.458
Q3	-	-	-	1.17	0.79-1.73	0.425	1.34	0.90-2.00	0.151	1.35	0.91-2.02	0.138	1.39	0.93-2.08	0.105
Q4	-	-	-	1.14	0.77-1.69	0.512	1.34	0.90-2.00	0.153	1.35	0.90-2.02	0.142	1.40	0.93-2.10	0.103
Q5	-	-	-	0.89	0.59-1.32	0.558	1.08	0.71-1.63	0.719	1.11	0.73-1.69	0.617	1.15	0.76-1.75	0.507
WHO QOL Score (normalised)	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.98	0.97-0.99	<0.001	0.98	0.97-0.99	<0.001	0.98	0.97-0.99	<.001
Multimorbidity (ref. No MM)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.84	0.61-1.16	0.281	0.92	0.66-1.28	0.613
WHO DAS Score (normalised)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.99	0.98-1.00	0.042

354 QOL is Quality of Life. Q is quintile. DAS is Disability Assessment schedule. MM is multimorbidity.



355

356 **Figure 3 Forest plot representing the Odd Ratios for frailty in each comparison of VSLY**
357 **quintiles, controlled for all covariates**

358

359 In addition to frailty, being female or single were significantly associated with a lower VSLY whereas
360 being older, educated, or wealthy had no statistically significant association. These associations were
361 not substantially modified by adding quality of life, multimorbidity, disability, or all together to the
362 model. Higher quality of life was significantly associated with a lower VSLY, greater disability was
363 associated with lower VSLY, whereas there was no significant association between VSLY and
364 multimorbidity (see Table 5 and Appendix Table 2, Supplementary Information 3).

365 The results for the multinomial regression done for the sensitivity analyses were not substantially
366 different to the binary logistic regression models (See Appendix Table 3 and Appendix Fig. 3,
367 Supplementary Information 3).

368

369 4. Discussion

370 We found a strong and significant association between frailty and VSLY in this population in Burkina
371 Faso with people who are frail assigning lower values to prevent a mortality risk than those who are
372 non-frail (robust). This association persisted after adjustment for other variables found in other studies
373 likely to impact upon the relationship, such as quality of life, multimorbidity, and age [17-19].

374 Given the global and widespread use of VSLY approaches to indicate benefits and calls to use this or
375 similar approaches to inform investment cases for health, it is important to understand how conditions
376 which affect health of populations in whom VSLY might be calculated impact upon it [5, 33]. Our
377 findings have relevance to the interpretation of VSLY values in older people in low-income settings
378 and will become increasingly important to recognise as ageing populations increase in these settings.
379 As far as we are aware, this is the first study to assess implications of frailty on VSLY in any setting,
380 hence our results have applicability for many countries where VSLY is being considered for use in an
381 older population.

382 When frailty was included in the model, the effect of age, wealth, or education on VSLY – which
383 were strongly associated with VSLY on bivariate analyses, became non-significant. Age and wealth
384 have been shown to be associated with VSLY in other studies but when controlling for other variables
385 in these studies these relationships were attenuated [9], as they did in our study. In fact, that frailty has
386 such a strong association with VSLY—over and above that of other variables traditionally thought of
387 as being associated with VSLY—suggests that it may be necessary to assess frailty status when
388 estimating VSLY. This is particularly important given that frailty is a highly dynamic state, thus
389 VSLY captured in frail individuals may change if that person changes frailty status [34].

390 Although not our main variables of interest, we saw associations between VSLY and other covariates
391 that are worth discussing. Similar to our study, previous studies have shown a relationship between
392 gender and VSLY that persists despite controlling for covariates. Women consistently value their
393 lives lower than do men [35]. Our finding that being married or cohabitating is associated with odds
394 of a higher VSLY is novel, but unsurprising if it is hypothesised that having family responsibilities
395 may increase the willingness to pay to avoid risk. Another study showed that married respondents
396 have significantly higher WTP to take care of a child/other adult than to protect themselves [18]. The
397 relationship between greater disability and lower willingness to pay was small, but significant. Again,
398 this finding is not surprising, given the influence of disability on people’s perceived value [36-38].
399 However, our finding that increasing quality of life is associated, both in bivariate and fully adjusted
400 analyses, with lower VSLY is puzzling. We hypothesise that this might be due to older people with a

401 higher quality of life also being comfortable with their status quo, but this hypothesis requires further
402 investigation in qualitative studies. That multimorbidity was associated with lower VSLY in bivariate
403 analyses but not the fully adjusted model suggests that the impact of MM on VSLY may be mostly
404 mediated through frailty and somewhat through disability.

405 Our study has several limitations. Given the cross-sectional nature of the study, we can only
406 determine associations and lack the longitudinal data needed for determining causation. We grouped
407 frail and pre-frail individuals into one category, losing the nuance of showing effects by three
408 categories. However, this has been done in to aid in the interpretation of results. We have also shown
409 (personal communication) that these categories behave in a similar way when considering future
410 outcomes of this population, so grouping them together is reasonable. The number of conditions that
411 we used to derive multimorbidity was limited by questions asked in the survey, but they have been
412 used in previous publications to classify multimorbidity [15]. Limited sample sizes for the individual
413 VSLY methods necessitated combining the data using quintiles; however, reassuringly, we saw
414 similar relationships between frailty and VSLY when the analysis was done by individual VSLY
415 methodologies. If the inverse U shape of the association with age found in other studies, was found in
416 our study, our adjustment for age may have introduced some errors. However, in our sample, we
417 found a linear association between VSLY and age. We used the method of Patenaude [6] to estimate
418 VSLY, as it has been found suitable for use in other similar settings [39]. However, we acknowledge
419 that there are other methods that could have been applied. Finally, our study lacks the contextual
420 grounding which would be afforded by doing mixed methods analysis and qualitative exploration to
421 allow a deeper understanding of the context. Future studies should explore what is important to people
422 in the Nouna region of Burkina Faso in terms of what they value in life, and how they relate their
423 values to money.

424 Our analysis also has several strengths. There have not been many former attempts to study
425 associations with VSLY in LMICs, and none that we are aware of globally which have ascertained
426 associations with frailty in an ageing population. We used multiple ways of assessing VSLY in a
427 fairly large sample, and included a broad range of covariates into the analysis. We used a standard

428 way of evaluating frailty, including use of objective measures of physical performance; standard QOL
429 and disability tools, facilitating replication in other settings.

430 In conclusion, ageing is a neglected phenomenon in many LMICs, where research has tended to focus
431 on diseases of poverty and infectious diseases more common in younger people. This is especially the
432 case in low income countries (LICs), which are typically thought of as being less far along the
433 epidemiological transition [7]. However, our recent work has shown that populations in LICs suffer a
434 high burden of multimorbidity, which is associated with frailty [40, 41]. Whilst our findings suggest
435 that people who are frail place a lower value on their lives, and given that frailty status is dynamic, we
436 recommend that frailty status is taken into account when calculating VSLY to avoid older people
437 being “assigned” lower values than they should be.

438

439 [List of abbreviations](#)

440 VSLY: Value of Statistical Life Years

441 LMICs: Low- and Middle-Income Countries

442 MM: Multimorbidity

443 QOL: Quality Of Life

444 DAS: Disability Assessment Schedule

445

446 [References](#)

447 1. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. World

448 Population Ageing 2019 (ST/ESA/SER. A/444). 2020.

449 2. Hutubessy R, Chisholm D, Edejer TT. Generalized cost-effectiveness analysis for national-level

450 priority-setting in the health sector. *Cost Eff Resour Alloc.* 2003;1(1):8.

451 3. Kniesner TJ, Viscusi WK, Woock C, Ziliak JP. The value of a statistical life: Evidence from panel

452 data. *Review of Economics and Statistics.* 2012;94(1):74-87.

453 4. Sweis NJ. Revisiting the value of a statistical life: an international approach during COVID-19.

454 *2022;24(3):259-72.*

455 5. Viscusi WK, Aldy JE. The Value of a Statistical Life: A Critical Review of Market Estimates

456 Throughout the World. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty.* 2003;27(1):5-76.

457 6. Patenaude BN, Semali I, Killewo J, Bärnighausen T. The Value of a Statistical Life-Year in Sub-

458 Saharan Africa: Evidence From a Large Population-Based Survey in Tanzania. *Value Health Reg*

459 *Issues.* 2019;19:151-6.

460 7. Goodman-Palmer D, Ferriolli E, Gordon AL, Greig C, Hirschhorn LR, Ogunyemi AO, et al. Health

461 and wellbeing of older people in LMICs: a call for research-informed decision making. *The Lancet*

462 *Global Health.* 2023;11(2):e191-e2.

463 8. Aldy JE, Viscusi WK. Age Differences in the Value of Statistical Life: Revealed Preference

464 Evidence. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy.* 2007;1(2):241-60.

- 465 9. Trautmann ST, Xu Y, König-Kersting C, Patenaude BN, Harling G, Sié A, et al. Value of statistical
466 life year in extreme poverty: a randomized experiment of measurement methods in rural Burkina
467 Faso. *Population Health Metrics*. 2021;19(1):45.
- 468 10. Harling G, Morris KA, Manderson L, Perkins JM, Berkman LF. Age and Gender Differences in
469 Social Network Composition and Social Support Among Older Rural South Africans: Findings From
470 the HAALSI Study. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*. 2018;75(1):148-59.
- 471 11. Clegg A, Young J, Iliffe S, Rikkert MO, Rockwood K. Frailty in elderly people. *Lancet*.
472 2013;381(9868):752-62.
- 473 12. Kojima G, Iliffe S, Jivraj S, Walters K. Association between frailty and quality of life among
474 community-dwelling older people: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Epidemiol Community*
475 *Health*. 2016;70(7):716-21.
- 476 13. Brinkmann B, Davies JI, Witham MD, Harling G, Bärnighausen T, Bountogo M, et al.
477 Impairment in Activities of Daily Living and Unmet Need for Care Among Older Adults: A
478 Population-Based Study From Burkina Faso. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*.
479 2021;76(9):1880-92.
- 480 14. Ben B, Collin FP, Iliana K, Guy H, Justine D, Miles W, et al. Depressive symptoms and
481 cardiovascular disease: a population-based study of older adults in rural Burkina Faso. *BMJ Open*.
482 2020;10(12):e038199.
- 483 15. Odland ML, Payne C, Witham MD, Siedner MJ, Barnighausen T, Bountogo M, et al.
484 Epidemiology of multimorbidity in conditions of extreme poverty: a population-based study of older
485 adults in rural Burkina Faso. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2020;5(3):e002096.
- 486 16. Witham M, Davies J, Bärnighausen T, Bountogo M, Manne-Goehler J, Payne C, et al. Frailty and
487 physical performance in the context of extreme poverty: a population-based study of older adults in
488 rural Burkina Faso [version 1; peer review: 2 approved]. *Wellcome Open Research*. 2019;4(135).
- 489 17. Hammitt JK. Consistent valuation of a reduction in mortality risk using values per life, life year,
490 and quality-adjusted life year. *Health Econ*. 2023.

- 491 18. Hammitt JK, Haninger K. Valuing nonfatal health risk as a function of illness severity and
492 duration: Benefit transfer using QALYs. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*.
493 2017;82:17-38.
- 494 19. CHESTNUT LG, ROWE RD, BREFFLE WS. ECONOMIC VALUATION OF MORTALITY-
495 RISK REDUCTION: STATED PREFERENCE ESTIMATES FROM THE UNITED STATES AND
496 CANADA. *Contemporary Economic Policy*. 2012;30(3):399-416.
- 497 20. Whitaker J, Harling G, Sie A, Bountogo M, Hirschhorn LR, Manne-Goehler J, et al. Non-fatal
498 injuries in rural Burkina Faso amongst older adults, disease burden and health system responsiveness:
499 a cross-sectional household survey. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(5):e045621.
- 500 21. Witham MD, Davies JI, Bärnighausen T, Bountogo M, Manne-Goehler J, Payne CF, et al. Frailty
501 and physical performance in the context of extreme poverty: a population-based study of older adults
502 in rural Burkina Faso. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2019;4:135.
- 503 22. Baltussen RM, Ye Y, Haddad S, Sauerborn RS. Perceived quality of care of primary health care
504 services in Burkina Faso. *Health Policy Plan*. 2002;17(1):42-8.
- 505 23. Miller JS, Mhalu A, Chalamilla G, Siril H, Kaaya S, Tito J, et al. Patient satisfaction with
506 HIV/AIDS care at private clinics in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *AIDS Care*. 2014;26(9):1150-4.
- 507 24. Ratcliffe HL, Bell G, Awoonor-Williams K, Bitton A, Kim JH, Lipstiz S, et al. Towards patient-
508 centred care in Ghana: health system responsiveness, self-rated health and experiential quality in a
509 nationally representative survey. *BMJ Open Qual*. 2020;9(2).
- 510 25. Plummer F, Manea L, Trepel D, McMillan D. Screening for anxiety disorders with the GAD-7
511 and GAD-2: a systematic review and diagnostic metaanalysis. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*. 2016;39:24-31.
- 512 26. Radloff LS. The CES-D Scale:A Self-Report Depression Scale for Research in the General
513 Population. *Applied Psychological Measurement*. 1977;1(3):385-401.
- 514 27. Schmidt S, Mühlan H, Power M. The EUROHIS-QOL 8-item index: psychometric results of a
515 cross-cultural field study. *Eur J Public Health*. 2006;16(4):420-8.

- 516 28. Garin O, Ayuso-Mateos JL, Almansa J, Nieto M, Chatterji S, Vilagut G, et al. Validation of the
517 "World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule, WHODAS-2" in patients with chronic
518 diseases. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2010;8:51.
- 519 29. Goldberg EM, Bountogo M, Harling G, Baernighausen T, Davies JI, Hirschhorn LR. Older
520 persons experiences of healthcare in rural Burkina Faso: Results of a cross sectional household
521 survey. *PLOS Global Public Health*. 2022;2(6):e0000193.
- 522 30. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, Newman AB, Hirsch C, Gottdiener J, et al. Frailty in older
523 adults: evidence for a phenotype. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2001;56(3):M146-56.
- 524 31. Filmer D, Pritchett LH. Estimating wealth effects without expenditure data--or tears: an
525 application to educational enrollments in states of India. *Demography*. 2001;38(1):115-32.
- 526 32. Gomez-Olive FX, Schröders J, Aboderin I, Byass P, Chatterji S, Davies JI, et al. Variations in
527 disability and quality of life with age and sex between eight lower income and middle-income
528 countries: data from the INDEPTH WHO-SAGE collaboration. *BMJ Glob Health*.
529 2017;2(4):e000508.
- 530 33. Jamison DT, Summers LH, Alleyne G, Arrow KJ, Berkley S, Binagwaho A, et al. Global health
531 2035: a world converging within a generation. *Lancet*. 2013;382(9908):1898-955.
- 532 34. Scott AJ, Ellison M, Sinclair DA. The economic value of targeting aging. *Nat Aging*.
533 2021;1(7):616-23.
- 534 35. Anderson E-L. Sex for Well-being. In: Anderson E-L, editor. *Gender, HIV and Risk: Navigating*
535 *Structural Violence*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK; 2015. p. 96-122.
- 536 36. Steigenberger C, Flatscher-Thoeni M, Siebert U, Leiter AM. Determinants of willingness to pay
537 for health services: a systematic review of contingent valuation studies. *The European Journal of*
538 *Health Economics*. 2022;23(9):1455-82.
- 539 37. Chuck A, Adamowicz W, Jacobs P, Ohinmaa A, Dick B, Rashid S. The Willingness to Pay for
540 Reducing Pain and Pain-Related Disability. *Value in Health*. 2009;12(4):498-506.

- 541 38. Floyd SB, Oostdyk A, Cozad M, Brooks JM, Siffri P, Burnikel B. Assessing the Patient-Perceived
542 Monetary Value of Patient-Reported Outcome Improvement for Patients With Chronic Knee
543 Conditions. *J Patient Cent Res Rev*. 2021;8(2):98-106.
- 544 39. Odihi D, De Broucker G, Hasan Z, Ahmed S, Constenla D, Uddin J, et al. Contingent Valuation:
545 A Pilot Study for Eliciting Willingness to Pay for a Reduction in Mortality From Vaccine-Preventable
546 Illnesses for Children and Adults in Bangladesh. *Value in Health Regional Issues*. 2021;24:67-76.
- 547 40. Vetrano DL, Palmer K, Marengoni A, Marzetti E, Lattanzio F, Roller-Wirnsberger R, et al. Frailty
548 and Multimorbidity: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*.
549 2019;74(5):659-66.
- 550 41. Bao J, Chua K-C, Prina M, Prince M. Multimorbidity and care dependence in older adults: a
551 longitudinal analysis of findings from the 10/66 study. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19(1):585.
552
553