

Frailty-Informed Deprescribing and Shared Decisions in Older Adults

William Martin - Corresponding author

Abstract

This clinical review examines frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults. The organizing question is how evidence, prognosis, treatment burden, and patient priorities should jointly guide medication review. Ten related scholarly sources are synthesized through a decision-centered framework spanning problem definition, mechanism, measurement, evaluation, implementation, and governance. The review does not invent experiments, pooled estimates, or unreported quantitative results. It instead evaluates the strength and transferability of the available evidence, with particular attention to using chronological age or medication count as a substitute for individualized benefit-risk assessment. The resulting framework links technical or empirical performance to explicit use conditions and identifies tests that should precede wider adoption in medication optimization for older people with complex needs.

Keywords: frailty, deprescribing, shared decision making, older adults, polypharmacy

Synthesis lens	Principal question
Mechanism	the interaction among physiological reserve, multimorbidity, medicine-specific benefit horizons, and lived goals
Evaluation	frailty measurement, adverse events, patient-reported outcomes, withdrawal effects, and implementation fidelity
Primary risk	using chronological age or medication count as a substitute for individualized benefit-risk assessment

1. Introduction

Research on frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults sits at the boundary between a promising component and a consequential decision. The core question is how evidence, prognosis, treatment burden, and patient priorities should jointly guide medication review. Answering it requires more than assembling favorable results. It requires a chain of evidence that makes the problem boundary, mechanism, measurement, comparator, uncertainty, and accountable decision visible to the reader.

This article presents a structured narrative review of ten related publications. Sources were selected for topical relevance, traceable publication metadata, and complementary coverage of technical, empirical, and governance questions. No meta-analytic pooling is attempted because the included studies differ in designs, populations, system boundaries, and outcomes. The purpose is decision-oriented synthesis: to identify what each source can support, where transfer remains uncertain, and which evidence would justify the next stage of use.

The central risk is using chronological age or medication count as a substitute for individualized benefit-risk assessment. A top-line metric or broad policy label can appear decisive while concealing the conditions that produced it. Accordingly, the synthesis separates observation from interpretation and implementation from validation. This separation is especially important when the same system creates benefits for one user or institution while transferring cost, risk, or administrative burden to another.

2. Evidence Base and Problem Boundary

A defensible review begins by defining the unit of analysis. For the present topic, the relevant boundary includes inputs, institutional or technical context, the mechanism producing an output, the person or system acting on that output, and the downstream outcome. Evidence falls outside the boundary when it measures only an intermediate proxy yet is used to claim an end-to-end benefit.

Kim and Rockwood (2024) addresses "Frailty in Older Adults." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on problem definition within frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for medication optimization for older people with complex needs. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Page et al. (2016) addresses "The feasibility and effect of deprescribing in older adults on mortality and health: a systematic review and meta-analysis." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on conceptual boundary within frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for medication optimization for older people with complex needs. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Ibrahim et al. (2021) addresses "A systematic review of the evidence for deprescribing interventions among older people living with frailty." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on measurement within frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for medication optimization for older people with complex needs. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Together, these works provide complementary entry points, but their conclusions should not be flattened into a single ranking. Differences in data generation, setting, temporal horizon, and outcome definition may be substantively meaningful. A review should therefore preserve those differences and state where analogy, rather than direct replication, connects one domain to another.

3. Mechanism and System Design

The operative mechanism is the interaction among physiological reserve, multimorbidity, medicine-specific benefit horizons, and lived goals. This formulation discourages component-only reasoning. A model, platform, policy, assay, or infrastructure service acquires practical meaning only when its interfaces and use conditions are specified. The evidence chain should describe what information is available, what transformation occurs, which assumptions make that transformation credible, and who is authorized to act.

Church et al. (2020) addresses "A scoping review of the Clinical Frailty Scale." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on system mechanism within frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for medication optimization for older people with complex needs. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Benetos et al. (2019) addresses "Hypertension Management in Older and Frail Older Patients." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on representation choice within frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for medication optimization for older people with complex needs. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Hung et al. (2024) addresses "Deprescribing in older adults with polypharmacy." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on failure analysis within frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for medication optimization for older people with complex needs. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

These studies also show why modular claims require interface tests. A component may perform well while the complete pathway fails because inputs drift, users interpret outputs differently, recovery semantics are ambiguous, or institutional incentives change. Design documentation should therefore include not only the intended pathway but also foreseeable deviations, degraded modes, and conditions under which the system should stop or defer.

4. Evaluation and Uncertainty

Evaluation should center on frailty measurement, adverse events, patient-reported outcomes, withdrawal effects, and implementation fidelity. Average performance remains useful, but it should be accompanied by distributions, error categories, relevant subgroups or operating regimes, and uncertainty at the point where a decision changes. Comparators must isolate the value of the proposed addition rather than compare a mature intervention with an intentionally weak baseline.

Ailabouni et al. (2019) addresses "DEFEAT-polypharmacy: deprescribing anticholinergic and sedative medicines feasibility trial in residential aged care facilities." In this synthesis, that work is used as a

source on comparative evaluation within frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for medication optimization for older people with complex needs. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Ho et al. (2024) addresses "Deprescribing Cardiovascular Medications in Older Adults Living with Frailty." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on uncertainty within frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for medication optimization for older people with complex needs. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

External validation should introduce meaningful shifts in setting, time, population, workload, market structure, or environmental conditions. A nominally independent sample can still be too similar to test transfer. Conversely, a failed transfer is scientifically informative when the changed conditions are measured and the mechanism of failure is examined rather than hidden in an aggregate score.

5. Translation and Governance

Translation to medication optimization for older people with complex needs depends on more than technical readiness. Decision rights, documentation, maintenance, monitoring, appeal, and recovery are part of the intervention. The governance requirement is interprofessional review, explicit consent, follow-up plans, and reversible stepwise changes. Each control should be connected to a named failure mode and should identify an owner, evidence source, review interval, and escalation path.

Curtin et al. (2019) addresses "Deprescribing in Older People Approaching End of Life: A Randomized Controlled Trial Using STOPPFrail Criteria." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on implementation within frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for medication optimization for older people with complex needs. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Ulley et al. (2019) addresses "Deprescribing interventions and their impact on medication adherence in community-dwelling older adults with polypharmacy: a systematic review." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on governance within frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for medication optimization for older people with complex needs. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

A credible implementation plan also defines sunset and revalidation conditions. New data, software updates, institutional restructuring, population change, or shifts in incentives can invalidate previously reasonable assumptions. Monitoring should therefore test the validity of the evidence chain, not merely whether a service remains online or a headline metric remains stable.

6. Research Agenda

Future studies should preregister or otherwise predefine the intended decision, principal outcomes, exclusions, and analysis plan when feasible. They should report missingness, sensitivity analyses, negative or null findings, and the cost of errors to differently situated stakeholders. Reproducible artifacts should include sufficient metadata to reconstruct data provenance, model or analytical versions, parameter choices, and the sequence from evidence to conclusion.

Cross-disciplinary work needs a shared object of explanation rather than a collection of adjacent vocabularies. For frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults, that shared object is the complete decision pathway. Technical, clinical, social, environmental, or economic expertise should each change the design or interpretation of the study. When evidence remains incomplete, the useful output is a bounded hypothesis, a transparent uncertainty statement, or a request for additional measurement.

7. Conclusion

The literature supports a disciplined approach to frailty-informed deprescribing and shared decisions in older adults: define the decision, preserve system boundaries, test consequential failure modes, connect uncertainty to action, and assign accountable control. The strongest conclusion is not that one method is universally superior. It is that credible use in medication optimization for older people with complex needs requires an auditable link from source evidence to design choice, evaluation result, and governed decision.

Declarations

Ethics approval: Not applicable. This article synthesizes previously published literature and reports no research involving human participants, identifiable data, animals, or human tissue.

Consent to participate and consent for publication: Not applicable.

Clinical trial registration: Not applicable; no clinical intervention or participant enrollment was conducted.

Data availability: All evidence discussed in this article is identified in the reference list. No new participant-level dataset was generated.

Competing interests: The authoring group declares no competing interests for this commissioned synthesis.

References

- Ailabouni, N., Mangin, D., & Nishtala, P. S. (2019). DEFEAT-polypharmacy: deprescribing anticholinergic and sedative medicines feasibility trial in residential aged care facilities. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacy*, 41(1), 167-178. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11096-019-00784-9>
- Benetos, A., Petrovic, M., & Strandberg, T. (2019). Hypertension Management in Older and Frail Older Patients. *Circulation Research*, 124(7), 1045-1060. <https://doi.org/10.1161/circresaha.118.313236>
- Church, S., Rogers, E., Rockwood, K., & Theou, O. (2020). A scoping review of the Clinical Frailty Scale. *BMC Geriatrics*, 20(1), 393. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-020-01801-7>
- Curtin, D., Jennings, E., Daunt, R., Curtin, S., Randles, M., Gallagher, P., & O'Mahony, D. (2019). Deprescribing in Older People Approaching End of Life: A Randomized Controlled Trial Using STOPPFrail Criteria. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 68(4), 762-769. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.16278>
- Ho, K., Mallery, L., Trenaman, S., Searle, S., & Bata, I. (2024). Deprescribing Cardiovascular Medications in Older Adults Living with Frailty. *CJC Open*, 6(12), 1503-1512. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjco.2024.09.008>
- Hung, A., Kim, Y. H., & Pavon, J. M. (2024). Deprescribing in older adults with polypharmacy. *BMJ*, 385, e074892. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2023-074892>

- Ibrahim, K., Cox, N. J., Stevenson, J. M., Lim, S., Fraser, S. D. S., & Roberts, H. C. (2021). A systematic review of the evidence for deprescribing interventions among older people living with frailty. *BMC Geriatrics*, 21(1), 258. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-021-02208-8>
- Kim, D. H., & Rockwood, K. (2024). Frailty in Older Adults. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 391(6), 538-548. <https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmra2301292>
- Page, A. T., Clifford, R. M., Potter, K., Schwartz, D., & Etherton-Beer, C. D. (2016). The feasibility and effect of deprescribing in older adults on mortality and health: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 82(3), 583-623. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bcp.12975>
- Ulley, J., Harrop, D., Ali, A., Alton, S., & Davis, S. F. (2019). Deprescribing interventions and their impact on medication adherence in community-dwelling older adults with polypharmacy: a systematic review. *BMC Geriatrics*, 19(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-019-1031-4>