

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

# **BMJ Open**

#### Trajectories of multiple long-term conditions and mortality in older adults: A retrospective cohort study using English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA)

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-074902
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Apr-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Chalitsios, Christos; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Santoso, Cornelia; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Nartey, Yvonne; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Khan, Nusrat; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Simpson, Glenn; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Islam, Nazrul; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Stuart, Beth; Queen Mary University of London Farmer, Andrew; University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciencesd Dambha-Miller, Hajira; University of Southampton, Primary Care and Population Sciences
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, GERIATRIC MEDICINE, PUBLIC HEALTH





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



**BMJ** Open

1 2 3	Trajectories of multiple long-term conditions and mortality in older adults: A retrospective using English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA)
4 5 6 7	Christos V. Chalitsios <sup>1</sup> , Cornelia Santoso <sup>1</sup> , Yvonne Nartey <sup>1</sup> , Nusrat Khan <sup>1,</sup> Glenn Simpson <sup>1</sup> , Nazro Stuart <sup>2</sup> , Andrew Farmer <sup>3</sup> , Hajira Dambha-Miller <sup>1</sup>
8 0	Affiliations
9 10	<sup>1</sup> Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK.
12 13 14	2 Centre for Evaluation and Methods, Wolfson Institute of Population Health, Queen Mary Univers London, UK
15 16	3 Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK
10 17 19	ORCID
19	Christos V. Chalitsios: 0000-0002-0836-9385
20 21	Cornelia Santoso: 0000-0002-5534-4404
22 23	Yvonne Nartey: 000-0001-9876-679X
24 25	Nusrat Khan: 0000-0003-3928-0022
26 27	Glenn Simpson: 0000-0002-1753-942X
28 29	Nazrul Islam: 0000-0003-3982-4325
30 31	Beth Stuart: 0000-0001-5432-7437
32	Andrew Farmer: 0000-0002-6170-4402
34 35	Hajira Dambha-Miller: 0000-0003-0175-443X
36	Corresponding author
37 38	Hajira Dambha-Miller,
39 40	Primary Care Research Centre,
41 42	Aldermoor Close, SO16 5ST,
43 44	University of Southampton, UK
45 46	H.Dambha-Miller@soton.ac.uk
47 48	
49 50	Word count: 2250
50 51	Tables and figures: 3 tables & 2 figures
52 53	Abstract: 250 words
54 55	
56 57	
58 59	1
60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

We would like to thank Ms Firoza Davies for her contribution as a patient and public representative in this study.

## Authors' contribution

All authors contributed to the study's conception and design. C.V.C and Cornelia are jointly the first authors. All authors contributed to the study's conception and design. C.v.C and Cornena are jointy the first authors. Material preparation and analysis were performed by HDM, C.V.C, and C.S. The first draft of the manuscript was written by C.V.C and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript. Funding The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) is funded by the National Institute on Aging/National Institutes of Health, USA (grant number 5R01AG017644-16) and by a consortium of the UK government departments coordinated by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC).

coordinated by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). ₫

The Primary Care Research Centre at the University of Southampton is a member of the NIHR School for Primary Care Research and is supported by National Institute for Health and care Research (NIHR) Research funds. HDM is a National Institute for Health Research-funded Academic Clinical Lecturer and has received NIHR funding for this grant (NIHR202637). AF is supported by the NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Consortium.

# Disclaimer

This report is independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (Artificial Intelligence for Multiple Long-Term Conditions (AIM), "The development and validation of population clusters for integrating health and social care: A mixed-methods study on Multiple Long-Term Conditions", " NIHR202637"). The views≥ expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National ning, Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Competing interests
None declared.
Ethics approval
Ethical approval for the study was provided by the Faculty of Medicine Ethics Committee, University Hospitales Southampton, (reference number 67953). 

õ

⋗

### Abstract

### **Objectives**

To classify older adults with MLTC into clusters based on accumulating conditions as trajectories over time, characterise clusters and quantify associations between derived cluster and all-cause mortality.

Design We conducted a retrospective cohort study using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) over nine years n=15,091 aged 50 years and older). Group-based trajectory modelling was used to classify people into MLTC clusters based on accumulating conditions over time. Derived clusters were used to quantify the associations between MLTC trajectory memberships, sociodemographic characteristics, and all-cause mortality. **Results** 

ę Five distinct clusters of MLTC trajectories were identified and characterised as: "no-LTC" (18.57%), "single-LTC (31.21%), "evolving MLTC" (25.82%), "moderate MLTC" (17.12%), and "high MLTC" (7.27%). Increasing age was consistently associated with an increased number of MLTC. Female sex (aOR = 1.13; 95%CI 1.01 to 1.27) and ethnic minority (aOR = 2.04; 95%CI 1.40 to 3.00) were associated with the "moderate MLCTC" and "high MLTC" clusters, respectively. Higher education and paid employment were associated with a lower likelihood of progression over time towards an increased number of MLTC. All the clusters had higher all-cause mortality than the "no-LTC" cluster.

# Conclusions

The development of MLTC and the increase in the number of conditions over time follow distinct trajectories. These are determined by non-modifiable (age, sex, ethnicity) and modifiable factors (education and employment). Stratifying risk through clustering will enable practitioners to identify older adults with a higher likelihood of worsening MLTC over time to tailor effective interventions. **Keywords** Multiple long-term conditions, trajectories, mortality, English Longitudinal Study on Ageing (ELSA), older.

### **Strengths and limitations**

- The main strength of the current study is the use of a large dataset, assessing longitudinal data to examine MLTC trajectories and a dataset that is nationally representative of people aged 50 years and older, including a wide range of long-term conditions and sociodemographics.
- The measurement of MLTC was limited to ten long-term conditions, which was all of what was available The measurement of MLTC was limited to ten long-term conditions, which was all of what was available in the English of Longitudinal Study of Ageing, which may not be exhaustive of all possible long-term conditions. to beet terien only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

Enseignement Superieur

(ABES

ta mining, Al training, and similar technologies

http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

ttp://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

#### 

### Introduction

Globally, the average life expectancy has risen from 66.8 years in 2000 to 73.4 years in 2019 (1). By 2050, the population over 60 and 80 years will reach 2.1 billion and 426 million, respectively (2,3). This rise in longevity raises the risk of developing multiple long-term conditions (MLTC), which is the co-occurrence of two or more chronic diseases (4). Globally, the prevalence of MLTC among older people is reported to be between 55-98% (5), and in the UK, this is expected to rise from 54% in 2015 to 68% in 2035 (2). MLTC represent an ongoing challenge for healthcare systems because people with MLTC have worse care outcomes, including functional limitation and disability (6,7), higher service utilisation (5), mortality (8) and poorer quality of life (5). Management of MLTC places considerable economic and logistical burdens on services which are traditionally organised around single disease models (6).

While there is ample evidence of identified risk factors (7,9) and adverse care outcomes for MLTC crosssectionally to help understand the prevalence and patterns of MLTC, they provide little evidence on temporal elements, including patterns of MLTC development over time (8,10,11). There is a paucity of longitudinal approaches examining patterns in the accumulation of diseases over time (12). Understanding the trajectory that an older adult will follow in the progression towards an increased number of MLTC could help predict when intervention is needed and inform targeted and earlier preventive interventions. To address this critical gap in the literature, this study aimed to classify older adults with MLTC into clusters based on the cumulation of conditions as trajectories over time; clusters were then characterised, and associations were quantified between derived clusters and all-cause mortality.

#### Methods

### Data source and study population

The English Longitudinal Study of Aging (ELSA) is a longitudinal cohort of people aged 50 years or older living in England (13). The ELSA cohort profile has been described in detail elsewhere (14). In summary, it included 12,099 people at study entry in 2002 with follow-up every two years with self-report questionnaires on physical and mental health, well-being, finances, and attitudes around ageing over time. Four yearly additional nurse visits collected objective data such as anthropometric data (13,15). The ELSA is an open cohort, and refreshment samples were added depending on the proportional age requirement for ELSA, so the total number of people in this cohort was 15091. Our baseline was wave 2 (2004/5) of the ELSA cohort, the first collecting time point in the study of long-term conditions with a nine-year follow-up to wave 6 (2012/3), the most recent wave with available uding for uses data on all-cause mortality status.

## **Multiple Long-Term Conditions**

MLTC was defined as the presence of two or more of the following ten conditions: hypertension, diabetes, cancer, **a** lung disease, cardiovascular disease, stroke, mental health disorder, arthritis, Parkinson's disease, and dementia. These are self-reported by patients, relatives or carers and verified by nurse visits (13). These ten conditions were available within the ELSA dataset based on our earlier work to define MLTC (16,17). After statistical consideration due to the small sample size and clinical discussion, we grouped some of the conditions as follows: people with ≥ depression were combined with mental health disorders, asthma was combined with lung disease, Alzheimer's within dementia, and finally, those with heart attack, angina, heart murmur, abnormal heart rhythm and

congestive heart failure combined into those with cardiovascular disease.
All-cause mortality
All-cause mortality was reported by end-of-life interviews on waves 2, 3, 4 and 6 with relatives and friends after ge death.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded

from

jopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

#### **Covariates**

Sociodemographic variables included were age, sex, ethnicity (defined as white/non-white), education, employment, and marital status. The education variable was categorised into four groups: less than upper secondary level, upper secondary and vocational level, tertiary level, and others. Employment status was categorised into 'paid employment and 'unemployed'. Marital status was categorised into three groups: never married, married/having a partner, and separated/divorced/widowed. These covariates were based on the baseline. We used data provided in the nearest subsequent waves if they were missing at baseline. **Statistical analysis** Descriptive statistics were used to summarise participants' characteristics. We used group-based trajectory

modelling (GBTM) to classify older adults with MLTC into clusters based on the accumulation of conditions as trajectories over time. GBTM is a finite mixture model applying maximum likelihood to identify a cluster of people following similar trajectories by the number of conditions over time (18). This model assumes the same error variance for all clusters and time points and treats missing data as 'missing at random' (19). The procedure for selecting the best model included two steps: identifying the ideal number of trajectory groups and determining polynomial orders to represent the shapes of the trajectories (18,20). Based on the observed distribution, we employed a censored normal model to specify MLTC (21,22). We fitted the models iteratively, starting with one and increasing up to a maximum of six clusters that would be useful in a clinical setting (20). We selected the number of trajectory clusters based on the following criteria: the lowest Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) value, Average Posterior Probability Assignment (APPA) >70%, Odds of a Correct Classification (OCC) >5, the percentage of participants in each trajectory groups >5% of the total sample (if less than 5% it is unlikely to be conceptually useful for clinical practice) (22–24). We first used cubic polynomials to characterise the shape of the clusters of MLTC trajectories. However, after selecting the number of trajectories, we refitted the model to use lower-order terms when the higher-order terms were insignificant (20). We then assigned individuals to the  $\frac{8}{2}$ trajectory group based on the maximum posterior probability (20). Multinomial logistic regression was then  $\mathbf{\hat{s}}$ performed to test the association between socio-demographic factors and clusters of MLTC trajectory, with the "no-LTC" cluster as the reference. Binary logistic regression was also performed to quantify the association between the clusters of MLTC trajectory membership and all-cause mortality, adjusting for all the covariates mentioned above. A squared term of age was included in the model to account for the non-linear relationship

between age and mortality. The significance level was set at a p-value <0.05, and all analyses were performed using STATA M.P v17.0.

#### **Patient and Public Involvement**

This study was conducted as part of a wider mixed-methods programme of research exploring the potential of machine learning to address multimorbidity through the 'clustering' of patients based on similarities in clinical and social care needs. Patient and public involvement has been incorporated throughout the wider research and social care needs. Patient and public involvement has been incorporated throughout the wider researcher programme from the initial inception, design, and dissemination of findings. The initial results and the final written draft of the study submitted in this manuscript were shared with our programme's patient and public, representative. ore terior only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

**Enseignement Superieur** 

(ABES)

ata mining, Al training, and similar technologies

http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

### Results

### Participants' characteristics

We identified 15,091 individuals participating in at least one wave during the follow-up period (The flow of participants through the study is shown in **Figure 1**). Six participants were excluded, as they had no information on MLTC. After excluding those (n = 123) with missing data on covariates, 14,962 people were included in the final analysis. The mean (SD) age of the cohort was 61.9 (11) years; most were females (53.5%), whites (96.5%), with educational attainment of upper secondary or vocational (43.1%), employed (56.8%), and married or had ap partner (72%) (**Table 1**). participants through the study is shown in **Figure 1**). Six participants were excluded, as they had no information To be to the work

Page 11 of 25

		Total	No-LTC	Single-LTC	Evolving MLTC		High MLTC
		14962 (100%)	2826 (18.9%)	4802 (32.1%)	3739 (25.0%)	<b>7</b> <b>7</b> <b>7</b> <b>7</b> <b>7</b> <b>7</b> <b>7</b> <b>7</b> <b>7</b> <b>1</b> <b>6</b> <b>7</b> <b>1</b> <b>6</b> <b>7</b> <b>1</b> <b>6</b> <b>1</b> <b>6</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>6</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b>	1063 (7.1%)
Age, me	ean (SD)	61.9 (11)	56.0 (9.1)	60.0 (10.0)	62.9 (10.8)	<b>490</b> .7)	69.8 (10.4)
Sex						on 11 g foi	
	Male	6951 (46.5)	1402 (20.2)	2361 (34.0)	1675 (24.1)	፝፟፟፝ <b>ኯ፝፼፝</b> <u>፟</u> ቘ	463 (6.7)
	Female	8011 (53.5)	1424 (17.8)	2441 (30.5)	2064 (25.8)	<b>iš iš ≺</b> 17482212018.5)	600 (7.5)
Ethnicit	y					24. [ Jnerr	
	White	14440 (96.5)	2726 (18.9)	4629 (32.1)	3618 (25.1)		1016 (7.0)
	Non-white	522 (3.5)	100 (19.2)	173 (33.1)	121 (23.2)	e s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s	47 (9.0)
Educati	on					ded and	
	Less than upper secondary	5107 (34.1)	629 (12.3)	1417 (27.8)	1326 (26.0)		599 (11.7)
	Upper secondary, vocational	6444 (43.1)	1399 (21.7)	2186 (33.9)	1609 (25.0)		309 (4.8)
	Tertiary	2277 (15.2)	626 (27.5)	859 (37.7)	497 (21.8)	<b>6</b> 27 ( <b>3</b> 0.0)	68 (3.0)
	Others	1134 (7.6)	172 (15.2)	340 (30.0)	307 (27.1)		87 (7.7)
Employ	ment					ainii	
	Paid employment	8500 (56.8)	895 (10.5)	2278 (26.8)	2333 (27.5)	2033 (23.9)	961 (11.3)
	Unemployed	6462 (43.2)	1931 (30.0)	2524 (39.1)	1406 (21.8)		102 (1.6)
Marital	status					simil	
	Never married	789 (5.3)	148 (18.8)	268 (34.0)	189 (24.0)	ar 5 1231 (56.6)	53 (6.7)
	Married/partner	10766 (72.0)	2282 (21.2)	3635 (33.8)	2674 (24.8)	566 <b>1</b> 4.6)	609 (5.7)
	Separated/divorced/widowed	3407 (22.8)	396 (11.6)	899 (26.4)	876 (25.7)	<b>2</b> 2835 (264.5)	401 (11.8)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

# **Clusters of MLTC trajectory**

We examined one to six clusters in the model to determine the optimal cluster number. Five clusters were selected based on the model fit indicators (Supplementary Table 1) and the interpretability of classified trajectories.

Participants displayed high posterior probabilities of belonging to their assigned clusters ranging from 0.88 to 0.97 across the five clusters. The "no-LTC" cluster (18.57%) was dominated by people (95.2%) without any record of the examined long-term condition during the follow-up, and the "single-LTC" cluster (31.21%) consisted of those who did not develop MLTC during the study period but may have had one long-term condition (Figure 2) 🖁 The "evolving MLTC" cluster (25.82%) was characterised by people who progressed from less than two long-term conditions at baseline to two, three, or four by the end of follow-up. Two clusters had MLTC profiles which showed increasing numbers of long-term conditions ("moderate MLTC" (17.12%) and "high MLTC" (7.27%)) Those in these clusters started with MLTC and continued to have higher counts of long-term conditions in the following periods. 

G. Attaining, and similar technology and socio-demographic characteristics Increasing age was consistently associated with all MLTC clusters, compared to the "no-LTC" cluster (Table 1 & Compared to the "no-LTC") 2). Females had higher odds (aOR = 1.13; 95%CI 1.01 to 1.27) of being in the "moderate MLTC" clusters than females. Being non-white increased the odds of belonging to the "high MLTC" cluster by 2.04 times (aOR = 2.04; 95%CI 1.40 to 3) compared to whites. Higher education and paid employment decreased the odds of belonging to any of the four clusters than those with less than upper secondary education and unemployment, respectively.

jopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

Page 13 of 25

#### **BMJ** Open

		Adjusted OR (95%C	I) (Reference: No-LTC	2)
Socio-demographics	Single-LTC	Evolving MLTC	Moderate MLTC	High MLT
Age	1.04 (1.03-1.04)	1.05 (1.05-1.06)	1.07 (1.06-1.08)	1.08 (1.07-1.09)
Sex				
Male	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Female	1.00 (0.91-1.10)	1.11 (0.99-1.23)	1.13 (1.01-1.27)	0.95 (0.81-1.11)
Ethnicity				
White	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Non-white	1.17 (0.91-1.50)	1.13 (0.85-1.49)	1.36 (1.00-1.86)	2.04 (1.40-3.00)
Education				
Less than upper secondary	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Upper secondary, vocational	0.92 (0.81-1.03)	0.87 (0.77-0.99)	0.77 (0.67-0.88)	0.53 (0.45-0.64)
Tertiary	0.84 (0.72-0.97)	0.68 (0.58-0.80)	0.51 (0.42-0.62)	0.33 (0.25-0.45)
Others	1.01 (0.83-1.25)	1.04 (0.84-1.28)	0.99 (0.79-1.25)	0.76 (0.57-1.02)
Employment				
Unemployed	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Paid employment	0.79 (0.70-0.89)	0.54 (0.4 8-0.62)	0.35 (0.31-0.40)	0.17 (0.13-0.21)
Marital status				
Never married	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Married/partner	0.85 (0.69-1.04)	0.90 (0.72-1.14)	0.80 (0.62-1.03)	0.82 (0.58-1.15)
Separated/divorced/widowed	0.97 (0.77-1.23)	1.14 (0.88-1.48)	1.27 (0.96-1.68)	1.41 (0.98-2.04)
Abbreviation: MLTC Multiple Long-	Term Conditions			

## **Clusters of MLTC trajectory and all-cause mortality**

	= 1.81: 95% CI 1.21 to 2	2.73), the "evolving	1 MLTC" (aOR = 2.	26: 95% CI 1.51 to	) 3.38), th
"moderate MITC" (200	- 2.62: 0.5% CI 1.75 to	$\sim 2.04$ ) and the "h			4 to 621
	- 2.02, 95% CI 1.75 (C	, and the m		4.05, 95% CI 2.04	4 10 051.
clusters were significant	ly associated with high	er all-cause morta	lity, compared with	n the people in the	e "no-LIC
cluster ( <b>Table 3</b> ).					
Table 3.	Association between cl	lusters of MLTC tra	jectory and all-cau	ise mortality.	
	Alive (14310, 95.6%)	Dead (652, 4.4%)	Unadjusted OR (95%CI)	Adjusted <sup>1</sup> OR (95%CI)	p-value
Frajectory cluster					
No-LTC	2796 (98.9)	30 (1.1)	Reference	Reference	<0.0001
Single-LTC	4668 (97.2)	134 (2.8)	2.69 (1.81-4.01)	1.81 (1.21-2.73)	
Evolving MLTC	3566 (95.4)	174 (4.6)	4.59 (3.10-6.78)	2.26 (1.51-3.38)	
Moderate MLTC	2349 (92.8)	183 (7.2)	7.22 (4.89-10.7)	2.62 (1.75-3.94)	
High MLTC	931 (87.6)	132 (12.4)	13.6 (9.11-20.3)	4.03 (2.64-6.15)	
Abbreviation: MLIC, mu	lltiple long-term condit	ion.			
Abbreviation: MLTC, mu	iltiple long-term condit	ion.			

#### **BMJ** Open

#### Discussion

This study examined clusters of MLTC based on the accumulation of conditions as trajectories over time, their associations with sociodemographic factors, and all-cause mortality among older adults in England. We identified five distinct clusters that can be described as "no-LTC", "Single-LTC", "evolving MLTC", "moderate MLTC", and "high MLTC". We observed that the accumulation of MLTC over time progresses differently among older adults with distinction by sex, ethnicity, educational level, and employment status. Specifically, females and ethnic minorities showed faster/steeper progression towards increased numbers of MLTC, whereas higher education and paid employment had a protective effect on the increase of the accumulation of MLTC. An interesting finding was that clusters with different initial levels and rates of change in MLTC indicating

An interesting finding was that clusters with different initial levels and rates of change in MLTC indicating individual differences in the process of health deterioration. This is in line with previous studies that identified different rates of MLTC (25). Those with persistently high levels of multimorbidity have been also similarly identified in other population (26). However, consistent with the literature (25,26), we did not find any trajectories that indicated improvement in health over time (i.e., decreasing levels of MLTC). This may be due to the difficulty of recovery from long-term conditions among older adults.

The faster/steeper progression observed towards increased numbers of MLTC in females is in line with previous a literature, which found that the accumulation of long-term conditions was more severe for older females (27). An explanation can be that females tend to live longer than males, and as a result, they are more likely to develop the chronic conditions associated with ageing, such as arthritis and dementia. Clinicians should consider that females are at greater likelihood of MLTC. The faster development of MLTC in ethnic minorities can be explained by evidence suggesting that access and engagement with healthcare are limited for some population groups, often on the basis of ethnicity. Specifically, a review from NHS Race and Health Observatory (28) suggests that there are 'clear barriers' for people from minority ethnic backgrounds to seek help for mental health problems, and another research has also found lower access to cancer screening in the UK (29). Socioeconomic risk factors are known to be associated with MLTC (30). Our findings support the role of higher educational attainment, a major socioeconomic risk factor, on MLTC prevention. Targeting education inequality is expected to lead further to the restriction of worsening MLTC. The effect of educational attainment on MLTC is thought to be explained by other's risk factors that may mediate this association, such as body mass index and smoking.

Over their life course, individuals develop MLTC. It is necessary to challenge the common statement that MLTC is inevitable in an ageing society. To do this, the focus on MLTC should shift from sole management of high-risk

#### **BMJ** Open

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11

July 2024. Downloaded from

//bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

older individuals to include integrated population-level prevention strategies throughout the life course to address the drivers of MLTC. Programs that bridge multiple clinical specialities and healthcare units should be developed to focus on single individuals, their specific clinical profiles, and their specific clinical trajectories (31). Knowledge of how long-term conditions cluster, and especially how the status of MLTC can change over subsequent years, helps not only in understanding the complexity and dynamic evolution of MLTC clusters but also in supporting clinicians who manage co-occurring long-term conditions and health policymakers who plan care resources use.

This is the first study to examine trajectories of MLTC with a view to stratifying within MLTC to identify those at greatest risk among older adults in England. The main strength of the current study is the use of a large dataset assessing longitudinal data to examine MLTC trajectories and a dataset that is nationally representative of people aged 50 years and older, including a wide range of long-term conditions and sociodemographics. However, the results of this study should be interpreted with some caution. First, the measurement of MLTC was limited to ten long-term conditions that was all of what was available in ELSA, which may not be exhaustive of all possible long-term conditions. Findings could be different if more long-term conditions are considered. Second, although we examined the correlates of MLTC trajectories using the variables measured at the baseline (wave 2), we cannot conclude on the directionality of the associations. Another limitation is that because our study utilised are longitudinal design that examined age-related changes, there may be inherent confounding of age and period effects. These effects could not be disentangled in this study due to the nature of our data. Lastly, the probability of being in a cluster membership is based on model assignment, which can lead to misclassification bias.

In conclusion, MLTC trajectories of older adults are characterised by dynamism but can still be tracked over time. Considering MLTC clusters will enable future researchers and practitioners to provide evidence in identifying older adults in England at a higher risk of worsening MLTC over time and further tailoring effective interventions for at-risk individuals. Targeting females and ethnic minorities is important for MLTC prevention. Higher levels of education can also lead to a further decrease in the number of long-term conditions. Policymakers should commit to increasing MLTC awareness.

BMJ Open

Refe	erences
1.	World Health Organisation. Life tables [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Mar 28]. Available from
	https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/mortality-and-global-health-estimates/ghe-life-expectancy-
	and-healthy-life-expectancy
2.	Kingston A, Comas-Herrera A, Jagger C. Forecasting the care needs of the older population in England
	over the next 20 years: estimates from the Population Ageing and Care Simulation (PACSim) modelling
	study. Lancet Public Health. 2018 Sep;3(9):e447.
3.	World Health Organisation. Ageing and health [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Mar 28]. Available from
	https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health
4.	Ho ISS, Azcoaga-Lorenzo A, Akbari A, Davies J, Hodgins P, Khunti K, et al. Variation in the estimated
	prevalence of multimorbidity: systematic review and meta-analysis of 193 international studies. BMJ Open
	2022 Apr;12(4).
5.	Makovski TT, Schmitz S, Zeegers MP, Stranges S, van den Akker M. Multimorbidity and quality of life
	Systematic literature review and meta-analysis. Ageing Res Rev. 2019;53(April):100903.
5.	Wang L, Si L, Cocker F, Palmer AJ, Sanderson K. A Systematic Review of Cost-of-Illness Studies of
	Multimorbidity. Appl Health Econ Health Policy. 2018;16(1):15–29.
′.	Pathirana TI, Jackson CA. Socioeconomic status and multimorbidity: a systematic review and meta-analysis
	Aust N Z J Public Health. 2018 Apr;42(2):186–94.
3.	Nunes BP, Flores TR, Mielke GI, Thumé E, Facchini LA. Multimorbidity and mortality in older adults: A
	systematic review and meta-analysis. Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2016 Nov;67:130–8.
Э.	Wang D, Li D, Mishra SR, Lim C, Dai X, Chen S, et al. Association between marital relationship and
	multimorbidity in middle-aged adults: a longitudinal study across the US, UK, Europe, and China. Maturitas
	2022 Jan;155:32–9.
10.	Nguyen H, Wu YT, Dregan A, Vitoratou S, Chua KC, Prina AM. Multimorbidity patterns, all-cause mortality
	and healthy aging in older English adults: Results from the English Longitudinal Study of Aging. Geriati
	Gerontol Int. 2020 Dec;20(12):1126–32.
	16

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

//bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

#### **BMJ** Open

11. Larsen FB, Pedersen MH, Friis K, Gluèmer C, Lasgaard M. A Latent Class Analysis of Multimorbidity and the Relationship to Socio-Demographic Factors and Health-Related Quality of Life. A National Population-Based Study of 162,283 Danish Adults. PLoS One. 2017 Jan;12(1):e0169426.

2 3

4 5

6

21

37

43

55 56 57

58 59

60

- 7 12. Fabbri E, Zoli M, Gonzalez-Freire M, Salive ME, Studenski SA, Ferrucci L. Aging and Multimorbidity: New 8 9 Tasks, Priorities, and Frontiers for Integrated Gerontological and Clinical Research. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 10 11 12
- Tasks, Priorities, and Frontiers for Integrated Gerontological and Clinical Research. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2015 Aug;16(8):640. Steptoe A, Breeze E, Banks J, Nazroo J. Cohort profile: the English longitudinal study of ageing. Int J Epidemiol. 2013 Dec;42(6):1640–8. Banks J, Batty GD, Breedvelt JJF, Coughlin K, Crawford. R, Marmot M, et al. English Longitudinal Study of 13 13. 14 15 16
- 17 14. 18 includi 19 Ageing: Waves 0-9, 1998-2019 [data collection]. 3rd ed. UK Data Service. SN: 5050; 2021. 20
- Cadar D, Abell J, Matthews FE, Brayne C, David Batty G, Llewellyn DJ, et al. Cohort Profile Update: The 15. 22 23 Harmonised Cognitive Assessment Protocol Sub-study of the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA 24 25 HCAP). Int J Epidemiol. 2021 Jun;50(3):725-726I. 26
- 27 Dambha-Miller H, Simpson G, Hobson L, Olaniyan D, Hodgson S, Roderick P, et al. Integrating primary 16. 28 29 care and social services for older adults with multimorbidity: a qualitative study. Br J Gen Pract. 2021 30 31 Oct;71(711):E753-61. 32
- 33 Guthrie B, Payne K, Alderson P, McMurdo MET, Mercer SW. Adapting clinical guidelines to take account of 3 17. 34 35 multimorbidity. BMJ. 2012 Oct;345(7878). ā 36
- Muggli E, Hearps S, Halliday J, Elliott EJ, Penington A, Thompson DK, et al. A data driven approach to 38 18. 39 identify trajectories of prenatal alcohol consumption in an Australian population-based cohort of pregnant 40 41 women. Scientific Reports 2022 12:1. 2022 Mar;12(1):1-9. 42 Ś

Dalrymple K V., Vogel C, Godfrey KM, Baird J, Harvey NC, Hanson MA, et al. Longitudinal dietary trajectories 🛱 44 19. 45 from preconception to mid-childhood in women and children in the Southampton Women's Survey and 46 47 their relation to offspring adiposity: a group-based trajectory modelling approach. International Journal 48 49 of Obesity 2021 46:4. 2021 Dec;46(4):758-66. 50

51 Mésidor M, Rousseau MC, O'Loughlin J, Sylvestre MP. Does group-based trajectory modeling estimate 20. 52 53 spurious trajectories? BMC Med Res Methodol. 2022 Dec;22(1). 54

### BMJ Open

า ร		BMJ Open: first pub
9		lished
Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.	Enseignement Superieur (ABES)	ed as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I

1 2	21.	Chen H, Zhou Y, Huang L, Xu X, Yuan C. Multimorbidity burden and developmental trajectory in relation
3 4		to later-life dementia: A prospective study. Alzheimer's & Dementia. 2022;1–10.
5 6	22.	Quiñones AR, Nagel CL, Botoseneanu A, Newsom JT, Dorr DA, Kaye J, et al. Multidimensional trajectories
7 8		of multimorbidity, functional status, cognitive performance, and depressive symptoms among diverse
9 10		groups of older adults. Journal of Multimorbidity and Comorbidity. 2022 Nov;12:263355652211430.
11 12	23.	Zhou H, Zhang H, Zhan Q, Bai Y, Liu S, Yang X, et al. Blood pressure trajectories in early adulthood and
13 14		myocardial structure and function in later life. ESC Heart Fail. 2022 Apr;9(2):1258–68.
15 16	24.	Walsh CA, Cahir C, Bennett KE. Longitudinal Medication Adherence in Older Adults With Multimorbidity
17 18		and Association With Health Care Utilization: Results From the Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing. Ann
19 20		Pharmacother. 2021 Jan;55(1):5–14.
21	25.	Strauss VY, Jones PW, Kadam UT, Jordan KP. Distinct trajectories of multimorbidity in primary care were
23 24		identified using latent class growth analysis. J Clin Epidemiol. 2014;67(10):1163–71.
25 26 27	26.	Lee SA, Joo S, Chai HW, Jun HJ. Patterns of multimorbidity trajectories and their correlates among Korean
27 28 20		older adults. Age Ageing. 2021;50(4):1336–41.
30 31	27.	García-Esquinas E, Ortolá R, Prina M, Stefler D, Rodríguez-Artalejo F, Pastor-Barriuso R. Trajectories of
32		Accumulation of Health Deficits in Older Adults: Are There Variations According to Health Domains? J Am
33 34 35		Med Dir Assoc. 2019;20(6):710-717.e6.
36 37	28.	Kapadia D, Zhang J, Salway S, Nazroo J, Booth A, Villarroel-Williams N, et al. Ethnic Inequalities in
38 39		Healthcare: A Rapid Evidence Review. 2022.
40 41	29.	Szczepura A. Access to health care for ethnic minority populations. Vol. 81, Postgraduate Medical Journal.
42 43		2005. p. 141–7.
44 45	30.	Ingram E, Ledden S, Beardon S, Gomes M, Hogarth S, Mcdonald H, et al. Household and area-level social
46 47		determinants of multimorbidity: a systematic review. J Epidemiol Community Health (1978).
48 49		2021;75(3):232–41.
50 51	31.	Hemingway H, Croft P, Perel P, Hayden JA, Abrams K, Timmis A, et al. Prognosis research strategy
52 53		(PROGRESS) 1: A framework for researching clinical outcomes. BMJ (Online). 2013;346.
54 55		
56 57		
58 59		18
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

tor peer teriew only

### **Figure legends**

Figure 1. Flow chart of participants selection. MLTC, multiple long-term conditions.

Figure 2. Clusters of MLTC trajectories over time (wave 2 to 6) in the English Longitudinal Study of Aging (ELSA) study. The solid lines represent the estimated mean count of MLTC profiles for the five clusters. The "no-LTC" cluster included people who did not have any of the examined long-term conditions; the "single-LTC" cluster included those who did not develop MLTC but may have had one long-term condition; the "evolving MLTC" cluster included those who developed MLTC lately; the "moderate MLTC" cluster included those who started with the lower number of MLTC and developed further long-term conditions the "high MLTC" cluster consisted of those who started with the higher number of MLTC and developed additional long-term conditions. Abbreviation: MLTC, Multiple long-term conditions. 





Flow chart of participants selection. MLTC, multiple long-term conditions.

174x87mm (96 x 96 DPI)



Clusters of MLTC trajectories over time (wave 2 to 6) in the English Longitudinal Study of Aging (ELSA) study. The solid lines represent the estimated mean count of MLTC profiles for the five clusters. The "no-LTC" cluster included people who did not have any of the examined long-term conditions; the "single-LTC" cluster included those who did not develop MLTC but may have had one long-term condition; the "evolving MLTC" cluster included those who developed MLTC lately; the "moderate MLTC" cluster included those who developed further long-term conditions; the "high MLTC" cluster included those who be developed further long-term conditions; the "high MLTC" cluster included those who started with the lower number of MLTC and developed further long-term conditions; the "high MLTC" cluster consisted of those who started with the higher number of MLTC and developed additional long-term conditions. Abbreviation: MLTC, Multiple long-term conditions.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

155x102mm (96 x 96 DPI)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

# Trajectories of multiple long-term conditions and mortality in older adults: A retrospective cohort study using English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA)

Christos V. Chalitsios<sup>1</sup>, Cornelia Santoso<sup>1</sup>, Yvonne Nartey<sup>1</sup>, Nusrat Khan<sup>1</sup>, Glenn Simpson<sup>1</sup>, Nazrul Islam<sup>1</sup>, Beth Stuart<sup>2</sup>, Andrew Farmer<sup>3</sup>, Hajira Dambha-Miller<sup>1</sup>

#### Supplements

1       (1)       100       3       -85493.21       1       N/A         2       (1)       53.49       33       -73870.19       0.94       12.80         (2)       46.51       0.94       17.77         3       (1)       21.77       333       -63524.35       0.97       105.27         (2)       53.83       0.96       18.00         (3)       24.40       0.95       67.92         4       (1)       19.24       3333       -59262.14       0.96       93.69         (2)       36.07       0.90       19.00       0.90       19.00         (4)       12.69       0.96       172.34       0.90       19.00         (4)       12.69       0.96       172.34       0.90       18.92         (3)       25.43       0.88       23.77       0.90       14.02         (3)       25.43       0.88       23.77       0.90       14.02         (5)       7.31       0.95       284.50       0.97       119.02         (4)       17.15       0.90       44.02       0.90       14.02         (5)       7.31       0.95       284.50       0.97 <th>Number of groups</th> <th>Group</th> <th>o membership</th> <th>Trajectory shapes</th> <th>BIC (sample size=15085)</th> <th>APPA</th> <th>occ</th>	Number of groups	Group	o membership	Trajectory shapes	BIC (sample size=15085)	APPA	occ
2       (1)       53.49       33       -73870.19       0.94       12.88         (2)       46.51       0.94       17.7         3       (1)       21.77       333       -63524.35       0.97       105.22         (2)       53.83       0.96       18.00         (3)       24.40       0.95       67.92         4       (1)       19.24       3333       -59262.14       0.96       93.60         (2)       36.07       0.90       1900       1900       1900       1900       1900         (4)       12.69       0.96       172.32       0.90       1900       18.92         (3)       32       0.90       18.92       0.90       18.92       0.90       18.92         (3)       25.43       0.88       23.74       0.90       44.02       0.90       18.92         (3)       25.43       0.90       18.92       0.90       14.92       0.90       14.92         (4)       17.15       0.90       0.90       19.32       0.90       19.32         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.92       0.90       19.32         (3)       25.82       0.87 </th <th>1</th> <th>(1)</th> <th>100</th> <th>3</th> <th>-85493.21</th> <th>1</th> <th>N/A</th>	1	(1)	100	3	-85493.21	1	N/A
(2)       46.51       0.94       17.7         3       (1)       21.77       333       -63524.35       0.97       105.23         (2)       53.83       0.96       18.00       0.95       67.92         (3)       24.40       0.95       67.92       67.92         4       (1)       19.24       3333       -59262.14       0.96       93.69         (2)       36.07       0.93       24.44       0.93       24.44         (3)       32       0.90       19.00       19.00         (4)       12.69       0.96       172.33         5       (1)       19.35       33333       -56474.28       0.97       119.00         (2)       30.77       0.90       18.99       0.90       18.99       0.90       18.99       0.90       18.99       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       14.00       0.90       1.00 <td>2</td> <td>(1)</td> <td>53.49</td> <td>33</td> <td>-73870.19</td> <td>0.94</td> <td>12.80</td>	2	(1)	53.49	33	-73870.19	0.94	12.80
3       (1)       21,77       333       -63524.35       0.97       105.24         (2)       53.83       0.96       18.00         (3)       24.40       0.95       67.92         4       (1)       19.24       3333       -59262.14       0.96       93.60         (2)       36.07       0.93       24.44       0.93       24.44         (3)       32       0.90       19.00         (4)       12.69       0.96       172.34         (2)       30.77       0.90       18.90         (3)       25.43       0.88       23.74         (4)       17.15       0.90       44.00         (5)       7.31       0.95       284.50         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.97         (4)       17.12       0.90       19.33         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.97         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.33         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29		(2)	46.51			0.94	17.71
(2)       53.83       0.96       18.00         (3)       24.40       0.95       67.92         (4)       19.24       3333       -59262.14       0.96       93.63         (2)       36.07       0.93       24.44         (3)       32       0.90       19.00         (4)       12.69       0.96       172.34         (5)       (1)       19.35       33333       -56474.28       0.97       119.00         (3)       25.43       0.88       23.74         (4)       17.15       0.90       44.00         (5)       7.31       0.95       284.50         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.92         (4)       17.12       0.90       19.32         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.92         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.33         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29	3	(1)	21.77	333	-63524.35	0.97	105.25
(3)       24.40       0.95       67.92         4       (1)       19.24       3333       -59262.14       0.96       93.60         (2)       36.07       0.93       24.44         (3)       32       0.90       19.00         (4)       12.69       0.96       172.34         5       (1)       19.35       33333       -56474.28       0.97       119.07         (2)       30.77       0.90       18.92       0.90       18.92         (3)       25.43       0.88       23.74         (4)       17.15       0.90       44.00         (5)       7.31       0.95       284.50         (2)       31.21       0.90       19.32         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.92         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.32         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29		(2)	53.83			0.96	18.03
4       (1)       19.24       3333       -59262.14       0.96       93.64         (2)       36.07       0.93       24.4         (3)       32       0.90       19.03         (4)       12.69       0.96       172.34         5       (1)       19.35       33333       -56474.28       0.97       119.07         (2)       30.77       0.90       18.99       0.90       18.99         (3)       25.43       0.88       23.74         (4)       17.15       0.90       44.03         (5)       7.31       0.95       284.50         5       (1)       18.57       03311       -57000.83       0.96       109.66         (2)       31.21       0.90       19.33       0.90       19.33         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.93       0.90       19.33         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.93       0.90       44.33         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.33       0.90       44.33         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29       0.95       259.29		(3)	24.40			0.95	67.92
(2)       36.07       0.93       24.4         (3)       32       0.90       19.0         (4)       12.69       0.96       172.3         5       (1)       19.35       33333       -56474.28       0.97       119.0         (2)       30.77       0.90       18.9         (3)       25.43       0.88       23.7         (4)       17.15       0.90       44.0         (5)       7.31       0.95       284.50         5       (1)       18.57       03311       -57000.83       0.96       109.69         (2)       31.21       0.90       19.33       0.90       19.33       0.90       19.33         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.92       0.90       44.33         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.33       0.90       14.33         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29       0.95       259.29	4	(1)	19.24	3333	-59262.14	0.96	93.69
(3)       32       0.90       19.0         (4)       12.69       0.96       172.3         5       (1)       19.35       33333       -56474.28       0.97       119.0         (2)       30.77       0.90       18.9         (3)       25.43       0.88       23.7         (4)       17.15       0.90       44.0         (5)       7.31       0.95       284.50         5       (1)       18.57       03311       -57000.83       0.96       109.69         (2)       31.21       0.90       14.33       0.90       19.33         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.93       0.90       14.33         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.33       0.90       14.33         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29       0.95       259.29		(2)	36.07			0.93	24.44
(4)       12.69       0.96       172.34         5       (1)       19.35       33333       -56474.28       0.97       119.07         (2)       30.77       0.90       18.99         (3)       25.43       0.88       23.77         (4)       17.15       0.90       44.02         (5)       7.31       0.95       284.50         (2)       31.21       0.90       19.32         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.92         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.32         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.25		(3)	32			0.90	19.03
5       (1)       19.35       33333       -56474.28       0.97       119.05         (2)       30.77       0.90       18.99         (3)       25.43       0.88       23.70         (4)       17.15       0.90       44.05         (5)       7.31       0.95       284.50         5       (1)       18.57       03311       -57000.83       0.96       109.69         (2)       31.21       0.90       19.33       0.90       19.33         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.91         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.33         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29		(4)	12.69			0.96	172.34
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	5	(1)	19.35	33333	-56474.28	0.97	119.07
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		(2)	30.77			0.90	18.95
(4)       17.15       0.90       44.03         (5)       7.31       0.95       284.50         5       (1)       18.57       03311       -57000.83       0.96       109.69         (2)       31.21       0.90       19.33         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.93         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.33         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29		(3)	25.43			0.88	23.76
(5)       7.31       0.95       284.50         5       (1)       18.57       03311       -57000.83       0.96       109.69         (2)       31.21       0.90       19.33         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.93         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.33         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29		(4)	17.15			0.90	44.02
5       (1)       18.57       03311       -57000.83       0.96       109.69         (2)       31.21       0.90       19.33         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.93         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.33         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29		(5)	7.31			0.95	284.50
(2)       31.21       0.90       19.32         (3)       25.82       0.87       20.92         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.32         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29	5	(1)	18.57	03311	-57000.83	0.96	109.69
(3)       25.82       0.87       20.92         (4)       17.12       0.90       44.32         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29		(2)	31.21			0.90	19.32
(4)       17.12       0.90       44.32         (5)       7.27       0.95       259.29		(3)	25.82			0.87	20.91
(5) 7.27 0.95 259.29		(4)	17.12			0.90	44.32
		(5)	7.27			0.95	259.29

Note: Trajectory shapes (0=intercept, 1=linear, 2=quadratic, 3=cubic); BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion; APPA = average posterior probability assignment; OCC = odds of a correct classification according to maximum posterior probability group.

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or	1
		the abstract	
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what	3
		was done and what was found	
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being	5
-		reported	
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of	6
5		recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	
Participants	6	(a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	6
I.		methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	
		methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale	
		for the choice of cases and controls	
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	
		methods of selection of participants	
		(b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and	NA
		number of exposed and unexposed	
		<i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the	
		number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders,	6,7
		and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	
Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods	6
measurement		of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment	
		methods if there is more than one group	
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6,7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	NA
Ouantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If	7
		applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for	7
		confounding	
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	7
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was	7
		addressed	
		<i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and	
		controls was addressed	
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking	
		account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	7
		(	1 1

Continued on next page

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

3
4
5
6
7
, 8
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
10
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
20
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
27
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
-0 //7
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
50
57
58
59
60

1 2

Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially	9
		eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study,	
		completing follow-up, and analysed	
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	9
Descriptive	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and	9, 10
data		information on exposures and potential confounders	
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9, 10
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	NA
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	NA
		Case-control study-Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary	13
		measures of exposure	
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	NA
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and	13
		their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were	
		adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	13
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a	NA
		meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and	NA
		sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			<u>.</u>
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	14
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or	15
		imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations,	14,
		multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	14,
			15
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if	2
-		applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

**BMJ** Open

# **BMJ Open**

#### Trajectories in long-term conditions accumulation and mortality in older adults: A group-based trajectory modelling approach using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-074902.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-Jan-2024
Complete List of Authors:	Chalitsios, Christos; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Santoso, Cornelia; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Nartey, Yvonne; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Khan, Nusrat; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Simpson, Glenn; University of Southampton, UK. Simpson, Glenn; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Islam, Nazrul; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Stuart, Beth; Queen Mary University of London Farmer, Andrew; University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciencesd Dambha-Miller, Hajira; University of Southampton, Primary Care and Population Sciences
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Geriatric medicine
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, GERIATRIC MEDICINE, PUBLIC HEALTH

# SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

# Trajectories in long-term conditions accumulation and mortality in older adults: A group-based trajectory modelling approach using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing

Christos V. Chalitsios<sup>1</sup>, Cornelia Santoso<sup>1</sup>, Yvonne Nartey<sup>1</sup>, Nusrat Khan<sup>1</sup>, Glenn Simpson<sup>1</sup>, Nazrul Islam<sup>1</sup>, Beth Stuart<sup>2</sup>, Andrew Farmer<sup>3</sup>, Hajira Dambha-Miller<sup>1</sup>

Affiliations
<sup>1</sup> Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK.
<sup>2</sup> Centre for Evaluation and Methods, Wolfson Institute of Population Health, Queen Mary University of London, UK.
<sup>3</sup> Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK.
ORCID
Christos V. Chalitsios: 0000-0002-0836-9385
Cornelia Santoso: 0000-0002-5534-4404
Yvonne Nartey: 000-0001-9876-679X
Nusrat Khan: 0000-0003-3928-0022
Glenn Simpson: 0000-0002-1753-942X

- Glenn Simpson: 0000-0002-1753-942X
- Nazrul Islam: 0000-0003-3982-4325
- Beth Stuart: 0000-0001-5432-7437
- Andrew Farmer: 0000-0002-6170-4402
- Hajira Dambha-Miller: 0000-0003-0175-443X

# **Corresponding author**

- Hajira Dambha-Miller,
- Primary Care Research Centre,
- Aldermoor Close, SO16 5ST,
- University of Southampton, UK
- H.Dambha-Miller@soton.ac.uk

Word count: 2370 

Tables and figures: 3 tables & 2 figures 

Abstract: 224 words 

#### Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Ms Firoza Davies for her contribution as a patient and public representative in this study.

#### Authors' contribution

All authors (CVC, CS, YN, NK, GS, NI, BS, AF, and HDM) contributed to the study's conception and design. Data acquisition, data management, and analysis were performed by CVC, CS, and YN. All authors (CVC, CS, YN, NK, GS, NI, BS, AF, and HDM) contributed to the interpretation of the fundings. The first draft of the manuscript was Written by CVC, and all authors (CS, YN, NK, GS, NI, BS, AF, and HDM) commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors (CVC, CS, YN, NK, GS, NI, BS, AF, and HDM) read and approved the final manuscript.
 Funding
 This study is independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (Artificial Intelligence for Multiple Lange Terms Canditions (All 1). (The development and validations of neurolations of neurol

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Down

loaded from

http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

ABES

Multiple Long-Term Conditions (AIM), "The development and validation of population clusters for integrating? health and social care: A mixed-methods study on Multiple Long-Term Conditions", NIHR202637). The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care.

#### **Competing interests**

None declared.

#### **Ethics** approval

Ethical approval for the study was provided by the Faculty of Medicine Ethics Committee, University Hospital Southampton, (reference number 67953). Data availability statement ELSA data were available through the UK Data Archive and are widely available to access in this way; as such, our study data will not be made available for access. Ethical approval for the study was provided by the Faculty of Medicine Ethics Committee, University Hospital E.

### Abstract

### **Objectives**

To classify older adults into clusters based on accumulating long-term conditions (LTC) as trajectories, characterise clusters, and quantify their associations with all-cause mortality.

Design We conducted a cross-sectional study using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) over nine years (n=15,091 aged 50 years and older). Group-based trajectory modelling was used to classify people into clusters based on accumulating LTC over time. Derived clusters were used to quantify the associations between trajectory memberships, sociodemographic characteristics, and all-cause mortality by conducting regression models. **Results** 

for Five distinct clusters of accumulating LTC trajectories were identified and characterised as: "no-LTC" (18.57%) "single-LTC" (31.21%), "evolving multimorbidity" (25.82%), "moderate multimorbidity" (17.12%), and "high multimorbidity" (7.27%). Increasing age was consistently associated with a larger number of LTC. Ethnic minorities (aOR = 2.04; 95%CI 1.40 to 3.00) were associated with the "high multimorbidity" cluster. Higher education and paid employment were associated with a lower likelihood of progression over time towards an increased number of LTC. All the clusters had higher all-cause mortality than the "no-LTC" cluster.

# **Conclusions**

The development of multimorbidity in the number of conditions over time follows distinct trajectories. These are≥ determined by non-modifiable (age, ethnicity) and modifiable factors (education and employment). Stratifying ng, and similar technologies risk through clustering will enable practitioners to identify older adults with a higher likelihood of worsening LT( over time to tailor effective interventions to prevent mortality.

### Keywords

Multimorbidity, trajectories, mortality, English Longitudinal Study on Ageing (ELSA), older adults.

## **Strengths and limitations**

- The main strength of the current study is the use of a large and nationally representative dataset of people aged 50 years and older assessing longitudinal data to examine long-term conditions (LTC) trajectories.
- <text> The measurement was limited to ten long-term conditions, based on what was available in the English . Longitudinal Study of Ageing, which may not be exhaustive of all possible long-term conditions.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from Enseignement Superieur (AF

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and

data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

(ABES)

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

### Introduction

Globally, the average life expectancy has risen from 66.8 years in 2000 to 73.4 years in 2019 (1). By 2050, the population over 60 and 80 years will reach 2.1 billion and 426 million, respectively (2,3). This rise in longevity raises the risk of developing multimorbidity, which is the co-occurrence of two or more chronic diseases (4). The worldwide prevalence of multimorbidity among older people is reported to be between 55-98% (5), and in the UK, this is expected to rise from 54% in 2015 to 68% in 2035 (2). Multimorbidity represents an ongoing challenge for healthcare systems because people with multimorbidity have worse care outcomes, including functional limitation and disability (6,7), higher service utilisation (5), mortality (8) and poorer quality of life (5). Management of multimorbidity places considerable economic and logistical burdens on services traditionally organised around single disease models (6).

While there is ample evidence of identified risk factors (7,9) and adverse care outcomes for multimorbidity crosssectionally to help understand the prevalence and patterns of LTC, they provide little evidence on temporal elements, including patterns of LTC development over time (8,10,11). There is a paucity of longitudinal approaches examining patterns in the accumulation of diseases (12). Understanding the trajectory that an older adult will follow in the progression towards an increased number of LTC could help predict when intervention is needed and inform targeted and earlier preventive interventions. To address this gap in the literature, this study aimed to classify older adults with LTC into clusters based on the accumulation of conditions as trajectories over time, characterise these clusters, and quantify the association between derived clusters and all-cause mortality.

#### **Methods**

### Data source and study population

The English Longitudinal Study of Aging (ELSA) is a longitudinal cohort of people aged 50 years or older living in England (13). The ELSA cohort profile has been described in detail elsewhere (14). In summary, it included 12,099 people at study entry in 2002 with follow-up every two years with self-report questionnaires on physical and mental health, well-being, finances, and attitudes around ageing over time. Four yearly additional nurse visits collected objective data such as anthropometric data (13,15). The ELSA is an open cohort, and refreshment samples were added depending on the proportional age requirement for ELSA, so the total number of people in this cohort was 15,091. Our baseline was wave 2 (2004/5) of the ELSA cohort, the first collecting time point in the study of long-term conditions with a nine-year follow-up to wave 6 (2012/3), the most recent wave with available luding for uses data on all-cause mortality status.

## **Multimorbidity**

Multimorbidity was defined as the presence of two or more of the following ten conditions: hypertension, diabetes, cancer, lung disease, cardiovascular disease, stroke, mental health disorder, arthritis, Parkinson's disease, and dementia. These are self-reported by patients, relatives or carers and verified by nurse visits (13). These ten conditions were available within the ELSA dataset based on our earlier work to define multimorbidity (16,17). After statistical consideration due to the small sample size and clinical discussion, we grouped some of the conditions as follows: people with depression were combined with mental health disorders, asthma was≥ combined with lung disease, Alzheimer's within dementia, and finally, those with heart attack, angina, heart

murmur, abnormal heart rhythm and congestive heart failure combined into those with cardiovascular disease. All-cause mortality All-cause mortality was reported by end-of-life interviews on waves 2, 3, 4 and 6 with relatives and friends after of death.
BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

jopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

### **Covariates**

Sociodemographic variables included were age, sex, ethnicity (defined as white/non-white), education, employment, and marital status. The education variable was categorised into four groups: less than upper secondary level, upper secondary and vocational level, tertiary level, and others. Employment status was categorised into 'paid employment and 'unemployed'. Marital status was categorised into three groups: never married, married/having a partner, and separated/divorced/widowed. These covariates were based on the baseline. We used data provided in the nearest subsequent waves if they were missing at baseline.

Statistical analysis
Descriptive statistics were used to summarise participants' characteristics. We used group-based trajectorydi

modelling (GBTM) to classify older adults with LTC into clusters based on accumulating conditions as trajectories over time. GBTM is a finite mixture model applying maximum likelihood to identify a cluster of people following similar trajectories by the number of conditions over time (18). This model assumes the same error variance for all clusters and time points and treats missing data as 'missing at random' (19). The procedure for selecting the best model included two steps: identifying the ideal number of trajectory groups and determining polynomial orders to represent the shapes of the trajectories (18,20). Based on the observed distribution, we employed a censored normal model to specify LTC (21,22). We fitted the models iteratively, starting with one and increasing up to a maximum of six clusters that would be useful in a clinical setting (20). We selected the number of trajectory clusters based on the following criteria: the lowest Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) value, Average Posterior Probability Assignment (APPA) >70%, Odds of a Correct Classification (OCC) >5, the percentage of participants in each trajectory groups >5% of the total sample (if less than 5% it is unlikely to be conceptually useful fore clinical practice) (22-24). We first used cubic polynomials to characterise the shape of the clusters of LTC trajectories. However, after selecting the number of trajectories, we refitted the model to use lower-order terms when the higher-order terms were insignificant (20). We then assigned individuals to the trajectory group based  $\Re$ on the maximum posterior probability (20). Multinomial logistic regression was then performed to test the association between socio-demographic factors and clusters of LTC trajectory, with the "no-LTC" cluster as the reference. Binary logistic regression was also performed to quantify the association between the clusters of LTC trajectory membership and all-cause mortality, adjusting for all the covariates mentioned above. A squared term of age was included in the model to account for the non-linear relationship between age and mortality. The significance level was set at a p-value <0.05, and all analyses were performed using STATA M.P v17.0.

### Patient and Public Involvement

This study was conducted as part of a wider mixed-methods programme of research exploring the potential of machine learning to address multimorbidity through the 'clustering' of patients based on similarities in clinical and social care needs. Patient and public involvement has been incorporated throughout the wider research  $_{\mathbf{u}}$ and social care needs. Patient and public involvement has been incorporated throughout the wider research programme from the initial inception, design, and dissemination of findings. The initial results and the final written draft of the study submitted in this manuscript were shared with our programme's patient and public representative. tor peer terien only

### Results

### Participants' characteristics

There were 9,170 participants in wave 2 and we identified 15,091 individuals participating in at least one wave during the follow-up period (The flow of participants through the study is shown in **Figure 1**). Six participants were excluded, as they had no information on LTC. After excluding those (n = 123) with missing data on covariates, 14,962 people were included in the final analysis. The mean (SD) age of the cohort was 61.9 (11) years most were females (53.5%), whites (96.5%), with educational attainment of upper secondary or vocational (43.1%), employed (56.8%), and married or had a partner (72%) (**Table 1**). were excluded, as they had no information on LTC. After excluding those (n = 123) with missing data on  $\underline{r}$ 

or oper teries only

Page 11 of 24

		<b>Total</b> 14962 (100%)	<b>No-LTC</b> 2826 (18.9%)	<b>Single-LTC</b> 4802 (32.1%)	Evolving multimorbidity 3739 (25.0%)	ୁଇପ୍ରିଙ୍ଗate multonorbidity ଅକ୍ତ 32 ଲି.6.9%)	High multimorbidit 1063 (7.1%)
<b>Age,</b> m	ean (SD)	61.9 (11)	56.0 (9.1)	60.0 (10.0)	62.9 (10.8)	<b>G</b> .1 <b>S</b> 0.7)	69.8 (10.4)
Sex						n 11 y for	
	Male	6951 (46.5)	1402 (20.2)	2361 (34.0)	1675 (24.1)		463 (6.7)
	Female	8011 (53.5)	1424 (17.8)	2441 (30.5)	2064 (25.8)	<b>s s</b> 1462 <u>1</u> 8.5) <b>e c</b>	600 (7.5)
Ethnici	ty					24. C ated	
	White	14440 (96.5)	2726 (18.9)	4629 (32.1)	3618 (25.1)		1016 (7.0)
	Non-white	522 (3.5)	100 (19.2)	173 (33.1)	121 (23.2)		47 (9.0)
Educat	ion					and a	
	Less than upper secondary	5107 (34.1)	629 (12.3)	1417 (27.8)	1326 (26.0)		599 (11.7)
	Upper secondary, vocational	6444 (43.1)	1399 (21.7)	2186 (33.9)	1609 (25.0)		309 (4.8)
	Tertiary	2277 (15.2)	626 (27.5)	859 (37.7)	497 (21.8)	27 (30.0)	68 (3.0)
	Others	1134 (7.6)	172 (15.2)	340 (30.0)	307 (27.1)		87 (7.7)
Employ	/ment					raini	
	Paid employment	8500 (56.8)	895 (10.5)	2278 (26.8)	2333 (27.5)	<b>2</b> 033 <b>2</b> 23.9)	961 (11.3)
	Unemployed	6462 (43.2)	1931 (30.0)	2524 (39.1)	1406 (21.8)		102 (1.6)
Marita	status					/ on	
	Never married	789 (5.3)	148 (18.8)	268 (34.0)	189 (24.0)	נק 131 (∰6.6)	53 (6.7)
	Married/partner	10766 (72.0)	2282 (21.2)	3635 (33.8)	2674 (24.8)	2566 J. 14.6)	609 (5.7)
	Separated/divorced/widowed	3407 (22.8)	396 (11.6)	899 (26.4)	876 (25.7)	885 (24.5)	401 (11.8)

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded

| from

//bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

BES

# **Clusters of LTC trajectory**

 We examined one to six clusters in the model to determine the optimal cluster number. Five clusters were selected based on the model fit indicators (Supplementary Table 1) and the interpretability of classified trajectories.

Participants displayed high posterior probabilities of belonging to their assigned clusters ranging from 0.88 to 0.97 across the five clusters. The "no-LTC" cluster (18.57%) was dominated by people (95.2%) without any record of the examined long-term condition during the follow-up, and the "single-LTC" cluster (31.21%) consisted of those who did not develop multimorbidity during the study period but may have had one long-term condition (Figure 2). The "evolving multimorbidity" cluster (25.82%) was characterised by people who progressed from less than two long-term conditions at baseline to two, three, or four by the end of follow-up. Two clusters had multimorbidity profiles which showed increasing numbers of long-term conditions ("moderate multimorbidity (17.12%) and "high multimorbidity" (7.27%)). Those in these clusters started with multimorbidity and continued to have higher counts of long-term conditions in the following periods.

# **Clusters of LTC trajectory and socio-demographic characteristics**

Increasing age was consistently associated with all LTC clusters, compared to the "no-LTC" cluster (Table 1 & 2). Females had higher odds (aOR = 1.13; 95%CI 1.01 to 1.27) of being in the "moderate multimorbidity" clusters than males. Being non-white increased the odds of belonging to the "high multimorbidity" cluster by 2.04 times (aOR = 2.04; 95%CI 1.40 to 3) compared to whites. Higher education and paid employment decreased the odds of belonging to any of the four clusters than those with less than upper secondary education and unemployment, training, and similar technologies respectively.

			Adjusted OR (95	%CI) (Reference: No-LTC	.) .)
Socio-d	emographics	Single-ITC	Evolving	Moderate	High
Age		1.04 (1.03-1.04)	1 05 (1 05-1 06)	1 07 (1 06-1 08)	1 08 (1 07-1 09
Sex		1.01 (1.00 1.01)	1.03 (1.03 1.00)	1.07 (1.00 1.00)	1.00 (1.07 1.03
	Male	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	Female	1.00 (0.91-1.10)	1.11 (0.99-1.23)	1.13 (1.01-1.27)	0.95 (0.81-1.11
Ethnicit	v	,	()	( ,	
	White	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	Non-white	1.17 (0.91-1.50)	1.13 (0.85-1.49)	1.36 (1.00-1.86)	2.04 (1.40-3.00
Educatio	on	(			( · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Less than upper secondary	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	Upper secondary, vocational	0.92 (0.81-1.03)	0.87 (0.77-0.99)	0.77 (0.67-0.88)	0.53 (0.45-0.64
	Tertiary	0.84 (0.72-0.97)	0.68 (0.58-0.80)	0.51 (0.42-0.62)	0.33 (0.25-0.45
	Others	1.01 (0.83-1.25)	1.04 (0.84-1.28)	0.99 (0.79-1.25)	0.76 (0.57-1.02
Employ	ment			( , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Υ.
	Unemployed	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	Paid employment	0.79 (0.70-0.89)	0.54 (0.4 8-0.62)	0.35 (0.31-0.40)	0.17 (0.13-0.21
Marital	status			( , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Υ.
	Never married	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	Married/partner	0.85 (0.69-1.04)	0.90 (0.72-1.14)	0.80 (0.62-1.03)	0.82 (0.58-1.15
	Separated/divorced/widowed	0.97 (0.77-1.23)	1 14 (0 88-1 48)	1 27 (0 96-1 68)	1 41 (0 98-2 04
			12		

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

**Enseignement Superieur** 

(ABES)

data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

### **BMJ** Open

# **Clusters of LTC trajectory and all-cause mortality**

The "Single-LTC" (aOR = 1.81; 95% CI 1.21 to 2.73), the "evolving multimorbidity" (aOR = 2.26; 95% CI 1.51 to 3.38), the "moderate multimorbidity" (aOR = 2.62; 95% CI 1.75 to 3.94), and the "high multimorbidity" (aOR = 4.03; 95% CI 2.64 to 6315) clusters were significantly associated with higher all-cause mortality, compared with the people in the "no-LTC" cluster (Table 3).

	Alive	Dead	Unadiusted OR	Adjusted <sup>1</sup> OR	p-value <sup>2</sup>
	(14310, 95.6%)	(652, 4.4%)	(95%CI)	(95%CI)	
Trajectory cluster					
No-LTC	2796 (98.9)	30 (1.1)	Reference	Reference	< 0.0001
Single-LTC	4668 (97.2)	134 (2.8)	2.69 (1.81-4.01)	1.81 (1.21-2.73)	
Evolving multimorbidity	3566 (95.4)	174 (4.6)	4.59 (3.10-6.78)	2.26 (1.51-3.38)	
Moderate multimorbidity	2349 (92.8)	183 (7.2)	7.22 (4.89-10.7)	2.62 (1.75-3.94)	
High multimorbidity	931 (87.6)	132 (12.4)	13.6 (9.11-20.3)	4.03 (2.64-6.15)	
djusted for age, sex, ethnicity, ed a squared term. -value for trend. breviation: LTC, long-term cond	ucation, employ lition.	rment status, a	nd marital status.	Age was included	d in the m

ation, employment status, and marital status. Age wa as a squared term.

### **BMJ** Open

### Discussion

This study examined clusters of LTC based on the accumulation of conditions as trajectories over time, their associations with sociodemographic factors, and all-cause mortality among older adults in England. We identified five distinct clusters that can be described as "no-LTC", "single-LTC", "evolving multimorbidity", "moderate multimorbidity", and "high multimorbidity". We observed that the accumulation of LTC over time progresses differently among older adults with distinction by ethnicity, educational level, and employment status. Specifically, ethnic minorities showed faster/steeper progression towards increased numbers of LTC, whereas higher education and paid employment had a protective effect on the increase in the accumulation of LTC. An interesting finding was that clusters with different initial levels and rates of change in LTC indicating individual"

An interesting finding was that clusters with different initial levels and rates of change in LTC indicating individual differences in the process of health deterioration. This is in line with previous studies that identified different rates of LTC (25). Those with persistently high levels of multimorbidity have also been similarly identified in other populations (26). However, consistent with the literature (25,26), we did not find any trajectories that indicated improvement in health over time (i.e., decreasing levels of LTC). This may be due to the difficulty of recovery from long-term conditions among older adults or due to the older population as it is anticipated that the mean number of conditions will increase as we follow them over time (waves).

The faster/steeper progression observed towards increased numbers of LTC in females is in line with previous a literature, which found that the accumulation of long-term conditions was more severe for older females (27). An explanation can be that females tend to live longer than males, and as a result, they are more likely to develop chronic conditions associated with ageing, such as arthritis and dementia. The faster development of MLTC in ethnic minorities can be explained by evidence suggesting that access and engagement with healthcare are limited for some population groups, often on the basis of ethnicity. Specifically, a review from NHS Race and Health Observatory (28) suggests that there are 'clear barriers' for people from minority ethnic backgrounds to seek help for mental health problems, and another research has also found lower access to cancer screening in the UK (29). Socioeconomic risk factors are known to be associated with MLTC (30). Our findings support the roleepool of higher educational attainment, a major socioeconomic risk factor, on MLTC prevention. Targeting education inequality is expected to lead further to the restriction of worsening MLTC. The effect of educational attainments on MLTC is thought to be explained by other risk factors that may mediate this association, such as body mass index and smoking.

Over their life course, individuals develop MLTC. It is necessary to challenge the common statement that MLTC is inevitable in an ageing society. To do this, the focus on MLTC should shift from sole management of high-risk

### **BMJ** Open

older individuals to include integrated population-level prevention strategies throughout the life course to address the drivers of MLTC. Programs that bridge multiple clinical specialities and healthcare units should be developed to focus on single individuals, their specific clinical profiles, and their specific clinical trajectories (31). Knowledge of how long-term conditions cluster, and especially how the status of MLTC can change over subsequent years, helps not only in understanding the complexity and dynamic evolution of MLTC clusters but also in supporting clinicians who manage co-occurring long-term conditions and health policymakers who plan care resources use. This is the first study to examine trajectories of MLTC with a view to stratifying within MLTC to identify those at

This is the first study to examine trajectories of MLTC with a view to stratifying within MLTC to identify those at greatest risk among older adults in England. The main strength of the current study is the use of a large dataset, assessing longitudinal data to examine MLTC trajectories and a dataset that is nationally representative of people aged 50 years and older, including a wide range of long-term conditions and sociodemographics. However, the results of this study should be interpreted with some caution. First, the measurement of MLTC was limited to ten long-term conditions that was all of what was available in ELSA, which may not be exhaustive of all possible long-term conditions. Findings could be different if more long-term conditions are considered. Second, although we examined the correlates of MLTC trajectories using the variables measured at the baseline (wave 2), we cannot conclude on the directionality of the associations. Another limitation is that because our study utilised age longitudinal design that examined age-related changes, there may be inherent confounding of age and period effects. These effects could not be disentangled in this study due to the nature of our data. Lastly, the probability of being in a cluster membership is based on model assignment, which can lead to misclassification bias.

In conclusion, LTC trajectories of older adults are characterised by dynamism but can still be tracked over time. Considering LTC clusters has potential to enable future researchers and practitioners to provide evidence in identifying older adults in England at a higher risk of worsening MLTC over time and further tailoring effective interventions for at-risk individuals. Targeting ethnic minorities is important for multimorbidity prevention. Higher levels of education can also lead to a further decrease in the number of long-term conditions. Policymakers should commit to increasing MLTC awareness.

### References 2 3 World Health Organisation. Life tables [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Mar 28]. Available from: 1. 4 5 https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/mortality-and-global-health-estimates/ghe-life-expectancy-6 7 and-healthy-life-expectancy 8 9 Kingston A, Comas-Herrera A, Jagger C. Forecasting the care needs of the older population in England 2. 10 over the next 20 years: estimates from the Population Ageing and Care Simulation (PACSim) modelling study. Lancet Public Health. 2018 Sep;3(9):e447. World Health Organisation. Ageing and health [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Mar 28]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health 11 12 13 14 15 3. 16 17 18 Ho ISS, Azcoaga-Lorenzo A, Akbari A, Davies J, Hodgins P, Khunti K, et al. Variation in the estimated 19 20 4. 21 prevalence of multimorbidity: systematic review and meta-analysis of 193 international studies. BMJ Open 22 23 2022 Apr;12(4). 24 25 Makovski TT, Schmitz S, Zeegers MP, Stranges S, van den Akker M. Multimorbidity and quality of life: 26 5. 27 Systematic literature review and meta-analysis. Ageing Res Rev. 2019;53(April):100903. 28 29 30 Wang L, Si L, Cocker F, Palmer AJ, Sanderson K. A Systematic Review of Cost-of-Illness Studies of 6. 31 32 Multimorbidity. Appl Health Econ Health Policy. 2018;16(1):15–29. 33 Pathirana TI, Jackson CA. Socioeconomic status and multimorbidity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. 34 7. 35 Вu 36 Aust N Z J Public Health. 2018 Apr;42(2):186–94. ≥ 37 Nunes BP, Flores TR, Mielke GI, Thumé E, Facchini LA. Multimorbidity and mortality in older adults: A 38 8. 39 ing, 40 systematic review and meta-analysis. Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2016 Nov;67:130-8. and 41 42 Wang D, Li D, Mishra SR, Lim C, Dai X, Chen S, et al. Association between marital relationship and 9. 43 multimorbidity in middle-aged adults: a longitudinal study across the US, UK, Europe, and China. Maturitas. 2022 Jan;155:32–9. Nguyen H, Wu YT, Dregan A, Vitoratou S, Chua KC, Prina AM. Multimorbidity patterns, all-cause mortality 44 45 46 47 48 10. 49 50 and healthy aging in older English adults: Results from the English Longitudinal Study of Aging. Geriatr 51 52 Gerontol Int. 2020 Dec;20(12):1126-32. 53 54 55 56 57 58 16 59

### **BMJ** Open

11. Larsen FB, Pedersen MH, Friis K, Gluèmer C, Lasgaard M. A Latent Class Analysis of Multimorbidity and the Relationship to Socio-Demographic Factors and Health-Related Quality of Life. A National Population-Based Study of 162,283 Danish Adults. PLoS One. 2017 Jan;12(1):e0169426.

2 3

4 5

6

12

59

60

- 7 12. Fabbri E, Zoli M, Gonzalez-Freire M, Salive ME, Studenski SA, Ferrucci L. Aging and Multimorbidity: New 8 9 Tasks, Priorities, and Frontiers for Integrated Gerontological and Clinical Research. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 10 11 2015 Aug;16(8):640.
- Protected by copyright 13 Steptoe A, Breeze E, Banks J, Nazroo J. Cohort profile: the English longitudinal study of ageing. Int 13. 14 15 Epidemiol. 2013 Dec;42(6):1640-8. 16
- 17 Banks J, Batty GD, Breedvelt JJF, Coughlin K, Crawford. R, Marmot M, et al. English Longitudinal Study o 14. 18 19 Ageing: Waves 0-9, 1998-2019 [data collection]. 3rd ed. UK Data Service. SN: 5050; 2021. 20
- Cadar D, Abell J, Matthews FE, Brayne C, David Batty G, Llewellyn DJ, et al. Cohort Profile Update: The 21 15. 22 23 Harmonised Cognitive Assessment Protocol Sub-study of the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA 24 25 HCAP). Int J Epidemiol. 2021 Jun;50(3):725-726I. 26
- 27 Dambha-Miller H, Simpson G, Hobson L, Olaniyan D, Hodgson S, Roderick P, et al. Integrating primary 16. 28 29 care and social services for older adults with multimorbidity: a qualitative study. Br J Gen Pract. 2021 30 31 Oct;71(711):E753-61. 32
- 33 Guthrie B, Payne K, Alderson P, McMurdo MET, Mercer SW. Adapting clinical guidelines to take account of 17. 34 35 multimorbidity. BMJ. 2012 Oct;345(7878). 36
- 37 Muggli E, Hearps S, Halliday J, Elliott EJ, Penington A, Thompson DK, et al. A data driven approach to 18. 38 39 identify trajectories of prenatal alcohol consumption in an Australian population-based cohort of pregnant 40 and 41 women. Scientific Reports 2022 12:1. 2022 Mar;12(1):1-9. 42 <u>0</u>

43 تق Dalrymple K V., Vogel C, Godfrey KM, Baird J, Harvey NC, Hanson MA, et al. Longitudinal dietary trajectories 19. 44 45 from preconception to mid-childhood in women and children in the Southampton Women's Survey and 46 their relation to offspring adiposity: a group-based trajectory modelling approach. International Journal 47 48 lies 49 of Obesity 2021 46:4. 2021 Dec;46(4):758-66. 50

51 20. Mésidor M, Rousseau MC, O'Loughlin J, Sylvestre MP. Does group-based trajectory modeling estimate 52 53 spurious trajectories? BMC Med Res Methodol. 2022 Dec;22(1). 54

### **BMJ** Open

1	21.	Chen H, Zhou Y, Huang L, Xu X, Yuan C. Multimorbidity burden and developmental trajectory in relation
2 3 4		to later-life dementia: A prospective study. Alzheimer's & Dementia. 2022;1–10.
5	22.	Quiñones AR, Nagel CL, Botoseneanu A, Newsom JT, Dorr DA, Kaye J, et al. Multidimensional trajectories
7		of multimorbidity, functional status, cognitive performance, and depressive symptoms among diverse
o 9 10		groups of older adults. Journal of Multimorbidity and Comorbidity. 2022 Nov;12:263355652211430.
10 11 12	23.	Zhou H, Zhang H, Zhan Q, Bai Y, Liu S, Yang X, et al. Blood pressure trajectories in early adulthood and
12 13 14		myocardial structure and function in later life. ESC Heart Fail. 2022 Apr;9(2):1258–68.
14 15 16	24.	Walsh CA. Cahir C. Bennett KE. Longitudinal Medication Adherence in Older Adults With Multimorbidity
17		and Association With Health Care Utilization: Results From the Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing App
18 19		Pharmacother 2021 Jan:55(1):5-14
20 21		
22	25.	Strauss VY, Jones PW, Kadam UT, Jordan KP. Distinct trajectories of multimorbidity in primary care were
23 24		identified using latent class growth analysis. J Clin Epidemiol. 2014;67(10):1163–71.
25 26	26.	Lee SA, Joo S, Chai HW, Jun HJ. Patterns of multimorbidity trajectories and their correlates among Korean
27 28		older adults. Age Ageing. 2021;50(4):1336–41.
29 30	27.	García-Esquinas E, Ortolá R, Prina M, Stefler D, Rodríguez-Artalejo F, Pastor-Barriuso R. Trajectories of
31 32		Accumulation of Health Deficits in Older Adults: Are There Variations According to Health Domains? J Am
33 34		Med Dir Assoc. 2019;20(6):710-717.e6.
35 36	28.	ترج Kapadia D, Zhang J, Salway S, Nazroo J, Booth A, Villarroel-Williams N, et al. Ethnic Inequalities in
37 38		Healthcare: A Rapid Evidence Review. 2022.
39 40	29.	Szczepura A. Access to health care for ethnic minority populations. Vol. 81, Postgraduate Medical Journal.
41 42 42		2005. p. 141–7.
45 44 45	30.	الله Ingram E, Ledden S, Beardon S, Gomes M, Hogarth S, Mcdonald H, et al. Household and area-level social
46		determinants of multimorbidity: a systematic review. J Epidemiol Community Health (1978).
47 48 40		2021;75(3):232–41.
50	31.	۳ Hemingway H, Croft P, Perel P, Hayden JA, Abrams K, Timmis A, et al. Prognosis research strategy
51 52		(PROGRESS) 1: A framework for researching clinical outcomes. BMJ (Online). 2013;346.
53 54		
55 56		
50 57		
58 59		18

# BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from Enseignement Su ABES http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de ning, Al training, and similar technologies

# Figure legends

Figure 1. Flow chart of participants selection. MLTC, multiple long-term conditions.

Figure 2. Clusters of long-term condition (LTC) trajectories over time (wave 2 to 6) in the English Longitudinal Study of Aging study. The solid lines represent the estimated mean count of LTC profiles for the five clusters. The "no-LTC" cluster included people who did not have any of the examined LTC; the "single-LTC" cluster included those who did not develop MLTC but may have had one LTC; the "evolving MLTC" cluster included those who developed MLTC lately; the "moderate MLTC" cluster included those MLTC cluster included those who developed MLTC lately; the "moderate MLTC" cluster included those who started with the lower number of MLTC and developed further long-term conditions; the "high MLTC" cluster consisted of those who started with the higher number of MLTC and developed additional long-term conditions. Abbreviation: MLTC, Multiple long-term conditions. ΦVI...



**BMJ** Open





Time period (waves)

Clusters of long-term condition (LTC) trajectories over time (wave 2 to 6) in the English Longitudinal Study of Aging study. The solid lines represent the estimated mean count of LTC profiles for the five clusters. The "no-LTC" cluster included people who did not have any of the examined LTC; the "single-LTC" cluster included those who did not develop MLTC but may have had one LTC; the "evolving MLTC" cluster included

those who developed MLTC lately; the "moderate MLTC" cluster included those who started with the lower number of MLTC and developed further long-term conditions; the "high MLTC" cluster consisted of those who started with the higher number of MLTC and developed additional long-term conditions. Abbreviation: MLTC, Multiple long-term conditions.

190x114mm (300 x 300 DPI)

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

# Trajectories in long-term conditions accumulation and mortality in older adults: A group-based trajectory modelling approach using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing

Christos V. Chalitsios<sup>1</sup>, Cornelia Santoso<sup>1</sup>, Yvonne Nartey<sup>1</sup>, Nusrat Khan<sup>1,</sup> Glenn Simpson<sup>1</sup>, Nazrul Islam<sup>1</sup>, Beth Stuart<sup>2</sup>, Andrew Farmer<sup>3</sup>, Hajira Dambha-Miller<sup>1</sup>

### Supplements

Number of groups	Grou	ıp membership	Trajectory shapes	BIC (sample size=15085)	APPA	OCC
1	(1)	100	3	-85493.21	1	N/A
2	(1)	53.49	33	-73870.19	0.94	12.80
	(2)	46.51			0.94	17.71
3	(1)	21.77	333	-63524.35	0.97	105.25
	(2)	53.83			0.96	18.03
	(3)	24.40			0.95	67.92
4	(1)	19.24	3333	-59262.14	0.96	93.69
	(2)	36.07			0.93	24.44
	(3)	32			0.90	19.03
	(4)	12.69			0.96	172.34
5	(1)	19.35	33333	-56474.28	0.97	119.07
	(2)	30.77			0.90	18.95
	(3)	25.43			0.88	23.76
	(4)	17.15			0.90	44.02
	(5)	7.31			0.95	284.50
6	(1)	15.57	333333	-57000.83	0.96	109.69
	(2)	29.21			0.90	19.32
	(3)	23.82			0.87	20.91
	(4)	15.12			0.90	44.32
	(5)	6.27			0.95	259.29
	(6)	10.6			0.92	221.23

Note: Trajectory shapes (0=intercept, 1=linear, 2=quadratic, 3=cubic); BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion; APPA = average posterior probability assignment; OCC = odds of a correct classification according to maximum posterior probability group.

STROBE Statement-checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or	1
		the abstract	
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what	3
		was done and what was found	
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of	6
C		recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	
Participants	6	(a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	6
1		methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	
		Case-control study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	
		methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale	
		for the choice of cases and controls	
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	
		methods of selection of participants	
		(b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and	NA
		number of exposed and unexposed	
		<i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the	
		number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders,	6,7
		and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	
Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods	6
measurement		of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment	
		methods if there is more than one group	
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6, 7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	NA
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If	7
		applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for	7
		confounding	
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	7
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was	7
		addressed	
		<i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and	
		controls was addressed	
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking	
		account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	7
		<u></u>	1 1

Continued on next page

Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study,	9
		completing follow-up, and analysed	
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	9
Descriptive	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and	9, 10
data		information on exposures and potential confounders	
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9, 10
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	NA
Outcome data	15*	Cohort study-Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	NA
		Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary	13
		measures of exposure	
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	NA
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and	13
		their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were	
		adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	13
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a	NA
		meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and	NA
		sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	14
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or	15
		imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations,	14,
		multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	14,
			15
Other informati	on		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if	2
-		applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

**BMJ** Open

# **BMJ Open**

### Trajectories in long-term conditions accumulation and mortality in older adults: A group-based trajectory modelling approach using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-074902.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Apr-2024
Complete List of Authors:	Chalitsios, Christos; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Santoso, Cornelia; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Nartey, Yvonne; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Khan, Nusrat; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Simpson, Glenn; University of Southampton, UK. Simpson, Glenn; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Islam, Nazrul; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Stuart, Beth; Queen Mary University of London Farmer, Andrew; University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciencesd Dambha-Miller, Hajira; University of Southampton, Primary Care and Population Sciences
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Geriatric medicine
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, GERIATRIC MEDICINE, PUBLIC HEALTH

# SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



# Trajectories in long-term conditions accumulation and mortality in older adults: A group-based trajectory modelling approach using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing Christos V. Chalitsios<sup>1</sup>, Cornelia Santoso<sup>1</sup>, Yvonne Nartey<sup>1</sup>, Nusrat Khan<sup>1</sup>, Glenn Simpson<sup>1</sup>, Nazrul Islam<sup>1</sup>, Beth Stuart<sup>2</sup>, Andrew Farmer<sup>3</sup>, Hajira Dambha-Miller<sup>1</sup> Affiliations <sup>1</sup> Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. <sup>2</sup> Centre for Evaluation and Methods, Wolfson Institute of Population Health, Queen Mary University of London London, UK. <sup>3</sup> Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK. ORCID Christos V. Chalitsios: 0000-0002-0836-9385 Cornelia Santoso: 0000-0002-5534-4404 Yvonne Nartey: 000-0001-9876-679X Nusrat Khan: 0000-0003-3928-0022 Glenn Simpson: 0000-0002-1753-942X Nazrul Islam: 0000-0003-3982-4325 Beth Stuart: 0000-0001-5432-7437 Andrew Farmer: 0000-0002-6170-4402 Hajira Dambha-Miller: 0000-0003-0175-443X **Corresponding author** Hajira Dambha-Miller, Primary Care Research Centre, Aldermoor Close, SO16 5ST, University of Southampton, UK H.Dambha-Miller@soton.ac.uk Word count: 2370 Tables and figures: 3 tables & 2 figures Abstract: 224 words For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

### Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Ms Firoza Davies for her contribution as a patient and public representative in this study.

### Authors' contribution

All authors (C.V.C, C.S, Y.N, N.K, G.S, N.I, B.S, A.F, H.D.M) contributed to the study's conception and design. Data management and analysis were performed by CVC, CS, and YN. The first draft of the manuscript was written by CVC, and all authors (C.S, Y.N, N.K, G.S, N.I, B.S, A.F, H.D.M) commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript. Supervision: H.D.M Funding This study is independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (Artificial Intelligence for

Multiple Long-Term Conditions (AIM), "The development and validation of population clusters for integrating health and social care: A mixed-methods study on Multiple Long-Term Conditions", NIHR202637). The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the Nationak Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

(ABES

http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

### **Competing interests**

None declared.

### **Ethics** approval

Ethics approval Ethical approval for the study was provided by the Faculty of Medicine Ethics Committee, University Hospital Southampton, (reference number 67953).

and similar technologies study data will not be made available for access.

### Abstract

### **Objectives**

To classify older adults into clusters based on accumulating long-term conditions (LTC) as trajectories, characterise clusters, and quantify their associations with all-cause mortality.

### Design

Protected by We conducted a cross-sectional study using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) over nine years (n=15,091 aged 50 years and older). Group-based trajectory modelling was used to classify people into clusters based on accumulating LTC over time. Derived clusters were used to quantify the associations between trajectory memberships, sociodemographic characteristics, and all-cause mortality by conducting regression models. **Results** 

l for us Five distinct clusters of accumulating LTC trajectories were identified and characterised as: "no-LTC" (18.57%) single-LTC" (31.21%), "evolving multimorbidity" (25.82%), "moderate multimorbidity" (17.12%), and "high" multimorbidity" (7.27%). Increasing age was consistently associated with a larger number of LTC. Ethnic minorities (aOR = 2.04; 95%CI 1.40 to 3.00) were associated with the "high multimorbidity" cluster. Higher education and paid employment were associated with a lower likelihood of progression over time towards an increased number of LTC. All the clusters had higher all-cause mortality than the "no-LTC" cluster.

### Conclusions

The development of multimorbidity in the number of conditions over time follows distinct trajectories. These are  $\frac{\lambda}{r}$ determined by non-modifiable (age, ethnicity) and modifiable factors (education and employment). Stratifying risk through clustering will enable practitioners to identify older adults with a higher likelihood of worsening LTC over time to tailor effective interventions to prevent mortality.

 Keywords

 Multimorbidity, trajectories, mortality, English Longitudinal Study on Ageing (ELSA), older adults.

### Strengths and limitations

- The main strength of the current study is the use of a large and nationally representative dataset of people aged 50 years and older assessing longitudinal data to examine long-term conditions (LTC) trajectories.
- The measurement was limited to ten long-term conditions, based on what was available in the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing, which may not be exhaustive of all possible long-term conditions.

tor pect terien only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

//bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

### 

### Introduction

Globally, the average life expectancy has risen from 66.8 years in 2000 to 73.4 years in 2019 (1). By 2050, the population over 60 and 80 years will reach 2.1 billion and 426 million, respectively (2,3). This rise in longevity raises the risk of developing multimorbidity, which is the co-occurrence of two or more chronic diseases (4). The worldwide prevalence of multimorbidity among older people is reported to be between 55-98% (5), and in the UK, this is expected to rise from 54% in 2015 to 68% in 2035 (2). Multimorbidity represents an ongoing challenge for healthcare systems because people with multimorbidity have worse care outcomes, including functional limitation and disability (6,7), higher service utilisation (5), mortality (8) and poorer quality of life (5). Management of multimorbidity places considerable economic and logistical burdens on services traditionally organised around single disease models (6). There are a range of risk factors for multimorbidity, although these may vary 'quantitively and qualitatively across life stages, ethnicities, sexes, socioeconomic groups and geographies' (9). The most significant risk factor in multimorbidity, in virtually all contexts, is older age (9,10). Other documented risk factors include low education, obesity, hypertension, depression, and low physical function, which were generally positively associated with multimorbidity (10).

While there is ample evidence of identified risk factors (7,9) and adverse care outcomes for multimorbidity crosssectionally to help understand the prevalence and patterns of LTC, they provide little evidence on temporal elements, including patterns of LTC development over time (8,10,11). There is a paucity of longitudinal approaches examining patterns in the accumulation of diseases (12). Understanding the trajectory that an older adult will follow in the progression towards an increased number of LTC could help predict when intervention is needed and inform targeted and earlier preventive interventions. To address this gap in the literature, this study aimed to classify older adults with LTC into clusters based on the accumulation of conditions as trajectories over similar technologies time, characterise these clusters, and quantify the association between derived clusters and all-cause mortality.

### Methods

### Data source and study population

The English Longitudinal Study of Aging (ELSA) is a longitudinal cohort of people aged 50 years or older living in England (13). The ELSA cohort profile has been described in detail elsewhere (14). In summary, it included 12,099 people at study entry in 2002 with follow-up every two years with self-report questionnaires on physical and mental health, well-being, finances, and attitudes around ageing over time. Four yearly additional nurse visits collected objective data such as anthropometric data (13,15). The ELSA is an open cohort, and refreshment samples were added depending on the proportional age requirement for ELSA, so the total number of people in this cohort was 15,091. Our baseline was wave 2 (2004/5) of the ELSA cohort, the first collecting time point in the study of long-term conditions with a nine-year follow-up to wave 6 (2012/3), the most recent wave with available data on all-cause mortality status.

### **Multimorbidity**

Multimorbidity was defined as the presence of two or more of the following ten conditions: hypertension, diabetes, cancer, lung disease, cardiovascular disease, stroke, mental health disorder, arthritis, Parkinson's disease, and dementia. These are self-reported by patients, relatives or carers and verified by nurse visits (13). These ten conditions were available within the ELSA dataset based on our earlier work to define multimorbidity3 (16,17). After statistical consideration due to the small sample size and clinical discussion, we grouped some of the conditions as follows: people with depression were combined with mental health disorders, asthma was combined with lung disease, Alzheimer's within dementia, and finally, those with heart attack, angina, heart

 

 murmur, abnormal heart rhythm and congestive heart failure combined into those with cardiovascular disease.

 All-cause mortality

 All-cause mortality was reported by end-of-life interviews on waves 2, 3, 4 and 6 with relatives and friends after get

 death.

bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

### **Covariates**

Sociodemographic variables included were age, sex, ethnicity (defined as white/non-white), education, employment, and marital status. The education variable was categorised into four groups: less than upper secondary level, upper secondary and vocational level, tertiary level, and others. Employment status was categorised into 'paid employment and 'unemployed'. Marital status was categorised into three groups: never married, married/having a partner, and separated/divorced/widowed. These covariates were based on the baseline. We used data provided in the nearest subsequent waves if they were missing at baseline.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from Enseignement Superieur (A) Descriptive statistics were used to summarise participants' characteristics. We used group-based trajectory modelling (GBTM) to classify older adults with LTC into clusters based on accumulating conditions as trajectories over time. GBTM is a finite mixture model applying maximum likelihood to identify a cluster of people following similar trajectories by the number of conditions over time (18). This model assumes the same error variance for all clusters and time points and treats missing data as 'missing at random' (19). The procedure for selecting the best model included two steps: identifying the ideal number of trajectory groups and determining polynomial orders to represent the shapes of the trajectories (18,20). Based on the observed distribution, we employed a $\mathbf{\overline{a}}$ censored normal model to specify LTC (21,22). We fitted the models iteratively, starting with one and increasing  $\overline{\mathfrak{s}} >$ up to a maximum of six clusters that would be useful in a clinical setting (20). We selected the number of trajectory clusters based on the following criteria: the lowest Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) value, Average Posterior≥ Probability Assignment (APPA) >70%, Odds of a Correct Classification (OCC) >5, the percentage of participants ₿ in each trajectory groups >5% of the total sample (if less than 5% it is unlikely to be conceptually useful for clinical practice) (22–24). We first used cubic polynomials to characterise the shape of the clusters of LTC trajectories. However, after selecting the number of trajectories, we refitted the model to use lower-order terms when the higher-order terms were insignificant (20). We then assigned individuals to the trajectory group based on the maximum posterior probability (20). Multinomial logistic regression was then performed to test the association between socio-demographic factors and clusters of LTC trajectory, with the "no-LTC" cluster as the reference. Binary logistic regression was also performed to quantify the association between the clusters of LTC trajectory membership and all-cause mortality, adjusting for all the covariates mentioned above. A squared term

of age was included in the model to account for the non-linear relationship between age and mortality. The significance level was set at a p-value <0.05, and all analyses were performed using STATA M.P v17.0.

### **Patient and Public Involvement**

This study was conducted as part of a wider mixed-methods programme of research exploring the potential of machine learning to address multimorbidity through the 'clustering' of patients based on similarities in clinical and social care needs. Patient and public involvement has been incorporated throughout the wider research programme from the initial inception, design, and dissemination of findings. The initial results and the final written draft of the study submitted in this manuscript were shared with our programme's patient and public, representative. 

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

Enseignement Si

ng, Al training, and similar technologies

//bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

# Results

### Participants' characteristics

There were 9,170 participants in wave 2 and we identified 15,091 individuals participating in at least one wave during the follow-up period (The flow of participants through the study is shown in **Figure 1**). Six participants during the follow-up period (The flow of participants through the study is shown in **Figure 1**). Six participants were excluded, as they had no information on LTC. After excluding those (n = 123) with missing data on covariates, 14,962 people were included in the final analysis. The mean (SD) age of the cohort was 61.9 (11) years; most were females (53.5%), whites (96.5%), with educational attainment of upper secondary or vocational (43.1%), employed (56.8%), and married or had a partner (72%) (**Table 1**). 

Page 11 of 25

		<b>Total</b> 14962 (100%)	<b>No-LTC</b> 2826 (18.9%)	<b>Single-LTC</b> 4802 (32.1%)	Evolving multimorbidity 3739 (25.0%)	Moderate Bultinorbidity B32	High multimorbidit 1063 (7.1%)
<b>Age,</b> m	ean (SD)	61.9 (11)	56.0 (9.1)	60.0 (10.0)	62.9 (10.8)	87.1 0.7)	69.8 (10.4)
Sex						for u	
	Male	6951 (46.5)	1402 (20.2)	2361 (34.0)	1675 (24.1)		463 (6.7)
	Female	8011 (53.5)	1424 (17.8)	2441 (30.5)	2064 (25.8)		600 (7.5)
Ethnici	ty					teme	
	White	14440 (96.5)	2726 (18.9)	4629 (32.1)	3618 (25.1)	245117.0)	1016 (7.0)
	Non-white	522 (3.5)	100 (19.2)	173 (33.1)	121 (23.2)		47 (9.0)
Educati	ion					nd di	
	Less than upper secondary	5107 (34.1)	629 (12.3)	1417 (27.8)	1326 (26.0)		599 (11.7)
	Upper secondary, vocational	6444 (43.1)	1399 (21.7)	2186 (33.9)	1609 (25.0)		309 (4.8)
	Tertiary	2277 (15.2)	626 (27.5)	859 (37.7)	497 (21.8)	27 (0.0)	68 (3.0)
	Others	1134 (7.6)	172 (15.2)	340 (30.0)	307 (27.1)	228 (20.1)	87 (7.7)
Employ	/ment					inin b	
	Paid employment	8500 (56.8)	895 (10.5)	2278 (26.8)	2333 (27.5)	ug 33723.9)	961 (11.3)
	Unemployed	6462 (43.2)	1931 (30.0)	2524 (39.1)	1406 (21.8)		102 (1.6)
Marital	status					on J mila	
	Never married	789 (5.3)	148 (18.8)	268 (34.0)	189 (24.0)	5 5631 (66.6)	53 (6.7)
	Married/partner	10766 (72.0)	2282 (21.2)	3635 (33.8)	2674 (24.8)	<b>h</b> <b>b</b> <b>b</b> <b>b</b> <b>c</b> <b>c</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b> <b>1</b>	609 (5.7)
	Separated/divorced/widowed	3407 (22.8)	396 (11.6)	899 (26.4)	876 (25.7)	<b>ĕ</b> ∰35 (%24.5)	401 (11.8)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

//bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

### **Clusters of LTC trajectory**

We examined one to six clusters in the model to determine the optimal cluster number. Five clusters were selected based on the model fit indicators (**Supplementary Table 1**) and the interpretability of classified trajectories.

Participants displayed high posterior probabilities of belonging to their assigned clusters ranging from 0.88 to 0.97 across the five clusters. The "no-LTC" cluster (18.57%) was dominated by people (95.2%) without any record of the examined long-term condition during the follow-up, and the "single-LTC" cluster (31.21%) consisted of those who did not develop multimorbidity during the study period but may have had one long-term condition (**Figure 2**). The "evolving multimorbidity" cluster (25.82%) was characterised by people who progressed from less than two long-term conditions at baseline to two, three, or four by the end of follow-up. Two clusters had multimorbidity profiles which showed increasing numbers of long-term conditions ("moderate multimorbidity" (17.12%) and "high multimorbidity" (7.27%)). Those in these clusters started with multimorbidity and continued to have higher counts of long-term conditions in the following periods.

# Clusters of LTC trajectory and socio-demographic characteristics

Increasing age was consistently associated with all LTC clusters, compared to the "no-LTC" cluster (**Table 1 & 2**). Females had higher odds (aOR = 1.13; 95%CI 1.01 to 1.27) of being in the "moderate multimorbidity" clusters than males. Being non-white increased the odds of belonging to the "high multimorbidity" cluster by 2.04 times (aOR = 2.04; 95%CI 1.40 to 3) compared to whites. Higher education and paid employment decreased the odds of belonging to any of the four clusters than those with less than upper secondary education and unemployment, training and similar respectively.

1	
2	
2	
3	
Δ	
-5	
6	
0	
7	
8	
a	
	_
1	0
1	1
1	1
1	2
1	h
I	3
1	4
	_
1	5
1	6
1	0
1	7
	~
1	8
1	۵
'	9
2	0
h	1
2	1
2	2
~	~
2	3
r	л
2	4
2	5
_	2
2	6
2	7
2	′
2	8
h	^
2	9
3	0
-	-
3	1
2	2
5	~
3	3
2	4
3	4
3	5
-	_
3	6
2	7
5	'
3	8
2	0
3	9
4	0
	1
4	1
⊿	2
-1	~
4	3
^	л
4	4
Λ	5

6			Adjusted OR (95)	%CI) (Reference: No-LTC	)
7			Evolving	Moderate	High
8	Socio-demographics	Single-LTC	multimorbidity	multimorbidity	multimorbidity
9	Age	1.04 (1.03-1.04)	1.05 (1.05-1.06)	1.07 (1.06-1.08)	1.08 (1.07-1.09)
10	Sex				
11	Male	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
12	Female	1.00 (0.91-1.10)	1.11 (0.99-1.23)	1.13 (1.01-1.27)	0.95 (0.81-1.11)
13	Ethnicity				
14	White	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
15	Non-white	1.17 (0.91-1.50)	1.13 (0.85-1.49)	1.36 (1.00-1.86)	2.04 (1.40-3.00)
16	Education				
17	Less than upper secondary	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
18	Upper secondary, vocational	0.92 (0.81-1.03)	0.87 (0.77-0.99)	0.77 (0.67-0.88)	0.53 (0.45-0.64)
19	Tertiary	0.84 (0.72-0.97)	0.68 (0.58-0.80)	0.51 (0.42-0.62)	0.33 (0.25-0.45)
20	Others	1.01 (0.83-1.25)	1.04 (0.84-1.28)	0.99 (0.79-1.25)	0.76 (0.57-1.02)
21	Employment				
22	Unemployed	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
23	Paid employment	0.79 (0.70-0.89)	0.54 (0.4 8-0.62)	0.35 (0.31-0.40)	0.17 (0.13-0.21)
24	Marital status				
25	Never married	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
26	Married/partner	0.85 (0.69-1.04)	🧢 0.90 (0.72-1.14)	0.80 (0.62-1.03)	0.82 (0.58-1.15)
27	Separated/divorced/widowed	0.97 (0.77-1.23)	1.14 (0.88-1.48)	1.27 (0.96-1.68)	1.41 (0.98-2.04)
28	Abbreviation: LTC, Long-Term C	onditions			
29					
30					
31					
32					
33					
34					
35					
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
51					
52					
53					

Table 2. The association between socio-demographic factors and clusters of LTC trajectories.

**BMJ** Open

### 

Clusters	of	LTC	trajectory	and	all-cause	mortality
			, ,			,

The "Single-LTC" (aOR = 1.81; 95% CI 1.21 to 2.73), the "evolving multimorbidity" (aOR = 2.26; 95% CI 1.51 to 3.38), the "moderate multimorbidity" (aOR = 2.62; 95% CI 1.75 to 3.94), and the "high multimorbidity" (aOR = 4.03; 95% CI 2.64 to 6315) clusters were significantly associated with higher all-cause mortality, compared with the people in the "no-LTC" cluster (Table 3).

	Alive	Dead	Unadjusted OR	Adjusted <sup>1</sup> OR	
	(14310, 95.6%)	(652, 4.4%)	(95%CI)	(95%CI)	p-value <sup>2</sup>
Trajectory cluster					
No-LTC	2796 (98.9)	30 (1.1)	Reference	Reference	<0.0001
Single-LTC	4668 (97.2)	134 (2.8)	2.69 (1.81-4.01)	1.81 (1.21-2.73)	
Evolving multimorbidity	3566 (95.4)	174 (4.6)	4.59 (3.10-6.78)	2.26 (1.51-3.38)	
Moderate multimorbidity	2349 (92.8)	183 (7.2)	7.22 (4.89-10.7)	2.62 (1.75-3.94)	
High multimorbidity	931 (87.6)	132 (12.4)	13.6 (9.11-20.3)	4.03 (2.64-6.15)	
usted for age, sex, ethnicity, ed	ducation, employ	ment status, a	nd marital status.	Age was included	d in the mo

### **BMJ** Open

### Discussion

This study examined clusters of LTC based on the accumulation of conditions as trajectories over time, their associations with sociodemographic factors, and all-cause mortality among older adults in England. We identified five distinct clusters that can be described as "no-LTC", "single-LTC", "evolving multimorbidity", "moderate multimorbidity", and "high multimorbidity". We observed that the accumulation of LTC over time progresses differently among older adults with distinction by ethnicity, educational level, and employment status. Specifically, ethnic minorities showed faster/steeper progression towards increased numbers of LTC, whereas higher education and paid employment had a protective effect on the increase in the accumulation of LTC. An interesting finding was that clusters with different initial levels and rates of change in LTC indicating individual.

An interesting finding was that clusters with different initial levels and rates of change in LTC indicating individual, differences in the process of health deterioration. This is in line with previous studies that identified different rates of LTC (25). Those with persistently high levels of multimorbidity have also been similarly identified in other populations (26). However, consistent with the literature (25,26), we did not find any trajectories that indicated improvement in health over time (i.e., decreasing levels of LTC). This may be due to the difficulty of recovery from long-term conditions among older adults or due to the older population as it is anticipated that the mean number of conditions will increase as we follow them over time (waves).

The faster/steeper progression observed towards increased numbers of LTC in females is in line with previous a literature, which found that the accumulation of long-term conditions was more severe for older females (27). An explanation can be that females tend to live longer than males, and as a result, they are more likely to develop chronic conditions associated with ageing, such as arthritis and dementia. The faster development of MLTC in the ethnic minorities can be explained by evidence suggesting that access and engagement with healthcare are limited for some population groups, often on the basis of ethnicity. Specifically, a review from NHS Race and Health Observatory (28) suggests that there are 'clear barriers' for people from minority ethnic backgrounds to seek help for mental health problems, and another research has also found lower access to cancer screening in the UK (29). Socioeconomic risk factors are known to be associated with MLTC (30). Our findings support the role of higher educational attainment, a major socioeconomic risk factor, on MLTC prevention. Targeting education inequality is expected to lead further to the restriction of worsening MLTC. The effect of educational attainment, on MLTC is thought to be explained by other risk factors that may mediate this association, such as body mass index and smoking.

### **BMJ** Open

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11

July 2024.

Downloaded from

//bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

Over their life course, individuals develop MLTC. It is necessary to challenge the common statement that MLTC is inevitable in an ageing society. To do this, the focus on MLTC should shift from sole management of high-risk older individuals to include integrated population-level prevention strategies throughout the life course to address the drivers of MLTC. Programs that bridge multiple clinical specialities and healthcare units should be developed to focus on single individuals, their specific clinical profiles, and their specific clinical trajectories (31). Knowledge of how long-term conditions cluster, and especially how the status of MLTC can change over subsequent years, helps not only in understanding the complexity and dynamic evolution of MLTC clusters but also in supporting clinicians who manage co-occurring long-term conditions and health policymakers who plane care resources use.

This is the first study to examine trajectories of MLTC with a view to stratifying within MLTC to identify those at greatest risk among older adults in England. The main strength of the current study is the use of a large dataset, assessing longitudinal data to examine MLTC trajectories and a dataset that is nationally representative of people aged 50 years and older, including a wide range of long-term conditions and sociodemographics. However, the results of this study should be interpreted with some caution. First, the measurement of MLTC was limited to ten long-term conditions that was all of what was available in ELSA, which may not be exhaustive of all possible long-term conditions. Findings could be different if more long-term conditions are considered. Second, although we examined the correlates of MLTC trajectories using the variables measured at the baseline (wave 2), we cannot conclude on the directionality of the associations. Another limitation is that because our study utilised a longitudinal design that examined age-related changes, there may be inherent confounding of age and period effects. These effects could not be disentangled in this study due to the nature of our data. Lastly, the probability of being in a cluster membership is based on model assignment, which can lead to misclassification bias.

In conclusion, LTC trajectories of older adults are characterised by dynamism but can still be tracked over time. Considering LTC clusters has potential to enable future researchers and practitioners to provide evidence in identifying older adults in England at a higher risk of worsening MLTC over time. Our findings contribute to existing evidence on the need to develop effective tailored interventions for at-risk individuals. Possible responses include targeting ethnic minorities for multimorbidity prevention. Additionally, higher levels of education can also lead to a further decrease in the number of long-term conditions. Policymakers should also commit to increasing MLTC awareness among at-risks groups and care providers. Page 17 of 25

BMJ Open

1 2 3	Refe	rences											
4 5	1.	World Health Organisation. Life tables [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Mar 28]. Available from:											
6 7 8		https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/mortality-and-global-health-estimates/ghe-life-expectancy-											
9 10 11		and-healthy-life-expectancy											
12 13	2.	Kingston A, Comas-Herrera A, Jagger C. Forecasting the care needs of the older population in England											
14 15 16 17 18		over the next 20 years: estimates from the Population Ageing and Care Simulation (PACSim) mode											
		study. Lancet Public Health. 2018 Sep;3(9):e447.											
19 20 21	3.	World Health Organisation. Ageing and health [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Mar 28]. Available from:											
22 23		https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health											
24 25 26 27 28	4.	Ho ISS, Azcoaga-Lorenzo A, Akbari A, Davies J, Hodgins P, Khunti K, et al. Variation in the estimated											
		prevalence of multimorbidity: systematic review and meta-analysis of 193 international studies. BMJ											
29 30 31		Open. 2022 Apr;12(4).											
32 33	5.	Makovski TT, Schmitz S, Zeegers MP, Stranges S, van den Akker M. Multimorbidity and quality of life:											
35 36		Systematic literature review and meta-analysis. Ageing Res Rev. 2019;53(April):100903.											
37 38 39	6.	Wang L, Si L, Cocker F, Palmer AJ, Sanderson K. A Systematic Review of Cost-of-Illness Studies of											
40 41		Multimorbidity. Appl Health Econ Health Policy. 2018;16(1):15–29.											
42 43 44	7.	Pathirana TI, Jackson CA. Socioeconomic status and multimorbidity: a systematic review and meta-											
45 46		analysis. Aust N Z J Public Health. 2018 Apr;42(2):186–94.											
47 48 49	8.	من Nunes BP, Flores TR, Mielke GI, Thumé E, Facchini LA. Multimorbidity and mortality in older adults: A											
50 51 52 53		systematic review and meta-analysis. Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2016 Nov;67:130–8.											
54 55 56													
57 58		16											
59 60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml											
BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) .

(ABES)

**BMJ** Open

2 3	9.	Wang D, Li D, Mishra SR, Lim C, Dai X, Chen S, et al. Association between marital relationship and
4 5		multimorbidity in middle-aged adults: a longitudinal study across the US, UK, Europe, and China.
6 7 8		Maturitas. 2022 Jan;155:32–9.
9 10 11	10.	Nguyen H, Wu YT, Dregan A, Vitoratou S, Chua KC, Prina AM. Multimorbidity patterns, all-cause mortality
12 13		and healthy aging in older English adults: Results from the English Longitudinal Study of Aging. Geriatr
14 15 16		Gerontol Int. 2020 Dec;20(12):1126–32.
17 18	11.	Larsen FB, Pedersen MH, Friis K, Gluèmer C, Lasgaard M. A Latent Class Analysis of Multimorbidity and
19 20 21		the Relationship to Socio-Demographic Factors and Health-Related Quality of Life. A National Population-
22 23		ق بق Based Study of 162,283 Danish Adults. PLoS One. 2017 Jan;12(1):e0169426.
24 25 26	12.	Fabbri E, Zoli M, Gonzalez-Freire M, Salive ME, Studenski SA, Ferrucci L. Aging and Multimorbidity: New
27 28		Tasks, Priorities, and Frontiers for Integrated Gerontological and Clinical Research. J Am Med Dir Assoc.
29 30 31		2015 Aug;16(8):640.
32 33	13.	Steptoe A, Breeze E, Banks J, Nazroo J. Cohort profile: the English longitudinal study of ageing. Int Jar
34 35 36		Epidemiol. 2013 Dec;42(6):1640–8.
37 38 39	14.	ع Banks J, Batty GD, Breedvelt JJF, Coughlin K, Crawford. R, Marmot M, et al. English Longitudinal Study عز
40 41		of Ageing: Waves 0-9, 1998-2019 [data collection]. 3rd ed. UK Data Service. SN: 5050; 2021.
42 43 44	15.	دي Si Cadar D, Abell J, Matthews FE, Brayne C, David Batty G, Llewellyn DJ, et al. Cohort Profile Update: The
45 46		Harmonised Cognitive Assessment Protocol Sub-study of the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing
47 48 49		(ELSA-HCAP). Int J Epidemiol. 2021 Jun;50(3):725-726I.
50 51		
52 53 54		
55 56 57		
58		17
59 60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1

nzalez-Freire M, Salive ME, Studenski SA, Ferrucci L. Aging a
Frontiers for Integrated Gerontological and Clinical Research
, Banks J, Nazroo J. Cohort profile: the English longitudina
;42(6):1640–8.
Breedvelt JJF, Coughlin K, Crawford. R, Marmot M, et al. Eng
9, 1998-2019 [data collection]. 3rd ed. UK Data Service. SN:
tthews FE, Brayne C, David Batty G, Llewellyn DJ, et al. Coh
ve Assessment Protocol Sub-study of the English Longitu
Epidemiol. 2021 Jun;50(3):725-726I.
17
eer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

- nglish Longitudinal Study N: 5050; 2021. N: Forfile Update: The
- tudinal Study of Ageing

### BMJ Open

1		
2 3	16.	Dambha-Miller H, Simpson G, Hobson L, Olaniyan D, Hodgson S, Roderick P, et al. Integrating primary
4 5		care and social services for older adults with multimorbidity: a qualitative study. Br J Gen Pract. 2021
6 7 8		Oct;71(711):E753–61.
9 10 11	17.	Guthrie B, Payne K, Alderson P, McMurdo MET, Mercer SW. Adapting clinical guidelines to take account
12 13		of multimorbidity. BMJ. 2012 Oct;345(7878).
14 15 16	18.	لمج Muggli E, Hearps S, Halliday J, Elliott EJ, Penington A, Thompson DK, et al. A data driven approach to
17 18 10		identify trajectories of prenatal alcohol consumption in an Australian population-based cohort of pregnant
20 21		women. Scientific Reports 2022 12:1. 2022 Mar;12(1):1–9.
22 23 24	19.	Dalrymple K V., Vogel C, Godfrey KM, Baird J, Harvey NC, Hanson MA, et al. Longitudinal dietary
25 26		trajectories from preconception to mid-childhood in women and children in the Southampton Women's
27 28 29		Survey and their relation to offspring adiposity: a group-based trajectory modelling approach. International
30 31		Journal of Obesity 2021 46:4. 2021 Dec;46(4):758–66.
32 33 34	20.	Mésidor M, Rousseau MC, O'Loughlin J, Sylvestre MP. Does group-based trajectory modeling estimate Mésidor M, Rousseau MC, O'Loughlin J, Sylvestre MP. Does group-based trajectory modeling estimate E R
35 36 37		spurious trajectories? BMC Med Res Methodol. 2022 Dec;22(1).
38 39	21.	Chen H, Zhou Y, Huang L, Xu X, Yuan C. Multimorbidity burden and developmental trajectory in relation
40 41 42		to later-life dementia: A prospective study. Alzheimer's & Dementia. 2022;1–10.
43 44	22.	Quiñones AR, Nagel CL, Botoseneanu A, Newsom JT, Dorr DA, Kaye J, et al. Multidimensional
45 46 47		trajectories of multimorbidity, functional status, cognitive performance, and depressive symptoms among
48 49		diverse groups of older adults. Journal of Multimorbidity and Comorbidity. 2022
50 51 52		Nov;12:263355652211430.
53 54 55		
55 56 57		10
58		10
59 60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 20 of 25

BMJ Open

1			BΜ
1 2 3	23.	Zhou H, Zhang H, Zhan Q, Bai Y, Liu S, Yang X, et al. Blood pressure trajectories in early adulthood and	J Open:
4 5 6		myocardial structure and function in later life. ESC Heart Fail. 2022 Apr;9(2):1258–68.	first pu
7 8	24.	Walsh CA, Cahir C, Bennett KE. Longitudinal Medication Adherence in Older Adults With Multimorbidity	blished
9 10 11		and Association With Health Care Utilization: Results From the Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing. Ann بر مج	as 10.1
12 13 14		Pharmacother. 2021 Jan;55(1):5–14.	136/bm
15 16	25.	Strauss VY, Jones PW, Kadam UT, Jordan KP. Distinct trajectories of multimorbidity in primary care were	ijopen-:
17 18 19		identified using latent class growth analysis. J Clin Epidemiol. 2014;67(10):1163–71.	2023-07
20 21	26.	Lee SA, Joo S, Chai HW, Jun HJ. Patterns of multimorbidity trajectories and their correlates among	4902 or
22 23 24		Korean older adults. Age Ageing. 2021;50(4):1336–41.	יוט 11 רו ווע 11 רו
25 26 27	27.	قي García-Esquinas E, Ortolá R, Prina M, Stefler D, Rodríguez-Artalejo F, Pastor-Barriuso R. Trajectories of	y 2024.
28 29		Accumulation of Health Deficits in Older Adults: Are There Variations According to Health Domains? J Am	Downlo
30 31 32		Med Dir Assoc. 2019;20(6):710-717.e6.	aded fr
33 34	28.	Kapadia D, Zhang J, Salway S, Nazroo J, Booth A, Villarroel-Williams N, et al. Ethnic Inequalities in	om http
35 36 37		Healthcare: A Rapid Evidence Review. 2022.	://bmjo
38 39 40	29.	Szczepura A. Access to health care for ethnic minority populations. Vol. 81, Postgraduate Medical Journal.	pen.bm
41 42		2005. p. 141–7.	j.com/ o
43 44 45	30.	<u>ع</u> Ingram E, Ledden S, Beardon S, Gomes M, Hogarth S, Mcdonald H, et al. Household and area-level تة	on June
46 47		social determinants of multimorbidity: a systematic review. J Epidemiol Community Health (1978).	12, 202
48 49 50		2021;75(3):232–41.	25 at Ag
51 52 53	31.	Hemingway H, Croft P, Perel P, Hayden JA, Abrams K, Timmis A, et al. Prognosis research strategy	ence Bi
54 55		(PROGRESS) 1: A framework for researching clinical outcomes. BMJ (Online). 2013;346.	ibliogra
56 57 58		19	phique
59			de
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	-

#### Figure legends

Figure 1. Flow chart of participants selection. MLTC, multiple long-term conditions.

**Figure 2.** Clusters of long-term condition (LTC) trajectories over time (wave 2 to 6) in the English Longitudinal Study of Aging study. The solid lines represent the estimated mean count of LTC profiles for the five clusters. The "no-LTC" cluster included people who did not have any of the examined LTC; the "single-LTC" cluster included those who did not develop MLTC but may have had one LTC; the "evolving MLTC" cluster included those who developed MLTC lately; the "moderate MLTC" cluster included those who developed MLTC lately; the "moderate MLTC" cluster included those who started with the lower number of MLTC and developed further long-term conditions; the "high MLTC" cluster consisted of those who started with the higher number of MLTC and developed additional long-term conditions. Abbreviation: MLTC, Multiple long-term conditions.

BMJ Open



60



Flow chart of participants selection. MLTC, multiple long-term conditions.

195x107mm (600 x 600 DPI)



Time period (waves)

Clusters of long-term condition (LTC) trajectories over time (wave 2 to 6) in the English Longitudinal Study of Aging study. The solid lines represent the estimated mean count of LTC profiles for the five clusters. The "no-LTC" cluster included people who did not have any of the examined LTC; the "single-LTC" cluster

included those who did not develop MLTC but may have had one LTC; the "evolving MLTC" cluster included those who developed MLTC lately; the "moderate MLTC" cluster included those who started with the lower number of MLTC and developed further long-term conditions; the "high MLTC" cluster consisted of those who started with the higher number of MLTC and developed additional long-term conditions. Abbreviation: MLTC, Multiple long-term conditions.

190x114mm (600 x 600 DPI)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

# Trajectories in long-term conditions accumulation and mortality in older adults: A group-based trajectory modelling approach using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing

Christos V. Chalitsios<sup>1</sup>, Cornelia Santoso<sup>1</sup>, Yvonne Nartey<sup>1</sup>, Nusrat Khan<sup>1,</sup> Glenn Simpson<sup>1</sup>, Nazrul Islam<sup>1</sup>, Beth Stuart<sup>2</sup>, Andrew Farmer<sup>3</sup>, Hajira Dambha-Miller<sup>1</sup>

#### **Supplements**

Supplementary	Table 1	. Statistical	parameters	of the o	otimal r	number o	of clusters	election.
			000000000000000000000000000000000000000	0				

Number of groups	Grou	p membership	Trajectory shapes	BIC (sample size=15085)	APPA	occ
1	(1)	100	3	-85493.21	1	N/A
2	(1)	53.49	33	-73870.19	0.94	12.80
	(2)	46.51			0.94	17.71
3	(1)	21.77	333	-63524.35	0.97	105.25
	(2)	53.83			0.96	18.03
	(3)	24.40			0.95	67.92
4	(1)	19.24	3333	-59262.14	0.96	93.69
	(2)	36.07			0.93	24.44
	(3)	32			0.90	19.03
	(4)	12.69			0.96	172.34
5	(1)	19.35	33333	-56474.28	0.97	119.07
	(2)	30.77			0.90	18.95
	(3)	25.43			0.88	23.76
	(4)	17.15			0.90	44.02
	(5)	7.31			0.95	284.50
6	(1)	15.57	333333	-57000.83	0.96	109.69
	(2)	29.21			0.90	19.32
	(3)	23.82			0.87	20.91
	(4)	15.12			0.90	44.32
	(5)	6.27			0.95	259.29
	(6)	10.6			0.92	221.23

Note: Trajectory shapes (0=intercept, 1=linear, 2=quadratic, 3=cubic); BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion; APPA = average posterior probability assignment; OCC = odds of a correct classification according to maximum posterior probability group.

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or	1
		the abstract	
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what	3
		was done and what was found	
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being	5
-		reported	
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of	6
5		recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	
Participants	6	(a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	6
I.		methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	
		methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale	
		for the choice of cases and controls	
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	
		methods of selection of participants	
		(b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and	NA
		number of exposed and unexposed	
		<i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the	
		number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders,	6,7
		and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	
Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods	6
measurement		of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment	
		methods if there is more than one group	
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6,7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	NA
Ouantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If	7
		applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for	7
		confounding	
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	7
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was	7
		addressed	
		<i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and	
		controls was addressed	
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking	
		account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	7
		(	1 1

Continued on next page

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

3
4
5
6
7
, 8
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
10
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
20
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
27
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
-0 //7
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
50
57
58
59
60

1 2

Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially	9
		eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study,	
		completing follow-up, and analysed	
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	9
Descriptive	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and	9, 10
data		information on exposures and potential confounders	
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9, 10
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	NA
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	NA
		Case-control study-Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary	13
		measures of exposure	
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	NA
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and	13
		their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were	
		adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	13
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a	NA
		meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and	NA
		sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	14
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or	15
		imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations,	14,
		multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	14,
			15
Other informati	on		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if	2
-		applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

**BMJ** Open

# **BMJ Open**

#### Trajectories in long-term conditions accumulation and mortality in older adults: A group-based trajectory modelling approach using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-074902.R3
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-May-2024
Complete List of Authors:	Chalitsios, Christos; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Santoso, Cornelia; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Nartey, Yvonne; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Khan, Nusrat; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Simpson, Glenn; University of Southampton, UK. Simpson, Glenn; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Islam, Nazrul; University of Southampton, Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. Stuart, Beth; Queen Mary University of London Farmer, Andrew; University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciencesd Dambha-Miller, Hajira; University of Southampton, Primary Care and Population Sciences
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Geriatric medicine
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, GERIATRIC MEDICINE, PUBLIC HEALTH

# SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

# Trajectories in long-term conditions accumulation and mortality in older adults: A group-based trajectory modelling approach using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing

Christos V. Chalitsios<sup>1</sup>, Cornelia Santoso<sup>1</sup>, Yvonne Nartey<sup>1</sup>, Nusrat Khan<sup>1</sup>, Glenn Simpson<sup>1</sup>, Nazrul Islam<sup>1</sup>, Beth Stuart<sup>2</sup>, Andrew Farmer<sup>3</sup>, Hajira Dambha-Miller<sup>1</sup>

Affiliations
<sup>1</sup> Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK.
<sup>2</sup> Centre for Evaluation and Methods, Wolfson Institute of Population Health, Queen Mary University of London, UK.
<sup>3</sup> Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK.
ORCID
Christos V. Chalitsios: 0000-0002-0836-9385
Cornelia Santoso: 0000-0002-5534-4404
Yvonne Nartey: 000-0001-9876-679X
Nusrat Khan: 0000-0003-3928-0022
Glenn Simpson: 0000-0002-1753-942X

- Glenn Simpson: 0000-0002-1753-942X
- Nazrul Islam: 0000-0003-3982-4325
- Beth Stuart: 0000-0001-5432-7437
- Andrew Farmer: 0000-0002-6170-4402
- Hajira Dambha-Miller: 0000-0003-0175-443X

### **Corresponding author**

- Hajira Dambha-Miller,
- Primary Care Research Centre,
- Aldermoor Close, SO16 5ST,
- University of Southampton, UK
- H.Dambha-Miller@soton.ac.uk

Word count: 2370 

Tables and figures: 3 tables & 2 figures 

Abstract: 224 words 

### Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Ms Firoza Davies for her contribution as a patient and public representative in this study.

### Authors' contribution

HDM was responsible for the study's conception and design. All authors (CVC, CS, YN, NK, GS, NI, BS, AF, HDM) critically reviewed and edited the manuscript, and contributed to the interpretation of the data and results. Data management and statistical analyses were performed by CVC, CS and YN. The first draft of the manuscript was written by CVC, and all authors commented on and contributed to subsequent iterations of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript before submission. HDM is the guarantor of the work. **Funding** This study is independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (Artificial Intelligence for

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded

//bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

Multiple Long-Term Conditions (AIM), "The development and validation of population clusters for integrating health and social care: A mixed-methods study on Multiple Long-Term Conditions", NIHR202637). The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care. HDM is a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) funded Academic Clinical Lecturer and has received NIHR funding for this grant (NIHR202637). AF is supported by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Oxford Biomedical Research Centre (BRC).

### **Competing interests**

None declared.

## **Ethics** approval

Ethical approval for the study was provided by the Faculty of Medicine Ethics Committee, University Hospital

Ethical approval for the study was provided by the Faculty of Medicine Ethics Committee, University Hospital, Southampton, (reference number 67953). Data availability statement ELSA data were available through the UK Data Archive and are widely available to access in this way; as such, our study data will not be made available for access.

### Abstract

### **Objectives**

To classify older adults into clusters based on accumulating long-term conditions (LTC) as trajectories, characterise clusters, and quantify their associations with all-cause mortality.

Design We conducted a longitudinal study using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) over nine years (n=15,091 aged 50 years and older). Group-based trajectory modelling was used to classify people into clusters based on accumulating LTC over time. Derived clusters were used to quantify the associations between trajectory memberships, sociodemographic characteristics, and all-cause mortality by conducting regression models. **Results** 

for Five distinct clusters of accumulating LTC trajectories were identified and characterised as: "no-LTC" (18.57%) "single-LTC" (31.21%), "evolving multimorbidity" (25.82%), "moderate multimorbidity" (17.12%), and "high multimorbidity" (7.27%). Increasing age was consistently associated with a larger number of LTC. Ethnic minorities (aOR = 2.04; 95%CI 1.40 to 3.00) were associated with the "high multimorbidity" cluster. Higher education and paid employment were associated with a lower likelihood of progression over time towards an increased number of LTC. All the clusters had higher all-cause mortality than the "no-LTC" cluster.

## **Conclusions**

The development of multimorbidity in the number of conditions over time follows distinct trajectories. These are≥ determined by non-modifiable (age, ethnicity) and modifiable factors (education and employment). Stratifying ng, and similar technologies risk through clustering will enable practitioners to identify older adults with a higher likelihood of worsening LT( over time to tailor effective interventions to prevent mortality.

### Keywords

Multimorbidity, trajectories, mortality, English Longitudinal Study on Ageing (ELSA), older adults.

# **Strengths and limitations**

- The main strength of this study is the use of a large dataset, the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA), assessing longitudinal data to examine MLTC trajectories.
- The ELSA dataset is nationally representative of people aged 50 years and older, including a broad range • of long-term conditions and sociodemographics.
- BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from Enseignement Superieur (Al of long-term conditions and sociodemographics. The measurement was limited to ten long-term conditions, based on what was available in ELSA, which may not be exhaustive of all possible long-term conditions. The probability of being in a cluster membership is based on model assignment, which can lead to misclassification bias. .
- ig in a

data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

(ABES)

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

//bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

similar technologies

### Introduction

Globally, the average life expectancy has risen from 66.8 years in 2000 to 73.4 years in 2019 (1). By 2050, the population over 60 and 80 years will reach 2.1 billion and 426 million, respectively (2,3). This rise in longevity raises the risk of developing multimorbidity, which is the co-occurrence of two or more chronic diseases (4). The worldwide prevalence of multimorbidity among older people is reported to be between 55-98% (5), and in the UK, this is expected to rise from 54% in 2015 to 68% in 2035 (2). Multimorbidity represents an ongoing challenge for healthcare systems because people with multimorbidity have worse care outcomes, including functional limitation and disability (6,7), higher service utilisation (5), mortality (8) and poorer quality of life (5). Management of multimorbidity places considerable economic and logistical burdens on services traditionally organised around single disease models (6). There are a range of risk factors for multimorbidity, although these may vary rquantitively and qualitatively across life stages, ethnicities, sexes, socioeconomic groups and geographies' (9). The most significant risk factor in multimorbidity, in virtually all contexts, is older age (9,10). Other documented prisk factors include low education, obesity, hypertension, depression, and low physical function, which were generally positively associated with multimorbidity (10).

While there is ample evidence of identified risk factors (7,9) and adverse care outcomes for multimorbidity crosssectionally to help understand the prevalence and patterns of LTC, they provide little evidence on temporal elements, including patterns of LTC development over time (8,10,11). There is a paucity of longitudinal approaches examining patterns in the accumulation of diseases (12). Understanding the trajectory that an older adult will follow in the progression towards an increased number of LTC could help predict when intervention is needed and inform targeted and earlier preventive interventions. To address this gap in the literature, this study aimed to classify older adults with LTC into clusters based on the accumulation of conditions as trajectories over time, characterise these clusters, and quantify the association between derived clusters and all-cause mortality.

#### **Methods**

#### Data source and study population

The English Longitudinal Study of Aging (ELSA) is a longitudinal cohort of people aged 50 years or older living in England (13). The ELSA cohort profile has been described in detail elsewhere (14). In summary, it included 12,099 people at study entry in 2002 with follow-up every two years with self-report questionnaires on physical and mental health, well-being, finances, and attitudes around ageing over time. Four yearly additional nurse visits collected objective data such as anthropometric data (13,15). The ELSA is an open cohort, and refreshment samples were added depending on the proportional age requirement for ELSA, so the total number of people in this cohort was 15,091. Our baseline was wave 2 (2004/5) of the ELSA cohort, the first collecting time point in the study of long-term conditions with a nine-year follow-up to wave 6 (2012/3), the most recent wave with available luding for uses data on all-cause mortality status.

### **Multimorbidity**

Multimorbidity was defined as the presence of two or more of the following ten conditions: hypertension, diabetes, cancer, lung disease, cardiovascular disease, stroke, mental health disorder, arthritis, Parkinson's disease, and dementia. These are self-reported by patients, relatives or carers and verified by nurse visits (13). These ten conditions were available within the ELSA dataset based on our earlier work to define multimorbidity (16,17). After statistical consideration due to the small sample size and clinical discussion, we grouped some of the conditions as follows: people with depression were combined with mental health disorders, asthma was≥ combined with lung disease, Alzheimer's within dementia, and finally, those with heart attack, angina, heart

murmur, abnormal heart rhythm and congestive heart failure combined into those with cardiovascular disease. All-cause mortality All-cause mortality was reported by end-of-life interviews on waves 2, 3, 4 and 6 with relatives and friends after of death.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

jopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

#### **Covariates**

Sociodemographic variables included were age, sex, ethnicity (defined as white/non-white), education, employment, and marital status. The education variable was categorised into four groups: less than upper secondary level, upper secondary and vocational level, tertiary level, and others. Employment status was categorised into 'paid employment and 'unemployed'. Marital status was categorised into three groups: never married, married/having a partner, and separated/divorced/widowed. These covariates were based on the baseline. We used data provided in the nearest subsequent waves if they were missing at baseline.

Statistical analysis
Descriptive statistics were used to summarise participants' characteristics. We used group-based trajectorydi

modelling (GBTM) to classify older adults with LTC into clusters based on accumulating conditions as trajectories over time. GBTM is a finite mixture model applying maximum likelihood to identify a cluster of people following similar trajectories by the number of conditions over time (18). This model assumes the same error variance for all clusters and time points and treats missing data as 'missing at random' (19). The procedure for selecting the best model included two steps: identifying the ideal number of trajectory groups and determining polynomial orders to represent the shapes of the trajectories (18,20). Based on the observed distribution, we employed a censored normal model to specify LTC (21,22). We fitted the models iteratively, starting with one and increasing up to a maximum of six clusters that would be useful in a clinical setting (20). We selected the number of trajectory clusters based on the following criteria: the lowest Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) value, Average Posterior Probability Assignment (APPA) >70%, Odds of a Correct Classification (OCC) >5, the percentage of participants in each trajectory groups >5% of the total sample (if less than 5% it is unlikely to be conceptually useful fore clinical practice) (22-24). We first used cubic polynomials to characterise the shape of the clusters of LTC trajectories. However, after selecting the number of trajectories, we refitted the model to use lower-order terms when the higher-order terms were insignificant (20). We then assigned individuals to the trajectory group based  $\Re$ on the maximum posterior probability (20). Multinomial logistic regression was then performed to test the association between socio-demographic factors and clusters of LTC trajectory, with the "no-LTC" cluster as the reference. Binary logistic regression was also performed to quantify the association between the clusters of LTC trajectory membership and all-cause mortality, adjusting for all the covariates mentioned above. A squared term of age was included in the model to account for the non-linear relationship between age and mortality. The significance level was set at a p-value <0.05, and all analyses were performed using STATA M.P v17.0.

#### Patient and Public Involvement

This study was conducted as part of a wider mixed-methods programme of research exploring the potential of machine learning to address multimorbidity through the 'clustering' of patients based on similarities in clinical and social care needs. Patient and public involvement has been incorporated throughout the wider research  $_{\mathbf{u}}$ and social care needs. Patient and public involvement has been incorporated throughout the wider research programme from the initial inception, design, and dissemination of findings. The initial results and the final written draft of the study submitted in this manuscript were shared with our programme's patient and public representative. tor per texien only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from

Enseignement Superieur

(ABES

mining, Al training, and similar technologies

http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

#### Results

### Participants' characteristics

There were 9,170 participants in wave 2 and we identified 15,091 individuals participating in at least one wave during the follow-up period (The flow of participants through the study is shown in **Figure 1**). Six participants were excluded, as they had no information on LTC. After excluding those (n = 123) with missing data on  $\underline{r}$ covariates, 14,962 people were included in the final analysis. The current analysis included 2688 (18.0%), 529 (3.5%), 4270 (28.5%), 4582 (30.6%) and 2893 (19.3%) people from wave 2, 3 4, 5 and 6, respectively. The mean (SD) age of the cohort was 61.9 (11) years; most were females (53.5%), whites (96.5%), with educational attainment of upper secondary or vocational (43.1%), employed (56.8%), and married or had a partner (72%) (Table 1).

opper to the second

Page 11 of 24

		<b>Total</b> 14962 (100%)	<b>No-LTC</b> 2826 (18.9%)	<b>Single-LTC</b> 4802 (32.1%)	Evolving multimorbidity 3739 (25.0%)	隣od욠ate multimorbidity 爭32歳6.9%)	High multimorbidi 1063 (7.1%)
Age, n	nean (SD)	61.9 (11)	56.0 (9.1)	60.0 (10.0)	62.9 (10.8)	() () () () () () () () () () () () () (	69.8 (10.4)
Sex						n 11   for	
	Male	6951 (46.5)	1402 (20.2)	2361 (34.0)	1675 (24.1)		463 (6.7)
	Female	8011 (53.5)	1424 (17.8)	2441 (30.5)	2064 (25.8)	14802 (18.5) eig	600 (7.5)
Ethnic	ity					14. D ated	
	White	14440 (96.5)	2726 (18.9)	4629 (32.1)	3618 (25.1)	267 <b>9 1</b> 7.0)	1016 (7.0)
	Non-white	522 (3.5)	100 (19.2)	173 (33.1)	121 (23.2)		47 (9.0)
Educa	tion					led f Prieu	
	Less than upper secondary	5107 (34.1)	629 (12.3)	1417 (27.8)	1326 (26.0)		599 (11.7)
	Upper secondary, vocational	6444 (43.1)	1399 (21.7)	2186 (33.9)	1609 (25.0)		309 (4.8)
	Tertiary	2277 (15.2)	626 (27.5)	859 (37.7)	497 (21.8)	27 (B).0)	68 (3.0)
	Others	1134 (7.6)	172 (15.2)	340 (30.0)	307 (27.1)		87 (7.7)
Emplo	yment					en.b	
	Paid employment	8500 (56.8)	895 (10.5)	2278 (26.8)	2333 (27.5)	<b>2</b> 033, 23.9)	961 (11.3)
	Unemployed	6462 (43.2)	1931 (30.0)	2524 (39.1)	1406 (21.8)		102 (1.6)
Marita	al status					on	
	Never married	789 (5.3)	148 (18.8)	268 (34.0)	189 (24.0)	a 131 (∰6.6)	53 (6.7)
	Married/partner	10766 (72.0)	2282 (21.2)	3635 (33.8)	2674 (24.8)	<b>123</b> 66 <b>1</b> 4.6)	609 (5.7)
	Separated/divorced/widowed	3407 (22.8)	396 (11.6)	899 (26.4)	876 (25.7)	805 (2014.5)	401 (11.8)

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded

| from

//bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

BES

# **Clusters of LTC trajectory**

We examined one to six clusters in the model to determine the optimal cluster number. Five clusters were selected using the model fit indicators (**Supplementary Table 1**) and the interpretability of classified trajectories. (25).

Participants displayed high posterior probabilities of belonging to their assigned clusters ranging from 0.88 to 0.97 across the five clusters. The "no-LTC" cluster (18.57%) was dominated by people (95.2%) without any record of the examined long-term condition during the follow-up, and the "single-LTC" cluster (31.21%) consisted of those who did not develop multimorbidity during the study period but may have had one long-term condition (**Figure 2**). The "evolving multimorbidity" cluster (25.82%) was characterised by people who progressed from less than two long-term conditions at baseline to two, three, or four by the end of follow-up. Two clusters had multimorbidity profiles which showed increasing numbers of long-term conditions ("moderate multimorbidity" (17.12%) and "high multimorbidity" (7.27%)). Those in these clusters started with multimorbidity and continued to have higher counts of long-term conditions in the following periods.

# Clusters of LTC trajectory and socio-demographic characteristics

Increasing age was consistently associated with all LTC clusters, compared to the "no-LTC" cluster (**Table 1 & 2**). Females had higher odds (aOR = 1.13; 95%CI 1.01 to 1.27) of being in the "moderate multimorbidity" clusters than males. Being non-white increased the odds of belonging to the "high multimorbidity" cluster by 2.04 times (aOR = 2.04; 95%CI 1.40 to 3) compared to whites. Higher education and paid employment decreased the odds of belonging to any of the four clusters than those with less than upper secondary education and unemployment, respectively.

			Adjusted OR (95	%CI) (Reference: No-LTC	.) .)
Socio-d	emographics	Single-ITC	Evolving	Moderate	High
Age		1.04 (1.03-1.04)	1 05 (1 05-1 06)	1 07 (1 06-1 08)	1 08 (1 07-1 09
Sex		1.01 (1.00 1.01)	1.03 (1.03 1.00)	1.07 (1.00 1.00)	1.00 (1.07 1.03
	Male	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	Female	1.00 (0.91-1.10)	1.11 (0.99-1.23)	1.13 (1.01-1.27)	0.95 (0.81-1.11
Ethnicit	v	,	()	( ,	
	White	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	Non-white	1.17 (0.91-1.50)	1.13 (0.85-1.49)	1.36 (1.00-1.86)	2.04 (1.40-3.00
Educatio	on	(			( · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Less than upper secondary	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	Upper secondary, vocational	0.92 (0.81-1.03)	0.87 (0.77-0.99)	0.77 (0.67-0.88)	0.53 (0.45-0.64
	Tertiary	0.84 (0.72-0.97)	0.68 (0.58-0.80)	0.51 (0.42-0.62)	0.33 (0.25-0.45
	Others	1.01 (0.83-1.25)	1.04 (0.84-1.28)	0.99 (0.79-1.25)	0.76 (0.57-1.02
Employ	ment			( , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Υ.
	Unemployed	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	Paid employment	0.79 (0.70-0.89)	0.54 (0.4 8-0.62)	0.35 (0.31-0.40)	0.17 (0.13-0.21
Marital	status			( , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Υ.
	Never married	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	Married/partner	0.85 (0.69-1.04)	0.90 (0.72-1.14)	0.80 (0.62-1.03)	0.82 (0.58-1.15
	Separated/divorced/widowed	0.97 (0.77-1.23)	1 14 (0 88-1 48)	1 27 (0 96-1 68)	1 41 (0 98-2 04
			12		

ata mining, Al training, and similar technologies

http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

#### **BMJ** Open

		BMJ Open			Page 14 of 2	
Clusters of LTC trajectory and al	l-cause mortali	ty			-	
The "Single-LTC" (aOR = 1.81; 95% CI 1.21 to 2.73), the "evolving multimorbidity" (aOR = 2.26; 95% CI 1.51 to						
3.38), the "moderate multimorbid	ity" (aOR = 2.62	; 95% CI 1.75	to 3.94), and the	"high multimork	oidity" (aOR =	
4.03; 95% CI 2.64 to 6315) clusters	showed an asso	ciation betwe	en increasing rate	s of all-cause mo	rtality relative	
to the severity and complexity of r	nultimorbidity (	Table 3).				
<b>T</b> 1 1 <b>D</b> A			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Prot	
I able 3. Associati	Alive	Dead	ajectory and all-ca	Adjusted <sup>1</sup> OP	ected	
	(14310, 95.6%)	(652, 4.4%)	(95%CI)	(95%CI)	p-value <sup>2</sup> by	
Trajectory cluster					юруг	
No-LTC	2796 (98.9)	30 (1.1)	Reference	Reference	<0.0001 <b>ig</b>	
Single-LTC	4668 (97.2)	134 (2.8)	2.69 (1.81-4.01)	1.81 (1.21-2.73)	, inc	
Evolving multimorbidity	3566 (95.4)	174 (4.6)	4.59 (3.10-6.78)	2.26 (1.51-3.38)	ludir	
Moderate multimorbidity	2349 (92.8)	183 (7.2)	7.22 (4.89-10.7)	2.62 (1.75-3.94)	ng fo	
High multimorbidity	931 (87.6)	132 (12.4)	13.6 (9.11-20.3)	4.03 (2.64-6.15)	ог us m	
<sup>1</sup> Adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, ec as a squared term. <sup>2</sup> p-value for trend. Abbreviation: LTC, long-term conc	lucation, employ	rment status, a	ind marital status.	Age was included	nseignement Superieur (ABES) . es related to text and data mining	

#### **BMJ** Open

#### Discussion

This study examined clusters of LTC based on the accumulation of conditions as trajectories over time, their associations with sociodemographic factors, and all-cause mortality among older adults in England. We identified five distinct clusters that can be described as "no-LTC", "single-LTC", "evolving multimorbidity", "moderate multimorbidity", and "high multimorbidity". We observed that the accumulation of LTC over time progresses differently among older adults with distinction by ethnicity, educational level, and employment status. Specifically, ethnic minorities showed faster/steeper progression towards increased numbers of LTC, wherease higher education and paid employment had a protective effect on the increase in the accumulation of LTC.

Similar to an earlier study, we also found clusters that started with multimorbidity and continued to have higher counts of LTC in the following periods, demonstrating individual variations in the progression of health decline (25). Other existing work has also shown variations in rates of LTC (26). No trajectories were identified demonstrating that health had improved over time (indicated by falling numbers of LTC), a finding that aligns with the existing literature (25-27). This finding may indicate there is limited recovery from LTC in older adults or the result of an older population cohort where the mean number of conditions will likely increase over time (waves) (25).

The faster and steeper progression observed towards increased numbers of LTC in females aligns with previous a research, which found that older females accumulated morbidities at a faster rate than most other cohorts (28). An explanation could be that females tend to live longer than males, and as a result, they are more likely to develop chronic conditions associated with ageing, such as arthritis and dementia. The faster development of MLTC in ethnic minorities can be explained by evidence suggesting that access and engagement with healthcare are limited for some population groups, often on the basis of ethnicity. Specifically, a review from NHS Race and Health Observatory (29) suggests that there are clear barriers for people from minority ethnic backgrounds to seek help for mental health problems, and another research has also found lower access to cancer screening in the UK (30). Socioeconomic risk factors are known to be associated with MLTC (31). Our findings support the roleer of higher educational attainment, a major socioeconomic risk factor, on MLTC prevention. Targeting educational inequality is expected to lead further to the restriction of worsening MLTC. The effect of educational attainment on MLTC is thought to be explained by other risk factors that may mediate this association, such as body mass index and smoking (32).

#### **BMJ** Open

Over their life course, individuals develop MLTC. It is necessary to challenge the common statement that MLTC is inevitable in an ageing society. To do this, the focus on MLTC should shift from sole management of high-risk older individuals to include integrated population-level prevention strategies throughout the life course to address the drivers of MLTC. As Vetrano et al., observe, knowledge of how long-term conditions cluster and how the health trajectories of individuals with multimorbidity change over time, can increase understanding of the complexity and dynamic evolution of multimorbidity clusters, as well as supporting clinicians who manage co-occurring long-term conditions and health policymakers who plan care resources use (33). This is the first study to examine trajectories of MLTC with a view to stratifying within MLTC to identify those at

This is the first study to examine trajectories of MLTC with a view to stratifying within MLTC to identify those at greatest risk among older adults in England. The main strength of the current study is the use of a large dataset, assessing longitudinal data to examine MLTC trajectories and a dataset that is nationally representative of people aged 50 years and older, including a wide range of long-term conditions and sociodemographics. However, this study has several limitations. Firstly, the measurement of MLTC used was limited to the ten LTC available in the ELSA database, which only encompasses a relatively limited number of possible LTC. Therefore, the results may have been different if more conditions were included in our analysis. Second, although we examined the directionality of the associations. Similar to other studies with a longitudinal design that have investigated age-related changes in multimorbidity over time, there is likely to be a confounding of age and period effects (25). Lastly, the probability of being in a cluster membership is based on model assignment, which can lead to misclassification bias.

To conclude, our work concurs with Vetrano et al's observation that health trajectories of older adults with multimorbidity are typically characterised by dynamism and complexity but can still be tracked over time (33). Our findings contribute to existing evidence on the need to develop effective tailored interventions for at-risks individuals. Possible responses include targeting ethnic minorities for multimorbidity prevention. Additionally, higher levels of education can also lead to a further decrease in the number of long-term conditions. Policymakers should also commit to increasing MLTC awareness among at-risks groups and care providers.

BMJ Open

1 2	Refe	eferences										
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	1.	World Health Organisation. Life tables [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Mar 28]. Available from https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/mortality-and-global-health-estimates/ghe-life-expectancy-and-healthy-life-expectancy										
	2.	Kingston A, Comas-Herrera A, Jagger C. Forecasting the care needs of the older population in England over the next 20 years: estimates from the Population Ageing and Care Simulation (PACSim) modelling study. Lancet Public Health. 2018 Sep;3(9):e447.										
	3.	World Health Organisation. Ageing and health [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Mar 28]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health										
	4.	Ho ISS, Azcoaga-Lorenzo A, Akbari A, Davies J, Hodgins P, Khunti K, et al. Variation in the estimated prevalence of multimorbidity: systematic review and meta-analysis of 193 international studies. BMJ Open. 2022 Apr;12(4).										
	5.	Makovski TT, Schmitz S, Zeegers MP, Stranges S, van den Akker M. Multimorbidity and quality of life: Systematic literature review and meta-analysis. Ageing Res Rev. 2019;53(April):100903.										
	6.	Wang L, Si L, Cocker F, Palmer AJ, Sanderson K. A Systematic Review of Cost-of-Illness Studies of Multimorbidity. Appl Health Econ Health Policy. 2018;16(1):15–29.										
	7.	Pathirana TI, Jackson CA. Socioeconomic status and multimorbidity: a systematic review and meta- analysis. Aust N Z J Public Health. 2018 Apr;42(2):186–94.										
	8.	Nunes BP, Flores TR, Mielke GI, Thumé E, Facchini LA. Multimorbidity and mortality in older adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2016 Nov;67:130–8.										
	9.	Wang D, Li D, Mishra SR, Lim C, Dai X, Chen S, et al. Association between marital relationship and multimorbidity in middle-aged adults: a longitudinal study across the US, UK, Europe, and China. Maturitas. 2022 Jan;155:32–9.										
42 43 44 45 46 47	10.	Nguyen H, Wu YT, Dregan A, Vitoratou S, Chua KC, Prina AM. Multimorbidity patterns, all-cause mortality and healthy aging in older English adults: Results from the English Longitudinal Study of Aging. Geriatr Gerontol Int. 2020 Dec;20(12):1126–32.										
47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57	11.	Larsen FB, Pedersen MH, Friis K, Gluèmer C, Lasgaard M. A Latent Class Analysis of Multimorbidity and the Relationship to Socio-Demographic Factors and Health-Related Quality of Life. A National Population-Based Study of 162,283 Danish Adults. PLoS One. 2017 Jan;12(1):e0169426.										
	12.	Fabbri E, Zoli M, Gonzalez-Freire M, Salive ME, Studenski SA, Ferrucci L. Aging and Multimorbidity: New Tasks, Priorities, and Frontiers for Integrated Gerontological and Clinical Research. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2015 Aug;16(8):640.										
58 59		16										

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11

July 2024.

Downloaded from

erie

٩

BE

jopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

#### **BMJ** Open

Steptoe A, Breeze E, Banks J, Nazroo J. Cohort profile: the English longitudinal study of ageing. Int J 13. 2 Epidemiol. 2013 Dec;42(6):1640-8. 3

1

48

57 58

59

- 4 14. Banks J, Batty GD, Breedvelt JJF, Coughlin K, Crawford. R, Marmot M, et al. English Longitudinal Study 5 6 of Ageing: Waves 0-9, 1998-2019 [data collection]. 3rd ed. UK Data Service. SN: 5050; 2021. 7
- 8 15. Cadar D, Abell J, Matthews FE, Brayne C, David Batty G, Llewellyn DJ, et al. Cohort Profile Update: The 9 Harmonised Cognitive Assessment Protocol Sub-study of the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA-HCAP). Int J Epidemiol. 2021 Jun;50(3):725-726I. 10 11 12
- 13 16. Dambha-Miller H, Simpson G, Hobson L, Olaniyan D, Hodgson S, Roderick P, et al. Integrating primary 14 15 care and social services for older adults with multimorbidity: a qualitative study. Br J Gen Pract. 2021 16 17 Oct;71(711):E753-61. 18
- Guthrie B, Payne K, Alderson P, McMurdo MET, Mercer SW. Adapting clinical guidelines to take account 19 17. 20 of multimorbidity. BMJ. 2012 Oct;345(7878). 21
- 22 Muggli E, Hearps S, Halliday J, Elliott EJ, Penington A, Thompson DK, et al. A data driven approach to 18. 23 24 identify trajectories of prenatal alcohol consumption in an Australian population-based cohort of pregnant 25 women. Scientific Reports 2022 12:1. 2022 Mar;12(1):1-9. 26 27
- 19. Dalrymple K V., Vogel C, Godfrey KM, Baird J, Harvey NC, Hanson MA, et al. Longitudinal dietary 28 29 trajectories from preconception to mid-childhood in women and children in the Southampton Women's 30 31 Survey and their relation to offspring adiposity: a group-based trajectory modelling approach. International 32 Journal of Obesity 2021 46:4. 2021 Dec;46(4):758-66. 33
- 34 20. Mésidor M, Rousseau MC, O'Loughlin J, Sylvestre MP. Does group-based trajectory modeling estimate 35 36 spurious trajectories? BMC Med Res Methodol. 2022 Dec;22(1). 37
- Chen H, Zhou Y, Huang L, Xu X, Yuan C. Multimorbidity burden and developmental trajectory in relation 38 21. 39 40 to later-life dementia: A prospective study. Alzheimer's & Dementia. 2022;1–10. 41
- 42 22. Quiñones AR, Nagel CL, Botoseneanu A, Newsom JT, Dorr DA, Kaye J, et al. Multidimensional 43 trajectories of multimorbidity, functional status, cognitive performance, and depressive symptoms among 44 45 20228 diverse groups of older adults. Journal of Multimorbidity and Comorbidity. 46 Nov;12:263355652211430. 47
- Zhou H, Zhang H, Zhan Q, Bai Y, Liu S, Yang X, et al. Blood pressure trajectories in early adulthood and 23. 49 50 myocardial structure and function in later life. ESC Heart Fail. 2022 Apr;9(2):1258-68. 51
- 52 24. Walsh CA, Cahir C, Bennett KE. Longitudinal Medication Adherence in Older Adults With Multimorbidity 53 54 and Association With Health Care Utilization: Results From the Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing. Ann 55 Pharmacother. 2021 Jan;55(1):5-14. 56

25.

26.

27.

28.

29.

30.

31.

32.

33.

2005. p. 141-7.

2021;75(3):232-41.

**Figure legends** 

2 3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26 27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

45 46 47

48 49

50 51

52

53

54 55

56

57 58

59

60

#### **BMJ** Open

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from Lee, S.A., Joo, S., Chai, H.W., & Jun, H.J. (2021). Patterns of multimorbidity trajectories and their correlates among Korean older adults. Age and ageing, Volume 50, Issue 4, July 2021, Pages 1336-1341, https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afab002. Strauss VY, Jones PW, Kadam UT, Jordan KP. Distinct trajectories of multimorbidity in primary care were identified using latent class growth analysis. J Clin Epidemiol. 2014;67(10):1163–71. Lee SA, Joo S, Chai HW, Jun HJ. Patterns of multimorbidity trajectories and their correlates among Korean older adults. Age Ageing. 2021;50(4):1336–41. García-Esquinas E, Ortolá R, Prina M, Stefler D, Rodríguez-Artalejo F, Pastor-Barriuso R. Trajectories of Accumulation of Health Deficits in Older Adults: Are There Variations According to Health Domains? J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2019;20(6):710-717.e6. Kapadia D, Zhang J, Salway S, Nazroo J, Booth A, Villarroel-Williams N, et al. Ethnic Inequalities in Bu Healthcare: A Rapid Evidence Review. 2022. ġ Szczepura A. Access to health care for ethnic minority populations. Vol. 81, Postgraduate Medical Journal. Ingram E, Ledden S, Beardon S, Gomes M, Hogarth S, Mcdonald H, et al. Household and area-level social determinants of multimorbidity: a systematic review. J Epidemiol Community Health (1978) ieur (ABES Hasse, Barbara et al. "Strong Impact of Smoking on Multimorbidity and Cardiovascular Risk Among Human Immunodeficiency Virus-Infected Individuals in Comparison With the General Population." Open forum Вu //bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de infectious diseases vol. 2,3 ofv108. 8 Jul. 2015, doi:10.1093/ofid/ofv108. ≥ Vetrano, D.L., Roso-Llorach, A., Fernández, S. *et al.* Twelve-year clinical trajectories of multimorbidity in a g population of older adults. Nat Commun 11, 3223 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-16780-x. and similar technolog Figure 1. Flow chart of participants selection. MLTC, multiple long-term conditions. Figure 2. Clusters of long-term condition (LTC) trajectories over time (wave 2 to 6) in the English Longitudinal Study of Aging study. The solid lines represent the estimated mean count of LTC profiles for the five clusters. The "no-LTC" cluster included people who did not have any of the examined LTC; the "single-LTC" cluster included those who did not develop MLTC but may have had one LTC; the "evolving MLTC" cluster included those who developed MLTC lately; the "moderate MLTC" cluster included those who started with the lower number of MLTC and developed further long-term conditions; the "high MLTC" 18

cluster consisted of those who started with the higher number of MLTC and developed additional long-term conditions. Abbreviation: MLTC, Multiple long-term conditions.

Jng



**BMJ** Open

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074902 on 11 July 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.





Time period (waves)

Clusters of long-term condition (LTC) trajectories over time (wave 2 to 6) in the English Longitudinal Study of Aging study. The solid lines represent the estimated mean count of LTC profiles for the five clusters. The "no-LTC" cluster included people who did not have any of the examined LTC; the "single-LTC" cluster

included those who did not develop MLTC but may have had one LTC; the "evolving MLTC" cluster included those who developed MLTC lately; the "moderate MLTC" cluster included those who started with the lower number of MLTC and developed further long-term conditions; the "high MLTC" cluster consisted of those who started with the higher number of MLTC and developed additional long-term conditions. Abbreviation: MLTC, Multiple long-term conditions.

190x114mm (600 x 600 DPI)

# Trajectories in long-term conditions accumulation and mortality in older adults: A group-based trajectory modelling approach using the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing

Christos V. Chalitsios<sup>1</sup>, Cornelia Santoso<sup>1</sup>, Yvonne Nartey<sup>1</sup>, Nusrat Khan<sup>1,</sup> Glenn Simpson<sup>1</sup>, Nazrul Islam<sup>1</sup>, Beth Stuart<sup>2</sup>, Andrew Farmer<sup>3</sup>, Hajira Dambha-Miller<sup>1</sup>

#### Supplements

Number of groups	Grou	ıp membership	Trajectory shapes	BIC (sample size=15085)	APPA	OCC
1	(1)	100	3	-85493.21	1	N/A
2	(1)	53.49	33	-73870.19	0.94	12.80
	(2)	46.51			0.94	17.71
3	(1)	21.77	333	-63524.35	0.97	105.25
	(2)	53.83			0.96	18.03
	(3)	24.40			0.95	67.92
4	(1)	19.24	3333	-59262.14	0.96	93.69
	(2)	36.07			0.93	24.44
	(3)	32			0.90	19.03
	(4)	12.69			0.96	172.34
5	(1)	19.35	33333	-56474.28	0.97	119.07
	(2)	30.77			0.90	18.95
	(3)	25.43			0.88	23.76
	(4)	17.15			0.90	44.02
	(5)	7.31			0.95	284.50
6	(1)	15.57	333333	-57000.83	0.96	109.69
	(2)	29.21			0.90	19.32
	(3)	23.82			0.87	20.91
	(4)	15.12			0.90	44.32
	(5)	6.27			0.95	259.29
	(6)	10.6			0.92	221.23

Note: Trajectory shapes (0=intercept, 1=linear, 2=quadratic, 3=cubic); BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion; APPA = average posterior probability assignment; OCC = odds of a correct classification according to maximum posterior probability group.

STROBE Statement-checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or	1
		the abstract	
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what	3
		was done and what was found	
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of	6
C		recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	
Participants	6	(a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	6
1		methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	
		Case-control study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	
		methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale	
		for the choice of cases and controls	
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	
		methods of selection of participants	
		(b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and	NA
		number of exposed and unexposed	
		<i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the	
		number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders,	6,7
		and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	,
Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods	6
measurement		of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment	
		methods if there is more than one group	
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6, 7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	NA
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If	7
		applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for	7
		confounding	
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	7
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was	7
		addressed	
		<i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and	
		controls was addressed	
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking	
		account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	7
		<u></u>	1 1

Continued on next page

Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study,	9
		completing follow-up, and analysed	
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	9
Descriptive	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and	9, 10
data		information on exposures and potential confounders	
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9, 10
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	NA
Outcome data	15*	Cohort study-Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	NA
		Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary	13
		measures of exposure	
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	NA
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and	13
		their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were	
		adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	13
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a	NA
		meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and	NA
		sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	14
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or	15
		imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations,	14,
		multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	14,
			15
Other informati	on		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if	2
-		applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.