|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions** | **Results** |
| Number of people asked to be on LEAD | 9 |
| Number who actually agreed | 9 |
| # of disciplines and healthcare providers represented on LEAD panel | There are 5 unique types of disciplines and 2 unique types of healthcare workers. Of the 9 panelists, 3 are healthcare workers. |
| Retention (how many people stayed on the LEAD panel overtime) | 9 unique panelists voted in the initial assessment, 9 in the secondary and 7 in the post-DETECT.  I included a plot of the number of unique panelists per month over time in figure 1 below |
| Average Meeting Attendance | 4.692 (the average number of unique people who filled out a secondary assessment each month). |
| Average meeting length | The average longest Webex meeting attendance duration per meeting date is 48.22 mins. |
| I understand people could vote 3 times as they got additional information/discussion– how many people did that? | 7 participants voted in all three assessments |
| Do you have meta-data to see if people accessed or downloaded all the materials provided? | The most relevant data we have is the DETECT database access time logs beginning from 11/4/2020. There were no materials that required downloading. |
| What was the congruence in voting (at vote 1, 2 and 3)? | I included a table that shows this information in figure 2 below. |
| For the cases that did not have congruence – what type of cases were they? (physical, self-neglect, etc) | Figures 3 and 4 show the counts and proportions of non-congruent cases between the assessment types where each type of abuse was detected by the LEAD panel. |
| For cases that did not have congruence (or at least initially) – were there certain disciplines that tended to diverge from the others? | This question was interpreted as:  For cases where the initial assessment differed from either the secondary or post-DETECT assessments, which discipline was more likely to vote differently that the others? |
| Total number of cases reviewed by the panel | In the initial assessment, the number of unique MedStar IDs of older adults is 798. For the secondary assessment, the number is 135 and for the post-DETECT assessment, the number is 553 |
| Outcomes of cases voted on: % physical, % self-neglect, etc. | This information is displayed in figures 6 to 8. |

*Fig 1*

A graph showing a number of unique panelists

Description automatically generated

The table below answers the question: When comparing the initial assessment abuse determinations to the other assessments, what is the percentage of determinations that were the same for the assessments completed in both?

*Fig 2*

Table Showing the Percent Similarity Between the Initial Assessment Determination and the Other Assessment Types

|  | Initial |
| --- | --- |
| Initial | 100.00 |
| Secondary | 84.21 |
| Post-DETECT | 97.83 |

*Fig 3*

Non-congruent Cases Between Initial Assessment Determination and Secondary Assessment (Total non-congruent cases = 21)

| Abuse Types | Count | Proportion |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Physical abuse | 0 | 0.0000000 |
| Sexual abuse | 0 | 0.0000000 |
| Emotional abuse | 10 | 0.4761905 |
| Neglect | 4 | 0.1904762 |
| Self-neglect | 4 | 0.1904762 |
| Financial abuse | 4 | 0.1904762 |
| Abandonment | 0 | 0.0000000 |

*Fig 4*

Non-congruent Cases Between Initial Assessment Determination and Post-DETECT Assessment (Total non-congruent cases = 12)

| Abuse Types | Count | Proportion |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Physical abuse | 0 | 0.00000000 |
| Sexual abuse | 0 | 0.00000000 |
| Emotional abuse | 3 | 0.25000000 |
| Neglect | 1 | 0.08333333 |
| Self-neglect | 7 | 0.58333333 |
| Financial abuse | 1 | 0.08333333 |
| Abandonment | 0 | 0.00000000 |

*Fig 5*

*Fig 6*

Abuse Determinations Overall - Initial LEAD Assessment

|  | Overall (N=798) |
| --- | --- |
| LEAD physical abuse determination |  |
| No | 790 (99.0%) |
| Yes | 7 (0.9%) |
| Missing | 1 (0.1%) |
| LEAD sexual abuse determination |  |
| No | 796 (99.7%) |
| Yes | 2 (0.3%) |
| LEAD emotional-psycho abuse determination |  |
| No | 759 (95.1%) |
| Yes | 38 (4.8%) |
| Missing | 1 (0.1%) |
| LEAD neglect determination |  |
| No | 793 (99.4%) |
| Yes | 5 (0.6%) |
| LEAD abandonment determination |  |
| No | 797 (99.9%) |
| Yes | 0 (0%) |
| Missing | 1 (0.1%) |
| LEAD financial exploitation determination |  |
| No | 789 (98.9%) |
| Yes | 9 (1.1%) |
| LEAD self-neglect determination |  |
| No | 784 (98.2%) |
| Yes | 13 (1.6%) |
| Missing | 1 (0.1%) |

*Fig 7*

Abuse Determinations Overall - Secondary LEAD Assessment

|  | Overall (N=135) |
| --- | --- |
| LEAD physical abuse determination |  |
| No | 128 (94.8%) |
| Yes | 7 (5.2%) |
| LEAD sexual abuse determination |  |
| No | 134 (99.3%) |
| Yes | 1 (0.7%) |
| LEAD emotional-psycho abuse determination |  |
| No | 101 (74.8%) |
| Yes | 34 (25.2%) |
| LEAD neglect determination |  |
| No | 127 (94.1%) |
| Yes | 8 (5.9%) |
| LEAD abandonment determination |  |
| No | 134 (99.3%) |
| Yes | 1 (0.7%) |
| LEAD financial exploitation determination |  |
| No | 124 (91.9%) |
| Yes | 11 (8.1%) |
| LEAD self-neglect determination |  |
| No | 123 (91.1%) |
| Yes | 12 (8.9%) |

*Fig 8*

Abuse Determinations Overall - Post-Detect LEAD Assessment

|  | Overall (N=553) |
| --- | --- |
| LEAD physical abuse determination |  |
| No | 547 (98.9%) |
| Yes | 6 (1.1%) |
| LEAD sexual abuse determination |  |
| No | 552 (99.8%) |
| Yes | 1 (0.2%) |
| LEAD emotional-psycho abuse determination |  |
| No | 524 (94.8%) |
| Yes | 29 (5.2%) |
| LEAD neglect determination |  |
| No | 548 (99.1%) |
| Yes | 5 (0.9%) |
| LEAD abandonment determination |  |
| No | 552 (99.8%) |
| Yes | 1 (0.2%) |
| LEAD financial exploitation determination |  |
| No | 545 (98.6%) |
| Yes | 8 (1.4%) |
| LEAD self-neglect determination |  |
| No | 538 (97.3%) |
| Yes | 15 (2.7%) |