



Article Hospital Frailty Risk Score Is Independently Associated with Mortality and Encephalopathy in Hospitalized Patients with Hepatocellular Carcinoma

Daryl Ramai¹, Khoi P. Dang-Ho², Anjali Kewalramani³, Praneeth Bandaru⁴, Rodolfo Sacco⁵, Luca Giacomelli^{6,*}, Aashni Shah⁶, Simonetta Papa⁶, Francesca Cappellini⁶, Fabio Perversi⁶, Sara di Nunzio⁶ and Antonio Facciorusso⁵

- ¹ Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84113, USA; Daryl.Ramai@hsc.utah.edu
- ² Department of Internal Medicine, The Brooklyn Hospital Center, Brooklyn, NY 11201, USA; kpdangho@tbh.org
- ³ Department of Internal Medicine, Mathers Hospital, Port Jefferson, NY 11777, USA; kewalramanian@gmail.com
- ⁴ Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, The Brooklyn Hospital Center, Brooklyn, NY 11201, USA; pbandaru@tbh.org
- ⁵ Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University of Foggia, 71122 Foggia, Italy; r.sacco@ao-pisa.toscana.it (R.S.); antonio.facciorusso@virgilio.it (A.F.)
- ⁶ Polistudium SRL, 20135 Milan, Italy; aashni.shah@polistudium.it (A.S.); simonetta.papa@polistudium.it (S.P.); Francesca.Cappellini@polistudium.it (F.C.); Fabio.Perversi@polistudium.it (F.P.); sara.dinunzio@polistudium.it (S.d.N.)
- Correspondence: luca.giacomelli@polistudium.it

Abstract: Frailty represents a state of vulnerability to multiple internal physiologic factors, as well as external pressures, and has been associated with clinical outcomes. We aim to understand the impact of frailty on patients admitted with hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) by using the validated Hospital Frailty Risk Score, which is implemented in several hospitals worldwide. We conducted a nation-wide retrospective cohort study to determine the effect of frailty on the risk of in-patient mortality, hepatic encephalopathy, length of stay and cost. Frailty was associated with a 4.5-fold increased risk of mortality and a 2.3-fold increased risk of hepatic encephalopathy. Adjusted Cox regression showed that frailty was correlated with increased risk of in-patient mortality (hazard ratio: 2.3, 95% CI 1.9–2.8, p < 0.001). Frail HCC patients had longer hospital stay (median 5 days) vs. non-frail HCC patients (median 3 days). Additionally, frail patients had higher total costs of hospitalization (\$40,875) compared with non-frail patients (\$31,667). Frailty is an independent predictor of hepatic encephalopathy and in-patient mortality. Frailty is a surrogate marker of hospital length of stay and cost.

Keywords: hepatocellular carcinoma; frailty; outcomes

1. Introduction

Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) is the fourth most common type of cancer in the world and is a leading cause of cancer-related mortality, primarily due to untreated hepatitis C virus, alcoholic hepatitis, and nonalcoholic steatohepatitis [1]. HCC is increasingly adding to the burden of cancer-related mortality with a 5-year survival of <12% [1]. With advances in surgical techniques, surgery offers a potential cure for HCC; however, it remains controversial in the elderly population. It is suggested that after liver resection, there is a delay in the regeneration of the liver remnant due to the liver's decreased proliferative capacity [2,3]. Indeed, normal aging is associated with a gradual decline in liver volume, blood flow to the liver and metabolic and synthetic function [2,3].



Citation: Ramai, D.; Dang-Ho, K.P.; Kewalramani, A.; Bandaru, P.; Sacco, R.; Giacomelli, L.; Shah, A.; Papa, S.; Cappellini, F.; Perversi, F.; et al. Hospital Frailty Risk Score Is Independently Associated with Mortality and Encephalopathy in Hospitalized Patients with Hepatocellular Carcinoma. *Biomedicines* **2021**, *9*, 1693. https:// doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines 9111693

Academic Editor: Marica Meroni

Received: 24 September 2021 Accepted: 11 November 2021 Published: 15 November 2021

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2021 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/). Frail adults can have alterations in their glucose metabolism, dysregulation of the autonomic nervous system, and age-related changes in the renin–angiotensin system and mitochondrial function [4]. Inflammatory markers, including IL-6, may also play a direct role in contributing to frailty [5]. Sarcopenia is a likely contributing factor in frailty due to loss of muscle mass and strength. Sarcopenia is reported in approximately one-third of patients with HCC and is an independent predictor of mortality [6].

Further studies have demonstrated that dysregulation of the stress response systems play an important role in the development of frailty. To this end, the dysregulation of stress response is driven by environmental changes, genetics, and age-related molecular changes [6].

While the number of elderly patients with HCC is expected to rise, their management is more complicated due to the presence of comorbid conditions [7,8]. However, age alone is insufficient to properly assess risk–benefit tradeoffs in HCC [9]. Treatment patterns vary amongst providers and some patients may be over- or under-treated, as there is a lack of consensus between existing risk assessment tools to identify elderly patients with increased risk of toxicity and adverse outcomes [1]. Additionally, generalizing the results obtained from phase III clinical trials to the elderly population may pose a risk on those who are frail and vulnerable and lead to increased morbidity and mortality [1].

Indeed, to assess physiological reserve and functional capacity, a more thorough measure is needed to determine overall risk. To this end, frailty should be regarded as vulnerability to multiple internal physiologic factors, as well as external stressors. Frailty describes a physiological decline in function due to aging which includes the inability to adapt and respond to stressors [10]. This process may occur at varying rates in different individuals [10].

Frailty increases the risk of other geriatric pathologies and adverse health outcomes [11]. The frailty phenotype is the most frequently used screening tool [12]. However, an assessment of the potential use of frailty as an index of measurement of healthcare-related outcomes in patients with HCC is lacking.

The approach to measuring frailty is based on the accumulation of illness, cognitive decline, and social illness [13]. Frailty syndrome is defined as meeting at least 3 of the following criteria: slowed walking speed, weakness as measured by low grip strength, unintentional weight loss, self-reported exhaustion, and low level of physical activity [13]. Another well-established tool is the comprehensive geriatric assessment, which looks at factors including nutritional status, mental and cognitive status, and physical medical comorbidities by utilizing laboratory values and assessment tools [14].

The Hospital Frailty Risk score provides a cost-effective, systematic way to screen patients for frailty to aid in prognostication and allocation of medical resources [15]. This scoring system has the advantage of using the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, Tenth Revision (ICD-10) codes. This allows for implementation within hospital information systems utilizing ICD-10 coding systems. The scoring system also accounts for variations in coding or the depth of coding and is predictive of poor outcomes regardless of coding depth.

We aim to understand and apply the Hospital Frailty Risk Score [15], a validated index, in patients admitted with HCC to assess the risk of inpatient mortality and hepatic encephalopathy. Hepatic encephalopathy was studied as a significant proportion of patients with chronic liver disease and malignancy are at increased risk. We also evaluated secondary outcomes including cost and hospital length of stay.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Data Source

A retrospective cohort study was conducted using the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) Nationwide Inpatient Sample (NIS), USA, for 2014 [16]. NIS is a database of inpatient admissions and represents about 20% of US non-federal acute care hospitals. Using International Classification of Diseases 9th Revision (ICD-9-CM) codes, we extracted

patients admitted with HCC. Demographical variables (age, gender, and ethnicity), length of hospital stay, elective admission, hospital teaching status, number of beds, type of insurance (Medicare, Medicaid, private, self-pay, other), discharge outcome (death or survival), hepatic encephalopathy, obesity, and depression were extracted.

2.2. Exposure

We calculated the Hospital Frailty Risk Score at the time of hospitalization for patients admitted with a diagnosis of HCC. Frailty index was created and endorsed using 1 million patients who were over the age of 74 years [15]. We used this frailty score to identify patients who were at higher risk of healthcare-related outcomes, including mortality, hepatic encephalopathy, and length of stay. We created separate categories, low and high risk to aid in the interpretation of our results with cut-off points to distinguish outcomes between different individuals. Patients were determined to be of low frailty risk with a score of <5, while patients of medium frailty risk had a score of 5–15, and high frailty risk with a score of >15. Since the high frailty group accounted for only approximately 8% of the total cohort, we merged medium and high frailty patients into one group.

2.3. Characteristics

Baseline patient characteristics included age, sex, race or ethnicity, type of insurance (Medicaid, private insurance, self-pay, and other insurance types), and relevant comorbidities used to determine the Charlson comorbidity index. In addition, patient data included transplant surgery, depression, obesity, and depression. For each hospitalization, we captured admission (elective or non-elective), number of beds (small, medium, or large), hospital teaching status (rural, urban, or urban teaching), and length of hospital stay (defined as less than or greater than 7 days).

2.4. Outcomes

Our primary outcomes were the risk of inpatient mortality and the development of hepatic encephalopathy. Secondary outcomes included hospital length of stay and total costs of hospitalization. Total cost was provided per individual patient within the National Impatient Sample (NIS) database and extracted for analysis. We calculated median and interquartile costs for frail and non-frail patients.

2.5. Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed by descriptive statistics. Categorical values were represented as percentages while continuous variables were represented by median and interquartile range. Pearson χ^2 tests were used to compare categorical variables. We used Kaplan-Meier estimations to compare survival rates between both cohorts. We used multivariable regression analysis to evaluate the effect of independent variables and frailty on mortality and/or hepatic encephalopathy outcomes. Cox proportion regression analysis was used to determine predictors of mortality outcomes. All statistical analyses were performed with SPSS Statistics (IBM, Version 25). The study was determined to be exempt from Institutional Review Board review because human subjects were not involved. Data were acquired from a de-identified registry publicly accessible.

3. Results

In total, 10,983 patients with HCC hospitalized in the year 2014 were identified. Of them, 2986 (27.2%) were females and the median age was 62 years (standard deviation \pm 15.1 years). Most patients were Caucasian (54.5%). Most admissions occurred at large hospitals (61.5%) and more frequently at Urban teaching institutions (78.0%). Most patients had less than 7 days of inpatient stay (71.9%). Based on the Hospital Frailty Risk Score, 6335 (57.7%) patients were considered frail and 4648 (42.3%) were considered non-frail at index admission (Table 1).

Admission Characteristics	Low Frailty (<i>n</i> = 4648)	Medium/High Frailty (<i>n</i> = 6335)	<i>p</i> -Value
Age (years)			
<40	357	188	
40-64	2775	3149	< 0.01
>65	1516	2998	
Ethinicy			
Caucasian	2414	3571	
African–American	655	957	
Hispanic	834	899	-0.01
Asian or Pacific Islander	341	389	<0.01
Native American	26	52	
Other	191	196	
Female	1176	1810	< 0.01
Elective	1282	696	< 0.01
Bed size			
Small	544	921	
Medium	1149	1612	< 0.01
Large	2955	3802	
Teaching Status			
Rural	188	313	
Urban	720	1194	< 0.01
Urban Teaching	3740	4828	
Payer Status			
Medicare	1782	3438	
Medicaid	1057	1132	
Private	1387	1370	~0.01
Self-Pay	183	200	<0.01
No Charge	22	16	
Other	196	170	
Length of Stay			
<7 days	3915	3985	<0.01
>7 days	733	2350	<0.01
Alcohol	882	1335	<0.01
Transplant	39	51	0.84
Hepatic Encephalopathy	52	188	<0.01
Depression	378	651	<0.01
Obese	276	597	<0.01

Table 1. Baseline characteristics.

Adjusting for age, ethnicity, sex, elective versus non-elective admission, transplant, depression, obesity, alcohol use, number of beds, teaching status, payer insurance, and hospital length of stay, frailty was independently correlated with a 4.5-fold increased risk of mortality (odds ratio (OR): 4.5; 95% confidence interval (CI): 3.7-5.5, $p \le 0.001$) (Table 2). In addition, frailty was associated with a 2.3-fold higher risk of hepatic encephalopathy (95% CI: 1.6-3.1, p < 0.001) (Table 3).

We performed Kaplan–Meier estimations to determine the impact of frailty on mortality. Kaplan–Meier estimations showed that higher frailty was associated with lower survival rates (log rank p < 0.001) (Figure 1). Adjusted Cox regression demonstrated that frailty was correlated with increased risk of in-patient mortality (hazard ratio (HR) 2.3, 95% CI: 1.9–2.8, p < 0.001). Patients who developed hepatic encephalopathy were also at higher risk for mortality during hospitalization (HR 2.2, 95% CI: 1.7–2.8, p < 0.001), as well as patients with increasing age 40–64 years (HR 5.5, 95% CI: 2.7–11.1, p < 0.001) and over 65 years (HR 5.7, 95% CI: 2.8–11.6, p < 0.001) (Table 4). ____

Characteristics p -value Odds Ratio Lower Upper Age (years) Reference 40^{-64} <0.001 4.885 2.395 9.963 >65 <0.001 5.049 2.441 10.444 Ethnicity 10.041 1.658 African-American 0.001 1.375 1.140 1.658 Hispanic 0.082 1.190 0.978 1.448 Asian or Pacific Islander 0.069 1.280 0.981 1.669 Native American 0.734 1.140 0.536 2.426 Other 0.434 1.161 0.799 1.688 Gender Male Reference 6 6 Male Reference 0.857 0.546 0.864 Bed size Small 0.665 1.029 Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching <0.001 0.453 0.345 0.601 Insurance Status		<i>n</i> Value O 11, D. (. 95% CI		
Age (years) Reference <40 Reference $40-64$ <0.001 4.885 2.395 9.963 >65 <0.001 5.049 2.441 10.444 Ethnicity reference 7 Caucasian Reference 7 African-American 0.001 1.375 1.140 1.658 Hispanic 0.082 1.190 0.978 1.448 Asian or Pacific Islander 0.069 1.280 0.981 1.669 Native American 0.734 1.140 0.535 2.426 Other 0.434 1.161 0.799 1.688 Gender Reference Male Reference Female 0.375 0.931 0.796 1.090 Elective Admission 0.001 0.687 0.546 0.864 Bed size small Reference Status Reference	Characteristics	<i>p</i> -value	Odds Katio	Lower	Upper	
<40 Reference $40-64$ <0.001	Age (years)					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	<40		Refere	nce		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	40-64	< 0.001	4.885	2.395	9.963	
Ethnicity Caucasian Reference African-American 0.001 1.375 1.140 1.658 Hispanic 0.082 1.190 0.978 1.448 Asian or Pacific Islander 0.069 1.280 0.981 1.669 Native American 0.734 1.140 0.536 2.426 Other 0.434 1.161 0.799 1.688 Gender E E Male Reference Male 0.375 0.931 0.796 1.090 Elective Admission 0.001 0.687 0.546 0.864 Bed size E E E E Small Reference Reference E E Medium 0.088 0.827 0.665 1.029 Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching Status E E Rural Reference E E Medicare Reference E E Medicare Reference E E	>65	< 0.001	5.049	2.441	10.444	
Caucasian Reference African-American 0.001 1.375 1.140 1.658 Hispanic 0.082 1.190 0.978 1.448 Asian or Pacific Islander 0.069 1.280 0.981 1.669 Native American 0.734 1.140 0.536 2.426 Other 0.434 1.161 0.799 1.688 Gender Keference Keference 1.090 1.688 Male Reference Keference 1.090 1.090 1.090 Elective Admission 0.001 0.687 0.546 0.864 Bed size Keference Keference 1.090 1.090 Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching <0.003	Ethnicity					
African-American 0.001 1.375 1.140 1.658 Hispanic 0.082 1.190 0.978 1.448 Asian or Pacific Islander 0.069 1.280 0.981 1.669 Native American 0.734 1.140 0.536 2.426 Other 0.434 1.161 0.799 1.688 Gender Keference Keference 1.900 Elective Admission 0.001 0.687 0.546 0.864 Bed size Keference Keference 1.029 1.029 Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching Keference Keference 1.029 1.029 Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching <0.001	Caucasian		Refere	nce		
Hispanic 0.082 1.190 0.978 1.448 Asian or Pacific Islander 0.069 1.280 0.981 1.669 Native American 0.734 1.140 0.536 2.426 Other 0.434 1.161 0.799 1.688 Gender Keference 1.090 1.688 Male Reference 0.375 0.931 0.796 1.090 Elective Admission 0.001 0.687 0.546 0.864 Bed size Status Reference 1.029 1.029 Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching V Netference Netference Netference Netference Netference No	African–American	0.001	1.375	1.140	1.658	
Asian or Pacific Islander 0.069 1.280 0.981 1.669 Native American 0.734 1.140 0.536 2.426 Other 0.434 1.161 0.799 1.688 Gender Keference Keference 0.375 0.931 0.796 1.090 Elective Admission 0.001 0.687 0.546 0.864 Bed size $Small$ Reference 0.887 0.665 1.029 Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching $Status$ $Rerence$ V V Rural Reference V V V V Medicare $Reference$ V V V V V Medicare $Reference$ V V V V V V Medicaid 0.134 1.181 0.950 1.469 V V Insurance Status V V V V V V V	Hispanic	0.082	1.190	0.978	1.448	
Native American 0.734 1.140 0.536 2.426 Other 0.434 1.161 0.799 1.688 Gender Male Reference 1.688 Male Reference 0.796 1.090 Elective Admission 0.001 0.687 0.546 0.864 Bed size 8767 8676766 1.029 Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching 867791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching 51029 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching 0.003 0.630 0.467 0.850 Urban 0.003 0.630 0.467 0.850 Urban Teaching <0.001 0.455 0.345 0.601 Insurance Status Reference 861679 0.6950 1.469 Private 0.008 1.308 1.074 1.594 Self-Pay 0.018 1.543 1.077 2.212 No Charge 0.831 1.143	Asian or Pacific Islander	0.069	1.280	0.981	1.669	
Other 0.434 1.161 0.799 1.688 Gender Reference Reference Nale Reference Male 0.375 0.931 0.796 1.090 Elective Admission 0.001 0.687 0.546 0.864 Bed size Reference Nall Nall Nall Small Reference 0.018 0.791 0.665 1.029 Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching Status Reference Nall Nall <t< td=""><td>Native American</td><td>0.734</td><td>1.140</td><td>0.536</td><td>2.426</td></t<>	Native American	0.734	1.140	0.536	2.426	
Gender Reference Male Reference Female 0.375 0.931 0.796 1.090 Elective Admission 0.001 0.687 0.546 0.864 Bed size	Other	0.434	1.161	0.799	1.688	
Male Reference Female 0.375 0.931 0.796 1.090 Elective Admission 0.001 0.687 0.546 0.864 Bed size reference refference reference	Gender					
Female 0.375 0.931 0.796 1.090 Elective Admission 0.001 0.687 0.546 0.864 Bed size Reference Small Reference Medium 0.088 0.827 0.665 1.029	Male		Refere	nce		
Elective Admission 0.001 0.687 0.546 0.864 Bed size Reference Small Reference 1.029 Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching Keference Rural Reference Urban 0.003 0.630 0.467 0.850 Urban Teaching <0.001	Female	0.375	0.931	0.796	1.090	
Bed size Reference Small Reference Medium 0.088 0.827 0.665 1.029 Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching Status Kural Reference Rural Reference Urban 0.003 0.630 0.467 0.850 Urban Teaching <0.001	Elective Admission	0.001	0.687	0.546	0.864	
Small Reference Medium 0.088 0.827 0.665 1.029 Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching Keference Kefere	Bed size					
Medium0.0880.8270.6651.029Large0.0180.7910.6520.960Hospital Teaching StatusRuralReference V RuralReference0.0030.6300.4670.850Urban Teaching<0.001	Small		Refere	nce		
Large 0.018 0.791 0.652 0.960 Hospital Teaching Status Rural Reference 1 Rural Reference 0.003 0.630 0.467 0.850 Urban 0.003 0.630 0.467 0.850 Urban Teaching <0.001	Medium	0.088	0.827	0.665	1.029	
Hospital Teaching StatusRuralReferenceUrban0.0030.6300.4670.850Urban Teaching<0.001	Large	0.018	0.791	0.652	0.960	
Status RuralReferenceUrban 0.003 0.630 0.467 0.850 Urban Teaching Nedicare 0.001 0.455 0.345 0.601 Insurance Status $Reference$ MedicareReferenceMedicaid 0.134 1.181 0.950 1.469 Private 0.008 1.308 1.074 1.594 Self-Pay 0.018 1.543 1.077 2.212 No Charge 0.831 1.143 0.335 3.903 Other <0.001 2.014 1.412 2.872 Length of StayReference <7 days 0.099 1.130 0.977 1.307 FrailtyReferenceLow frailtyReferenceMedium/high frailty <0.001 4.518 3.743 5.455 Alcohol 0.179 0.887 0.745 1.057 Transplant 0.255 0.551 0.197 1.539 Depression <0.001 0.555 0.420 0.734	Hospital Teaching					
Rural Reference Urban 0.003 0.630 0.467 0.850 Urban Teaching <0.001	Status					
Urban0.0030.6300.4670.850Urban Teaching<0.001	Rural		Refere	nce		
Urban Teaching <0.001 0.455 0.345 0.601 Insurance Status	Urban	0.003	0.630	0.467	0.850	
Insurance Status Reference Medicare Reference Medicaid 0.134 1.181 0.950 1.469 Private 0.008 1.308 1.074 1.594 Self-Pay 0.018 1.543 1.077 2.212 No Charge 0.831 1.143 0.335 3.903 Other <0.001	Urban Teaching	< 0.001	0.455	0.345	0.601	
MedicareReferenceMedicaid0.1341.1810.9501.469Private0.0081.3081.0741.594Self-Pay0.0181.5431.0772.212No Charge0.8311.1430.3353.903Other<0.001	Insurance Status					
Medicaid 0.134 1.181 0.950 1.469 Private 0.008 1.308 1.074 1.594 Self-Pay 0.018 1.543 1.077 2.212 No Charge 0.831 1.143 0.335 3.903 Other <0.001	Medicare		Refere	nce		
Private 0.008 1.308 1.074 1.594 Self-Pay 0.018 1.543 1.077 2.212 No Charge 0.831 1.143 0.335 3.903 Other <0.001	Medicaid	0.134	1.181	0.950	1.469	
Self-Pay 0.018 1.543 1.077 2.212 No Charge 0.831 1.143 0.335 3.903 Other <0.001	Private	0.008	1.308	1.074	1.594	
No Charge 0.831 1.143 0.335 3.903 Other <0.001	Self-Pay	0.018	1.543	1.077	2.212	
Other <0.001 2.014 1.412 2.872 Length of Stay Reference <7 days	No Charge	0.831	1.143	0.335	3.903	
Length of Stay Reference <7 days	Other	< 0.001	2.014	1.412	2.872	
<7 days Reference >7 days 0.099 1.130 0.977 1.307 Frailty 1.130 1.130 Low frailty Reference Medium/high frailty <0.001	Length of Stay					
>7 days 0.099 1.130 0.977 1.307 Frailty Reference 1.307 Low frailty <0.001	<7 days		Refere	nce		
FrailtyLow frailtyReferenceMedium/high frailty<0.001	>7 days	0.099	1.130	0.977	1.307	
Low frailty Reference Medium/high frailty <0.001	Frailty					
Medium/high frailty<0.0014.5183.7435.455Alcohol0.1790.8870.7451.057Transplant0.2550.5510.1971.539Depression<0.001	Low frailty		Refere	nce		
Alcohol0.1790.8870.7451.057Transplant0.2550.5510.1971.539Depression<0.001	Medium/high frailty	< 0.001	4.518	3.743	5.455	
Transplant0.2550.5510.1971.539Depression<0.001	Alcohol	0.179	0.887	0.745	1.057	
Depression <0.001 0.555 0.420 0.734	Transplant	0.255	0.551	0.197	1.539	
	Depression	< 0.001	0.555	0.420	0.734	
Obese 0.001 0.630 0.475 0.836	Ōbese	0.001	0.630	0.475	0.836	

Table 2. Logistic regression model showing the effect of frailty on patient mortality.

Table 3. Logistic regression model showing the effect of frailty on the risk of hepatic encephalopathy.

	<i>p</i> -Value	Odds Ratio	95% CI	
Characteristics			Lower	Upper
Age (years)				
<40		Refere	ence	
40-64	0.027	4.880	1.201	19.830
>65	0.018	5.430	1.333	22.111
Length of Stay				
<7 days	Reference			
>7 days	< 0.001	1.653	1.268	2.155
Frailty				
Low frailty	Reference			
Medium/high frailty	< 0.001	2.256	1.640	3.104



Figure 1. Kaplan–Meier estimation in determining the impact of frailty on in-patient mortality.

Characteristics	<i>p</i> -Value		95% CI	
		Hazard Katio	Lower	Upper
Age (years)				
<40		Referen	nce	
40-64	< 0.001	5.519	2.733	11.146
>65	< 0.001	5.668	2.769	11.606
Ethnicity				
Caucasian		Referen	nce	
African–American	0.005	1.276	1.075	1.516
Hispanic	0.078	1.177	0.982	1.412
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.214	1.170	0.913	1.498
Native American	0.692	0.868	0.431	1.748
Other	0.871	0.972	0.685	1.378
Gender				
Male		Referen	nce	
Female	0.083	0.878	0.757	1.017
Elective Admission	0.002	0.704	0.566	0.875
Bed size				
Small		Referen	nce	
Medium	0.053	0.820	0.670	1.002
Large	< 0.001	0.708	0.592	0.846
Hospital Teaching				
Status				
Rural		Referen	nce	
Urban	< 0.001	0.542	0.413	0.710
Urban Teaching	< 0.001	0.353	0.275	0.453
Insurance Status				

 Table 4. Adjusted Cox regression model showing the impact of frailty on the risk of inpatient mortality.

~	<i>p</i> -Value	Hazard Ratio	95% CI	
Characteristics			Lower	Upper
Medicare	Reference			
Medicaid	0.576	1.059	0.866	1.296
Private	0.056	1.197	0.996	1.440
Self-Pay	0.034	1.432	1.028	1.994
No Charge	0.458	1.542	0.492	4.835
Other	0.002	1.681	1.217	2.322
Hepatic encephalopathy	< 0.001	2.226	1.745	2.840
Frailty				
Low frailty	Reference			
Medium/high frailty	0.000	2.324	1.937	2.789
Transplant	0.344	0.622	0.232	1.665
Alcohol	0.248	0.909	0.773	1.069
Depression	< 0.001	0.559	0.428	0.731
Ôbese	< 0.001	0.592	0.452	0.773

Table 4. Cont.

Frail patients with HCC were more likely to have longer hospital length of stay (median 5 days; interquartile range, 6 days) vs. non-frail patients (median 3 days non-frail patients; interquartile range, 3 days). Additionally, frail patients tend to have higher median total costs of hospitalization (\$40,875; interquartile range, \$60,764) compared to non-frail patients \$31,667; interquartile range, \$44,150).

4. Discussion

In this nationally representative study, representing about 20% of non-federal acute care hospitals in the US, we made several prognostic observations regarding the use of a validated hospital frailty index in patients with HCC. Firstly, frailty score was an independent predictor of mortality and hepatic encephalopathy in adjusted models. Secondly, frail patients were observed to have longer hospital stays and higher cost burden. Although the score serves as a good risk-stratification tool at a group level, individual outcomes are unpredictable in acute care settings.

The ability to use routine data for patients admitted to the hospital serves as an advantage of using hospital administrative data to determine frailty risk. Studies performed in the UK have employed the use of electronic medical records to develop an electronic frailty index, which is utilized in UK general practices [17]. Using frailty to evaluate treatment measures are recommended by international guidelines. The electronic frailty index was calculated by the presence or absence of individual deficits. It was used to categorize patients with mild, moderate, and severe frailty with strong predictive value for outcomes of mortality, nursing home admission, and hospitalization [17].

Frailty has been associated with the elevation of pro-inflammatory cytokines which is independently linked to increased morbidity and mortality [3]. Upregulation of cytokines, including IL-6, IL-10, and TNF- α , have been associated with poor mobility and functional status. In a study performed by Epps et al., mean IL-6 levels in frail patients was approximately three-times that of those found in non-frail patients [3]. Frailty has also been associated with superoxide anion overproduction by NADPH oxidase [18]. The Framingham Offspring study suggests oxidative stress as an underlying mechanism of frailty [18].

HCC develops as a result of chronic insults from HBC or HCV infection, chronic alcohol abuse, non-alcoholic steatosis, or exposure to aflatoxin B. The mediators of inflammation play an important role in the progression of HCC [19]. In the setting of HBC or HCV, hepatic oxidative stress is linked to increased risk of HCC. The chronic inflammation in HCC causes dysregulation of cellular pathways leading to cirrhosis and hepatocarcinogenesis [20].

Factors that contribute to general frailty, including altered gut microbiota, sarcopenia and endotoxemia, are drivers of liver decompensation in HCC [21]. Several factors contribute to sarcopenia in cirrhosis including low glycogen deposits, lack of adequate energy sources, and physical inactivity [21]. Alterations in the gut microbiota can lead to systemic endotoxemia which activates Toll-like receptors on muscle. This leads to increased protein breakdown and reduction in protein synthesis, resulting in sarcopenia. Sarcopenia, which is a key contributing factor in frailty and has been associated with a poor quality of life, mortality pre- and post-liver transplant, and longer hospital stay [21].

Patients with cancer are more likely to be frail and at higher risk for treatment-related morbidity and mortality [22]. Hurria et al. reported a multicenter prospective study that included multiple cancer types from 500 patients in the US [23]. The study showed a significant correlation between geriatric assessment variables and grade 3–5 toxicities. A meta-analysis concluded that the risk of morbidity was 2.7-fold higher in the elderly population when compared to younger patients with colorectal and liver metastases. However, the morbidity and mortality rates did not differ considerably between the younger and older population undergoing hepatic resection in the setting of HCC [24]. Another meta-analysis revealed a higher risk of postoperative renal failure, infection occurrence, and mortality in frail patients compared to non-frail undergoing liver resection [25].

Similarly, Aparicio et al. observed that patients with metastatic colorectal cancer starting first-line chemotherapy were associated with frailty-related factors, such as Instrumental Activities of Daily [26]. Another study by Gani et al. reported that frailty was predictive of poor outcomes following liver surgery [27]. Fong et al. concluded that age was an independent risk factor for morbidity in patients older than 65 years undergoing liver resection in the setting of colorectal liver metastasis [10]. A study conducted by Yamada et al. investigated the role of frailty in the prognosis of elderly patients undergoing hepatectomy in the setting of hepatocellular carcinoma. The frailty group included patients with larger tumor size, higher rate of postoperative complications, and longer length of stay. The study also showed worse disease-free survival rates in the frailty group [21].

Recently, Soto et al. reported that frail patients with liver cirrhosis were likely to have higher mortality rates at long-term follow-up [28]. A reduction in gait speed was highly associated with lower mortality and was proposed as a clinical indicator of frailty. In a study performed by Lai et al., Liver Frailty Index (LFI) scores were calculated and the association between LFI scores, hepatic encephalopathy, and mortality was investigated [29]. It was found that a larger number of frail patients with hepatic encephalopathy and ascites died who were on the liver transplant waitlist, compared to patients who were not frail. Frailty was determined to be a prevailing complication of cirrhosis and an independent risk factor for waitlist mortality [29]. Furthermore, frailty likely represents the end result of chronic hepatic synthetic dysfunction with muscle wasting and malnutrition, which plays a role in worsening overt portal hypertensive complications, including hepatic encephalopathy and, ultimately, mortality.

Sarcopenia has been associated with a high risk of hepatic encephalopathy likely due to decreased removal of ammonia from muscle in the setting of increased muscle breakdown in the elderly. Sarcopenia has also been identified as a predictor of hepatic decompensation [30].

As a result, frailty can be used to prognosticate and stratify patients with HCC. Furthermore, using this risk assessment, programs involving exercise, nutrition, and neurocognitive strategies may improve functional capacity and frailty scores, with better results when all three approaches are combined [17]. Exercise has been most consistently beneficial in the treatment of the key components of frailty syndrome. The article published by Tsuchihashi et al. demonstrated that in-hospital exercise significantly improved frailty in patients with HCC [31]. Whereas the use of pharmacology as a treatment has not been adequately evaluated.

Our study has limitations, which should be considered when interpreting its data. Firstly, we used administrative codes (ICD codes), which are subject to misclassification. For example, classification and documentation of a condition, such as physical deconditioning may vary between different physicians and hospitals. ICD codes may not accurately represent the severity of illness and, therefore, may fail to include aspects including polypharmacy and the need for supportive care. Secondly, frailty was considered static at the time of admission. However, frailty should be regarded as a dynamic process that changes during hospitalization [32]. Therefore, in order to understand how frailty impacts mortality and outcomes in healthcare systems, further validation work is required. Thirdly, a population level database, such has the NIS, does not provide hepatic tumor stage or child classification.

Lastly, our cohort includes only hospitalized patients and does not include outpatient clinic visits. However, our study possesses several strengths that warrant merit. Our study used a large database, which is nationally representative of the US population. The NIS is a validated database used in clinical and epidemiological research. Our study also utilized a validated and novel hospital frailty score to stratify HCC patients according to low versus medium to high risk which is clinically applicable.

5. Conclusions and Future Perspectives

We observed that 50% of our national cohort of HCC patients had a medium/high frailty score. Frail patients were more likely to experience in-hospital patient mortality, hepatic encephalopathy, higher cost, and longer lengths of stay. Future studies are needed to evaluate the impact of rehabilitation programs in reducing frailty risk and adverse outcomes in patients with HCC. Although there are some proposed interventions to reduce frailty, including nutrition and exercise, these data are inconclusive. As the world's elderly population increases, challenges posed by frailty will become a priority in most health care settings. Employing the hospital frailty score will allow for goal-oriented care for frail HCC patients as well as improving utilization of health care services.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, D.R. and R.S.; methodology, D.R.; software, D.R.; validation, A.F., K.P.D.-H. and A.F.; formal analysis, D.R., K.P.D.-H., L.G., A.S., S.P., F.C., F.P. and S.d.N.; investigation, D.R.; data curation, D.R., K.P.D.-H., P.B., A.K., L.G., A.S., S.P., F.C., F.P. and S.d.N.; writing—original draft preparation, D.R.; writing—review and editing, R.S., L.G., A.S., S.P., F.C., F.P. and S.d.N.; visualization, D.R., R.S., A.S., S.P., F.C., F.P. and S.d.N.; supervision, L.G. and A.F. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are openly available in National Inpatient Sample using ICD-9 code 155.0.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- 1. Arellano, L.M.; Arora, S.P. Systemic Treatment of Advanced Hepatocellular Carcinoma in Older Adults. *South Pac. J. Nat. Appl. Sci.* **2018**, *4*, 518.
- Van Epps, P.; Oswald, D.; Higgins, P.A.; Hornick, T.R.; Aung, H.; Banks, R.E.; Wilson, B.M.; Burant, C.; Gravenstein, S.; Canaday, D.H.; et al. Frailty has a stronger association with inflammation than age in older veterans. *Immun. Ageing* 2016, *13*, 27. [CrossRef]
 Jansen, P.L. Liver disease in the elderly. *Best Pr. Res. Clin. Gastroenterol.* 2002, *16*, 149–158. [CrossRef]
- 4. Leng, S.; Chen, X.; Mao, G. Frailty syndrome: An overview. Clin. Interv. Aging 2014, 9, 433–441. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Arai, Y.; Takayama, M.; Gondo, Y.; Inagaki, H.; Yamamura, K.; Nakazawa, S.; Kojima, T.; Ebihara, Y.; Shimizu, K.; Masui, Y.; et al. Adipose endocrine function, insulin-like growth factor-1 axis, and exceptional survival beyond 100 years of age. *Biol. Sci. Med. Sci.* 2008, 63, 1209–1218. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Meza-Junco, J.; Montano-Loza, A.J.; Baracos, V.E.; Prado, C.M.; Bain, V.G.; Beaumont, C.; Esfandiari, N.; Lieffers, J.R.; Sawyer, M.B. Sarcopenia as a Prognostic Index of Nutritional Status in Concurrent Cirrhosis and Hepatocellular Carcinoma. *J. Clin. Gastroenterol.* 2013, 47, 861–870. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

- Balducci, L.; Extermann, M. Management of Cancer in the Older Person: A Practical Approach. Oncologist 2000, 5, 224–237. [CrossRef]
- 8. Guo, H.; Wu, T.; Lu, Q.; Dong, J.; Ren, Y.-F.; Nan, K.-J.; Lv, Y.; Zhang, X.-F. Hepatocellular carcinoma in elderly: Clinical characteristics, treatments and outcomes compared with younger adults. *PLoS ONE* **2017**, *12*, e0184160. [CrossRef]
- 9. Yang, J.D.; Hainaut, P.; Gores, G.J.; Amadou, A.; Plymoth, A.; Roberts, L.R. A global view of hepatocellular carcinoma: Trends, risk, prevention and management. *Nat. Rev. Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* **2019**, *16*, 589–604. [CrossRef]
- 10. Sioutas, G.S.; Ziogas, I.A.; Tsoulfas, G. Frailty and Liver resection: Where do we stand? Hepatoma Res. 2020, 2020, 4. [CrossRef]
- 11. Walston, J.; Buta, B.; Xue, Q.L. Frailty Screening and Interventions: Considerations for Clinical Practice. *Clin. Geriatr. Med.* **2018**, 34, 25–38. [CrossRef]
- 12. Fried, L.P.; Tangen, C.M.; Walston, J.; Newman, A.B.; Hirsch, C.; Gottdiener, J.; Seeman, T.; Tracy, R.; Kop, W.J.; Burke, G.; et al. Cardiovascular Health Study Collaborative Research Group. J. Gerontol. A. Biol. Sci. Med. Sci. 2001, 56, M146–M156. [CrossRef]
- Feng, M.A.; McMillan, D.T.; Crowell, K.; Muss, H.; Nielsen, M.E.; Smith, A.B. Geriatric assessment in surgical oncology: A systematic review. J. Surg. Res. 2015, 193, 265–272. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Borzio, M.; Dionigi, E.; Vitale, A.; Rossini, A.; Marignani, M.; Fornari, F.; Vicari, S.; De Sio, I.; Farinati, F.; Bertolini, E.; et al. Management and prognosis of HCC in the elderly: Results of an in-field multicenter cohort study. *Liver. Int.* 2017, 37, 1184–1192. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 15. Gilbert, T.; Neuburger, J.; Kraindler, J.; Keeble, E.; Smith, P.; Ariti, C.; Arora, S.; Street, A.; Parker, S.; Roberts, H.C.; et al. Development and validation of a Hospital Frailty Risk Score focusing on older people in acute care settings using electronic hospital records: An observational study. *Lancet* **2018**, *391*, 1775–1782. [CrossRef]
- 16. HCUP National Inpatient Sample (NIS). Available online: https://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/nisoverview.jsp (accessed on 14 July 2021).
- 17. Clegg, A.; Bates, C.; Young, J.; Ryan, R.; Nichols, L.; Teale, E.A.; Mohammed, M.A.; Parry, J.; Marshall, T. Development and validation of an electronic frailty index using routine primary care electronic health record data. *Age Ageing* **2016**, *45*, 353–360. [CrossRef]
- 18. Liu, C.K.; Lyass, A.; Larson, M.G.; Massaro, J.M.; Wang, N.; D'Agostino, R.B.; Benjamin, E.; Murabito, J.M. Biomarkers of oxidative stress are associated with frailty: The Framingham Offspring Study. *AGE* **2015**, *38*, 1. [CrossRef]
- Douglas, W.G.; Wang, Y.; Gibbs, J.F.; Tracy, E.; Kuvshinoff, B.; Huntoon, K.; Baumann, H. Proinflammatory Cytokines Increase Hepatocellular Carcinoma Cells Thermotolerance: Evidence of How Local Inflammation May Negatively Impact Radiofrequency Ablation Local Control Rates. J. Surg. Res. 2008, 150, 118–124. [CrossRef]
- Capece, D.; Fischietti, M.; Verzella, D.; Gaggiano, A.; Cicciarelli, G.; Tessitore, A.; Zazzeroni, F.; Alesse, E. The Inflammatory Microenvironment in Hepatocellular Carcinoma: A Pivotal Role for Tumor-Associated Macrophages. *BioMed Res. Int.* 2013, 2013, 187204. [CrossRef]
- 21. Tandon, P.; Montano-Loza, A.J.; Lai, J.C.; Dasarathy, S.; Merli, M. Sarcopenia and frailty in decompensated cirrhosis. *J. Hepatol.* **2021**, *75*, S147–S162. [CrossRef]
- 22. Ethun, C.G.; Bilen, M.A.; Jani, A.B.; Maithel, S.K.; Ogan, K.; Master, V.A. Frailty and cancer: Implications for oncology surgery, medical oncology, and radiation oncology. *CA: A Cancer J. Clin.* **2017**, *67*, 362–377. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Hurria, A.; Togawa, K.; Mohile, S.G.; Owusu, C.; Klepin, H.D.; Gross, C.P.; Lichtman, S.M.; Gajra, A.; Bhatia, S.; Katheria, V.; et al. Predicting Chemotherapy Toxicity in Older Adults with Cancer: A Prospective Multicenter Study. *J. Clin. Oncol.* 2011, 29, 3457–3465. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Yamada, S.; Shimada, M.; Morine, Y.; Imura, S.; Ikemoto, T.; Saito, Y.; Miyazaki, K.; Tokunaga, T.; Nishi, M. Significance of frailty in prognosis after surgery in patients with pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. *World J. Surg. Oncol.* 2021, 19, 94. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Mizuguchi, T.; Kawamoto, M.; Meguro, M.; Okita, K.; Ota, S.; Ishii, M.; Ueki, T.; Nishidate, T.; Kimura, Y.; Furuhata, T.; et al. The impact of aging on morbidity and mortality after liver resection: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surg. Today* 2015, 45, 259–270. [CrossRef]
- Aparicio, T.; Jouve, J.-L.; Teillet, L.; Gargot, D.; Subtil, F.; Le Brun-Ly, V.; Cretin, J.; Locher, C.; Bouché, O.; Breysacher, G.; et al. Geriatric Factors Predict Chemotherapy Feasibility: Ancillary Results of FFCD 2001-02 Phase III Study in First-Line Chemotherapy for Metastatic Colorectal Cancer in Elderly Patients. J. Clin. Oncol. 2013, 31, 1464–1470. [CrossRef]
- 27. Gani, F.; Cerullo, M.; Amini, N.; Buettner, S.; Margonis, G.A.; Sasaki, K.; Kim, Y.; Pawlik, T.M. Frailty as a Risk Predictor of Morbidity and Mortality Following Liver Surgery. J. Gastrointest. Surg. 2017, 21, 822–830. [CrossRef]
- Soto, R.; Díaz, L.A.; Rivas, V.; Fuentes-López, E.; Zalaquett, M.; Bruera, M.J.; González, C.; Mezzano, G.; Benítez, C. Frailty and reduced gait speed are independently related to mortality of cirrhotic patients in long-term follow-up. *Ann. Hepatol.* 2021, 25, 100327. [CrossRef]
- Lai, J.C.; Rahimi, R.S.; Verna, E.C.; Kappus, M.R.; Dunn, M.A.; McAdams-DeMarco, M.; Haugen, C.E.; Volk, M.L.; Duarte-Rojo, A.; Ganger, D.R.; et al. Frailty Associated With Waitlist Mortality Independent of Ascites and Hepatic Encephalopathy in a Multicenter Study. *Gastroenterology* 2019, 156, 1675–1682. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Liu, L.-K.; Lee, W.-J.; Liu, C.-L.; Chen, L.-Y.; Lin, M.-H.; Peng, L.-N. Age-related skeletal muscle mass loss and physical performance in Taiwan: Implications to diagnostic strategy of sarcopenia in Asia. *Geriatr. Gerontol. Int.* 2013, 13, 964–971. [CrossRef]

- 31. Tsuchihashi, J.; Koya, S.; Hirota, K.; Koga, N.; Narao, H.; Tomita, M.; Kawaguchi, T.; Hashida, R.; Nakano, D.; Tsutsumi, T.; et al. Effects of In-Hospital Exercise on Frailty in Patients with Hepatocellular Carcinoma. *Cancers* **2021**, *13*, 194. [CrossRef]
- 32. Asscher, V.E.; Jong, A.E.V.D.M.-D.; Mooijaart, S.P. The Challenges of Managing Inflammatory Bowel Diseases in Older Patients. *Clin. Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* **2020**, *18*, 1648–1649. [CrossRef] [PubMed]