these drugs were withdrawn went into long-term remission after recommencing them. Most patients who were seizure free after surgery chose to remain on an antiepileptic drug and we await further analysis of the effects of drug reduction in this cohort.

Studies have been unable to make these patterns explicit and so have tended to overestimate the number of patients who had no seizure from the time of surgery. de Tisi and colleagues' data have helped to identify these patterns and will be useful for counselling patients and guiding their physicians. This study validates the long-term effectiveness of epilepsy surgery showing that over 50% of all patients are rendered continuously long-term seizure free; it also raises important questions and challenges. Are the benefits of seizure freedom apportioned equally to the continuous and later remission groups? Can selection and resection strategies be further improved to optimise long-term seizure control? Finally, the median duration of epilepsy before surgery in this study was 20 years. In view of the long-term results of surgery shown, clinical practice needs to change with the early referral of appropriate patients.

Ahmed-Ramadan Sadek, \*William Peter Gray Wessex Neurological Centre, Southampton University Hospitals NHS Trust, Southampton, UK; and Division of Clinical Neurosciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton SO16 6YD, UK (ARS, WPG) w.p.gray@soton.ac.uk We declare that we have no conflicts of interest.

- 1 Engel J Jr. Surgery for seizures. N Engl J Med 1996; **334:** 647–52.
- 2 Duncan JS. Imaging in the surgical treatment of epilepsy. Nat Rev Neurol 2010; 6: 537–50.
- 3 Wiebe S, Blume WT, Girvin JP, Eliasziw M, for the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Surgery for Temporal Lobe Epilepsy Study Group. A randomized, controlled trial of surgery for temporal-lobe epilepsy. N Engl J Med 2001; 345: 311–18.
- 4 Engel J Jr, Rasmussen TB, Ojemann LM. Surgical treatment of the epilepsies, 2nd edn. New York: Raven Press, 1993.
- 5 Téllez-Zenteno JF, Dhar R, Wiebe S. Long-term seizure outcomes following epilepsy surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Brain 2005; 128: 1188–98.
- 6 Salanova V, Markand O, Worth R. Longitudinal follow-up in 145 patients with medically refractory temporal lobe epilepsy treated surgically between 1984 and 1995. *Epilepsia* 1999; **40**: 1417–23.
- <sup>7</sup> McIntosh AM, Kalnins RM, Mitchell LA, Fabinyi GC, Briellmann RS, Berkovic SF. Temporal lobectomy: long-term seizure outcome, late recurrence and risks for seizure recurrence. Brain 2004; **127**: 2018–30.
- de Tisi J, Bell GS, Peacock JL, et al. The long-term outcome of adult epilepsy surgery, patterns of seizure remission, and relapse: a cohort study. *Lancet* 2011; **378:** 1388–95.
- 9 Lee SA, Yim SB, Lim YM, Kang JK, Lee JK. Factors predicting seizure outcome of anterior temporal lobectomy for patients with mesial temporal sclerosis. *Seizure* 2006; **15**: 397–404.
- 10 Janszky J, Pannek HW, Janszky I, et al. Failed surgery for temporal lobe epilepsy: predictors of long-term seizure-free course. *Epilepsy Res* 2005; 64: 35–44.
- 11 Elwes RD, Dunn G, Binnie CD, Polkey CE. Outcome following resective surgery for temporal lobe epilepsy: a prospective follow up study of 102 consecutive cases. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1991; 54: 949–52.
- 12 Cohen-Gadol AA, Wilhelmi BG, Collignon F, et al. Long-term outcome of epilepsy surgery among 399 patients with nonlesional seizure foci including mesial temporal lobe sclerosis. J Neurosurg 2006; 104: 513-24.
- 13 Salanova V, Andermann F, Rasmussen T, Olivier A, Quesney L. The running down phenomenon in temporal lobe epilepsy. Brain 1996; 119: 989–96.

# Ŵ

# Patient blood management is key before elective surgery

Published Online October 6, 2011 DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61552-3 See Articles page 1396 Writing in *The Lancet*, Khaled Musallam and colleagues address an important topic through their analysis of the American College of Surgeons' National Surgical Quality Improvement Program database;<sup>1</sup> namely, what is the prevalence of preoperative anaemia in patients undergoing major non-cardiac surgery and what are the implications? Moreover, by removal of data for allogeneic red-blood-cell transfusions in their analysis (and thus in the absence of treatment for anaemia) the independent and natural course of preoperative anaemia is shown. The main finding of their study<sup>1</sup> was that preoperative anaemia—even to a mild degree was significantly and independently associated with increased postoperative morbidity and mortality. This association might be aggravated by concomitant perisurgical blood loss<sup>2</sup> and (frequently unnecessary) allogeneic transfusions.<sup>3</sup> I believe that Musallam and colleagues' findings could have an enormous effect on health-care systems worldwide because preoperative diagnosis and treatment of anaemia (apart from transfusions of red blood cells) has almost never been undertaken routinely before surgery.<sup>3</sup>

Anaemia is a serious but easily treatable condition. Treatment is less costly than is transfusion and would possibly improve outcomes, not only by increased tolerance of perioperative blood loss and avoidance of allogeneic transfusions but also through elimination of the risk of anaemia by maintaining increased physiological haemoglobin values throughout the perioperative period.4

Because of the nature of Musallam and colleagues' retrospective observational study,<sup>1</sup> the cause of anaemia was not assessed. However, about a third of patients with anaemia probably would have had nutritional deficiencies, a third probably would have had chronic disease, and a third would have had anaemia from an unknown cause.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, diagnostic and interventional blood loss might have had an additional role in the rates of anaemia reported.

Because of the prevalence, treatability, and negative outcomes of preoperative anaemia, preservation and improvement of preoperative red-blood-cell mass is essential as one of the three pillars of the new patient blood management strategy,6 which lasts for the entire perioperative period and has a patient-specific perioperative multidisciplinary and multifaceted team approach. Implementation of the patient blood management strategy not only reduces transfusion requirements but also improves postoperative outcome, at least in patients undergoing orthopaedic and cardiac surgery.7.8

However, some drawbacks of preoperative anaemia treatment need to be considered. Diagnosis and treatment of preoperative anaemia is time consuming and therefore detection and assessment of anaemia should be undertaken close to 28 days before a scheduled surgery to enable adequate treatment.9 Furthermore, in case of unexplained anaemia a planned surgery with substantial predicted blood loss should be rescheduled.9 In some populations of patients, treatment with iron or erythropoiesis-stimulating drugs might be ineffective, have serious side-effects, and therefore not be indicated.<sup>10,11</sup> Moreover, at least in patients with chronic disease, anaemia might be regarded as an adaptive mechanism. For such patients, treatment of mild-to-moderate anaemia with iron or erythropoiesis-stimulating drugs might increase mortality despite an improvement in functional capacity and wellbeing.<sup>12</sup>

Nonetheless, Musallam and colleagues' study<sup>1</sup> strongly suggests that implementation of treatment of anaemia as part of a universal patient blood management strategy should become standard of care in patients undergoing elective surgical procedures, particularly in those where substantial blood loss is



expected. However, additional studies are urgently needed to secure the efficacy and safety of preoperative treatment of anaemia.

# Hans Gombotz

Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, General Hospital Linz, A-4020 Linz, Austria hans.gombotz@akh.linz.at

I have given lectures for Vifor Pharma Österreich.

- Musallam KM, Tamim HM, Richards T, et al. Preoperative anaemia and postoperative outcomes in non-cardiac surgery: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet 2011; published online Oct 6. DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61381-0.
- 2 Beattie WS, Karkouti K, Wijeysundera DN, Tait G. Risk associated with preoperative anemia in noncardiac surgery: a single-center cohort study. Anesthesiology 2009; 110: 574-81.
- Gombotz H, Rehak PH, Shander A, Hofmann A. Blood use in elective surgery: the Austrian benchmark study. Transfusion 2007; 47: 1468-80
- Shander A, Hofmann A, Ozawa S, Theusinger OM, Gombotz H, Spahn DR. Activity-based costs of blood transfusions in surgical patients at four hospitals, Transfusion 2010: 50: 753-65.
- Guralnik JM, Eisenstaedt RS, Ferrucci L, Klein HG, Woodman RC. Prevalence of anemia in persons 65 years and older in the United States: evidence for a high rate of unexplained anemia. Blood 2004; 104: 2263-68.
- Spahn DR, Moch H, Hofmann A, Isbister JP. Patient blood management: 6 the pragmatic solution for the problems with blood transfusions. Anesthesiology 2008; 109: 951-53
- Moskowitz DM, McCullough IN, Shander A, et al. The impact of blood conservation on outcomes in cardiac surgery: is it safe and effective? Ann Thorac Surg 2010; 90: 451-58.
  - Spahn DR. Anemia and patient blood management in hip and knee surgery: a systematic review of the literature. Anesthesiology 2010; 113: 482-95.
- Goodnough LT, Maniatis A, Earnshaw P, et al. Detection, evaluation, and 9 management of preoperative anaemia in the elective orthopaedic surgical patient: NATA guidelines. Br J Anaesth 2011; 106: 13-22.
- Aapro MS, Link H. September 2007 update on EORTC guidelines and anemia 10 management with erythropoiesis-stimulating agents. Oncologist 2008; 13 (suppl 3): 33-36.
- Bennett CL, Silver SM, Djulbegovic B, et al. Venous thromboembolism and 11 mortality associated with recombinant erythropoietin and darbepoetin administration for the treatment of cancer-associated anemia. JAMA 2008; 299: 914-24.
- 12 Zarychanski R, Houston DSMP. Anemia of chronic disease: a harmful disorder or an adaptive, beneficial response? CMAJ 2008; 179: 333-37.

# Articles

# Preoperative anaemia and postoperative outcomes in non-cardiac surgery: a retrospective cohort study



Khaled M Musallam, Hani M Tamim, Toby Richards, Donat R Spahn, Frits R Rosendaal, Aida Habbal, Mohammad Khreiss, Fadi S Dahdaleh, Kaivan Khavandi , Pierre M Sfeir, Assaad Soweid, Jamal J Hoballah, Ali T Taher, Faek R Jamali

# Summary

**Background** Preoperative anaemia is associated with adverse outcomes after cardiac surgery but outcomes after non-cardiac surgery are not well established. We aimed to assess the effect of preoperative anaemia on 30-day postoperative morbidity and mortality in patients undergoing major non-cardiac surgery.

Methods We analysed data for patients undergoing major non-cardiac surgery in 2008 from The American College of Surgeons' National Surgical Quality Improvement Program database (a prospective validated outcomes registry from 211 hospitals worldwide in 2008). We obtained anonymised data for 30-day mortality and morbidity (cardiac, respiratory, CNS, urinary tract, wound, sepsis, and venous thromboembolism outcomes), demographics, and preoperative and perioperative risk factors. We used multivariate logistic regression to assess the adjusted and modified (nine predefined risk factor subgroups) effect of anaemia, which was defined as mild (haematocrit concentration >29–<36% in women) or moderate-to-severe ( $\leq$ 29% in men and women) on postoperative outcomes.

Published Online October 6, 2011 DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61381-0

See Online/Comment DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61552-3

Department of Internal Medicine (K M Musallam MD. H M Tamim PhD, A Soweid MD, Prof A T Taher MD). Department of Surgery (A Habbal BSN, M Khreiss MD, F S Dahdaleh MD. P M Sfeir MD. Prof J | Hoballah MD, F R Jamali MD), American University of Beirut Medical Center, Beirut, Lebanon; Angelo Bianchi Bonomi Haemophilia and Thrombosis Centre. Fondazione IRCCS Cà Granda, Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italv

(K M Musallam): College of Medicine, King Abdullah International Medical Research Center, King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia (H M Tamim): Division of Surgery and Interventional Science, University College London Hospital, London, UK (T Richards MD); Institute of Anesthesiology, University Hospital and University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland (Prof D R Spahn MD); Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Leiden University Medical Center Leiden, Netherlands (Prof F R Rosendaal MD); and King's College London British Heart Foundation Centre. The Rayne Institute, St Thomas' Hospital, King's Health Partners AHSC London UK (K Khavandi MD)

Correspondence to: Dr Faek R Jamali, Department of Surgery, American University of Beirut Medical Center, PO Box 11-0236, Beirut 1107 2020, Lebanon **fj03@aub.edu.lb** 

For the ACS NSQIP database see http://www.acsnsqip.org

Findings We obtained data for 227 425 patients, of whom 69 229 (30.44%) had preoperative anaemia. After adjustment, postoperative mortality at 30 days was higher in patients with anaemia than in those without anaemia (odds ratio [OR] 1.42, 95% CI 1.31-1.54); this difference was consistent in mild anaemia (1.41, 1.30-1.53) and moderate-to-severe anaemia (1.44, 1.29-1.60). Composite postoperative morbidity at 30 days was also higher in patients with anaemia than in those without anaemia (adjusted OR 1.35, 1.30-1.40), again consistent in patients with mild anaemia (1.31, 1.26-1.36) and moderate-to-severe anaemia (1.56, 1.47-1.66). When compared with patients without anaemia or a defined risk factor, patients with anaemia and most risk factors had a higher adjusted OR for 30-day mortality and morbidity than did patients with either anaemia or the risk factor alone.

**Interpretation** Preoperative anaemia, even to a mild degree, is independently associated with an increased risk of 30-day morbidity and mortality in patients undergoing major non-cardiac surgery.

# Funding Vifor Pharma.

# Introduction

Preoperative anaemia is associated with increased morbidity and mortality in patients undergoing cardiac surgery.1-3 Although haematocrit concentrations are almost always measured before major non-cardiac surgery,4 few studies have explored the implications of preoperative anaemia on postoperative outcomes. Preoperative anaemia is usually regarded as a risk factor because of its association with increased perioperative transfusions of blood components.<sup>5-8</sup> Perioperative transfusion is associated with increased morbidity and mortality, even when as little as one unit of packed red blood cells is administered.9-11 Several studies12-17 have tried to assess whether anaemia is independently associated with harmful effects in addition to the risks caused by an increased need for transfusion. However, such studies have had small sample sizes,12-15 been undertaken only in specific subgroups such as elderly patients<sup>16</sup> or individual surgery types, <sup>12,17</sup> included patients undergoing emergency surgery without stratification of outcomes,16 or failed to adjust for the major known confounders, especially the use of perioperative transfusions.13,16 Furthermore, most of these studies assessed only the outcomes of mortality or cardiac morbidity, leaving other serious complications unexplored.

With these limitations in mind, we aimed to establish whether patients with preoperative anaemia undergoing major non-cardiac surgery were less likely to survive or more likely to have major morbidities than were patients without anaemia from an analysis of a large dataset from the American College of Surgeons' National Surgical Quality Improvement Program (ACS NSQIP).

# Methods

# Study design and data collection

We analysed data from the ACS NSQIP database (panel 1). This database is a prospective validated outcomes registry designed to provide feedback to member hospitals about 30-day risk-adjusted surgical mortality and morbidity,<sup>18,19</sup> and includes anonymised data for patients' demographics, functional statuses, admission sources, preoperative risk factors, and laboratory data, perioperative variables, and 30-day postoperative outcomes for patients undergoing major surgery in more than 200 participating

Panel 1: The American College of Surgeons' National Surgical Quality Improvement Program (ASC NSQIP)

# Aim

The ACS NSQIP was set up as a rigorous data collection network for measurement of surgical outcomes. The ACS NSQIP gathers data for various clinical variables, including preoperative risk factors, intraoperative variables, and 30-day postoperative mortality and morbidity outcomes for patients undergoing major surgical procedures in the inpatient and outpatient settings. Data quality is ensured through comprehensive training of the nurse reviewers, an inter-rater reliability audit of participating sites, regular conference calls, and an annual meeting.<sup>20</sup> By use of validated statistical methods that were developed and tested in large population-based studies, the ACS NSQIP program generates an expected outcome based on the case complexity mixes. The observed outcomes are then compared with the expected outcomes to obtain an observed to expected ratio and estimate outcomes for a specific medical centre with regard to the national average. These data are then used to identify areas in need of quality improvement.

# Participants

Contribution to the ACS NSQIP is voluntary. Non-Veterans' Affairs hospitals sign-up for inclusion into the ACS NSQIP database and enter cases prospectively into this database. At present, 282 hospitals import data to the ACS NSQIP database. Participating hospitals are located in 42 states in the USA and five sites in three Canadian provinces. Other international sites include one in Lebanon and one in the United Arab Emirates. 51% of the enrolled medical centres are classified as academic or teaching centres and 49% are non-teaching sites. 47% of participating medical centres have more than 500 beds, 44% have 300–499 beds, 6% have 100–299 beds, and 3% have fewer than 100 beds.

# Inclusion and exclusion of cases

The ACS NSQIP includes all major surgeries as determined by current procedural terminology (CPT) codes. The ACS NSQIP has developed a comprehensive CPT code inclusion list available online. Exclusions include:

- Patients younger than 16 years (<18 years from 2008).
- Cases listed on the CPT code exclusion list (available online).
- Trauma cases (specifically patients who are admitted to hospital with acute trauma
  and have surgery(ies) for that trauma will be excluded; any operation done after the
  patient has been discharged from the trauma stay will be included).
- Transplantations (specifically patients who are admitted to the hospital for a transplantation and has a transplantation procedure and any additional surgical procedure during the hospitalisation will be excluded; any operation done after the patient has been discharged from the transplantation stay will be included).
- American Society of Anesthesiologists score 6 (brain-death organ donors).
- Concurrent cases (an additional operative procedure undertaken by a different surgical team under the same anaesthetic; for example, coronary artery bypass graft procedure on a patient who is also undergoing a carotid endarterectomy. An assessment is not required on the concurrent procedure; however, this procedure would be reported as concurrent in the operative section for the assessed case).
- To ensure a diverse surgical casemix, the following criteria are also excluded (at each centre):
- More than three inguinal herniorrhaphies in 8 days
- More than three breast lumpectomies in 8 days
- More than three laparoscopic cholecystectomies in 8 days
- If the site is collecting urology cases, more than three transurethral resections of the prostate or transurethral resections of bladder tumour in 8 days

non-Veterans' Affairs administration hospitals.<sup>18</sup> Trained surgical clinical reviewers obtain data for patients on admission from the medical chart, operative log, anaesthesia record, interviews with the surgical attending, and telephone interviews with patients.<sup>18</sup> For this study, the ACS NSQIP participant use file for 2008 was retrieved for all major surgeries undertaken at participating ACS NSQIP medical centres.

From this file, we identified 271368 patients who had undergone major surgery in 2008. No patient was included in the database twice and only the index case was used for patients who had more than one procedure in 2008. We excluded 1898 patients who underwent cardiac surgery and 7131 patients who underwent minor procedures with a work relative value unit (a measure of surgical complexity) of 0. We also excluded patients with missing information about preoperative haematocrit concentrations (34905 patients) and sex (nine patients) because these parameters were used to define anaemia. We did the main analysis for 227425 patients who underwent major noncardiac surgery. In accordance with the American University of Beirut's guidelines (which follow the US Code of Federal Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects), institutional review board approval was not needed or sought for our analysis because data were collected as part of a quality assurance activity.

# Procedures

We defined preoperative haematocrit concentrations as the last haematocrit measurement before the index operation. We defined preoperative anaemia as a haematocrit concentration of less than 36.0% for women and less than 39.0% for men according to WHO's sexbased criteria.<sup>21</sup> Patients with anaemia were further divided into two groups: mild anaemia (haematocrit >29.0–<36.0% for women and >29.0–<39.0% for men) and moderate-severe anaemia (haematocrit ≤29% for men and women), according to previous studies.<sup>17,22</sup>

Postoperative outcomes were mortality and morbidity at 30 days, including events affecting the heart (acute myocardial infarction or cardiac arrest necessitating cardiopulmonary resuscitation), respiratory tract (pneumonia, ventilator support for >48 h, or unplanned intubation), CNS (cerebrovascular accident or coma lasting >24 h), urinary tract (progressive renal insufficiency or acute renal failure), wound (deep incisional surgical site infection, organ or space surgical site infection, or wound dehiscence), and sepsis (sepsis or septic shock) or venous thromboembolism (deep venous thrombosis or pulmonary embolism). We defined composite morbidity as one or more of these major morbidities.

# Statistical analysis

We defined demographics and preoperative and perioperative variables between preoperative haematocrit groups (no anaemia *vs* anaemia, no anaemia *vs* mild anaemia, and no anaemia *vs* moderate-severe anaemia) with the  $\chi^2$  test for categorical variables and the independent samples *t* test for continuous variables. The primary outcome measure was death within 30 days of

	No anaemia (n=158 196)	Mild anaemia (n=57 870)	Moderate-to-severe anaemia (n=11359)	Any anaemia (n=69 229)
General variables				
Age ≥65 years	29.43%	46.96%***	46.88%***	46.95%***
Sex (female)	59.67%	52.61%***	54·58%***	52.94%***
Race (white)	78.61%	73·20%***	68.96%***	72·51%***
Surgical subspecialty				
General	73.83%	68.86%***	67.60%***	68.65%***
Vascular	10.9%	19.44%***	24.78%***	20.31%***
Orthopaedic	5.08%	4.17%***	2.77%***	3.94%***
Other†	10.19%	7.54%***	4.84%***	7.09%***
Mean work relative value unit‡ (SD)	16.49 (8.81)	18.50 (9.58)***	18.96 (9.68)***	18.65 (9.65)***
General anaesthesia	91.92%	91.95%	93.37%***	92.18%*
ASA class§				
1-11	60.34%	35.48%***	18.60%***	32.71%***
Ш	35.65%	51·12%***	50.86%***	51.07%***
IV-V	4.01%	13.40%***	30.55%***	16.21%***
Airway trauma	0.26%	0.27%	0.30%	0.27%
Infected surgical wound class	5.26%	11.44%***	22.82%***	13.31%***
Mean total operation time in min (SD)	108-27 (86-65)	125-28 (99-85)***	123.16 (98.24)***	124-93 (99-59)***
Inpatient status	65.62%	82.53%***	93.51%***	84.34%***
Days from admission to operation				
0	90.26%	64.41%***	33.80%***	59·39 %***
1	5.31%	10.63%***	13.03%***	11.02%***
>1	4.43%	24.96%***	53·17%***	29.59%***
Emergency case	13.14%	15.27%***	28.65%***	17.46%***
Perioperative transfusion¶	2.52%	10.49%***	35.88%***	14.65%***
Do-not-resuscitate status	0.32%	1.46%***	2.90%***	1.70%***
Functional status				
Independent	96.71%	86.01%***	65.49%***	82.64%***
Partially dependent	2.64%	10.16%***	19.78%***	11·74%***
Dependent	0.65%	3.84%***	14.73%***	5.62%***
Cardiovascular variables				
Dysponea at rest or with moderate exertion	10.04%	14.79%***	19.59%***	15·58%***
Congestive heart failure in previous 30 days	0.33%	2.01%***	4.64%***	2.44%***
Angina in previous 30 days	0.53%	1.32%***	2.97%***	1.43%***
Myocardial infarction in previous 6 months	0.29%	1.42%***	2.00%***	1.68%***
Previous percutaneous coronary intervention	4.68%	8.96%***	8.72%***	8.92%***
Previous cardiac surgery	4·37%	10.87%***	12.22%***	11.09%***
Hypertension requiring medication	43·53%	58.09%***	60.92%***	58·55%***
History of peripheral vascular disease	2.60%	8.11%***	13.67%***	9.02%***
Rest pain or gangrene	1.29%	5.16%***	9.79%***	5.92%***
Respiratory variables				
Tobacco use in past year	21.45%	19.11%***	22.63%**	19.69%***
Current pneumonia	0.15%	1.15%***	4.23%***	1.66%***
History of severe COPD	4.15%	7.68%***	9.81%***	8.03%***
Ventilator-dependent in previous 48 h	0.25%	1.70%***	9.45%***	2.97%***
Hepatobiliary variables				
Ascites in 30 previous days	0.41%	1.75%	5.31%***	2.33%***
Oesophageal varices in previous 6 months	0.07%	0.24%***	0.62%***	0.30%***
Renal variables				
Acute renal failure	0.21%	1.23%	4·22%***	1.72%***
Presently on dialysis	1.02%	4·55%***	9.85%***	5.42%***
				(Continues on next page)

	No anaemia (n=158 196)	Mild anaemia (n=57 870)	Moderate-to-severe anaemia (n=11359)	Any anaemia (n=69 229)		
(Continued from previous page)						
Neurological variables						
Impaired sensorium in previous 48 h	0.32%	1.59%***	4.99%***	2.15%***		
Hemiplegia	0.69%	1.69%***	2.31%***	1.79%***		
Paraplegia	0.41%	0.89%***	1.72%***	1.03%***		
Quadraplegia	0.08%	0.23%***	0.39%***	0.26%***		
Coma lasting >24 h	0.03%	0.12%***	0.67%***	0.21%***		
History of transient ischaemic attacks	2.78%	4.56%***	4-44%***	4.54%***		
History of CVA with neurological deficit	1.78%	4.19%***	5.88%***	4.47%***		
History of CVA without neurological deficit	1.66%	3.42%	4·51%***	3.60%***		
Tumour involving CNS	0.19%	0.25%**	0.31%**	0.26%**		
Haemato-oncological variables						
Bleeding disorder	3.87%	10.15%***	18·59%***	11.54%***		
Weight loss >10% in previous 6 months	1.32%	4.64%***	8.83%***	5.32%***		
Disseminated cancer	1.31%	3.81%***	6.20%***	4.20%***		
Chemotherapy in previous 30 days	0.54%	2.30%***	3.92%***	2.57%***		
Radiotherapy in previous 90 days	0.5%	1.48%***	1.59%***	1.50%***		
Other variables						
Body-mass index ≥30 kg/m²	41.04%	32.93%***	30.35%***	32.51%***		
Diabetic on oral drugs or insulin	12.29%	23.17%***	28.83%***	24·10%***		
Alcohol intake in previous 2 weeks††	2.65%	2.79%	3.08%**	2.84%*		
Open wound (with or without infection)	1.99%	9.91%***	24·10%***	12.24%***		
Steroid use for chronic condition	2.18%	5.25%***	8.21%***	5.74%***		
Systemic sepsis in previous 48 h	7.06%	13.15%***	33.12%***	16.43%***		
Pregnancy	0.16%	0.60%***	0.76%***	0.62%***		
Operation within previous 30 days	1.3%	5.71%***	18.28%***	7.77%***		
Preoperative laboratory studies						
Serum sodium ≤135 mmol/L	9.17%	17.62%***	27.92%***	19.35%***		
Serum sodium >145 mmol/L	0.89%	1.33%***	2.85%***	1.58%***		
Blood urea nitrogen >14·3 mmol/L	1.48%	6.78%***	14.82%***	8.15%***		
Serum creatinine >106·1 μmol/L	9.73%	24.03%***	34-40%***	25.78%***		
Mean serum albumin, g/L (SD)	40.8 (5.3)	35.0 (7.4)***	28.6 (8.4)***	33.9 (8.0)***		
Total bilirubin >17·1 µmol/L	12.91%	14.15%***	19.97%***	15.21%***		
Alanine aminotransferase >40 U/L	10.67%	15.60%***	21.55%***	16.67%***		
Alkaline phosphatase >125 U/L	8.04%	17.44%***	25.73%***	18·94%***		
White-blood-cell count >11 000 cells per µl	16.35%	18·33%***	32.88%***	20.73%***		
Platelet count ≤150 000 cells per µl	4.30%	9.60%***	18.10%***	11.00%***		
International normalised ratio >1.4	3.43%	- 8.04%***	17.60%***	9.95%***		
Days from haematocrit measurement to oper	ation					
<14	78.42%	85.51%***	93.81%***	86.87%***		
<28	92.02%	94.24%***	96.90%***	94.68%***		
<56	97.79%	98.35%***	98.87%***	98.44%***		

Mild anaemia was defined as a haematocrit concentration of >29-<39% in men and >29-<36% in women. Moderate-to-severe anaemia was defined as a haematocrit concentration of ≤29%. Data are percentage of patients, unless otherwise indicated. ASA=American Society of Anesthesiologists. CVA=cerebrovascular accident. \*p<0-05 compared with no anaemia group. \*\*p<0-01 compared with no anaemia group. tGynaecological, urological, neurosurgery, otolaryngological, plastic, or thoracic. ‡Work relative value unit is a scale (0-95) to quantify the amount of work involved in a specific surgery on the basis of preprocedural, intraprocedural, and postprocedural time, technical skill, physical effort, mental effort and judgment, and stress due to potential risk; the scale is the work portion of the Resource-based Relative Value System adopted by US Medicare to quantify the amount of work involved in every medical procedure (score of 0=least complex and 95=most complex). \$ASA scores: I is a healthy patient; II is mild systemic disease but no functional limitations; III is severe systemic disease with definite functional limitations; IV is severe systemic disease that is a constant threat to life; and V is a moribund patient unlikely to survive 24 h with or without an operation. ¶Transfusion of more than four packed red blood cell units within 72 h preoperatively, any number of units transfused intraoperatively, or transfusion of more than four units within 72 h postoperatively. ||Requiring revascularisation, angioplasty, or amputation. ††>two drinks per day.

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of patients

the index surgery in the preoperative anaemia group compared with the no anaemia group.

The secondary study outcome measure was occurrence of morbidity (composite and individual morbidities) within 30 days of the index surgery in the preoperative anaemia compared with the no anaemia group. We subdivided the analysis to compare patients with mild anaemia or moderate-to-severe anaemia with the patients without anaemia.

We created separate multivariate logistic regression models for 30-day mortality, composite morbidity, and for individual morbidity types with adjusted odds ratios (OR<sub>adi</sub>). We built models by adjustment for the determinant variable (preoperative haematocrit category) to potential confounders of clinical relevance. Two levels of adjustment were used: model 1 (OR<sub>adi-1</sub>) had a basic adjustment for the most clinically relevant variables and model 2 ( $OR_{adj,2}$ ) had an extended adjustment for a larger number of clinically relevant variables as described in webappendix pp 1-4. Data were almost See Online for webappendix complete, apart from some missing values for preoperative laboratory studies. Webappendix pp 1-4 details the frequency of missing values and the method used for imputation. We assessed model discrimination in terms of the C statistic. We also analysed data in model 2 separately for different age groups, sexes, surgical subspecialties, and duration from haematocrit measurement to operation, as well as for emergency status versus non-emergency status and receipt versus non-receipt of perioperative transfusions (stratified by duration from admission to operation).

To assess the effect of the 34905 excluded patients without preoperative haematocrit values for the reported association between anaemia and outcomes, we did two

	No anaemia (n=158 196)	Mild anaemia (n=57 870)	Moderate-to-severe anaemia (n=11359)	Any anaemia (n=69 229)
Mortality				
n	1240 (0.78%)	2037 (3.52%)	1155 (10·17%)	3192 (4.61%)
OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	Reference	4.62 (4.30-4.96)	14·33 (13·19–15·56)	6.12 (5.73-6.54)
$OR_{adj}$	Reference	1.67 (1.54–1.80)	2.40 (2.18-2.65)	1.83 (1.70–1.97)
OR <sub>adj-2</sub>	Reference	1.41 (1.30–1.53)	1.44 (1.29–1.60)	1.42 (1.31–1.54)
Strata OR <sub>adj-2</sub>				
Age				
65 years (n=148 364)	Reference	1.67 (1.42–1.97)	1.69 (1.39–2.06)	1.68 (1.43–1.96)
<40 years (n=41 077)	Reference	1.95 (1.08–3.51)	1.86 (0.92-3.74)	1.93 (1.09–3.41)
40-<65 years (n=107 287)	Reference	1.65 (1.39–1.95)	1.69 (1.38–2.08)	1.66 (1.41–1.95)
≥65 years (n=79 061)	Reference	1.39 (1.26–1.52)	1.42 (1.25–1.61)	1.39 (1.27–1.53)
65-85 years (n=71 901)	Reference	1.36 (1.23–1.52)	1.40 (1.22–1.62)	1.37 (1.24–1.52)
>85 years (n=7160)	Reference	1.28 (1.04–1.57)	1.43 (1.07–1.92)	1.31 (1.07–1.59)
Sex				
Male (n=96385)	Reference	1.58 (1.41–1.77)	1.61 (1.38–1.87)	1.59 (1.42–1.77)
Female (n=131 040)	Reference	1.37 (1.22–1.54)	1.45 (1.25–1.68)	1·39 (1·25–1·55)
Surgical subspecialty				
General (n=164330)	Reference	1.46 (1.32–1.61)	1.54 (1.35–1.75)	1.48 (1.34–1.63)
Vascular (n=31311)	Reference	1.45 (1.24–1.70)	1.42 (1.16–1.75)	1.44 (1.24–1.68)
Orthopaedic (n=10758)	Reference	1.45 (1.01–2.55)	1.24 (0.81–3.03)	1.42 (1.02–2.48)
Other* (n=21026)	Reference	1.52 (1.04–2.21)	1.55 (0.86–2.78)	1.52 (1.05–2.20)
Emergency case				
No (n=194542)	Reference	1.85 (1.66–2.06)	2.09 (1.80–2.43)	1.89 (1.70–2.10)
Yes (n=32883)	Reference	1.00 (0.89–1.13)	0.96 (0.82–1.11)	0.99 (0.88–1.11)
Perioperative transfusion				
No (n=213 295)	Reference	1.56 (1.42–1.72)	1.84 (1.60–2.11)	1.61 (1.47–1.77)
0 days from admission to operation (n=176 559)	Reference	1.46 (1.27–1.69)	2·39 (1·81–3·17)	1.56 (1.36–1.78)
1 day from admission to operation (n=14201)	Reference	1.12 (0.87–1.45)	1.25 (0.85–1.83)	1.15 (1.01–1.46)
>1 days from admission to operation (n=22 535)	Reference	1.16 (0.98–1.36)	1.15 (0.94–1.39)	1.15 (1.01–1.35)
Yes (n=14130)	Reference	0.97 (0.83–1.14)	0.96 (0.81-1.13)	0.97 (0.84–1.12)
Days from haemocrit measurement to operation				
<14 (n=184189)	Reference	1.45 (1.33–1.58)	1.48 (1.33–1.65)	1.46 (1.35–1.58)
<28 (n=211120)	Reference	1.46 (1.35–1.59)	1.51 (1.36–1.68)	1.45 (1.36–1.59)
<56 (n=222 845)	Reference	1.46 (1.35–1.59)	1.51 (1.36–1.68)	1.47 (1.36–1.59)
			(1	Continues on next page)

	No anaemia (n=158 196)	Mild anaemia (n=57 870)	Moderate-to-severe anaemia (n=11359)	Any anaemia (n=69 229)
(Continued from previous page)				
Composite morbidity				
n	8436 (5·33%)	7677 (13·27%)	3170 (27·91%)	10847 (15.67%)
OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	Reference	2.72 (2.63–2.81)	6.87 (6.56-7.20)	3·30 (3·20–3·40)
OR <sub>adj-1</sub>	Reference	1.60 (1.54–1.65)	2.59 (2.45-2.73)	1.75 (1.69–1.81)
OR <sub>adj-2</sub>	Reference	1.31 (1.26–1.36)	1.56 (1.47–1.66)	1.35 (1.30–1.40)
Strata OR <sub>adj-2</sub>				
Age				
<65 years (n=148 364)	Reference	1.36 (1.29–1.44)	1.81 (1.66–1.98)	1.43 (1.36–1.51)
<40 years (n=41077)	Reference	1.33 (1.17–1.51)	2.17 (1.77–2.67)	1.45 (1.28–1.64)
40-<65 years (n=107 287)	Reference	1.36 (1.28–1.45)	1.72 (1.56–1.89)	1.42 (1.40–1.50)
≥65 years (n=79 061)	Reference	1.25 (1.18–1.31)	1.31 (1.20–1.43)	1.26 (1.19–1.32)
65–85 years (n=71901)	Reference	1.23 (1.16–1.30)	1.31 (1.20–1.44)	1.24 (1.18–1.32)
>85 years (n=7160)	Reference	1.25 (1.07–1.47)	1.20 (0.95–1.53)	1.24 (1.07–1.45)
Sex				
Male (n=96 385)	Reference	1.29 (1.23–1.37)	1.51 (1.38–1.65)	1.32 (1.25–1.39)
Female (n=131040)	Reference	1.34 (1.27–1.41)	1.60 (1.47–1.74)	1.38 (1.32–1.46)
Surgical subspecialty				
General (n=164330)	Reference	1.32 (1.26–1.38)	1.56 (1.45–1.68)	1.36 (1.30–1.42)
Vascular (n=31 311)	Reference	1.21 (1.11–1.32)	1.42 (1.25–1.61)	1.24 (1.14–1.35)
Orthopaedic (n=10758)	Reference	1.53 (1.23–1.91)	1.52 (1.00–2.31)	1.53 (1.23–1.90)
Other* (n=21026)	Reference	1.25 (1.07–1.47)	1.48 (1.09–2.01)	1.28 (1.09–1.50)
Emergency case				
No (n=194542)	Reference	1.33 (1.27–1.38)	1.60 (1.49–1.72)	1.36 (1.30–1.42)
Yes (n=32 883)	Reference	1.18 (1.09–1.27)	1.34 (1.20–1.49)	1.21 (1.12–1.31)
Perioperative transfusion†				
No (n=213 295)	Reference	1.32 (1.27–1.38)	1.79 (1.66–1.93)	1.38 (1.33–1.44)
0 days from admission to operation (n=176559)	Reference	1.23 (1.17–1.30)	1.56 (1.36–1.80)	1.26 (1.19–1.32)
1 day from admission to operation (n=14 201)	Reference	1.18 (1.04–1.34)	1.44 (1.17–1.78)	1.22 (1.08–1.37)
>1 days from admission to operation (n=22 535)	Reference	1.11 (1.01–1.21)	1.41 (1.25–1.57)	1.17 (1.07–1.28)
Yes (n=14130)	Reference	1.05 (0.95–1.15)	0.99 (0.89–1.11)	1.03 (0.94–1.13)
Days from haematocrit measurement to operation				
<14 (n=184189)	Reference	1.32 (1.22–1.44)	1.34 (1.20–1.50)	1.33 (1.22–1.44)
<28 (n=211120)	Reference	1.35 (1.24–1.47)	1.40 (1.26–1.56)	1.34 (1.23–1.45)
<56 (n=222 845)	Reference	1.32 (1.22–1.44)	1.36 (1.22–1.51)	1.33 (1.23–1.44)
Specific morbidity				
Cardiac				
n	487 (0.31%)	657 (1·14%)	291 (2·56%)	948 (1·37%)
OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	Reference	3.72 (3.31-4.18)	8.51 (7.35–9.86)	4.50 (4.03–5.02)
OR <sub>adj-1</sub>	Reference	1.68 (1.48–1.90)	2.15 (1.82–2.53)	1.77 (1.57–2.00)
OR <sub>adj-2</sub>	Reference	1.44 (1.26–1.63)	1.52 (1.28–1.81)	1.45 (1.29–1.65)
Respiratory				
n	3233 (2·04%)	3769 (6.51%)	1888 (16.62%)	5657 (8·17%)
OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	Reference	3·34 (3·18–3·50)	9.56 (8.99–10.15)	4.27 (4.08- 4.46)
OR <sub>adj-1</sub>	Reference	1.54 (1.46–1.63)	2.37 (2.20-2.55)	1.70 (1.62–1.79)
OR <sub>adj-2</sub>	Reference	1.31 (1.24–1.39)	1.41 (1.30–1.52)	1.33 (1.26–1.41)
CNS				
n	486 (0.31%)	404 (0.70%)	156 (1·37%)	560 (0.81%)
OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	Reference	2.28 (2.00–2.60)	4.52 (3.77-5.42)	2.65 (2.34–2.99)
OR <sub>adj-1</sub>	Reference	1.14 (0.99–1.31)	1.26 (1.03–1.54)	1.16 (1.02- 1.33)
OR <sub>adj-2</sub>	Reference	1.05 (0.91–1.21)	1.02 (0.82–1.26)	1.05 (0.91–1.20)
			(	Continues on next page)

	No anaemia (n=158 196)	Mild anaemia (n=57 870)	Moderate-to-severe anaemia (n=11359)	Any anaemia (n=69 229)
(Continued from previous page)				
Urinary tract				
n	675 (0.43%)	882 (1.52%)	403 (3·55%)	1285 (1.86%)
OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	Reference	3.61 (3.27-3.99)	8.58 (7.58-9.73)	4.42 (4.02–4.85)
OR <sub>adj-1</sub>	Reference	1.81 (1.63–2.02)	2.54 (2.20-2.92)	1.95 (1.76–2.16)
OR <sub>adj-2</sub>	Reference	1.37 (1.22–1.53)	1.38 (1.18–1.62)	1.37 (1.23–1.53)
Wound				
n	3219 (2.03%)	2157 (3·73%)	716 (6·30%)	2873 (4·15%)
OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	Reference	1.86 (1.76–1.97)	3.24 (2.98-3.52)	2.08 (1.98–2.19)
OR <sub>adj-1</sub>	Reference	1.47 (1.38–1.56)	2.10 (1.917-2.30)	1.56 (1.48–1.65)
OR <sub>adj-2</sub>	Reference	1.11 (1.04–1.18)	1.18 (1.06–1.31)	1.12 (1.05–1.19)
Sepsis				
n	3214 (2·03%)	3264 (5·64%)	1328 (11.69%)	4592 (6.63%)
OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	Reference	2.88 (2.74-3.03)	6.38 (5.97-6.83)	3.43 (3.27-3.59)
OR <sub>adj-1</sub>	Reference	1.70 (1.62–1.80)	2.42 (2.25–2.62)	1.83 (1.74–1.92)
OR <sub>adj-2</sub>	Reference	1.24 (1.17–1.31)	1.25 (1.14–1.36)	1.24 (1.18–1.31)
Venous thromboembolism				
n	1135 (0.72%)	913 (1.58%)	385 (3·39%)	1298 (1.87%)
OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	Reference	2.22 (2.03-2.42)	4.85 (4.32-5.46)	2.64 (2.44–2.86)
OR <sub>adj-1</sub>	Reference	1.43 (1.31–1.57)	2.26 (1.99–2.58)	1.57 (1.44–1.71)
OR <sub>adj-2</sub>	Reference	1.27 (1.16–1.40)	1.67 (1.45–1.92)	1.33 (1.22–1.46)

Data are n (%) or odds ratio (95% CI), unless otherwise stated. Mild anaemia was defined as a haematocrit concentration of >29–<39% in men and >29–<36% in women. Moderate-to-severe anaemia was defined as a haematocrit concentration of  $\leq$ 29%. Models were built as described in webappendix pp 1–4. OR<sub>undpated</sub>=unadjusted odds ratio. OR<sub>undpated</sub>=odds ratio adjusted with basic adjustment (model 1). OR<sub>undpated</sub>=odds ratio with extended adjustment (model 2). \*Gynaecological, neurosurgery, otolaryngological, plastic, or thoracic. †Transfusion of more than four packed red blood cell units within 72 h preoperatively, any number of units transfused intraoperatively, or transfusion of more than four units within 72 h postoperatively.

Table 2: Effect of preoperative anaemia on mortality and morbidity at 30 days

separate sensitivity analyses (of excluded patients in the anaemia group and excluded patients in the no anaemia group). If the absence of preoperative haematocrit values were non-random, these analyses were designed to provide two extremes of bias.

We assessed the effect of other preoperative risk factors on the association between preoperative anaemia and outcomes. Risk factors were categorised into the following subgroups: age 65 years or older, cardiac disease (congestive heart failure in previous 30 days, angina in previous 30 days, myocardial infarction in previous 6 months, previous percutaneous coronary intervention, or previous cardiac surgery), severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, CNS disease (hemiplegia, paraplegia, quadraplegia, history of transient ischaemic attack, history of cerebrovascular accident with neurological deficit, or history of cerebrovascular accident without neurological deficit), renal disease (acute renal failure, currently on dialysis, or with a preoperative creatinine concentration of  $\geq$ 221 µmol/L), cancer (disseminated cancer, chemotherapy in previous 30 days, radiotherapy in previous 90 days, tumour involving CNS), diabetes (on oral drugs or insulin), systemic sepsis (in previous 48 h), and obesity (body-mass index  $\geq$  30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>). We calculated the OR<sub>adi-2</sub> of 30-day mortality and composite morbidity for patients with either anaemia or the risk factor, and for patients with anaemia plus the risk factor with model 2; patients without anaemia or the risk factor were the reference population. For every risk-factor subgroup, the respective variables defining the risk factor were removed from the analyses. All p values were two-sided with the level of significance set at <0.05. We did the data management and analyses with SAS version 9.1.

# Role of the funding source

The sponsor of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. KMM and FRJ had full access to all data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and accuracy of the data analysis. All authors had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

# Results

We included data for 227425 patients. Webappendix pp 5–6 list the 50 most common surgical procedures undertaken. Patients had a mean age of 56.4 years (SD 17.3, range 16–90) and 131 040 (57.61%) were women. We obtained haematocrit concentrations for 222845 (97.99%) patients within 2 months of the index surgery (211120 [92.83%] were obtained within 4 weeks



**Figure 1: 30-day mortality, by anaemia and risk factor status** COPD=chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

	Anaemia positive, factor negative or anaemia negative, factor positive		Anaemia positive, factor positive		
	OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	$OR_{adj}$	OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	OR <sub>adj-2</sub>	
Age ≥65 years	8.15 (7.22–9.20)	2.57 (2.26–2.93)	27.72 (24.59–31.25)	4·45 (3·90–5·09)	
Cardiac disease	5.77 (5.34-6.24)	1.46 (1.33–1.59)	14.89 (13.61–16.28)	1.58 (1.41–1.76)	
Severe COPD	6-39 (5-94-6-87)	1.53 (1.40–1.66)	19·02 (17·133–21·11)	1.80 (1.59–2.05)	
CNS disease	6.09 (5.65–6.55)	1.43 (1.31–1.56)	13-31 (12-05–14-69)	1.48 (1.31–1.67)	
Renal disease	6.06 (5.63-6.51)	1.52 (1.40–1.65)	23.48 (21.34–25.85)	2.52 (2.23–2.85)	
Cancer	5.91 (5.51-6.33)	1.44 (1.33–1.56)	14.99 (13.41–16.76)	4.10 (3.59-4.69)	
Diabetes	5·16 (4·79- 5·56)	1.40 (1.28–1.52)	7.93 (7.23-8.69)	1.18 (1.05–1.31)	
Systemic sepsis	6.41 (5.88-6.99)	2.02 (1.83–2.22)	37.56 (34.30-41.12)	3.10 (2.76-3.48)	
Obesity	2.45 (2.28–2.64)	0.95 (0.87–1.04)	3.55 (3.23-3.91)	0.77 (0.68–0.86)	

Data are odds ratio (95% Cl). Models were built as described in webappendix pp 1–4.  $OR_{watghted}$  = unadjusted odds ratio.  $OR_{watghted}$  = odds ratio with extended adjustment (model 2). COPD=chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

Table 3:  $OR_{unspired}$  and  $OR_{usp_2}$  of mortality at 30 days for patients with anaemia or risk factors and anaemia and risk factors, compared with reference populations of patients with neither anaemia nor risk factors

and 184189 [80.99%] were obtained within 14 days). 69229 patients (30.44%) had anaemia, of whom 57870 (83.59%) had mild anaemia and 11359 (16.41%) had moderate-to-severe anaemia. 158196 patients (69.56%), had no preoperative anaemia.

Table 1 compares demographics, preoperative variables, and perioperative variables between patients without anaemia with those with anaemia. Compared with patients without anaemia, patients with anaemia were more likely to be elderly (≥65 years) and not white. Patients with anaemia also had a higher prevalence of diabetes, systemic sepsis, cardiovascular, respiratory, hepatobiliary, renal, neurological, and haematologicaloncological disorders, and chronic steroid use, operations within the past month, and infected surgical wounds; however, they had a lower prevalence of obesity than did patients without anaemia. Furthermore, patients with anaemia were more likely to be inpatients, under a donot-resuscitate order, at a high American Society of Anesthesiologists class, non-independent in functional status, emergency cases, undergo general anaesthesia, undergo vascular surgery, had longer mean total operation time, and more likely to have abnormal preoperative laboratory studies and receive perioperative transfusions (table 1).

Crude mortality was 0.78% for patients without anaemia compared with 4.61% for patients with anaemia (unadjusted odds ratio [OR<sub>unadjusted</sub>] 6.12, 95% CI 5.73-6.54). The crude composite morbidity was 5.33%for patients without anaemia compared with 15.67% for patients with anaemia (OR<sub>unadjusted</sub> 3.30, 3.20-3.40; table 2). Based on the sample size used for the analyses, we calculated a >99% power to detect the reported increase in mortality between the two groups (absolute difference of 3.83%). Conversely, the available sample size yielded a power of 80% to detect a difference in mortality of as low as 0.035%.

After adjustment for all potential confounders (webappendix pp 1–4), preoperative anaemia remained independently and significantly associated with increased 30-day mortality and morbidity (table 2). Moreover, compared with patients without anaemia, patients with anaemia had higher rates of almost all specific morbidities including cardiac, respiratory, urinary tract, and wound events, sepsis, and venous thromboembolism (table 2). Although CNS events were numerically more common in patients with anaemia than they were in patients without anaemia, the association did not reach significance. Effects of anaemia



Figure 2: 30-day composite morbidity, by anaemia and risk factor status COPD=chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

on mortality and morbidity at 30 days was evident between all age groups, sexes, and surgical subspecialties (table 2). Although patients with anaemia had a higher morbidity after emergency or non-emergency procedures than did patients without anaemia, this association was only noted in non-emergency (elective) cases for mortality (table 2). Preoperative anaemia led to increased 30-day mortality and morbidity in patients who probably did not receive packed-red-blood-cell transfusions compared with those that did (had no documented perioperative transfusions in the database and had same day surgery; table 2). However, patients with anaemia who received perioperative transfusions did not have increased adjusted odds ratio of outcomes compared with patients without anaemia who also received transfusions. Perioperative transfusion in itself was associated with an increased odds ratio of mortality and all morbidities (webappendix pp 1-4). Reported associations between preoperative anaemia and postoperative outcomes were evident irrespective of the duration from haematocrit measurement to operation (table 2).

In the sensitivity analyses of patients with missing haematocrit measurements, results did not differ for the primary and secondary study outcome measures (see webappendix pp 7–8).

When compared with patients with neither anaemia nor a risk factor, patients with anaemia and most risk factors had a significant and higher  $OR_{adj,2}$  for 30-day mortality than did patients with either anaemia or the risk factor alone (figure 1; table 3). Similarly, when compared with patients with neither anaemia nor a risk factor, patients with both anaemia and most risk factors had a significant and higher  $OR_{adj,2}$  for 30-day composite morbidity than did patients with either anaemia or the risk factor alone (figure 2; table 4).

	Anaemia positive, factor negative or anaemia negative, factor positive		Anaemia positive, factor positive		
	OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	OR <sub>adj-2</sub>	OR <sub>unadjusted</sub>	OR <sub>adj-2</sub>	
Age ≥65 years	2.65 (2.55–2.75)	1.39 (1.34–1.45)	5·15 (4·95–5·36)	1.56 (1.48–1.65)	
Cardiac disease	3.05 (2.95-3.15)	1.35 (1.30–1.40)	5·39 (5·14–5·65)	1.39 (1.31–1.48)	
Severe COPD	3·30 (3·20–3·40)	1.40 (1.35–1.46)	8.01 (7.53-8.53)	1.83 (1.70–1.98)	
CNS disease	3.17 (3.08-3.28)	1.37 (1.32–1.42)	5.16 (4.87-5.46)	1.41 (1.32–1.51)	
Renal disease	3.18 (3.08–3.28)	1.37 (1.32–1.42)	7.31 (6.88–7.77)	1.95 (1.80–2.11)	
Cancer	3.28 (3.18-3.38)	1.35 (1.30–1.40)	5.42 (5.043-5.82)	1.55 (1.42–1.69)	
Diabetes	2.85 (2.76–2.95)	1.29 (1.24–1.34)	4.17 (3.99-4.37)	1.26 (1.19–1.34)	
Systemic sepsis	2.93 (2.83-3.03)	1.49 (1.43–1.54)	12.58 (12.02–13.16)	2.87 (2.70–3.04)	
Obesity	1.87 (1.80–1.93)	1.14 (1.09–1.18)	3.06 (2.92-3.21)	1.36 (1.29–1.44)	

Data are odds ratio (95% CI). Models were built as described in webappendix pp 1–4. OR<sub>unational</sub>=unadjusted odds ratio. OR<sub>unational</sub>=odds ratio with extended adjustment (model 2). COPD=chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

Table 4: OR<sub>unaljusted</sub> and OR<sub>adj-2</sub> of morbidity at 30 days for patients with anaemia or risk factors and anaemia and risk factors, compared with reference populations of patients with neither anaemia nor risk factors

# Discussion

From analysis of a large multicentre database, we show that even mild preoperative anaemia is independently associated with an increased risk of 30-day morbidity and mortality in patients undergoing major non-cardiac surgery. We noted these findings in a large cohort of patients irrespective of age, sex, or type of surgical procedure. Furthermore, when anaemia was present concomitantly with a known preoperative risk factor, it led to a significant increase in the effect of this risk factor on outcomes (panel 2).

Anaemia can lead to adverse outcomes in patients undergoing vascular surgery, extensive surgical procedures, or for those with major blood loss or cardiac disease.<sup>12-14,23</sup> In the largest study to date, Wu and

# Panel 2: Research in context

## Systematic review

We searched PubMed without date or language restrictions for articles with the following terms: "surgery" or "procedure" and "anemia", in combination with "mortality", "death", "morbidity", "complications", or "outcomes". We excluded articles on the basis of their titles or abstracts and included remaining full-text articles and those identified from reference lists of relevant reports. The main criteria for the selection of relevant articles were inclusion of patients undergoing major non-cardiac surgery and having preoperative anaemia and mortality or morbidity as the major topic. We identified seven relevant articles, published between 1988 and 2011. Early studies showed that preoperative anaemia was associated with increased perioperative cardiac morbidity in patients undergoing radical prostatectomy,<sup>12</sup> and increased postoperative mortality in patients with cardiovascular disease<sup>13</sup> or extensive operative blood loss.<sup>14,15</sup> Preoperative anaemia was since reported to be independently associated with increased mortality in patients undergoing major non-cardiac surgery,<sup>24</sup> and increased morbidity and hospital length of stay in patients undergoing colorectal surgery.<sup>17</sup> The largest available study also reported an independent effect of preoperative anaemia on postoperative mortality and cardiac morbidity in 310 311 (mostly male) veterans aged 65 years or older who underwent major non-cardiac surgery.<sup>16</sup> The main limitations in these studies were the small sample size, <sup>12-15</sup> restrictions of the study to a specific subgroup of patients such as elderly men<sup>16</sup> or to one type of surgery,<sup>12,17</sup> inclusion of patients undergoing emergency surgery without stratification of outcomes,<sup>16</sup> or failure to adjust for the major known confounders,<sup>24</sup> especially the use of perioperative transfusions.<sup>13,16</sup> Moreover, most of these studies only assessed the outcomes of mortality<sup>13-16,24</sup> or cardiac morbidity.<sup>12,16</sup>

# Interpretation

After attending to the limitations of previous studies, our study of 227 425 patients with major non-cardiac surgery established that preoperative anaemia is independently associated with an increased risk of 30-day mortality and several major morbidities in both men and women, and across all age groups and surgical subspecialties. This observation should lead to careful assessment and early detection of preoperative anaemia is associated with serious adverse outcomes is important not only for surgeons and anaesthesiologists but also for referring doctors because in most cases treatment of mild anaemia is possible at a relatively low cost.

colleagues suggested that even mild degrees of preoperative anaemia were associated with an increased risk of 30-day postoperative mortality and cardiac events in elderly patients (mostly male veterans) undergoing major non-cardiac surgery.<sup>16</sup> Our study reinforces these findings and suggests that the detrimental effects of preoperative anaemia occur across all age groups and sexes, and are associated with increased risk of major non-cardiac morbidity, including respiratory, urinary, wound, septic, and thromboembolic complications. Our study distinguished between patients who had emergency and elective procedures, unlike Wu and colleagues' study<sup>16</sup> that assessed emergency surgery without stratification. We suggest that the severity of the underlying disease causing the emergency might have modified the effect of anaemia on outcomes, as we noted in our study. Another study of 7759 patients undergoing major non-cardiac surgery also reported that preoperative anaemia was associated with increased mortality (adjusted odds

ratio  $2 \cdot 36$ ,  $1 \cdot 57 - 3 \cdot 41$ ).<sup>24</sup> However, the retrospective nature of data collection in the study<sup>24</sup> and the short list of measured confounders available for adjustment might have affected the size of the reported association.

The adjusted odds ratio of dying that we reported (a 42% adjusted increase in mortality) attributable to anaemia might be regarded as a modest effect because the mortality in patients without preoperative anaemia was only 0.78%, and could be explained by the association of anaemia with other risk factors for death. However, the key strengths of our study were the large number of patients and the reliable and comprehensive data collection of the ACS NSOIP, which provides more than 60 demographic, preoperative, and perioperative variables for adjustment. This completeness, together with the good discrimination in our model, suggests that the effect of anaemia is independent and cannot be straightforwardly explained through an association with other known risk factors, especially in patients with mild preoperative anaemia. Moreover, a 42% adjusted increase in death rate in such a large sample size means that around 500 extra people could die from even a mild degree of anaemia after elective major non-cardiac surgery. We also did a thorough analysis of the effect of anaemia not only on mortality but also on morbidity. We assessed the effect of anaemia on seven major morbidities that might be associated with substantial sequelae and health-care costs. The frequency of composite morbidity in patients without preoperative anaemia was 5.33% (8436 patients), making a 35% adjusted increased rate of composite morbidity due to anaemia (much higher for some individual morbidities) very alarming.

The relative contribution of preoperative anaemia and perioperative transfusions on postoperative outcomes, and their interactions, is hard to specify. Although some studies did not attempt to explore such interaction,13,16 others tried to establish the independent effect of every factor through various statistical techniques.9,17,24,25 In these studies of preoperative anaemia, multivariate analysis was commonly used to adjust for perioperative transfusion as a confounder, or transfused patients were matched against non-transfused patients. Although these approaches are acceptable, they are restricted by the availability of other variables in the dataset. Thus, in our analysis we not only relied on adjustment for perioperative transfusions but also did separate analyses for patients who received and those who did not receive perioperative transfusions, thus confirming the negative effects of untreated anaemia on postoperative outcomes.

Our findings should lead to a careful consideration of appropriate interventions aimed at correction of preoperative anaemia in the most patients. Present guidelines recommend measurement of haematocrit concentration as close to 28 days before the scheduled surgical procedure as possible, and subsequent investigation and intervention in patients with anaemia.<sup>4,26</sup> Our study supports these guidelines because even mild

degrees of anaemia can increase the risk of morbidity and mortality. At least in elective surgical cases, the treatment of preoperative anaemia before surgical intervention should be strongly considered, not least because preoperative anaemia is easy to detect and, in many situations, cheap to treat.<sup>4</sup> The high morbidity and mortality reported with the use of blood transfusion,<sup>9,10,25</sup> which we also noted in our analysis (albeit a nonrandomised study), make it the least favourable option. Alternative interventions include preoperative iron and vitamin supplementation or administration of erythropoietin. At least in orthopaedic<sup>27</sup> and cardiac<sup>28</sup> surgery, compelling evidence supports the use of preoperative treatment of anaemia for reduction of blood transfusion and improved outcomes.<sup>29</sup>

Our study had limitations. About 7% of the preoperative haematocrit concentrations were obtained more than 4 weeks before surgery and might not accurately predict the concentrations at the time of surgery. However, variation of haematocrit concentrations in an individual is usually low in the absence of major bleeding, which in our database would have been identified by preoperative blood transfusions and thus corrected for in the analysis. Moreover, in our analysis the reported effect of anaemia on postoperative outcomes remained significant irrespective of the duration from haematocrit concentration measurement to operation. The ACS NSQIP database does not record the haematocrit concentration at the lowest point intraoperatively or immediately postoperative. Thus, we do not know if reduced intraoperative haematocrit concentrations were associated with worse outcomes. Furthermore, the database does not document use of four or fewer packed red-blood-cell transfusions in the preoperative or postoperative period, which means that some patients regarded as not having received any perioperative transfusions in the analysis might have received such transfusion. Nonetheless, about 83% of patients without documented perioperative transfusions had surgery on the same day, suggesting that preoperative transfusion was mostly unlikely, and they had a significant association between anaemia and postoperative mortality and morbidity at 30 days. We were unable to adjust for blood transfusion (four units or fewer) received during the postoperative period. In the preoperative anaemia group, postoperative transfusions might have corrected the anaemia. Moreover, patients without anaemia might have also received blood postoperatively, and blood transfusion is associated with adverse outcomes. However, these eventualities would bias our study toward the null hypothesis, leading us to underestimate the effect of anaemia on outcomes. Thus, this form of bias would have been important only if we were not able to detect a significant difference between the anaemia and the no anaemia group. Although our data included various surgical procedures and showed preoperative anaemia to be associated with adverse outcomes between all surgical subspecialties, overall estimates of increased morbidity and mortality might only be applicable in a population with a similar casemix as that generated by the ACS NSQIP sampling strategy. Lastly, our study cannot relate the cause and time course of anaemia to morbidity and mortality.

Because even mild anaemia increases the risk of postoperative morbidity and mortality in patients undergoing major non-cardiac surgery, doctors need to consider preoperative treatment of anaemia when possible. Further research is needed to establish the efficacy, safety, and cost-effectiveness of such preoperative anaemia management.

# Contributors

KMM and FRJ designed the study. AH, MK, FSD, KK, PMS, AS, JJH, and ATT obtained the data. KMM, TR, DRS, FRR, and FRJ analysed the data. KMM and FRJ wrote the report. TR, DRS, FRR, AH, MK, FSD, KK, PMS, AS, JJH, and ATT critically revised the report. HT and KMM did the statistical analysis. All authors approved the final report for submission.

# Conflicts of interest

TR's department receives consultancy fees and research funding from Vifor Pharma. DRS receives consultancy fees and travel support from Vifor Pharma. DRS's department receives research funding from the Swiss National Science Foundation in Bern (Switzerland; grant numbers 33CM30\_124117 and 406440-131268), the Swiss Society of Anesthesiology and Reanimation in Bern, the Swiss Foundation for Anaesthesia Research in Zurich (Switzerland), the Bundesprogramm Chancengleichheit in Bern, CSL Behring in Bern, and Vifor SA in Villars-sur-Glâne (Switzerland). DRS was the chairman of the ABC Faculty and is a member of the ABC Trauma Faculty, which both are managed by Thomson Physicians World GmbH in Mannheim (Germany) and sponsored by an unrestricted educational grant from Novo Nordisk in Bagsvärd (Denmark) and CSL Behring in Hattersheim am Main (Germany). In the past 5 years, DRS has received honoraria or travel support for consulting or lecturing from Abbott (Baar, Switzerland), AstraZeneca (Zug, Switzerland), Bayer (Schweiz; Zurich), Baxter (Rome, Italy), B Braun Melsungen (Melsungen, Germany), Boehringer Ingelheim (Schweiz; Basel, Switzerland), Bristol-Myers Squibb (Rueil-Malmaison Cedex, France), CSL Behring (Hattersheim am Main and Bern), Curacyte (Munich, Germany), Ethicon Biosurgery (Sommerville, NJ, USA), Fresenius (Bad Homburg vor der Höhe, Germany), Galenica (Bern), Switzerland, including Vifor SA), GlaxoSmithKline (Hamburg, Germany), Janssen-Cilag (Baar, Switzerland), Janssen-Cilag EMEA (Beerse, Belgium), Novo Nordisk (Bagsvärd), Octapharma (Lachen, Switzerland), Organon (Pfäffikon, Switzerland), Oxygen Biotherapeutics (Costa Mesa, CA, USA), tem Innovations (Munich), Roche Pharma (Schweiz; Reinach, Switzerland), and Schering-Plough (Kenilworth, NJ, USA). ATT is a member of Novartis speakers' bureau. All other authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

## Acknowledgments

The American College of Surgeons' National Surgical Quality Improvement Program (ACS NSQIP) and the hospitals participating in the ACS NSQIP provided the data; they have not verified and are not responsible for the statistical validity of the data analysis or the conclusions derived by the authors. We thank Maya Moussa for her support towards the completion of this study.

### References

- Kulier A, Levin J, Moser R, et al, and the Investigators of the Multicenter Study of Perioperative Ischemia Research Group and the Ischemia Research and Education Foundation. Impact of preoperative anemia on outcome in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass graft surgery. *Circulation* 2007; **116**: 471–79.
- 2 Karkouti K, Wijeysundera DN, Beattie WS, and the Reducing Bleeding in Cardiac Surgery (RBC) Investigators. Risk associated with preoperative anemia in cardiac surgery: a multicenter cohort study. *Circulation* 2008; 117: 478–84.

- 3 van Straten AH, Hamad MA, van Zundert AJ, Martens EJ, Schönberger JP, de Wolf AM. Preoperative hemoglobin level as a predictor of survival after coronary artery bypass grafting: a comparison with the matched general population. *Circulation* 2009; **120**: 118–25.
- 4 Goodnough LT, Shander A, Spivak JL, et al. Detection, evaluation, and management of anemia in the elective surgical patient. *Anesth Analg* 2005; **101**: 1858–61.
- 5 van Klei WA, Moons KG, Leyssius AT, Knape JT, Rutten CL, Grobbee DE. A reduction in type and screen: preoperative prediction of RBC transfusions in surgery procedures with intermediate transfusion risks. *Br J Anaesth* 2001; 87: 250–57.
- 6 Ong AH, Sim KM, Boey SK. Preoperative prediction of intra and postoperative red blood cell transfusion in surgical patients. *Ann Acad Med Singapore* 1997; 26: 430–34.
- 7 Rashiq S, Finegan BA. The effect of spinal anesthesia on blood transfusion rate in total joint arthroplasty. *Can J Surg* 2006; 49: 391–96.
- 8 McCluskey SA, Karkouti K, Wijeysundera DN, et al. Derivation of a risk index for the prediction of massive blood transfusion in liver transplantation. *Liver Transpl* 2006; 12: 1584–93.
- 9 Bernard AC, Davenport DL, Chang PK, Vaughan TB, Zwischenberger JB. Intraoperative transfusion of 1 U to 2 U packed red blood cells is associated with increased 30-day mortality, surgical-site infection, pneumonia, and sepsis in general surgery patients. J Am Coll Surg 2009; 208: 931–37.
- 10 Wu WC, Smith TS, Henderson WG, et al. Operative blood loss, blood transfusion, and 30-day mortality in older patients after major noncardiac surgery. Ann Surg 2010; 252: 11–17.
- 11 Glance LG, Dick AW, Mukamel DB, et al. Association between intraoperative blood transfusion and mortality and morbidity in patients undergoing noncardiac surgery. *Anesthesiology* 2011; 114: 283–92.
- 12 Hogue CW Jr, Goodnough LT, Monk TG. Perioperative myocardial ischemic episodes are related to hematocrit level in patients undergoing radical prostatectomy. *Transfusion* 1998; 38: 924–31.
- 13 Carson JL, Duff A, Poses RM, et al. Effect of anaemia and cardiovascular disease on surgical mortality and morbidity. *Lancet* 1996; 348: 1055–60.
- 14 Spence RK, Carson JA, Poses R, et al. Elective surgery without transfusion: influence of preoperative hemoglobin level and blood loss on mortality. Am J Surg 1990; 159: 320–24.
- 15 Carson JL, Poses RM, Spence RK, Bonavita G. Severity of anaemia and operative mortality and morbidity. *Lancet* 1988; 331: 727–28.

- 16 Wu WC, Schifftner TL, Henderson WG, et al. Preoperative hematocrit levels and postoperative outcomes in older patients undergoing noncardiac surgery. JAMA 2007; 297: 2481–88.
- 17 Leichtle SW, Mouawad NJ, Lampman R, Singal B, Cleary RK. Does preoperative anemia adversely affect colon and rectal surgery outcomes? J Am Coll Surg 2011; 212: 187–94.
- 18 Khuri SF, Henderson WG, Daley J, et al, and the Principal Site Investigators of the Patient Safety in Surgery Study. The patient safety in surgery study: background, study design, and patient populations. J Am Coll Surg 2007; 204: 1089–102.
- 19 Fink AS, Campbell DA Jr, Mentzer RM Jr, et al. The National Surgical Quality Improvement Program in non-veterans administration hospitals: initial demonstration of feasibility. *Ann Surg* 2002; 236: 344–53.
- 20 ACS NSQIP user guide for the 2008 participant use data file. Am Coll Surg 2009: 10-2-2009.
- 21 WHO. Nutritional anaemias. Report of a WHO scientific group. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1968.
- 22 Shander A, Knight K, Thurer R, Adamson J, Spence R. Prevalence and outcomes of anemia in surgery: a systematic review of the literature. *Am J Med* 2004; **116** (suppl 7A): 58S–69S.
- 23 Nelson AH, Fleisher LA, Rosenbaum SH. Relationship between postoperative anemia and cardiac morbidity in high-risk vascular patients in the intensive care unit. *Crit Care Med* 1993; 21: 860–66.
- 24 Beattie WS, Karkouti K, Wijeysundera DN, Tait G. Risk associated with preoperative anemia in noncardiac surgery: a single-center cohort study. *Anesthesiology* 2009; 110: 574–81.
- 25 Glance LG, Wissler R, Mukamel DB, et al. Perioperative outcomes among patients with the modified metabolic syndrome who are undergoing noncardiac surgery. *Anesthesiology* 2010; **113**: 859–72.
- 26 Goodnough LT, Maniatis A, Earnshaw P, et al. Detection, evaluation, and management of preoperative anaemia in the elective orthopaedic surgical patient: NATA guidelines. *Br J Anaesth* 2011; **106**: 13–22.
- 27 Spahn DR. Anemia and patient blood management in hip and knee surgery: a systematic review of the literature. *Anesthesiology* 2010; 113: 482–95.
- 28 Moskowitz DM, McCullough JN, Shander A, et al. The impact of blood conservation on outcomes in cardiac surgery: is it safe and effective? Ann Thorac Surg 2010; 90: 451–58.
- 29 Spahn DR, Moch H, Hofmann A, Isbister JP. Patient blood management: the pragmatic solution for the problems with blood transfusions. *Anesthesiology* 2008; 109: 951–53.

# Treatment intensity at end of life—time to act on the evidence 🕢

Current health-care spending in the USA is unsustainable. Advances in expensive medical technologies and ageing of the population have resulted in soaring health-care costs. Medicare expenses in the last year of life are on average five times greater than non-terminal years, and vary substantially across geographical regions.<sup>1,2</sup> Despite high costs, the quality of care at the end of life is often poor: many patients suffer with pain and other symptoms, and some receive treatments inconsistent with their preferences and goals.<sup>3,4</sup>

To understand health-care spending, especially for the most seriously ill patients, many studies have examined patterns of treatment intensity and investigated regional and patients' factors associated with high-intensity care.<sup>2,5</sup> Studies have shown a strong association between Medicare costs and regional characteristics, including number of hospital beds or specialist physicians per head.<sup>6,7</sup> These data suggest that some hospital admissions could be discretionary or avoidable and some high-intensity treatments could be unnecessary or discordant with patients' preferences.

In The Lancet, Alvin Kwok and colleagues<sup>8</sup> investigate the use of surgical procedures in the last year of life in the USA. Among beneficiaries of fee-for-service Medicare who died in 2008, they report that 31.9% (95% CI 31.9-32.0) underwent surgery in the last year of life, of whom 18.3% (18.2-18.4) had a surgical procedure within the last 30 days of their life. The adjusted rate of surgical intensity varied by three times between the highest intensity region (Munster, IN, USA; end-of-life surgical intensity score 34.4 [95% CI 33.7-35.1]) and the lowest intensity region (Honolulu, HI, USA; 11.5 [11.3-11.7]). While these data specific to surgical procedures are new, the patterns of variation and associated characteristics are those that we have seen in previous studies. For example, regions with high surgical intensity also have high Medicare costs; and surgical intensity is positively correlated with number of hospital beds per head.

The merits and deficiencies of the decedent followback study design continue to be debated.<sup>9,10</sup> Certainly, studies relying solely on administrative and census data cannot sufficiently adjust for patients' risk factors (ie, health, function, and socioeconomic status), or for patients' or families' preferences; and studies of decedents cannot fully account for those who survived despite a high risk of mortality. Nevertheless, the consistent reproducible pattern of findings across many studies cannot be ignored. Treatments are heavily influenced by external factors (ie, number of hospital beds per head, local practice patterns, physician supply), rather than purely what is medically appropriate for and preferred by patients. Although some might continue to critique such study methods, including those used by Kwok and colleagues,<sup>8</sup> the weight of evidence supports the need for action on many levels.

What can be done? First, policymakers must align incentives for insurance plans, health-care institutions, and providers with individual patients' goals. In this regard Kwok and colleagues' findings are especially relevant because surgical procedures are highly reimbursed and, therefore, surgeons and hospitals are often financially motivated to operate regardless of the patient's preferences or goals. Furthermore, patients' treatment options might be artificially limited by benefit structure or available local services. For example, disproportionate out-of-pocket costs or limited caregiver availability could preclude a plan for care at home resulting in extended hospital stays or unwanted hospital admissions. New health-care systems and reimbursement models (ie, accountable care organisations or bundled payments) should be structured to offer an increased level of service and support in settings outside hospital when this is most appropriate for the patient. New policies and



DOI:10.1016/S0140-See Online/Articles DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61268-3



1

programmes must prioritise care of the patient across care settings rather than tolerating disjointed and poorly coordinated division of care.

Second, regional differences in medical culture could influence patterns of treatment intensity. For patients with serious illness, provision of palliative care and skilled communication is associated with improved clinical care, enhanced satisfaction, and lower costs;<sup>11-13</sup> and in select populations, palliative care provided in conjunction with disease-directed care has been shown to extend life.<sup>14</sup> Medical and nursing schools must ensure that all graduates achieve basic competencies in palliative care. Institutions, especially hospitals and nursing homes, need to include palliative care as a core component of their medical services. Such requirements would help to ensure that treatments are consistent with patients' personal goals.

Finally, Kwok and colleagues' study shows that the provision of appropriate, preference-guided treatment for patients with serious illness is the shared responsibility of all clinicians. Surgeons, like general practitioners, are obliged to work with patients and their families to identify appropriate goals of care and recommend treatment plans that help achieve those goals. The personal commitment of thoughtful and well-trained practitioners, if supported by proper incentives and well designed health-care systems and programmes, will help to improve alignment of patients' preferences and treatment plans. The evidence of regional variation in treatment intensity is substantial. We must now focus on addressing the problem.

## Amy S Kelley

Brookdale Department of Geriatrics and Palliative Medicine, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, NY 10029, USA amy.kelley@mssm.edu I declare that I have no conflicts of interest.

- 1 Hoover DR, Crystal S, Kumar R, Sambamoorthi U, Cantor JC. Medical expenditures during the last year of life: findings from the 1992-1996 Medicare current beneficiary survey. *Health Serv Res* 2002; **37**: 1625-42.
- 2 The Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy and Clinical Practice. The Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care: end of life care. http://www. dartmouthatlas.org/data/.topic/topic.aspx?cat=18 (accessed Aug 18, 2011).
- 3 Desbiens NA, Wu AW. Pain and suffering in seriously ill hospitalized patients. J Am Geriatr Soc 2000; **48** (5 suppl): 5183–86.
- 4 Teno JM, Fisher ES, Hamel MB, Coppola K, Dawson NV. Medical care inconsistent with patients' treatment goals: association with 1-year Medicare resource use and survival. J Am Geriatr Soc 2002; 50: 496–500.
- 5 Kelley AS, Ettner SL, Morrison RS, Du Q, Wenger NS, Sarkisian CA. Determinants of medical expenditures in the last 6 months of life. Ann Intern Med 2011; 154: 235–42.
- Fisher ES, Wennberg DE, Stukel TA, Gottlieb DJ, Lucas FL, Pinder EL. The implications of regional variations in Medicare spending. Part 1: the content, quality, and accessibility of care. Ann Intern Med 2003; 138: 273–87.
- <sup>1</sup> Fisher ES, Wennberg DE, Stukel TA, Gottlieb DJ, Lucas FL, Pinder EL. The implications of regional variations in Medicare spending. Part 2: health outcomes and satisfaction with care. Ann Intern Med 2003; 138: 288–98.
- 8 Kwok AC, Semel ME, Lipsitz SR, et al. The intensity and variation of surgical care at the end-of-life: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* 2011; published online Oct 6. DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61268-3.
- 9 Bach PB. A map to bad policy—hospital efficiency measures in the Dartmouth Atlas. N Engl J Med 2010; 362: 569–73.
- 10 Skinner J, Staiger D, Fisher ES. Looking back, moving forward. N Engl J Med 2010; **362:** 569–74.
- 11 Bakitas M, Lyons KD, Hegel MT, et al. Effects of a palliative care intervention on clinical outcomes in patients with advanced cancer: the Project ENABLE II randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2009; 302: 741–49.
- 12 Wright AA, Zhang B, Ray A, et al. Associations between end-of-life discussions, patient mental health, medical care near death, and caregiver bereavement adjustment. JAMA 2008; **300:** 1665–73.
- 13 Morrison RS, Penrod JD, Cassel JB, et al, for the Palliative Care Leadership Centers' Outcomes Group. Cost savings associated with US hospital palliative care consultation programs. Arch Intern Med 2008; 168: 1783–90.
- 14 Temel JS, Greer JA, Muzikansky A, Gallagher E. Early palliative care in patients with metastatic non-small cell lung cancer. N Engl J Med 2010; 363: 733–42.