

THE COST OF INACTION: STRENGTHENING NUTRITION IN FRAILTY GUIDELINES ACROSS EUROPE

Authors: **Mohede I¹, Dular A¹, Alderson D², Ricci M², Tchoukouaha T²**

¹Danone Nutricia Research, Hoofddorp, Netherlands, ²Cogentia Healthcare Consulting, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, UK

Background and aims

- Frailty in older adults increases the risk of falls, fractures, and healthcare burden.
- Frailty increases vulnerability to even minor physical challenges, making falls both more likely and more harmful.
- As the population ages, costs are rising: for example, in the UK, fragility fractures cost over £1.8 billion annually⁶.
- Similarly, in the Netherlands, falls among older adults already cost €1.5 billion annually, projected to rise to €5 billion by 2050⁷.
- International guidance¹ recommends multimodal interventions, including nutritional support as a key cost-effective component of frailty management.
- Yet it remains unclear to what extent national frailty and/or fall-prevention guidelines across Europe effectively incorporate and operationalise nutritional interventions, highlighting a critical gap with significant cost and outcome implications.

Objective

- To assess whether national frailty and/or fall-prevention guidelines integrate nutrition as an actionable strategy and provide practical implementation guidance.

Methods

- National frailty and/or fall-prevention guidelines and geriatrics-society recommendations (2015–2024) from France, Germany, Italy, Spain, the UK, and the Netherlands were reviewed.
- Guidelines were assessed against seven predefined criteria: frailty definition, screening recommendation, screening tool, nutritional assessment, nutritional intervention, care setting, and implementation strategy.
- A comparative rating table (Figure 1) was developed to identify cross-country patterns and inconsistencies.

Results

- Across the six countries reviewed, nutrition was included in most guidelines but not consistently operationalised into specific, funded interventions.
- France, Italy, and Germany provide structured frailty guidance through the comprehensive geriatric assessment (CGA), yet implementation mechanisms are limited.
- Spain, the UK, and the Netherlands include national or regional prevention frameworks

Table 1: Comparative assessment of national frailty guidelines (2015–2024) across six European countries, evaluated against seven predefined criteria

	Descriptive				Evaluative		
	Frailty Definition	Screening Tool	Care Setting	Screening Recommendation	Nutritional Assessment	Nutritional Intervention	Implementation Strategy
France ²	Clear clinical definition (HAS 2013)	6-item frailty grid + MNA	Covers community + hospital	Early detection in primary care	MNA part of CGA	Dietary advice ("alimentation adaptée")	No national roll-out or funding plan
Germany ³	Frailty via geriatric criteria	G8 / TRST used	Hospital focus only	Mandatory CGA screening inpatient	Nutrition listed as CGA domain	Intervention left to clinician	No national strategy
Italy ⁴	No national frailty definition; Uses MPI prognostic index		Principles across settings; inpatient detail strongest	Case-based CGA use	Mentioned indirectly in CGA	No specific guidance	No implementation plan
Spain ⁵	WHO-based definition	SPPB / FRAIL / Fried	All levels incl. community	Proactive primary-care screening	Included in assessment	Personalised diet ± ONS + Vit D	National consensus; implementation via regions
UK ⁶	Recognised clinical condition	eFI / CFS	Primary + secondary care	Mandatory GP case-finding	Acknowledged but not routine	Mentioned; not structured	Mandated via GP contract
Netherlands ^{7,8}	Multi-domain approach used in practice (e.g., TFI)	GFI / TFI / PRISMA-7	Community + integrated care	Selective early detection	Malnutrition screening in local pathways	Dietitian referral via care networks	National "chain-of-care approach"

Colour legend: = Explicit inclusion and operational guidance; = Partial mention or assessment without structured implementation; = Absent or minimal reference.

Acronyms: CGA = Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment; CFS = Clinical Frailty Scale; eFI = Electronic Frailty Index; FRAIL = Fatigue, Resistance, Ambulation, Illnesses, Loss of Weight; G8 = Geriatric 8; GFI = Groningen Frailty Indicator; MNA = Mini Nutritional Assessment; MPI = Multidimensional Prognostic Index; ONS = Oral Nutritional Supplement; PRISMA-7 = 7-item frailty questionnaire; SPPB = Short Physical Performance Battery; TFI = Tilburg Frailty Indicator; TRST = Triage Risk Screening Tool.

Discussion

- Despite broad recognition, nutrition is rarely positioned as a core fall-prevention or frailty-management strategy. Strengthening nutritional assessment and intervention could meaningfully improve outcomes and reduce healthcare burden.
- In the UK, modelling by Public Health England estimated that a coordinated fracture-prevention programme could deliver potential savings of £2.1 million over five years⁶; In the Netherlands, modelling of community-based falls-prevention programmes estimated net savings of €0.2–5.6 million per 100,000 older adults⁸, potentially reducing part of the country's projected €5 billion annual fall-related healthcare costs by 2050⁷.
- The Netherlands demonstrates strong implementability, with the *Ketenaanpak Valpreventie* (chain-of-care approach) linking primary care, municipalities, and insurers to deliver validated fall-prevention programmes. This coordinated national model shows how preventive guidelines can be translated into scalable local action, providing a blueprint for other European markets to strengthen uptake of multimodal, nutrition-inclusive interventions.

Conclusion

With the burden of frailty and falls continuing to grow, **now is the time to act**. European health systems should:

- Embed **routine nutritional screening and intervention** within frailty pathways.
- Strengthen **implementation frameworks and funding models** to ensure preventive care is delivered locally.
- Investigate **payment pathways and access barriers** that currently limit uptake of multimodal prevention, including **medical nutrition**.

Future analyses should focus on understanding these barriers and **quantifying both the clinical and economic benefits of full and consistent implementation of prevention guidelines**.

REFERENCES

- Haute Autorité de Santé (HAS). Repérage de la fragilité et prévention de la perte d'autonomie chez les personnes âgées vivant à domicile. Paris: HAS; 2013.
- Deutsche Gesellschaft für Geriatrie (DGG). S3-Leitlinie: Umfassendes Geriatrisches Assessment (CGA). AWMF-Registernr. 084-003; 2023.
- Società Italiana di Gerontologia e Geriatria (SIGG). Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment in Older People: National Guideline. Aging Clinical and Experimental Research. 2024;36(5):179–187.
- Ministerio de Sanidad de España. Actualización del documento de consenso sobre fragilidad y caídas en la persona mayor. Madrid: Gobierno de España; 2022.
- NHS England, Public Health England, Age UK. Falls and Fractures Consensus Statement and Resource Pack. London: NHS England; 2017;
- RCP FFFAP "State of the nation – England" (2019)
- VeiligheidNL. Feiten en cijfers valongevallen 65+ 2024. Amsterdam: VeiligheidNL; 2024. VeiligheidNL. Feiten en cijfers valongevallen 65+ 2022. Amsterdam: VeiligheidNL; 2022.
- Klaassen M, et al. A societal cost-benefit analysis of falls prevention in community-dwelling older people in the Netherlands. Health Policy. 2025
- Cederholm T, et al. ESPEN Guidelines on Clinical Nutrition and Hydration in Geriatrics. Clinical Nutrition. 2019;38(1):10–47.