## **Summary**

Dizziness in older patients in general practice:

a diagnostic challenge

<u>R1</u>

R2 R3

<u>R4</u>

\_\_\_\_

<u>R6</u>

R7 R8

R9

R10

<u>R11</u>

R12

R13

<u>R14</u>

R15

R16

R17

R18

R19

R20

R21

R22

R23

R24

R25

R26

R27

R28

R29

R30

R31

R32

R33

R34

Dizziness is a common symptom among older persons. Thirty percent of people above 65 years of age experience some form of dizziness, increasing to 40-50% of persons above 80 years of age. For general practitioners dizziness often represents a diagnostic challenge: it is a subjective sensation that depends on self-report, it may refer to several different and overlapping sensations, and it can be caused by a wide range of benign or serious conditions. Often, dizziness has more than one cause, especially in older patients. Although patients with dizziness are managed largely in general practice (Dutch general practitioners refer less than 5% of dizzy patients to a medical specialist), most previous studies on dizziness were performed among patients not representative of patients seen in general practice. Practice guidelines on dizziness recommend the use of many diagnostic tests, like the measurement of pulse and blood pressure, or the Dix-Hallpike manoeuvre. However, these (often contradictory) recommendations are mainly authority-based and lack empirical evidence. Furthermore, despite the high prevalence of dizziness among older persons, no guideline on dizziness provides specific information about the diagnostic approach of older dizzy patients. The principle aim of this thesis was to obtain more insight into the epidemiology of dizziness in older patients, and to provide clinical guidance in the diagnostic approach of older dizzy patients in general practice.

In *Chapter 1* we describe the context of this thesis, including the definition of dizziness, the epidemiology of dizziness, dizziness in older persons, the impact of dizziness, diagnosing dizziness, and the study Dizziness In Elderly Patients (DIEP). The chapter ends with a description of the objectives and the outline of this thesis.

In *Chapter 2* we used the data from the Second Dutch National Survey of General Practice to investigate the prevalence and incidence of dizziness reported by older patients in general practice, to describe the final diagnoses as recorded by general practitioners, and to compare the clinical characteristics of dizzy patients with those of non-dizzy patients. A total number of 195 general practitioners in 104 practices across the Netherlands recorded all contacts with patients during 12 consecutive months. For the identification of dizzy patients we developed a search strategy based on Dutch synonyms for dizziness. The one-year prevalence of dizziness in general practice in patients aged 65 or older was 8.3%. Dizziness was more common in women than in men, but this gender difference disappeared in the very old (patients aged 85 or older). The incidence of dizziness in general practice was 47.1 per 1000

R1

R2

R3

R4

R5

R6

R7

R8

R9

R10

R11

R12

R13

R14

R15

R16

R17

R19

R20

R21

R22

R24

R25

R26

R27

R28

R29

R30

R31

R32

R33

R1

R2

R3

R4

R6

R7 R8

R9

R10

R11

R12

R13

<u>R14</u>

R15

R16

<u>R17</u>

R18

R19

R20

R21

R22

R23

R24 R25

R26

<u>R27</u>

R28

R29

R30

<u>R31</u>

R32

R33 R34 person-years. The incidence rates of all dizziness subtypes increased with age, except for the subtype "vertigo". For 39% of the dizzy patients the general practitioners did not specify a diagnosis and recorded a symptom diagnosis as the final diagnosis. Other groups of recorded diagnoses were cardiovascular disease (14%), peripheral vestibular disease (12%), and psychiatric disease (6%). Living alone, lower level of education, pre-existing cerebrovascular disease, and pre-existing hypertension were independently associated with dizziness.

In Chapter 3 we searched the databases of MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO, CINAHL, and Gerolit in order to assess and summarize the existing evidence about the accuracy of diagnostic tests for evaluating dizziness in primary care. Two pairs of reviewers assessed the methodological quality of the studies with the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies (QUADAS) checklist. Of 29.285 articles, we identified 26 studies eligible for our systematic review: 25 studies on neuro-otologic tests and one study on a psychiatric test. All diagnostic accuracy studies used some kind of preselection of patients and were intended to diagnose specific conditions, such as Ménière's disease or peripheral vestibular dysfunction. All accuracy studies were at least partially conducted in a secondary/tertiary care setting, and almost none of the studies included a spectrum of patients representative of primary care patients. The data of two diagnostic tests, the head-shaking nystagmus test (HSN) and the head impulse test (HIT), were considered appropriate for pooled analysis. The pooled sensitivity of the HSN was 45% (95% CI, 30-62%), the specificity 82% (95% CI, 68-90%), and the LR+ 2.5 (95% CI, 1.5-4.1). The pooled sensitivity of the HIT was 63% (95% CI, 40-81%), the specificity 93% (95% CI, 83-98%), and the LR+ 9.3 (95% CI, 4.3-20.2).

The results presented in Chapter 3 laid the foundation of the Delphi procedure described in *Chapter 4*. During this consensus procedure, an international panel of 16 experts in the field of dizziness used the collected evidence to select 21 out of 37 diagnostic tests for evaluating dizziness in older patients in general practice. Five diagnostic tests were excluded, although they are recommended by existing practice guidelines on dizziness (auscultation of the carotids, toe and heel gait, one-leg stance test, the timed 'up and go' test, and carotid sinus massage), two tests were included, although several guidelines question their diagnostic value (serum haemoglobin level and non-capillary non-fasting blood glucose level), and two tests were included

that have never been recommended by practice guidelines on dizziness (Semmes-Weinstein Monofilament Test and Patient Health Questionnaire).

The resulting set of 21 diagnostic tests - as determined by the expert panel - was the starting point of a cross-sectional diagnostic study performed among 417 older dizzy patients, which we described in Chapters 5, 6, and 7.

In *Chapter 5* the test results of each dizzy patient were independently reviewed by a panel consisting of a general practitioner, a geriatrician, and a nursing home physician, in order to describe subtypes of dizziness and to assess contributory causes of dizziness in older patients in general practice. According to the panel, presyncope was the most common dizziness subtype (69%), followed by vertigo (41%), disequilibrium (40%), and other dizziness (2%). Forty-four percent of the patients were assigned more than one dizziness subtype. Cardiovascular disease was considered to be the most common major contributory cause of dizziness in older dizzy patients in general practice (57%), followed by peripheral vestibular disease (14%), and psychiatric disease (10%). In a quarter of all dizzy patients an adverse drug effect was considered to be a contributory cause of dizziness. Sixty-two percent of the patients were assigned more than one contributory cause of dizziness.

In *Chapter 6* we used principal component analysis (PCA) to establish an empirical classification of diagnostic subtypes/profiles of dizziness in older patients in general practice. Based on history, physical examination, and additional diagnostic tests, we identified six diagnostic profiles: "frailty", "psychological", "cardiovascular", "presyncope", "non-specific dizziness", and "ear, nose, and throat" (ENT). Seventy-six percent of the dizzy patients scored on more than one diagnostic profile. Additional information on physical examination and diagnostic tests hardly increased the explained variance (history alone 29.4% vs. history, physical examination and additional diagnostic tests 32.0%).

Dizzy patients with both psychological and physical symptoms tend to have high levels of disability and are at risk to remain symptomatic and disabled. In *Chapter 7* we used the results of the cross-sectional diagnostic study to develop a prediction model for the presence of anxiety and/or depressive disorder in older dizzy patients in general practice. An anxiety and/or depressive disorder was present in 22% of

R1

R2 R3

R4

R5

R6 R7

R8

R9

R10

R11

R12

R13

R14

R15

R16

R17

R18

R20

R21

R22

R23

R24

R25

R26

R27

R28

R29

R30

R31

R32

R33

R1

R2

R3

R4

R6

R7

R8

R9

R10

R11

R12

R13

<u>R14</u>

R15

R16

<u>R17</u> R18 R19 R20 R21 R22 <u>R23</u> R24 R25 R26 <u>R27</u> R28 R29 R30 <u>R31</u> R32 R33 R34

the patients. Dizziness-related disability was a strong diagnostic indicator of anxiety and/or depression. Other diagnostic indicators of anxiety and/or depression were accompanying fear and a history of depression (associated with an increased odds), and tinnitus and rotational dizziness (associated with a decreased odds).

In *Chapter 8* we put the results of this thesis in a wider perspective, reflecting on expert opinion as a methodological instrument, the importance of being population-aware, and the supposed benefit of additional diagnostic testing. Additionally, we propose some ideas for future research. We end with recommendations for clinical practice. First of all, we advocate a change of focus from vestibular to cardiovascular disease when evaluating older dizzy patients in general practice. Second, we recommend a systematic exploration of (categories of) causes of dizziness in order to reveal contributory causes that are amenable to treatment. Third, we strongly recommend to perform a medication check during the evaluation of older dizzy patients in general practice. Finally, we recommend general practitioners to consider the existence of anxiety and depression in older patients presenting with dizziness, especially because patients with both psychological and physical symptoms tend to have a worse prognosis and effective treatment is available.