

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (http://bmjopen.bmj.com).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <a href="mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com">info.bmjopen@bmj.com</a>

# **BMJ Open**

# Predictors of falls and fractures leading to hospitalization in 36,101 people with affective disorders: A large representative cohort study

Manuscript ID  Article Type: Original research  Date Submitted by the Author: 05-Jul-2021  Complete List of Authors: Ma, Ruimin; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Perera, Gayan; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Romano, Eugenia; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Vancampfort, Davy; KU Leuven Koyanagi, Ai; Parc Sanitari Sant Joan de Deu, Research and Development Unit Stewart, Robert; King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry Mueller, Christoph; King's College London, Department of Old Age Psychiatry Stubbs, B; King's College London, Psychological Medicine  Keywords: MENTAL HEALTH, Anxiety disorders < PSYCHIATRY, Adult psychiatry < PSYCHIATRY, Depression & mood disorders < PSYCHIATRY	Journal:	BMJ Open
Date Submitted by the Author:  Complete List of Authors:  Ma, Ruimin; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Perera, Gayan; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Romano, Eugenia; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Vancampfort, Davy; KU Leuven Koyanagi, Ai; Parc Sanitari Sant Joan de Deu, Research and Development Unit Stewart, Robert; King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry Mueller, Christoph; King's College London, Department of Old Age Psychiatry Stubbs, B; King's College London, Psychological Medicine  MENTAL HEALTH, Anxiety disorders < PSYCHIATRY, Adult psychiatry <	Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-055070
Complete List of Authors:  Ma, Ruimin; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Perera, Gayan; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Romano, Eugenia; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Vancampfort, Davy; KU Leuven Koyanagi, Ai; Parc Sanitari Sant Joan de Deu, Research and Development Unit Stewart, Robert; King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry Mueller, Christoph; King's College London, Department of Old Age Psychiatry Stubbs, B; King's College London, Psychological Medicine  MENTAL HEALTH, Anxiety disorders < PSYCHIATRY, Adult psychiatry <	Article Type:	Original research
Perera, Gayan; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Romano, Eugenia; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Vancampfort, Davy; KU Leuven Koyanagi, Ai; Parc Sanitari Sant Joan de Deu, Research and Development Unit Stewart, Robert; King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry Mueller, Christoph; King's College London, Department of Old Age Psychiatry Stubbs, B; King's College London, Psychological Medicine  MENTAL HEALTH, Anxiety disorders < PSYCHIATRY, Adult psychiatry <		05-Jul-2021
κ Δ///// γ γ γ γ γ γ γ γ γ γ γ γ γ γ γ γ	Complete List of Authors:	Perera, Gayan; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Romano, Eugenia; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Vancampfort, Davy; KU Leuven Koyanagi, Ai; Parc Sanitari Sant Joan de Deu, Research and Development Unit Stewart, Robert; King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry Mueller, Christoph; King's College London, Department of Old Age Psychiatry
	Keywords:	

SCHOLARONE™ Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our licence.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which Creative Commons licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

- 1 Predictors of falls and fractures leading to hospitalization in 36,101 people with
- 2 affective disorders: A large representative cohort study
- 3 Running title: Predictors of falls and fractures in people with affective disorders
- 4 Ruimin Ma<sup>a</sup>, Gayan Perera, Eugenia Romano, Davy Vancampfort, d, Ai Koyanagi<sup>e, f</sup>,
- 5 Robert Stewart<sup>a, b</sup>, Christoph Mueller<sup>^,a, b</sup> Brendon Stubbs<sup>^,a, b</sup>,
- 6 a Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience (IoPPN), King's College London,
- 7 London, United Kingdom
- 8 b South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom
- 9 ° KU Leuven University of Leuven, Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, Leuven, Belgium
- 10 d KU Leuven University of Leuven, University Psychiatric Centre KU Leuven, Leuven,
- 11 Kortenberg, Belgium
- e Research and Development Unit, Parc Sanitari Sant Joan de Déu, Universitat de Barcelona,
- Fundació Sant Joan de Déu, Dr. Antoni Pujadas, 42 Sant Boi de Llobregat, Barcelona 08830,
- 14 Spain
- 15 f ICREA, Pg. Lluis Companys 23, Barcelona, Spain
- 16 ^ Joint first author
- 17 ^^ Joint last author
- Corresponding author at: Psychological Medicine, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology
- and Neuroscience (IoPPN), King's College London, De Crespigny Park, London, BOX
- SE5 8AF, United Kingdom.
- Email address: ruimin.1.ma@kcl.ac.uk

- 23 Abstract (257/300)
- Objectives: To investigate predictors of falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation in people
- with affective disorders.
- **Design**: Cohort study
- 27 Setting: the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust (SLaM) Biomedical Research
- 28 Centre (BRC) Case Register
- **Participants**: A large cohort of people with affective disorders (ICD10 codes F30-F34)
- diagnosed between January 2008 and March 2016 was assembled using data from the SLaM
- 31 BRC Case Register
- **Primary and secondary outcome measures**: Falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation
- were ascertained from linked national hospitalization data. Multivariable Cox proportional
- hazards analyses were administrated to identify predictors of first falls and fractures.
- Results: Of 36,101 people with affective disorders (mean age 44.4 years, 60.2% female), 816
- 36 (incidence rate 9.91 per 1000 person years) and 1,117 (incidence rate 11.92 per 1000 person
- years) experienced either a fall or fracture respectively. In multivariable analyses, older age,
- analgesics use, increased physical illness burden, previous hospital admission due to certain
- 39 co-morbid physical illnesses and increase in attendances to accident and emergency services
- 40 following diagnosis were significant risk factors for both falls and fractures. Having a history
- of falls was a strong risk factor for recurrent falls, and a previous fracture was also associated
- with future fractures.
- 43 Conclusions: Over a mean 5 years' follow-up, approximately 8% of people with affective
- disorders were hospitalised with a fall or fracture. Several similar factors were found to
- 45 predict risk of falls and fracture, for example, older age, comorbid physical disorders and

- analgesic use. Routine screening for bone mineral density and falls prevention programmesshould be considered for this clinical group.
- **Key words**: osteoporosis, affective disorders, falls, fractures, hospital admission

## Strength and limitation of the study:

- Predictors of falls and fractures leading to hospitalization in people with affective disorders were investigated with a large representative cohort
- Data of the study were derived directly from the electronic health record
- Falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation were ascertained from linked national hospitalization data
- We did not stratify according to different affective disorder subtypes and psychotropic medication categories
- We had no information on lifestyle factors and type of fractures recorded at admission

#### Word count: 3636/4000

#### Introduction

Falls and fractures are strongly related with increased morbidity, mortality, disability, and healthcare expenditure in the general population [1, 2], and they are a frequent issue in older adults [3]. Their causes are multifactorial, such as muscle weakness [4] and use of antiepileptic drugs [5]. Several government strategies have been implemented to prevent and assess falls in the general population [3, 6]. Fractures, for example, hip and spine fractures increase the risk of future falls and fractures [7]. Over 3 million people in the UK are at a high risk for fractures [8], and prevention has been acknowledged as a worldwide priority [9].

Despite some progress in the general population, there is poor evidence on risk factors for falls and fractures for patients with affective disorders. People with mental health problems like depression and schizophrenia report higher risks of falls and fractures compared to the general population [10, 11], and despite poor evidence in people with bipolar disorders, a few studies suggest this population may also be at increased risk [12, 13].

Several studies have investigated the association between bone loss and depression, but there is a lack of large-scale cohort studies focussing on falls and fractures and related predictors. Another major limitation is that the majority of studies have relied on self-reported affective symptoms rather than clinical diagnosis [14, 15].

Given these limitations and the increased concerns about the adverse events of falls and fractures, this representative cohort study investigates predictors of falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation among people with clinically diagnosed affective disorders.

#### Methods

A retrospective observational study was carried out using data from the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust (SLaM) Biomedical Research Centre (BRC) Case Register. SLaM is one of the largest mental health and dementia care providers in Europe, serving a geographic catchment of four South London Boroughs (including Lambeth, Lewisham, Southwark, and Croydon) with a population in excess of 1.3 million. Data for this study were retrieved using the Clinical Record Interactive Search (CRIS) platform, which enables a deidentified version of SLaM's electronic health record to be accessible for research projects within a robust and patient-led government framework [16]. The SLaM BRC Case Register has been described in detail elsewhere [17] and has supported a wide range of studies [18, 19], including longitudinal cohort studies investigating falls and fractures in other populations [20, 21]. Data are currently archived in CRIS on more than 450,000 cases with a wide variety of mental disorders. CRIS has full approval for secondary analysis (Oxford Research Ethnic Committee C, reference 18/SC/0372). Data from source structured fields have been extensively supplemented through natural language process (NLP) applications using Generalised Architecture for Text Engineering software, applying information extraction techniques to derive structured information from the extensive text fields held in the mental health record [17].

#### Participants, study period and additional data sources

All SLaM patients with mood [affective] disorders (ICD10 codes F30-F34), diagnosed between 1st of January 2008 and 31st March 2016, were included. SLaM patient records have been linked with national Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) which are compiled from all NHS Trusts in England (both acute and mental health services), including statistical abstracts of records of all inpatient episodes, as well as outpatient and emergency care [17]. In addition,

CRIS data have been linked to the Office for National Statistics (ONS) mortality records over the same period.

#### Patient and public involvement (PPI)

The entire research program was developed after extensive patient, public and carer input, who helped develop the study, and contributed to the funding applicable. They co-developed the research questions, outcomes and contributed to factors included in the models. Moreover, they reinforced this research as a neglected topic of utmost importance to them. The PPI group designed the study with the senior researcher of the paper (Dr BS), they were involved in the conception of the idea, the planning of the study during bimonthly meetings to discuss study design, hypotheses, outcomes and what matters to patients of interest. They were also involved in helping interpret the data outputs and publication. Results will be summarised and made available to the PPI group through local newsletters and inform clinical services and local codeveloped Recovery College Courses.

# Co-primary outcome: falls and any fractures

The co-primary outcomes were hospital admissions relating to a fall or any fracture extracted from linked HES data and all discharge diagnoses (primary or any secondary diagnosis codes) recorded between January 2008 to March 2016, and based on the following ICD 10 codes: i) falls (W00-W19); ii) fractures (M80-M84, M907, S02, S12, S32, S42, S52, S62, S72, S82, S92, S22, T02, T08, T10, T12X, T902, T911, T912, T921). In addition, linked mortality records from the ONS linkage were examined for any instance of fall or fracture ICD codes in

any cause of death field on the death certificate to identify the date of death attributed to a fall or fracture.

#### Measurements

Several additional measurements were obtained from CRIS. All independent variables (covariates) were defined according to the value closest to the date of the first recorded mood [affective] disorder diagnosis. Demographic covariates comprised: age at diagnosis, gender, and ethnicity [multiple codes categorised into 1) White, consists of White British, White Irish and other White; and 2) Non-White]. Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2015) for the neighbourhood of residence (i.e. Lower Super Output Area, which consists of approximately 650 households) at the time of diagnosis was divided into quintiles according to deprivation scores with equal size allocated to each group. The IMD has previously been used in CRIS [22] and combines Census-derived data at area level across several domains including income, employment, health, education, barriers to housing and services, living environment, and crime [23]. Information on cohabiting status (Cohabiting: married/civil partner, married, cohabiting; Non-cohabiting: single, divorced, civil partnership dissolved, widowed, separated) was also ascertained at the index diagnosis.

#### Illness burden

The Health of the Nation Outcome Scales (HoNOS) [24] are routinely administered measures of illness burden in UK mental health services and are recorded in structured fields on the electronic health record. Individual HoNOS item scores (agitated behaviour, self-injury, problem drinking & drugs, cognitive problems, physical illness, hallucinations, depressed mood, relationship problems, daily living problems, living conditions problems, occupational

problems) and dates were obtained within 6 months before or after the date of the index diagnosis, and the closest scores in time to this date were included in analyses. Each HoNOS item is rated on a Likert Scale, ranging from 0 (i.e. no problem) to 4 (i.e. severe or very severe problem). A detailed glossary for HoNOS is reported elsewhere [25]. Scores 2 or over in the individual HoNOS scales were classified as having a problem on each item, generating binary covariates.

#### Mental disorder comorbidity

Diagnoses of F00-F03 (dementia); F20-F29 (schizophrenia spectrum disorder); F40-F48 (neurotic, stress-related and somatoform disorders); F50 (eating disorders); F60-F69 (disorders of adult personality and behaviour) were ascertained within one year before or after the index diagnosis of mood [affective] disorder.

#### Medication

Medications received were extracted from structured medication fields in the record, supplemented by an NLP application applied to text fields ascertaining mentions of current medication [17]. Presence or not of the following medication groups was ascertained on the basis of information within six months before or after the index diagnosis: anticholinergics, antihypertensives, antidepressants, antipsychotics, anxiolytics and hypnotics, and analgesics. The total number of medications prescribed for any condition was calculated for each participant and used as a continuous variable.

### Physical comorbidity

Information on physical comorbidities was ascertained utilising the data linkage between CRIS and national HES records. Information on all ICD-10 diagnoses at discharge (primary or any secondary diagnosis codes) was ascertained from any hospitalisations within 6 months before or after the index diagnosis date and the following binary variables generated: i) Ischaemic heart disease (IHD; I20, I21, I22, including coronary heart disease (CHD; I25); ii) Arrhythmia (I44-I49, including atrial fibrillation (AF; I48); iii) Heart failure (I50); iv) Diabetes (E08, E09, E10, E11, E12, E13; v) Hypotension (I95-99); vi) Hypercholesterolemia (E78); vii) Hypertension (I10-15); viii) Urinary tract infections (UTI) (N39); ix) Osteoporosis (M80-85); x) Visual disturbance and blindness (H53-54); xi) Hearing loss (H90-95); xii) Syncope or collapse (R50-R69); xiii) Parkinson's disease (G20). Furthermore, occurrence of falls and/or fractures before the index diagnosis was also collected. Finally, the number of attendances to accident and emergency services (A&E) following the index diagnosis was also recorded.

# Statistical analysis

The study sample was described initially in terms of demographic and clinical variables, followed by unadjusted Cox proportional hazard models to predict the first fall and first fracture separately after the index diagnosis of mood [affective] disorder. The predictor variables at baseline used in the first univariate models included sociodemographic information (year of index diagnosis, mean age, gender, ethnicity, marital status), medications (antipsychotics, anxiolytics & hypnotics, antidepressants, analgesics, anticholinergics, antihypertensives), comorbid psychiatric diagnosis (F20-29 schizophrenia spectrum disorder, F40-48 neurotic/stress disorders, F00-F03 dementia, F50 eating disorders, F60 disorders of adult personality and behaviour), HONOS scores (mean total and each individual item) and physical

health comorbidities (as indicated above). Factors that yielded a p-value < 0.10 in the univariate model for fall or fracture outcome were subsequently entered into the multivariable model. A final multivariable Cox proportional hazards model, using stepwise backward elimination technique where those variables not significant (p-value > 0.05) were eliminated, with hazard ratios and 95% confidence intervals (CI) displayed. Having checked a correlation matrix of coefficients in the Cox model, total number of medications received was substantially collinear with individual types of medication received; therefore, this total number was removed as a covariate. All analyses were conducted utilising STATA, version 13.

#### **Results**

The sample comprised 36,101 people with a diagnosis of mood [affective] disorder (F30\* - F34\*) (mean age at first diagnosis 44.4, SD: 17.8, 60.2% female). Over a mean 5 years' follow-up, 2,948 patients had a fall and/or a fracture recorded: 816 only a fall, 1,117 only a fracture, and 1,015 both; 1,831 with any fall and 2,193 with any fracture. The incidence rate of falls was 9.91 per 1,000 person years and that for fractures 11.92 per 1,000 person years. Table 1 summarises characteristics of those who had a recorded fall or fracture compared to those who did not.

#### [Table 1]

# Length of hospital stay

The mean length of hospitalisation following a fall (n = 1,831) was 7.9 days (range 0-374), for a total of 20,767 full days in hospital. The mean length of stay in hospital following a fracture

(n=2,193) was 13.2 days (range 0-374), for a total of 40,548 days. This equates to 18.51 years of inpatient hospital stay for 1,000-person years of follow-up due to a fall and 36.15 years of inpatient hospital stay for 1,000-person years of follow-up due to a fracture. For the 1,831 patients reporting a fall, the mean hospital admissions due to a fall was 1.5 (range 1-15); for the 2,193 patients reporting a fracture, the mean number of hospital admissions due to a fracture was 2.3 (range 1-42).

#### Factors associated with falls and fractures

- Cox proportional hazard models analysing unadjusted predictors of falls and fractures (95%
- 231 CI) are reported in Table 2.

233 [Table 2]

# **Multivariable predictors of falls**

Multivariable models of factors associated with first fall hospital admission are presented in Table 3. In Model 2, older age was strongly associated with higher risk, and Non-European ethnicity with lower risk, but neighbourhood deprivation reported no association. Analgesics had a significant association (with increased risk), and of co-morbid psychiatric conditions, only the ICD-10 F40-F48 group had a significant association (with reduced risk). Of the HoNOS items, cognitive problems and physical illness were associated with higher risk, and depressed mood problems with lower risk. Higher risk of falls was associated with several hospitalisation discharge diagnoses, namely heart failure, diabetes, hypotension, UTI, osteoporosis, and syncope or collapse. Hospitalised fall was associated with having a previous

history of falls reported before the index diagnosis and with increased A&E attendance after the index diagnosis.

247 [Table 3]

### **Multivariable predictors of fractures**

Table 4 presents multivariable models of factors associated with first fracture hospitalisation. Fracture risk was increased in older patients and women and was decreased in those of Non-European. Fracture risk was lower in patients receiving antihypertensives and higher in those receiving analgesics. It was also lower in those with neurotic, stress-related and somatoform disorders (i.e. F40-F48), as well as bipolar affective disorder and manic episodes (i.e. F30-F31). An elevated fracture risk was associated with physical illness on the HoNOS. Fracture risk was independently predicted by previous hospitalisations for heart failure, diabetes, UTI, osteoporosis, hearing loss and preceding fracture-related (but not fall-related) hospitalisations. Fracture risk was also associated with higher levels of post-diagnostic A&E attendance.

260 [Table 4]

### **Discussion**

To our knowledge, the current study is the first using representative data to investigate the predictors of hospitalised falls and fractures in people with clinically diagnosed affective disorders. Our data suggest that out of 36,101 people with affective disorders, 816 (i.e. 2.26%) and 1,117 (i.e. 3.09%) of patients experienced a fall and fracture, respectively. Length of hospital stay was considerable, equating to 18.51 and 36.15 years of inpatient hospital stay for 1,000-person years of follow-up due to a fall and a fracture, respectively. The key factors increasing the risk of a hospitalised fall were older age, analgesic use, increased illness burden due to cognitive problems and physical illness, a history of general hospital admission due to co-morbid physical illnesses (in particular syncope or collapse), increase in one attendance to A & E following affective disorder diagnosis, and falls before the diagnosis. Similar risk factors for fractures were noted.

Approximately 8.2% of our sample experienced a hospital admission due to either a fall or fracture. Studies on healthy populations have suggested several mechanisms which may explain these elevated risks in our sample, such as vitamin D deficiency [26, 27] and use of antidepressants [28]. Several studies also proposed a negative effect of leptin on bone mass and bone formation through a hypothalamic relay [29]. Some lifestyle factors seem to also be associated with a poor bone health, including physical inactivity [30] and alcohol consumption [31]. Previous studies have hypothesised other risk factors contributing to falls and fractures in people with depressive disorders [32], but no large-scale study has yet focused on patients with clinically diagnosed affective disorders. Our data advance the current literature by providing detailed evidence on how a multitude of demographic, medical, and psychological factors can differently affect risks of falls and fractures in people with affective disorder.

The association between older age and incidence of fall may be due to age-related physical conditions, as well as physiologic (e.g. loss of BMD) [33] and pathologic changes (e.g. decreased cardiovascular functions) [34]. Female gender is also a well-established risk factor for osteoporosis [35], consistent with our finding. Surprisingly, we found no relationship between deprivation and falls and fractures, although previous evidence has associated deprivation with fractures across different age groups [36, 37]. We might suppose that while deprivation is associated with poor nutrition and physical inactivity, people with affective disorders have a poorer lifestyle, compared to the general population [38], regardless of their financial status or living condition. Finally, the protective role of a non-European ethnic background is comparable with previous evidence supporting a higher fracture rate in Caucasian women compared to women from other ethnic groups [39], and a lower fall rate in older immigrants than those with an English-speaking background [40].

Our results provide new evidence on how hospitalisation due to falls or fractures can be an important burden for the NHS resources and for people with affective disorders, who are already at risk for a prolonged hospitalisation [41]. Given the long hospital stay among our sample, its burden on NHS costs in unsurprising. The total cost of fracture is estimated to reach £4.4 billion per year in the UK alone [8]. Several items from the HoNOS were also associated with increased hazard of hospitalisation due to falls or fractures (e.g. cognitive problems). Evidence on the role of these factors on hospital stay among this population is warranted for future research.

Our study reports stress-related and somatoform disorders to be associated with a decreased risk of falls and fractures, which could be due to increased fear avoidance and reduced activities due to stress-related disorders, leading to fewer falls [42]. We also found the presence of bipolar affective disorder and manic episodes to be protective factors against increased fracture risk. Although there has been little evidence investigating the role of bipolar affective disorder or its characteristics (including manic symptoms) in the risk of fracture, preliminary evidence has suggested an association between the use of lithium (i.e. a primary treatment for bipolar disorder) and decreased fracture risk [43], the preservation and enhancement of bone mass [44].

Surprisingly, neither antidepressants nor antipsychotics were associated with risks of falls or fracture, despite documented associations between antipsychotic medications and reduced bone metabolism [45] and BMD [46]. Evidence on the association between antidepressants and BMD is ambiguous: while some authors reported that some antidepressants, especially SSRIs, have a negative impact on bone strength [47, 48], other findings have been null [49]. However, we did not attempt to account for specific types of antidepressants in the analysis, and previous studies indicate that tricyclic antidepressants have no adverse effect on bone health [28]. On the other hand, analgesics use was associated with increased risks for falls and fractures, consistently with previous findings [50], and possibly mediated by central nervous system effects, such as dizziness [51]. Antihypertensive drugs use was associated with a decreased fracture risk, confirming previous results [52], potentially due to their improving effect on calcium absorption [53].

Finally, extensive evidence has indicated several physical conditions as risk factors for falls or fractures in the general population [54, 55], including UTI [56] and diabetes [57]. It is known

that mental health disorders (e.g. depression) increase the chance of major physical comorbidities [58]. However, few studies have established the impact of comorbid physical conditions on risks of falls and fractures among people with affective disorders. Our study indicates heart failure, diabetes, UTI and osteoporosis to be associated with hospitalisation due to falls or fractures. Hypotension and syncope or collapse were additionally associated with an increased risk of falls, and hearing loss was associated with an elevated fracture risk. Unsurprisingly, osteoporosis was strongly associated with falls and fractures, as it has been acknowledged as the most important yet potentially treatable factor for falls [54] and fractures [59] due to its effect on BMD. Moreover, osteoporosis tends to occur simultaneously with heart failure [60] due to shared risk factors such as diabetes. Unsurprisingly, syncope or collapse was also strongly associated with an increased risk of falls, as syncope is frequently mistaken for falls, to the point that the European Society of Cardiology has emphasised the need to explore syncope as an independent factor leading to falls [61]. Diabetes was another risk factor for both falls and fracture, confirming the association found in the general population [62]. Hearing loss was the only factor associated with an elevated risk of fracture in our study, an association previously confirmed in the general population [63]. This finding may be explained by the damaging impact of hearing loss on orientation skills and physical activity [64]. Finally, our study confirmed the association between history of falls and increased risk of future falls, previously reported in the general population [34, 65] and in people with depression [66]. Moreover, our data confirmed how a prior fracture represents a 50-100% higher risk for experiencing future fracture, as reported in the general population [67].

The main strengths of our study are: i) analyses controlling for various confounders; and ii) a large sample including people with clinically diagnosed affective disorders. However, there are important limitations. Firstly, we did not stratify according to different affective disorder

subtypes which could report different risk factors; similarly, we analysed psychotropic medication categories but did not investigate specific agents or sub-categories. Second, we had no information on the types of fractures reported at admission and on factors (e.g. balance) that are influenced by neuropathological lesions in people with depression [68]. Third, lifestyle factors, such as alcohol consumption [31, 38], could not be explored. Fourth, our study only ascertained information on physical co-morbidities from hospitalisation records and could have overlooked patients with mild osteoporosis. Additionally, physical co-morbidities were ascertained within six months of diagnosis, and patients who were hospitalised for a fall or fracture within these six months would be more likely to have their osteoporosis ascertained. Finally, since medication records were ascertained within one year of diagnosis, we cannot assess whether medications were prescribed as a result or as a cause of falls for those who had a fall or fracture within six months of their diagnosis.

#### Conclusion

Our study reports that over a mean 5 years' follow-up, approximately 8% of a large cohort with affective disorders was hospitalised due to either a fall or fracture. Factors such as older age, certain medications and having a history of fall or fracture are significant predictors, broadly comparable to risk factors established in the general population. Heavy hospital burden following a fall or fracture was also described.

Our current study provides important implications for future research and clinical practice. BMD checks and osteoporosis screenings should be a routine for people with affective disorders, especially if older and with established co-morbid chronic illnesses. However, evidence suggests a lack of osteoporosis screening and fracture prevention for people with

mental health problems [69]. Fall assessments (e.g. the Fracture Risk Assessment Tool) should be considered for people with affective disorders, since approximately 70% of low-energy fractures are due to falls [70]. However, there is a lack of fall prevention programmes for this population, despite research indicating an average 14% reduction in falls risk in the general population [71]. Fall/fracture prevention programmes should therefore be offered; for example, the combination of cognitive behavioural therapy and exercise for improving depressive symptoms [72] and self-efficacy [73].

# Acknowledgments

#### Author's contributions

BS acquired funding for the study. GP conducted the analysis with support from all co-authors. RM drafted introduction and discussion sections, ER drafted results section and all authors (BS, GP, DV, AK, RS, CM) provided critical revisions and approved the final version. The PPI group helped conceptualize and co-develop the study, as well as contributed to the funding applications.

# Financial support

BS is supported by a Clinical Lectureship (ICA-CL-2017-03-001) jointly funded by Health Education England (HEE) and the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). BS and RS are part funded by the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust. RM is part funded by the HDR-UK London award to King's College London. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the (partner organisation), the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

	BMJ Open
407	
408	Ethics approval
409	This study has full approval for secondary analysis of CRIS (Oxford Research Ethnic
410	Committee C, reference 18/SC/0372).
411	
412	Conflicts of interest
413	All authors declare no conflicts of interest.
414	
415	Data availability statement
416	Data are available on reasonable request. For questions regarding the study, please contact RM
417	at ruimin.1.ma@kcl.ac.uk
418	
	1

420	References
421	
422	[1] Hernlund E, Svedbom A, Ivergård M, Compston J, Cooper C, Stenmark J, McCloskey
423	EV, Jönsson B, Kanis JA. Osteoporosis in the European Union: Medical management,
424	epidemiology and economic burden: A report prepared in collaboration with the International
425	Osteoporosis Foundation (IOF) and the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industry
426	Associations (EFPIA). Archives of Osteoporosis. 2013 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11657-013-
427	<u>0136-1</u>
428	[2] Sattui SE, Saag KG. Fracture mortality: Associations with epidemiology and osteoporosis
429	treatment. Nature Reviews Endocrinology, 2014; 10, 592–602.
430	[3] Panel on Prevention of Falls in Older Persons, American Geriatric Society and British
431	Geriatric Society. Summary of the updated American Geiratric Society/British Geiratric
432	Society clincial practice guideline for prevention of falls in older persons. Journal of
433	American Geiratric Society, 2011; 59(1): 148-157
434	[4] Dionyssiotis Y. Analysing the problem of falls among older people. International Journal
435	of General Medicine, 2012; 5: 805-813.
436	[5] Deandrea S, Lucenteforte E, Bravi F, Foschi R, La Vecchia C, Negri E. Risk factors for
437	falls in community-dwelling older people: A systematic review and meta-analysis. In

- Epidemiology 2010: pp. 658–668. https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181e89905
- [6] NICE. Falls in older people: assessing risk and prevention. 2013. Available at https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg161. Accessed 13 March 2020
- [7] Sanguineti VA, Wild JR, Joseph B, Fain MJ. Management of common fractures in older adults. In Michel, J-P., Beattie, B. L., Martin, F. C., & Walston, J (eds). Oxford Textbook of Geriatric Medictine (3ed).2017. Oxford University Press. DOI:

444	10.1093/med/9780198701590.003.0070
445	[8] Public Health England. Falls: applying all our health. 2020. Available at
446	https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/falls-applying-all-our-health/falls-
447	applying-all-our-health. Accessed 13 March 2020
448	[9] Johnell O, Kanis JA. An estimate of the worldwide prevalence and disability associated
449	with osteoporotic fractures. Osteoporos. Int. 2006; 17 (12): 1726–1733
450	[10] Correll CU, Detraux J, De Lepeleire J, De Hert M. Effects of antipsychotics,
451	antidepressants and mood stabilizers on risk for physical diseases in people with
452	schizophrenia, depression and bipolar disorder. World Psychiatry, 2015; 14, 119-136.
453	https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20204
454	[11] Shi TT, Min M, Zhang Y, Sun CY, Liang MM, Sun YH. Depression and risk of hip
455	fracture: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. In Osteoporosis
456	International, 2019; 30(6): 1157–1165. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-019-04951-6
457	[12] Chandrasekaran V, Brennan-Olsen SL, Stuart AL, Pasco JA, Berk M, Hodge JM,
458	Williams LJ. Bipolar disorder and bone health: A systematic review. Journal of
459	Affective Disorders, 2019; 249: 262–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2019.02.013
460	[13] Hong-Jhe C, Chin-Yuan, K, Ming-Shium T, Fu-Wei W, Ru-Yih C, Kuang-Chieh H,
461	Hsiang-Ju P, Ming-Yueh C, Pan-Ming C, Chih-Chuan P. The incidence and risk of
462	osteoporosis in patients with anxiety disorder: A Population-based retrospective cohort
463	study. Medicine, 2016; 95(38): e4912. https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.000000000004912
464	[14] Wu Q, Liu B, Tonmoy S. Depression and risk of fracture and bone loss: an updated
465	meta-analysis of prospective studies. Osteoporosis International, 2018; 29: 1303–1312.
466	https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-018-4420-1

- [15] Stubbs B, Stubbs J, Gnanaraj SD, Soundy A. Falls in older adults with major depressive disorder (MDD): a systematic review and exploratory meta-analysis of prospective studies. Int Psychogeriatr, 2016; 28(1): 23-29. doi: 10.1017/S104161021500126X. [16] Fernandes AC, Cloete D, Broadbent MTM, Hayes RD, Chang CK., Jackson RG, et al. Development and evaluation of a de-identification procedure for a case register sourced from mental health electronic records. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, 2013; 13: 71. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6947-13-71 [17] Perera G, Broadbent M, Callard F, Chang CK, Downs J, Dutta R, et al. Cohort profile of the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust Biomedical Research Centre (SLaM BRC) Case Register: Current status and recent enhancement of an Electronic Mental Health Record-derived data resource. BMJ Open, 2016; 6(3): e008721. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008721 [18] Sultana J, Chang CK, Haves RD, Broadbent M, Stewart R, Corbett A, Ballard C. Associations between risk of mortality and atypical antipsychotic use in vascular dementia: A clinical cohort study. International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 2014; 29(12): 1249–1254. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.4101 [19] Ward G, Perera G, Stewart R. Predictors of mortality for people aged over 65 years receiving mental health care for delirium in a South London Mental Health Trust, UK: A retrospective survival analysis. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 2015; 30(6): 639–646. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.4195
  - [20] Mueller C, Perera G, Hayes RD, Shetty H, Stewart R. Associations of acetylcholinesterase inhibitor treatment with reduced mortality in Alzheimer's disease:

    A retrospective survival analysis. *Age and Ageing*, 2018; 47: 88–94.
- 490 https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afx098

491	[21] Stubbs B, Mueller C, Gaughran F, Lally J, Vancampfort D, Lamb SE, et al. Predictors of
492	falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation in people with schizophrenia spectrum
493	disorder: a large representative cohort study. Schizophrenia Research, 2018; 201: 70-78
494	[22] Das-Munshi J, Chang C-K, Dutta R et al. Ethnicity and excess mortality in severe mental
495	illness: a cohort study. The Lancet 2017; 4(5): 389-399. Doi:
496	https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(17)30097-4
497	[23] Richardson EA, Mitchell RJ, Shortt NK et al. Evidence-based selection of environmental
498	factors and datasets for measuring multiple environmental deprivation in
499	epidemiological research. Environ Health, 2009; 8: S18. DOI:
500	https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-069X-8-S1-S18
501	[24] Wing JK, Beevor AS, Curtis RH, Park SGB, Hadden J, Burns, A. Health of the Nation
502	Outcomes Scales (HoNOS): Research and development. The British Journal of
503	Psychaitry, 1998; 172(1):11-18. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.172.1.11
504	[25] Burns A, Beevor A, Lelliott P, Wing J, Blakey A, Orrell M, et al. Health of the Nation
505	Outcome Scales for Elderly People (HoNOS 65+): Glossary for HoNOS 65+ score
506	sheet. Cambridge University Press, 1999; 174(5): 435-438.
507	DOI: https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.174.5.435
508	[26] Kahl KG, Greggersen W, Rudolf S, Stoeckelhuber BM, Bergmann-Koester CU, Dibbelt
509	L, Schweiger U. Bone mineral density, bone turnover, and osteoprotegerin in depressed
510	women with and without borderline personality disorder. Psychosomatic Medicine,
511	2006; 68: 669–674. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.psy.0000237858.76880.3d
512	[27] Kahl KG, Rudolf S, Dibbelt L, Stoeckelhuber BM, Gehl HB, Hohagen F, Schweiger U.
513	Decreased osteoprotegerin and increased bone turnover in young female patients with
514	major depressive disorder and a lifetime history of anorexia nervosa. Osteoporosis

515	International, 2005; 16: 424–429. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-004-1711-5">https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-004-1711-5</a>
516	[28] Diem SJ, Blackwell TL, Stone KL, Yaffe K, Haney EM, Bliziotes MM, Ensrud, KE.
517	Use of antidepressants and rates of hip bone loss in older women: The study of
518	osteoporotic fractures. Archives of Internal Medicine, 2007; 167: 1240–1245.
519	https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.167.12.1240
520	[29] Trivedi R, Goswami R, Chattopadhyay N. Invesgitational anabolic therapies for
521	osteoporosis. Expert Opin Investig Drugs, 2010; 19(8): 995-1005
522	[30] Wong SYS, Lau EMC, Lynn H, Leung PC, Woo J, Cummings SR, Orwoll E.
523	Depression and bone mineral density: Is there a relationship in elderly Asian men?
524	Results from Mr. Os (Hong Kong). Osteoporosis International, 2005; 16: 610–615.
525	https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-004-1730-2
526	[31] Mussolino ME. Depression and hip fracture risk: The NHANES I epidemiologic follow-
527	up study. Public Health Reports, 2005; 120: 71–75.
528	https://doi.org/10.1177/003335490512000112
529	[32] Cizza G. Major depressive disorder is a risk factor for low bone mass, central obesity,
530	and other medical conditions. Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience, 2011; 13(1): 73–87.
531	[33] Wu Q, Magnus JH, Liu J, Bencaz AF, Hentz JG. (2009). Depression and low bone
532	mineral density: A meta-analysis of epidemiologic studies. Osteoporosis International,
533	2009; 20(8): 1309–1320. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-009-0918-x
534	[34] Ambrose AF, Paul G, Hausdorff JM. (2013). Risk factors for falls among older adults: A
535	review of the literature. Maturitas, 2013; 75(1): 51–61.
536	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2013.02.009

[35] Williams J, Kool B, Robinson E, Ameratunga S. Longer term health of young and

538	middle-aged adults following unintentional falls at home resulting in hospitalisation.
539	<i>Injury</i> , 2012; 43(1): 103–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2011.03.050
540	[36] Court-Brown CM, Aitken SA, Duckworth AD, Clement ND, McQueen MM. The
541	relationship between social deprivation and the incidence of adult fractures. Journal of
542	Bone and Joint Surgery - Series A, 2013; 95(6): e321–e327.
543	https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.K.00631
544	[37] Menon MRG, Walker JL, Court-Brown CM. The epidemiology of fractures in
545	adolescents with reference to social deprivation. Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery -
546	Series B, 2008; 90(11): 1482–1486. https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.90B11.21163
547	[38] Eskandari F, Martinez PE, Torvik S, Phillips TM, Sternberg EM, Mistry S, et al. Low
548	bone mass in premenopausal women with depression. Archives of Internal Medicine,
549	2007; 167: 2329–2336. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.167.21.2329
550	[39] Cauley JA, Chalhoub D, Kassem AM, Fuleihan GEH. Geographic and ethnic disparities
551	in osteoporotic fractures. Nature Reviews Endocrinology, 2014; 10(6): 338–351.
552	https://doi.org/10.1038/nrendo.2014.51
553	[40] Bradley C, Harrison JE. (2007). Fall-related hospitalisations among older people:
554	Sociocultural and regional aspects. AIHW. Available at:
555	https://www.aihw.gov.au/getmedia/17a9a4b4-32a1-4481-8a42-
556	<u>b67ec21db92f/10447.pdf.aspx?inline=true</u> , accessed on 28th March 2020
557	[41] Wolff J, McCrone P, Patel A, Kaier K, Normann C. Predictors of length of stay in
558	psychiatry: Analyses of electronic medical records. BMC Psychiatry, 2015;15(1): 238.
559	https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-015-0623-6
560	[42] Stubbs B, Patchay B, Soundy A, Schofield P. The avoidance of activities due to fear of

561	falling contribute to sedentary behavior among community-dwelling older adults with
562	chronic musculoskeletal pain: a multisite observational study. Pain Med, 2014; 15(11):
563	1861-1871. doi: 10.1111/pme.12570.
564	[43] Vestergaard P. Skeletal effects of central nervous system active drugs: anxiolytics,
565	sedatives, antidepressants, lithum and neuroletpics. Curr Drug Saf, 2008; 3: 185-189.
566	DOI: <u>10.2174/157488608785699432</u>
567	[44] Zamani A, Omrani GR, Nasab MM. Lithium's effect on bone mineral density. Bone,
568	2009; 44: 331-334. doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2008.10.001.
569	[45] Klibanski A, Biller BMK, Rosenthal DI, Schoenfeld DA, Saxe V. Effects of prolactin
570	and estrogen deficiency in amenorrheic bone loss. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology
571	and Metabolism, 1988; 67: 124-130. https://doi.org/10.1210/jcem-67-1-124
572	[46] Crews MPK, Howes OD. Is antipsychotic treatment linked to low bone mineral density
573	and osteoporosis? A review of the evidence and the clinical implications. In Human
574	Psychopharmacology 2012; 27(1): 15–23. https://doi.org/10.1002/hup.1265
575	[47] Coupland C, Dhiman P, Morriss R, Arthur A, Barton G, Hippisley-Cox J.
576	Antidepressant use and risk of adverse outcomes in older people: Population based
577	cohort study. BMJ (Online), 2011; 343: 4551. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d4551
578	[48] Rauma PH, Honkanen RJ, Williams LJ, Tuppurainen MT, Kröger HP, Koivumaa-
579	Honkanen H. Effects of antidepressants on postmenopausal bone loss - A 5-year
580	longitudinal study from the OSTPRE cohort. Bone, 2016; 89: 25-31.
581	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2016.05.003
582	[49] Ruths S, Bakken MS, Ranhoff AH, Hunskaar S, Engesæter LB, Engeland A. Risk of hip

fracture among older people using antihypertensive drugs: A nationwide cohort study.

584	BMC Geriatrics, 2015; 15: 153. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-015-0154-5
585	[50] Rossini M, Viapiana O, Adami S, Idolazzi L, Buda S, Veronesi C, Degli Esposti L, Gatti
586	D. Medication use before and after hip fracture: A population-based cohort and case-
587	control study. Drugs and Aging, 2014; 31: 547-553. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40266-
588	014-0184-2
589	[51] Vestergaard P, Rejnmark L, Mosekilde L. Fracture risk associated with the use of
590	morphine and opiates. Journal of Internal Medicine, 2006; 260(1): 76-87.
591	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2796.2006.01667.x
592	[52] Solomon DH, Mogun H, Garneau K, Fischer MA. Risk of fractures in older adults using
593	antihypertensive medications. Journal of Bone and Mineral Research, 2011; 26(7):
594	1561–1567. https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.356
595	[53] Pérez-Castrillón JL, Silva J, Justo I, Sanz A, Martín-Luquero M, Igea R, et al. Effect of
596	quinapril, quinapril-hydrochlorothiazide, and enalapril on the bone mass of hypertensive
597	subjects: Relationship with angiotensin converting enzyme polymorphisms. American
598	Journal of Hypertension, 2003; 16: 453-459. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-
599	7061(03)00845-8
600	[54] Choi EJI, Kim SA, Kim NRI, Rhee JA, Yun YW, Shin MH. Risk factors for falls in
601	older Korean adults: the 2011 Community Health Survey. Journal of Korean Medical
602	Science, 2014; 29(11): 1482–1487. https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2014.29.11.1482
603	[55] Menant JC, Wong AKW, Trollor JN, Close JCT, Lord SR. Depressive Symptoms and
604	Orthostatic Hypotension Are Risk Factors for Unexplained Falls in Community-Living
605	Older People. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 2016; 64: 1073–1078.
606	https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.14104

607	[56] Soliman Y, Meyer R, Baum N. (2016). Falls in the Elderly Secondary to Urinary
608	Symptoms. Reviews in Urology, 2016; 18(1): 28–32.
609	[57] Wang J, You W, Jing Z, Wang R, Fu Z, Wang Y. Increased risk of vertebral fracture in
610	patients with diabetes: a meta-analysis of cohort studies. In International Orthopaedics
611	2016; 40(6): 1299–1307. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-016-3146-y
612	[58] Ojike N, Sowers JR, Seixas A, Ravenell J, Rodriguez-Figueroa G, Awadallah M, et al.
613	Psychological distress and hypertension: results from the national health interview
614	survey for 2004-2013. CardioRenal Medicine, 2016; 6(3): 198–208.
615	https://doi.org/10.1159/000443933
616	[59] Friedman SM, Mendelson DA. Epidemiology of fragility fractures. Clinics in Geriatric
617	Medicine 2014; 30(2): 175–181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cger.2014.01.001
618	[60] Carbone LD, Bková P, Fink HA, Lee JS, Chen Z, Ahmed A, Parashar S, Robbins JR.
619	Hip fractures and heart failure: Findings from the Cardiovascular Health Study.
620	European Heart Journal, 2010; 31: 77–84. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehp483
621	[61] Moya A, Sutton R, Ammirati F, Blanc JJ, Brignole M, Dahm JB, et al. Guidelines for the
622	diagnosis and management of syncope (version 2009). European Heart Journal 2009;
623	30(21): e2631–e2671. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehp298
624	[62] López-Ibarra PJ, Pastor MMC, Escobar-Jiménez F, Pardo MDS, Gonzlez AG, De Dios
625	Luna J, et al. Bone mineral density at time of clinical diagnosis of adult-onset type 1
626	diabetes mellitus. Endocrine Practice, 2001; 7: 346–351.
627	https://doi.org/10.4158/EP.7.5.346

[63] Kim S-Y, Lee J-K, Sim S, Choi HG. Hearing impairement increases the risk of distal radius, hip and spine fractures: a longitudinal follow-up study using a national sample

630	cohort. PLoS One, 2018; 13(2): e0192820. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0192820
631	[64] Keller BK, Morton JL, Thomas VS, Potter JF. The effect of hearing and visual
632	impairments on functional status. J Am Geriatr Soc, 1999; 47(11): 1319-1325.
633	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.1999.tb07432.x
634	[65] American Geriatrics Society, British Geriatrics Society, and A. A. of, & Orthopaedic
635	Surgeons. Guideline for the Prevention of Falls in Older Persons and American
636	Academy of Orthn of opaedic Surgeons Panel on Falls Prevention. American Geriatrics
637	Society, 2001; 49(5): 664–672.
638	[66] Briggs R, Kennelly SP, Kenny RA. Does baseline depression increase the risk of
639	unexplained and accidental falls in a cohort of community-dwelling older people? Data
640	from The Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing (TILDA). International Journal of
641	Geriatric Psychiatry, 2018; 33(2): e205–e211. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.4770
642	[67] Van Den Berg M, Verdijk NA, Leusink GL, Wijnands-Van Gent CJM., Romeijnders
643	AC, Pop VJM, et al. Depression after low-energy fracture in older women predicts
644	future falls: A prospective observational study. BMC Geriatrics, 2011; 11: 73.
645	https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2318-11-73
646	[68] Lee SC, Hu LY, Huang MW, Shen CC, Huang WL, Lu T, Hsu CL, Pan CC. Risk of
647	vertebral fracture in patients diagnosed with a depressive disorder: A nationwide
648	population-based cohort study. Clinics, 2017; 72(1): 44–50.
649	https://doi.org/10.6061/clinics/2017(01)08
650	[69] Gleason LJ, Menzies IB, Mendelson DA, Kates SL, Friedman SM. Diagnosis and
651	Treatment of Osteoporosis in High-Risk Patients Prior to Hip Fracture. Geriatric
652	Orthopaedic Surgery & Rehabilitation, 2012; 3(2): 79–83.
653	https://doi.org/10.1177/2151458512454878

654	[70] Appleby PN, Allen NE, Roddam AW, Key TJ. Physical activity and fracture risk: A
655	prospective study of 1898 incident fractures among 34 696 British men and women.
656	Journal of Bone and Mineral Metabolism, 2008; 26: 191–198.
657	https://doi.org/10.1007/s00774-007-0806-4
658	[71] Choi M, Hector M. Effectiveness of intervention programs in preventing falls: A
659	systematic review of recent 10 years and meta-analysis. Journal of the American
660	Medical Directors Association, 2012; 13(2): e13-e21.
661	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2011.04.022
662	[72] Krogh J, Nordentoft M, Sterne JAC, Lawlor DA. The effect of exercise in clinically
663	depressed adults: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.
664	Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 2011; 72: 529–538.
665	https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.08r04913blu
666	[73] Zijlstra GAR, Van Haastregt JCM, Ambergen T, Van Rossum E, Van Eijk JTM,
667	Tennstedt SL, Kempen GIJM. Effects of a multicomponent cognitive behavioral group
668	intervention on fear of falling and activity avoidance in community-dwelling older
669	adults: Results of a randomized controlled trial. Journal of the American Geriatrics
670	Society, 2009; 57(11): 2020–2028. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2009.02489.x
671	
672	
673	
674	
675	

TO COLONIA ON THE COL

Table 1: Characteristics of those Mood [affective] disorders patients who were admitted to hospital with a fall/fracture after a diagnosis of Mood [affective] disorders (F30\* to F34\*).

	Presence of falls		Presence of fractures	
Characteristics of sample	No (n= 34,270)	Yes (n= 1,831)	Nogn= 33,208)	Yes (n= 2,193)
Age at the time of Mood [affective] disorders diagnosis			owr	
18- 34	12685 (37.0)	205 (11.2)	12572 \$\overline{\bar{\pi}} 37.1)	318 (14.5)
35- 49	11409 (33.3)	336 (18.4)	11346 (33.5)	399 (18.2)
50- 64	5829 (17.0)	362 (19.8)	5751 ( <b>‡</b> 7.0)	440 (20.1)
65- 79	2797 (8.2)	485 (26.5)	2728 (8.0)	554 (25.3)
80 & over	1550 (4.5)	443 (24.2)	1511 (4.5)	482 (22.0)
Gender			mj. O	
Female	20627 (60.2)	1107 (60.5)	20348 (60.0)	1386 (63.2)
Male	13638 (39.8)	724 (39.5)	13555 40.0)	807 (36.8)
Ethnicity			.con	
White	20772 (60.6)	1519 (83.0)	20536 (60.6)	1755 (80.0)
Non-white	12450 (36.3)	288 (15.7)	12333₹36.4)	405 (18.5)
Marital status			ril 23	
Cohabiting	7957 (23.2)	416 (22.7)	7867 (23.2)	506 (23.1)
Non-cohabiting	23028 (67.2)	1345 (73.5)	22776 <b>(</b> 67.2)	1597 (72.8)
Index of multiple deprivation: IMD 2015 (SD)	27.97 (11.31)	27.90 (11.53)	27.97 (11.30)	27.97 (11.52)
Least deprived quintile	6657 (19.4)	388 (21.2)	$6593 (\frac{1}{19}.4)$	452 (20.6)
2nd most deprived quintile	6682 (19.5)	378 (20.6)	6643 (\$9.6)	417 (19.0)
3rd most deprived quintile	6706 (19.6)	354 (19.3)	$6637 \ (\frac{2}{8}9.6)$	423 (19.3)
Most deprived quintile	6708 (19.6)	346 (18.9)	6612 (\$9.5)	442 (20.2)

	BMJ Open		Vbmjopen-2021-055070 on				
			507(				
Medication prescription (within 6 months before or after N	Mood [affective]	disorders diagnosis	s) og				
Anticholinergics	17714 (51.7)	1089 (59.5)	17489 <b>£</b> 51.6)	1314 (59.9)			
Antihypertensives	2561 (7.5)	386 (21.1)	2553 (₹.5)	394 (18.0)			
Antidepressants	19351 (56.5)	1168 (63.8)	19113 (56.4)	1406 (64.1)			
Antipsychotics	8777 (25.6)	469 (25.6)	8694 (25.6)	552 (25.2)			
Anxiolytics and Hypnotics	9443 (27.6)	558 (30.5)	9349 (27.6)	652 (29.7)			
Analgesics	3083 (9.0)	405 (22.1)	3059 ( <u>§</u> .0)	429 (19.6)			
Number of medications received (within 6 months before or after Mood [affective] disorders diagnosise							
	10207 (29.8)	394 (21.5)	10126≩29.9)	475 (21.7)			
1	5330 (15.6)	259 (14.1)	5275 (\$\overline{1}\overline{5}.6)	314 (14.3)			
2	7062 (20.6)	360 (19.7)	6961 (20.5)	461 (21.0)			
3	6599 (19.3)	361 (19.7)	6503 (\$\frac{1}{2}9.2)	457 (20.8)			
4	3858 (11.3)	304 (16.6)	3839 (\$\frac{9}{2}1.3)	323 (14.7)			
5	1038 (3.0)	121 (6.6)	1029 (3.0)	130 (5.9)			
6	176 (0.5)	32 (1.7)	175 (0 3)	33 (1.5)			
Other psychiatric conditions (within six months before or after Mood [affective] disorders diagnosis) &							
F00- F03 (Dementia)	754 (2.2)	207 (11.3)	749 (2 <u>3</u> )	212 (9.7)			
F 20- F29 (Schizophrenia spectrum disorder)	2701 (7.9)	119 (6.5)	2676 (英9)	144 (6.6)			
F30- F31 (Bipolar affective disorder)	5489 (16.0)	222 (12.1)	5475 (1 <u>6</u> .1)	236 (10.8)			
F50 (Eating Disorders)	447 (1.3)	13 (0.7)	441 (13)	19 (0.9)			
F40- F48 (Neurotic, stress-related and somatoform disorders)	` /	147 (8.0)	3601 ( <u>\$</u> 0.6)	19 (0.9)			
F 60 (Disorders of adult personality and behaviour)	1436 (4.2)	77 (4.2)	1428 (東2.2)	85 (3.9)			
1 00 (Disorders of addit personanty and benaviour)	1430 (4.2)	// ( <del>T</del> .2)	1720 (3.2) ot op	05 (5.3)			
Problem HoNOS (score 2 or over) (within six months before or after Mood [affective] disorders diagnosis)							
Agitated Behaviour	3571 (10.4)	234 (12.8)	3547 (\$0.5)	258 (11.8)			
			уруг				

1		BMJ Open		bmjopen-2021-05567 354567	
	Self-Injury	3586 (10.5)	186 (10.2)	3545 <b>6</b> 10 5)	227 (10.4)
	Problem Drinking Drugs	2957 (8.6)	204 (11.1)	2932 (8.6)	229 (10.4)
	Cognitive Problems	2821 (8.2)	349 (19.1)	2792 (8.2)	378 (17.2)
	Physical Illness	6514 (19.0)	770 (42.1)	6355₹18.7)	929 (42.4)
	Hallucinations	3198 (9.3)	175 (9.6)	3176 (9.4)	197 (9.0)
	Depressed Mood	14582 (42.6)	766 (41.8)	14390 (42.4)	958 (43.7)
	Relationship Problems	7644 (22.3)	342 (18.7)	7560 <del>(</del> 22.3)	426 (19.4)
	Daily Living Problems	5854 (17.1)	576 (31.5)	5723 <b>§</b> 16.9)	707 (32.2)
	Living Conditions Problems Score	3431 (10)	190 (10.4)	3404 (10.0)	217 (9.9)
	Occupational Problems	5574 (16.3)	392 (21.4)	$5513\frac{\overline{9}}{4}16.3$	453 (20.7)
	Mean overall HoNoS score (SD)	10.67 (5.63)	11.64 (5.53)	10.64 (5.63)	11.91 (5.46)
	Number with missing HoNoS	12545 (36.6)	523 (28.6)	1241 (36.6)	657 (30.0)
	Hospital admissions (within six months before or after I			<b>is)</b> 1089 (₹2)	240 (11.4)
	Ischaemia +CHD+ IHD	1128 (3.3)	210 (11.5)		249 (11.4)
	Arrhythmia + AF Heart failure	1003 (2.9)	197 (10.8)	967 (2 <b>3</b> )	233 (10.6)
	Diabetes	437 (1.3)	88 (4.8)	417 (12)	108 (4.9)
	Hypotension	1516 (4.4)	264 (14.4)	1488 ( <b>4</b> .4)	292 (13.3) 115 (5.2)
	Hypercholesterolemia	435 (1.3) 1097 (3.2)	104 (5.7) 221 (12.1)	424 (1월) 1090 (32)	228 (10.4)
	Hypertension	2837 (8.3)	546 (29.8)	2752 (§ 1)	631 (28.8)
	Urinary tract infections (UTI)	1366 (4.0)	324 (17.7)	1297 (3.8)	393 (17.9)
	Osteoporosis	409 (1.2)	121 (6.6)	183 (0వ్ర)	347 (15.8)
	Visual Disturbance and Blindness	241 (0.7)	53 (2.9)	246 (0g/)	48 (2.2)
	Hearing Loss	189 (0.6)	41 (2.2)	174 (05)	56 (2.6)
	Syncope or Collapse	1990 (5.8)	444 (24.2)	2022 ( .0)	412 (18.8)
	Parkinson's Disease	116 (0.3)	45 (2.5)	128 (0.4)	33 (1.5)
	Falls before diagnosis	750 (2.2)	267 (14.6)		268 (12.2)
			( ·/	749 (2%) 749 (2%) 749 (2%)	

Page 35 of 51

/bmjopen-2021-

March 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

Fractures before diagnosis mean number of attendances to A&E following Mood	1075 (3.1)	231 (12.6)	860 (25) 4.00 (962)	446 (20.3)
[affective] disorders diagnosis (SD)	3.94 (9.98)	16.64 (28.88)	_	13.67 (29.35)
For per	Property of the property of th		1 March 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protecte	

BMJ Open

Table 2: Univariate Cox proportional hazard model (95% CI) showing factors affecting time to first facture hospital admission since diagnosis of Mood [affective] disorders

	Outcome falls			Outcome fractures	
Characteristics	HR (95% CI)	P value	1 March 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.	HR (95% CI)	P value
Age at the time of Mood [affective] disorders diagnosis			022.		
18- 34	Ref.		Do	Ref.	
35- 49	1.74 (1.46, 2.07)	< 0.001	vnlo	1.33 (1.15, 1.54)	< 0.001
50- 64	3.88 (3.27, 4.61)	< 0.001	ade	3.03 (2.62, 3.50)	< 0.001
65- 79	12.41 (10.54, 14.62)	< 0.001	d fro	9.11 (7.94, 10.46)	< 0.001
80 & over	26.94 (22.8, 31.83)	<0.001	m http	18.46 (16.00, 21.29)	<0.001
			o://bmj		
Female gender	0.99 (0.90, 1.09)	0.87	ope	1.12 (1.03, 1.22)	0.01
Non-European ethnicity	0.32 (0.28, 0.37)	< 0.001	n.bn	0.39 (0.35, 0.44)	< 0.001
Non-cohabiting marital status	1.08 (0.97, 1.21)	0.17	າj.com	1.05 (0.95, 1.16)	0.31
Deprivation quintile (IMD 2015)			V on /		
Least deprived quintile	Ref.		prii	Ref.	
2nd least deprived quintile	0.83 (0.71, 0.96)	0.01	23,	0.89(0.78, 0.99)	0.04
3rd most deprived quintile	0.88 (0.76, 1.02)	0.09	202	0.90 (0.79, 1.03)	0.13
2nd most deprived quintile	0.94 (0.82, 1.09)	0.43	4 by	0.89 (0.78, 1.00)	0.05
Most deprived quintile	0.86 (0.74, 0.99)	0.04	gues	0.94 (0.82, 1.07)	0.35
Medication prescribed (within one year before or after Moo	d [affective] disorders dia	gnosis)	t. Prot		
Anticholinergics received	1.42 (1.3, 1.56)	< 0.001	ecte	1.45 (1.33, 1.57)	< 0.001
Antihypertensive received	3.69 (3.3, 4.13)	< 0.001	ğ	2.98 (2.67, 3.33)	< 0.001
Antidepressants received	1.41 (1.29, 1.56)	<0.001	/ copyr	1.43 (1.31, 1.56)	<0.001
			ight.		

5

6

8

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30 31

32

33

34

35

36

37 38

43

44 45 46 0.12

0.18

< 0.001

< 0.001

< 0.001

0.01

< 0.001

0.05

0.06

0.22

0.71

0.06

0.48

< 0.001

< 0.001

0.01

0.02

< 0.001

< 0.001

0.10

< 0.001

< 0.001

Page 39 of 51		BMJ Open	vamjope		
1 2			<0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001		
3	Ischaemia +CHD+ IHD	5.25 (4.54, 6.06)	<0.001	5.17 (4.53, 5.90)	< 0.001
4 5	Arrhythmia + AF	6.30 (5.43, 7.31)	<0.001	6.10 (5.32, 6.99)	< 0.001
6	Heart failure	7.81 (6.29, 9.68)	<0.001	7.89 (6.49, 9.59)	< 0.001
7	Diabetes	4.66 (4.09, 5.31)	<0.001	4.18 (3.69, 4.73)	< 0.001
8 9	Hypotension	7.29 (5.98, 8.90)	<0.001	6.51 (5.39, 7.86)	< 0.001
10	Hypercholesterolemia	5.14 (4.47, 5.92)	<0.001	3 4.24 (3.70, 4.87)	< 0.001
11	Hypertension	6.08 (5.50, 6.72)	<0.001	5.78 (5.26, 6.34)	< 0.001
12 13	Urinary tract infections (UTI)	7.24 (6.42, 8.17)	<0.001	7.36 (6.59, 8.21)	< 0.001
14	Osteoporosis	7.75 (6.44, 9.32)	<0.001	36.39 (32.35, 40.94)	< 0.001
15	Visual Disturbance and Blindness	5.25 (3.99, 6.90)	<0.001	3.78 (2.84, 5.03)	< 0.001
16 17	Hearing Loss	5.57 (4.09, 7.60)	<0.001	6.45 (4.95, 8.41)	< 0.001
18	Syncope or Collapse	6.17 (5.54, 6.86)	<0.001	4.27 (3.84, 4.76)	< 0.001
19	Parkinson's Disease	9.83 (7.31, 13.23)	<0.001	5.60 (3.97, 7.89)	< 0.001
20			mjo O		
21 22	Falls before Mood [affective] disorders diagnosis	8.88 (7.8, 10.12)	<0.001	7.03 (6.18, 7.99)	< 0.001
23	Fractures before Mood [affective] disorders diagnosis	5.31 (4.62, 6.10)	<0.001	10.67 (9.61, 11.85)	< 0.001
24	Increase in one attendance to A&E following Mood [affective]		.con	, , ,	
25 26	disorders diagnosis	1.01 (1.01, 1.01)	<0.001	1.01 (1.01, 1.01)	<0.001
27 28 29 30 31 32 33			April 23, 2024 by gues		
34 35					
36			t. Protected by copyr		
37			)CTe0		
38			d by	<u>-</u>	
39 40			cop		
41			Ϋ́		

BMJ Open

Table 3: Two models showing predictors of first fall hospital admission among Mood [affective] disorders. (used stepwise removal of factors that were not significant at 0.05 P value). factors that were not significant at 0.05 P value).

	<b>Falls</b>		1 1	
	Model 1 (n=20	,938)	ত্র Model 2 (n=22,4	114)
Characteristics	HR (95% CI)	P value	PR (95% CI)	P value
Age at the time of Mood [affective] disorders diagram	nosis		Dov	
18- 34	Ref.		Ref. 1.58 (1.24, 2.02)	
35-49	1.59 (1.23, 2.06)	< 0.001	ਰੂ 1.58 (1.24, 2.02)	< 0.001
50- 64	3.11 (2.40, 4.01)	< 0.001	ਰੋਂ 2.98 (2.33, 3.81)	< 0.001
65- 79	8.07 (6.31, 10.33)	< 0.001	<sup>3</sup> 7.65 (6.07, 9.64)	< 0.001
80 & over	12.40 (9.51, 16.17)	<0.001	<b>11.80</b> (9.25, 15.05)	< 0.001
			/bmj	
Non-European ethnicity	0.43 (0.36, 0.51)	< 0.001	0.45 (0.38, 0.52)	< 0.001
			n.br	
Deprivation quintile (IMD 2015)			<u>nj.</u> cc	
Least deprived quintile	Ref.		m,	
2nd least deprived quintile	0.99 (0.83, 1.19)	0.92	on A	
3rd most deprived quintile	1.14 (0.95, 1.36)	0.17	pril	
2nd most deprived quintile	1.15 (0.96, 1.38)	0.13	23,	
Most deprived quintile	1.00 (0.84, 1.20)	0.85	202	
•			4 by	
Medication prescribed (within one year before or	after diagnosis of Mood [affe	ctive] disorders)	gue '	
Anticholinergics received	0.95 (0.74, 1.22)	0.68	est.	
Antihypertensive received	0.98 (0.79, 1.21)	0.82	Prot	
Antidepressants received	0.91 (0.74, 1.11)	0.36	ecte	
Anxiolytics and Hypnotics received	1.00 (0.80, 1.24)	0.97	11.80 (9.25, 15.05)  0.45 (0.38, 0.52)  0.45 (0.38, 0.52)  1.39 (1.22, 1.58)	
Analgesics received	1.36 (1.10, 1.68)	0.01	<u>8</u> 1.39 (1.22, 1.58)	< 0.001
	, , ,		pyriq	
			yht.	

Page 41 of 51		BMJ Open		bmjopen-2021-055070	
1 2				-2021-0:	
3 4 5	Increase in one type of polypharmacy	1.02 (0.87, 1.19)	0.80	55070 o	
6	Presence of other psychiatric conditions (within one ye	ar before or after diagn	osis of Mood [af	fectiveHdisorders)	
7	F00- F03 (Dementia)	1.05 (0.86, 1.27)	0.64	- ·	
8 9	F20- F29 (Schizophrenia spectrum disorder)	1.07 (0.85, 1.34)	0.57	March 2022	
10	F30-F31 (Bipolar affective disorder)	0.87 (0.72, 1.06)	0.16	202	
11 12	F40- F48 (Neurotic, stress-related and somatoform disorders)	0.74 (0.60, 0.91)	0.01	© 0.75 (0.61, 0.91)	0.01
13 14	F50 (Eating Disorders)	0.86 (0.36, 2.09)	0.74	nloe	
15		` , ,		wnloaded	
16	One unit increase in HoNoS			Ifro	
17	Self-Injury Self-Injury	1.10 (0.92, 1.32)	0.30	3	
18 19	Cognitive Problems	1.25 (1.06, 1.46)	0.01	1.28 (1.12, 1.46)	< 0.001
20	Physical Illness	1.23 (1.07, 1.42)	<0.001	1.28 (1.12, 1.46) 1.25 (1.10, 1.42) 0.83 (0.74, 0.93)	< 0.001
21	Depressed Mood	0.80 (0.70, 0.92)	<0.001	0.83 (0.74, 0.93)	< 0.001
22 23	Relationship Problems	0.98 (0.84, 1.14)	0.77	•	.0.001
24	Daily Living Problems	1.01 (0.87, 1.17)	0.94	bmj.com/ on	
25	Occupational Problems	0.90 (0.78, 1.03)	0.13	om/	
26	Occupational Froncins	0.70 (0.76, 1.03)	0.13	on .	
27 28	Admitted to general hospital (within one year before or	e often diagnosis of Maa	d [affactiva] disa	P p padoms)≕	
29	Ischaemia +CHD+ IHD			7 (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	
30		0.95 (0.78, 1.15)	0.59	2024	
31	Arrhythmia + AF	0.88 (0.73, 1.07)	0.20		0.07
32 33	Heart failure	1.37 (1.05, 1.78)	0.02	1.27 (1.00, 1.63) 1.36 (1.16, 1.59)	0.05
34	Diabetes	1.37 (1.16, 1.63)	<0.001	5 1.36 (1.16, 1.59)	<0.001
35	Hypotension	1.38 (1.09, 1.75)	0.01	. 1 24 (1 ()7 1 20)	0.01
36	Hypercholesterolemia	1.16 (0.96, 1.39)	0.13	P 1.34 (1.07, 1.08)	
37 38	Hypertension	1.05 (0.88, 1.23)	0.63		
39	Urinary tract infections (UTI)	1.33 (1.13, 1.56)	<0.001	₹ 1.33 (1.14, 1.54)	< 0.001
40				\$\frac{5}{20} 1.33 (1.14, 1.54)	
41				righ	
42				<del>: *</del>	,

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

43

44 45 46 Page 42 of 51

BMJ Open

Table 4: Two models showing predictors of first fracture hospital admission among Mood [affective] desorders patients.

			=	
	Model 1 (n=20	,936)	Model 2 (n=2	2,322)
Characteristics	HR (95% CI)	P value	नु HR (95% CI)	P value
Age at the time of Mood [affective] disorders di	agnosis		2002 2022 2. Paf	
18- 34	Ref.			
35- 49	1.27 (1.02, 1.57)	0.03	§1.27 (1.03, 1.55)	0.02
50- 64	2.31 (1.85, 2.88)	< 0.001	$\frac{3}{8}$ 2.28 (1.85, 2.81)	< 0.001
65- 79	5.75 (4.65, 7.11)	< 0.001	85.55 (4.54, 6.77)	< 0.001
80 & over	7.46 (5.90, 9.45)	<0.001	<u> </u>	<0.001
Female gender	1.21 (1.08, 1.36)	< 0.001	1.15 (1.03, 1.29)	0.01
Non-European ethnicity	0.59 (0.51, 0.68)	< 0.001	0.59 (0.51, 0.67)	< 0.001
			%1.13 (1.03, 1.29) %1.13 (1.03, 1.29) %1.05 (0.51, 0.67) %1.05 (0.51, 0.67) %2.29 (0.51, 0.67)	
Deprivation quintile (IMD 2015)			nj. cor	
Least deprived quintile	Ref.		<del>1</del> 0	
2nd least deprived quintile	1.07 (0.91, 1.28)	0.41	n Ą	
3rd most deprived quintile	1.11 (0.94, 1.32)	0.23	oril 2	
2nd most deprived quintile	1.17 (0.99, 1.39)	0.07	μ N	
Most deprived quintile	1.00 (0.85, 1.19)	0.96	024	
			by (	
Medication prescribed (within one year before	or after diagnosis of Mood [affe	ctive] disorder	s) gues	
Anticholinergics received	1.08 (0.85, 1.26)	0.76	<del>."</del> □	
Antihypertensive received	0.76 (0.65, 0.91)	< 0.001	$\frac{1}{6}$ .80 (0.70, 0.92)	< 0.001
Antidepressants received	1.08 (0.91, 1.28)	0.37	F.80 (0.70, 0.92)	
Analgesics received	1.28 (1.08, 1.52)	< 0.001	₹.33 (1.17, 1.51)	< 0.001
			\$33 (1.17, 1.51) copyrigh	
			<del>.</del>	

	BMJ Open		/bmjopen-2021-055070 on	
Increase in one type of polypharmacy	1.01 (0.93, 1.11)	0.75	1-055070	
Presence of other psychiatric conditions (within one ye	ar before or after diagno	osis of Mood [a	sffecti <u>v</u> e  disorders)	
F00- F03 (Dementia)	1.14 (0.96, 1.41)	0.12	_	
F20- F29 (Schizophrenia spectrum disorder)	1.11 (0.91, 1.38)	0.30	March	
F30- F31 (Bipolar affective disorder)	0.81 (0.67, 0.98)	0.03	80.80 (0.68, 0.95)	0.01
F40- F48 (Neurotic, stress-related and somatoform				
disorders)	0.82 (0.68, 0.99)	0.04	$\frac{9}{5}$ 0.83 (0.70, 0.99)	0.04
One unit increase in HoNoS			Downloaded from http://bm/open.bm/.com/ o	
Cognitive Problems	1.02 (0.87, 1.19)	0.92	ed fr	
Physical Illness	1.36 (1.19, 1.56)	0.83	9 1 40 (1 21 1 67)	<0.001
Hallucinations	0.91 (0.76, 1.10)	< <b>0.001</b> 0.34	1.48 (1.31, 1.07)	< 0.001
Depressed Mood	0.83 (0.72, 0.94)	0.34 <b>0.01</b>	\$0.01 (0.82 1.00)	0.05
Relationship Problems	0.89 (0.77, 1.02)	0.01	0.91 (0.02, 1.00)	0.05
Daily Living Problems	1.12 (0.98, 1.29)		en.b	
Occupational Problems	0.91 (0.79, 1.04)	0.11 0.15	<u></u>	
			/mox	
Admitted to general hospital (within one year before of Ischaemia +CHD+ IHD Arrhythmia + AF	r after diagnosis of Mood	l [affective] di	sorders)	
Ischaemia +CHD+ IHD	1.01 (0.85, 1.22)	0.88	pril	
Arrhythmia + AF	1.03 (0.86, 1.23)	0.78	23,	
Heart failure	1.44 (1.12, 1.86)	0.01	R1.43 (1.14, 1.80)	< 0.001
Diabetes	1.22 (1.04, 1.44)	0.02		< 0.001
Hypotension	1.18 (0.93, 1.48)	0.17	ਉ1.23 (1.06, 1.44)	*****
Hypercholesterolemia	0.85 (0.71, 1.03)	0.10	est.	
Hypertension	1.05 (0.90, 1.23)	0.53	Prot	
Urinary tract infections (UTI)	1.49 (1.28, 1.74)	< 0.001	8. Prote 6. 1.52 (1.32, 1.75)	< 0.001
Osteoporosis	7.31 (5.82, 9.18)	< 0.001	ਭ੍ਰੈ7.00 (5.65, 8.70)	< 0.001
Visual Disturbance and Blindness	1.06 (0.74, 1.53)	0.74	y copyright.	

Page 45 of 51

//bmjopen-2021-055070 on 11 March 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

The RECORD statement – checklist of items, extended from the STROBE statement, that should be reported in observational studies using routinely collected health data.

	Item No.	STROBE items	Location in manuscript where items are reported	RECORD items 055070 on	Location in manuscript where items are
			items are reported	On .	reported
Title and abstrac	et			Z	Терогеси
	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Page 1 and 2	RECORD 1.1: The type of data used should be specified in the title or abstract. When possible, the name of the databases used should be shoulded.  RECORD 1.2: If applicable, the geographic region and timeframe within which the study took place should be reported in the title or abstract.  RECORD 1.3: If linkage between databases was conducted for the study, this should be clearly stated in the title or abstract.	
Introduction				or dostract.	
Background rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Page 4	n April 23,	
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Page 4	2024 by gues	
Methods				e st	
Study Design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Page 5	. Protected	
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Page 5	cted by copyri	
Participants	6	(a) Cohort study - Give the	Page 5	RECORD 6.1: The methods of study	Page 5
		eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection	ittp://bmjopen.bmj.com/sit	population selection (such as codes or algorithms used to identify subjects)	

7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable.	Page 6-8	RECORD 7.1: A complete list of codes and algorithms used to classify exposures, outcomes, confounders, and effect modifiers should be provided. If these cannot be reported, an explanation should be provided.
8	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement).  Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Page 6-8	on 11 March 2022. Downloaded
9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Page 9	
10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Page 5	rom htt
11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen, and why	Page 6-8	rom http://bmjopen.bmj.
			com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. P
			. Protected by copyright
	8	exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable.  8 For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement).  Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group  9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias  10 Explain how the study size was arrived at  11 Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen,	exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable.  8 For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement).  Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group  9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias  10 Explain how the study size was arrived at  11 Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen,

Statistical	12	(a) Describe all statistical	Page 9	jppen-2021-055070 on 11 March 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjoper	
methods		methods, including those used to		n-20	
		control for confounding		021	
		(b) Describe any methods used		-05	
		to examine subgroups and		507	
		interactions		O Q	
		(c) Explain how missing data		<u> </u>	
		were addressed		_ 	
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> - If applicable,		arch	
		explain how loss to follow-up		1 20	
		was addressed		22.	
		Case-control study - If		Dog	
		applicable, explain how		wn le	
		matching of cases and controls		oad	
		was addressed		ed f	
		Cross-sectional study - If		rom	
		applicable, describe analytical	<b>Y</b> /-	n htt	
		methods taking account of	<b>/</b>	<b>p://</b> /	
		sampling strategy	10.	<u>a</u> .	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity		оре	
		analyses		<u></u>	
Data access and			(		Page 5
cleaning methods				describe the extent to which the	
				investigators had access to the database	
				population used to create the study	
				population.	
				ω DECODD 12.2: A-411N1	
				RECORD 12.2: Authors should	
				provide information on the data	
T ' 1				cleaning methods used in the study.	D. C
Linkage				RECORD 12.3: State whether the	Page 6
				study included person-level,	
				institutional-level, or other data linkage	
				across two or more databases. The	
				methods of linkage and methods of	
				linkage quality evaluation should be	
Results				provided. 역	

Page 9  RECORD 13.1: Describe in detail the study (e.g., numbers of individuals at each stage of the study (e.g., numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibli, included in the study, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed)  (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage.  (c) Consider use of a flow diagram  Descriptive data  14  (a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g., demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders  (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (e) Cohort study - summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)  Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of exposure category, or summary measures of outcome events or summary measures of outcome events or summary measures  summary measures    Page 9  RECORD 13.1: Describe in detail the study (f.e., study population selection) including filtering based on data quality, data availability and ghakage. The selection of included persons can be described in the text and/og_by means of the study flow diagram.    Table 1 and page 9    Table 1 and page 9    Table 1 and page 9	Γ	D (: : )	1.2	( ) D + 1 1 0	b 0	DECORD 12.1 D 1 1 2 2 1 1	<b>D</b> 0
Study (e.g., numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligiblity, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed)  (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage. (c) Consider use of a flow diagram  Descriptive data  14 (a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g., demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study - summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)  Outcome data  15 (Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of outcome events or summary measures of oxysoure Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of oxysoure Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or		Participants	13		Page 9	l <u>"</u>	Page 9
eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed)  (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage. (c) Consider use of a flow diagram  Descriptive data  14  (a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g., demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study - summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)  Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or							
Confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed)				study (e.g., numbers potentially		study (i.e., study population selection)	
the study, completing follow-up, and analysed) (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage. (c) Consider use of a flow diagram  Descriptive data  14 (a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g., demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study - summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)  Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure outcome events or summary me				eligible, examined for eligibility,		including filtering based on data	
and analysed) (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage. (c) Consider use of a flow diagram  Descriptive data  14  (a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g., demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study - summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)  Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of outcome events or lumbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or				confirmed eligible, included in			
and analysed) (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage. (c) Consider use of a flow diagram  Descriptive data  14  (a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g., demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study - summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)  Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of outcome events or lumbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or				the study, completing follow-up,		The selection of included persons can	
(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage. (c) Consider use of a flow diagram  Descriptive data  14  (a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g., demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study - summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)  Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers of exposure category, or summary measures of exposure Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or				and analysed)			
Descriptive data  14  (a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g., demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study - summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)  Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers of exposure category, or summary measures of exposure Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure category, or summary measures of exposure Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or						ı <u> </u>	
Descriptive data  14 (a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g., demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study - summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)  Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or						arc arc	
Descriptive data  14 (a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g., demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study - summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)  Outcome data  15 Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or				1 1		h 2	
Descriptive data  14  (a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g., demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study - summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)  Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or outcome events or						022	
Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or  Page 10	l	Descriptive data	14		Table 1 and page 9	•	
Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or  Page 10		1		3		nwc	
Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or  Page 10						loa	
Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or  Page 10						ded	
Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or  Page 10				•		fro	
Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or  Page 10					V <sub>4</sub>	m #	
Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or  Page 10						ittp:	
Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or  Page 10						//br	
Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or  Page 10						njop	
Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or  Page 10						) en	
Outcome data  15  Cohort study - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time  Case-control study - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure  Cross-sectional study - Report numbers of outcome events or  Page 10						.bm	
ס	}	Outcome data	15		Daga 10	njj. DC	
		Outcome data	13		rage 10	JMC	
ס						on	
ס						Apr	
ס				, <u> </u>		   ±   2;	
ס				1		3, 2	
ס						022	
ס						by	
ס						n gu	
ס				numbers of outcome events or		est.	
summary measures	ļ					ס	
				summary measures		) Dtec	

Page 51 of 51				BMJ Open	1136/bm	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounderadjusted estimates and their precision (e.g., 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	Page 10-11	jppen-2021-055070 on 11 March 2022. Downloac	
16 17 18 19 20	Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done— e.g., analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Not applicable	ed from http://	
21	Discussion					
22	Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Page 13-16	open.t	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34	Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision.  Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Page 16-17	RECORD 19.1: Discuss the implications of using data that were not created or collected to answer the specific research question(s). Include discussion of misclassification bias, unmeasured confounding, missing data, and changing eligibility over time, as they pertain to the study being reported.	Page 16-17
35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Page 17-18	guest. Protected by copyright	
43 44 45 46	Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study of results	Page 17 http://bmjopen.bmj.com/sit		

Other Information Science Control of the Control of					
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Page 18	n-2021-055070 o	
Accessibility of protocol, raw data, and programming code				RECORD 22.1: Authors should provide information on how a access any supplemental information such as the study protocol, raw data, or programming code.	Page 19

\*Reference: Benchimol EI, Smeeth L, Guttmann A, Harron K, Moher D, Petersen I, Sørensen HT, von Elm E, Langen SM, the RECORD Working Committee. The REporting of studies Conducted using Observational Routinely-collected health Data (RECORD) Statement. PLoS Medicine 2015; in press. from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

\*Checklist is protected under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.

# **BMJ Open**

# Predictors of falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation in 36,101 people with affective disorders: A large representative cohort study

Journal:	BMJ Open		
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-055070.R1		
Article Type:	Original research		
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Feb-2022		
Complete List of Authors:	Ma, Ruimin; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Perera, Gayan; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Romano, Eugenia; King's College London, Psychological Medicine Vancampfort, Davy; KU Leuven Koyanagi, Ai; Parc Sanitari Sant Joan de Deu, Research and Development Unit Stewart, Robert; King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry Mueller, Christoph; King's College London, Department of Old Age Psychiatry Stubbs, B; King's College London, Psychological Medicine		
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Mental health		
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology		
Keywords:	MENTAL HEALTH, Anxiety disorders < PSYCHIATRY, Adult psychiatry < PSYCHIATRY, Depression & mood disorders < PSYCHIATRY		

SCHOLARONE™ Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our licence.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which Creative Commons licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

- 1 Predictors of falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation in 36,101 people with
- 2 affective disorders: A large representative cohort study
- 3 Running title: Predictors of falls and fractures in people with affective disorders
- 4 Ruimin Ma<sup>a</sup>, Gayan Perera, Eugenia Romano, Davy Vancampfort, d, Ai Koyanagi, f,
- 5 Robert Stewart<sup>a, b</sup>, Christoph Mueller<sup>^,a, b</sup> Brendon Stubbs<sup>^,a, b</sup>,
- 6 a Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience (IoPPN), King's College London,
- 7 London, United Kingdom
- 8 b South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom
- 9 c KU Leuven University of Leuven, Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, Leuven, Belgium
- 10 d KU Leuven University of Leuven, University Psychiatric Centre KU Leuven, Leuven,
- 11 Kortenberg, Belgium
- 12 e Research and Development Unit, Parc Sanitari Sant Joan de Déu, Universitat de Barcelona,
- Fundació Sant Joan de Déu, Dr. Antoni Pujadas, 42 ,Sant Boi de Llobregat, Barcelona 08830,
- 14 Spain
- 15 f ICREA, Pg. Lluis Companys 23, Barcelona, Spain
- 16 ^ Joint first author
- 17 ^^ Joint last author
- Corresponding author at: Psychological Medicine, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology
- and Neuroscience (IoPPN), King's College London, De Crespigny Park, London, BOX
- SE5 8AF, United Kingdom.
- 21 Email address: ruimin.1.ma@kcl.ac.uk

- **Objectives:** To investigate predictors of falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation in people
- with affective disorders.
- **Design**: Cohort study
- **Setting**: the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust (SLaM) Biomedical Research
- 28 Centre (BRC) Case Register
- **Participants**: A large cohort of people with affective disorders (ICD10 codes F30-F34)
- diagnosed between January 2008 and March 2016 was assembled using data from the SLaM
- 31 BRC Case Register
- **Primary and secondary outcome measures**: Falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation
- were ascertained from linked national hospitalisation data. Multivariable Cox proportional
- hazards analyses were administrated to identify predictors of first falls and fractures.
- Results: Of 36,101 people with affective disorders (mean age 44.4 years, 60.2% female), 816
- 36 (incidence rate 9.91 per 1000 person years) and 1,117 (incidence rate 11.92 per 1000 person
- years) experienced either a fall or fracture respectively. In multivariable analyses, older age,
- analgesics use, increased physical illness burden, previous hospital admission due to certain
- 39 co-morbid physical illnesses and increase in attendances to accident and emergency services
- 40 following diagnosis were significant risk factors for both falls and fractures. Having a history
- of falls was a strong risk factor for recurrent falls, and a previous fracture was also associated
- 42 with future fractures.
- **Conclusions**: Over a mean 5 years' follow-up, approximately 8% of people with affective
- 44 disorders were hospitalised with a fall or fracture. Several similar factors were found to
- 45 predict risk of falls and fracture, for example, older age, comorbid physical disorders and
- analgesic use. Routine screening for bone mineral density and falls prevention programmes
- should be considered for this clinical group.

Key word	ls: osteoporosis	, affective	disorders,	falls,	fractures,	hospital	admission

# Strength and limitation of the study:

- Predictors of falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation in people with affective disorders were investigated with a large representative cohort
- Data of the study were derived directly from the electronic health record
- Falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation were ascertained from linked national hospitalisation data
- We did not stratify according to different affective disorder subtypes and psychotropic medication categories
- We had no information on lifestyle factors and type of fractures recorded at admission

#### Word count: 3636/4000

#### Introduction

Falls and fractures are strongly related with increased morbidity, mortality, disability, and healthcare expenditure in the general population [1], and they are a frequent issue in older adults [2]. They often overlap, with more than 90% of hip fractures caused by falls [3] and share similar and multifactorial causes, such as muscle weakness [4] and use of antiepileptic drugs [5]. Several government strategies have been implemented to prevent and assess falls in the general population [6]. Fractures, for example, hip and spine fractures increase the risk of future falls and fractures [7]. Over 3 million people in the UK are at a high risk for fractures [8], and prevention has been acknowledged as a worldwide priority [9]. However, management is difficult, as causes for falls and fractures can be both intrinsic and extrinsic, and prevention requires both pharmacologic and nonpharmacologic interventions [3]. Despite some progress in the general population, there is poor evidence on risk factors for falls and fractures for patients with affective disorders. People with mental health problems like depression and schizophrenia report higher risks of falls and fractures compared to the general population [10, 11], and despite poor evidence in people with bipolar disorders, a few studies suggest this population may also be at increased risk [12, 13]. Several studies have investigated the association between bone loss and depression, but there is a lack of large-scale cohort studies focussing on falls and fractures and related predictors. Another major limitation is that the majority of studies have relied on self-reported affective symptoms rather than clinical diagnosis [14, 15]. Given the increased concerns about the multifactorial causes of falls and fractures [3, 4, 5], and as an answer to the lack of large-scale studies on the matter, this study examines a large representative cohort study to investigate predictors of falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation among people with clinically diagnosed affective disorders. In this way, we aim to provide results based on clinical diagnosis rather than self-reported data [14, 15], presenting a solid overview on potential risk factors for falls and fractures in the high-risk population of people with affective disorders.

#### Methods

A retrospective observational study was carried out using data from the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust (SLaM) Biomedical Research Centre (BRC) Case Register. SLaM is one of the largest mental health and dementia care providers in Europe, serving a geographic catchment of four South London Boroughs (including Lambeth, Lewisham, Southwark, and Croydon) with a population in excess of 1.3 million. Data for this study were retrieved using the Clinical Record Interactive Search (CRIS) platform, which enables a deidentified version of SLaM's electronic health record to be accessible for research projects within a robust and patient-led government framework [16]. The SLaM BRC Case Register has been described in detail elsewhere [17] and has supported a wide range of studies [18]. 19], including longitudinal cohort studies investigating falls and fractures in other populations [20, 21]. Data are currently archived in CRIS on more than 450,000 cases with a wide variety of mental disorders. CRIS has full approval for secondary analysis (Oxford Research Ethnic Committee C, reference 18/SC/0372). Data from source structured fields have been extensively supplemented through natural language process (NLP) applications using Generalised Architecture for Text Engineering software, applying information extraction techniques to derive structured information from the extensive text fields held in the mental health record [17].

#### Participants, study period and additional data sources

All SLaM patients with mood [affective] disorders (ICD10 codes F30-F34), diagnosed between 1st of January 2008 and 31st March 2016, were included. Those patients with an age

under 18 at the time of mood disorders were excluded. SLaM patient records have been linked with national Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) which are compiled from all NHS Trusts in England (both acute and mental health services), including statistical abstracts of records of all inpatient episodes, as well as outpatient and emergency care [17]. In addition, CRIS data have been linked to the Office for National Statistics (ONS) mortality records over the same period.

#### Patient and public involvement (PPI)

The entire research program was developed after extensive patient, public and carer input, who helped develop the study, and contributed to the funding applicable. They co-developed the research questions, outcomes and contributed to factors included in the models. Moreover, they reinforced this research as a neglected topic of utmost importance to them. The PPI group designed the study with the senior researcher of the paper (Dr BS), they were involved in the conception of the idea, the planning of the study during bimonthly meetings to discuss study design, hypotheses, outcomes and what matters to patients of interest. They were also involved in helping interpret the data outputs and publication. Results will be summarised and made available to the PPI group through local newsletters and inform clinical services and local codeveloped Recovery College Courses.

# Co-primary outcome: falls and any fractures

The co-primary outcomes were hospital admissions relating to a fall or any fracture extracted from linked HES data and all discharge diagnoses (primary or any secondary diagnosis codes) recorded between January 2008 to March 2016, and based on the following ICD 10 codes: i) falls (W00-W19); ii) fractures (M80-M84, M907, S02, S12, S32, S42, S52, S62, S72, S82, S92, S22, T02, T08, T10, T12X, T902, T911, T912, T921). In addition, linked mortality records from the ONS linkage were examined for any instance of fall or fracture ICD codes in

any cause of death field on the death certificate to identify the date of death attributed to a fall or fracture.

#### Measurements

Several additional measurements were obtained from CRIS. All independent variables (covariates) were defined according to the value closest to the date of the first recorded mood [affective] disorder diagnosis. Demographic covariates comprised: age at diagnosis, gender, and ethnicity [multiple codes categorised into 1) White, consists of White British, White Irish and other White; and 2) Non-White]. Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2015) for the neighbourhood of residence (i.e. Lower Super Output Area, which consists of approximately 650 households) at the time of diagnosis was divided into quintiles according to deprivation scores with equal size allocated to each group. The IMD has previously been used in CRIS [22] and combines Census-derived data at area level across several domains including income, employment, health, education, barriers to housing and services, living environment, and crime [23]. Information on cohabiting status (Cohabiting: married/civil partner, married, cohabiting; Non-cohabiting: single, divorced, civil partnership dissolved, widowed, separated) was also ascertained at the index diagnosis.

#### Illness burden

The Health of the Nation Outcome Scales (HoNOS) [24] are routinely administered measures of illness burden in UK mental health services and are recorded in structured fields on the electronic health record. Individual HoNOS item scores (agitated behaviour, self-injury, problem drinking & drugs, cognitive problems, physical illness, hallucinations, depressed mood, relationship problems, daily living problems, living conditions problems, occupational problems) and dates were obtained within 6 months before or after the date of the index

diagnosis, and the closest scores in time to this date were included in analyses. Each HoNOS item is rated on a Likert Scale, ranging from 0 (i.e. no problem) to 4 (i.e. severe or very severe problem). A detailed glossary for HoNOS is reported elsewhere [25]. Scores 2 or over in the individual HoNOS scales were classified as having a problem on each item, generating binary covariates.

#### Mental disorder comorbidity

Diagnoses of F00-F03 (dementia); F20-F29 (schizophrenia spectrum disorder); F40-F48 (neurotic, stress-related and somatoform disorders); F50 (eating disorders); F60-F69 (disorders of adult personality and behaviour) were ascertained within one year before or after the index diagnosis of mood [affective] disorder.

#### Medication

Medications received were extracted from structured medication fields in the record, supplemented by an NLP application applied to text fields ascertaining mentions of current medication [17]. Presence or not of the following medication groups was ascertained on the basis of information within six months before or after the index diagnosis: anticholinergics, antihypertensives, antidepressants, antipsychotics, anxiolytics and hypnotics, and analgesics. The total number of medications prescribed for any condition was calculated for each participant and used as a continuous variable.

#### Physical comorbidity

Information on physical comorbidities was ascertained utilising the data linkage between CRIS and national HES records. Information on all ICD-10 diagnoses at discharge (primary or any secondary diagnosis codes) was ascertained from any hospitalisations within 6 months before or after the index diagnosis date and the following binary variables generated: i) Ischaemic

heart disease (IHD; I20, I21, I22, including coronary heart disease (CHD; I25); ii) Arrhythmia (I44-I49, including atrial fibrillation (AF; I48); iii) Heart failure (I50); iv) Diabetes (E08, E09, E10, E11, E12, E13; v) Hypotension (I95-99); vi) Hypercholesterolemia (E78); vii) Hypertension (I10-15); viii) Urinary tract infections (UTI) (N39); ix) Osteoporosis (M80-85); x) Visual disturbance and blindness (H53-54); xi) Hearing loss (H90-95); xii) Syncope or collapse (R50-R69); xiii) Parkinson's disease (G20). Furthermore, occurrence of falls and/or fractures before the index diagnosis was also collected. Finally, the number of attendances to accident and emergency services (A&E) following the index diagnosis was also recorded.

# Statistical analysis

The study sample was described initially in terms of demographic and clinical variables, followed by unadjusted Cox proportional hazard models to predict the first fall and first fracture separately after the index diagnosis of mood [affective] disorder. The predictor variables at baseline used in the first univariate models included sociodemographic information (year of index diagnosis, mean age, gender, ethnicity, marital status), medications (antipsychotics, anxiolytics & hypnotics, antidepressants, analgesics, anticholinergics, antihypertensives), comorbid psychiatric diagnosis (F20-29 schizophrenia spectrum disorder, F40-48 neurotic/stress disorders, F00-F03 dementia, F50 eating disorders, F60 disorders of adult personality and behaviour), HONOS scores (mean total and each individual item) and physical health comorbidities (as indicated above). Factors that yielded a p-value < 0.10 in the univariate model for fall or fracture outcome were subsequently entered into the multivariable model. A final multivariable Cox proportional hazards model, using stepwise backward elimination technique where those variables not significant (p-value > 0.05) were eliminated, with hazard ratios and 95% confidence intervals (CI) displayed. Having checked a correlation matrix of coefficients in the Cox model, total number of medications received was substantially collinear

with individual types of medication received; therefore, this total number was removed as a covariate. All analyses were conducted utilising STATA, version 13.

#### **Results**

The sample comprised 36,101 people with a diagnosis of mood [affective] disorder (F30\* -F34\*) (mean age at first diagnosis 44.4, SD: 17.8, 60.2% female). Over a mean 5 years' followup, 2,948 patients had a fall and/or a fracture recorded: 816 only a fall, 1,117 only a fracture, and 1,015 both; 1,831 with any fall and 2,193 with any fracture (mean age at first fall 64.2, SD: 24.8; mean age at first fracture 62.5, SD: 22.8 (Supplementary material Table 1). The incidence rate of falls was 9.91 per 1,000 person years and that for fractures 11.92 per 1,000 person years. Table 1 summarises characteristics of those who had a recorded fall or fracture compared to EL. those who did not.

[Table 1]

### Length of hospital stay

The mean length of hospitalisation following a fall (n = 1.831) was 7.9 days (range 0-374), for a total of 20,767 full days in hospital. The mean length of stay in hospital following a fracture (n=2,193) was 13.2 days (range 0-374), for a total of 40,548 days. This equates to 18.51 years of inpatient hospital stay for 1,000-person years of follow-up due to a fall and 36.15 years of inpatient hospital stay for 1,000-person years of follow-up due to a fracture. For the 1,831 patients reporting a fall, the mean hospital admissions due to a fall was 1.5 (range 1-15); for the 2,193 patients reporting a fracture, the mean number of hospital admissions due to a fracture was 2.3 (range 1-42).

#### Factors associated with falls and fractures

Cox proportional hazard models analysing unadjusted predictors of falls and fractures (95%

CI) are reported in Table 2.

[Table 2]

# Multivariable predictors of falls

Multivariable models of factors associated with first fall hospital admission are presented in Table 3. In Model 2, older age was strongly associated with higher risk, and Non-European ethnicity with lower risk, but neighbourhood deprivation reported no association. Analgesics had a significant association (with increased risk), and of co-morbid psychiatric conditions, only the ICD-10 F40-F48 group had a significant association (with reduced risk). Of the HoNOS items, cognitive problems and physical illness were associated with higher risk, and depressed mood problems with lower risk. Higher risk of falls was associated with several hospitalisation discharge diagnoses, namely heart failure, diabetes, hypotension, UTI, osteoporosis, and syncope or collapse. Hospitalised fall was associated with having a previous history of falls reported before the index diagnosis and with increased A&E attendance after the index diagnosis.

[Table 3]

# **Multivariable predictors of fractures**

Table 4 presents multivariable models of factors associated with first fracture hospitalisation.

Fracture risk was increased in older patients and women and was decreased in those of Non-

European. Fracture risk was lower in patients receiving antihypertensives and higher in those

receiving analgesics. It was also lower in those with neurotic, stress-related and somatoform

 disorders (i.e. F40-F48), as well as bipolar affective disorder and manic episodes (i.e. F30-F31). An elevated fracture risk was associated with physical illness on the HoNOS. Fracture risk was independently predicted by previous hospitalisations for heart failure, diabetes, UTI, osteoporosis, hearing loss and preceding fracture-related (but not fall-related) hospitalisations. Fracture risk was also associated with higher levels of post-diagnostic A&E attendance.

TO COLONIA ON THE STATE OF THE

268 [Table 4]

#### **Discussion**

To our knowledge, the current study is the first using representative data to investigate the predictors of hospitalised falls and fractures in people with clinically diagnosed affective disorders. Our data suggest that out of 36,101 people with affective disorders, 816 (i.e. 2.26%) and 1,117 (i.e. 3.09%) of patients experienced a fall and fracture, respectively. Length of hospital stay was considerable, equating to 18.51 and 36.15 years of inpatient hospital stay for 1,000-person years of follow-up due to a fall and a fracture, respectively. The key factors increasing the risk of a hospitalised fall were older age, analgesic use, increased illness burden due to cognitive problems and physical illness, a history of general hospital admission due to co-morbid physical illnesses (in particular syncope or collapse), increase in one attendance to A & E following affective disorder diagnosis, and falls before the diagnosis. Similar risk factors for fractures were noted.

Approximately 8.2% of our sample experienced a hospital admission due to either a fall or fracture. Studies on healthy populations have suggested several mechanisms which may explain these elevated risks in our sample, such as vitamin D deficiency [26, 27] and use of antidepressants [28]. Several studies also proposed a negative effect of leptin on bone mass and bone formation through a hypothalamic relay [29]. Some lifestyle factors seem to also be associated with a poor bone health, including physical inactivity [30] and alcohol consumption [31]. Previous studies have hypothesised other risk factors contributing to falls and fractures in people with depressive disorders [32], but no large-scale study has yet focused on patients with clinically diagnosed affective disorders. Our data advance the current literature by providing detailed evidence on how a multitude of demographic, medical, and psychological factors can differently affect risks of falls and fractures in people with affective disorder.

The association between older age and incidence of fall may be due to age-related physical conditions, as well as physiologic (e.g. loss of BMD) [33] and pathologic changes (e.g. decreased cardiovascular functions) [34]. Female gender is also a well-established risk factor for osteoporosis [35], consistent with our finding. Surprisingly, we found no relationship between deprivation and falls and fractures, although previous evidence has associated deprivation with fractures across different age groups [36, 37]. We might suppose that while deprivation is associated with poor nutrition and physical inactivity, people with affective disorders have a poorer lifestyle, compared to the general population [38], regardless of their financial status or living condition. Finally, the protective role of a non-European ethnic background is comparable with previous evidence supporting a higher fracture rate in Caucasian women compared to women from other ethnic groups [39], and a lower fall rate in older immigrants than those with an English-speaking background [40].

Our results provide new evidence on how hospitalisation due to falls or fractures can be an important burden for the NHS resources and for people with affective disorders, who are already at risk for a prolonged hospitalisation [41]. Given the long hospital stay among our sample, its burden on NHS costs in unsurprising. The total cost of fracture is estimated to reach £4.4 billion per year in the UK alone [8]. Several items from the HoNOS were also associated with increased hazard of hospitalisation due to falls or fractures (e.g. cognitive problems). Evidence on the role of these factors on hospital stay among this population is warranted for future research.

Our study reports stress-related and somatoform disorders to be associated with a decreased risk of falls and fractures, which could be due to increased fear avoidance and reduced activities due to stress-related disorders, leading to fewer falls [42]. We also found the presence of bipolar

affective disorder and manic episodes to be protective factors against increased fracture risk. Although there has been little evidence investigating the role of bipolar affective disorder or its characteristics (including manic symptoms) in the risk of fracture, preliminary evidence has suggested an association between the use of lithium (i.e. a primary treatment for bipolar disorder) and decreased fracture risk [43], the preservation and enhancement of bone mass [44].

Surprisingly, neither antidepressants nor antipsychotics were associated with risks of falls or fracture, despite documented associations between antipsychotic medications and reduced bone metabolism [45] and BMD [46]. Evidence on the association between antidepressants and BMD is ambiguous: while some authors reported that some antidepressants, especially SSRIs, have a negative impact on bone strength [47, 48], other findings have been null [49]. However, we did not attempt to account for specific types of antidepressants in the analysis, and previous studies indicate that tricyclic antidepressants have no adverse effect on bone health [28]. On the other hand, analgesics use was associated with increased risks for falls and fractures, consistently with previous findings [50], and possibly mediated by central nervous system effects, such as dizziness [51]. Antihypertensive drugs use was associated with a decreased fracture risk, confirming previous results [52], potentially due to their improving effect on calcium absorption [53].

Finally, extensive evidence has indicated several physical conditions as risk factors for falls or fractures in the general population [54, 55], including UTI [56] and diabetes [57]. It is known that mental health disorders (e.g. depression) increase the chance of major physical comorbidities [58]. However, few studies have established the impact of comorbid physical conditions on risks of falls and fractures among people with affective disorders. Our study indicates heart failure, diabetes, UTI and osteoporosis to be associated with hospitalisation due

to falls or fractures. Hypotension and syncope or collapse were additionally associated with an increased risk of falls, and hearing loss was associated with an elevated fracture risk. Unsurprisingly, osteoporosis was strongly associated with falls and fractures, as it has been acknowledged as the most important yet potentially treatable factor for falls [54] and fractures [59] due to its effect on BMD. Moreover, osteoporosis tends to occur simultaneously with heart failure [60] due to shared risk factors such as diabetes. Unsurprisingly, syncope or collapse was also strongly associated with an increased risk of falls, as syncope is frequently mistaken for falls, to the point that the European Society of Cardiology has emphasised the need to explore syncope as an independent factor leading to falls [61]. Diabetes was another risk factor for both falls and fracture, confirming the association found in the general population [62]. Hearing loss was the only factor associated with an elevated risk of fracture in our study, an association previously confirmed in the general population [63]. This finding may be explained by the damaging impact of hearing loss on orientation skills and physical activity [64]. Finally, our study confirmed the association between history of falls and increased risk of future falls, previously reported in the general population [34, 65] and in people with depression [66]. Moreover, our data confirmed how a prior fracture represents a 50-100% higher risk for experiencing future fracture, as reported in the general population [67].

The main strengths of our study are: i) analyses controlling for various confounders; and ii) a large sample including people with clinically diagnosed affective disorders. However, there are important limitations. Firstly, we did not stratify according to different affective disorder subtypes which could report different risk factors; similarly, we analysed psychotropic medication categories but did not investigate specific agents or sub-categories. Second, we had no information on the types of fractures reported at admission and on factors (e.g. balance) that are influenced by neuropathological lesions in people with depression [68]. Additionally, the

majority of studies investigating falls and fractures rely upon self-report data whilst our study relied on ICD hospitalisation codes increasing reliability. However, the causes of fractures and the types of falls could not be explored in the current study, although we investigate factors associated with falls across the whole sample from the rich mental health record database. Future research should attempt to disentangle of the potential risk factors/causes of falls and fractures research in affective disorders. A limitation of health administrative data is some inconsistency or limited data on the granular detail. Third, lifestyle factors, such as alcohol consumption [31, 38], could not be explored. Fourth, our study only ascertained information on physical co-morbidities from hospitalisation records and could have overlooked patients with mild osteoporosis. Additionally, physical co-morbidities were ascertained within six months of diagnosis, and patients who were hospitalised for a fall or fracture within these six months would be more likely to have their osteoporosis ascertained. Fifth, falls and fractures are closely related and often co-occur [69]. In this study, although falls and fractures were identified from ICD hospitalisation codes, falls and fractures categories were not mutually exclusive, as a patient could be counted in both the fall and fracture cohort if he/she had a fall and a fracture in the same event. Moreover, factors such as inaccurate recording and fine distinction between ICD hospitalisation codes for falls and fractures, could also potentially hinder our attempt to differentiate the two concepts. Thus, further work is needed to elucidate the potential overlap and distinct relationship among falls and fractures in people with affective disorders. Finally, since medication records were ascertained within one year of diagnosis, we cannot assess whether medications were prescribed as a result or as a cause of falls for those who had a fall or fracture within six months of their diagnosis.

## **Conclusion**

Our study reports that over a mean 5 years' follow-up, approximately 8% of a large cohort with affective disorders was hospitalised due to either a fall or fracture. Factors such as older age, certain medications and having a history of fall or fracture are significant predictors, broadly comparable to risk factors established in the general population. Heavy hospital burden following a fall or fracture was also described. Our current study provides important implications for future research and clinical practice. Future research should take into account the limitations listed above and potentially explore the mechanisms through which the factors identified in this study (e.g., physical conditions such as UTI, or medication use) may impact risks for falls and fractures in people with affective disorders. The associations between certain factors (e.g., psychotropic medication use) and risk for falls and fractures were not confirmed in the current study, future studies are encouraged to replicate our findings and explore these factors further. In terms of implications for future clinical practice, given the lack of osteoporosis screening for people with mental health problems in current clinical settings [70], BMD checks and osteoporosis screenings should be a routine for people with affective disorders, especially if older and with established co-morbid chronic illnesses. Fall assessments (e.g., the Fracture Risk Assessment Tool) should be routinely conducted for people with affective disorders, since approximately 70% of low-energy fractures are due to falls [71]. Fall/fracture prevention programmes should also be offered due to an average 14% reduction in falls risk in the general population following fall prevention programmes [72]. For example, the combination of cognitive behavioural therapy and exercise have been previously found to be effective in improving depressive symptoms [73] and self-efficacy [74] in the general population. The effectiveness of these prevention programmes should also be examined in people with affective disorders and subsequently provided if their benefits are confirmed.

419	
420 421	Acknowledgments
422	Author's contributions
423	BS acquired funding for the study. GP conducted the analysis with support from all co-authors.
424	RM drafted introduction and discussion sections, ER drafted results section and all authors
425	(BS, GP, DV, AK, RS, CM) provided critical revisions and approved the final version. The PPI
426	group helped conceptualize and co-develop the study, as well as contributed to the funding
427	applications.
428	
429	Financial support
430	BS is supported by a Clinical Lectureship (ICA-CL-2017-03-001) jointly funded by Health
431	Education England (HEE) and the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). BS and RS
432	are part funded by the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS
433	Foundation Trust. RM is part funded by the HDR-UK London award to King's College London.
434	The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the (partner
435	organisation), the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.
436	
437	Ethics approval
438	This study has full approval for secondary analysis of CRIS (Oxford Research Ethnic
439	Committee C, reference 18/SC/0372).
440	
441	Conflicts of interest
442	All authors declare no conflicts of interest.
443	
444	Data availability statement

Data are available on reasonable request. For questions regarding the study, please contact RM

at ruimin.1.ma@kcl.ac.uk Totoest etien ont

449 450	References
451	[1] Hernlund E, Svedbom A, Ivergård M, Compston J, Cooper C, Stenmark J, McCloskey
452	EV, Jönsson B, Kanis JA. Osteoporosis in the European Union: Medical management,
453	epidemiology and economic burden: A report prepared in collaboration with the International
454	Osteoporosis Foundation (IOF) and the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industry
455	Associations (EFPIA). Archives of Osteoporosis. 2013 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11657-013-
456	<u>0136-1</u>
457	[2] Panel on Prevention of Falls in Older Persons, American Geriatric Society and British
458	Geriatric Society. Summary of the updated American Geiratric Society/British Geiratric
459	Society clincial practice guideline for prevention of falls in older persons. Journal of
460	American Geiratric Society, 2011; 59(1): 148-157
461	[3] Sinaki, M. Falls, fractures, and hip pads. Current osteoporosis reports, 2004; 2(4): 131-
462	137.
463	[4] Dionyssiotis Y. Analysing the problem of falls among older people. International Journal
464	of General Medicine, 2012; 5: 805-813.
465	[5] Deandrea S, Lucenteforte E, Bravi F, Foschi R, La Vecchia C, Negri E. Risk factors for
466	falls in community-dwelling older people: A systematic review and meta-analysis. In
467	Epidemiology 2010: pp. 658-668. https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181e89905
468	[6] NICE. Falls in older people: assessing risk and prevention. 2013. Available at
469	https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg161. Accessed 13 March 2020
470	[7] Sanguineti VA, Wild JR, Joseph B, Fain MJ. Management of common fractures in older
471	adults. In Michel, J-P., Beattie, B. L., Martin, F. C., & Walston, J (eds). Oxford
472	Textbookof Geriatric Medictine (3ed).2017. Oxford University Press. DOI:
473	10.1093/med/9780198701590.003.0070
474	[8] Public Health England. Falls: applying all our health. 2020. Available at

475	https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/falls-applying-all-our-health/falls-
476	applying-all-our-health. Accessed 13 March 2020
477	[9] Johnell O, Kanis JA. An estimate of the worldwide prevalence and disability associated
478	with osteoporotic fractures. Osteoporos. Int. 2006; 17 (12): 1726-1733
479	[10] Correll CU, Detraux J, De Lepeleire J, De Hert M. Effects of antipsychotics,
480	antidepressants and mood stabilizers on risk for physical diseases in people with
481	schizophrenia, depression and bipolar disorder. World Psychiatry, 2015; 14, 119–136.
482	https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20204
483	[11] Shi TT, Min M, Zhang Y, Sun CY, Liang MM, Sun YH. Depression and risk of hip
484	fracture: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. In Osteoporosis
485	International, 2019; 30(6): 1157–1165. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-019-04951-6
486	[12] Chandrasekaran V, Brennan-Olsen SL, Stuart AL, Pasco JA, Berk M, Hodge JM,
487	Williams LJ. Bipolar disorder and bone health: A systematic review. Journal of
488	Affective Disorders, 2019; 249: 262–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2019.02.013
489	[13] Hong-Jhe C, Chin-Yuan, K, Ming-Shium T, Fu-Wei W, Ru-Yih C, Kuang-Chieh H,
490	Hsiang-Ju P, Ming-Yueh C, Pan-Ming C, Chih-Chuan P. The incidence and risk of
491	osteoporosis in patients with anxiety disorder: A Population-based retrospective cohort
492	study. Medicine, 2016; 95(38): e4912. https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.000000000004912
493	[14] Wu Q, Liu B, Tonmoy S. Depression and risk of fracture and bone loss: an updated
494	meta-analysis of prospective studies. Osteoporosis International, 2018; 29: 1303–1312.
495	https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-018-4420-1
496	[15] Stubbs B, Stubbs J, Gnanaraj SD, Soundy A. Falls in older adults with major depressive
497	disorder (MDD): a systematic review and exploratory meta-analysis of prospective
498	studies. Int Psychogeriatr, 2016; 28(1): 23-29. doi: 10.1017/S104161021500126X.
499	[16] Fernandes AC, Cloete D, Broadbent MTM, Hayes RD, Chang CK., Jackson RG, et al.

500	Development and evaluation of a de-identification procedure for a case register sourced
501	from mental health electronic records. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making,
502	2013; 13: 71. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6947-13-71
503	[17] Perera G, Broadbent M, Callard F, Chang CK, Downs J, Dutta R, et al. Cohort profile of
504	the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust Biomedical Research Centre
505	(SLaM BRC) Case Register: Current status and recent enhancement of an Electronic
506	Mental Health Record-derived data resource. BMJ Open, 2016; 6(3): e008721.
507	https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008721
508	[18] Sultana J, Chang CK, Hayes RD, Broadbent M, Stewart R, Corbett A, Ballard C.
509	Associations between risk of mortality and atypical antipsychotic use in vascular
510	dementia: A clinical cohort study. International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 2014;
511	29(12): 1249–1254. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.4101
512	[19] Ward G, Perera G, Stewart R. Predictors of mortality for people aged over 65 years
513	receiving mental health care for delirium in a South London Mental Health Trust, UK: A
514	retrospective survival analysis. International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 2015;
515	30(6): 639–646. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.4195
516	[20] Mueller C, Perera G, Hayes RD, Shetty H, Stewart R. Associations of
517	acetylcholinesterase inhibitor treatment with reduced mortality in Alzheimer's disease:
518	A retrospective survival analysis. Age and Ageing, 2018; 47: 88–94.
519	https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afx098
520	[21] Stubbs B, Mueller C, Gaughran F, Lally J, Vancampfort D, Lamb SE, et al. Predictors of
521	falls and fractures leading to hospitalisation in people with schizophrenia spectrum
522	disorder: a large representative cohort study. Schizophrenia Research, 2018; 201: 70-78
523	[22] Das-Munshi J, Chang C-K, Dutta R et al. Ethnicity and excess mortality in severe mental

illness: a cohort study. The Lancet 2017; 4(5): 389-399. Doi:

525	https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(17)30097-4
526	[23] Richardson EA, Mitchell RJ, Shortt NK et al. Evidence-based selection of environmental
527	factors and datasets for measuring multiple environmental deprivation in
528	epidemiological research. Environ Health, 2009; 8: S18. DOI:
529	https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-069X-8-S1-S18
530	[24] Wing JK, Beevor AS, Curtis RH, Park SGB, Hadden J, Burns, A. Health of the Nation
531	Outcomes Scales (HoNOS): Research and development. The British Journal of
532	Psychaitry, 1998; 172(1):11-18. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.172.1.11
533	[25] Burns A, Beevor A, Lelliott P, Wing J, Blakey A, Orrell M, et al. Health of the Nation
534	Outcome Scales for Elderly People (HoNOS 65+): Glossary for HoNOS 65+ score
535	sheet. Cambridge University Press, 1999; 174(5): 435-438.
536	DOI: https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.174.5.435
537	[26] Kahl KG, Greggersen W, Rudolf S, Stoeckelhuber BM, Bergmann-Koester CU, Dibbelt
538	L, Schweiger U. Bone mineral density, bone turnover, and osteoprotegerin in depressed
539	women with and without borderline personality disorder. Psychosomatic Medicine,
540	2006; 68: 669–674. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.psy.0000237858.76880.3d
541	[27] Kahl KG, Rudolf S, Dibbelt L, Stoeckelhuber BM, Gehl HB, Hohagen F, Schweiger U.
542	Decreased osteoprotegerin and increased bone turnover in young female patients with
543	major depressive disorder and a lifetime history of anorexia nervosa. Osteoporosis
544	International, 2005; 16: 424–429. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-004-1711-5
545	[28] Diem SJ, Blackwell TL, Stone KL, Yaffe K, Haney EM, Bliziotes MM, Ensrud, KE.
546	Use of antidepressants and rates of hip bone loss in older women: The study of
547	osteoporotic fractures. Archives of Internal Medicine, 2007; 167: 1240–1245.
548	https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.167.12.1240
549	[29] Trivedi R, Goswami R, Chattopadhyay N. Invesgitational anabolic therapies for

550	osteoporosis. Expert Opin Investig Drugs, 2010; 19(8): 995-1005
551	[30] Wong SYS, Lau EMC, Lynn H, Leung PC, Woo J, Cummings SR, Orwoll E.
552	Depression and bone mineral density: Is there a relationship in elderly Asian men?
553	Results from Mr. Os (Hong Kong). Osteoporosis International, 2005; 16: 610–615.
554	https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-004-1730-2
555	[31] Mussolino ME. Depression and hip fracture risk: The NHANES I epidemiologic follow-
556	up study. Public Health Reports, 2005; 120: 71–75.
557	https://doi.org/10.1177/003335490512000112
558	[32] Cizza G. Major depressive disorder is a risk factor for low bone mass, central obesity,
559	and other medical conditions. Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience, 2011; 13(1): 73-87.
560	[33] Wu Q, Magnus JH, Liu J, Bencaz AF, Hentz JG. (2009). Depression and low bone
561	mineral density: A meta-analysis of epidemiologic studies. Osteoporosis International,
562	2009; 20(8): 1309–1320. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-009-0918-x
563	[34] Ambrose AF, Paul G, Hausdorff JM. (2013). Risk factors for falls among older adults: A
564	review of the literature. Maturitas, 2013; 75(1): 51–61.
565	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2013.02.009
566	[35] Williams J, Kool B, Robinson E, Ameratunga S. Longer term health of young and
567	middle-aged adults following unintentional falls at home resulting in hospitalisation.
568	<i>Injury</i> , 2012; 43(1): 103–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2011.03.050
569	[36] Court-Brown CM, Aitken SA, Duckworth AD, Clement ND, McQueen MM. The
570	relationship between social deprivation and the incidence of adult fractures. Journal of
571	Bone and Joint Surgery - Series A, 2013; 95(6): e321–e327.
572	https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.K.00631
573	[37] Menon MRG, Walker JL, Court-Brown CM. The epidemiology of fractures in
574	adolescents with reference to social deprivation. Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery -

575	Series B, 2008; 90(11): 1482–1486. https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.90B11.21163
576	[38] Eskandari F, Martinez PE, Torvik S, Phillips TM, Sternberg EM, Mistry S, et al. Low
577	bone mass in premenopausal women with depression. Archives of Internal Medicine,
578	2007; 167: 2329–2336. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.167.21.2329
579	[39] Cauley JA, Chalhoub D, Kassem AM, Fuleihan GEH. Geographic and ethnic disparities
580	in osteoporotic fractures. Nature Reviews Endocrinology, 2014; 10(6): 338-351.
581	https://doi.org/10.1038/nrendo.2014.51
582	[40] Bradley C, Harrison JE. (2007). Fall-related hospitalisations among older people:
583	Sociocultural and regional aspects. AIHW. Available at:
584	https://www.aihw.gov.au/getmedia/17a9a4b4-32a1-4481-8a42-
585	b67ec21db92f/10447.pdf.aspx?inline=true, accessed on 28th March 2020
586	[41] Wolff J, McCrone P, Patel A, Kaier K, Normann C. Predictors of length of stay in
587	psychiatry: Analyses of electronic medical records. BMC Psychiatry, 2015;15(1): 238.
588	https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-015-0623-6
589	[42] Stubbs B, Patchay B, Soundy A, Schofield P. The avoidance of activities due to fear of
590	falling contribute to sedentary behavior among community-dwelling older adults with
591	chronic musculoskeletal pain: a multisite observational study. Pain Med, 2014; 15(11):
592	1861-1871. doi: 10.1111/pme.12570.
593	[43] Vestergaard P. Skeletal effects of central nervous system active drugs: anxiolytics,
594	sedatives, antidepressants, lithum and neuroletpics. Curr Drug Saf, 2008; 3: 185-189.
595	DOI: <u>10.2174/157488608785699432</u>
596	[44] Zamani A, Omrani GR, Nasab MM. Lithium's effect on bone mineral density. Bone,
597	2009; 44: 331-334. doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2008.10.001.
598	[45] Klibanski A, Biller BMK, Rosenthal DI, Schoenfeld DA, Saxe V. Effects of prolactin

and estrogen deficiency in amenorrheic bone loss. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology

600	and Metabolism, 1988; 67: 124-130. https://doi.org/10.1210/jcem-67-1-124
601	[46] Crews MPK, Howes OD. Is antipsychotic treatment linked to low bone mineral density
602	and osteoporosis? A review of the evidence and the clinical implications. In Human
603	Psychopharmacology 2012; 27(1): 15–23. https://doi.org/10.1002/hup.1265
604	[47] Coupland C, Dhiman P, Morriss R, Arthur A, Barton G, Hippisley-Cox J.
605	Antidepressant use and risk of adverse outcomes in older people: Population based
606	cohort study. BMJ (Online), 2011; 343: 4551. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d4551
607	[48] Rauma PH, Honkanen RJ, Williams LJ, Tuppurainen MT, Kröger HP, Koivumaa-
608	Honkanen H. Effects of antidepressants on postmenopausal bone loss - A 5-year
609	longitudinal study from the OSTPRE cohort. Bone, 2016; 89: 25–31.
610	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2016.05.003
611	[49] Ruths S, Bakken MS, Ranhoff AH, Hunskaar S, Engesæter LB, Engeland A. Risk of hip
612	fracture among older people using antihypertensive drugs: A nationwide cohort study.
613	BMC Geriatrics, 2015; 15: 153. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-015-0154-5
614	[50] Rossini M, Viapiana O, Adami S, Idolazzi L, Buda S, Veronesi C, Degli Esposti L, Gatt
615	D. Medication use before and after hip fracture: A population-based cohort and case-
616	control study. Drugs and Aging, 2014; 31: 547-553. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40266-
617	014-0184-2
618	[51] Vestergaard P, Rejnmark L, Mosekilde L. Fracture risk associated with the use of
619	morphine and opiates. Journal of Internal Medicine, 2006; 260(1): 76-87.
620	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2796.2006.01667.x
621	[52] Solomon DH, Mogun H, Garneau K, Fischer MA. Risk of fractures in older adults using
622	antihypertensive medications. Journal of Bone and Mineral Research, 2011; 26(7):
623	1561–1567. https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.356
624	[53] Pérez-Castrillón JL, Silva J, Justo I, Sanz A, Martín-Luguero M, Igea R, et al. Effect of

625	quinapril, quinapril-hydrochlorothiazide, and enalapril on the bone mass of hypertensive
626	subjects: Relationship with angiotensin converting enzyme polymorphisms. American
627	Journal of Hypertension, 2003; 16: 453-459. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-
628	7061(03)00845-8
629	[54] Choi EJI, Kim SA, Kim NRI, Rhee JA, Yun YW, Shin MH. Risk factors for falls in
630	older Korean adults: the 2011 Community Health Survey. Journal of Korean Medical
631	Science, 2014; 29(11): 1482–1487. https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2014.29.11.1482
632	[55] Menant JC, Wong AKW, Trollor JN, Close JCT, Lord SR. Depressive Symptoms and
633	Orthostatic Hypotension Are Risk Factors for Unexplained Falls in Community-Living
634	Older People. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 2016; 64: 1073–1078.
635	https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.14104
636	[56] Soliman Y, Meyer R, Baum N. (2016). Falls in the Elderly Secondary to Urinary
637	Symptoms. <i>Reviews in Urology</i> , 2016; <i>18</i> (1): 28–32.
638	[57] Wang J, You W, Jing Z, Wang R, Fu Z, Wang Y. Increased risk of vertebral fracture in
639	patients with diabetes: a meta-analysis of cohort studies. In International Orthopaedics
640	2016; 40(6): 1299–1307. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-016-3146-y
641	[58] Ojike N, Sowers JR, Seixas A, Ravenell J, Rodriguez-Figueroa G, Awadallah M, et al.
642	Psychological distress and hypertension: results from the national health interview
643	survey for 2004-2013. CardioRenal Medicine, 2016; 6(3): 198–208.
644	https://doi.org/10.1159/000443933
645	[59] Friedman SM, Mendelson DA. Epidemiology of fragility fractures. Clinics in Geriatric
646	Medicine 2014; 30(2): 175–181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cger.2014.01.001
647	[60] Carbone LD, Bková P, Fink HA, Lee JS, Chen Z, Ahmed A, Parashar S, Robbins JR.
648	Hip fractures and heart failure: Findings from the Cardiovascular Health Study.
649	European Heart Journal, 2010; 31: 77–84. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehp483

650	[61] Moya A, Sutton R, Ammirati F, Blanc JJ, Brignole M, Dahm JB, et al. Guidelines for the
651	diagnosis and management of syncope (version 2009). European Heart Journal 2009;
652	30(21): e2631–e2671. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehp298
653	[62] López-Ibarra PJ, Pastor MMC, Escobar-Jiménez F, Pardo MDS, Gonzlez AG, De Dios
654	Luna J, et al. Bone mineral density at time of clinical diagnosis of adult-onset type 1
655	diabetes mellitus. Endocrine Practice, 2001; 7: 346–351.
656	https://doi.org/10.4158/EP.7.5.346
657	[63] Kim S-Y, Lee J-K, Sim S, Choi HG. Hearing impairement increases the risk of distal
658	radius, hip and spine fractures: a longitudinal follow-up study using a national sample
659	cohort. PLoS One, 2018; 13(2): e0192820. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0192820
660	[64] Keller BK, Morton JL, Thomas VS, Potter JF. The effect of hearing and visual
661	impairments on functional status. J Am Geriatr Soc, 1999; 47(11): 1319-1325.
662	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.1999.tb07432.x
663	[65] American Geriatrics Society, British Geriatrics Society, and A. A. of, & Orthopaedic
664	Surgeons. Guideline for the Prevention of Falls in Older Persons and American
665	Academy of Orthn of opaedic Surgeons Panel on Falls Prevention. American Geriatrics
666	Society, 2001; 49(5): 664–672.
667	[66] Briggs R, Kennelly SP, Kenny RA. Does baseline depression increase the risk of
668	unexplained and accidental falls in a cohort of community-dwelling older people? Data
669	from The Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing (TILDA). International Journal of
670	Geriatric Psychiatry, 2018; 33(2): e205-e211. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.4770
671	[67] Van Den Berg M, Verdijk NA, Leusink GL, Wijnands-Van Gent CJM., Romeijnders
672	AC, Pop VJM, et al. Depression after low-energy fracture in older women predicts
673	future falls: A prospective observational study. BMC Geriatrics, 2011; 11: 73.

https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2318-11-73

675	[68] Lee SC, Hu LY, Huang MW, Shen CC, Huang WL, Lu T, Hsu CL, Pan CC. Risk of
676	vertebral fracture in patients diagnosed with a depressive disorder: A nationwide
677	population-based cohort study. Clinics, 2017; 72(1): 44-50.
678	https://doi.org/10.6061/clinics/2017(01)08
679	[69] Berry SD & Miller R. Falls: epidemiology, pathphysiology and relationship to fracture.
680	Curr Osteroporos rep, 2008; 6(4):149-154
681	[70] Gleason LJ, Menzies IB, Mendelson DA, Kates SL, Friedman SM. Diagnosis and
682	Treatment of Osteoporosis in High-Risk Patients Prior to Hip Fracture. Geriatric
683	Orthopaedic Surgery & Rehabilitation, 2012; 3(2): 79–83.
684	https://doi.org/10.1177/2151458512454878
685	[71] Appleby PN, Allen NE, Roddam AW, Key TJ. Physical activity and fracture risk: A
686	prospective study of 1898 incident fractures among 34 696 British men and women.
687	Journal of Bone and Mineral Metabolism, 2008; 26: 191–198.
688	https://doi.org/10.1007/s00774-007-0806-4
689	[72] Choi M, Hector M. Effectiveness of intervention programs in preventing falls: A
690	systematic review of recent 10 years and meta-analysis. Journal of the American
691	Medical Directors Association, 2012; 13(2): e13–e21.
692	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2011.04.022
693	[73] Krogh J, Nordentoft M, Sterne JAC, Lawlor DA. The effect of exercise in clinically
694	depressed adults: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.
695	Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 2011; 72: 529–538.
696	https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.08r04913blu
697	[74] Zijlstra GAR, Van Haastregt JCM, Ambergen T, Van Rossum E, Van Eijk JTM,
698	Tennstedt SL, Kempen GIJM. Effects of a multicomponent cognitive behavioral group
699	intervention on fear of falling and activity avoidance in community-dwelling older

adults: Results of a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the American Geriatrics*Society, 2009; 57(11): 2020–2028. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2009.02489.x



Table 1: Characteristics of those Mood [affective] disorders patients who were admitted to hospital with a fall/fracture after a diagnosis of Mood [affective] disorders (F30\* to F34\*).

	Presenc	e of falls	Pr <u>e</u> sence of fractures	
Characteristics of sample	No (n= 34,270)	Yes (n= 1,831)	Nog(n= 33, <b>9</b> 08)	Yes (n= 2,193)
Age at the time of Mood [affective] disorders diagnosis	, ,	,	22	, ,
18- 34	12685 (37.0)	205 (11.2)	12572 37.1)	318 (14.5)
35-49	11409 (33.3)	336 (18.4)	11346 (33.5)	399 (18.2)
50- 64	5829 (17.0)	362 (19.8)	5751 ( <b>§</b> 7.0)	440 (20.1)
65- 79	2797 (8.2)	485 (26.5)	2728 ( <b>\overline{8}</b> .0)	554 (25.3)
80 & over	1550 (4.5)	443 (24.2)	1511 (4.5)	482 (22.0)
Gender			ф://I	
Female	20627 (60.2)	1107 (60.5)	20348 60.0)	1386 (63.2)
Male	13638 (39.8)	724 (39.5)	13555 40.0)	807 (36.8)
Ethnicity			ı.bm	
White	20772 (60.6)	1519 (83.0)	20536 (60.6)	1755 (80.0)
Non-white	12450 (36.3)	288 (15.7)	12333 (36.4)	405 (18.5)
Marital status			n ≱	
Cohabiting	7957 (23.2)	416 (22.7)	7867 (₹3.2)	506 (23.1)
Non-cohabiting	23028 (67.2)	1345 (73.5)	22776 (67.2)	1597 (72.8)
Index of multiple deprivation: IMD 2015 (SD)	27.97 (11.31)	27.90 (11.53)	27.97 (11.30)	27.97 (11.52)
Least deprived quintile	6657 (19.4)	388 (21.2)	6593 (\$9.4)	452 (20.6)
2nd most deprived quintile	6682 (19.5)	378 (20.6)	6643 (T9.6)	417 (19.0)
3rd most deprived quintile	6706 (19.6)	354 (19.3)	6637 (\$\vec{8}9.6)	423 (19.3)
Most deprived quintile	6708 (19.6)	346 (18.9)	6612 ( <u>\$</u> 9.5)	442 (20.2)
Medication prescription (within 6 months before or after Mood [affective] disorders diagnosis)				

			-2021-	
			05	
Anticholinergies	17714 (51.7)	1089 (59.5)	17489 (51.6)	1314 (59.9)
Antihypertensives	2561 (7.5)	386 (21.1)	2553 (ट्वि.5)	394 (18.0)
Antidepressants	19351 (56.5)	1168 (63.8)	19113 <u>£</u> 56.4)	1406 (64.1)
Antipsychotics	8777 (25.6)	469 (25.6)	8694 ( <b>돌</b> 5.6)	552 (25.2)
Anxiolytics and Hypnotics	9443 (27.6)	558 (30.5)	9349 ( <del>2</del> 7.6)	652 (29.7)
Analgesics	3083 (9.0)	405 (22.1)	3059 (8.0)	429 (19.6)
			D	
Number of medications received (within 6 months before o	•	•	○ ₹	
0	10207 (29.8)	394 (21.5)	10126 (29.9)	475 (21.7)
	5330 (15.6)	259 (14.1)	5275 (\$\frac{4}{5}.6)	314 (14.3)
2	7062 (20.6)	360 (19.7)	6961 (\$\frac{2}{3}0.5)	461 (21.0)
3	6599 (19.3)	361 (19.7)	6503 (\$\frac{1}{8}9.2)	457 (20.8)
4	3858 (11.3)	304 (16.6)	3839 (1.3)	323 (14.7)
5	1038 (3.0)	121 (6.6)	1029 (\$.0)	130 (5.9)
6	176 (0.5)	32 (1.7)	175 (0 3)	33 (1.5)
Other psychiatric conditions (within six months before or	after Mood [aff	ectivel disorders dis	<u>∃.</u> 2gnosis)	
F00- F03 (Dementia)	754 (2.2)	207 (11.3)	749 (2 <b>2</b> )	212 (9.7)
F 20- F29 (Schizophrenia spectrum disorder)	2701 (7.9)	119 (6.5)	2676 (₹.9)	144 (6.6)
F30- F31 (Bipolar affective disorder)	5489 (16.0)	222 (12.1)	5475 (46.1)	236 (10.8)
F50 (Eating Disorders)	447 (1.3)	13 (0.7)	441 (1 <u>3</u> )	19 (0.9)
F40- F48 (Neurotic, stress-related and somatoform disorders)	3652 (10.7)	147 (8.0)	3601 (±0.6)	198 (9.0)
F 60 (Disorders of adult personality and behaviour)	1436 (4.2)	77 (4.2)	1428 (4.2)	85 (3.9)
,			jues	( )
Problem HoNOS (score 2 or over) (within six months before	re or after Moo	d [affective] disorde	ers diagn <b>o</b> sis)	
Agitated Behaviour	3571 (10.4)	234 (12.8)	3547 (\$0.5)	258 (11.8)
Self-Injury	3586 (10.5)	186 (10.2)	$3545$ $\frac{10.5}{4}$	227 (10.4)
Problem Drinking Drugs	2957 (8.6)	204 (11.1)	2932 (8.6)	229 (10.4)
			opyrig	
			<b>∕</b> ≓.	

Page 35 of 51		BMJ Open		bmjopen-2021-0	
2	Cognitive Droblems	2021 (0.2)	240 (10.1)	Οī	279 (17.2)
4	Cognitive Problems	2821 (8.2)	349 (19.1)	2792 (8.2)	378 (17.2)
5	Physical Illness Hallucinations	6514 (19.0)	770 (42.1)	6355 (18.7)	929 (42.4)
6 7		3198 (9.3)	175 (9.6)	3176 <u>(</u> 9.4)	197 (9.0)
8	Depressed Mood	14582 (42.6)	766 (41.8)	1439(\$\overline{4}(42.4)	958 (43.7)
9	Relationship Problems	7644 (22.3)	342 (18.7)	7560 (22.3)	426 (19.4)
10 11	Daily Living Problems	5854 (17.1)	576 (31.5)	5723 (16.9)	707 (32.2)
12	Living Conditions Problems Score	3431 (10)	190 (10.4)	3404 (10.0)	217 (9.9)
13	Occupational Problems	5574 (16.3)	392 (21.4)	5513 <u>§</u> 16.3)	453 (20.7)
14	Mean overall HoNoS score (SD)	10.67 (5.63)	11.64 (5.53)	10.648(5.63)	11.91 (5.46)
15 16	Number with missing HoNoS	12545 (36.6)	523 (28.6)	1241 (36.6)	657 (30.0)
17				om_	
18	Hospital admissions (within six months before or afte		sorders diagnosis)	<u>Q</u>	
19 20	Ischaemia +CHD+ IHD	1128 (3.3)	210 (11.5)	1089 (3.2)	249 (11.4)
20	Arrhythmia + AF	1003 (2.9)	197 (10.8)	967 (239)	233 (10.6)
22	Heart failure	437 (1.3)	88 (4.8)	417 (12)	108 (4.9)
23	Diabetes	1516 (4.4)	264 (14.4)	1488 (4.4)	292 (13.3)
24 25	Hypotension	435 (1.3)	104 (5.7)	424 (133)	115 (5.2)
26	Hypercholesterolemia	1097 (3.2)	221 (12.1)	1090 (3.2)	228 (10.4)
27	Hypertension	2837 (8.3)	546 (29.8)	<u>2752 (₹.1)</u>	631 (28.8)
28	Urinary tract infections (UTI)	1366 (4.0)	324 (17.7)	1297 (\$\overline{3}.8)	393 (17.9)
29 30	Osteoporosis	409 (1.2)	121 (6.6)	183 (05)	347 (15.8)
31	Visual Disturbance and Blindness	241 (0.7)	53 (2.9)	246 (0 💆)	48 (2.2)
32	Hearing Loss	189 (0.6)	41 (2.2)	174 (05)	56 (2.6)
33 34	Syncope or Collapse	1990 (5.8)	444 (24.2)	2022 ( (2.0)	412 (18.8)
35	Parkinson's Disease	116 (0.3)	45 (2.5)	128 (0 4)	33 (1.5)
36	Falls before diagnosis	750 (2.2)	267 (14.6)	749 (28)	268 (12.2)
37	Fractures before diagnosis	1075 (3.1)	231 (12.6)	860 (25)	446 (20.3)
38 39	Trustales seriore diagnosis	1070 (3.1)	231 (12.0)		(20.5)
40				oy copyright	
41				yrigł	
42				.∺	

mean number of attendances to A&E following Mood		
[affective] disorders diagnosis (SD)	3.94 (9.98)	10

-yril 23, 2024

16.64 (28.88)

13.67 (29.35)

Table 2: Univariate Cox proportional hazard model (95% CI) showing factors affecting time to first fall/fracture hospital admission since diagnosis of Mood [affective] disorders

	Outcome fall	S	) 1	Outcome fractu	res
Characteristics	HR (95% CI)	P value	March	HR (95% CI)	P value
Age at the time of Mood [affective] disorders di	agnosis				
18- 34	Ref.		22.	Ref.	
35-49	1.74 (1.46, 2.07)	< 0.001	)owi	1.33 (1.15, 1.54)	< 0.001
50- 64	3.88 (3.27, 4.61)	< 0.001	nloa	3.03 (2.62, 3.50)	< 0.001
65- 79	12.41 (10.54, 14.62)	< 0.001	ded	9.11 (7.94, 10.46)	< 0.001
80 & over	26.94 (22.8, 31.83)	<0.001	2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.	18.46 (16.00, 21.29)	<0.001
Female gender	0.99 (0.90, 1.09)	0.87	tp://bmj	1.12 (1.03, 1.22)	0.01
Non-European ethnicity	0.32 (0.28, 0.37)	<0.001	ope	0.39 (0.35, 0.44)	< 0.001
Non-cohabiting marital status	1.08 (0.97, 1.21)	0.17	n.bmj.c	1.05 (0.95, 1.16)	0.31
Deprivation quintile (IMD 2015)			com/ oi		
Least deprived quintile	Ref.		n Ac	Ref.	
2nd least deprived quintile	0.83 (0.71, 0.96)	0.01	<u>≓</u> 2	0.89(0.78, 0.99)	0.04
3rd most deprived quintile	0.88 (0.76, 1.02)	0.09	, Ω	0.90 (0.79, 1.03)	0.13
2nd most deprived quintile	0.94 (0.82, 1.09)	0.43	024	0.89 (0.78, 1.00)	0.05
Most deprived quintile	0.86 (0.74, 0.99)	0.04	by gu	0.94 (0.82, 1.07)	0.35
Medication prescribed (within one year before	or after Mood [affective] disorders dia	gnosis)	est. Pı		
Anticholinergics received	1.42 (1.3, 1.56)	< 0.001	rote	1.45 (1.33, 1.57)	< 0.001
Antihypertensive received	3.69 (3.3, 4.13)	< 0.001	cted	2.98 (2.67, 3.33)	< 0.001
Antidepressants received	1.41 (1.29, 1.56)	<0.001	by cop	1.43 (1.31, 1.56)	<0.001
			yright.		

5

6

8

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30 31

32

33

34

35

36

37 38

43

44 45 46 0.12

0.18

< 0.001

< 0.001

< 0.001

0.01

< 0.001

0.05

0.06

0.22

0.71

0.06

0.48

< 0.001

< 0.001

0.01

0.02

< 0.001

< 0.001

0.10

< 0.001

< 0.001

Page 39 of 51		BMJ Open	vamjope		
1 2			<0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001		
3	Ischaemia +CHD+ IHD	5.25 (4.54, 6.06)	<0.001	5.17 (4.53, 5.90)	< 0.001
4 5	Arrhythmia + AF	6.30 (5.43, 7.31)	<0.001	6.10 (5.32, 6.99)	< 0.001
6	Heart failure	7.81 (6.29, 9.68)	<0.001	7.89 (6.49, 9.59)	< 0.001
7	Diabetes	4.66 (4.09, 5.31)	<0.001	4.18 (3.69, 4.73)	< 0.001
8 9	Hypotension	7.29 (5.98, 8.90)	<0.001	6.51 (5.39, 7.86)	< 0.001
10	Hypercholesterolemia	5.14 (4.47, 5.92)	<0.001	3 4.24 (3.70, 4.87)	< 0.001
11	Hypertension	6.08 (5.50, 6.72)	<0.001	5.78 (5.26, 6.34)	< 0.001
12 13	Urinary tract infections (UTI)	7.24 (6.42, 8.17)	<0.001	7.36 (6.59, 8.21)	< 0.001
14	Osteoporosis	7.75 (6.44, 9.32)	<0.001	36.39 (32.35, 40.94)	< 0.001
15	Visual Disturbance and Blindness	5.25 (3.99, 6.90)	<0.001	3.78 (2.84, 5.03)	< 0.001
16 17	Hearing Loss	5.57 (4.09, 7.60)	<0.001	6.45 (4.95, 8.41)	< 0.001
18	Syncope or Collapse	6.17 (5.54, 6.86)	<0.001	4.27 (3.84, 4.76)	< 0.001
19	Parkinson's Disease	9.83 (7.31, 13.23)	<0.001	5.60 (3.97, 7.89)	< 0.001
20			mjo O		
21 22	Falls before Mood [affective] disorders diagnosis	8.88 (7.8, 10.12)	<0.001	7.03 (6.18, 7.99)	< 0.001
23	Fractures before Mood [affective] disorders diagnosis	5.31 (4.62, 6.10)	<0.001	10.67 (9.61, 11.85)	< 0.001
24	Increase in one attendance to A&E following Mood [affective]		.con	, , ,	
25 26	disorders diagnosis	1.01 (1.01, 1.01)	<0.001	1.01 (1.01, 1.01)	<0.001
27 28 29 30 31 32 33			April 23, 2024 by gues		
34 35					
36			t. Protected by copyr		
37			)CTe0		
38			d by	<u>-</u>	
39 40			COC		
41			Ϋ́		

BMJ Open

Table 3: Two models showing predictors of first fall hospital admission among Mood [affective] disorders. (used stepwise removal of factors that were not significant at 0.05 P value). factors that were not significant at 0.05 P value).

	<b>Falls</b>		on 1.		
	Model 1 (n=20	,938)	I Ма	Model 2 (n=22,4	14)
Characteristics	HR (95% CI)	P value	rch 202	IR (95% CI)	P value
Age at the time of Mood [affective] disorders diagnosis			2. 0		
18- 34	Ref.		) OWI	Ref.	
35- 49	1.59 (1.23, 2.06)	<0.001	Downloaded 2.9	58 (1.24, 2.02)	< 0.001
50- 64	3.11 (2.40, 4.01)	<0.001	g 2.9	98 (2.33, 3.81)	< 0.001
65- 79	8.07 (6.31, 10.33)	<0.001	from 7.0	65 (6.07, 9.64)	< 0.001
80 & over	12.40 (9.51, 16.17)	<0.001		80 (9.25, 15.05)	<0.001
Non-European ethnicity	0.43 (0.36, 0.51)	<0.001	http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected	45 (0.38, 0.52)	<0.001
Deprivation quintile (IMD 2015)			en.bm		
Least deprived quintile	Ref.		j.cor		
2nd least deprived quintile	0.99 (0.83, 1.19)	0.92	<u>n</u> / o		
3rd most deprived quintile	1.14 (0.95, 1.36)	0.17	n Ar		
2nd most deprived quintile	1.15 (0.96, 1.38)	0.13	лі 2		
Most deprived quintile	1.00 (0.84, 1.20)	0.85	3, 20:		
Medication prescribed (within one year before or after o	diagnosis of Mood [affe	ctivel disorders)	24 by		
Anticholinergics received	0.95 (0.74, 1.22)	0.68	gue		
Antihypertensive received	0.98 (0.79, 1.21)	0.82	<u>\$</u> . ₽		
Antidepressants received	0.91 (0.74, 1.11)	0.36	rote		
Anxiolytics and Hypnotics received	1.00 (0.80, 1.24)	0.97	ctec		
Analgesics received	1.36 (1.10, 1.68)	0.01		39 (1.22, 1.58)	<0.001
			by copyright.		

Page 41 of 51		BMJ Open		bmjopen-2021-055070	
1 2				-2021-0:	
3 4 5	Increase in one type of polypharmacy	1.02 (0.87, 1.19)	0.80	55070 o	
6	Presence of other psychiatric conditions (within one ye	ar before or after diagn	osis of Mood [af	fectiveHdisorders)	
7	F00- F03 (Dementia)	1.05 (0.86, 1.27)	0.64	- ·	
8 9	F20- F29 (Schizophrenia spectrum disorder)	1.07 (0.85, 1.34)	0.57	March 2022	
10	F30-F31 (Bipolar affective disorder)	0.87 (0.72, 1.06)	0.16	202	
11 12	F40- F48 (Neurotic, stress-related and somatoform disorders)	0.74 (0.60, 0.91)	0.01	© 0.75 (0.61, 0.91)	0.01
13 14	F50 (Eating Disorders)	0.86 (0.36, 2.09)	0.74	nloe	
15		` , ,		wnloaded	
16	One unit increase in HoNoS			Ifro	
17	Self-Injury Self-Injury	1.10 (0.92, 1.32)	0.30	3	
18 19	Cognitive Problems	1.25 (1.06, 1.46)	0.01	1.28 (1.12, 1.46)	< 0.001
20	Physical Illness	1.23 (1.07, 1.42)	<0.001	1.28 (1.12, 1.46) 1.25 (1.10, 1.42) 0.83 (0.74, 0.93)	< 0.001
21	Depressed Mood	0.80 (0.70, 0.92)	<0.001	0.83 (0.74, 0.93)	< 0.001
22 23	Relationship Problems	0.98 (0.84, 1.14)	0.77	•	.0.001
24	Daily Living Problems	1.01 (0.87, 1.17)	0.94	bmj.com/ on	
25	Occupational Problems	0.90 (0.78, 1.03)	0.13	om/	
26	Occupational Froncins	0.70 (0.76, 1.03)	0.13	on .	
27 28	Admitted to general hospital (within one year before or	e often diagnosis of Maa	d [affactiva] disa	P p padoms)≕	
29	Ischaemia +CHD+ IHD			7 (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	
30		0.95 (0.78, 1.15)	0.59	2024	
31	Arrhythmia + AF	0.88 (0.73, 1.07)	0.20		0.07
32 33	Heart failure	1.37 (1.05, 1.78)	0.02	1.27 (1.00, 1.63) 1.36 (1.16, 1.59)	0.05
34	Diabetes	1.37 (1.16, 1.63)	<0.001	5 1.36 (1.16, 1.59)	<0.001
35	Hypotension	1.38 (1.09, 1.75)	0.01	. 1 24 (1 ()7 1 20)	0.01
36	Hypercholesterolemia	1.16 (0.96, 1.39)	0.13	P 1.34 (1.07, 1.08)	
37 38	Hypertension	1.05 (0.88, 1.23)	0.63		
39	Urinary tract infections (UTI)	1.33 (1.13, 1.56)	<0.001	₹ 1.33 (1.14, 1.54)	< 0.001
40				\$\frac{5}{20} 1.33 (1.14, 1.54)	
41				righ	
42				<del>: *</del>	,

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

43

44 45 46 Page 42 of 51

BMJ Open

BMJ Open

Table 4: Two models showing predictors of first fracture hospital admission among Mood [affective] disorders patients.

		0	
Model 1 (n=20	),936)	Model 2 (n=2	2,322)
HR (95% CI)	P value	≦ HR (95% CI)	P value
		o N	
Ref.		Ref.	
1.27 (1.02, 1.57)	0.03	S1.27 (1.03, 1.55)	0.02
	< 0.001	$\frac{5}{2}$ 2.28 (1.85, 2.81)	< 0.001
	< 0.001	85.55 (4.54, 6.77)	< 0.001
7.46 (5.90, 9.45)	<0.001	ਰੂੰ ਜੂਨ ਜੂਨ ਜੂਨ ਜੂਨ ਜੂਨ ਜੂਨ ਜੂਨ ਜੂਨ ਜੂਨ ਜੂਨ	<0.001
<b>1.21</b> (1.08, 1.36)	< 0.001	₹1.15 (1.03, 1.29)	0.01
0.59 (0.51, 0.68)	< 0.001	90.59 (0.51, 0.67)	< 0.001
		njopen.b	
		<u>m</u>	
Ref.		om/	
1.07 (0.91, 1.28)	0.41	on .	
1.11 (0.94, 1.32)	0.23	Apri	
1.17 (0.99, 1.39)	0.07	1 23,	
1.00 (0.85, 1.19)	0.96	2024 b	
liagnosis of Mood [affe	ective] disorders	s) ලි	
1.08 (0.85, 1.26)	0.76	iest.	
0.76 (0.65, 0.91)	< 0.001	£80 (0.70, 0.92)	< 0.001
1.08 (0.91, 1.28)	0.37	tect	
1.28 (1.08, 1.52)	< 0.001	$\frac{9}{5}$ 33 (1.17, 1.51)	< 0.001
1.01 (0.93, 1.11)	0.75	y copyright	
	Ref. 1.27 (1.02, 1.57) 2.31 (1.85, 2.88) 5.75 (4.65, 7.11) 7.46 (5.90, 9.45)  1.21 (1.08, 1.36) 0.59 (0.51, 0.68)  Ref. 1.07 (0.91, 1.28) 1.11 (0.94, 1.32) 1.17 (0.99, 1.39) 1.00 (0.85, 1.19)  liagnosis of Mood [afferd 1.08 (0.85, 1.26) 0.76 (0.65, 0.91) 1.08 (0.91, 1.28) 1.28 (1.08, 1.52)	Ref.  1.27 (1.02, 1.57)	Ref.

	BMJ Open		;/bm	
	вил Ореп		/bmjopen-2021-0550	
			n-20	
			021-	
			055(	
Presence of other psychiatric conditions (within one year	· before or after diagno	osis of Mood [affe	7	
F00- F03 (Dementia)	1.14 (0.96, 1.41)	0.12	<b>3</b>	
F20- F29 (Schizophrenia spectrum disorder)	1.11 (0.91, 1.38)	0.30	M <sub>e</sub>	
F30- F31 (Bipolar affective disorder)	0.81 (0.67, 0.98)	0.03	$\frac{5}{9}$ 0.80 (0.68, 0.95)	0.01
F40- F48 (Neurotic, stress-related and somatoform			202	
disorders)	0.82 (0.68, 0.99)	0.04	$^{N}_{\Box}0.83 (0.70, 0.99)$	0.04
			March 0.80 (0.68, 0.95) 2022: 0.83 (0.70, 0.99) Downloaded	
One unit increase in HoNoS			iloac	
Cognitive Problems	1.02 (0.87, 1.19)	0.83	ed -	
Physical Illness	1.36 (1.19, 1.56)	<0.001	ត្ត1.48 (1.31, 1.67)	< 0.001
Hallucinations	0.91 (0.76, 1.10)	0.34	htt	
Depressed Mood	0.83 (0.72, 0.94)	0.01	0.91 (0.82, 1.00)	0.05
Relationship Problems	0.89 (0.77, 1.02)	0.10	o <mark>m</mark> jo	
Daily Living Problems	1.12 (0.98, 1.29)	0.11	pen pen	
Occupational Problems	0.91 (0.79, 1.04)	0.15	http://bmjopen.bmj.co	
			j. cor	
Admitted to general hospital (within one year before or a				
Ischaemia +CHD+ IHD	1.01 (0.85, 1.22)	0.88	on April	
Arrhythmia + AF	1.03 (0.86, 1.23)	0.78	oril 2	
Heart failure	1.44 (1.12, 1.86)	0.01	$^{\Sigma}_{N}$ 1.43 (1.14, 1.80)	< 0.001
Diabetes	1.22 (1.04, 1.44)	0.02	ੈੱਬ 1.23 (1.06, 1.44)	< 0.001
Hypotension	1.18 (0.93, 1.48)	0.17	yd 1	
Hypercholesterolemia	0.85 (0.71, 1.03)	0.10	21.43 (1.14, 1.80) 221.23 (1.06, 1.44) by	
Hypertension	1.05 (0.90, 1.23)	0.53	st. F	
Urinary tract infections (UTI)	1.49 (1.28, 1.74)	< 0.001	ਰੂ1.52 (1.32, 1.75)	< 0.001
Osteoporosis	7.31 (5.82, 9.18)	< 0.001	$\frac{6}{2}$ 7.00 (5.65, 8.70)	< 0.001
Visual Disturbance and Blindness	1.06 (0.74, 1.53)	0.74	d by	
Hearing Loss	1.40 (1.03, 1.92)	0.03	81.46 (1.09, 1.96)	0.01
			ਝ 81.46 (1.09, 1.96) ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਾਹ	

BMJ Open Page 4

The RECORD statement – checklist of items, extended from the STROBE statement, that should be reported in observational studies using routinely collected health data.

	T -	CER OPE I	T	2	
	Item	STROBE items	Location in	RECORD items -055070 on	<b>Location in</b>
	No.		manuscript where	077	manuscript
			items are reported	0 0	where items are
				<del>1</del>	reported
Title and abstra	act			<u> </u>	
	1	(a) Indicate the study's design	Page 1 and 2	RECORD 1.1: The type of data used	Page 2
		with a commonly used term in		should be specified in the titleor	
		the title or the abstract (b)		abstract. When possible, the mame of	
		Provide in the abstract an		the databases used should be acluded	
		informative and balanced		w <sub>n</sub>	
		summary of what was done and		RECORD 1.2: If applicable, the	
		what was found		geographic region and timeframe	
				within which the study took pagace	
•			N <sub>L</sub>	should be reported in the title or	
				abstract.	
				/bn	
				RECORD 1.3: If linkage between	
				databases was conducted for the study	
				this should be clearly stated in the title	
				or abstract.	
Introduction				or acounce.	
Background	2	Explain the scientific	Page 4	<u>3</u> >	
rationale		background and rationale for the		pri	
Tutionale		investigation being reported		April 23,	
Objectives	3	State specific objectives,	Page 4	20;	
		including any prespecified	1 400	24 t	
I		hypotheses		oy ç	
Methods		njpouisos.		2024 by gues	
Study Design	4	Present key elements of study	Page 5	<del>.</del>	
21007 - 12-8-2		design early in the paper	8	Prote	
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations,	Page 5	ed.	
~		and relevant dates, including	1	d b	
		periods of recruitment, exposure,		) oc	
		follow-up, and data collection		соругі	
Participants	6	(a) Cohort study - Give the	Page 5	RECORD 6.1: The methods of study	Page 5
		eligibility criteria, and the	ittp://bmjopen.bmj.com/sit	e/about/goidelines.xhtml population selection (such as codes or	
				1 = =	
		sources and methods of selection		algorithms used to identify subjects)	
		of participanta Dogariba		Labould be listed in detail. If this is not	

1	
2	
_	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 33 33 34 35 36 36 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
3 I	
32 22	
ο 21	
25	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	

47 of 51			BMJ Open	136/bm
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable.	Page 6-8	RECORD 7.1: A complete list of codes and algorithms used to classify exposures, outcomes, confounders, and effect modifiers should be provided. If these cannot be reported, an explanation should be provided.
Data sources/ measurement	8	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement).  Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Page 6-8	n 11 March 2022. Downlpaded
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Page 9	
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Page 5	rom htt
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen, and why	Page 6-8	p://bmjopen.bmj.d
				rom http://bmjopen.bmj.dom/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

	<u> </u>	
BMJ Open	3 <sub>6</sub>	Page 48 of 51
55 ope	ò	. age .e c. c .
	.3	
	——————————————————————————————————————	

G: .: 1	10	() 75 21 11	D 0	<u> </u>	
Statistical	12	(a) Describe all statistical	Page 9	pen	
methods		methods, including those used to		-2C	
		control for confounding		21-	
		(b) Describe any methods used		055	
		to examine subgroups and		507	
		interactions		0 0	
		(c) Explain how missing data		7	
		were addressed		\   	
		(d) Cohort study - If applicable,		larc	
		explain how loss to follow-up		pen-2021-055070 on 11 March 2022.	
		was addressed		022	
		Case-control study - If			
		applicable, explain how		OWI	
				nloa	
		matching of cases and controls was addressed		Downloaded from http://bmjope	
				d fr	
		Cross-sectional study - If		om om	
		applicable, describe analytical		http	
		methods taking account of		)://k	
		sampling strategy	(0)	) mj	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity		) Pe	
		analyses		n.	
Data access and			(		Page 5
cleaning methods				describe the extent to which the	
				investigators had access to the database	
				population used to create the study	
				population.	
				23,	
				RECORD 12.2: Authors should	
				provide information on the data	
				cleaning methods used in the study.	
Linkage					Page 6
				study included person-level,	
				institutional-level, or other data linkage	
				across two or more databases The	
				methods of linkage and methods of	
				linkage quality evaluation should be	
				provided.	
Results				provided. #	
IXCSUITS		For peer review only - h	nttp://bmjopen.bmj.com/sit	e/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1
2
3
4
5
6
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

49 of 51			BMJ Open	136/bm	
Participants	individua study (e.g eligible, confirme the study and analy (b) Give participat	als at each stage of the g., numbers potentially examined for eligibility, d eligible, included in , completing follow-up,	Page 9	RECORD 13.1: Describe in detail the selection of the persons included in the study ( <i>i.e.</i> , study population selection) including filtering based on data quality, data availability and enkage. The selection of included persons can be described in the text and/ox by means of the study flow diagram.	Page 9
Descriptive data	14 (a) Give participal clinical, son expose confound (b) Indical participal for each (c) Cohologon	nte the number of nts with missing data variable of interest rt study - summarise o time (e.g., average	Table 1 and page 9	2. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.pom/ on April 23, 2024 by	
Outcome data	15 Cohort st of outcor measures Case-con numbers category, of exposi Cross-sec	and the events or summary over time extrol study - Report in each exposure or summary measures	Page 10	i.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. P	
	summary	measures		rotected by copyright	

BMJ Open	36/b	Page 50 of 51

Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounderadjusted estimates and their precision (e.g., 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	Page 10-11	mjppen-2021-055070 on 11 March 2022. Downloa		
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done— e.g., analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Not applicable	ded from http://		
Discussion				Bin		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Page 13-16	open.b		
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision.  Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Page 16-17	RECORD 19.1: Discuss the implications of using data that created or collected to answer specific research question(s) discussion of misclassification unmeasured confounding, mischanging eligibility time, as they pertain to the stuck reported.	were not the nclude bias, sing	Page 16-17
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Page 17-18	iest. Protected by copyright		
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Page 17 http://bmjopen.bmj.com/sit			

Other Information	on			j. ope	
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Page 18	n-2021-055070 o	
Accessibility of protocol, raw data, and programming code				RECORD 22.1: Authors should provide information on how a access any supplemental information such as the study protocol, raw data, or programming code.	Page 19

\*Reference: Benchimol EI, Smeeth L, Guttmann A, Harron K, Moher D, Petersen I, Sørensen HT, von Elm E, Langen SM, the RECORD Working Committee. The REporting of studies Conducted using Observational Routinely-collected health Data (RECORD) Statement. PLoS Medicine 2015; in press. from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

\*Checklist is protected under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.

BMJ Open

Supplementary material Table 1. Mean age at the time of fall/ fracture and mood disorder diagnosis arong patients with Mood [affective] disorders

	Presenc	e of falls	Presence	Presence of fractures No (n= 33,908) Yes (n= 2,193		
Age	No (n= 34,270)	Yes (n=1,831)	No (n= 33,908)	Yes (n= 2,193		
Mean age at diagnosis (SD) Mean age at fall/ fracture/ (SD)	43.4 (17.1)	62.4 (19.9) 64.2 (20.8)	43.3 (17.1)	60.6 (20.6) 62.5 (22.8)		
				60.6 (20.6) 62.5 (22.8)		