



University of Dundee

Predicting risk of unplanned hospital readmission in survivors of critical illness

Lone, Nazir; Lee, Robert ; Salisbury, Lisa; Donaghy, Eddie; Ramsay, Pamela; Rattray, Janice

Published in:
Thorax

DOI:
[10.1136/thoraxjnl-2017-210822](https://doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2017-210822)

Publication date:
2019

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Lone, N., Lee, R., Salisbury, L., Donaghy, E., Ramsay, P., Rattray, J., & Walsh, T. S. (2019). Predicting risk of unplanned hospital readmission in survivors of critical illness: a population-level cohort study. *Thorax*, *74*(11), 1046-1054. <https://doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2017-210822>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Predicting risk of unplanned hospital readmission in survivors of critical illness: a population-level cohort study

Nazir I Lone PhD^{1,2}, Robert Lee MSc², Lisa Salisbury PhD^{1,3}, Eddie Donaghy PhD^{1,4}, Pamela Ramsay PhD^{1,5}, Janice Rattray PhD⁶, Timothy S Walsh MD^{1,2,4}

1 University Department of Anaesthesia, Critical Care, and Pain Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences, University of Edinburgh, 47 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4SA, UK.

2 Usher Institute for Population Health Sciences and Informatics, University of Edinburgh, Teviot Place, Edinburgh, EH8 9AG, UK.

3 Queen Margaret University Edinburgh, Queen Margaret Drive, Musselburgh, EH21 6UU, UK.

4 MRC Centre for Inflammation Research, University of Edinburgh, 47 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4TJ, UK.

5 Edinburgh Napier University, 219 Colinton Rd, Edinburgh EH14 1DJ, UK.

6 School of Nursing and Health Sciences, University of Dundee, 11 Airlie Place, Dundee, DD1 4HJ

Corresponding author and institution where work was performed

Dr Nazir Lone, University Department of Anaesthesia, Critical Care, and Pain Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences, University of Edinburgh, 47 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4SA. Email: {
HYPERLINK "mailto:twalsh@staffmail.ed.ac.uk" } Phone: +44 131 242 6395

Word count

3689

Online supplement

This article has an online data supplement.

Key words

Intensive care; critical care; patient readmission; hospitalization; outcome

Abstract

Background

Intensive care unit survivors experience high levels of morbidity after hospital discharge and are at high risk of unplanned hospital readmission. Identifying those at highest-risk before hospital discharge may allow targeting of novel risk reduction strategies. We aimed to identify risk factors for unplanned 90-day readmission, develop a risk prediction model and assess its performance to screen for ICU survivors at highest readmission risk.

Methods

Population cohort study linking registry data for patients discharged from general ICUs in Scotland (2005-2013). Independent risk factors for 90-day readmission and discriminant ability (c-index) of groups of variables were identified using multivariable logistic regression. Derivation and validation risk prediction models were constructed using a time-based split.

Results

Of 55,975 ICU survivors, 24.1% (95%CI 23.7%,24.4%) had unplanned 90-day readmission. Pre-existing health factors were fair discriminators of readmission (c-index 0.63,95%CI 0.63,0.64), but better than acute illness factors (0.60) or demographics (0.54). In a subgroup of those with no comorbidity, acute illness factors (0.62) were better discriminators than pre-existing health factors (0.56). Overall model performance and calibration in the validation cohort was fair (0.65,95%CI 0.64,0.66) but did not perform sufficiently well as a screening tool, demonstrating high false positive/false negative rates at clinically relevant thresholds.

Conclusions

Unplanned 90-day hospital readmission is common. Pre-existing illness indices are better predictors of readmission than acute illness factors. Identifying additional patient-centred drivers of readmission may improve risk prediction models. Improved understanding of risk factors that are amenable to intervention could improve the clinical and cost-effectiveness of post-ICU care and rehabilitation.

Word count: 250

Key points

What is the key question?

What is the relative importance of risk factors for unplanned 90-day readmission in ICU survivors and can those at highest risk of readmission be screened for using risk prediction models?

What is the bottom line?

24.1% of ICU survivors had unplanned 90-day readmission. Pre-existing illness indices were better predictors of readmission than acute illness factors but this was reversed in the subgroup with no recorded comorbidity. Discriminant ability of the overall risk prediction model was fair (c-index 0.65) but the model did not perform sufficiently well as a screening tool at clinically relevant probability thresholds.

Why read on?

The high unplanned hospital readmission rates we report in ICU survivors are similar to those with chronic diseases. We provide a comprehensive evaluation of drivers for readmission and highlight the importance of pre-illness health factors in post-ICU morbidity.

Introduction

Unplanned hospital readmissions within 30 days are estimated to cost the health service in England over £2 billion per year and over \$17 billion per year in US Medicare expenditure. { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} Reduction strategies targeting readmissions have therefore been a focus for policy makers through quality improvement activities and financial penalties. { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} ICU survivors are known to experience increased mortality, use more acute hospital resource and reduced quality of life in the years following hospital discharge. { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} This increased morbidity has been termed the 'post-intensive care syndrome' and may leave ICU survivors and their care-givers with less resilience to new acute stressors as well as persisting problems related to the acute critical illness. { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}

Unplanned hospital readmission is a potentially useful outcome measure in ICU survivor populations. It is easy to measure in linked information systems, is associated with increased costs, and may reflect the effectiveness of rehabilitation interventions, which are increasingly considered a standard of care following critical illness { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Tan</Author><Year>2009</Year><RecNum>94</RecNum><DisplayText>(10)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>94</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="wst9aeeppzfrseov2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1476373228">94</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Tan, T.</author><author>Brett, S. J.</author><author>Stokes, T.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Centre for Clinical Practice, National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, Manchester M1 4BD.</auth-address><titles><title>Rehabilitation after critical illness: summary of NICE guidance</title><secondary-title>Bmj</secondary-title><alt-title>BMJ (Clinical research ed.)</alt-title></titles><periodical><full-title>BMJ</full-title></periodical><pages>b822</pages><volume>338</volume><edition>2009/03/27</edition><keywords><keyword>Community Health Services/organization &

administration</keyword><keyword>Continuity of Patient Care</keyword><keyword>Critical
Care</keyword><keyword>Critical
Illness/*rehabilitation</keyword><keyword>Humans</keyword><keyword>Patient
Discharge</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2009</year></dates><isbn>0959-
535x</isbn><accession-num>19321554</accession-num><urls></urls><electronic-resource-
num>10.1136/bmj.b822</electronic-resource-num><remote-database-provider>NLM</remote-
database-provider><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>} despite recent
conflicting trial evidence.{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} However, the validity of
unplanned readmission as an outcome measure requires an understanding of contributing factors,
especially those that are potentially modifiable by intervention within survivor populations.

Although statistical models have been developed to predict readmission risk for many hospitalised
patient groups,{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} none have specifically assessed ICU
populations with risk factors related to the critical illness episode e.g. organ dysfunction. An ICU-
specific model could potentially identify survivors at high risk, and might enable screening of
survivors before hospital discharge in whom to target novel risk reduction strategies.

As part of a mixed-methods programme exploring drivers of unplanned readmission following
critical illness{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}, we undertook a national cohort study to
quantify the proportion of ICU survivors experiencing readmission within 90 days of discharge and
identify risk factors for 90-day readmission. We also aimed to develop a risk prediction model and
assess its performance as a screening tool to identify ICU survivors at highest readmission risk.

Methods

Approvals

This study gained approval from the Privacy Advisory Committee of NHS National Services Scotland (Reference PAC 12/14). South East Scotland Research Ethics Committee granted a waiver (Reference NR/1403AB5). All data were anonymised and analysed in a safe haven environment.

Study setting and databases

We used a cohort study design. Data sources were linked registries: Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group (SICSAG),{ ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>SICSAG</Author><Year>2016</Year><RecNum>65</RecNum><DisplayText>(16)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>65</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="wst9aeepzfrseov2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1475575083">65</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Web Page">12</ref-

type><contributors><authors><author>SICSAG,</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group Annual Report: Audit of Intensive Care Units in Scotland 2016 Reporting on

2015</title></titles><number>04/10/2016</number><dates><year>2016</year></dates><pub-location>Edinburgh</pub-location><publisher>ISD Scotland Publications</publisher><urls><related-urls><url>[http://www.sicsag.scot.nhs.uk/docs/2016-08-09-SICSAG-Publication-](http://www.sicsag.scot.nhs.uk/docs/2016-08-09-SICSAG-Publication-Report.pdf)

Report.pdf</url></related-urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} Scottish Morbidity Record of acute hospital admissions (SMR01), Scottish death records, acute psychiatric hospital admissions (SMR04), Scottish Cancer Registry, and Scottish outpatient registry (SMR00). The SICSAG audit registry captures all adult general intensive care activity (24 units in 2013) serving a population of around 5 million (4.2 million aged ≥16) within Scotland and is subject to regular validation assessments.{ ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>SICSAG</Author><Year>2017</Year><RecNum>110</RecNum><DisplayT

ext>(17)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>110</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="wst9aeezfrseoev2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1491472642">110</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Web Page">12</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>SICSAG,</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group Annual Report: Data Quality</title></titles><number>06/04/2017</number><dates><year>2017</year></dates><urls><related-urls><url>http://www.sicsag.scot.nhs.uk/quality/data.html</url></related-urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} See Supplement health service setting details.

Participants

The cohort comprised Scottish residents aged ≥ 16 admitted to and discharged from general ICUs in Scotland (01/01/2005-31/12/2013) who survived to hospital discharge. For analyses to identify predictors of readmission, the whole cohort was used. For analyses relating to the risk prediction model construction, a time-based partition of the dataset was used to create two groups: discharge from index hospital stay 01/01/2005-17/01/2012, derivation cohort (70%); 18/01/2012-31/12/2013, validation cohort (30%). For analyses demonstrating the performance of the risk prediction model as a screening tool, the validation cohort was used.

Variables

Outcomes: The primary outcome was first unplanned hospital readmission within 90 days of discharge from index hospitalisation. Second and subsequent readmissions were not included. We chose this time-point as the survivorship literature shows a longer period 'at risk', both for increased mortality and hospital resource use. { ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} 'Unplanned hospital admission' was defined using 'emergency admission' codes in the 'Admission Type' field in SMR01 database (accuracy >93% in validation reports). { ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>NSS</Author><Year>2015</Year><RecNum>111</RecNum><DisplayText>(18)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>111</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-

id="wst9aeezfrseov2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1491473008">111</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Web Page">12</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>NSS,</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Assessment of SMR01 Data Scotland 2014-2015</title></titles><number>06/04/2017</number><dates><year>2015</year></dates><pub-location>Edinburgh</pub-location><publisher>NHS National Services Scotland Publications</publisher><work-type>Online</work-type><urls><related-urls><url><http://www.isdscotland.org/Health-Topics/Hospital-Care/Publications/2012-05-08/Assessment-of-SMR01Data-2010-2011-ScotlandReport.pdf></url></related-urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>} We also reported a secondary composite outcome of 90d death or unplanned readmission. Follow up was complete, although emigration from Scotland was not recorded. However, emigration in older age groups from Scotland to the remainder of the UK or overseas is known to be low (0.6% of residents aged ≥45 years annually).{ ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Scotland</Author><Year>2017</Year><RecNum>156</RecNum><DisplayText>(19)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>156</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="wst9aeezfrseov2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1495189174">156</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Web Page">12</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>National Records of Scotland</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Migration between Scotland and Overseas.</title></titles><number>01/05/2017</number><dates><year>2017</year></dates><urls><related-urls><url><http://www.nrscotland.gov.uk/statistics-and-data/statistics/statistics-by-theme/migration/migration-statistics/migration-between-scotland-and-overseas></url></related-urls></urls></record></Cite></EndNote>}

Predictors: Factors were classified into three groups: demographics; indices of pre-existing patient health; and indices of critical illness severity. See Supplement for additional information relating to variables.

Statistical analysis

Data were analysed using SAS Enterprise Guide v6.1 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA) and Stata v14 (StataCorp LC, Texas, USA). A complete cases analysis was performed for all analyses. Additional information is available in the Supplement. We undertook two separate modelling strategies: one to identify independent predictors of readmission risk and one to develop a risk prediction model.

Univariable/multivariable predictors: Individual univariable associations with the outcome were assessed by entering each variable in a logistic regression model and reporting the odds ratio with 95% confidence interval (95%CI). The c-index was presented to aid interpretation of the predictive ability of each variable. The c-index quantifies the ability of a model to distinguish between patients who experience a readmission and those who do not. A c-index of 0.5 indicates the model performs no better than chance and 1.0 indicates perfect discrimination. However, the c-index may be insensitive when used alone to compare between models. Therefore, to assess the relative importance of the three pre-defined groups of variables (demographics, indices of pre-existing health, indices of critical illness), the c-index of each group was estimated and observed risk was plotted against equal size deciles of predicted risk. This plot differs from a calibration plot as the deciles of predicted risk are plotted at intervals of equal width on the x-axis rather than at the mean of predicted risk for the decile. Therefore, a steeper upward gradient of observed risk across the x-axis indicates that the group of variables is a better predictor of the outcome than another group. In addition, we presented the classification tables in supplementary material.

{ ADDIN EN.CITE
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Kerr</Author><Year>2014</Year><RecNum>180</RecNum><DisplayText>(20)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>180</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="wst9aeezfrseoev2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1516979977">180</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Kerr, Kathleen F.</author><author>Wang, Zheyu</author><author>Janes, Holly</author><author>McClelland, Robyn L.</author><author>Psaty, Bruce M.</author><author>Pepe, Margaret S.</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Net

Reclassification Indices for Evaluating Risk-Prediction Instruments: A Critical
Review</title><secondary-title>Epidemiology</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-
title>Epidemiology</full-title></periodical><pages>114-
121</pages><volume>25</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2014</year></dates><isbn
>1044-39831531-5487</isbn><accession-num>PMC3918180</accession-num><urls><related-
urls><url>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3918180/</url></related-
urls></urls><electronic-resource-num>10.1097/EDE.000000000000018</electronic-resource-
num><remote-database-name>PMC</remote-database-name></record></Cite></EndNote>} This

illustrates the change in classification of events and non-events when comparing two models.

Multivariable associations with the outcome were assessed using logistic regression with no variable
selection procedures.

Risk prediction model: We chose a time-based split as this is a stronger design for internal validation
than a random split as the former method allows for random variation.{ ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Moons</Author><Year>2015</Year><RecNum>61</RecNum><DisplayTe
xt>(21)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>61</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-
id="wst9aeezfrseoev2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1475574136">61</key></foreign-
keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Moons, K.
G.</author><author>Altman, D. G.</author><author>Reitsma, J. B.</author><author>Ioannidis, J.
P.</author><author>Macaskill, P.</author><author>Steyerberg, E. W.</author><author>Vickers, A.
J.</author><author>Ransohoff, D. F.</author><author>Collins, G.

S.</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Transparent Reporting of a multivariable
prediction model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis (TRIPOD): explanation and

elaboration</title><secondary-title>Ann Intern Med</secondary-title><alt-title>Annals of internal
medicine</alt-title></titles><alt-periodical><full-title>Annals of Internal Medicine</full-title></alt-
periodical><pages>W1-

73</pages><volume>162</volume><number>1</number><edition>2015/01/07</edition><keyword

s><keyword>Checklist</keyword><keyword>*Decision Support
Techniques</keyword><keyword>*Diagnosis</keyword><keyword>Guidelines as
Topic</keyword><keyword>Humans</keyword><keyword>*Models,
Statistical</keyword><keyword>Multivariate
Analysis</keyword><keyword>*Prognosis</keyword><keyword>Publishing/*standards</keyword><
keyword>Reproducibility of Results</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2015</year><pub-
dates><date>Jan 6</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0003-4819</isbn><accession-
num>25560730</accession-num><urls></urls><electronic-resource-num>10.7326/m14-
0698</electronic-resource-num><remote-database-provider>NLM</remote-database-
provider><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>} Variable selection for the model
derivation was performed using backward elimination with a significance level of 0.05 using 70% of
the cohort. We assessed model performance by assessing: discriminant ability, assessed by
calculating the concordance index (c-index) and presenting a receiver operating characteristics (ROC)
curve; calibration, assessed with a calibration plot of predicted probability against observed
proportion with the outcome; and overall model performance by calculating Brier's score. We
followed best practice and did not apply a statistical test for calibration (e.g. Hosmer-Lemeshow
test) nor reported calibration in the derivation dataset.{ ADDIN EN.CITE
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Moons</Author><Year>2015</Year><RecNum>61</RecNum><DisplayTe
xt>(21)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>61</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-
id="wst9aeepzfrseoev2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1475574136">61</key></foreign-
keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Moons, K.
G.</author><author>Altman, D. G.</author><author>Reitsma, J. B.</author><author>Ioannidis, J.
P.</author><author>Macaskill, P.</author><author>Steyerberg, E. W.</author><author>Vickers, A.
J.</author><author>Ransohoff, D. F.</author><author>Collins, G.
S.</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Transparent Reporting of a multivariable
prediction model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis (TRIPOD): explanation and

elaboration</title><secondary-title>Ann Intern Med</secondary-title><alt-title>Annals of internal medicine</alt-title></titles><alt-periodical><full-title>Annals of Internal Medicine</full-title></alt-periodical><pages>W1-73</pages><volume>162</volume><number>1</number><edition>2015/01/07</edition><keywords><keyword>Checklist</keyword><keyword>*Decision Support Techniques</keyword><keyword>*Diagnosis</keyword><keyword>Guidelines as Topic</keyword><keyword>Humans</keyword><keyword>*Models, Statistical</keyword><keyword>Multivariate Analysis</keyword><keyword>*Prognosis</keyword><keyword>Publishing/*standards</keyword><keyword>Reproducibility of Results</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2015</year><pub-dates><date>Jan 6</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0003-4819</isbn><accession-num>25560730</accession-num><urls></urls><electronic-resource-num>10.7326/m14-0698</electronic-resource-num><remote-database-provider>NLM</remote-database-provider><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>} We presented sensitivity and specificity at thresholds of predicted risk to illustrate the ability of the model to be used as a tool to screen patients before hospital discharge.

Subgroup analyses: We repeated multivariable analyses to identify if the relationship between groups of predictors and unplanned readmission differed in two subgroups: patients admitted to ICU on an unplanned basis (excluding those admitted after elective surgery) and patients with no recorded comorbidity. The rationale for this was that patients admitted electively to ICU after planned surgery may follow recognised pathways post-hospital discharge. Similarly, patients with no previous comorbidity may have different drivers for unplanned readmission which may be more attributable to acute illness rather than pre-existing ill health.

Sensitivity analysis: We performed the following sensitivity analyses:

1. To evaluate if a shorter follow-up period affected the relative importance of the three pre-defined groups of variables, we repeated analyses using 30-day unscheduled readmission as the outcome comparing c-indices and ROC curves between groups.
2. To evaluate the effect of death as a competing risk to readmission, we used two approaches. We repeated analyses with the composite outcome of 90-day death or unplanned readmission, inspecting outcome distribution of death without readmission across categories, univariable odds ratios, and risk prediction model performance. However, this approach gives equal value to death and readmission in the outcome. Therefore, we also used Fine and Gray competing risk regression models to identify independent predictors of time to unscheduled readmission within 90 days which explicitly accounts for the competing risk of death. We evaluated the relative importance of groups of variables by reporting change in Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), a measure of model fit (lower values indicate better fit).
3. To evaluate the effect of representation of comorbidities, we repeated the multivariable analysis replacing count of comorbidities with individual comorbidities.

Results

In total, 55,975 patients were admitted to ICUs and discharged alive (eFigure 1). Median age was 60yrs (IQR 45,71), and patients living in the most deprived regions were over-represented (49.2% resident in two most deprived quintiles, 40% in general population) (Table 1; eTable 1). Pre-existing illness and morbidity was prevalent: 31.3% had an unplanned admission during the previous year; 56.4% had at least one comorbidity. Previous alcohol-related (10.8%) and drug-related morbidity (7.0%) were prevalent (eTable 1). The commonest admission diagnosis was pneumonia (8.4%).

Of 55,975 patients, 13,471 (24.1%,95%CI 23.7%,24.4%) experienced unplanned 90d readmission (Figure 1). A further 712 (1.3%,95%CI 1.2%,1.4%) died without being admitted. 14,183 patients

(25.3%,95%CI 25.0%,25.7%) experienced 90d readmission/death). An additional 1015 (1.8%, 95%CI 1.7%,1.9%) died within 90 days, but these deaths occurred after an unplanned readmission.

Table 1 Baseline characteristics of patients and number experiencing 90 day unplanned hospital readmission

For full version of baseline characteristics table and missing data, see eTable 1. Unplanned readmission proportions for continuous variables are presented in eTable 2.

Demographics	Category	Number with characteristic n(%) or median (IQR)	Number with 90d unplanned readmission n(%)
Sex	Female	24466 (43.7)	5952 (24.3)
Age at admission to ICU (years)	Median and Quartiles	60 (45, 71)	-
Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation	First quintile (Most deprived)	14809 (26.5)	3810 (25.7)
	Second quintile	12907 (23.1)	3182 (24.7)
	Third quintile	11269 (20.1)	2645 (23.5)
	Fourth quintile	9631 (17.2)	2129 (22.1)
	Fifth quintile (Least deprived)	7328 (13.1)	1699 (23.2)
Remoteness of residence	Urban area	37469 (68.1)	9321 (24.9)
	Accessible	13271 (24.1)	2974 (22.4)
	Remote or Very remote	4294 (7.8)	965 (22.5)
Indices of pre-existing patient health			
Admissions/attendances in year prior to index hospital stay			
Number of unplanned inpatient admissions	0	38429 (68.7)	7494 (19.5)
	1	10582 (18.9)	2968 (28)
	2 or more	6964 (12.5)	3009 (43.2)
Number of elective inpatient and day case admissions	0	37770 (67.5)	8395 (22.2)
	1	4286 (7.7)	1203 (28.1)
	2 or more	13919 (24.9)	3873 (27.8)
Number of new outpatient attendances	0	27134 (48.5)	5889 (21.7)
	1 or more	28841 (51.5)	7582 (26.3)
Number of acute psychiatric admissions	0	54703 (97.7)	13079 (23.9)
	1 or more	1272 (2.3)	392 (30.8)
Number of comorbidities present	0	24420 (43.6)	4214 (17.3)
	1	17490 (31.2)	4419 (25.3)
	2 or more	14065 (25.1)	4838 (34.4)
Indices of critical illness severity			
Type of admission to ICU	Elective surgery	15553 (28)	3480 (22.4)
	Emergency surgery	13222 (23.8)	3323 (25.1)
	Non-operative	26798 (48.2)	6576 (24.5)
APACHE II score at admission to ICU	Median and Quartiles	15 (11, 20)	-
Mechanical ventilation during ICU stay	Yes	33447 (60.2)	8116 (24.3)
Renal replacement therapy during ICU stay	Yes	3925 (7.1)	1170 (29.8)
Cardiovascular system support during ICU stay	Yes	20101 (36.2)	5174 (25.7)
Maximum number of organs supported on any day during ICU stay	0	17877 (32.2)	4070 (22.8)
	1	20969 (37.8)	5032 (24)
	2	14277 (25.7)	3638 (25.5)
	3	2407 (4.3)	649 (27)
Length of ICU stay (days)	Median and Quartiles	2 (1, 4)	-
Length of index hospital stay (days)	Median and Quartiles	15 (8, 31)	-

Predictors of 90-day unplanned hospital readmission

Patient demographics

In univariable analyses, all demographic factors other than sex had statistically significant associations with readmission risk (older age, social deprivation, remoteness of residence (eTable 2)). As a combined group, the c-index was 0.54 (95%CI 0.54,0.55), indicating weak discriminant ability (Figure 2).

Indices of pre-existing patient health

Prior health resource use and comorbidities demonstrated better discrimination for readmission risk. The number of previous unplanned inpatient admissions was associated with readmission rates from 19.5% (95%CI 19.1%,19.9%) (zero admissions) to 70.2% (95%CI 66.6%,73.6%) (6 or more) (eTable 2; c-index 0.60). Pre-existing comorbidities demonstrated moderate discrimination overall (c-index 0.60). In those experiencing an unplanned 90-day readmission, 68.7% (95%CI 67.9%,69.5%) had at least one comorbidity. All individual co-morbidities were associated with increased risk (eFigure 3A, greatest risk: renal disease, moderate/severe liver disease, diabetes with complications with >40% risk). As a combined group, indices of pre-existing health and resource use demonstrated moderate discrimination (c-index 0.63,95%CI 0.63,0.64) which was the highest compared with the other two groups (Figure 2, $\chi^2=389,2df,p<0.001$). This was reflected in improvement in the classification of patients not experiencing a readmission of 31.5% and 10.7% in comparison to demographics and critical illness severity indices respectively at the expense of worse reclassification of patients experiencing a readmission (-18.2% and -6.1% respectively) (eTables 3a and 3b).

Indices of critical illness severity

Overall, diagnostic category (c-index 0.57) and APACHE II score (c-index 0.55) were weak discriminators (eTable 2). Some specific diagnostic categories were associated with high readmission risk (variceal bleed (45.8%; 95%CI 41.3%,50.4%) and pancreatitis (40.0%; 95%CI 36.1%,44.1%)).

Organ support variables were weak discriminators of 90-day readmission (c-index range 0.51-0.52).

Similarly, length of post-ICU hospital stay and overall length of hospital stay were weak discriminators (c-index 0.52-0.56). As a combined group, the c-index for indices of critical illness severity was 0.60 (95%CI 0.60,0.61) (Figure 2).

Multivariable analyses

In multivariable analyses, number of previous unplanned admissions was strongly associated with risk of 90-day readmission, with a predicted absolute risk increase from 20.3% (95%CI 19.9%,20.8%) in those with no previous readmissions to 61.1% (95%CI 57.7%,65.5%) in those with 6 or more (OR 6.19,95%CI 5.12,7.49) (eTable 4). Readmission risk increased with comorbidity count, from 19.5% (no comorbidities;95%CI 18.8%,20.1%) to 34.5% (5 or more;95%CI 30.6%,38.5%). Replacing comorbidity count with individual comorbidities revealed seven individual comorbidities no longer retained statistical significance (eFigure 3B). Several other factors remained statistically significant, but the gradient of readmission risk across categories was less pronounced; these included age, type of admission to ICU, and length of post-ICU hospital stay. Several specific diagnoses were independently associated with predicted risk substantially higher than the population mean, namely oesophageal variceal bleed (33.5%, 95%CI 28.8%,38.1%) and pancreatitis (38.4%, 95%CI 34.0%,42.7%). Several factors were not significant predictors in multivariable analysis, including socioeconomic status, APS, and ICU length of stay.

Risk prediction model

In the derivation cohort (n=33294, eTable 5), the overall discriminant ability of the model was fair (c-index 0.67,95%CI 0.66,0.67) and overall performance was acceptable (Brier's score 0.170). In the validation cohort (eTable 6), discriminant ability and overall performance were similar (c-index 0.65,95%CI 0.64,0.66; Brier's score 0.176; Figure 3). Model calibration across the range of predicted risk in the validation cohort was reasonable although the model slightly under-predicted readmission risk (mean observed risk 25.0%; mean predicted risk 23.6%) (eFigure 4).

Performance of risk prediction model as a screening tool

The model’s performance as a screening tool is illustrated using the validation cohort in Table 2 (see eTable 7 for 95%CI). Assigning $\geq 20\%$ predicted probability of the outcome as the threshold to ‘screen positive’ would lead to the majority (54.2%, 95%CI 53.4%,55.0%) of patients screening positive with a 30.7% (95%CI 29.2%,32.3%) false negative rate and a 49.2% (95%CI 48.2%,50.1%) false positive rate. Increasing the threshold to $\geq 50\%$ improves the probability of identifying a patient who will subsequently experience a readmission but a substantially smaller proportion of the population screen positive (decreasing to 1.6%, 95%CI 1.4%,1.8%). eTable 8 illustrates the patient characteristics and outcomes of those who would screen positive compared with those who would screen negative at two probability thresholds ($\geq 20\%$ and $\geq 50\%$).

Table 2 Performance of risk prediction model as a screening tool to identify patients at risk of unplanned hospital readmission

See eTable 7 for 95% confidence intervals.

Threshold of predicted risk for screening positive	Number (%) screening positive	Sensitivity & False Negative Rate (%)	Specificity & False Positive Rate (%)	Positive Predictive Value (%)	Negative Predictive Value (%)	Positive Likelihood Ratio	Negative Likelihood Ratio
$\geq 20\%$	7,734 (54.2)	69.3 / 30.7	50.8 / 49.2	31.9	83.3	1.41	0.60
$\geq 30\%$	2,806 (19.7)	32.6 / 67.4	84.7 / 15.3	41.4	79.1	2.13	0.80
$\geq 40\%$	1,129 (7.9)	16.7 / 83.3	95.0 / 5.0	52.7	77.4	3.35	0.88
$\geq 50\%$	484 (3.4)	8.6 / 91.4	98.3 / 1.7	63.2	76.4	5.17	0.93
$\geq 60\%$	226 (1.6)	4.4 / 95.6	99.4 / 0.6	69.0	75.8	6.74	0.96

The likelihood ratio for a positive screening test result is the ratio of the true positive rate to the false positive rate. Larger values of the positive likelihood ratio (greater than 1) indicate better performance of the screening test at obtaining positive screening test results in patients who experience a readmission in comparison with those who do not experience a readmission. The likelihood ratio for a negative screening test result is the ratio of the false negative rate to the true negative rate. Smaller values of the negative likelihood ratio (less than 1) indicate better performance of the screening test at obtaining negative screening test results in patients who do not experience a readmission in comparison with those who do experience a readmission. Equations: Sensitivity = True Positive Rate; 1 – Sensitivity = False Negative Rate; Specificity = True Negative Rate; 1 – Specificity = False Positive Rate; Positive Likelihood Ratio = True Positive Rate / False Positive Rate = Sensitivity / (1 – Specificity); Negative Likelihood Ratio = False Negative Rate / True Negative Rate = (1 – Sensitivity) / Specificity

Subgroup analyses

In the subgroup of patients admitted to ICU on an unplanned basis (n=40020; unplanned hospital readmissions n=9899, 24.7%, 95%CI 24.3%, 25.2%), results were similar to the full cohort. The three groups of variables had similar patterns of association compared with the full cohort (eFigure 5A and 6A, eTable 9). In the subgroup of patients with no previous comorbidity (n=24420; unplanned readmissions n=4214, 17.3%, 95%CI 16.8%, 17.7%), indices of critical illness severity had the greatest discriminant ability (c-index 0.622) (eFigure 5B and 6B, eTable 9).

Sensitivity analysis

Similar results were found using 30-day unscheduled readmission as the outcome: indices of pre-existing patient health retained the highest discriminant ability (c-index 0.617 vs 0.601 critical illness indices vs 0.535 demographics; $\chi^2=304, 2df, p<0.001$) (eFigure 2; eTable 9).

The small proportion of deaths without a preceding unplanned readmission that occurred in individuals was relatively balanced across covariates in the derivation cohort (eTable 2). Both sensitivity analyses using logistic regression models of combined outcome of 90-day death or readmission and time to first unplanned readmission (Fine and Gray regression model) accounting for the competing risk of death (eTable 4) did not substantially differ from the findings of the primary multivariable analysis. Model performance for the combined outcome of 90-day death or readmission was similar (c-index 0.66, 95%CI 0.65, 0.67; Brier's score 0.179). The relative importance of the three groups of covariates was similar for both analyses comparing c-indices of the combined outcome (90d death/readmission) (eFigure 2; eTable 9) and analyses comparing AIC for time to first unplanned readmission (AIC 244863 pre-existing health vs 246039 critical illness indices vs 246909 demographics; full model 244238).

Discussion

In a large, complete population study, we have demonstrated that 1 in 4 ICU survivors experience an unplanned readmission within 90 days of hospital discharge. Indices of pre-existing ill health were more strongly predictive of readmission than indices of critical illness severity in the whole cohort, but this was reversed in subgroup analyses of patients with no recorded comorbidity. A risk prediction model derived from multiple data sources had, at best, only moderate discriminant ability. A screening tool derived from this model is unlikely to perform sufficiently well in isolation to identify cases in whom to target high intensity interventions aimed at reducing readmissions amongst ICU survivors.

Our data indicate unplanned readmission rates among ICU survivors are substantially higher than the general hospital population (30 day readmission 14.7% in ICU survivors vs 7.0% in all hospital inpatients{ ADDIN EN.CITE

```
<EndNote><Cite><Author>Blunt</Author><Year>2015</Year><RecNum>179</RecNum><DisplayText>(22)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>179</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="wst9aeepzfrseov2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1515602612">179</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Blunt, Ian</author><author>Bardsley, Martin</author><author>Grove, Amy</author><author>Clarke, Aileen</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Classifying emergency 30-day readmissions in England using routine hospital data 2004–2010: what is the scope for reduction?</title><secondary-title>Emergency Medicine Journal</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Emergency Medicine Journal</full-title></periodical><pages>44-50</pages><volume>32</volume><number>1</number><dates><year>2015</year></dates><urls><related-urls><url>http://emj.bmj.com/content/emmermed/32/1/44.full.pdf</url></related-urls></urls><electronic-resource-num>10.1136/emmermed-2013-202531</electronic-resource-num></record></Cite></EndNote>}. Unplanned readmission rates are increasingly used as a quality
```

indicator and target for improvement. Although many variables had statistically significant associations with readmission risk, almost all had limited discriminant power as individual factors. A key finding was that ICU-related factors such as organ support are not independently associated with readmission risk among survivors. In contrast, pre-existing health factors had the greatest predictive power of all variables. However, in the subgroup of patients with no pre-existing comorbidity, indices of critical illness had greater discriminant power than pre-existing health factors. These findings are consistent with pre-critical illness chronic health being the dominant factor *at a population-level* in general critical care survivors in determining post-ICU health trajectories, whereas new impairments that follow an ICU admission may be more dominant in subgroups with no comorbidity.

Addressing recovery from critical illness from this perspective has important implications for research, policy, and service design given the high prevalence of older patients with comorbidity in critical care populations. For example, it may explain the lack of effect on clinical outcomes from rehabilitation interventions focussed mostly on physical therapy alone, and also questions the rationale for using outcomes such as longer term hospital costs and HRQoL in critical care trials without accounting for pre-illness health status.

Our model had a similar discriminant ability compared with other published risk prediction scores used in general hospitalised populations (c-indices of studies using retrospective administrative data 0.55-0.72)

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Kansagara</Author><Year>2011</Year><RecNum>90</RecNum><DisplayText>(28)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>90</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="wst9aeeepzfrseoev2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1476363086">90</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Kansagara, D.</author><author>Englander, H.</author><author>Salanitro, A.</author><author>Kagen,

D./author><author>Theobald, C./author><author>Freeman, M./author><author>Kripalani, S./author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Risk Prediction Models for Hospital Readmission A Systematic Review</title><secondary-title>Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association</full-title></periodical><pages>1688-1698</pages><volume>306</volume><number>15</number><dates><year>2011</year><pub-dates><date>Oct</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0098-7484</isbn><accession-num>WOS:000295963200028</accession-num><urls><related-urls><url><Go to ISI>;//WOS:000295963200028</url></related-urls></urls><electronic-resource-num>10.1001/jama.2011.1515</electronic-resource-num></record></Cite></EndNote>}. This was despite inclusion of ICU-related/acute factors. These findings may be explained by our datasets not including important factors associated with readmission risk, such as social and organisational factors identified in a systematic review.{ ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Kansagara</Author><Year>2011</Year><RecNum>90</RecNum><DisplayText>(28)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>90</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="wst9aeepzfrseov2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1476363086">90</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Kansagara, D./author><author>Englander, H./author><author>Salanitro, A./author><author>Kagen, D./author><author>Theobald, C./author><author>Freeman, M./author><author>Kripalani, S./author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Risk Prediction Models for Hospital Readmission A Systematic Review</title><secondary-title>Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association</full-title></periodical><pages>1688-1698</pages><volume>306</volume><number>15</number><dates><year>2011</year><pub-dates><date>Oct</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0098-7484</isbn><accession-num>WOS:000295963200028</accession-num><urls><related-urls><url><Go to

ISI>://WOS:000295963200028</url></related-urls></urls><electronic-resource-num>10.1001/jama.2011.1515</electronic-resource-num></record></Cite></EndNote>} Research in other populations highlights the importance of these factors, which have not previously been well-addressed in ICU survivor populations. For example, family stress,{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} lack of information,{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} and frailty{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} could all be important during the early post-hospital period. Furthermore, some patients will experience readmissions due to unpredictable factors which would not be present in exhaustively comprehensive datasets. Analysis of PROFILE's qualitative component, comprising interviews and focus groups with ICU survivors and their carers, may reveal additional insights.{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} Our study clearly shows that additional research is needed to understand other factors driving readmission risk in this population to improve the discriminant value of a clinical decision support tool.

We used 90-day unplanned readmission as our primary outcome, whereas 30-day readmission is widely used in other patient groups.{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} We believe the longer time period is justified because the ICU survivorship literature shows a longer period 'at risk', both for increased mortality and hospital resource use.{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} In addition, a sensitivity analysis using 30-day readmission as the outcome was similar to the primary outcome. Furthermore, HRQoL typically starts to plateau in ICU survivors after three months{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} and this time point is widely used for primary outcome measurement in critical care trials.{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} Extending the period of interest further risks including readmissions that are less causally related to the critical illness hospitalisation.

Our study has a number of strengths. The database had complete population coverage, included a diverse range of data sources which undergo regular validation, and contained a large number of events, resulting in unbiased, precise estimates. We undertook sensitivity analyses to explore the

effect of death as a competing risk. We reported our risk prediction model using current best practice and undertook internal validation using a recommended time-based split. { ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>Moons</Author><Year>2015</Year><RecNum>61</RecNum><DisplayText>(21)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>61</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="wst9aeepzfrseov2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1475574136">61</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Moons, K. G.</author><author>Altman, D. G.</author><author>Reitsma, J. B.</author><author>Ioannidis, J. P.</author><author>Macaskill, P.</author><author>Steyerberg, E. W.</author><author>Vickers, A. J.</author><author>Ransohoff, D. F.</author><author>Collins, G. S.</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis (TRIPOD): explanation and elaboration</title><secondary-title>Ann Intern Med</secondary-title><alt-title>Annals of internal medicine</alt-title></titles><alt-periodical><full-title>Annals of Internal Medicine</full-title></alt-periodical><pages>W1-73</pages><volume>162</volume><number>1</number><edition>2015/01/07</edition><keywords><keyword>Checklist</keyword><keyword>*Decision Support Techniques</keyword><keyword>*Diagnosis</keyword><keyword>Guidelines as Topic</keyword><keyword>Humans</keyword><keyword>*Models, Statistical</keyword><keyword>Multivariate Analysis</keyword><keyword>*Prognosis</keyword><keyword>Publishing/*standards</keyword><keyword>Reproducibility of Results</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2015</year><pub-dates><date>Jan 6</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0003-4819</isbn><accession-num>25560730</accession-num><urls></urls><electronic-resource-num>10.7326/m14-0698</electronic-resource-num><remote-database-provider>NLM</remote-database-provider><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>} Other risk prediction scores for readmission have minimised the number of variables to ensure ease of clinical use. { ADDIN EN.CITE {

ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} We decided *a priori* to pursue a non-parsimonious approach to model building with the intention of electronic implementation.

There are potential limitations to our study. We were unable to access measurements of preadmission functional status, frailty trajectories or biomarkers relating to inflammation, which have been associated with poorer health outcomes following critical illness.{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} Furthermore, we had no data on social care or other non-clinical variables that have been shown to influence readmission risk, for example polypharmacy,{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} or low health literacy.{ ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Bailey</Author><Year>2015</Year><RecNum>102</RecNum><DisplayText>(38)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>102</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="wst9aeezfrseoev2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1476378242">102</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Bailey, S. C.</author><author>Fang, G.</author><author>Annis, I. E.</author><author>O'Conor, R.</author><author>Paasche-Orlow, M. K.</author><author>Wolf, M. S.</author></authors></contributors><titles><title>Health literacy and 30-day hospital readmission after acute myocardial infarction</title><secondary-title>Bmj Open</secondary-title></titles><periodical><full-title>BMJ Open</full-title><abbr-1>BMJ open</abbr-1></periodical><pages>e006975</pages><volume>5</volume><number>6</number><dates><year>2015</year></dates><isbn>2044-6055</isbn><accession-num>WOS:000363479900022</accession-num><urls><related-urls><url><Go to ISI>://WOS:000363479900022</url></related-urls></urls><electronic-resource-num>10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006975</electronic-resource-num></record></Cite></EndNote>}

These are not routinely considered in critical care recovery pathways.

Our study has a number of methodological limitations. Whilst a time-based split is a robust method of model validation, secular trends in demographics, clinical practice and healthcare organisation

can bias model performance. This may mean time-based validation methods perform worse than methods in which derivation and validation cohorts are drawn from the same time period. In addition, using statistical significance to select variables may have resulted in more complex models than, for example, using change in Bayesian Information Criterion. Furthermore, 12.8% were missing APACHE II scores. This is due to specific APACHE II model exclusions, rather than being 'missing', and these values cannot therefore be imputed. This means our model cannot be generalised to those patients excluded from APACHE II scoring.

Our design did not enable an assessment of the proportion of readmissions that might be avoided through interventions. A recent systematic review estimated the median proportion of avoidable readmissions was 27%.^{{ ADDIN EN.CITE <EndNote><Cite><Author>van Walraven</Author><Year>2011</Year><RecNum>98</RecNum><DisplayText>(39)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>98</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-id="wst9aeezfrseoev2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1476375362">98</key></foreign-keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>van Walraven, C.</author><author>Bennett, C.</author><author>Jennings, A.</author><author>Austin, P. C.</author><author>Forster, A. J.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ont. carlv@ohri.ca</auth-address><titles><title>Proportion of hospital readmissions deemed avoidable: a systematic review</title><secondary-title>Cmaj</secondary-title><alt-title>CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne</alt-title></titles><periodical><full-title>Cmaj</full-title><abbr-1>CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne</abbr-1></periodical><alt-periodical><full-title>Cmaj</full-title><abbr-1>CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne</abbr-1></alt-periodical><pages>E391-402</pages><volume>183</volume><number>7</number><edition>2011/03/30</edition><keywords><keyword>Humans</keyword><keyword>*Patient Readmission/standards/statistics &}

numerical data</keyword><keyword>Quality Indicators, Health Care/standards/statistics & amp;

numerical data</keyword><keyword>Regression

Analysis</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2011</year><pub-dates><date>Apr

19</date></pub-dates></dates><isbn>0820-3946</isbn><accession-num>21444623</accession-

num><urls></urls><custom2>Pmc3080556</custom2><electronic-resource-

num>10.1503/cmaj.101860</electronic-resource-num><remote-database-provider>NLM</remote-

database-provider><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>} This research question

may be better investigated using qualitative methodology, which was the approach used in a parallel

part of our research programme.{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }} Understanding the

modifiable factors that cause readmissions in critical care survivors is essential for designing

effective anticipatory interventions. Developing and testing such interventions requires detailed

understanding of the factors that may be important.{ ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Craig</Author><Year>2008</Year><RecNum>96</RecNum><DisplayText

>(40)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>96</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-

id="wst9aeepzfrseoev2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1476374151">96</key></foreign-

keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Craig,

P.</author><author>Dieppe, P.</author><author>Macintyre, S.</author><author>Michie,

S.</author><author>Nazareth, I.</author><author>Petticrew,

M.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>MRC Population Health Sciences Research

Network, Glasgow G12 8RZ. peter@sphsu.mrc.ac.uk</auth-address><titles><title>Developing and

evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance</title><secondary-

title>Bmj</secondary-title><alt-title>BMJ (Clinical research ed.)</alt-title></titles><periodical><full-

title>BMJ</full-

title></periodical><pages>a1655</pages><volume>337</volume><edition>2008/10/01</edition><k

eywords><keyword>*Diffusion of Innovation</keyword><keyword>Evaluation Studies as

Topic</keyword><keyword>Evidence-Based Medicine</keyword><keyword>*Practice Guidelines as

Topic</keyword><keyword>Therapeutics</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2008</year></date
s><isbn>0959-535x</isbn><accession-num>18824488</accession-
num><urls></urls><custom2>Pmc2769032</custom2><electronic-resource-
num>10.1136/bmj.a1655</electronic-resource-num><remote-database-provider>NLM</remote-
database-provider><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>} Whilst we could only
report presence of comorbidity, our study suggests optimising chronic disease management is at
least as important as strategies specific to the complications of critical illness.

Our results have important implications for future research and policy. The unplanned readmission
rates we report in ICU survivors are similar to those with chronic disease currently targeted with
specific discharge pathways and community support.{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN EN.CITE.DATA }}
Although guidelines promote rehabilitation after critical illness,{ ADDIN EN.CITE { ADDIN
EN.CITE.DATA }} the most clinically and cost-effective way to deliver these are unknown and
evidence-based care pathways do not yet exist, in contrast with other conditions such as myocardial
infarction{ ADDIN EN.CITE

<EndNote><Cite><Author>Jones</Author><Year>2013</Year><RecNum>100</RecNum><DisplayTe
xt>(42)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>100</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN" db-
id="wst9aeepzfrseoev2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1476376409">100</key></foreign-
keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Jones,
K.</author><author>Saxon, L.</author><author>Cunningham, W.</author><author>Adams,
P.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>Royal College of Physicians, National Clinical
Guideline Centre, London NW1 4LE, UK.</auth-address><titles><title>Secondary prevention for
patients after a myocardial infarction: summary of updated NICE guidance</title><secondary-
title>Bmj</secondary-title><alt-title>BMJ (Clinical research ed.)</alt-title></titles><periodical><full-
title>BMJ</full-
title></periodical><pages>f6544</pages><volume>347</volume><edition>2013/11/15</edition><k
eywords><keyword>Adrenergic beta-Antagonists/therapeutic

use</keyword><keyword>Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibitors/therapeutic
 use</keyword><keyword>Humans</keyword><keyword>Myocardial Infarction/*prevention & amp;
 control/rehabilitation/therapy</keyword><keyword>Platelet Aggregation Inhibitors/therapeutic
 use</keyword><keyword>Practice Guidelines as Topic</keyword><keyword>Risk Reduction
 Behavior</keyword><keyword>Secondary
 Prevention</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2013</year></dates><isbn>0959-
 535x</isbn><accession-num>24227827</accession-num><urls></urls><electronic-resource-
 num>10.1136/bmj.f6544</electronic-resource-num><remote-database-provider>NLM</remote-
 database-provider><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>} and stroke.{ ADDIN
 EN.CITE
 <EndNote><Cite><Author>Dworzynski</Author><Year>2013</Year><RecNum>99</RecNum><Displ
 ayText>(44)</DisplayText><record><rec-number>99</rec-number><foreign-keys><key app="EN"
 db-id="wst9aeezfrseoev2dkxxadmavtww2dawdrv" timestamp="1476375806">99</key></foreign-
 keys><ref-type name="Journal Article">17</ref-type><contributors><authors><author>Dworzynski,
 K.</author><author>Ritchie, G.</author><author>Fenu, E.</author><author>MacDermott,
 K.</author><author>Playford, E. D.</author></authors></contributors><auth-address>National
 Clinical Guideline Centre, Royal College of Physicians of London, London NW1 4LE, UK.
 Katharina.Dworzynski@rcplondon.ac.uk</auth-address><titles><title>Rehabilitation after stroke:
 summary of NICE guidance</title><secondary-title>Bmj</secondary-title><alt-title>BMJ (Clinical
 research ed.)</alt-title></titles><periodical><full-title>BMJ</full-
 title></periodical><pages>f3615</pages><volume>346</volume><edition>2013/06/14</edition><k
 eywords><keyword>Evidence-Based Medicine/*standards</keyword><keyword>Great
 Britain</keyword><keyword>Humans</keyword><keyword>*Practice Guidelines as
 Topic</keyword><keyword>Rehabilitation/*standards</keyword><keyword>Stroke/physiopatholog
 y/*rehabilitation</keyword></keywords><dates><year>2013</year></dates><isbn>0959-
 535x</isbn><accession-num>23760965</accession-num><urls></urls><electronic-resource-

num>10.1136/bmj.f3615</electronic-resource-num><remote-database-provider>NLM</remote-database-provider><language>eng</language></record></Cite></EndNote>} Our data support the need for clear pathways with appropriate support for ICU survivors during care transitions, especially from secondary into primary care.

Conclusion

We have demonstrated that 1 in 4 patients experience an unplanned hospital readmission within 90 days of discharge following an episode of critical illness. Pre-existing illness indices are better predictors of readmission risk than acute illness factors at a whole cohort level. In a subgroup of those with no comorbidity, acute illness factors predominate. Identifying additional patient-centred drivers of readmission may improve risk prediction models. Improving our understanding of patient groups and risk factors that are amenable to intervention could improve the clinical and cost-effectiveness of post-ICU care and rehabilitation.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to clinicians in ICUs in Scotland who contribute data to the Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group registry and Information Services Division (ISD Scotland) for providing data and undertaking linkage.

Competing interests

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

Role of the funding source

The project was funded through a research grant from the Chief Scientist Office for Scotland (reference CZH/401026). The funder had no role in study design; collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and in the decision to submit the paper for publication. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Authors' contributions

All contributed to conception and design of the work. NL and RL contributed to data acquisition and analysis. All authors contributed to interpretation of data for the work. NL and TW drafted the work. All authors revised it critically for important intellectual content. All authors gave final approval of the version to be published. All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Ethical approval

All data relating to patients were anonymised and analysed in a safe haven environment. This study gained approval from the Privacy Advisory Committee of NHS National Services Scotland (Reference PAC 12/14). South East Scotland Research Ethics Committee granted a waiver (Reference NR/1403AB5).

References

{ ADDIN EN.REFLIST }

Figure Legends

Figure 1 Cumulative incidence within 90 days of discharge from index hospital stay of (a) unplanned hospital admission and (b) unplanned hospital admission or death

Figure 2 (A) Observed risk of 90 day unplanned hospital readmission by deciles of predicted risk and (B) Receiver operator characteristics for three groups: patient demographics, indices of pre-existing patient health, and indices of critical illness severity.

Within each panel, each point represents 10% of the cohort grouped by their predicted risk of 90 day readmission derived from the group of characteristics labelled by the panel axis label. The observed risk for 'Demographics' variables ranges from 18.2% in the lowest predicted risk decile to 29.4% in the highest. The observed risk for the 'pre-existing health indices' group of variables ranges from 15.3% in the lowest predicted risk decile to 46.9% in the highest. The gradient of the line is therefore steeper. The steeper positive gradient observed for 'Pre-existing health indices' compared with 'Demographics' indicates that there is a greater increase in observed readmission risk for each increment in decile of predicted risk for the group of characteristics, and therefore this group is a better predictor of readmission across the range of predicted risk.

Figure 3 Receiver operator characteristics curve for model predicting unplanned hospital readmission within 90 days of discharge from index hospital stay in the validation cohort (n=14,273){ ADDIN }