



University of Dundee

Polypharmacy and emergency readmission to hospital after critical illness

Turnbull, Angus J.; Donaghy, Eddie; Salisbury, Lisa; Ramsay, Pamela; Rattray, Janice; Walsh, Timothy

Published in:
British Journal of Anaesthesia

DOI:
[10.1016/j.bja.2020.09.035](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2020.09.035)

Publication date:
2021

Licence:
CC BY-NC-ND

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

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

Citation for published version (APA):

Turnbull, A. J., Donaghy, E., Salisbury, L., Ramsay, P., Rattray, J., Walsh, T., & Lone, N. (2021). Polypharmacy and emergency readmission to hospital after critical illness: a population-level cohort study. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, 126(2), 415-422. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2020.09.035>

General rights

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

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

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

Polypharmacy and emergency readmission to hospital after critical illness: a population-level cohort study

Authors: Dr Angus J. Turnbull^{1*}, Dr Eddie Donaghy^{1,2}, Dr Lisa Salisbury³, Dr Pamela Ramsay⁴, Dr Janice Rattray⁵, Professor Timothy Walsh^{1,2,6}, Dr Nazir Lone^{1,2}

Affiliations:

1. University Department of Anaesthesia, Critical Care and Pain Medicine, Deanery of Clinical Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
2. Usher Institute, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
3. School of Health Sciences, Queen Margaret University Edinburgh, Musselburgh, UK
4. School of Health and Social Care, Edinburgh Napier University, Edinburgh, UK
5. School of Nursing and Health Sciences, University of Dundee, Dundee, UK
6. MRC Centre for Inflammation Research, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

Corresponding Author:

Dr Angus J. Turnbull

University Department of Anaesthesia, Critical Care and Pain Medicine

University of Edinburgh, UK

Email: angus.turnbull@nhs.net

140-Character Tweet: Polypharmacy is an independent risk factor for emergency readmission following discharge from critical illness.

Short Running Title: Polypharmacy and readmission in ICU survivors

Online Data Supplement: This article has an online data supplement

Take-home Message: Polypharmacy is prevalent in the intensive care setting and is an independent risk factor for emergency readmission after critical illness. 1 in 2 patients with pre-admission polypharmacy experience emergency readmission to hospital within 1-year from critical care discharge.

ABSTRACT

Background: Polypharmacy is becoming increasingly prevalent and is closely linked to drug interactions. The impact of polypharmacy has not been previously quantified in survivors of critical illness who have reduced resilience to stressors. The study aimed to identify factors associated with pre-admission polypharmacy and ascertain whether polypharmacy is an independent risk factor for emergency readmission to hospital following discharge from a critical illness.

Methods: Population wide cohort study which consisted of patients admitted to all Scottish general intensive care units (ICU) between 1st January 2011 and 31st December 2013, whom survived their ICU stay. Patients were stratified by presence of pre-admission polypharmacy, defined as being prescribed 5 or more regular medications. The primary outcome was emergency hospital readmission within 1-year of discharge from index hospital stay.

Results: Of 23,844 ICU patients, 29.9% were identified with polypharmacy (n=7,138). Factors associated with polypharmacy included female sex, increasing age and social deprivation. Emergency 1-year hospital readmission was significantly higher in the polypharmacy cohort (51.8% vs 35.8%, $P<0.001$). After confounder adjustment, patients with polypharmacy had a 22% higher hazard of emergency 1-year readmission (adjusted hazard ratio[adjHR] 1.22, 95% confidence interval[CI] 1.16-1.28, $P<0.001$). On a linear scale of polypharmacy each additional prescription conferred a 3% increase in hazard of emergency readmission by 1-year (adjHR 1.03, 95%CI 1.02-1.03, $P<0.001$).

Conclusions: This national cohort study of ICU survivors demonstrates that pre-admission polypharmacy is an independent risk factor for emergency readmission. In an ever-growing

epidemic of polypharmacy, this risk factor may represent a substantial burden in the at-risk post-intensive care population.

Key Words: critical illness, drug interactions, emergency readmission, hospital readmission, intensive care, polypharmacy

INTRODUCTION

Polypharmacy is an ever-perpetuating global phenomenon fuelled by our aging population and rising tide of multi-morbidity. It occurs throughout all aspects of healthcare making the application of single disease-focused evidence-based practice more challenging. Between 1995 and 2010 the mean number of dispensed drugs increased from 3.3 to 4.4 and the percentage of patients prescribed 5 or more medications doubled from 11% to 22%(1). Polypharmacy is strongly associated with potentially serious drug-drug interactions; a prevalence of which also doubled to 13% between 1995 and 2010(1). Primary care analyses demonstrate that for each additional drug prescribed the odds of a prescription or monitoring error increase by 16%(2). Potential interactions occur at a frequency of around 50% when five or more medications are prescribed and rise to 80% and 100% when 10 and 20 drugs are prescribed respectively(3). Adverse drug reactions account for 6.5% of hospital admissions (with a 2.2% mortality rate) and an estimated annual cost of £466million(4). 72% of these adverse drug events are avoidable(4).

Polypharmacy prevalence is significantly greater in the intensive care setting compared to general wards, with between 54% and 64% of patients experiencing a potential drug-drug interaction(5,6). The well described 'post-intensive care syndrome' results in patients with ongoing issues related to their acute admission and a reduced resilience to stressors(7). Consequently, these patients are likely at increased risk of adverse medication prescriptions and side-effects. The combination of the ageing population (proportion of over65s is predicted to increase from 18% in 2016 to 24% in 2036)(8), increasing multi-morbidity and an evolving intensive care population (favouring increases in age) is culminating in a growing polypharmacy intensive care population.

A report into the burden of polypharmacy in 2013 and highlighted that the evidence base for multiple interventions in the multi-morbid patient is currently poor(9). There is limited research to date on pre-admission polypharmacy in the intensive care setting and its effects on emergency readmission and mortality. This paper investigates the relationship between pre-admission polypharmacy and emergency readmission in patients from a Scottish national ICU registry. We hypothesised that, in intensive care survivors, pre-admission polypharmacy would be associated with increased emergency readmission and mortality at 1-year.

METHODS

We used a cohort study design. Data sources were linked registries collated for the PROFILE study(10): Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group (SICSAG)(11), Scottish Morbidity Record of acute hospital admissions (SMR01), Scottish death records, acute psychiatric hospital admissions (SMR04) and Prescribing Information System (PIS). The SICSAG registry is subject to regular validation assessments and includes Scottish intensive care activity and derives a population from 24 adult ICUs which serve a population of 5.1million(12). The PIS records all prescriptions dispensed in Scotland since 2009, with high levels of linkage accuracy (95% by 2014) and completeness(13).

All data were anonymised before release and analysed in a safe-haven environment. The study formed a secondary analysis of a subset of the population included in the PROFILE study(10) which gained approval from the Privacy Advisory Committee of NHS National Services Scotland (Reference-PAC12/14) and The Research Ethics Committee granted a waiver (Reference-NR/1403AB5).

Participants

The cohort comprised adult patients (aged ≥ 16) admitted to a Scottish ICU and who were subsequently discharged alive from their index hospital stay between 1 January 2011 and 31 December 2013. These participants were a subset of the original PROFILE dataset and this timeframe chosen as full required prescribing data were available.

Exposure

Pre-admission polypharmacy was defined as five or more monthly prescribed drugs, a threshold suggested by NHS Scotland guidance and the most prevalent numerical definition used in current literature(14,15). We derived this by calculating the total number of dispensed items to each patient over a one-year period before admission and then divided this by 12 to create a monthly mean number of prescriptions. Origin of prescribing data is available in the online supplement. The primary exposure variable was represented as a binary variable (presence vs absence) of pre-admission polypharmacy. Acknowledging that a binary cut-off for polypharmacy may be viewed as arbitrary, as a secondary exposure we modelled the monthly mean number of prescriptions as a continuous variable. In sensitivity analyses, we modelled an additional continuous measure of polypharmacy using the number of distinct drugs prescribed over the pre-admission one-year period (tertiary exposure).

Outcomes

The primary outcome was emergency hospital readmission within 1-year of discharge from index hospital stay. Emergency versus elective admission type was coded in SMR01 with a validated accuracy of >93%(16). The secondary outcome was mortality within 1-year of index admission discharge. Complete follow-up was assumed. Emigration from Scotland was unrecorded in the database, however is known to be low (<0.8% of residents aged ≥ 16 years annually in 2013)(17).

Confounders

The following confounders were used to adjust in multivariable models: number of comorbidities, sex, age, Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD)(18), remoteness of residence(19), Acute Physiology Score (APS), number of previous emergency/elective hospital admissions, outpatient attendances, psychiatric admissions, ICU admission type (elective/emergency), ICU admission diagnosis, mechanical ventilation/renal replacement therapy/cardiovascular support/tracheostomy use (binary), and length of stay pre/during/post-ICU. See online supplement for details relating to confounders.

Statistical Methods

Baseline characteristics and cohort analyses

Data analyses were undertaken using Stata/IC.V.14. Baseline characteristics were compared between polypharmacy and non-polypharmacy groups using χ^2 and Wilcoxon rank-sum. We evaluated the relationship between mean monthly dispensed drugs and both age and social deprivation graphically.

Primary analysis

The primary analysis was to investigate the association between pre-admission polypharmacy on the primary outcome of 1-year emergency readmission to hospital. Fine and Gray competing risk regression analysis was used allowing for the competing risk of death. We took a sequential approach to model building. Firstly, a univariable analysis between polypharmacy and 1-year emergency readmission. The second model was a multivariable model adjusting for confounders including comorbidities listed above. This model is presented as the primary multivariable model. However, because number of comorbidities and polypharmacy is

correlated (Spearman's rho 0.37, $P < 0.001$) and comorbidity count is potentially causally related to polypharmacy, we followed with a third multivariable model adjusting for confounders but excluding number of comorbidities.

We calculated cumulative risk data for emergency 1-year readmission to hospital using the Stata cumulative incidence function 'stcrreg' followed by 'stcurve'. In order to visualise results, we used logistic regression to calculate predicted probabilities for emergency readmission and then graphed using a margins plot. The logistic regression model included all confounders.

To increase robustness, we first analysed using a binary cut-off for polypharmacy (primary exposure) and then progressed (using the same models) to considering polypharmacy as a continuous scale entered as a linear term (secondary exposure).

Secondary analysis

The secondary analysis investigated the association between polypharmacy on the secondary outcome of 1-year mortality. Cox regression analysis was used in the same sequential approach to the primary analysis. Further detail available in online supplement.

Sensitivity analysis

For the primary and secondary analyses, polypharmacy was calculated using the monthly mean number of prescriptions. To evaluate robustness of the main analysis, we used the number of distinct drugs prescribed over the preceding year to derive the exposure. We used the same sequential Fine and Gray model approach as in the primary/secondary analysis. We also evaluated age/polypharmacy and comorbidity/polypharmacy interactions. In addition,

we undertook a propensity score matched analysis in an attempt to further control for confounding. Further detail in the online supplement.

Drug category analysis

We investigated which drug categories contributed most towards readmission risk. A Fine and Gray fully adjusted multivariable model was run for each of the 44 drug chapter codes for the primary outcome of 1-year emergency readmission. Chapter codes were sorted into associated categories. Chapter codes with $n < 50$ or no associated category were placed in 'Other' (eTable 1).

RESULTS

Baseline Characteristics

A total of 23,844 patients, aged ≥ 16 , were admitted to a Scottish ICU and subsequently discharged from hospital alive between 1 January 2011 and 31 December 2013. Median age was 62 years (IQR 47-72), 22% had at least one emergency inpatient admission in the preceding year, 58.1% had at least one comorbidity and 11.4% had 3 or more comorbidities. Median length of ICU stay was 1 day (IQR 0-4) with a median post-ICU stay of 8 days (IQR 4-18). Emergency 1-year readmission occurred in 40.6% and 1-year mortality in 8.2%. Median monthly dispensed medications were 3 (IQR 1-5) with a median of 9 distinct prescriptions in the past 12 months (IQR 5-15). (Table 1). Further baseline characteristics available in online supplement.

Cohort analyses

The prevalence of pre-admission polypharmacy (5 or more medications) was 29.9% (n=7,138). Polypharmacy patients were more likely to be female (50.1% vs 39.4%, $P<0.001$), older (median 66 years IQR 55-75 vs 59 years IQR 44-70, $P<0.001$) and living in more socially deprived areas ($P<0.001$). Polypharmacy patients had greater APACHE II scores on admission (median 16 IQR 12-21 vs median 14 IQR 10-19, $P<0.001$), required greater cardiovascular system support (44.1% vs 40.2%, $P<0.001$), less mechanical ventilation (56.9% vs 62.0%, $P<0.001$) and longer ICU stay (median 2 days IQR 1-4 vs 1 day IQR 0-4, $P<0.001$)(Table-1). The full version of baseline characteristics table including individual comorbidities prevalence is available in the Supplement (eTable-2). Throughout the age range women were

prescribed a greater number of mean monthly dispensed drugs than men (Figure 1a) and social deprivation was also associated with higher mean monthly dispensed drugs (Figure 1b).

Primary analysis

Emergency 1-year hospital readmission was significantly higher in the polypharmacy cohort (51.8% vs 35.8%, $P<0.001$). Univariable analysis demonstrated a 61% increase in hazard of 1-year emergency readmission (HR 1.61, 95%CI 1.54-1.67, $P<0.001$). After adjustment for confounders (including comorbidities), there was a 22% relative increase in hazard (adjHR 1.22, 95%CI 1.16-1.28, $P<0.001$, Figure 2). Multivariable analysis adjusted for confounders, after excluding number of comorbidities, yielded a 30% relative increase in hazard for emergency 1-year admission (adjHR 1.30, 95%CI 1.24-1.37, $P<0.001$).

For a 'typical' patient (median 62 years) the predicted adjusted probability of 1-year emergency readmission was 37% in the non-polypharmacy cohort and 53% in the polypharmacy cohort. At all ages pre-admission polypharmacy markedly increased the probability of emergency readmission by one-year post-hospital discharge (Figure 3). In those patients experiencing emergency readmission by 1-year after discharge the median time to readmission was sooner in the polypharmacy cohort at 55 days (IQR 13-159) vs 59 (IQR 17-162).

Analysing mean number of dispensed items per month as a continuous variable rather than binary, the risk of 1-year emergency hospital readmission was 6% higher for each additional dispensed medication per month (HR 1.06, 95%CI 1.06-1.07, $P<0.001$) in the univariable model. With adjustment for confounders the additional risk for each additional prescription

was 3% (adjHR 1.03, 95%CI 1.02-1.03,P<0.001). Multivariable model excluding number of comorbidities yielded the additional risk at 4% per medication (adjHR 1.04, 95%CI 1.03-1.04,P<0.001). Predicted probabilities demonstrated a linear relationship between mean prescriptions per month and probability of emergency hospital readmission (Figure 4).

Secondary analysis

Pre-admission polypharmacy was associated with higher 1-year mortality (11.5% vs 6.8%,P<0.001). A univariable model showed polypharmacy to incur a 9% increase risk in hazard for 1-year mortality (HR 1.09, 95%CI 1.00-1.19,P=0.06). A fully adjusted multivariable model showed a non-significant increase in risk in hazard (adjHR 1.06 95%CI 0.95-1.18,P=0.29) which remained non-significant upon the withdrawal of comorbidities from the model (adjHR 1.05 95%CI 0.95-1.17,P=0.34).

Sensitivity analysis

Using the tertiary exposure of polypharmacy, calculated via the number of distinct prescriptions over a 12-month period, the median number of dispensed items was 9 with interquartile range of 5-15. The univariable model showed a 4% increase in readmission risk for each additional dispensed medication (HR 1.04, 95%CI 1.04-1.04,P<0.001). With adjustment for confounders the additional risk for each additional prescription was 2% (adjHR 1.02, 95%CI 1.02-1.02,P<0.001). Multivariable model excluding number of comorbidities yielded a similar result (adjHR 1.02, 95%CI 1.02-1.03,P<0.001). The association between polypharmacy and emergency hospital readmission did not vary by age (p-value for

interaction=0.08) (eTable 3). However, polypharmacy was associated with a higher risk of readmission in patients without comorbidity compared to those with comorbidity (adjHR 1.36 vs 1.24, p-value for interaction=0.002). The matched propensity score analysis used two matched cohorts with a total of 9,712 patients. The propensity matched approach yielded no substantial difference in the hazard for emergency readmission (adjHR 1.21, 95%CI 1.14-1.29, P<0.001) compared with the primary analysis. Further detail in online supplement (eTable 4, eFigure1, eTable 5)

Drug category analysis

After an adjusted multivariable model, the drug chapters which conferred the greatest increase in risk were: oxygen (adjHR 1.32), anti-parkinsonian agents (adjHR 1.29) and anti-migraine medications (adjHR 1.28). (eFigure 2). Full results available in online supplement

DISCUSSION

In this complete, large national database cohort study focusing on ICU survivors, patients with pre-admission polypharmacy experienced higher emergency readmission rates. Within a year post-hospital discharge one in two patients with pre-admission polypharmacy experienced emergency readmission to hospital. Polypharmacy patients also experienced longer ICU stays and higher mortality rates. Patient factors associated with polypharmacy included female sex, greater age and social deprivation.

The prevalence of pre-admission polypharmacy in our study was 30%. It is difficult to directly compare this to wider literature for a multitude of reasons. Firstly the definition of polypharmacy is variable(15), secondly the prevalence of polypharmacy is increasing over time(1), thirdly prevalence varies markedly on the age of the cohort population(1,20,21) and finally the prevalence varies geographically worldwide(21–24). Emergency readmission rates to hospital after a critical care index stay were similar in our study (cohort emergency readmission 15% at 30-days and 41% at 1-year) when comparing with other large cohort studies of general ICU discharged patients (16% at 30-days)(25).

Whilst much literature exists showing the detrimental effects of inappropriate polypharmacy, it is largely restricted to geriatric services(26–29), with some evidence in the post-operative period(30,31). Polypharmacy has been included in risk scores for readmission for general medical patients(32–34). Our results demonstrated that each additional medication attributed a 3-4% increased risk of 1-year emergency readmission which is comparable to a study in a non-ICU survivor cohort(26). There are no previous comparable studies which have stratified emergency readmission by presence of pre-admission polypharmacy in ICU

survivors. Our results, unique in current literature and reporting a large cohort, highlight the importance of pre-admission polypharmacy in relation to healthcare burden after critical illness.

Factors associated with ICU survivor readmission have been well documented and are divided into system, clinical and patient factors(10). 'Post-intensive care syndrome' results in patients with reduced resilience to stressors who are subsequently at increased readmission risk(7). It is credible that these patients would be at particular risk for emergency readmission when subjected to known medication side-effects, drug-drug interactions and potentially inappropriately prescribed medications – all known to directly correlate with number of prescriptions(3,22).

Our study has a number of strengths. We used a large cohort of data covering a whole population over a three-year time period. Our coverage was complete for ICU admissions throughout Scotland and the quality and robustness of the data was high. We had the ability to capture nation-wide hospital readmission, rather than a single site. Caution must be taken when extrapolating the results to other countries as our study was solely based in Scotland and clinical practice and organisation vary considerably between healthcare systems. Our dataset contained multiple factors relating to the ICU and hospital admission resulting in a diverse range of data and the ability to adjust for potential confounders. Our primary end-point was at 1-year rather than the commonly reported 30 or 90-days. The strength of this prolonged follow-up is related to capturing a longer period of post-ICU discharge risk which is known to extend well beyond 90 days(35). Our visual data enables readers to draw conclusions on a linear scale for both time after discharge and number of regular medications rather than being limited to binary end-points.

Limitations within our study include variation in the literature surrounding the definition of polypharmacy. Our binary definition was five or more regular medications as this threshold has been suggested for use within the health system in which the cohort was derived, and is also the most common literature threshold(14,15). In sensitivity analyses, we progressed from a binary cut-off to a linear scale of prescribed medications. There are discussions that polypharmacy should focus less on the number of medications prescribed and rather focus on the appropriateness of the individual prescribed items. This has led to the terms 'appropriate' and 'inappropriate' polypharmacy(9). Our study did not have access to the information required to determine polypharmacy appropriateness. However, we were able to evaluate the effect of certain drug classes and also used two separate measures of polypharmacy. We were unable to evaluate polypharmacy after ICU discharge, which is of concern to clinicians managing post-ICU services.

We opted to report the multivariable model including comorbidities as a confounder as the primary analysis. However, a further potential limitation is that polypharmacy correlates with number of comorbidities which, depending on inclusion in a statistical model, may confound or 'over-adjust' an association between polypharmacy and readmission. To evaluate this effect, we developed statistical models both with and without adjustment for the number of comorbidities. We demonstrated that polypharmacy remained associated with readmission even after adjustment for comorbidities. This builds evidence for the biological plausibility that polypharmacy has its own causative effect via drug-drug interactions and side-effects in a susceptible and physiologically frail population following on from ICU discharge. However, we were also unable to investigate this putative causal mechanism due to limitations in the datasets.

Our study has implications for clinical practice. The importance of polypharmacy is recognised to have implications for policy and practice in general(9), confirmed in our study by the impact of polypharmacy on patient outcomes and subsequent healthcare resource use. The ICU itself, the downstream hospital ward, the community pharmacy or a post-ICU discharge clinic may be the ideal clinical setting to perform medication reconciliation and identify interactions to minimise ongoing risk. It could also act as a time for patients and families to receive medication-related education, especially focusing on long-term conditions known to have high readmission risks. Studies in other clinical settings have shown that medication reconciliation combined with education, support and pharmaceutical care-plans resulted in fewer adverse drug events and lower hospital utilisation compared to usual care(36,37).

Further studies are required to add to the body of evidence regarding the mechanism through which polypharmacy contributes to emergency readmission and the potential effectiveness of a dedicated medication reconciliation for patients after a critical care admission.

Conclusion

Pre-admission polypharmacy is prevalent in the intensive care setting. Our study highlights polypharmacy as an independent risk factor for emergency readmission after critical illness. We have demonstrated that 1 in 2 patients with pre-admission polypharmacy experience emergency readmission to hospital within 1-year from discharge following a critical illness. Further understanding of the mechanisms leading to readmission and possible interventions could improve clinical care and reduce the post-ICU financial burden.

Author Contributions: AT and NL had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the data analysis. All authors contributed to the conception and design of the study. AT and NL drafted the manuscript. All authors revised it critically for important intellectual content. All authors gave final approval of the version to be published. All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Acknowledgements: We thank all the clinicians in the Scottish ICUs who contributed data to the Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group registry (SICSAG), the SICSAG team for undertaking data extraction and the electronic Data Research and Innovation Service for undertaking linkage.

Sources of Support: Linkage of the dataset was funded through a research grant from the Chief Scientist Office for Scotland (reference CZH/401026).

Declaration of interests: All authors report a grant from the Chief Scientist Office for Scotland, during the conduct of the study.

REFERENCES

1. Guthrie B, Makubate B, Hernandez-Santiago V, et al.: The rising tide of polypharmacy and drug-drug interactions: population database analysis 1995-2010. *BMC Med* 2015; 13:74
2. Avery AJ, Ghaleb M, Barber N, et al.: The prevalence and nature of prescribing and monitoring errors in English general practice: a retrospective case note review [Internet]. *Br J Gen Pract* 2013; 63:e543–e553[cited 2019 Oct 28] Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3722831/>
3. Doan J, Zakrzewski-Jakubiak H, Roy J, et al.: Prevalence and risk of potential cytochrome P450-mediated drug-drug interactions in older hospitalized patients with polypharmacy. *Ann Pharmacother* 2013; 47:324–332
4. Pirmohamed M, James S, Meakin S, et al.: Adverse drug reactions as cause of admission to hospital: prospective analysis of 18 820 patients [Internet]. *BMJ* 2004; 329:15–19[cited 2019 Oct 28] Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/content/329/7456/15>
5. Uijtendaal EV, van Harsseel LLM, Hugenholtz GWK, et al.: Analysis of potential drug-drug interactions in medical intensive care unit patients. *Pharmacotherapy* 2014; 34:213–219
6. Ray S, Bhattacharyya M, Pramanik J, et al.: Drug-drug interactions in the ICU [Internet]. *Crit Care* 2009; 13:P495[cited 2019 Oct 28] Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/cc7659>
7. Lone NI, Lee R, Salisbury L, et al.: Predicting risk of unplanned hospital readmission in survivors of critical illness: a population-level cohort study. *Thorax* 2019; 74:1046–1054
8. Office for National Statistics: Overview of the UK population: July 2017 [Internet]. 2017; Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/articles/overviewoftheukpopulation/july2017>
9. Duerden M, Avery T, Payne R: Polypharmacy and medicines optimisation. Making it safe and sound. 2013;
10. Walsh TS, Salisbury L, Donaghy E, et al.: PReventing early unplanned hOspital readmission aFter critical ILInEss (PROFILE): protocol and analysis framework for a mixed methods study [Internet]. *BMJ Open* 2016; 6:e012590[cited 2019 Oct 28] Available from: <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/6/6/e012590>
11. SICSAG (2016) Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group Annual Report: Audit of Intensive Care Units in Scotland 2016 Reporting on 2015. In: Editor (ed)^(eds) Book

- Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group Annual Report: Audit of Intensive Care Units in Scotland 2016 Reporting on 2015. ISD Scotland Publications, City, pp.
12. SICSAG (2017) Scottish intensive care society audit group annual report: data quality. 2017 <http://www.sicsag.scot.nhs.uk/quality/data.html> (cited 06 apr 2017).
 13. Alvarez-Madrado S, McTaggart S, Nangle C, et al.: Data Resource Profile: The Scottish National Prescribing Information System (PIS) [Internet]. *Int J Epidemiol* 2016; 45:714–715f[cited 2019 Nov 23] Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5005947/>
 14. Scottish Government Model of Care Polypharmacy Working Group: Polypharmacy Guidance (2nd edition). 2015;
 15. Masnoon N, Shakib S, Kalisch-Ellett L, et al.: What is polypharmacy? A systematic review of definitions. *BMC Geriatr* 2017; 17:230
 16. NSS. Assessment of SMR01 Data Scotland 2014-2015.2015 <http://www.isdscotland.org/Health-topics/Hospital-care/Publications/2012-05-08/assessment-of-SMr01Data-2010-2011Scotlandreport.pdf>.
 17. Scotland NRo. Migration between Scotland and Overseas. 2017 <http://www.nrscotland.gov.uk/statistics-and-data/statistics/statistics-by-theme/migration/migration-statistics/migration-between-scotland-and-overseas> (cited 02 March 2019).
 18. Scottish Government. SIMD Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2009 General Report. 2009 [cited 04/05/2017] Available from: <http://www.gov.scot/resource/doc/289599/0088642.pdf>.
 19. Scottish Government. Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification 2013-2014. 2014 [cited 04/04/2017] Available from: <http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2014/11/2763/0>.
 20. Payne RA: The epidemiology of polypharmacy [Internet]. *Clin Med* 2016; 16:465–469[cited 2019 Oct 28] Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6297306/>
 21. Hovstadius B, Hovstadius K, Astrand B, et al.: Increasing polypharmacy - an individual-based study of the Swedish population 2005-2008. *BMC Clin Pharmacol* 2010; 10:16
 22. Gallagher P, Lang PO, Cherubini A, et al.: Prevalence of potentially inappropriate prescribing in an acutely ill population of older patients admitted to six European hospitals [Internet]. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 2011; 67:1175[cited 2019 Oct 28] Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00228-011-1061-0>
 23. Kim H-A, Shin J-Y, Kim M-H, et al.: Prevalence and predictors of polypharmacy among Korean elderly. *PloS One* 2014; 9:e98043

24. Onoue H, Koyama T, Zamami Y, et al.: Trends in Polypharmacy in Japan: A Nationwide Retrospective Study [Internet]. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2018; 66:2267–2273[cited 2019 Oct 28] Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jgs.15569>
25. Hua M, Gong MN, Brady J, et al.: Early and late unplanned rehospitalizations for survivors of critical illness*. *Crit Care Med* 2015; 43:430–438
26. Basnet S, Zhang M, Lesser M, et al.: Thirty-day hospital readmission rate amongst older adults correlates with an increased number of medications, but not with Beers medications. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2018; 18:1513–1518
27. Fabbietti P, Di Stefano G, Moresi R, et al.: Impact of potentially inappropriate medications and polypharmacy on 3-month readmission among older patients discharged from acute care hospital: a prospective study. *Aging Clin Exp Res* 2018; 30:977–984
28. Rosted E, Schultz M, Sanders S: Frailty and polypharmacy in elderly patients are associated with a high readmission risk. *Dan Med J* 2016; 63
29. Campbell SE, Seymour DG, Primrose WR, et al.: A systematic literature review of factors affecting outcome in older medical patients admitted to hospital. *Age Ageing* 2004; 33:110–115
30. McIsaac DI, Wong CA, Bryson GL, et al.: Association of Polypharmacy with Survival, Complications, and Healthcare Resource Use after Elective Noncardiac Surgery: A Population-based Cohort Study. *Anesthesiology* 2018; 128:1140–1150
31. Härstedt M, Rogmark C, Sutton R, et al.: Polypharmacy and adverse outcomes after hip fracture surgery. *J Orthop Surg* 2016; 11:151
32. Taha M, Pal A, Mahnken JD, et al.: Derivation and validation of a formula to estimate risk for 30-day readmission in medical patients. *Int J Qual Health Care J Int Soc Qual Health Care* 2014; 26:271–277
33. Dorajoo SR, See V, Chan CT, et al.: Identifying Potentially Avoidable Readmissions: A Medication-Based 15-Day Readmission Risk Stratification Algorithm. *Pharmacotherapy* 2017; 37:268–277
34. Logue E, Smucker W, Regan C: Admission Data Predict High Hospital Readmission Risk. *J Am Board Fam Med JABFM* 2016; 29:50–59
35. Lone NI, Gillies MA, Haddow C, et al.: Five-Year Mortality and Hospital Costs Associated with Surviving Intensive Care [Internet]. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2016; 194:198–208[cited 2019 Oct 28] Available from: <https://www.atsjournals.org/doi/10.1164/rccm.201511-2234OC>
36. Phatak A, Prusi R, Ward B, et al.: Impact of pharmacist involvement in the transitional care of high-risk patients through medication reconciliation, medication education, and postdischarge call-backs (IPITCH Study). *J Hosp Med* 2016; 11:39–44

37. Jack BW, Chetty VK, Anthony D, et al.: A reengineered hospital discharge program to decrease rehospitalization: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2009; 150:178–187

	Whole Cohort (n=23,844)	No Polypharmacy Cohort (n=16,706)	Polypharmacy Cohort (n=7,138)	P Value
Demographics				
Female, n (%)	10,166 (42.6%)	6590 (39.4%)	3576 (50.1%)	p<0.001
Age at admission to ICU, yr, median (IQR)	62 (47, 72)	59 (44, 70)	66 (55, 75)	p<0.001
Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation, n (%)				p<0.001
<i>First Quartile (Most Deprived)</i>	6174 (25.9%)	4127 (24.7%)	2047 (28.7%)	
<i>Second Quartile</i>	5402 (22.7%)	3591 (21.5%)	1811 (25.4%)	
<i>Third Quartile</i>	4741 (19.9%)	3259 (19.5%)	1482 (20.8%)	
<i>Fourth Quartile</i>	4194 (17.6%)	3099 (18.6%)	1095 (15.3%)	
<i>Fifth Quartile (Least Deprived)</i>	3311 (13.9%)	2616 (15.7%)	695 (9.7%)	
Remoteness of Residence, n (%)				p=0.073
<i>Urban Area</i>	15,944 (66.9%)	11,202 (67.1%)	4742 (66.4%)	
<i>Accessible</i>	5456 (22.9%)	3813 (22.8%)	1643 (23.0%)	
<i>Remote</i>	1001 (4.2%)	698 (4.2%)	303 (4.2%)	
<i>Very Remote</i>	855 (3.6%)	557 (3.3%)	298 (4.2%)	
Indices of Pre-Existing Patient Health				
Unplanned inpatient admissions in the year prior to index stay, n (%)				p<0.001
0	16,206 (68.0%)	12,299 (73.6%)	3907 (54.7%)	
1	4705 (19.7%)	2967 (17.8%)	1738 (24.3%)	
2 or more	2933 (12.3%)	1440 (8.6%)	1493 (20.9%)	
Count of Charlson comorbidities, n (%)				p<0.001
0	9983 (41.9%)	8183 (49.0%)	1800 (25.2%)	
1	7468 (31.3%)	5336 (31.9%)	2132 (29.9%)	
2	3673 (15.4%)	2109 (12.6%)	1564 (21.9%)	
3 or more	2720 (11.4%)	1078 (6.5%)	1642 (23.0%)	
Indices of critical illness severity				
Type of admission to ICU				p=0.009
<i>Elective Surgery</i>	8630 (36.2%)	6124 (36.7%)	2506 (35.1%)	
<i>Emergency Surgery</i>	4807 (20.2%)	3394 (20.3%)	1413 (19.8%)	
<i>Non-operative</i>	10,222 (42.9%)	7055 (42.2%)	3167 (44.4%)	
APACHE II score at admission to ICU, median (IQR)	15 (11, 19)	14 (10, 19)	16 (12, 21)	p<0.001
Acute physiology score at admission to ICU, median (IQR)	10 (7, 15)	10 (7, 15)	11 (8, 16)	p<0.001
Outcomes				
Length of ICU stay, days, median (IQR)	1 (0, 4)	1 (0, 4)	2 (1, 4)	p<0.001
Length of index hospital stay, days, median (IQR)	13 (7, 27)	12 (7, 25)	15 (8, 29)	p<0.001
Readmission Outcome at 1 Year				p<0.001
<i>Emergency Readmission</i>	9685 (40.6%)	5985 (35.8%)	3700 (51.8%)	
<i>Alive with no readmission</i>	13,687 (57.4%)	10,444 (62.5%)	3243 (45.4%)	
<i>Died with no readmission</i>	472 (2.0%)	277 (1.7%)	195 (2.7%)	
Mortality at 1 Year	1963 (8.2%)	1140 (6.8%)	823 (11.5%)	p<0.001
Time till death (days, median + quartiles)	153 (69, 248)	158 (75, 252)	144 (61, 244)	p=0.024
Prescribing				
Average Monthly Dispensed Items (median + quartiles)	3 (1, 5)	1 (0, 3)	7 (6, 10)	p<0.001
Total Distinct Items in Past 12 Months (median + quartiles)	9 (5, 15)	7 (3, 10)	17 (13, 22)	p<0.001

Table 1 - Baseline characteristics of the whole Intensive Care cohort, non-polypharmacy cohort and polypharmacy cohort. Abbreviations: ICU = intensive care unit, IQR = interquartile range. See eTable 2 in the online supplement for more detailed characteristics of the full, non-polypharmacy, and polypharmacy cohorts.

Figure Legends

Figure 1 – Mean number of monthly prescriptions in the year preceding critical care index admission by age at index admission stratified by A) gender or B) social deprivation as determined from Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD, version 2009). First and fifth quintile 95% confidence intervals for social deprivation only shown for clarity. *Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval, ICU = intensive care unit.*

Figure 2 – Cumulative incidence plot for 1-year emergency readmission by time since discharge from hospital following index critical care stay stratified by presence of polypharmacy.

Figure 3 – Predicted probability of 1-year emergency readmission following discharge from hospital containing index critical care stay according to age, stratified by presence of polypharmacy. *Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval, ICU = intensive care unit.*

Figure 4 – Predicted probability of 1-year emergency readmission following discharge from hospital containing index critical care stay on a linear scale of polypharmacy. *Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval.*