



Reflections in Internal Medicine

The geriatric management of frailty as paradigm of “The end of the disease era”



Matteo Cesari^{a,b,*}, Emanuele Marzetti^c, Ulrich Thiem^d, Mario Ulises Pérez-Zepeda^e, Gabor Abellan Van Kan^a, Francesco Landi^c, Mirko Petrovic^f, Antonio Cherubini^g, Roberto Bernabei^c

^a Gérontopôle, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Toulouse, Toulouse, France

^b Université de Toulouse III Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, France

^c Department of Geriatrics, Neurosciences, and Orthopedics, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Rome, Italy

^d Department of Geriatrics, Marien Hospital Herne, University of Bochum, Bochum, Germany

^e Clinical and Epidemiological Research Department, National Geriatric Institute, Mexico City, Mexico

^f Department of Geriatrics, Ghent University Hospital, Ghent, Belgium

^g Geriatrics and Geriatric Emergency Care, IRCCS-INRCA, Ancona, Italy

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 25 February 2016

Received in revised form 27 February 2016

Accepted 2 March 2016

Available online 18 March 2016

Keywords:

Frailty

Comprehensive geriatric assessment

Geriatrics

Multi-morbidity

Aging

ABSTRACT

The sustainability of healthcare systems worldwide is threatened by the absolute and relative increase in the number of older persons. The traditional models of care (largely based on a disease-centered approach) are inadequate for a clinical world dominated by older individuals with multiple (chronic) comorbidities and mutually interacting syndromes. There is the need to shift the center of the medical intervention from the disease to the biological age of the individual. Thus, multiple medical specialties have started looking with some interest at concepts of geriatric medicine in order to better face the increased complexity (due to age-related conditions) of their average patient. In this scenario, special interest has been given to frailty, a condition characterized by the reduction of the individual's homeostatic reserves and increased vulnerability to stressors. Frailty may indeed represent the fulcrum to lever for reshaping the healthcare systems in order to make them more responsive to new clinical needs. However, the dissemination of the frailty concept across medical specialties requires a parallel and careful consideration around the currently undervalued role of geriatricians in our daily practice.

© 2016 European Federation of Internal Medicine. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Inadequacy of traditional healthcare models

The absolute and relative number of older persons is increasing worldwide [1]. This phenomenon implies the urgent need to revise the structures and the methodologies of current healthcare systems, which were originally designed for younger patients with single acute diseases. The traditional paradigm of stand-alone disease medicine has become out-of-date in a clinical world dominated by older individuals characterized by multi-morbidity and mutually interacting syndromes.

Already in 2004, Tinetti and Fried [2] published a landmark though controversial article presenting “The end of the disease era”. In that paper, authors stated:

“...The time has come to abandon disease as the primary focus of medical care. [...] The changed spectrum of health conditions, the complex interplay of biological and non-biological factors, the aging population, and the inter-individual variability in health priorities render medical care that is centered primarily on the diagnosis and

treatment of individual diseases at best out-of-date and at worst harmful...”

These statements directly imply the necessity of a different approach to the older person's needs and resources. The article was fiercely criticized in the belief it could pave the way to a risky adventure in a landscape with no rules where subjectivity might dangerously become predominant. In fact, it was argued that medicine could not be emptied of the disease concept without substantially affecting our capacity of understanding pathophysiological mechanisms and developing innovative interventions [3]. These concerns were and still are as legitimate as valid. Nevertheless, moving the center of the medical intervention from the individual's disease to his/her overall functioning represents the only possibility we have for correctly weighting the clinically complex cases of advanced age. In other words, it is the only practical and effective solution for escaping from the long lasting evidence-based medicine issue.

Our belief is especially motivated by the fact that a disease-centered model of care frequently leads to two opposite scenarios when applied to the older patient:

- 1) The risk of polypharmacy and over-medicalization (because multiple subclinical and clinical abnormalities are simultaneously detected and treated), or

* Corresponding author at: Gérontopôle, Université Toulouse III–Paul Sabatier, 37 Allées Jules Guesde, 31000 Toulouse, France. Tel.: +33 5 61145628; fax: +33 5 61145640.
E-mail address: macesari@gmail.com (M. Cesari).

- 2) The under- or inappropriate treatment of clinical conditions (due to ageism, poor knowledge of the patient, or lack of evidence-based algorithms applicable to the heterogeneous geriatric population) [4–7].

In either case, the quality of life of the individual as well as his/her clinical outcomes might be substantially and negatively affected. In this scenario, geriatrics might indeed be considered the medical discipline in which the highest degree of common sense is required for coping with the biological and clinical complexity of the aged organism and the (consequent) lack of well-established medical standards. After all, the impact of multi-morbidity on the health status of older persons is significantly greater than the sum of the individual effects expected from the single conditions, as also explained in the recent *World Report on Ageing and Health* released by the World Health Organization [8].

2. Geriatric practice in different medical specialties

Nowadays, the assessment and treatment of age-related conditions is no longer a unique challenge for geriatricians. A wide spectrum of medical specialties is facing the consequences of global aging in the routine clinical practice. The older age of their patients has forced many specialties at reconsidering their traditional models of care because unable to satisfy the emerging clinical needs. In this context, the success of care models involving the geriatrician in the co-management of older patients in different medical specialties (e.g., orthopedics [9], oncology [10], emergency care [11,12]) should be acknowledged. The spreading diffusion of some geriatric concepts in other disciplines is therefore not surprising.

Frailty (i.e., a geriatric condition characterized by the reduction of the individual's homeostatic reserves, determining an increased vulnerability to endogenous and exogenous stressors [13]) represents a paradigmatic example of the geriatric contamination of other medical disciplines. Today, the term “frailty” is no longer confined within the borders of the geriatrics and gerontology world. From cardiology [14] to infectious disease medicine [15], from oncology [16] to anesthesiology [17], frailty has become a condition of wide interest both in clinical and research settings. Some healthcare systems have even implemented special economical bonuses to award those clinical services that follow the principles of the comprehensive geriatric assessment for the management of frail elders. The spreading recognition of frailty in different fields makes it a promising candidate for potentially serving as fulcrum on which to reshape our healthcare systems. That is, the geriatric condition of frailty may represent the turning point for modifying clinical decisional algorithms surpassing the obsolete and unreliable age criterion.

The diffusion of such sparks of geriatric culture in other medical specialties is undoubtedly a major accomplishment for geriatricians, but there is the consistent risk that it might turn out to be a victory with no winners. Geriatricians should surely be proud that other specialties are finally recognizing the benefits of the adapted and multi-dimensional approach when targeting frail older persons. It is gratifying to see other disciplines modifying their practices to better take into account the needs and characteristics of the geriatric patient. It is not a mere matter of *ego*, but the evidence-based awareness that the care of older patients requires a more systematic and individual-tailored approach [18–20].

3. The underestimated value of the geriatrician

In spite of the recent achievements of geriatric medicine, it is evident that its major concepts are too often misinterpreted and misused outside of its field [21]. In the literature, there is a worrying tendency to consider the geriatrician a specialist in scales and questionnaires. The assessment instruments are repeatedly confused with/considered

equivalent to the practice of the geriatric specialty. There is the alarming idea that the comprehensive geriatric assessment may exist independent of a geriatric clinical competence/sense driving its interpretation. It often seems as everyone capable of filling a checklist or completing a standardized set of questions automatically becomes able to manage a complex older patient like a geriatrician! Or that the numeric result of a test may be sufficient to improve the clinical care offered to the older person or his/her outcomes.

The comprehensive geriatric assessment means nothing if (1) the right instruments are not used, and (2) its outputs are not combined with the geriatrician's capacity to design a patient-tailored intervention. Most of the instruments usually applied in a standard comprehensive geriatric assessment are screening and not diagnostic tools. They often present large margins of error and are characterized by being focused on single specific aspects of the health status (e.g., cognition, nutrition, physical function). Moreover, two instruments measuring the same domain may provide completely different results depending on the patient's characteristics and setting, and the scope of the evaluation. The real meaning of these assessment tools exclusively resides in the sensibility of the geriatrician at considering them small pieces of the overall, complex picture. Taken separately, they might even be misleading.

Administering and scoring the Activities of Daily Living scale, the Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Scale, the Mini Mental State Examination, etc. do not make us (and anyone else) experts in geriatric care. And this, without taking into account that geriatricians have been playing a major role in developing more advanced and user-friendly clinical tools after having directly experienced the limitations of these old-fashioned, first-generation instruments [22]. The geriatrician is called at more properly using available and state-of-the-art devices in order to support and standardize the clinical approach to frail older patients [23–25]. The internist background of geriatricians combined with their function-oriented approach and knowledge about age-related phenomena will then allow the interpretation of results and their translation into a beneficial intervention for the older patient.

Furthermore, the geriatrician's clinical activities find their major effectiveness when nested into a specifically designed healthcare system. In fact, key to the provision of health services for older people is the partnership across the whole healthcare professionals and social care workers in a territory [26]. Geriatricians have a vital role and duty to provide care for older people in collaboration with medical professionals (in particular, primary care physicians) as well as non-medical healthcare professionals [27]. Multidisciplinary working also necessitates close liaison with many complementary services such as other branches of internal medicine, surgery, physical medicine and rehabilitation, or psychiatry of old age. Respect for patient's autonomy is at the center of practice, particularly when dealing with interventions such as cardiopulmonary resuscitation, assisted ventilation, or artificial feeding. Geriatricians recognize the importance of involving informal carers in decisions about complex treatments and consider a patient's quality of life and disability-free life expectancy to be pivotal goals of treatment rather than absolute life expectancy.

4. Frailty as paradigmatic target of geriatric care

As mentioned, frailty may represent the fulcrum on which reshaping our healthcare systems as repeatedly requested by public health agencies. At the same time, it might become the tombstone for our specialty if geriatricians will not enforce respect for their background and capacities.

Although every one of us agrees on the theoretical definition of frailty [13], more than 40 different instruments have been developed and validated over the past years to determine the frailty status [28]. The most popular operational definition of frailty (i.e., the frailty phenotype proposed by Fried et al. [29]) is seldom reproduced as originally developed, and most studies use adaptations of it (with consequent

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/3465863>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/3465863>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)