

に脳血管障害を合併しているケースではガラ  
ンタミンが推奨される。また中等度で易興奮  
や攻撃などのBPSDがある場合にはメマンチ  
ンが推奨される。

### 治療効果不十分の場合の 薬剤選択基準

治療効果不十分な場合や副作用で変更する  
場合には、やはり重症度別に判断する。副作  
用として消化器症状が強い場合には、リバス  
チグミンやメマンチンを選択する。副作用と  
して皮膚症状がある場合にはリバスチグミン  
以外のものを選択する。

なお、ドネペジルから変更する場合にはガ  
ランタミンもリバスチグミンも認知機能低下  
のギャップはそれほどなく、スムーズな変更  
が可能であるとの報告も存在する。

### BPSDからみた選択基準

BPSDに対しては適応がとれていない薬剤  
が多い。以前は定型抗精神病薬が用いられて  
きたが、最近ではリスペリドンやオランザピ  
ン、アリピプラゾールなどの非定型抗精神病  
薬が用いられるようになってきた。しかし米  
国ではこの種類の薬剤は脳卒中の発生率が高  
いとして、ADには禁忌となっている。日本で  
は副作用が少なく、かつ有用性があるため、  
慎重に適応を判断し使用されている。これら  
の薬剤では副作用の発現頻度が比較的高いた  
め、副作用を軽減するためにも少量から投与  
することがポイントである。また認知症の  
BPSDには抑肝散がよく用いられている。特  
にレビー小体型認知症のBPSDには有効性が  
高いとされている。副作用としては低カリウ  
ム血症に注意する。またメマンチンは興奮や  
攻撃などのBPSDに有効であることが知られ  
ている。ただし、発現頻度は低いが、傾眠傾  
向が報告されている。BPSDをコントロール

することは医師だけでなく、家族や本人の苦  
痛をとる意味においても重要である。

### 薬剤の変更のタイミング

薬剤の変更は、効果を短期間で判断せずに、  
数カ月間みた後に判断する。

すなわち、コリンエステラーゼ阻害剤から  
1剤を選択し、2～3カ月ごとに効果を観察  
し、6カ月程度みても効果がみられない場合  
には他の薬剤に変更する。その際には薬剤の  
特徴を考慮する。また、メマンチンの併用も  
選択肢として考慮する。なお、攻撃や興奮な  
どのBPSDがある場合には、メマンチンを初  
期から投与することも考慮する。

### 薬剤の中止について

薬剤の中止時期については、嚥下障害など  
で食事がとれなくなった場合、介護施設に入  
所した場合、病状が悪化した場合などである。  
また重症化し、薬剤の効果が期待できないと  
判断された場合である。

### おわりに


ADを早期に発見し、早期治療した場合に4  
剤のさらなる有用性に期待している。さらに  
長期使用時の効果についても一定のエビデ  
ンスが存在する。その有用性は確かであろう。  
しかし日本での効果の検証は、今後一定の時  
間を経て判断する必要がある。また、新薬に  
対する認知症の人や家族の期待は大きい  
が、効果に対する過剰な期待は問題である。

### 参考文献

- 1) 日本神経学会監修。認知症疾患治療ガイドライ  
ン。医学書院：2010。



JAMDA

journal homepage: [www.jamda.com](http://www.jamda.com)

## Original Study

## Priorities of Health Care Outcomes for the Elderly

Masahiro Akishita MD, PhD<sup>a,\*</sup>, Shinya Ishii MD<sup>a</sup>, Taro Kojima MD<sup>a</sup>, Koichi Kozaki MD, PhD<sup>b</sup>, Masafumi Kuzuya MD, PhD<sup>c</sup>, Hidenori Arai MD, PhD<sup>d</sup>, Hiroyuki Arai MD, PhD<sup>e</sup>, Masato Eto MD, PhD<sup>a</sup>, Ryutaro Takahashi MD, PhD<sup>f</sup>, Hidetoshi Endo MD, PhD<sup>g</sup>, Shigeo Horie MD, PhD<sup>h</sup>, Kazuhiko Ezawa MD, PhD<sup>i</sup>, Shuji Kawai MD, PhD<sup>i</sup>, Yozo Takehisa MD, PhD<sup>j</sup>, Hiroshi Mikami MD, PhD<sup>k</sup>, Shōgo Takegawa MSc<sup>l</sup>, Akira Morita BPS<sup>m</sup>, Minoru Kamata DME<sup>n</sup>, Yasuyoshi Ouchi MD, PhD<sup>a</sup>, Kenji Toba MD, PhD<sup>g</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Geriatric Medicine, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

<sup>b</sup> Department of Geriatric Medicine, Kyorin University School of Medicine, Mitaka, Japan

<sup>c</sup> Department of Geriatric Medicine, Nagoya University Graduate School of Medicine, Nagoya, Japan

<sup>d</sup> Department of Human Health Sciences, Kyoto University Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto, Japan

<sup>e</sup> Department of Geriatric Medicine, Tohoku University Graduate School of Medicine, Sendai, Japan

<sup>f</sup> Tokyo Metropolitan Geriatric Hospital and Institute of Gerontology, Tokyo, Japan

<sup>g</sup> National Center for Geriatrics and Gerontology, Obu, Japan

<sup>h</sup> Department of Urology, Teikyo University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

<sup>i</sup> Japan Association of Geriatric Health Services Facilities, Tokyo, Japan

<sup>j</sup> Japan Association of Medical and Care Facilities, Tokyo, Japan

<sup>k</sup> Japan Medical Association, Tokyo, Japan

<sup>l</sup> Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

<sup>m</sup> Faculty of Law, Gakushuin University, Tokyo, Japan

<sup>n</sup> Institute of Gerontology, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

## A B S T R A C T

**Keyword:**  
Geriatrics  
quality of care  
health care policy

**Objectives:** Physicians are uncertain about what medical services should be provided to older and/or disabled patients. Better understanding of health outcome prioritization among health care providers and recipients may help the process of decision- and policy-making. For this purpose, surveys were conducted on priorities of health care outcomes for the elderly.

**Design:** Survey research.

**Setting:** Four groups of health care providers and four groups of health care recipients.

**Participants:** A total of 2512 health care providers and 4277 recipients.

**Measurements:** Questionnaires were sent to more than 8000 health care providers and more than 9000 health care recipients: geriatricians, physicians who commonly see older patients or work in long term care facilities, staff members and participants in adult day care, patients in outpatient geriatric clinics, family members of patients with dementia, and community-dwelling older adults. The questionnaire asked the subjects to rank 12 measures of health care outcomes.

**Results:** The mean response rate was 49%. All health care provider groups considered "improvement of quality of life" the most important. In contrast, in health care recipient groups, "effective treatment of illness," "improvement of physical function," and "reduction of carer burden" were given high priority, whereas "improvement of quality of life" was perceived as less important. All the groups, including health care providers and recipients, ranked "reduction of mortality" the least important, followed by "avoiding institutional care." Stratification analysis showed that the results did not differ by sex, nursing care level, or the existence of relatives who required nursing care, whereas age slightly influenced the order of high-ranked measures.

This study was supported by a Health and Labor Sciences Research Grant (H22-Choju-Shitei-009) from the Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare of Japan.

\* Address correspondence to Masahiro Akishita, MD, PhD, Department of Geriatric Medicine, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo; 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8655, Japan.  
E-mail address: akishita-ky@umin.ac.jp (M. Akishita).

**Conclusion:** Priorities of health care services and their differences between providers and recipients should be taken into account in the health care of older patients and the design of health care policies and research.  
Copyright © 2013 - American Medical Directors Association, Inc.

Japanese society has been rapidly aging owing to long life expectancy and a low birth rate.<sup>1</sup> People older than 65 comprised 23.8% of the population in 2012, which is expected to rise to 31.8% in 2030<sup>2</sup> and will be by far the highest in the world. Japanese physicians have been exposed to a high load of older patients, and management of older patients remains a major challenge. There are several reasons for this difficulty. Evidence is still largely lacking for older patients, especially for those older than 75 years, who account for 11.8% of the Japanese population.<sup>2,3</sup> Older patients are likely to have multimorbidities, or co-occurrence of two or more chronic conditions,<sup>4</sup> but application of disease-specific guidelines to older patients with multimorbidities may result in polypharmacy, an increased risk of adverse drug reactions, and poor outcomes.<sup>5,6</sup> At the same time, however, older patients are at increased risk of underuse of necessary medication, for fear of polypharmacy or complications.<sup>7,8</sup>

In an attempt to help optimize prescribing for older patients, investigators have devised numerous tools to guide clinicians, such as lists of indicated, beneficial medication or medication with high potential for harm.<sup>9,10</sup> Although these tools are helpful in reducing exposure of older patients to inappropriate medication and risk of adverse drug events,<sup>11</sup> they do not provide more general considerations, such as when or how to discontinue potentially inappropriate medications, how to balance risks and benefits of unlisted medication, or how to manage medication in special circumstances, such as palliative and hospice care where symptom control is of higher priority. Therefore, the process of determining the medication regimen is inevitably subjective and individualized, taking into account patients' cognitive, physical, and social function, remaining life expectancy, and the goals of care.

Unfortunately, few studies have examined the priorities of health care perceived by health care providers and recipients in geriatric medicine. One small study conducted in England more than 15 years ago showed that geriatricians and patients similarly gave high priority to reducing disability and improving quality of care, and low priority to reducing mortality.<sup>12</sup> However, the serious question of whether there may be a gap in priorities of health care between health care providers and recipients has been raised.<sup>13,14</sup>

Better understanding of health outcome prioritization among health care providers and recipients in geriatric medicine is necessary

to help physicians, older patients, and their family members discuss the goals of care and to assist health policy makers in effectively using resources to address the needs of older patients. In this study, we aimed to obtain a comprehensive picture of the views of groups with an important stake in geriatric health care services (geriatricians, physicians who commonly see older patients or work in long term care facilities, staff members and participants in adult day care, patients in outpatient geriatric clinics, family members of patients with dementia, and community-dwelling older adults) on the relative priorities of different outcome measures that are relevant to geriatric clinical practice and health care policy.

## Methods

Between September 2010 and October 2011, surveys were conducted in the following eight groups:

- (1) All geriatricians (approximately 1500) board certified by the Japan Geriatrics Society
- (2) A total of 5000 physicians randomly selected from the list of board-certified physicians in five subspecialties (two internal medicine subspecialties, two surgical subspecialties, and one other) with high exposure to older patients
- (3) Physicians working in 800 long term care facilities that were randomly chosen from the nationwide list of long term care facilities
- (4) Staff members working in adult day care at 400 randomly chosen long term care facilities as mentioned previously
- (5) Participants in adult day care at the same 400 long term care facilities as mentioned previously
- (6) Patients in geriatric outpatient clinics at five university teaching hospitals (the University of Tokyo, Kyorin University, Nagoya University, Kyoto University, and Tohoku University)
- (7) Family members of patients with dementia who had been seen in geriatric outpatient clinics at four university teaching hospitals (Tohoku University was excluded because of the Tohoku Earthquake at the time of this survey)
- (8) A total of 6000 community-dwelling, functionally independent (ie, not requiring nursing care provided by long term care

**Table 1**  
Survey Methods and Number of Valid Answers in 8 Groups

Groups	Time of Survey	Survey Methods	No. of Questionnaires Sent	No. (%) of Valid Answers*
<b>Health care providers</b>				
Geriatricians	2010, Sep	By post	1500	619 (41)
Physicians in 5 subspecialties	2011, Oct	By post	5000	1305 (26)
Physicians in long term care facilities	2011, Oct	By post	800	384 (48)
Adult day care staff	2010, Sep	By post for each facility	400 facilities (2 per facility)	204†
<b>Health care recipients</b>				
Adult day care participants	2010, Sep	By post for each facility	400 facilities (5–10 per facility)	795†
Patients in geriatric outpatient clinics	2010, Sep	Distributed by physicians and returned by post	950	512 (55)
Family members of patients with dementia	2011, Oct	Distributed by physicians and returned by post	542	333 (61)
Community-dwelling older adults	2010, Sep	By post	6000	2637 (44)

\*Responses with missing items or invalid answers were excluded.

†For adult day care staff members and participants, questionnaires were sent to each facility by post, where 2 staff members and 5 to 10 participants were offered the questionnaire; 123 facilities (31%) returned the completed questionnaires.

insurance) older adults randomly drawn from the community registers of two target areas (Kashiwa, Chiba Prefecture, a city close to Tokyo, and Sabae, Fukui Prefecture, a provincial city), from which men and women, 65 to 74 years and older than 75 years, were equally selected

Postal questionnaires were sent to all groups of physicians and community-dwelling old adults. For adult day care staff members and participants, questionnaires were sent to each facility, where two staff members and 5 to 10 participants were offered the questionnaire, to be completed on a voluntary basis. The completed questionnaires were gathered at each facility and then returned to us. Patients and family members of patients with dementia received the questionnaires from their physicians (Table 1).

The questionnaire asked about the relative priorities of 12 health care measures that were derived from a literature review and a previous Internet-based survey conducted by the National Center for Geriatrics and Gerontology in 2009 (in Japanese; <http://www.ncgg.go.jp/pdf/itaku/21hokoku/20si-3.pdf>). Each item was expressed as several words so as to help health care recipients understand the meaning. The respondents were asked to rank the measures in order of priority from 1 (most importance) to 12 (least important). To facilitate ranking the outcomes in order, they were prompted to choose and rank the three most important outcomes, then the three least important outcomes, and last, the six middle outcomes. Ties, or the same ranks, were not allowed.

To examine whether variation in the question wording could affect the results, we devised another version of the questionnaire with different wording for four items and sent that version to a randomly selected subset of participants; however, the results were almost identical (data not shown). We also tested whether the order of health care measures that appeared in the questionnaire would affect the results in a random subset of participants, but the responses to the reverse order questionnaire were similar to those of the original version (data not shown). Therefore, we analyzed the responses from different versions (wording and order) together.

The following information was also collected using the questionnaire: age and sex for all participants; specialty (internal medicine, surgery, psychiatry, or others) and years of experience for physicians; qualification and years of experience for adult day care staff; nursing care level (level of required nursing care: relatively independent, limited impairment, needing extensive help, or severely dependent) for adult day care participants; nursing care level and the existence of relatives who required nursing care for patients in geriatric outpatient clinics; nursing care level, morbid conditions, and the existence of relatives who required nursing care for community-dwelling older adults.

The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo. Ethical approval for the surveys on patients in geriatric outpatient clinics and family members of patients with dementia was also obtained from the participating institutions.

**Results**

The mean response rate for the eight groups was 49%, which varied from 28% for board-certified physicians to 68% for family members of patients with dementia (Table 1). The analytic sample included a total of 2512 health care providers and 4277 recipients.

Tables 2 and 3 show the relative priorities of 12 measures of health care services from the highest importance to the lowest, with mean and 95% CI, perceived by health care providers and recipients, respectively.

All physician groups considered "improvement of quality of life" the most important, and the low mean value for this item across physician

**Table 2**  
Health Care Providers' Priorities for Health Care Outcome

Rank Order	Geriatricians (n = 619)		Physicians from 5 Relevant Subspecialties (n = 1305)		Physicians in Long Term Care Facilities (n = 384)		Adult Day Care Staff (n = 204)	
	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI
1	2.62	2.45–2.80	3.09	2.96–3.22	2.88	2.62–3.14	4.29	3.88–4.71
2	4.37	4.15–4.58	4.34	4.19–4.49	4.60	4.32–4.88	4.35	3.96–4.73
3	4.80	4.53–5.07	4.64	4.48–4.80	4.68	4.39–4.97	4.80	4.42–5.17
4	4.92	4.69–5.15	5.25	5.08–5.42	4.73	4.43–5.03	5.15	4.74–5.55
5	4.94	4.71–5.18	5.32	5.13–5.52	5.50	5.29–5.71	5.26	4.86–5.65
6	6.04	5.87–6.20	5.93	5.79–6.07	5.77	5.51–6.04	5.43	5.03–5.83
7	6.39	6.17–6.61	6.12	5.97–6.27	6.10	5.84–6.37	5.83	5.42–6.25
8	6.45	6.27–6.64	6.39	6.26–6.52	6.22	5.87–6.57	7.17	6.79–7.55
9	7.83	7.67–8.00	7.50	7.37–7.62	8.15	7.95–8.35	7.41	6.95–7.87
10	8.80	8.62–8.98	8.69	8.56–8.82	8.20	7.95–8.44	7.43	7.04–7.81
11	10.28	10.15–10.42	10.24	10.14–10.34	10.31	10.13–10.50	9.97	9.71–10.23
12	10.56	10.37–10.76	10.49	10.36–10.62	10.85	10.67–11.04	10.92	10.66–11.17

CI, confidence interval.

**Table 3**  
Health Care Recipients' Priorities for Health Care Outcome

Rank Order	Community-Dwelling Older Adults (n = 2637)		Family Members of Patients With Dementia (n = 333)		Patients in Geriatric Outpatient Clinics (n = 512)		Adult Day Care Participants (n = 795)	
	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI
1	4.23	4.11–4.36	3.04	2.76–3.32	2.79	2.58–3.00	3.64	3.42–3.86
2	4.56	4.44–4.67	4.49	4.19–4.78	4.06	3.84–4.29	4.33	4.11–4.55
3	5.24	5.13–5.36	5.11	4.76–5.45	5.46	5.19–5.73	5.40	5.18–5.63
4	5.88	5.76–5.99	5.29	4.98–5.61	5.52	5.28–5.77	6.08	5.86–6.30
5	5.91	5.76–6.05	5.53	5.24–5.82	5.81	5.58–6.04	6.12	5.88–6.37
6	6.26	6.15–6.36	5.80	5.48–6.13	5.97	5.66–6.28	6.38	6.17–6.58
7	6.36	6.23–6.49	5.98	5.69–6.27	6.17	5.93–6.42	6.44	6.24–6.64
8	6.81	6.70–6.92	6.01	5.70–6.31	6.72	6.47–6.96	6.45	6.26–6.65
9	6.91	6.81–7.02	7.49	7.21–7.76	7.46	7.24–7.69	6.57	6.36–6.77
10	7.44	7.32–7.56	9.17	8.90–9.45	8.42	8.18–8.65	8.22	8.03–8.42
11	8.43	8.31–8.56	9.86	9.60–10.12	9.39	9.16–9.62	8.61	8.41–8.81
12	9.98	9.87–10.08	10.23	9.99–10.48	10.22	10.00–10.44	9.75	9.55–9.95

CI, confidence interval.

groups indicated physicians' strong preference for this item. All the physician groups also considered "patient satisfaction," "maintaining a high level of activity," and "improvement of physical function" important after "improvement of quality of life," with some variation in the order of their preferences. Geriatricians ranked "effective treatment of illness" the third most important, in contrast to the other two physician groups that ranked this item lower. Adult day care staff ranked "improvement of quality of life" and "maintaining a high level of activity" first and second, respectively, but placed "reduction of carer burden" the third most important, unlike physicians.

With regard to the receiving side of health care, "effective treatment of illness," "improvement of physical function," and "reduction of carer burden" were given high priority, whereas "improvement of quality of life" tended to be perceived as less important.

All the groups, including both health care providers and recipients, ranked "reduction of mortality" the least important, followed by "avoiding institutional care," "improvement of social functioning," and "efficient use of resources," except for the adult day care staff who ranked "improvement of social functioning" higher than "effective treatment of illness."

Stratification analysis demonstrated that the results from physicians were not influenced by sex (male vs female, data not shown); however, physicians older than 60 years tended to rank "effective treatment of illness" and "improvement of physical function" higher compared with younger physicians, who appeared to prioritize "patient satisfaction" and "maintaining a high level of activity." Physicians with more than 30 years' experience, most of whom were older than 60 years, showed a similar tendency, prioritizing "effective treatment of illness" and "improvement of physical function." The results from adult day care staff were identical across groups stratified by age, years of experience, and qualification (data not shown).

The results from the health care recipients did not differ by nursing care level (relatively independent vs limited impairment or higher, or limited impairment vs needing extensive help or higher) for adult day care participants and patients in geriatric outpatient clinics, the existence of relatives who required nursing care (present vs absent) for patients in geriatric outpatient clinics, study site for patients in geriatric outpatient clinics and community-dwelling older adults, or sex for all health care recipient groups (data not shown). Although stratification by age showed that the three measures given highest priority were the same across the age groups (65 to 74 vs older than 75) in community-dwelling older adults, the younger group ranked "reduction of carer burden" first, whereas the older group ranked "effective treatment of illness" first (data not shown).

## Discussion

This study is, to our knowledge, the largest survey ever conducted to describe health outcome prioritization in geriatric medicine. We aimed to obtain a comprehensive picture of the views of those involved in decision-making processes in geriatric medicine and compare views between health care providers and recipients. We chose four groups each from providers and recipients that are considered relevant to our purpose. The mean response rate was close to 50%, which was good for a large-scale postal survey and ensured the representative nature of our respondents.

This survey demonstrated that there may be an important gap in health outcome prioritization between health care providers and recipients in geriatric medicine. All health care provider groups, notably physicians, expressed a strong preference for improvement in quality of life (QOL) as a priority of care, whereas health care recipients gave the highest priority to effective treatment of diseases and tended to put lower importance on QOL. In the context of clinical medicine, QOL is often used as a nonspecific, all-encompassing term to describe

nonmortality outcomes averaged over multiple domains (ie, physical, social, and psychological functioning and well-being). Consideration of QOL is essential for the selection of a treatment option, particularly when conditions are noncurative and chronic.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, it is not surprising that physicians who regularly see older patients with multiple chronic conditions consider QOL the most important health care outcome. On the other hand, the term QOL may not be familiar to many health care recipients, and we cannot exclude the possibility that QOL might be confused with other terms, such as standard of living.

Most health care recipients ranked effective treatment of diseases as the most important, suggesting that patients are concerned about their own particular symptoms rather than nonspecific QOL, arguing for efforts to examine the symptoms most concerning to patients. The high importance of effective treatment of diseases ascribed by health care recipients, but not physicians, also implies the significance of the often-neglected aspect of inappropriate prescribing in older adults: underuse of medication likely to be beneficial to older adults. Increased evidence has suggested that failure to prescribe indicated, beneficial medication is common in older adults,<sup>7,8,16</sup> and recent attempts to provide an explicit list of appropriate, indicated medication for older adults are justified.<sup>10</sup>

Interestingly, views on patient satisfaction were also different. All physician groups ranked patient satisfaction as the second top priority, whereas health care recipients considered this to be less important. This tendency has been demonstrated in a prior small study in England more than 15 years ago.<sup>12</sup> Recently, patient satisfaction has been increasingly used to measure health care qualities and compare health plans or physicians.<sup>17</sup> However, our finding may argue against the value of patient satisfaction as a performance measure in geriatric medicine, especially in light of recent evidence suggesting that higher patient satisfaction is accomplished at the sacrifice of increased use of health care resources and may not be directly associated with technical quality of care or improved outcome.<sup>17,18</sup>

We observed agreement on several items between health care providers and recipients. The importance of physical and mental function, such as maintaining activity or improving physical function, was expressed by both health care providers and recipients. This finding was consistent with prior studies in older adults with multiple chronic conditions<sup>12,19</sup> or terminal conditions,<sup>20,21</sup> suggesting that physical and mental function should be an essential factor to consider as a health care outcome in various care settings for older patients.

Reduction in mortality was given the lowest priority by all the groups in health care providers and recipients alike. This view is similar to that observed in previous studies.<sup>12,19</sup> This finding supports the contention that treatment interventions should be assessed in terms of reduced morbidity and improved QOL in addition to reduced mortality.

In this survey, respondents' characteristics, except age, had limited influence on their views on health outcome prioritization within each group. Geriatricians older than 60 years and community-dwelling adults older than 75 years gave higher priority to effective treatment of diseases compared with their younger counterparts. This suggests that health outcome priorities may not be stable, and can change as respondents age or differ from generation to generation. The cross-sectional design of our survey prevented us from separating the age effect from the secular trend, and further studies will be required to examine the time- or setting-dependent variability of health outcome prioritization.

This study has several limitations. First, although the average response rate was high for a postal survey, it was lower in physician groups than in health care recipient groups (26% to 48% vs 44% to 61%, Table 1). Thus, selection bias cannot be excluded. Second, it was not sure that health care recipients, particularly adult day care participants, correctly understood the study terminology. Third, some of the

items used in the survey were not mutually exclusive. Nevertheless, a similar trend in priorities of outcome measures according to either side of health care providers or recipients suggests that the overall results were not significantly affected by these limitations.

## Conclusion

We demonstrated that there was significant agreement and disagreement of health outcome prioritization between health care providers and recipients in geriatric medicine. Health care providers and recipients agreed on high priority for function and low priority for reduction in mortality, but there was obvious disagreement in how they perceived QOL, treatment effect, and patient satisfaction as goals of care. Such disagreement necessitates better communication between providers and recipients to reach goals of care that are mutually understandable and tailored to meet patients' specific needs. The low importance of reduction in mortality and patient satisfaction ascribed by health care recipients may question the value of these outcomes as a way to assess treatment interventions and quality of care. We propose that the priorities of health care outcomes and their differences between providers and recipients demonstrated in this study should be taken into account in the health care of older patients and the design of health care policies and research.

## Acknowledgments

We thank the following individuals for helping the acquisition and/or interpretation of data: Dr Yumi Kameyama, Dr Kiyoshi Yamaguchi, and Dr Sumito Ogawa, Department of Geriatric Medicine, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo; Dr Katsuya Iijima, Institute of Gerontology, The University of Tokyo; Dr Yoichi Kosaka, Department of Geriatric Medicine, Tohoku University Graduate School of Medicine; Dr Hiroyuki Umegaki and Dr Yusuke Suzuki, Department of Geriatric Medicine, Nagoya University Graduate School of Medicine; and Dr Yukihiko Ikehata and Dr Ban Mihara, Japan Association of Medical and Care Facilities.

## References

1. Tamiya N, Noguchi H, Nishi A, et al. Population ageing and wellbeing: Lessons from Japan's long-term care insurance policy. *Lancet* 2011;378:1183–1192.
2. Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications Statistics Bureau, Director General for Policy Planning and Statistical Research and Training Institute. Population Estimate. 2012. Available at: <http://www.stat.go.jp/english/index.htm>. Accessed July 8, 2012.
3. Scott IA, Guyatt GH. Cautionary tales in the interpretation of clinical studies involving older persons. *Arch Intern Med* 2010;170:587–595.
4. Barnett K, Mercer SW, Norbury M, et al. Epidemiology of multimorbidity and implications for health care, research, and medical education: A cross-sectional study. *Lancet* 2012;380:37–43.
5. Boyd CM, Darer J, Boult C, et al. Clinical practice guidelines and quality of care for older patients with multiple comorbid diseases: Implications for pay for performance. *JAMA* 2005;294:716–724.
6. Tinetti ME, Bogardus ST Jr, Agostini JV. Potential pitfalls of disease-specific guidelines for patients with multiple conditions. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:2870–2874.
7. Hanlon JT, Schumacher KE, Ruby CM, Weinberger M. Suboptimal prescribing in older inpatients and outpatients. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2001;49:200–209.
8. Higashi T, Shekelle PG, Solomon DH, et al. The quality of pharmacologic care for vulnerable older patients. *Ann Intern Med* 2004;140:714–720.
9. American Geriatrics Society. Updated Beers Criteria for potentially inappropriate medication use in older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2012;60:616–631.
10. Gallagher P, Ryan C, Byrne S, et al. STOPP (Screening Tool of Older Person's Prescriptions) and START (Screening Tool to Alert doctors to Right Treatment). Consensus validation. *Int J Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2008;46:72–83.
11. Kaur S, Mitchell G, Vitetta L, Roberts MS. Interventions that can reduce inappropriate prescribing in the elderly: A systematic review. *Drugs Aging* 2009;26:1013–1028.
12. Roberts H, Khee TS, Philip I. Setting priorities for measures of performance for geriatric medical services. *Age Ageing* 1994;23:154–157.
13. Voigt I, Wrede J, Diederichs-Egidi H, et al. Priority setting in general practice: Health priorities of older patients differ from treatment priorities of their physicians. *Croat Med J* 2010;51:483–492.

14. Junius-Walker U, Stolberg D, Steinke P, et al. Health and treatment priorities of older patients and their general practitioners: A cross-sectional study. *Qual Prim Care* 2011;19:67–76.
15. Symonds T, Berzon R, Marquis P, Rummans TA. The clinical significance of quality-of-life results: Practical considerations for specific audiences. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2002;77:572–583.
16. Gurwitz JH. Polypharmacy: A new paradigm for quality drug therapy in the elderly? *Arch Intern Med* 2004;164:1957–1959.
17. Fenton JJ, Jerañt AF, Bertakis KD, Franks P. The cost of satisfaction: A national study of patient satisfaction, health care utilization, expenditures, and mortality. *Arch Intern Med* 2012;172:405–411.
18. Chang JT, Hays RD, Shekelle PG, et al. Patients' global ratings of their health care are not associated with the technical quality of their care. *Ann Intern Med* 2006;144:665–672.
19. Fried TR, Tinetti ME, Iannone L, et al. Health outcome-prioritization as a tool for decision making among older persons with multiple chronic conditions. *Arch Intern Med* 2011;171:1854–1856.
20. Rosenfeld KE, Wenger NS, Kagawa-Singer M. End-of-life decision making: A qualitative study of elderly individuals. *J Gen Intern Med* 2000;15:620–625.
21. Fried TR, Bradley EH, Towle VR, Allore H. Understanding the treatment preferences of seriously ill patients. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346:1061–1066.



