

**Title:** Using Latent Class Analysis to Identify Subgroups of Post-Operative Older Adults

**Authors:**

Kevin McLaughlin, DPT; Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

Amie Bettencourt, PhD; Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences

Daniel Young, DPT, PhD, University of Nevada Las Vegas, Department of Physical Therapy

Erik Hoyer, MD; Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

Michael Friedman, PT, MBA; Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

Elizabeth Colantuoni, PhD; Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Department of Biostatistics

Lee A. Goeddel, MD, MPH; Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine

Pedro Gozalo, PhD; Brown University School of Public Health, Department of Health Services, Policy and Practice

Correspondence and Reprints:

21 Kevin McLaughlin

22 600 N. Wolfe Street

23 Baltimore, MD 21287

24 [Kevin.mclaughlin@jhmi.edu](mailto:Kevin.mclaughlin@jhmi.edu)

25

26 Abstract word count: 252

27 Main text word count: 2,790

28

29 Funding Statement: Funding for this study was provided by the Learning Health

30 Systems Rehabilitation Research Network (LeaRRn) (NIH 5P2CHD101895-03)

## Abstract

Objective: Identify subgroups of postoperative older adults using electronic health record data.

Summary of Background Data: Postoperative older adults represent a vulnerable population who may benefit from tailored postoperative care pathways. Identifying clinical subgroups can inform the development of these pathways.

Methods: Retrospective cohort study of postoperative adults  $\geq 65$  years (N=2,036) from a single healthcare system. Latent class analysis was used to identify patient subgroups based on measures of frailty, mobility, activities of daily living, and general health status. Hospital outcomes were described among each subgroup, including extended lengths of stay (LOS) ( $>0.5$  SD beyond mean LOS by surgical category), discharge disposition (i.e., home versus non-home discharge), and utilization (weekly visit frequency) of physical therapy (PT) and occupational therapy (OT).

Results: We identified 3 subgroups that we labeled Low Frailty-High Mobility (LF-HM), High Frailty-Low Mobility (HF-LM), and Low Frailty-Low Mobility (LF-LM), representing 15.3%, 27.6%, and 57.1% of the cohort, respectively. Discharge to home was highest among the LF-HM group (99%), followed by LF-LM (96%), and HF-LM (77%). Extended LOS was most common among the HF-LM group (27%), followed by LF-LM (18%), and LF-HM (6%). PT and OT visit frequencies were highest in the HF-LM group followed by the LF-LM and LF-HM groups.

Conclusions: This study identified 3 subgroups of postoperative older adults using routinely collected patient data. These groups may help to identify patients with increased odds of non-home discharge, extended LOS, and higher utilization of PT and OT and may inform the development of tailored postoperative care pathways for older adults.

## Introduction

More than half of the 20 million surgeries performed each year in the US are for adults who will require an inpatient hospital stay.<sup>1</sup> Among these, older adults are at increased risk for extended hospital lengths of stay (LOS) and discharge to post-acute care facilities,<sup>2-7</sup> which conflict with patient preferences and contribute to increased cost of care.<sup>8-10</sup> Enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) pathways have been shown to improve clinical outcomes among post-operative older adults.<sup>11-15</sup> However, ERAS pathways typically include additional interventions or services (e.g., medication rehabilitation services), with associated costs, and not all patients are equally likely to benefit from these services. There is a need to better identify older adult patients at risk of poor post-operative outcomes to better target resources and tailor postoperative care pathways to the needs of individual patients.

Previous studies have identified individual patient-level factors associated with post-operative outcomes. For example, studies have found that pre-operative frailty is associated with increased risk for loss of independence following surgery, as well as longer LOS, among older adults.<sup>7,16</sup> Another study found that patients with lower levels of mobility one day after gastrointestinal surgery were more likely to experience an extended LOS.<sup>17</sup> Additional studies have observed associations between age, gender, body mass index, pre-operative function and American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) rating with post-operative outcomes following surgery.<sup>2,6,18,19</sup> However, few studies have examined preoperative and postoperative patient data in combination, which is likely to account for variability in patient outcomes better than preoperative or postoperative data alone.

Latent class analysis is a statistical approach that is increasingly being used to identify subgroups of patients within heterogenous clinical populations who have similar patterns of clinical outcome techniques.<sup>20–23</sup> Identifying subgroups in this manner is commonly used to inform the development of tailored or “precision” treatment approaches.<sup>20,23–26</sup> The purpose of this study was to identify subgroups of post-operative older adults using a latent class analysis of routinely collected patient-level data from a large academic health care system. We also examined differences in key post-operative outcomes among those in each of the identified latent subgroups.

## Methods

We utilized a retrospective cohort design to identify latent subgroups of older adults admitted to the hospital following surgery and to examine differences in hospital outcomes among those in each latent subgroup. Data for this study were collected during routine care encounters and extracted from the electronic health record (EHR) for analysis.

### *Patient Cohort*

We included older adults ( $\geq 65$ ) hospitalized at Johns Hopkins Hospital or Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center following inpatient surgery between September 2016 and March 2020. Eligible patients included those having any of the following surgical procedures: abdominal surgery, gynecologic surgery, pancreatic surgery, head & neck surgery, neurosurgery, orthopaedic surgery, plastic surgery, spine surgery, thoracic

surgery, urologic surgery, or vascular surgery. Individuals undergoing outpatient surgery were not included in our cohort.

### *Latent Class Indicators*

Based on previous evidence and standard data collection practices at our institution, we utilized patient age, general health status, frailty, mobility, and activities of daily living to identify latent subgroups of older adults after surgery.<sup>2,6,7,16–19</sup> General health status was measured prior to surgery by the anesthesiology team using the American Society of Anesthesiologists Physical Status Classification System (ASA PS Classification), a method used to succinctly assess and communicate patients' pre-anesthesia medical comorbidities.<sup>27</sup> ASA PS Classification scores range from 1 (normal health patient) to 6 (brain-dead). Frailty was measured at pre-operative appointments by nursing using the Edmonton Frail Scale (EFS), a valid and reliable measure of frailty with scores ranging from 0-17 and higher scores indicative of greater frailty.<sup>28,29</sup> Patient mobility function was assessed using the Activity Measure for Post-Acute Care (AM-PAC) Inpatient Basic Mobility "6-Clicks" Short Form.<sup>30,31</sup> Patient function in activities of daily living was measured using the AM-PAC Inpatient Daily Activity "6-Clicks" Short Form. Both AM-PAC short forms include 6 items scored by clinicians on a scale of 1-4 with lower scores indicating greater impairment. Raw scores were converted to t-scores and used in all analyses; these t-scores range from 16.6 to 57.7.<sup>32</sup> In our hospitals, AM-PAC short forms are scored daily by nursing and at all PT visits (mobility short form) and OT visits (daily activity short form). Previous studies have shown high interrater reliability across and within disciplines for these measures.<sup>33,34</sup> We utilized the first observed AM-PAC

mobility and daily activity scores recorded by either discipline following surgery for analysis.

### *Hospital Outcomes*

Hospital outcomes for this study included LOS, discharge disposition, and utilization of physical therapy (PT) and occupational therapy (OT) services. LOS was categorized as an extended LOS, defined as a LOS (days) that was  $\geq 0.5$  standard deviations above the mean LOS for each surgical category, or a non-extended LOS, defined as any LOS less than the extended LOS definition. Discharge disposition was categorized as home discharge or non-home discharge (e.g., skilled nursing facility, inpatient rehabilitation facility). PT and OT utilization were examined separately based on weekly visit frequency, which was identified based on the number of PT or OT visits received, divided by patients' LOS, and multiplied by 7.

### *Analysis*

Descriptive statistics were used to describe the sample. LCA was used to identify classes based on the continuous variables: age, AM-PAC mobility and AM-PAC daily activity scores, and dichotomized variables: ASA ratings, EFS total score, and individual EFS items (i.e., general health status, functional dependence, functional performance). ASA ratings were dichotomized to those patients who were healthy or with mild systemic disease (i.e., scores of 1-2) or patients with severe disease (i.e., scores of 3 and above). The general health status item on the EFS was dichotomized to those patients in good to excellent health or patients in fair to poor health. The functional

dependence criterion of the EFS was dichotomized to those who required help in 0-1 activities or those who required help in 2 or more activities. The functional performance criterion of the EFS was dichotomized to those who completed the timed up and go test in 0-10 seconds or for those who completed it in 11 or more seconds. All LCA models were estimated using Mplus, Version 8.6.<sup>35</sup> Fit statistics, classification accuracy and relative class size were considered in selecting the best fitting latent class model.

Model fit was measured using the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) and the sample size-adjusted BIC (aBIC).<sup>36</sup> For the BIC and aBIC, smaller values indicate better model fit. The Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin Likelihood Ratio Test (VLMR-LRT) was used to compare the relative fit of a model with  $k$  classes to a model with one fewer class. Significant  $p$  values for the VLMR-LRT indicate that the latent class solution with fewer classes should be rejected in support of the solution with more classes.<sup>36</sup> Entropy, ranging from 0 to 1, was also examined with larger values indicating better classification accuracy. Finally, class sizes were examined for each solution as simulation studies indicate that small or uncommon classes can be difficult to identify reliably and it is important to avoid over extracting classes.<sup>36</sup>

Once the unconditional latent class model was established, we used multinomial logistic regression to examine class differences in two dichotomous (i.e., discharge disposition, extended length of stay) and two continuous hospital outcomes (i.e., PT and OT weekly frequencies).

Next, the auxiliary function with Bolck, Croon and Hagenaars (BCH) weights was used to examine differences in the prevalence of these outcomes across classes. In the BCH approach, weights were applied to individual participants based on their posterior



probabilities of class membership and an overall test of equality as well as pairwise tests of prevalence differences across classes using one degree of freedom were conducted.<sup>35,37</sup>

## *Ethical Statement*

This study was acknowledged as exempt by the Johns Hopkins Medicine Institutional Review Board (IRB00337243). Data were collected for all participants under a waiver of consent.

## **Results**

We identified 2,036 older adults ( $\geq 65$ ) hospitalized after eligible surgical procedures between September 2016 and March 2022. Our cohort was 45% female and the majority of patients were White (76.6%) or Black (16.1%). The average length of stay among included patients was 4.4 days (SD: 4.4). Length of stay varied by surgical category, from 2.8 days (SD: 3.3) in urologic surgery to 8.5 days (SD: 5.7) in pancreatic/hepatobiliary surgery. The most common surgical categories were abdominal surgery (21.2%) and urologic surgery (20.3%) (Table 1).

For our LCA, comparison of the fit statistics, classification quality, and class size for solutions specifying one to eight classes suggested several reasonable models (see Table 2). Although the eight-class model had the lowest BIC and aBIC values, the scree plot indicated that minimal benefit of extending the model beyond five- or six- classes

(visualized as the line flattening between the models with five or six classes indicating minimal decrease in BIC and aBIC for models with more than 6 classes). The VLMR indicated that a four-class model fit the data better than a three-class model and a five-class model fit better than a four-class model but adding a sixth class did not improve model fit. However, the smallest class in the four-class model included only 2-3% of the sample (33-57 people) suggesting that these patients were outliers on each of the measures, and not a particularly clinically meaningful class. Based on all of these considerations, we selected the three-class model as the best fitting model and further analyses focused on that solution.

Based on the characteristics of the members of each of the identified classes, we labeled the 3 identified classes as the Low Frailty-High Mobility (LF-HM) class (15.3%), the High Frailty-Low Mobility (HF-LM) class (27.6%), and the Low Frailty-Low Mobility (LF-LM) class (57.1%) (Table 3). Age was similar between the LF-HM and LF-LM classes (71.6 and 72.5 years, respectively), but was higher in the HF-LM class (75.0 years). Frailty scores were similar in the LF-HM class (2.6) and LF-LM class (2.2) but were notably higher among those in the HF-LM class. Mean AM-PAC mobility scores were highest in the LF-HM class (54.2), followed by the LF-LM class (41.6), and HF-LM class (37.7). AM-PAC daily activity scores followed a similar pattern with mean scores of 54.8, 40.7, and 37.5 in the LF-HM, LF-LM, and HF-LM classes, respectively. ASA also differed by class with the HF-LM class having the highest probability (0.87) of receiving an ASA rating of 3 or higher and the LF-HM and LF-LM having similar but lower probabilities of receiving an ASA rating of 3 or higher (0.64 and 0.67, respectively). Individual EFS items also differed by class. Specifically, individuals in the

HF-LM had a much higher probability of having fair to poor health status, being functionally dependent, and requiring more than 10 seconds to complete the up and go test as compared to the LF-HM and LF-LM classes.

Class membership varied by surgical category (Figure 1). For example, the LF-HM class was most represented among those undergoing head & neck surgery (32%) and was least represented among those undergoing hepatobiliary/pancreatic surgery (2%). The HF-LM class was most represented among those undergoing vascular surgery (50%) and least represented by those undergoing urologic surgery (12%). Finally, the LF-LM class was most represented by those undergoing hepatobiliary/pancreatic surgery (69%) and least among those undergoing plastic surgery (38%).

All hospital outcomes of interest were significantly different by class ( $p < 0.001$ ) (Table 3). The proportion of those discharged home was 99% in the LF-HM class, 96% in the LF-LM class, and 77% in the HF-LM class. We observed that the percentage of patients experiencing an extended LOS was highest in the HF-LM class (27%), followed by the LF-LM class (18%), and the LF-HM class (6%). PT and OT visit frequencies were highest in HF-LM class (PT: 2.1 visits/week; OT: 1.1 visits/week), followed by the LF-LM class (PT: 1.2 visits/week; OT: 0.5 visit/week), and the LF-HM class (PT: 0.3 visits/week; OT: 0.1 visits/week).

## Discussion

The results of this study indicate that LCA may be a useful approach for identifying latent subgroups of post-operative older adults, a large patient population vulnerable to

poor outcomes. We specifically identified three latent subgroups of post-operative older adults, which we have labeled as Low Frailty-High Mobility (LF-HM) (15.3%), High Frailty-Low Mobility (HF-LM) (27.6%), and Low-Frailty-Low Mobility (LF-LM) (57.1%). These subgroups were present within each of the included surgical categories, although the proportion of patients belonging to each subgroup varied by type of surgery. Furthermore, patients in each subgroup differed significantly from one another in discharge disposition, LOS, and utilization of PT and OT services.

The classes identified in this study align with clinical reasoning and highlight the importance of physical function in the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) domains of mobility and self-care (activities of daily living).<sup>38</sup> It was not surprising to us that our analysis identified a subgroup of patients (HF-LM) with poorer general health, higher frailty scores, and lower physical function and that these patients were more commonly discharged to post-acute care and experienced higher rates of extended LOS. Likewise, it stands to reason that our analysis identified another class of patients (LF-HM) that were generally healthy, had low frailty scores, had high mobility and daily activity function scores, were nearly always discharged home and rarely experienced an extended LOS. However, less expected was the identification of the LF-LM class, which is similar to the LF-HM group for all class identifiers, with the exception of AM-PAC scores which are both lower in the LF-LM class compared to the LF-HM class. Despite only this difference between groups, the LF-LM class experienced extended LOS rates 3 times higher and utilized 4-5 times as many PT and OT visits per week compared to the LF-HM class. These findings align with previous studies that have highlighted the influence of patient mobility and daily

activity function on hospital outcomes and the importance of measuring these items as part of routine care.<sup>17,39–41</sup>

The findings of this study may be useful for the development of tailored postoperative pathways that facilitate more efficient use of hospital services and increase the overall value of postoperative care. For example, we observed that 99% of those in the LF-HM class were discharged home and only 6% experienced extended LOS. On the other hand, those in the HF-LM class were discharged home only 77% of the time and 27% of these patients experienced an extended LOS. In this scenario, it could be argued that services such as PT and OT consults provided to those in the HF-LM class are of greater value, given these patients are at greater risk of undesired outcomes. Similar concepts have been proposed using AM-PAC scores alone, which were shown to have the potential to reduce low-value PT and OT consults among patients admitted to the hospital for medical diagnoses.<sup>42</sup> This study expands on this approach by examining the influence of multiple patient factors on key outcomes and by identifying patient subgroups that can inform tailored postoperative care pathways.

The classes identified in this study, while corresponding to one institution, are likely generalizable to other institutions performing surgery among older adults seeking to identify clinical subgroups. Importantly, this study was conducted exclusively using routinely collected data extracted from the EHR. While this increases the overall feasibility of the study performed, it does place additional emphasis on the identification and selection of clinical measures, as well as systematic collection and documentation of these measures. Previous publications can provide guidance on the process of

selecting outcome measures for healthcare systems seeking to implement or refine data collection strategies.<sup>43,44</sup>

Strengths of this study include a large patient sample that have undergone a wide variety of surgical procedures. This study also utilized data elements that are routinely collected at many hospitals, increasing the generalizability of our results. There are also limitations to this study that should be considered when interpreting results. It is likely that there are factors not measured routinely in our healthcare system that would have altered the subgroups identified in this study had they been included in our analysis. For example, social determinants of health and mental health (i.e., depression) have been shown to influence LOS and discharge disposition among hospitalized patients and may have altered the composition of the classes we identified.<sup>45–49</sup> Our analysis was also performed specifically among older adults after surgery and it is possible that this affects the generalizability of our results to other populations, such as postoperative adults under 65 years of age.

## *Conclusion*

We identified three clinically relevant subgroups of postoperative older adults based on data routinely collected in the EHR. We observed significant differences in the proportion of patients discharged to home, the proportion with extended LOS, and utilization of PT and OT services between each of the groups. The design and results of this study may inform the development of more patient-centered care pathways after surgery that maximize patient outcomes and thus the value of postoperative hospital services.

## Author Contributions

KM wrote the primary manuscript draft. AB led the analysis of study data. EH and LG assisted with extraction of clinical data from the medical record. All authors contributed to idea development, provided manuscript revisions, and approved of the final manuscript.

## Funding Information

Funding for this study was provided by the Learning Health Systems Rehabilitation Research Network (LeaRRn) (NIH 5P2CHD101895-03)

## Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors have no financial or personal conflicts to disclose.

## Sponsor's Role

The sponsor had no role in the design of the study, data acquisition, analysis, interpretation of results, or writing of the manuscript.

## References

1. Inpatient vs. Outpatient Surgeries. Accessed October 5, 2021.  
<http://www.ahrq.gov/data/infographics/outpatient-surgery.html>
2. Collins TC, Daley J, Henderson WH, Khuri SF. Risk Factors for Prolonged Length of Stay After Major Elective Surgery. *Ann Surg.* 1999;230(2):251.
3. Clark DE, Ryan LM. Concurrent Prediction of Hospital Mortality and Length of Stay from Risk Factors on Admission. *Health Services Research.* 2002;37(3):631-645. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.00041
4. Cleveland Clinic Orthopaedic Arthroplasty Group. The Main Predictors of Length of Stay After Total Knee Arthroplasty: Patient-Related or Procedure-Related Risk Factors. *JBJS.* 2019;101(12):1093-1101. doi:10.2106/JBJS.18.00758
5. Karhade AV, Ogink PT, Thio QCBS, et al. Discharge Disposition After Anterior Cervical Discectomy and Fusion. *World Neurosurgery.* 2019;132:e14-e20. doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2019.09.026
6. Al-Mazrou AM, Chiuzan C, Kiran RP. Factors influencing discharge disposition after colectomy. *Surg Endosc.* 2018;32(7):3032-3040. doi:10.1007/s00464-017-6013-z
7. Goeddel LA, Murphy Z, Owodunni O, et al. Domains of Frailty Predict Loss of Independence in Older Adults After Noncardiac Surgery. *Annals of Surgery.* 2023;278(2):e226. doi:10.1097/SLA.0000000000005720
8. Henry L, Halpin L, Hunt S, Holmes SD, Ad N. Patient disposition and long-term outcomes after valve surgery in octogenarians. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2012;94(3):744-750. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2012.04.073
9. Lala A, Chang HL, Liu X, et al. Risk for non-home discharge following surgery for ischemic mitral valve disease. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* Published online March 4, 2020:S0022-5223(20)30524-9. doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2020.02.084
10. Okoh AK, Haik N, Singh S, et al. Discharge disposition of older patients undergoing trans-catheter aortic valve replacement and its impact on survival. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2019;94(3):448-455. doi:10.1002/ccd.28069
11. Ljungqvist O, Scott M, Fearon KC. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery: A Review. *JAMA Surg.* 2017;152(3):292-298. doi:10.1001/jamasurg.2016.4952
12. Baxter R, Squiers J, Conner W, et al. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery: A Narrative Review of its Application in Cardiac Surgery. *Ann Thorac Surg.* Published online December 23, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2019.11.008



13. Lirosi MC, Tirelli F, Biondi A, et al. Enhanced Recovery Program for Colorectal Surgery: a Focus on Elderly Patients Over 75 Years Old. *J Gastrointest Surg*. 2019;23(3):587-594. doi:10.1007/s11605-018-3943-2
14. Tan P, Huo M, Zhou X, Zhao B. The safety and effectiveness of enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) in older patients undergoing orthopedic surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*. 2023;143(11):6535-6545. doi:10.1007/s00402-023-04963-2
15. Tong Y, Fernandez L, Bendo JA, Spivak JM. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery Trends in Adult Spine Surgery: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Spine Surgery*. 2020;14(4):623-640. doi:10.14444/7083
16. Mrdutt MM, Papaconstantinou HT, Robinson BD, Bird ET, Isbell CL. Preoperative Frailty and Surgical Outcomes Across Diverse Surgical Subspecialties in a Large Health Care System. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*. 2019;228(4):482-490. doi:10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2018.12.036
17. Carroll GM, Hampton J, Carroll R, Smith SR. Mobility scores as a predictor of length of stay in general surgery: a prospective cohort study. *ANZ Journal of Surgery*. 2018;88(9):860-864. doi:10.1111/ans.14555
18. Chen Y, Scholten A, Chomsky-Higgins K, et al. Risk Factors Associated With Perioperative Complications and Prolonged Length of Stay After Laparoscopic Adrenalectomy. *JAMA Surgery*. 2018;153(11):1036-1041. doi:10.1001/jamasurg.2018.2648
19. Shah A, Memon M, Kay J, Wood TJ, Tushinski DM, Khanna V. Preoperative Patient Factors Affecting Length of Stay following Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *The Journal of Arthroplasty*. 2019;34(9):2124-2165.e1. doi:10.1016/j.arth.2019.04.048
20. Grant RW, McCloskey J, Hatfield M, et al. Use of Latent Class Analysis and k-Means Clustering to Identify Complex Patient Profiles. *JAMA Network Open*. 2020;3(12):e2029068. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.29068
21. Smeets RGM, Elissen AMJ, Kroese MEAL, Hameleers N, Ruwaard D. Identifying subgroups of high-need, high-cost, chronically ill patients in primary care: A latent class analysis. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15(1):e0228103. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0228103
22. Vermunt JK, Magidson J. Latent Class Cluster Analysis. In: McCutcheon AL, Hagenars JA, eds. *Applied Latent Class Analysis*. Cambridge University Press; 2002:89-106. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511499531.004
23. Mori M, Krumholz HM, Allore HG. Using Latent Class Analysis to Identify Hidden Clinical Phenotypes. *JAMA*. 2020;324(7):700-701. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2278

24. Dandis R, Westeneng JM, Inthout J, et al. Latent Class Analysis to Predict Outcomes of Early High-Intensity Physical Therapy After Total Knee Arthroplasty, Based on Longitudinal Trajectories of Walking Speed. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2021;51(7):362-371. doi:10.2519/jospt.2021.10299
25. Ulbricht CM, Chrysanthopoulou SA, Levin L, Lapane KL. The use of latent class analysis for identifying subtypes of depression: A systematic review. *Psychiatry Research.* 2018;266:228-246. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2018.03.003
26. Neumann M, Wirtz M, Ernstmann N, et al. Identifying and predicting subgroups of information needs among cancer patients: an initial study using latent class analysis. *Support Care Cancer.* 2011;19(8):1197-1209. doi:10.1007/s00520-010-0939-1
27. Statement on ASA Physical Status Classification System. American Society of Anesthesiologists. Accessed April 23, 2024. <https://www.asahq.org/standards-and-practice-parameters/statement-on-asa-physical-status-classification-system>
28. He Y, Li LW, Hao Y, et al. Assessment of predictive validity and feasibility of Edmonton Frail Scale in identifying postoperative complications among elderly patients: a prospective observational study. *Sci Rep.* 2020;10(1):14682. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-71140-5
29. Rolfson DB, Majumdar SR, Tsuyuki RT, Tahir A, Rockwood K. Validity and reliability of the Edmonton Frail Scale. *Age Ageing.* 2006;35(5):526-529. doi:10.1093/ageing/afl041
30. Tevald MA, Clancy MJ, Butler K, Drollinger M, Adler J, Malone D. AM-PAC “6-Clicks” for the Prediction of Short Term Clinical Outcomes in Individuals Hospitalized with COVID-19: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation.* 2021;0(0). doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2021.08.006
31. Hull BL, Thut MC. A Simple Tool Using AM-PAC “6-Clicks” to Measure Value Added in Acute Care Physical Therapy: The Therapy Value Quotient. *Journal of Acute Care Physical Therapy.* 2018;9(4):155-162. doi:10.1097/JAT.0000000000000082
32. Haley SM, Coster WJ, Andres PL, Kosinski M, Ni P. Score comparability of short forms and computerized adaptive testing: simulation study with the activity measure for post-acute care 1. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation.* 2004;85(4):661-666. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2003.08.097
33. Jette D, Stilphen M, Ranganathan VK, Passek S, Frost FS, Jette AM. Interrater Reliability of AM-PAC “6-Clicks” Basic Mobility and Daily Activity Short Forms. *Physical therapy.* 2015;95(5):758-766. doi:10.2522/ptj.20140174
34. Hoyer EH, Young DL, Klein LM, et al. Toward a Common Language for Measuring Patient Mobility in the Hospital: Reliability and Construct Validity of

interprofessional Mobility Measures. *Phys Ther*. Published online November 2, 2017. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzx110

35. Linda K. Muthen, Bengt O. Muthen. *Mplus User's Guide*. Eighth. Muthen & Muthen

36. Nylund KL, Asparouhov T, Muthén BO. Deciding on the Number of Classes in Latent Class Analysis and Growth Mixture Modeling: A Monte Carlo Simulation Study. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*. 2007;14(4):535-569. doi:10.1080/10705510701575396

37. Asparouhov, T, Muthén, B. Auxiliary variables in mixture modeling: Using the BCH method in Mplus to estimate a distal outcome model and an arbitrary secondary model. 2016. Accessed April 26, 2024. <https://www.statmodel.com/example/webnotes/webnote21.pdf>.

38. Boonen A, Maksymowych WP. Measurement: function and mobility (focussing on the ICF framework). *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol*. 2010;24(5):605-624. doi:10.1016/j.berh.2010.05.008

39. Menendez ME, Schumacher CS, Ring D, Freiberg AA, Rubash HE, Kwon YM. Does “6-Clicks” Day 1 Postoperative Mobility Score Predict Discharge Disposition After Total Hip and Knee Arthroplasties? *The Journal of Arthroplasty*. 2016;31(9):1916-1920. doi:10.1016/j.arth.2016.02.017

40. Blackwood J, Fernandez N. AM-PAC 6-Clicks Scores Predict Hospital Discharge Destination In Older Adults With Cardiovascular Disease (poster). *Innov Aging*. 2018;2(Suppl 1):489. doi:10.1093/geroni/igy023.1824

41. McLaughlin KH, Friedman M, Hoyer EH, et al. The Johns Hopkins Activity and Mobility Promotion Program: A Framework to Increase Activity and Mobility Among Hospitalized Patients. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*. 2023;38(2):164. doi:10.1097/NCQ.0000000000000678

42. Capo-Lugo CE, McLaughlin KH, Ye B, et al. Using Nursing Assessments of Mobility and Activity to Prioritize Patients Most Likely to Need Rehabilitation Services. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2023;104(9):1402-1408. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2023.03.018

43. Bull C, Teede H, Watson D, Callander EJ. Selecting and Implementing Patient-Reported Outcome and Experience Measures to Assess Health System Performance. *JAMA Health Forum*. 2022;3(4):e220326. doi:10.1001/jamahealthforum.2022.0326

44. Franklin P, Chenok K, Lavalee D, et al. Framework To Guide The Collection And Use Of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures In The Learning Healthcare System. *EGEMS (Wash DC)*. 5(1):17. doi:10.5334/egems.227

45. Delanois RE, Tarazi JM, Wilkie WA, et al. Social determinants of health in total knee arthroplasty: are social factors associated with increased 30-day post-discharge cost of care and length of stay? *The Bone & Joint Journal*. 2021;103-B(6 Supple A):113-118. doi:10.1302/0301-620X.103B6.BJJ-2020-2430.R1
46. Segar MW, Keshvani N, Rao S, Fonarow GC, Das SR, Pandey A. Race, Social Determinants of Health, and Length of Stay Among Hospitalized Patients With Heart Failure: An Analysis From the Get With The Guidelines-Heart Failure Registry. *Circulation: Heart Failure*. 2022;15(11):e009401. doi:10.1161/CIRCHEARTFAILURE.121.009401
47. Nguyen TA, Page A, Aggarwal A, Henke P. Social Determinants of Discharge Destination for Patients After Stroke With Low Admission FIM Instrument Scores. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2007;88(6):740-744. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2007.03.011
48. Beeler PE, Cheetham M, Held U, Battegay E. Depression is independently associated with increased length of stay and readmissions in multimorbid inpatients. *European Journal of Internal Medicine*. 2020;73:59-66. doi:10.1016/j.ejim.2019.11.012
49. Oh C, Gold H, Slover J. Diagnosis of depression and other patient factors impacts length of stay after total knee arthroplasty. *Arthroplasty Today*. 2020;6(1):77-80. doi:10.1016/j.artd.2019.11.010

**Table 1. Cohort Description**

<b>Age</b> , mean (SD)	73.0 (5.9)
<b>Female</b> , No. (%)	917 (45.0)
<b>Race</b> , No. (%)	
White	1559 (76.6)
Black	328 (16.1)
Asian	70 (3.4)
Other	79 (3.9)
<b>Ethnicity</b> , No. (%)	
Hispanic	46 (2.3)
Non-Hispanic	1973 (96.9)
Other/unknown	17 (0.8)
<b>Length of stay (days)</b> , mean (SD)	4.4 (4.4)
<b>Surgical specialty</b> , No. (%)	
Abdominal	432 (21.2)
Gynecology	89 (4.4)
Hepatobiliary/pancreatic	239 (11.7)
Head and neck	59 (2.9)
Neurosurgery	194 (9.5)
Orthopaedics	100 (4.9)
Plastics	65 (3.2)
Spine	287 (14.1)
Thoracic	99 (4.9)
Urology	414 (20.3)
Vascular	58 (2.8)
<b>Total</b> , No.	2036

**Table 2. Fit Indices for Latent Class Models**

# Classes	LL-value	# of free Parameter s	BIC	aBIC	VLMR- LRT	VLMR- LRT <i>p value</i>	Entropy	Smallest class n (%)
1	-30253	12	60597	60559	---	---	---	---
2	-29179	21	58518	58452	2147.6	0.00	0.80	630 (30.9)
3	-28718	30	57664	57568	923.2	0.00	0.83	311 (15.3)
4	-28319	39	56936	56812	796.3	0.00	0.88	57 (2.8)
5	-28108	48	56583	56430	421.9	0.00	0.84	48 (2.3)
6	-27935	57	56305	56124	346.00	0.40	0.85	34 (1.7)
7	-27808	66	56119	55910	254.34	0.12	0.85	34 (1.7)
8	-27706	75	55983	55745	204.98	0.15	0.85	33 (1.6)

LL-value = Log-likelihood value. BIC = Bayesian information criterion. aBIC = sample size adjusted BIC. VLMR-LRT = Veong Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test. VLMR-LRT and entropy are not applicable for the 1-class model.

	Low Frailty-High Mobility (15.3%)	High Frailty-Low Mobility (27.6%)	Low Frailty-Low Mobility (57.1%)	
Class Indicators	Age	71.59	75.03	72.46
	EFS Total Score, mean	2.57	6.46	2.20
	AMPAC Mobility t-score, mean	54.24	37.68	41.59
	AMPAC Daily activity t-score, mean	54.78	37.53	40.68
	ASA Rating 1-2, (%)	0.36	0.13	0.33
	ASA Rating 3-4, (%)	0.64	0.87	0.67
	Health status -0, (%)	0.75	0.27	0.79
	Health status -1-2, (%)	0.25	0.73	0.21
	Functional dependence -0, (%)	0.96	0.49	0.98
	Functional dependence -1-2, (%)	0.05	0.51	0.02
	Functional performance -0, (%)	0.70	0.15	0.74
	Functional performance -1-2, (%)	0.30	0.85	0.26
Hospital Outcomes	Discharge to home, % (SE)	99 (1)†	77 (2)†	96 (1)†
	Extended length of stay*, % (SE)	6 (2)†	27 (2)†	18 (1)†
	Physical therapy visits (per week), mean (SE)	0.3 (0.07)†	2.1 (0.10)†	1.2 (0.06)†
	Occupational therapy visits (per week), mean (SE)	0.1 (0.04)†	1.1 (0.07)†	0.5 (0.04)†

**Table 3: Description of Identified Classes and Outcomes of Class Membership (N=2036)**

N=2,036.

*Note:* For categorical hospital outcomes, values by class represent proportions. For continuous outcomes values represent means.

†Significantly different compared to other classes in row ( $p < 0.001$ )

\*Represents a length of stay  $\geq 1$  SD above mean length of stay (days), by surgical category

493

494 **Figure 1: Class Membership by Surgical Category**

495

496 HB: hepatobiliary

497



Percentage of Patients by Class and Specialty

