

This is a repository copy of *Comparing routine inpatient data and death records as a means of identifying children and young people with life limiting conditions*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/119926/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Jarvis, Stuart William orcid.org/0000-0001-8447-0306 and Fraser, Lorna Katharine orcid.org/0000-0002-1360-4191 (2017) Comparing routine inpatient data and death records as a means of identifying children and young people with life limiting conditions. Palliative Medicine. ISSN: 0269-2163

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0269216317728432>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Comparing routine inpatient data and death records as a means of identifying children and young people with life limiting conditions

Stuart Jarvis¹, Lorna K Fraser¹

¹Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK

Corresponding Author:

Dr Stuart Jarvis

stuart.jarvis@york.ac.uk

Department of Health Sciences

Area 2, Seebohm Rowntree Building

University of York

Heslington

YORK

YO10 5DD

Tel: 01904 321106

ABSTRACT

Background

Recent estimates of the number of children and young people with life limiting conditions derived from routine inpatient data are higher than earlier estimates using death record data.

Aim

To compare routine inpatient data and death records as means of identifying life limiting conditions in children and young people.

Design

Two national cohorts of children and young people with a life limiting condition (primary cohort from England with a comparator cohort from Scotland) were identified using linked routinely collected healthcare and administrative data.

Participants

37563 children and young people with a life limiting condition in England who died between 1 April 2001 and 30 March 2015 and 2249 children and young people with a life limiting condition in Scotland who died between 1 April 2003 and 30 March 2014.

Results

In England, 16642 (57%) non-neonatal cohort members had a life limiting condition recorded as the underlying cause of death; 3364 (12%) had a life limiting condition -related condition recorded as the underlying cause and 3435 (12%) had life limiting conditions recorded only among contributing causes. 5651 (19%) non-neonates and 3443 (41%) neonates had no indication of a life limiting condition recorded in their death records. Similar results were seen in Scotland (overall, 16% had no indication of life limiting conditions). In both cohorts, the recording of life limiting condition was highest amongst those with haematology or oncology diagnoses and lowest for genitourinary and gastrointestinal diagnoses.

Conclusions

Using death record data alone to identify children and young people with life limiting condition - and therefore those who would require palliative care services - would underestimate the numbers. This underestimation varies by age, deprivation, ethnicity and diagnostic group.

What is already known about the topic?

- Children and young people - with life limiting conditions have complex healthcare needs—often with repeated hospital admissions, particularly at end of life.
- Recent estimates of prevalence of life limiting conditions among children and young people using routinely collected inpatient data are much higher than earlier estimates using death records.

What this paper adds?

- Compares identification of life limiting conditions in children and young people using death records and inpatient data in the same population for the first time.
- Shows where the differences occur (by diagnostic group, age group, ethnic group and deprivation).
- Identifies shortcomings in use of death records to identify life limiting conditions in children and young people.

Implications for practice, theory or policy?

- Inpatient-based estimates of life limiting conditions prevalence among children and young people should be used for service planning.
- Epidemiological studies based on life limiting conditions identification from death record data may be biased.
- Use of death records for life limiting conditions identification is particularly limited in countries that only record the underlying cause of death.

Keywords:

Palliative medicine

Child

Inpatients

Cause of death

BACKGROUND

Children and young people with Life-limiting conditions (encompassing both life-limiting conditions that will lead to premature death, e.g. Duchenne muscular dystrophy, and life threatening conditions that may lead to premature death, but may be cured, e.g. cancer) typically have complex healthcare needs, often with repeated hospital admissions, particularly towards the end of life.^{1, 2} Planning paediatric palliative care services, where there is evidence that demand outstrips provision,³ requires accurate estimates of prevalence (in addition to estimates of future survival times).

Recent prevalence estimates³⁻⁵ of children and young people with a life limiting condition in England and Scotland, which used an International Classification of Diseases Version 10⁶ coding framework to identify life limiting conditions within routine inpatient hospital data, were much higher than earlier estimates.⁷⁻⁹ This may be due to previous estimates being based on death record data, about which there are concerns of quality and completeness,⁹ but no work has been previously published comparing the two methods within the same population to quantify these differences. Previous research has found that there are discrepancies between recorded cause of death and conditions recorded during life for a population sample¹⁰ and for children with chronic conditions,¹¹ but these differ from the present study in not focusing on children (first study) and not limiting analyses to life limiting conditions (both studies). In the latter study it was noted that the discrepancies may be due to chronic conditions not being related to the cause of death, but for children with life limiting conditions most deaths are expected to be related to the condition.

This study compares methods of identifying children and young people with a life limiting condition by analysing recorded cause of death for children and young people identified with a life limiting condition from routinely collected English and Scottish inpatient hospital data.

METHODS

Definition of Life-Limiting Conditions

Individuals with a life limiting condition were identified using a refined version⁵ of a previously developed International Classification of Diseases Version 10 coding framework.⁴

Data used and cohort identification

Two national cohorts were identified: a primary cohort from England and a comparison cohort from Scotland (the latter was used to assess whether any differences found were unique to England and is described in the supplement).

For England, linked inpatient Hospital Episode Statistics data and Office for National Statistics death records were used. Data access was granted by the Health and Social Care Information Centre and Office for National Statistics microdata release panel (ref: NIC-379681-D6L7G). Children and young people with a life limiting condition were identified by matching recorded diagnostic codes in inpatient records against the coding framework, for individuals aged 0-25 in the English study period (1 April 2001 to 30 March 2015). The cohort was restricted to individuals with a death record with a date of death in the respective study period.

Data Management

The English datasets were linked by the Health and Social Care Information Centre based on National Health Service number, gender, date of birth and postcode.¹² Management of Scottish datasets is described in the supplement.

Date of birth was assigned as the most commonly recorded date in the inpatient data. Dates of death came from death records. Individuals with invalid dates of death (more than one day before the beginning of an inpatient record) were excluded from the cohort.

Individuals who had died were assigned an age group at death: neonates (0-27 days), postneonatal infants (28-364 days), 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25 and over 25 years. Age at death was determined by subtracting date of birth from date of death. Only month and year of birth was provided, so postneonatal ages of death were approximated setting all birth dates to the 15th day of the month. Neonates were separately identified from the presence of neonate-specific cause of death fields in the death records.

Published populations¹³ and Index of Multiple deprivation 2004¹⁴ rankings¹⁵ for the Lower Super Output Areas provided in the data were used to assign each individual to one of five Index of Multiple deprivation categories, with approximately 20% of the population of England in each category. The Index of Multiple

deprivation 2004 is an area based measure of deprivation under seven domains.¹⁶ Individuals were assigned the last recorded category before death.

Recorded ethnic categories were collapsed to seven groups: White, Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Black, Mixed and Other. The most commonly recorded ethnicity (from the collapsed groupings) was assigned to each individual.

Life limiting condition diagnoses were categorized into 11 groups based on the main International Classification of Diseases Version 10 chapters: neurology, haematology, oncology, metabolic, respiratory, circulatory, gastrointestinal, genitourinary, perinatal, congenital, and 'other'. Individuals may be assigned more than one diagnostic group if they had more than one life limiting condition recorded in the inpatient hospital data. A primary diagnostic group, the most common diagnostic group across all inpatient records, was assigned to each individual. Where there was more than one most common diagnostic group, later diagnoses were prioritised (diagnoses from the earliest records were progressively removed until the tie was broken).

Analyses

Cause of death

The English death records contained underlying cause of death (the condition that initiated the chain of events that led to death, not necessarily the proximate cause of death) and other causes of death for non-neonates. It was expected that most deaths in the cohort (all of whom were known to have a life limiting condition) would have a life limiting condition as the underlying cause. The proximate cause of death may differ – for example, it may be an infection – but with a life limiting condition as the underlying cause in most cases, making infection either more likely or more severe. A small number of individuals were also expected to die from trauma (e.g. car or other accidents) not related to the life limiting condition. Whether the underlying cause of death was a life limiting condition was checked using the coding framework. If not a life limiting condition, underlying cause was assessed to see whether it was related to a life limiting condition identified in the inpatient data. For example, nonspecific cerebral palsy as cause of death was considered related to quadriplegic cerebral palsy; unspecified congenital malformations of heart to tetralogy of Fallot. Finally, for those with underlying cause neither a life limiting condition nor life limiting condition-related, contributing causes of death were checked against the life limiting condition coding framework. Where life limiting condition was recorded as a

contributing cause, trauma-related underlying causes were determined (all codes starting S; T0; T1; T2; T30; T31; T32; T5; T6; T7; T9; V; W; X; Y1; Y2; Y3) as it was expected that most deaths in the cohort not due to life limiting conditions would be due to trauma.

For English neonate death records, underlying cause of death was not specified. All causes of death were checked for life limiting conditions or being life limiting condition-related (only presence or absence of life limiting conditions among causes of death could be determined, subdivision into underlying, related or contributory causes was not possible for this age group).

The analyses were split by age group (at death), by ethnic group, by deprivation category, by diagnostic category and by financial year of death. Neonates were excluded from analyses by ethnic group, deprivation category, diagnostic category and year as they could not be categorised as having underlying, related or contributory cause of death as a life limiting condition.

Statistical modelling

Predictors of life limiting conditions being present in death records were explored. A binary outcome variable was defined indicating presence of life limiting conditions in a death record, set to 1 if the underlying cause was a life limiting condition or was related to a life limiting condition or a contributing cause of death was a life limiting condition and to 0 if there was no indication of life limiting conditions. Candidate predictor variables were: age group at death, primary diagnostic group, deprivation category and ethnic group. Multivariable logistic regression models were fitted, with candidate predictors added in turn and retained if their odds-ratios were significantly ($p < 0.05$) different to 1 or inclusion reduced Schwarz's Bayesian Information Criterion for the model by more than 2.^{17, 18} Interactions between deprivation and ethnic group were also considered (using the same inclusion criteria). Models stratified between neonates and non neonates and between oncology and non-oncology primary diagnoses were also developed as it was observed that levels of life limiting condition recording in death records varied greatly between these groups. Individuals with data missing for any included predictors were excluded from the corresponding models.

RESULTS

England

Cohort size

411154 children and young people with a life limiting condition were identified between 1 April 2001 and 31 March 2015 while aged 0-25; 37784 had death records with a date of death in the period. 221 death records (0.6%) were considered invalid as there were one or more inpatient admissions after their recorded date of death and were excluded, leaving 37563 individuals in the final cohort. There were 73 individuals (0.2% of final cohort) with conflicting dates of birth between records: in each case the more commonly recorded date of birth was used. Numbers of deaths in each year and cohort demographics are shown in Table 1.

Missing data

6% of non-neonates had unknown ethnicity, although this figure reduced to 3% for individuals with a date of death on or after 1 April 2009. Including neonates, 10% missed ethnicity information (5% excluding deaths before 1 April 2009, Table 1). 3% of non-neonates had an unknown deprivation category, rising to 10% including neonates. There were no missing data for age group at death or diagnostic category. To test for effects of missing data, a sensitivity analyses was undertaken in the statistical modelling, generating models for the whole time period and also for only 1 April 2009 onwards and with and without neonates.

Cause of death

Among non-neonates, 16642 (57%) had a life limiting condition recorded as underlying cause of death (Table 2); 3364 (12%) had a life limiting condition-related underlying cause and 3435 (12%) had life limiting conditions only among contributing causes, of which 116 had a trauma-related underlying cause (Table 2). 5651 (19%) had no indication of life limiting conditions in their death records. Among neonates, 5028 (59%) had a life limiting condition or life limiting condition-related condition among their causes of death; 3443 (41%) had no indication of life limiting conditions among causes of death.

Table 1: Demographics, missing data and cause of death by year of death for the English cohort.

	Financial year of death		
	2001/02 – 2004/05	2005/06-2009/10	2010/11-2014/15
Deaths in period	9,055	13,984	14,524
Deaths by age group			
Neonate	1,781	3,118	3,572
Post-neonatal infant	1,476	2,282	2,161
1-5 years	1,334	1,793	1,723
6-10 years	713	928	891
11-15 years	882	1,120	886
16-20 years	1,233	1,697	1,465
21-25 years	1,324	2,021	2,009
Over 25 years	312	1,025	1,817
Deaths by ethnic group			
White	5,837	9,505	10,154
Indian	199	359	381
Pakistani	478	995	1,089
Bangladeshi	102	223	195
Black	348	739	851
Mixed	84	300	383
Other	358	641	730
Not known	1,649	1,222	741
Not known (excl nates)	964	622	299
Deaths by deprivation category			
1 (most deprived)	2,496	3,912	4,157
2	1,716	2,802	2,969
3	1,507	2,123	2,309
4	1,325	1,889	2,003
5 (least deprived)	1,200	1,757	1,704
Not known	811	1,501	1,382
Not known (excl nates)	221	390	310
Deaths by diagnostic category			
Neurology	1,530	2,698	2,993
Haematology	1,486	2,258	2,417
Oncology	2,670	3,431	3,433
Respiratory	1,263	2,268	2,975
Circulatory	675	1,267	1,242
Gastrointestinal	496	931	1,272
Genitourinary	993	1,907	2,493
Perinatal	1,447	2,673	3,328
Congenital	2,286	3,830	4,190

Metabolic		413	791	945
Other		205	336	429
Life limiting condition recording (excluding neonates)				
As underlying cause	Matched*	4,496 (62%)	6,204 (57%)	5,942 (54%)
	Related*	759 (10%)	1,275 (12%)	1,330 (12%)
As contributing cause		780 (11%)	1,319 (12%)	1,336 (12%)
<i>With trauma-related underlying cause</i>		26	46	44
Not recorded		1,239 (17%)	2,068 (19%)	2,344 (21%)
All non-neonate deaths		7,274	10,866	10,952

*Matched' underlying causes are those that matched diagnostic codes within the life limiting condition coding framework. 'Related' causes were considered to be related to framework diagnoses present for the individual in the inpatient data.

Cause of death by financial year of death

There was only minor variation in recording of life limiting conditions across financial year of death (Table 1).

The proportion of deaths reporting a life limiting condition as underlying cause varied from 53% to 62% while the proportion with no indication of life limiting conditions varied from 16% to 22%. There was no clear trend over time.

Table 2: Recorded cause of death for cohort members, split by age group at death.

Life limiting condition recording		Neonate	Age at death – English data							
			Post-neonatal Infant	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	21-25 years	> 25 years	All non-neonates
As underlying cause	Matched	5028* (59%)	2463 (42%)	2598 (54%)	1601 (63%)	1865 (65%)	2808 (64%)	3378 (63%)	1929 (61%)	16642 (57%)
	Related		1231 (21%)	673 (14%)	261 (10%)	302 (10%)	386 (9%)	300 (6%)	211 (7%)	3364 (12%)
As contributing cause			903 (15%)	631 (13%)	278 (11%)	323 (11%)	433 (10%)	522 (10%)	345 (11%)	3435 (12%)
With trauma-related underlying cause			<10	<10	<10	14	21	43	20	116
Not recorded		3443 (41%)	1322 (22%)	948 (20%)	392 (15%)	398 (14%)	768 (17%)	1154 (22%)	669 (21%)	5651 (19%)
All deaths in age group		8471	5919	4850	2532	2888	4395	5354	3154	29092

* 'Matched' underlying causes are those that matched diagnostic codes within the life limiting condition coding framework. 'Related' causes were considered to be related to framework diagnoses present for the individual in the inpatient data.

** Neonate cause of death could not be split between underlying, related or contributory life limiting condition in the English data – all causes of death that were a life limiting condition or related to a life limiting condition were counted

Cause of death by age at death

Neonates were significantly more likely to have no indication of life limiting conditions in death records than non neonates (40.6%, 95% CI 39.6-41.7% compared to 19.4%, 95%CI 19.0-19.9%) (Table 2). Recording of a life limiting condition as underlying cause of death was lowest (2463, 42%) amongst postneonatal infants, but they had the highest percentage of life limiting condition -related deaths (1231, 21%). The youngest and eldest were most likely among the age groups to have no indication of life limiting condition in death records.

Cause of death by ethnic group

Children and young people of Bangladeshi or Black ethnicity were less likely than White children and young people to have a life limiting condition as underlying cause of death (Bangladeshi: 48.5%, 95%CI 43.5-53.4%; Black: 49.4, 95% CI 46.9-52.0%; White: 58.9%, 95% CI 58.2-59.6%) although they had higher levels of life

limiting condition-related underlying or contributory causes of death (Table 3). Black children and young people were significantly more likely than White children and young people to have no indication of life limiting conditions in their death records (Black: 24.0%, 95% CI 21.8-26.2%; White: 18.8%, 95%CI 18.3-19.3%).

Table 3: Recorded cause of death for England cohort members, split by ethnic group.

		Ethnic group – English data								
Life limiting condition recording		White	Indian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Black	Mixed	Other	Unknown	All groups
As underlying cause	Matched*	12176 (59%)	415 (57%)	1104 (53%)	191 (48%)	729 (49%)	299 (54%)	749 (56%)	979 (52%)	16642 (57%)
	Related*	2325 (11%)	69 (9%)	263 (13%)	50 (13%)	201 (14%)	74 (13%)	170 (13%)	212 (11%)	3364 (12%)
As contributing cause		2284 (11%)	100 (14%)	324 (16%)	74 (19%)	191 (13%)	68 (12%)	186 (14%)	208 (11%)	3435 (12%)
With trauma-related underlying cause		92	≤10	≤10	≤10	≤10	≤10	≤10	≤10	116
Not recorded		3883 (19%)	144 (20%)	376 (18%)	79 (20%)	354 (24%)	108 (20%)	221 (17%)	486 (26%)	5651 (19%)
All deaths associated with ethnic group		20668	728	2067	394	1475	549	1326	1885	29092

*‘Matched’ underlying causes are those that matched diagnostic codes within the life limiting condition coding framework. ‘Related’ causes were considered to be related to framework diagnoses present for the individual in the inpatient data.

Cause of death by deprivation category

Individuals in the most deprived categories were less likely than those in the least deprived category to have a life limiting condition recorded as the underlying cause of death (category 1: 53.7%, 95% CI 52.6-54.7%; category 5: 62.6%, 95% CI 61.1-64.1%) and more likely to have no indication of life limiting conditions (category 1: 22.3%, 95% CI 21.5-23.2%; category 5: 15.7%, 95% CI 14.5-16.8%) (Table 4).

Table 4: Recorded cause of death for cohort members, excluding English neonates, split by deprivation category of last recorded deprivation score. The categories are population weighted so that 20% of the general population is in each category.

Life limiting condition recording		Deprivation category – English data				
		1 (most deprived)	2	3	4	5 (least deprived)
As underlying cause	Matched*	4639 (54%)	3436 (56%)	3012 (59%)	2576 (60%)	2494 (63%)
	Related*	948 (11%)	727 (12%)	605 (12%)	510 (12%)	446 (11%)
	As contributing cause	1125 (13%)	767 (12%)	563 (11%)	449 (11%)	418 (10%)
	With trauma-related underlying cause	34	30	21	18	11
Not recorded		1930 (22%)	1259 (20%)	906 (18%)	737 (17%)	624 (16%)
All deaths associated with IMD score		8642	6189	5086	4272	3982

*‘Matched’ underlying causes are those that matched diagnostic codes within the life limiting condition coding framework. ‘Related’ causes were considered to be related to framework diagnoses present for the individual in the inpatient data.

Cause of death by diagnostic group

94% of individuals with an Oncology diagnosis had a life limiting condition as underlying cause of death; only 3% had no indication of life limiting conditions in their death records (Table 5). Only 28% of patients with a perinatal diagnosis had a life limiting condition as the underlying cause of death, while those with genitourinary diagnoses were most likely (31%) to have no life limiting condition among any cause of death.

Table 5: Recorded cause of death for cohort members, excluding English neonates, split by diagnostic group.

		Diagnostic group – English data										
Life limiting condition recording		Neurology	Haematology	Oncology	Respiratory	Circulatory	Gastrointestinal	Genitourinary	Perinatal	Congenital	Metabolic	Other
As underlying cause	Matched*	3143 (45%)	5105 (83%)	8862 (94%)	3188 (49%)	1457 (52%)	1242 (50%)	2167 (43%)	652 (28%)	2766 (41%)	1288 (65%)	700 (72%)
	Related*	1433 (20%)	108 (2%)	22 (0%)	100 (12%)	788 (16%)	443 (7%)	174 (8%)	411 (28%)	656 (24%)	1638 (5%)	25 (2%)
As contributing cause		946 (13%)	457 (7%)	292 (3%)	1046 (16%)	431 (15%)	425 (17%)	900 (18%)	400 (17%)	1088 (16%)	333 (17%)	155 (16%)
With trauma-related underlying cause		33	<10	11	18	<10	16	32	<10	29	<10	<10
Not recorded		1516 (21%)	455 (7%)	299 (3%)	1448 (22%)	455 (16%)	650 (26%)	1571 (31%)	609 (26%)	1334 (20%)	1983 (13%)	91 (9%)
All deaths associated with diagnostic group		7028	6125	9474	6467	2782	2491	5046	2319	6823	1983	970

*‘Matched’ underlying causes are those that matched diagnostic codes within the life limiting condition coding framework. ‘Related’ causes were considered to be related to framework diagnoses present for the individual in the inpatient data.

Multivariable model

The final model (Table 6) showed some differences to the univariable analyses. Neonates were least likely to have a life limiting condition recorded, but 21-25 year olds, and 1-5 and 6-10 year olds were next least likely to have a life limiting condition recorded (odds ratio compared to post neonatal infants: neonate 0.54, 95% CI 0.49-0.60; 1-5 year olds 0.74, 95% CI 0.67-0.83; 6-10 year olds 0.74, 95% CI 0.64-0.86; 21-25 year olds 0.62, 95% CI 0.55-0.69). Variations by ethnic group were also different in the multivariable model, with minority ethnic groups either not significantly different to White children and young people in likelihood of having a life limiting condition recorded or more likely (Pakistani: 1.40, 95% CI 1.25-1.57 times more likely than White children and young people; Other ethnicity 1.25, 95% 1.08-1.43 times more likely than White children and young people). Children and young people in less deprived categories were more likely than children and young people in more deprived categories to have a life limiting condition recorded (odds ratio for least deprived category 1.19, 95% CI 1.08-1.32 compared to most deprived category). However, there were only small differences between the three least deprived categories. Primary diagnostic group showed similar patterns to those seen in the univariable analyses: haematology and oncology diagnoses were most likely to be associated with life limiting condition recording in death records and genitourinary, gastrointestinal and perinatal diagnoses least likely.

There were only minor differences between models stratified between neonates and non-neonates or between individuals with and without oncology as primary diagnostic group. Neither was there significant evidence for interaction between deprivation and ethnic group, so the interaction was not included in the final model. The sensitivity analyses produced models that were not significantly different to the main model (Tables S7 and S8, in the supplement).

Table 6: Logistic regression model, using the English data, for the odds ratio of a death record containing any indication of life limiting condition (underlying, related or contributing) depending on age group at death, ethnic group, deprivation category and primary diagnostic group.

	Odds Ratio for life limiting condition in death record	95% confidence interval		P value
Age group at death				
Neonate	0.54	0.49	0.60	< 0.01
Post neonatal infant	1 (ref)			
1-5	0.74	0.67	0.83	< 0.01
6-10	0.74	0.64	0.86	< 0.01
11-15	0.98	0.85	1.13	0.77
16-20	0.80	0.71	0.90	< 0.01
21-25	0.62	0.55	0.69	< 0.01
> 25	0.74	0.65	0.84	< 0.01
Ethnic group				
White	1 (ref)			
Indian	1.13	0.94	1.34	0.19
Pakistani	1.40	1.25	1.57	< 0.01
Bangladeshi	1.15	0.91	1.45	0.24
Black	0.99	0.87	1.11	0.81
Mixed	1.10	0.90	1.33	0.35
Other	1.25	1.08	1.43	< 0.01
Last recorded deprivation category				
1 (most deprived)	1 (ref)			
2	1.11	1.02	1.20	0.01
3	1.17	1.07	1.28	< 0.01
4	1.21	1.10	1.33	< 0.01
5 (least deprived)	1.19	1.08	1.32	< 0.01
Primary diagnostic group				
Neurology	0.09	0.08	0.10	< 0.01
Haematology	0.06	0.05	0.08	< 0.01
Oncology	1 (ref)			
Respiratory	0.06	0.05	0.07	< 0.01
Circulatory	0.09	0.07	0.11	< 0.01
Gastrointestinal	0.03	0.03	0.04	< 0.01
Genitourinary	0.03	0.02	0.03	< 0.01
Perinatal	0.04	0.03	0.05	< 0.01
Congenital	0.10	0.08	0.11	< 0.01
Metabolic	0.18	0.14	0.22	< 0.01
Other	0.08	0.05	0.12	< 0.01
Model characteristics				
Log likelihood	-13744			
BIC	27778			
Degrees of freedom	28			

Scotland

Full results are presented in the supplement. Of 2249 individuals in the final cohort, 57% had a life limiting condition recorded as underlying cause of death, 14% had a life limiting condition-related underlying cause, 12% had a life limiting condition only among contributing causes and 16% had no indication of life limiting conditions. Under 1 and over 20 year olds were most likely to have no life limiting condition recorded. Those in the most deprived category were more likely (20%) to have no life limiting condition recorded than those in the least deprived category (15%). Only primary diagnostic group showed significant associations with life limiting condition recording in the multivariable model, with life limiting condition recording most likely for individuals in the haematology and oncology primary diagnostic group and least likely for those in the genitourinary group (odds ratio 0.02, 95%CI 0.01-0.05 compared to haematology and oncology).

DISCUSSION

This study has shown that using death certificate data alone to identify the numbers of children and young people with a life limiting condition would have resulted in underestimation of approximately 24% when compared to those identified via inpatient hospital data (for neonates and non-neonates, counting life limiting conditions in all cause of death fields in the English data). The Scottish data provided similar results (see supplement), although recording of life limiting conditions was higher (only 16% had no indication of life limiting conditions in any cause of death field). Readily available death register data in many countries only include the underlying cause of death and using these alone would underestimate the number of children and young people with a life limiting condition further (in the English data, 31% of non-neonate cohort members had neither a life limiting condition nor life limiting condition-related underlying cause of death recorded; for Scotland this figure was 28% for all ages). This may explain the differences in life limiting condition prevalence estimates between studies using routine inpatient hospital data³⁻⁵ and studies using death records.⁷⁻⁹

There are grounds to favour estimates from the inpatient data over estimates from the death records. The number of deaths each year among children identified with a life limiting condition from the inpatient data (e.g. 1766 among 0-14 year olds in 2013) is close to a previous estimate of 50% of child deaths being due to life limiting conditions,¹⁹ (3631 0-14 year olds died in England in 2013).²⁰ It would be expected that most deaths in individuals identified as having a life limiting condition should either have the life limiting condition as underlying cause or be due to trauma (as broadly defined here), but only 116 of the 3435 deaths with life

limiting conditions recorded as a contributing cause were trauma-related. This suggests there are quality or completeness issues with the death records. The cause of death data are produced by automated analysis of death certificates²¹ and the ONS have noted issues and changes in the way that underlying cause of death is determined in recent years,²² which may result in more maternal conditions as underlying cause of death being recorded as perinatal conditions.²³ This study was concerned with whether death records for children and young people known (from routine hospital data) to have had a life limiting condition would also record the life limiting condition, whether as underlying or any cause of death as this affects the reliability of life limiting condition prevalence estimates based on these data. It is immaterial, when using these data to estimate prevalence, whether any errors in recording are in the manual completion of death certificates or their later automated analysis.

As paediatric palliative care is recommended to start at the point of diagnosis (or recognition) of a life limiting condition rather than just end of life care, only counting the number of children who have died from death records cannot provide a useful estimate of paediatric palliative care need. As treatments improve and survival times for many life limiting conditions increase, death rates are likely to lag behind prevalence increases and underestimate current life limiting condition prevalence.⁹ There is no indication that the gap between life limiting conditions recorded on death records and indicated in inpatient data is decreasing over time, for either the English or Scottish data.

The multivariable model for England is broadly consistent with the univariable descriptive analyses – similar variations are seen for age, deprivation category and diagnostic group. Variation by ethnic group however appears reversed. After controlling for age, primary diagnostic group and deprivation category, individuals of Pakistani and Other ethnicity appear more likely than White individuals to have life limiting condition recorded on their death records; there were no significant differences between White individuals and those from Indian, Bangladeshi, Black or Mixed ethnic groups. This may suggest that the previously observed variation by ethnicity was due to factors such as deprivation or diagnoses (both known to vary by ethnic group²⁴⁻²⁷). The decreased likelihood of life limiting condition recording in death certificates for individuals from more deprived areas may suggest geographical variations in cause of death recording, possibly due to differences in resource provision and quality of recording. Lower likelihood of life limiting condition recording in death records for the very young may be due to greater uncertainty about the exact causes of death; for the older groups, reduced

recording may be due to death following a longer and more complex chain of events from underlying life limiting condition to proximate cause of death, with the underlying life limiting condition not always being recorded. Differences in life limiting condition recording in different diagnostic categories may also be linked to the directness or otherwise of the life limiting condition leading to death. Differences in conditions and the clarity of any link between the life limiting condition and death in those conditions may influence levels of recording among ethnic groups. Further work is needed to investigate these issues. Similar results were seen for the multivariable model for the Scottish data (see Table S6, supplement), although most of the variations – except by primary diagnostic group – were not statistically significant, possibly due to the smaller sample size.

Underestimation of life limiting condition prevalence from death records particularly affects some diagnostic groups (e.g. genitourinary diagnoses), the more deprived and (perhaps as a consequence of diagnostic and deprivation variations) some minority ethnic groups. This has implications for service planning where it could lead to under-provision for these groups or incorrect prioritisation of other groups that appear to have comparatively higher demand and for epidemiological studies, such as those looking at levels of particular life limiting conditions in populations, where bias may be introduced, underestimating prevalence of some conditions more than others. For example, LF's earlier study⁴ on prevalence of life limiting conditions among children and young people in England would be expected to produce different estimates with different relative levels across diagnostic and age groups if using death records. Estimation of demand for service planning should be based on routine hospital data as this is both more up to date and more complete than the death records.

This study used high quality national healthcare data and compared data independently collected in England and Scotland to verify that the variations seen were not unique to one country. The cohorts were identified using an objectively applied coding framework. However, decisions over what constituted a life limiting condition-related underlying cause of death were subjective. The number of cohort members with unknown ethnicity and deprivation category is a concern for the robustness of the analyses with regard to ethnicity and deprivation. The missing data could not be imputed from other fields, but a sensitivity analysis using only data from 2009/10 onwards (with more complete ethnicity data, Table S7, supplement) and excluding neonates (providing more complete ethnicity and deprivation data, Table S8, supplement) supports the findings using the whole study period and all age groups.

CONCLUSION

Using death record data to estimate need for paediatric palliative care services should be undertaken with caution as 19% of non-neonates (31% if using only underlying cause of death) and 41% of neonates identified using the life limiting condition coding framework as having a life limiting condition would have been missed. The most deprived, the youngest and oldest, Black individuals and those with genitourinary, gastrointestinal or perinatal diagnoses were most likely to be missed using death records alone.

FUNDING

This paper is independent research arising from a Postdoctoral Fellowship (LF) supported by the National Institute for Health Research. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health.

SJ was funded to perform the analyses as part of the Paediatric Palliative Care Program supported by Martin House Children's Hospice.

REFERENCES

1. Feudtner C, DiGiuseppe DL and Neff JM. Hospital care for children and young adults in the last year of life: a population-based study. *BMC Medicine*. 2003; 1: 3-.
2. Cohen E, Berry JG, Camacho X, Anderson G, Wodchis W and Guttmann A. Patterns and Costs of Health Care Use of Children With Medical Complexity. *Pediatrics*. 2012; 130: e1463-e70.
3. Jarvis S, Parslow RC, Carragher P, Beresford B and Fraser LK. How many children and young people with life-limiting conditions are clinically unstable? A national data linkage study. *Archives of disease in childhood*. 2016: archdischild-2016-310800.
4. Fraser LK, Miller M, Hain R, et al. Rising national prevalence of life-limiting conditions in children in England. *Pediatrics*. 2012; 129: e923-9.
5. Fraser LK, Jarvis SW, Moran NE, Aldridge J, Parslow RC and Beresford BA. Children in Scotland requiring Palliative Care: identifying numbers and needs (The ChiSP Study). 2015.
6. World Health Organisation. *International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems*. 10 ed. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organisation, 1992.
7. Cochrane H, Liynage S and Nantanmbi R. *Palliative Care Statistics for Children and Young Adults: Health and Care Partnerships Analysis*. Department of Health, 2007.
8. Baum D, Curtis H, Elston S, et al. A Guide to the Development of Children's Palliative Care Services. Bristol/London 1997.
9. Chambers L, Dodd W, McCulloch R, et al. A Guide to the Development of Children's Palliative Care Services: Third Edition. Bristol 2009.
10. Johansson LA and Westerling R. Comparing Swedish hospital discharge records with death certificates: implications for mortality statistics. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2000; 29(3):495-502
11. Hardeid P, Dattani N and Gilbert R. Estimating the prevalence of chronic conditions in children who die in England, Scotland and Wales: a data linkage cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2014; 4(8):e005331
12. Health & Social Care Information Centre. A Guide to Linked Mortality Data from Hospital Episode Statistics and the Office for National Statistics. Health & Social Care Information Centre, 2015.
13. Department for Communities and Local Government. SOA level 2001 population estimates - rounded. <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100410180038/http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/general-content/communities/indicesofdeprivation/216309/>
14. Department for Communities and Local Government. Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004. https://data.gov.uk/dataset/imd_2004
15. Department for Communities and Local Government. SOA level ID 2004. <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100410180038/http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/general-content/communities/indicesofdeprivation/216309/>
16. Noble M, Wright G, Dibben C, et al. *The English Indices of Deprivation 2004*. London: ODPM Publications, 2003.
17. Schwarz G. Estimating the dimension of a model. *The annals of statistics*. 1978; 6: 461-4.
18. Kass RE and Raftery AE. Bayes factors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 1995; 90: 773-95.
19. Sidebotham P, Fraser J, Fleming P, Ward-Platt M and Hain R. Patterns of child death in England and Wales. *The Lancet*. 2014; 384: 904-14.
20. Office for National Statistics. Mortality Statistics: Deaths Registered in England and Wales (Series DR), 2013. *Statistical Bulletin*. Fareham: Office for National Statistics, 2014.
21. Office for National Statistics. Mortality Statistics: Metadata, 2015. Newport: Office for National Statistics, 2015.
22. Office for National Statistics. Impact of the Implementation of IRIS Software for ICD-10 Cause of Death Coding on Mortality Statistics, England and Wales. *Statistical Bulletin*. Newport: Office for National Statistics, 2014.
23. Office for National Statistics. Impact of the implementation of IRIS software for ICD-10 cause of death coding on stillbirth and neonatal death statistics: England and Wales. *Statistical Bulletin*. Newport: Office for National Statistics, 2016
24. Platt L. *Poverty and ethnicity in the UK*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2007.
25. Parslow RC, Tasker RC, Draper ES, et al. Epidemiology of critically ill children in England and Wales: Incidence, mortality, deprivation and ethnicity. *Archives of disease in childhood*. 2009; 94: 210-5.

26. Sheridan E, Wright J, Small N, et al. Risk factors for congenital anomaly in a multiethnic birth cohort: an analysis of the Born in Bradford study. *The Lancet*. 2013; 382: 1350-9.
27. Corry PC. Consanguinity and Prevalence Patterns of Inherited Disease in the UK Pakistani Community. *Human Heredity*. 2014; 77: 207-16.

Supplement Part 1: Scotland

METHODS

Data used and cohort identification

For Scotland, the inpatient dataset (SMR01), Scottish Birth Records and General Records Office death record data were used. Data access was approved by the Privacy Advisory Committee (ref: XRB14010). The Scottish data were analysed within the NSS Electronic Data Research and Innovation Service safe haven¹ and results underwent disclosure control.²

Children and young people with a life limiting condition were identified by matching recorded diagnostic codes in inpatient records and birth records against the International Classification of Diseases Version 10 coding framework, for individuals aged 0-25 in the study period (1 April 2003 to 30 March 2014).

Data Management

The Scottish datasets were linked by NHS National Services Scotland using the Community Health Index number.^{3, 4}

Date of birth was assigned as the most commonly recorded date in the inpatient and birth data. Dates of death came from death records. Individuals with invalid dates of death (more than one day before the beginning of an inpatient record) were excluded from the cohort.

Individuals who had died were assigned an age group at death: under 1 year old (in Scotland, neonates and post-neonatal infants could not be separated), 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25 and over 25 years. Age at death was determined by subtracting date of birth from date of death.

Provided within the data was a population-weighted Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2009 category, with 10% of the population in each category. These ten categories were collapsed to five for analyses. Individuals were assigned the last deprivation category recorded before death.

The available ethnic categories were collapsed to three, due to small numbers: White, South Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi) and Other. Ethnic group was determined as the most commonly recorded ethnicity (from these collapsed groupings) within the data.

Life limiting condition diagnoses were categorized into 9 groups based on the main diagnostic chapters: neurology, haematology and oncology, metabolic and other, respiratory, circulatory, gastrointestinal, genitourinary, perinatal and congenital (for the Scottish data, small numbers in some groups meant that haematology and oncology were combined into one group, as were metabolic and other). Individuals may be assigned more than one diagnostic group if they had more than one life limiting condition recorded in the inpatient hospital data. A primary diagnostic group, the most common diagnostic group across all inpatient records, was assigned to each individual. Where there was more than one most common diagnostic group, later diagnoses were prioritised (diagnoses from earliest records were progressively removed until the tie was broken).

Analyses

Cause of death

The Scottish death records contained underlying and other causes of death. Whether underlying cause of death was a life limiting condition was checked using the coding framework. If not a life limiting condition, underlying cause was assessed to see whether it was related to a life limiting condition identified in the

inpatient data. For example, nonspecific cerebral palsy as cause of death was considered related to quadriplegic cerebral palsy; unspecified congenital malformations of heart to tetralogy of Fallot. Finally, for those with underlying cause neither a life limiting condition nor life limiting condition-related, contributing causes of death were checked against the life limiting condition coding framework. Where life limiting condition was recorded as a contributing cause, trauma-related underlying causes were determined (all codes starting S; T0; T1; T2; T30; T31; T32; T5; T6; T7; T9; V; W; X; Y1; Y2; Y3).

The analyses were split by age group (at death), by ethnic group, by deprivation category, by diagnostic category and by financial year of death.

Statistical modelling

Predictors of life limiting condition being present in death records were explored. A binary outcome variable was defined indicating presence of life limiting condition in a death record, set to 1 if the underlying cause was a life limiting condition or was related to a life limiting condition or a contributing cause of death was a life limiting condition and to 0 if there was no indication of life limiting conditions. Candidate predictor variables were: age group at death, primary diagnostic group, deprivation category and ethnic group. Multivariable logistic regression models were fitted, with candidate predictors added in turn and retained if their odds-ratios were significantly ($p < 0.05$) different to 1 or inclusion reduced Schwarz's Bayesian Information Criterion for the model by more than 2.^{5,6} Interactions between deprivation and ethnic group were also considered (using the same inclusion criteria). Individuals with data missing for any included predictors were excluded from the corresponding models.

RESULTS

Cohort size

In Scotland, 20436 children and young people with a life limiting condition were identified between 1 April 2009 and 31 March 2014 in the Scottish inpatient and birth records. Of these, 2320 had death records in the period. 71 death records were excluded as there were one or more inpatient admissions after the recorded date of death, leaving 2249 individuals in the final cohort. Numbers of deaths in each year and cohort demographics are shown in Table S1.

Missing data

There were large numbers of missing ethnicity data in the Scottish cohort, over half for those dying in the first few years of the study (Table S1). There were no missing data for age group or diagnostic group and missing data for deprivation were at or below 1%.

Table S1: Demographics, missing data and cause of death by year of death for the Scottish cohort.

	Financial year of death		
	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06
Deaths in year	598	843	808
Age group			
Under 1 year	186	217	183
1-5 years	121	97	89
6-10 years	≤50**	66	58
11-15 years	68	79	64
16-20 years	79	155	144
21-25 years	92	171	154
Over 25 years	≤10	58	116
Ethnic group			
White	209	381	580
South Asian	≤20**	≤20**	≤20**
Other	≤10	≤10	≤10
Not known	385	441	188
Deprivation category			
1 (most deprived)	159	252	208
2	117	194	192
3	115	148	152
4	107	126	133
5 (least deprived)	96	121	118
Not known	≤10	≤10	≤10
Diagnostic category			
Neurology	115	175	187
Haematology & Oncology	193	286	255
Respiratory	98	196	181
Circulatory	48	60	64
Gastrointestinal	30	42	66
Genitourinary	54	105	132
Perinatal	93	97	76
Congenital	151	204	200
Metabolic & Other	69	85	72
Life limiting condition recording			
As underlying cause	Matched* 362 (61%)	479 (57%)	450 (56%)
As contributing cause	Related* 93 (16%)	118 (14%)	108 (13%)
With trauma-related underlying cause	57 (10%)	113 (13%)	98 (12%)
Not recorded	≤10	≤10	≤10
	86 (14%)	133 (16%)	152 (19%)

* Matched' underlying causes are those that matched diagnostic codes within the life limiting condition coding framework. 'Related' causes were considered to be related to framework diagnoses present for the individual in the inpatient data.

** larger values censored to prevent reconstruction of smaller censored values

Cause of death

In Scotland, 1291 cohort members (57%) had a life limiting condition recorded as underlying cause of death (Table S2); 319 (14%) had a life limiting condition-related underlying cause and 268 (12%) had life limiting

conditions only among contributing causes, of which 10 had a trauma-related underlying cause (Table S2). 371 (16%) had no indication of life limiting conditions in their death records.

Cause of death by financial year of death

There was only minor variation in recording of life limiting conditions across financial year of death (Table S1), with no clear trend over time.

Cause of death by age at death

In Scotland, recording of a life limiting condition as underlying cause of death was lowest (239, 41%) amongst under 1 year olds, but they had the highest percentage of life limiting condition-related deaths (150, 26%) (Table S2). Under 1 and over 20 year olds were most likely to have no life limiting condition among any cause of death (under 1s: 19%; 21-25 year olds: 21%; over 25 year olds: 19%).

Table S2: Recorded cause of death for cohort members, split by age group at death.

Life limiting condition recording		Age at death						
		Under 1 year	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	21-25 years	> 25 years
As underlying cause	Matched*	239 (41%)	185 (60%)	114 (67%)	147 (70%)	236 (62%)	264 (63%)	106 (59%)
	Related*	150 (26%)	51 (17%)	20 (12%)	28 (13%)	36 (10%)	23 (6%)	11 (6%)
As contributing cause		84 (14%)	30 (10%)	15 (9%)	18 (9%)	49 (13%)	44 (11%)	28 (16%)
<i>With trauma-related underlying cause</i>		≤5	≤5	≤5	≤5	≤5	7	≤5
Not recorded		113 (19%)	41 (13%)	22 (13%)	18 (9%)	57 (15%)	86 (21%)	34 (19%)
All deaths in age group		586	307	171	211	378	417	179

*'Matched' underlying causes are those that matched diagnostic codes within the life limiting condition coding framework. 'Related' causes were considered to be related to framework diagnoses present for the individual in the inpatient data.

Cause of death by ethnic group

In Scotland, White individuals were more likely to have life limiting conditions recorded as underlying cause of death (675, 58%) than those in the South Asian (21, 49%) or Other (≤10, <50%) groups. Disclosure control prevented release of most values for non-White groups.

Table S3: Recorded cause of death for Scotland cohort members, split by ethnic group.

Life limiting condition recording		Ethnic group		
		White	South Asian	Other
As underlying cause	Matched*	675 (58%)	21 (49%)	≤10
	Related*	177 (15%)	≤10	≤10
As contributing cause		134 (11%)	≤10	≤10
<i>With trauma-related underlying cause</i>		≤10	≤10	≤10
Not recorded		184 (16%)	≤10	≤10
All deaths associated with ethnic group		1170	43	18

*‘Matched’ underlying causes are those that matched diagnostic codes within the life limiting condition coding framework. ‘Related’ causes were considered to be related to framework diagnoses present for the individual in the inpatient data.

Cause of death by deprivation category

In Scotland, recording of a life limiting condition as the underlying cause of death was less likely for those in the more deprived categories than in the least deprived categories (category 1: 50.4%, 95% CI 46.5-54.3%; category 5: 61.2%, 95%CI 56.0-66.4%).

Table S4: Recorded cause of death for Scotland cohort members, split by deprivation category of last recorded deprivation score. The categories are population weighted so that 20% of the general population is in each category.

Life limiting condition recording		Deprivation category				
		1 (most deprived)	2	3	4	5 (least deprived)
As underlying cause	Matched	312 (50%)	286 (57%)	245 (59%)	236 (64%)	205 (61%)
	Related	101 (16%)	70 (14%)	57 (14%)	42 (11%)	49 (15%)
As contributing cause		81 (13%)	61 (12%)	54 (13%)	39 (11%)	30 (9%)
<i>With trauma-related underlying cause</i>		≤10	≤10	≤10	≤10	≤10
Not recorded		125 (20%)	86 (17%)	59 (14%)	49 (13%)	51 (15%)
All deaths associated with deprivation category		619	503	415	366	335

* ‘Matched’ underlying causes are those that matched diagnostic codes within the life limiting condition coding framework. ‘Related’ causes were considered to be related to framework diagnoses present for the individual in the inpatient data.

Cause of death by diagnostic group

In Scotland, 94% of individuals with a haematology or oncology diagnosis had a life limiting condition as underlying cause of death; only 2% had no indication of life limiting conditions in their death records (Table S5). Only 36% of patients with a genitourinary diagnosis had a life limiting condition as the underlying cause of death and 33% no life limiting condition among any cause of death.

Table S5: Recorded cause of death for Scotland cohort members split by diagnostic group.

		Diagnostic group – Scottish data								
Life limiting condition recording		Neurology	Haematology & Oncology	Respiratory	Circulatory	Gastrointestinal	Genitourinary	Perinatal	Congenital	Metabolic & Other
As underlying cause	Matched*	222 (47%)	900 (94%)	265 (56%)	93 (54%)	59 (43%)	104 (36%)	91 (34%)	254 (46%)	183 (79%)
	Related*	106 (22%)	8 (1%)	60 (13%)	25 (15%)	17 (12%)	28 (10%)	72 (27%)	155 (28%)	10 (4%)
As contributing cause		75 (16%)	30 (3%)	75 (16%)	28 (16%)	35 (25%)	63 (22%)	50 (19%)	86 (15%)	17 (7%)
<i>With trauma-related underlying cause</i>		≤5	≤5	≤5	≤5	7	≤5	≤5	≤5	≤5
Not recorded		74 (16%)	23 (2%)	75 (16%)	26 (15%)	27 (20%)	96 (33%)	53 (20%)	60 (11%)	21 (9%)
All deaths associated with diagnostic group		477	961	475	172	138	291	266	555	231

* 'Matched' underlying causes are those that matched diagnostic codes within the life limiting condition coding framework. 'Related' causes were considered to be related to framework diagnoses present for the individual in the inpatient data.

Multivariable model

The multivariable model for the Scottish data (Table S6) showed no significant variations by age. Neither were there significant variations by ethnic group or deprivation category (although for deprivation category there was an apparent trend towards increased likelihood of life limiting condition recording for individuals from less deprived areas, albeit not significant). Primary diagnostic group showed similar patterns to those seen in the univariable analyses: haematology and oncology diagnoses were most likely to be associated with life limiting condition recording in death records and genitourinary, gastrointestinal and perinatal diagnoses least likely.

Table S6: Logistic regression model, using the Scottish data, for the odds ratio of a death record containing any indication of life limiting conditions (underlying, related or contributing) depending on age group at death, ethnic group, deprivation category and primary diagnostic group.

	Odds Ratio for life limiting conditions in death record	95% confidence interval		P value
Age group				
Under 1	1 (ref)			
1-5	0.95	0.53	1.68	0.85
6-10	0.84	0.42	1.70	0.63
11-15	1.11	0.52	2.36	0.79
16-20	0.88	0.49	1.57	0.67
21-25	0.58	0.32	1.05	0.07
> 25	0.73	0.36	1.48	0.38
Ethnic group				
White	1 (ref)			
South Asian	1.44	0.57	3.66	0.45
Other	0.63	0.21	1.89	0.41
Last recorded deprivation category				
1 (most deprived)	1 (ref)			
2	1.06	0.67	1.65	0.81
3	1.15	0.71	1.86	0.58
4	1.27	0.74	2.19	0.39
5 (least deprived)	1.40	0.79	2.49	0.26
Primary diagnostic group				
Neurology	0.09	0.04	0.19	< 0.01
Haematology and oncology	1 (ref)			
Respiratory	0.06	0.03	0.14	< 0.01
Circulatory	0.08	0.03	0.20	< 0.01
Gastrointestinal	0.05	0.02	0.13	< 0.01
Genitourinary	0.02	0.01	0.05	< 0.01
Perinatal	0.06	0.02	0.18	< 0.01
Congenital	0.17	0.08	0.39	< 0.01
Metabolic and Other	0.14	0.05	0.43	< 0.01
Model characteristics				
Log likelihood	-452			
BIC	1053			
Degrees of freedom	21			

REFERENCES

1. ISD Scotland. Electronic Data Research and Innovation Service (eDRIS). <http://www.isdscotland.org/Products-and-Services/EDRIS/>.
2. Buchanan D. *ISD Statistical Disclosure Control Protocol*. Edinburgh: ISD Scotland Publications, 2009.
3. Kendrick S and Clarke J. The Scottish record linkage system. *Health bulletin*. Edinburgh 1993, p. 72-9.
4. Kendrick S. The Development of Record Linkage in Scotland: The Responsive Application of Probability Matching. In: Alvey W and Jamerson B, (eds.). *Record linkage techniques – 1997 Proceedings of an*

International Workshop and Exposition. Washington DC: Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology, Office of Management and Budget, 1997, p. 319-32.

5. Schwarz G. Estimating the dimension of a model. *The annals of statistics*. 1978; 6: 461-4.

6. Kass RE and Raftery AE. Bayes factors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 1995; 90: 773-95.

Supplement Part 2: Sensitivity analyses for England

Table S7: Logistic regression model, using the English data, for the odds ratio of a death record containing any indication of life limiting conditions (underlying, related or contributing) depending on age group at death, ethnic group, deprivation category and primary diagnostic group. Sensitivity analysis for deaths from 1 April 2009 onwards when there are fewer missing ethnicity data.

	Odds Ratio for life limiting conditions in death record	95% confidence interval		P value
Age group at death				
Neonate	0.55	0.48	0.63	< 0.01
Post neonatal infant	1 (ref)			
1-5	0.71	0.60	0.83	< 0.01
6-10	0.67	0.55	0.83	< 0.01
11-15	1.03	0.83	1.29	0.76
16-20	0.69	0.58	0.82	< 0.01
21-25	0.55	0.47	0.64	< 0.01
> 25	0.71	0.60	0.84	< 0.01
Ethnic group				
White	1 (ref)			
Indian	1.11	0.87	1.41	0.39
Pakistani	1.51	1.28	1.78	< 0.01
Bangladeshi	1.34	0.96	1.86	0.09
Black	1.04	0.88	1.23	0.64
Mixed	1.13	0.89	1.45	0.31
Other	1.44	1.18	1.75	< 0.01
Last recorded deprivation category				
1 (most deprived)	1 (ref)			
2	1.11	1.00	1.24	0.06
3	1.21	1.07	1.36	< 0.01
4	1.19	1.04	1.36	0.01
5 (least deprived)	1.20	1.05	1.38	< 0.01
Primary diagnostic group				
Neurology	0.09	0.07	0.11	< 0.01
Haematology	0.06	0.05	0.08	< 0.01
Oncology	1 (ref)			
Respiratory	0.05	0.04	0.07	< 0.01
Circulatory	0.09	0.07	0.12	< 0.01
Gastrointestinal	0.03	0.02	0.04	< 0.01
Genitourinary	0.03	0.02	0.03	< 0.01
Perinatal	0.05	0.04	0.06	< 0.01
Congenital	0.10	0.08	0.12	< 0.01
Metabolic	0.18	0.13	0.24	< 0.01
Other	0.06	0.03	0.12	< 0.01
Model characteristics				
Log likelihood	-7048			
BIC	14366			
Degrees of freedom	28			

Table S8: Logistic regression model, using the English data, for the odds ratio of a death record containing any indication of life limiting condition(underlying, related or contributing) depending on age group at death, ethnic group, deprivation category and primary diagnostic group. Sensitivity analysis excluding neonates.

	Odds Ratio for a life limiting condition in death record	95% confidence interval		P value
Age group at death				
Post neonatal infant	1 (ref)			
1-5	0.76	0.68	0.85	< 0.01
6-10	0.76	0.66	0.88	< 0.01
11-15	1.00	0.86	1.16	0.98
16-20	0.82	0.72	0.93	< 0.01
21-25	0.63	0.56	0.71	< 0.01
> 25	0.76	0.67	0.87	< 0.01
Ethnic group				
White	1 (ref)			
Indian	1.07	0.88	1.31	0.49
Pakistani	1.36	1.19	1.54	< 0.01
Bangladeshi	1.14	0.87	1.49	0.34
Black	0.92	0.81	1.06	0.27
Mixed	1.10	0.87	1.39	0.42
Other	1.20	1.02	1.41	0.03
Last recorded deprivation category				
1 (most deprived)	1 (ref)			
2	1.09	1.00	1.20	0.06
3	1.20	1.08	1.32	< 0.01
4	1.23	1.10	1.37	< 0.01
5 (least deprived)	1.27	1.13	1.42	< 0.01
Primary diagnostic group				
Neurology	0.09	0.08	0.10	< 0.01
Haematology	0.06	0.05	0.08	< 0.01
Oncology	1 (ref)			
Respiratory	0.06	0.05	0.07	< 0.01
Circulatory	0.10	0.08	0.12	< 0.01
Gastrointestinal	0.03	0.02	0.04	< 0.01
Genitourinary	0.03	0.02	0.03	< 0.01
Perinatal	0.05	0.04	0.06	< 0.01
Congenital	0.10	0.08	0.11	< 0.01
Metabolic	0.19	0.15	0.23	< 0.01
Other	0.08	0.05	0.13	< 0.01
Model characteristics				
Log likelihood	-10801			
BIC	21876			
Degrees of freedom	27			