RESEARCH

Open Access

Elevated albumin: a protective factor against mortality in geriatric hip fracture patients



Hai Huang¹, Yao Liu^{2*} and Bin-Fei Zhang³

Abstract

Introduction To evaluate the association between albumin concentration at admission and mortality in elderly patients with hip fractures.

Methods Elderly patients with hip fractures were screened between Jan 2015 and Sep 2019. Demographic and clinical characteristics of the patients were collected. Linear and nonlinear multivariate Cox regression models were used to identify the association between albumin concentration at admission and mortality. All analyses were performed using EmpowerStats and the R software.

Results This retrospective cohort study included 2387 patients who met the study criteria. The mean follow-up was 37.64 months. The albumin concentration was 37.72 ± 4.03 g/L. Multivariate Cox regression showed that albumin concentration was associated with mortality in geriatric patients with hip fracture (Hazard Ratio [HR] = 0.94, 95% confidence intervals [CI]:0.92–0.96, P < 0.0001). Compared to the low albumin group (< 35 g/L), the medium group (≥ 35 g/L and < 40 g/L) decreased mortality risk by 29% (HR = 0.71, 95%CI:0.59–0.86, P = 0.0003), and the high group (≥ 40 g/L) decreased mortality risk by 38% (HR = 0.62, 95%CI:0.49–0.79, P < 0.0001). In addition, the test for a linear trend (P for trend) also showed a linear correlation in the different models. No saturation or threshold effect was observed in the nonlinear association. The sensitivity analysis used propensity score matching, and the results were stable.

Conclusion The albumin concentrations at admission were associated with mortality in geriatric hip fractures, and it could be considered a predictor for the risk of mortality. (ChiCTR2200057323)

Keywords Albumin concentration, Mortality, Elderly patients, Hip fracture, Cox regression

*Correspondence:

Yao Liu

43744989@qq.com

¹Department of Trauma Orthopaedic, Honghui Hospital, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, China

²Department of Anesthesiology, Honghui Hospital, Xi'an Jiaotong University, No. 555 Youyi East Road, Xi'an, Shaanxi Province 710054, China ³Department of Joint Surgery, Honghui Hospital, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Beilin District, Xi'an, Shaanxi Province, China

Introduction

Proximal femur fractures are a common consequence of osteoporosis, and we refer collectively to them as "hip fractures". They are a global challenge for healthcare systems, patients, and their families [1, 2]. The hip fracture incidences were estimated to be 14.2 million in 2019 [3], and the total annual number of hip fractures nearly doubled from 2018 to 2050 [4]. The mean overall one-year mortality rate is 22% [5].

Many risk factors and indicators are related to patient prognosis [6, 7]. Albumin is the most abundant plasma protein in humans. It is only produced by the



© The Author(s) 2025. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this licence to share adapted material derived from this article or provide are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicate otherwise in a credit ine to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicate otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

liver, and the full extent of its metabolic function is not known in detail [8]. A previous study demonstrated a progressive reduction in serum albumin concentration with age between 0.12 and 0.15 g/L per year in the elderly population [9], and the mean levels of albumin in community-dwelling and hospitalized were 41.13 g/L and 36.04 g/L, respectively [8]. Albumin is considered a poor marker as a nutritional indicator, as stated in guidelines such as ESPEN [10], and is thought to be an indicator of disease severity [11–14]. Detection of hypoalbuminemia and medical intervention could decrease the complication rates and improve the prognosis [15, 16].

In geriatric patients with hip fractures, hypoalbuminemia is a powerful independent risk factor for mortality following a surgical procedure in comparison with patients with normal albumin concentration [17]. Further, it was reported that albumin levels < 38 g/L were associated with a higher risk of postoperative infections in hip fractures [8]. A meta-analysis by Li et al. [18] concluded that low serum albumin level was the sole indicator of increased risk of in-hospital death, postoperative complications, and mortality following hip fracture surgery. Malafarina et al. also concluded that an early nutritional intervention could improve recovery [16].

Previous research has established correlations between hypoalbuminemia and post-fracture mortality in hip fracture patients. Nevertheless, the existing evidence regarding the precise association patterns between admission albumin levels and mortality risk within the geriatric hip fracture population is still incomplete, especially when it comes to longitudinal outcomes. To bridge this knowledge gap, we carried out a large-scale cohort study with a follow-up period more than three years. The aim was to systematically assess the relationship between admission albumin concentrations and all-cause mortality in elderly hip fracture patients. Our study specifically examined the hypothesis that this association exhibits either linear or non-linear characteristics. We aimed to potentially unearth crucial insights into the prognostic value of albumin for mortality risk in this vulnerable group.

Materials and methods

Study design

This retrospective cohort study included elderly adults with hip fractures from 1 Jan 2015 to 30 Sep 2019 at the largest trauma center in northwestern China.

The Ethics Committee of the Honghui Hospital, Xi'an Jiaotong University approved this retrospective study (No. 202201009). All human-related procedures were performed in accordance with the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and its later amendments. The study has been reported according to the STROCSS 2021 guidelines [19]. The oral informed consent was obtained from all subjects and/or their legal guardians.

Participants

Demographic and clinical data of the patients were obtained from their original medical records. The inclusion criteria were as follows:1) age \geq 65 years; 2) X-ray or computed tomography diagnosis of the femoral neck, intertrochanteric, or subtrochanteric fracture; 3) participants who were receiving surgical or conservative treatment in the hospital; 4) availability of clinical data in the hospital; and 5) patients or their families contacted via telephone. Patients who could not be contacted were excluded. Figure 1 shows a flow chart of the study.

Hospital treatment

Patients underwent blood examinations prior to the surgery. Intertrochanteric fractures are often chosen for closed/open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF) of the proximal femoral nail anti-rotation [20–22] and less arthroplasty [23]. Femoral neck fractures are often treated with hemiarthroplasty (HA) or total hip arthroplasty (THA) according to the patient's age. Prophylaxis for deep vein thrombosis was initiated at admission. As for the patients with conservative treatment, we would give skin traction to stabilize the fracture for union, and we transferred them to the department of internal medicine to adjust the body condition. Patients were advised to visit for monthly follow-ups at discharge to assess fracture union or function. During the hospitalization, the patients received the orthogeriatric co-management strategy [24].

Follow-up

After discharge, patients' family members were contacted by telephone from Jan 2022 to Mar 2022 to record data on survival, survival time, and activities of daily living. Telephone follow-up was conducted by two medical professionals with two weeks of training and one year of experience. We tried twice for patients who could not be contacted on the first attempt. When the family members of the patients did not respond, we stopped and recorded the patients as lost to follow-up.

Endpoint events

The endpoint event in this study was all-cause mortality after treatment. We defined all-cause mortality as any death reported by patient family members, including intraoperative, intensive care, hospital, and followup deaths.



Fig. 1 Study flow chart

Variables

The following variables were collected in this study: age, sex, occupation, history of allergy, injury mechanism, fracture classification, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, coronary heart disease (CHD), arrhythmia, hemorrhagic stroke, ischemic stroke, cancer, associated injuries, dementia, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), hepatitis, gastritis, age-adjusted Charlson comorbidity index (aCCI) [25], time from injury to admission, time from admission to surgery, admission albumin concentration, operation time, blood loss, infusion, transfusion, treatment strategy, time in hospital, and follow-up. Occupations included retirement, farmers, and others. Injury mechanisms included falls, accidents, and others. Blood loss was defined as the total blood loss during the surgery. The infusion was defined as the total volume of liquid used in the operation. Transfusion was defined as the total volume of red blood cells used during the surgery. The treatment strategy was divided into the conservation and surgery groups (ORIF/HA/THA).

The albumin concentration at admission was defined as the result of a blood test at admission. The dependent variable was all-cause mortality, and the independent variable was albumin concentration at admission. Other variables were categorized as potentially confounding factors.

Statistics analysis

Data are expressed as mean (standard deviation) (Gaussian distribution) or median (min, max) (skewed distribution) for continuous variables and as numbers and percentages for categorical variables. χ^2 (categorical variables), one-way ANOVA test (normal distribution), or Kruskal-Wallis H test (skewed distribution) were used to detect differences among different albumin concentrations (tertiles). To examine the association between albumin concentration and mortality, we constructed three distinct models using univariate and multivariate Cox proportional hazards regression models, including a non-adjusted model (no covariates were adjusted), a minimally adjusted model (only sociodemographic variables were adjusted), and a fully adjusted model (all covariates presented in the study were adjusted). The effect sizes with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were recorded. Because Cox proportional hazards regression model-based methods are often suspected to be unable to deal with nonlinear models, the nonlinearity between admission albumin concentration and mortality was addressed using a Cox proportional hazards regression model with cubic spline functions and smooth curve fitting (penalized spline method). If nonlinearity was detected, we first calculated the inflection point using a recursive algorithm and then constructed a two-piecewise Cox proportional hazards regression model on both sides of the inflection point.

To test the robustness of our results, we performed a sensitivity analysis. We converted albumin into a categorical variable according to the tertiles and calculated the *P* for trend to verify the results of albumin as a continuous variable and to examine the possibility of non-linearity. In addition, propensity score matching (PSM) was introduced to compare matched groups, and we adjusted for confounding factors in PSM models.

All analyses were performed using statistical software packages R (http://www.R-project.org, The R F oundation) and EmpowerStats (http://www.empowerstats.com, X&Y Solutions Inc., Boston, MA, USA). Hazard ratios (HR) and 95%CI were calculated. A P value of < 0.05 (two-sided) was considered statistically significant.

Results

Patient characteristics

From the initial 2887 consecutive participants who had hip fractures between Jan 2015 and Sep 2019, we enrolled 2387 participants who met the study criteria. The mean follow-up was 37.64 months (ranged from 0.00 to 78.21 months for total patients, ranged from 0.00 to 69.89 months for death patients, ranged from 26.48 to 78.21 months for survival patients). There were 47 deaths in hospital totally. During follow-up, 787 (33%) patients died for all-cause reasons. The albumin concentration was 37.72 ± 4.03 g/L. We divided the patients into three groups according to

their albumin concentration. Table 1 lists the patients' demographic and clinical characteristics, including comorbidities, factors associated with injuries, and treatment.

Most patients (91.83%) received surgical treatment, and 195 patients (8.17%) received conservative treatment because of poor status, comorbidities, or refusal to undergo surgery. The albumin concentration at admission was 35.91 ± 4.45 g/L in the conservation group and 37.88 ± 3.95 g/L in the operation group (P < 0.001).

Univariate analysis of the association between variates and mortality

We performed univariate analysis to identify potential confounding factors and the relationship between variables and mortality (Table 2). According to the criteria of P < 0.1, the following variables were considered in the multivariate Cox regression: age, sex, injury mechanism, fracture classification, aCCI, CHD, arrhythmia, ischemic stroke, cancer, dementia, COPD, hepatitis, time to operation, treatment strategy, operation time, infusion, and transfusion.

Multivariate analysis between admission albumin concentration and mortality

We used three models (Table 3) to correlate albumin concentrations at admission and mortality. Stable linear regression was observed when the albumin concentration was a continuous variable. The fully adjusted model showed a mortality risk decrease of 6% (HR = 0.94, 95% CI:0.92–0.96), P < 0.0001) when albumin concentration increased by 1 g/L and after controlling for confounding factors. When albumin concentration was used as a categorical variable, we found statistically significant differences among the three models (P < 0.05). Compared to the low albumin group (< 35 g/L), the medium group (\geq 35 g/L and < 40 g/L) decreased mortality risk by 29% (HR = 0.71, 95% CI:0.59–0.86, P = 0.0003), and the high group $(\geq 40 \text{ g/L})$ decreased mortality risk by 38% (HR = 0.62, 95% CI:0.49-0.79, P<0.0001). In addition, the P for trend showed a linear correlation in the three models (*P* < 0.0001).

In addition, we divided the age into $65 \le age < 75$, $75 \le age < 85$, and $age \ge 85$ subgroups. The age-stratified analysis in the fully-adjusted model showed that the preoperative albumin level was not associated with mortality (HR = 0.95, 95% CI:0.91–1.01, *P* = 0.0893) in $65 \le age < 75$ patients but associated with the mortality in $75 \le age < 85$ patients (HR = 0.94, 95% CI:0.91–0.97, *P* = 0.0001) and $85 \le age$ patients (HR = 0.94, 95% CI:0.91–0.98, *P* = 0.0010).

Admission Albumin (g/L)	Low group (<35 g/L)	Medium group (≥ 35 g/L, < 40 g/L)	High group (≥40 g/L)	P-value	P-value*
No. of patients	521	1179	687		
Age (years)	81.63±6.87	79.89±6.51	77.29±6.61	< 0.001	< 0.001
Sex				0.068	-
Male	181 (34.74%)	399 (33.84%)	201 (29.26%)		
Female	340 (65.26%)	780 (66.16%)	486 (70.74%)		
Occupation				0.703	-
Retirement	293 (56.24%)	692 (58.69%)	401 (58.37%)		
Farmer	127 (24.38%)	287 (24.34%)	158 (23.00%)		
Other	101 (19.39%)	200 (16.96%)	128 (18.63%)		
History of allergy				0.309	-
No	495 (95.01%)	1138 (96.52%)	657 (95.63%)		
Yes	26 (4.99%)	41 (3.48%)	30 (4.37%)		
Injury mechanism				0.729	-
Falling	501 (96.16%)	1144 (97.03%)	662 (96.36%)		
Accident	14 (2.69%)	28 (2.37%)	20 (2.91%)		
Other	6 (1.15%)	7 (0.59%)	5 (0.73%)		
Fracture classification				< 0.001	-
Intertrochanteric fracture	414 (79.46%)	877 (74.39%)	414 (60,26%)		
Femoral neck fracture	89 (17.08%)	272 (23.07%)	261 (37.99%)		
Subtrochanteric fracture	18 (3.45%)	30 (2.54%)	12 (1.75%)		
aCCI	10 (011070)	55 (2.5 175)	12 (11, 37, 6)	< 0.001	-
2	6 (1 15%)	38 (3 22%)	60 (8 73%)	0.001	
3	65 (12 48%)	225 (19 08%)	174 (25 33%)		
4	218 (41 84%)	495 (41 98%)	254 (36 97%)		
5	151 (28 98%)	293 (24.85%)	139 (20 23%)		
6	65 (12 48%)	98 (8 31%)	44 (6 40%)		
7	14 (2 69%)	25 (2.12%)	14 (2 04%)		
, 8	2 (0 38%)	4 (0 34%)	2 (0 29%)		
9	2 (0.00%)	1 (0.08%)	0 (0.00%)		
Hypertension	0 (0.0070)	1 (0.0070)	0 (0.0070)	0.052	_
No	285 (54 70%)	608 (51 57%)	328 (47 74%)	0.052	
Yes	236 (45 30%)	571 (48 43%)	359 (52 26%)		
	250 (45.5070)	571 (-0	555 (52.2070)	0.018	
No	120 (82 34%)	955 (81 00%)	525 (76 42%)	0.010	
Voc	92 (17 66%)	224 (19.00%)	162 (23 58%)		
	92 (17.0070)	224 (19.00%)	102 (23.30%)	0.282	_
No	231 (11 3106)	572 (48 52%)	324 (47 1606)	0.202	
Voc	200 (55 66%)	572 (+0.52%) 607 (51 48%)	363 (52 840%)		
Arrhythmia	290 (33.00%)	007 (31.48%)	505 (52.0470)	0.004	_
No	219 (61 0404)	912 (69 06%)	169 (69 1 20%)	0.004	
No	202 (22 06%)	266 (21 0404)	400 (00.12%)		
Homorrhagic stroko	203 (38.90%)	500 (51.04%)	219 (31.00%)	0.05	
No	500 (07 70%)	1154 (07 8804)	672 (07 060%)	0.95	-
No	12 (2 2004)	25 (21204)	073 (97.90%)		
les	12 (2.30%)	Z3 (Z.1270)	14 (2.04%)	0.420	
No.	261 (60 200/)	925 (70 920%)	400 (72 620/)	0.456	-
NO	160 (09.29%)	000 (70.02%)	499 (72.05%)		
185	100 (50.7 1%)	२ ५५ (८४.१०%)	100 (27.57%)	0.015	
Cancer	405 (05 200()	1147 (07 200()		0.015	-
INU Voc	490 (93.20%)	1147(97.29%)	14 (2 04%)		
	25 (4.8U%)	52 (2./ 1%)	14 (2.04%)	0.007	
Associated injuries	460 (00 020/)	1107 (02 000/)	(44 (02 740/)	0.007	-
INO Mar	408 (89.83%)	I IU/ (93.89%)	044 (93./4%)		
res	53 (10.17%)	/2(0.11%)	43 (6.26%)		

Table 1 The demographic and clinical characteristics (N = 2387)

Admission Albumin (g/L)	Low group (<35 g/L)	Medium group (≥ 35 g/L, < 40 g/L)	High group (≥40 g/L)	P-value	P-value*
Dementia				< 0.001	-
No	482 (92.51%)	1136 (96.35%)	671 (97.67%)		
Yes	39 (7.49%)	43 (3.65%)	16 (2.33%)		
COPD				< 0.001	-
No	480 (92.13%)	1088 (92.28%)	667 (97.09%)		
Yes	41 (7.87%)	91 (7.72%)	20 (2.91%)		
Hepatitis				0.025	-
No	495 (95.01%)	1150 (97.54%)	665 (96.80%)		
Yes	26 (4.99%)	29 (2.46%)	22 (3.20%)		
Gastritis				0.834	-
No	512 (98.27%)	1161 (98.47%)	674 (98.11%)		
Yes	9 (1.73%)	18 (1.53%)	13 (1.89%)		
Treatment strategy				< 0.001	-
Conservation	76 (14.59%)	85 (7.21%)	34 (4.95%)		
ORIF	354 (67.95%)	832 (70.57%)	401 (58.37%)		
HA	89 (17.08%)	254 (21.54%)	228 (33.19%)		
THA	2 (0.38%)	8 (0.68%)	24 (3.49%)		
Albumin (g/L)	32.12±2.36	37.53 ± 1.40	42.31±1.98	< 0.001	< 0.001
Time to admission (hours)	135.35±274.20	77.37 ± 280.78	41.58±181.27	< 0.001	< 0.001
Time to operation (days)	4.67±2.91	4.25 ± 2.53	4.11±2.25	0.001	0.002
Operation time (mins)	98.48 ± 43.34	92.83 ± 36.22	95.02 ± 34.22	0.025	0.053
Blood loss (mL)	257.62±171.59	248.40±158.33	230.66±147.45	0.015	0.254
Infusion (mL)	1558.55±417.30	1552.06±387.20	1598.42±368.85	0.053	0.003
Transfusion (U)	1.56 ± 1.30	1.18±1.26	0.79±1.16	< 0.001	< 0.001
Follow-up (months)	33.75 ± 20.39	38.72±18.51	38.74±16.64	< 0.001	< 0.001
In-hospital mortality	11 (2.11%)	21 (1.78%)	15 (2.18%)	0.805	-
Mortality				< 0.001	-
Survival	261 (50.10%)	804 (68.19%)	535 (77.87%)		
Dead	260 (49.90%)	375 (31.81%)	152 (22.13%)		

Table 1 (continued)

Mean + SD/N(%). P-value*: For continuous variables, we used the Kruskal Wallis rank-sum test and Fisher's exact probability test for count variables with a theoretical number of < 10

aCCI, age-adjusted Charlson Comorbidity Index; CHD, coronary heart disease; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; ORIF, open reduction and internal fixation; HA, hemiarthroplasty; THA, total hip arthroplasty

Curve fitting

As shown in Fig. 2, there was a smooth curve between albumin concentration at admission and mortality after adjusting for confounding factors. We compared two fitting models to explain this association (Table 4). Unfortunately, we found no saturation or threshold effect.

Propensity score matching (PSM)

To test the robustness of our results, we performed sensitivity analysis using PSM, as shown in Tables 5, 6 and 7; Fig. 3. One thousand three hundred eighty patients (57.8%) were successfully matched (Table **5and** Fig. 3). Age and aCCI treatment did not match between the two groups (Table 6). We found the results were stable in the multivariate Cox regression under the PSM and PSM-adjusted models (Table 7).

Discussion

Preoperative health status is a critical predictor of postoperative outcomes in elderly patients [26]. We found a linear association between the serum albumin concentration and mortality in geriatric patients with hip fractures. The higher the albumin concentration, the lower the mortality rate. This detailed result showed a mortality risk decrease of 6% (HR = 0.94) when albumin concentration increased by 1 g/L after controlling for confounding factors. Compared to albumin concentration < 35 g/L, the medium group $(\geq 35 \text{ g/L} \text{ and } < 40 \text{ g/L})$ could decrease the mortality risk by 29% (HR = 0.71), and the high group (\geq 40 g/L) could decrease the mortality risk by 38% (HR = 0.62). In addition, preoperative albumin level was not associated with mortality in $65 \le age < 75$ patients but associated with mortality in patients $75 \leq age$.

These findings suggest albumin can be used as a risk stratification metric, with 35 g/L being a crucial

Table 2 Effects of factors on mortality measured by univariate analysis (N=2387)

Factors	Statistics	HR (95%CI)	P-value
Age (year)	79.52±6.80	1.08 (1.07, 1.09)	< 0.0001
Sex			
Male	781 (32.72%)	1.0	
Female	1606 (67.28%)	0.73 (0.63, 0.84)	< 0.0001
Occupation			
Retirement	1386 (58.06%)	1.0	
Farmer	572 (23.96%)	0.93 (0.78, 1.10)	0.3965
Other	429 (17.97%)	0.88 (0.72, 1.06)	0.1775
History of allergy			
No	2290 (95.94%)	1.0	
Yes	97 (4.06%)	0.93 (0.64, 1.35)	0.7158
Injury mechanism			
Falling	2307 (96.65%)	1.0	
Accident	62 (2 60%)	0.24 (0.11, 0.54)	0.0006
Other	18 (0 75%)	1 60 (0.83, 3.09)	0.1593
Time to admission (bours)	7973+25662	1 00 (1 00 1 00)	0.1107
Fracture classification	15.15±250.02	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	0.1107
Intertrochanteric fracture	1705 (71 / 3%)	1.0	
Formoral pock fracture	622 (26 06%)	0.86 (0.72, 1.03)	0.0020
	60 (2 5 104)	0.60 (0.72, 1.03)	0.0920
	00 (2.3190)	0.09 (0.43, 1.12)	0.1540
	104 (4 260()	1.0	
2	104 (4.30%)	2.91 (1.22, 6.46)	0.0149
	404 (19.44%)	2.01 (1.22, 0.40)	0.0148
4	907 (40.51%)	0.77 (3.02, 15.19)	< 0.0001
5	583 (24.42%)	9.31 (4.14, 20.92)	< 0.0001
0	207 (8.67%)	11.78 (5.17, 20.84)	< 0.0001
/	53 (2.22%)	15.71 (0.54, 37.77)	< 0.0001
8	8 (0.34%)	29.32 (9.45, 91.03)	< 0.0001
9	1 (0.04%)	31.74 (3.82, 263.93)	0.0014
Hypertension	1221 (51.150()	1.0	
No	1221 (51.15%)	1.0	
Yes	1166 (48.85%)	1.12 (0.97, 1.29)	0.1133
Diabetes Mellitus			
No	1909 (79.97%)	1.0	
Yes	478 (20.03%)	0.99 (0.83, 1.18)	0.8672
CHD			
No	1127 (47.21%)	1.0	
Yes	1260 (52.79%)	1.35 (1.17, 1.55)	< 0.0001
Arrhythmia			
No	1599 (66.99%)	1.0	
Yes	788 (33.01%)	1.31 (1.14, 1.51)	0.0002
Hemorrhagic stroke			
No	2336 (97.86%)	1.0	
Yes	51 (2.14%)	1.11 (0.70, 1.77)	0.6561
lschemic stroke			
No	1695 (71.01%)	1.0	
Yes	692 (28.99%)	1.44 (1.24, 1.67)	< 0.0001
Cancer			
No	2316 (97.03%)	1.0	
Yes	71 (2.97%)	1.79 (1.29, 2.50)	0.0005
Associated injuries			
No	2219 (92.96%)	1.0	
Yes	168 (7.04%)	0.93 (0.70, 1.24)	0.6313

Table 2 (continued)

Factors	Statistics	HR (95%CI)	P-value
Dementia			
No	2289 (95.89%)	1.0	
Yes	98 (4.11%)	2.81 (2.17, 3.65)	< 0.0001
COPD			
No	2235 (93.63%)	1.0	
Yes	152 (6.37%)	1.54 (1.20, 1.97)	0.0006
Hepatitis			
No	2310 (96.77%)	1.0	
Yes	77 (3.23%)	1.46 (1.04, 2.06)	0.0274
Gastritis			
No	2347 (98.32%)	1.0	
Yes	40 (1.68%)	0.97 (0.57, 1.65)	0.9122
Albumin concentration (g/L)	37.72±4.03	0.91 (0.89, 0.92)	< 0.0001
Time to operation (days)	4.29 ± 2.54	1.03 (1.00, 1.06)	0.0427
Treatment strategy			
Conservation	195 (8.17%)	1.0	
ORIF	1587 (66.49%)	0.30 (0.25, 0.36)	< 0.0001
HA	571 (23.92%)	0.32 (0.26, 0.41)	< 0.0001
THA	34 (1.42%)	0.06 (0.02, 0.25)	< 0.0001
Operation time (mins)	94.63±37.26	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	0.0849
Blood loss (mL)	245.09 ± 158.31	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	0.5711
Infusion (mL)	1567.08 ± 388.57	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	0.0003
Transfusion (U)	1.14±1.27	1.06 (1.00, 1.13)	0.0344

aCCI, age-adjusted Charlson Comorbidity Index; CHD, coronary heart disease; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; ORIF, open reduction and internal fixation; HA, hemiarthroplasty; THA, total hip arthroplasty; HR, Hazard ratios; CI, confidence intervals

 Table 3
 Multivariate results by Cox regression (N=2387)

Exposure	Non-adjusted model	Minimally-adjusted model	Fully-adjusted model
Admission albumin	0.92 (0.90, 0.94) < 0.0001	0.93 (0.91, 0.95) < 0.0001	0.94 (0.92, 0.96) < 0.0001
Age Stratified Analysis			
65≤age<75	0.91 (0.88, 0.95) < 0.0001	0.92 (0.88, 0.96) 0.0002	0.95 (0.91, 1.01) 0.0893
75≤age<85	0.91 (0.89, 0.93) < 0.0001	0.92 (0.90, 0.95) < 0.0001	0.94 (0.91, 0.97) 0.0001
age≥85	0.93 (0.91, 0.96) < 0.0001	0.94 (0.91, 0.97) < 0.0001	0.94 (0.91, 0.98) 0.0010
Admission albumin tertiles			
Low group (< 35 g/L)	Ref	Ref	Ref
Medium group (≥35 g/L, < 40 g/L)	0.56 (0.48, 0.66) < 0.0001	0.63 (0.54, 0.74) < 0.0001	0.71 (0.59, 0.86) 0.0003
High group (≥ 40 g/L)	0.39 (0.32, 0.48) < 0.0001	0.52 (0.42, 0.64) < 0.0001	0.62 (0.49, 0.79) < 0.0001
<i>P</i> for trend	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001

Data in table: HR (95%CI) P-value

Outcome variable: mortality

Exposed variables: admission albumin concentration

Minimally-adjusted adjust for: age; sex

Fully-adjusted model adjust for: age; sex; injury mechanism; fracture classification; aCCI; CHD; arrhythmia; ischemic stroke; cancer; dementia; COPD; hepatitis; time to operation; treatment strategy; operation time; infusion; transfusion

clinical threshold, thus justifying more rigorous albumin level monitoring in this patient group. There are some implications for clinical practice: Firstly, it is necessary to standardize albumin monitoring in the routine assessment of elderly hip fracture patients, especially those \geq 75 years old. Secondly, it is necessary to set 35 g/L as the intervention threshold. For patients with albumin < 35 g/L, it is necessary to start personalized nutritional support or albumin supplementation plans and prioritize fixing potential nutritional deficits (like low protein intake) and occult blood loss. Thirdly, it is necessary to integrate albumin levels into preoperative risk assessment tools to predict longterm prognosis. In the future, prospective randomized controlled trials should be conducted to validate the impact of albumin supplementation on mortality and elucidate the causal relationship. Secondly, the study should explore the clinical significance and the optimal



Fig. 2 Curve fitting between admission albumin concentration and mortality. Adjusted for age; sex; injury mechanism; fracture classification; aCCI; CHD; arrhythmia; ischemic stroke; cancer; dementia; COPD; hepatitis; time to operation; treatment strategy; operation time; infusion; transfusion

Table 4	Nonlinearity	of admission	albumin	concentration	(g/L
versus m	ortality $(N=2)$	387)			

Outcome	HR (95%CI) P-value
Fitting model by stand linear regression	0.94 (0.92,
	0.96) < 0.0001
Fitting model by two-piecewise linear regression	
Inflection point	31
<31	1.00 (0.88, 1.14)
	0.9786
>31	0.93 (0.91,
	0.96) < 0.0001
P for log-likelihood ratio test	0.322

Adjust for: age; sex; injury mechanism; fracture classification; aCCl; CHD; arrhythmia; ischemic stroke; cancer; dementia; COPD; hepatitis; time to operation; treatment strategy; operation time; infusion; transfusion

intervention window of dynamic albumin changes, such as the acute decline following hip fractures.

Several retrospective, prospective studies and systematic reviews have revealed associations between albumin concentration at admission and mortality or postoperative complications [17, 27-37] in geriatric patients with hip fractures. All previous studies

showed that low serum albumin concentration was associated with later mortality or complications, and all reported associations were linear, or a group of low albumin concentration was related to a high rate of mortality or complications. A retrospective study by Dhingra et al. [33] found that low serum albumin levels were associated with a higher incidence of mortality in 95 geriatric patients with femoral neck fractures. A retrospective study by Miyanishi et al. [29] found that a serum albumin concentration < 36 g/L on admission was a predictive factor for mortality after hip fracture surgery in 129 hip joints (OR = 5.85). In the largest sample size retrospective cohort study, Bohl et al. [17] found that the prevalence of hypoalbuminemia was 45.9%, and hypoalbuminemia was a powerful independent risk factor for mortality following a surgical procedure for geriatric hip fracture. Additionally, the authors reported that patients with hypoalbuminemia had a higher risk of sepsis, pneumonia, and unplanned intubation. Pimlott et al. [28] pointed out that the association between low serum albumin levels

The variables used in calculating the propensity score	Age; sex; injury mechanism; fracture classifica- tion; aCCl; CHD; arrhythmia; ischemic stroke; ca cer; dementia; COPD; hepatitis; time to operatio operation; operation time; infusion; transfusion	
Propensity score algorithm	Cox regression model	
C-statistical	0.6597	
Matching method	Greedy matching within specified caliper distances	
Metric Distances	0.05	
Matching ratio	1:1	
Use of replacement	With replacement	
Matching sample size	No. of mortality = 1:690 cases	
	No. of mortality = 0: 690 cases	
	Total 1380 cases	

 Table 5
 Propensity score parameter list

and in-hospital mortality (OR = 2.44) remained statistically significant in a prospective cohort study. Ko et al. [32] reported that the albumin level (OR = 2.87) was associated with a higher mortality risk in a larger cohort of 1841 patients. In the field of geriatric hip fractures, two systematic reviews assessed the negative effect of low albumin levels on prognosis. Li et al. [18] reported that low serum albumin levels were an indicator of increased risk of in-hospital death, complications, and total mortality. In the studies mentioned above, the authors did not consider the duration of follow-up. As a retrospective cohort study, our study provided a long follow-up time. In our study, the average follow-up was 37.64 months (more than 3 years), and the longest follow-up was 84.19 months. Previous prospective studies by Pimlott et al. [28] and Ko et al. [32] did not report follow-up data. Thus, to our knowledge, this study is the first to provide follow-up data and hazard ratio values to describe survival analysis and the slope of the survival curve.

Previous studies provide various definitions of low albumin levels. Low albumin concentration was defined as <35 g/dL in Canadians by Pimlott et al. [28] and Americans by Bohl et al. [17], and < 32 g/dL in South Korea by Ko et al. [32], and < 36 g/L in Japanese individuals by Malafarina et al. [16]. At the beginning of the variable descriptions, we divided the study population into <35 g/L, ≥ 35 g/L and <40 g/L, and \geq 40 g/L. In the 35 g/L group, the incidence of hypoalbuminemia was 21.83%. In the multivariate analysis, we not only built the association by albumin as a continuous variable and categorical variable but also provided a test for linear trend, the null hypothesis being that there is no linear trend between albumin concentration and group order. The value of P for the trend shows positive findings.

Our study is the first to explain a stable linear association using multivariate Cox regression. Although previous studies have reported a progressive reduction in serum albumin concentration associated with ageing [9, 38, 39], a meta-analysis showed that the average level of albumin in the community (41.13 g/L)was assessed in older people [8]. However, serum albumin concentration rapidly declined when a hip fracture occurred. In our study, the albumin concentration at admission was 37.72 g/L, indicating an approximate loss of 3.4 g/L. The reason for the acute loss of albumin remains unclear. It is possible that hidden blood loss was the main reason, as described by Liu et al., who reported that albumin level < 30 g/L at admission was associated with a greater likelihood of more hidden blood loss [40]. According to our results, increased albumin concentration was associated with decreased mortality. Future studies were needed to conduct the randomized controlled trial, showing the effect of albumin supplementation on hip fracture.

Inflammation and nutritional status play important roles in the development of mortality [41, 42]. Serum albumin concentration is an important marker of nutritional status and the inflammatory response [43, 44]. Therefore, the potential mechanism of association between hypoalbuminemia and mortality in hip fracture was pre-injury chronic inflammation and nutritional status. Previous studies have reported that lower serum albumin concentrations [8, 45] were associated with an increased risk of incident chronic disease and mortality in the general population. In addition, the inflammatory response would increase after the injury [46] and duration of the operation [47]. Therefore, we hypothesized that the integration of albumin may reflect inflammation, malnutrition, and other abnormalities throughout the lifespan and could be associated with all-cause and cause-specific mortality.

Our study was designed as a retrospective cohort, and 500 patients were lost to follow-up. In the analysis, we found that patients who were lost to follow-up were randomized, and most of the variables in Table 1 were comparable between the present and absent groups. Furthermore, we included patients admitted before September 2019 to avoid the effect of COVID-19 on

Page 11 of 15

Table 6 The balance test of PSM

<table-container>Ade (ser)B322-824D25 (1A 0.23)CAD3*Sw009 (0.01, 0.03)0.09Male225 (12,75%)226 (0.10%)0.09Fatteria441 (0.20%)12 (0.01, 0.22)Retirement42 (64.05%)141 (0.00%)100Barmer12 (0.01, 0.22)0.09Dateria12 (10, 10, 0.21)0.09Barmer12 (10, 10, 0.21)0.01Dateria12 (10, 10, 0.01)0.01Dateria12 (10, 10, 0.01)0.01Dater</table-container>	Variables	Survival (690)	Mortality (690)	Standardized difference	<i>P</i> value
Sec0.09 (-0.01, 0.20)0.09Male2.26 (0.276)454 (0.256)0.00Famale464 (07.2576)434 (0.2564)0.00Famile44.20 (-0.026)0.000.00Famile44.20 (-0.026)0.000.00Famile12.10 (-2.8418)160 (2.2.1764)0.00Other12.10 (-2.8418)160 (2.2.1764)0.03 (-0.03, 0.1.3)0.017Other12.10 (-2.8418)0.00 (-0.01, 0.1.3)0.0170.01Ne0.50 (-2.076, 0.1.57)0.01 (-0.01, 0.02)0.0130.017Ne0.50 (-2.076, 0.1.57)0.077 (08.128)0.0110.01Ne0.50 (-2.076, 0.1.57)0.0110.0110.011Accident10.10, 0.0210.1310.0110.011Accident10.10, 0.0210.1310.0110.011Accident10.10, 0.0210.0120.0120.011Accident10.10, 0.0210.1310.0110.011Accident10.10, 0.0210.0120.0110.011Accident10.10, 0.0210.0120.0110.011Accident10.10, 0.0210.0120.0110.011Accident10.10, 0.0210.0120.0110.011Accident10.10, 0.0210.0120.0110.011Accident10.10, 0.0210.0110.0110.011Accident10.10, 0.0210.0110.0110.011Accident10.00, 0.0210.0110.0110.011Acc	Age (year)	83.22±4.54	81.87±6.29	0.25 (0.14, 0.35)	< 0.001*
Male Famila26 (2) 2/94)26 (3) 1/94)Famila444 (60.2596)434 (60.2906)Occupation127 (18.4196)414 (60.29149)Other127 (18.4196)115 (16.8196)Other127 (18.4196)0.01 (20.2006)Other127 (18.4196)0.01 (20.2006)Missor Otallary0.01 (20.2006)0.01 (20.2006)No6.74 (9) (2006)0.01 (20.0006)Accident12 (12.4606)6.77 (90.1206)Other0.01 (20.0006)0.01 (20.0006)Other0.01 (20.0006)0.01 (20.0006)Other0.01 (20.0006)0.01 (20.0006)Other0.01 (20.0006)0.01 (20.0006)Other0.01 (20.0006)0.01 (20.0006)Other0.01 (20.0006)0.01 (20.0006)Other0.01 (20.0006)0.01 (20.0006)Accident171 (24.7908)0.32 (20.2006)Subtrochanteric fracture80 (10.690)73 (10.5880)Accident171 (24.7908)0.32 (20.2006)Accident171 (24.7908)0.02 (20.0006)Accident171 (24.7908)0.02 (20.0006)Accident13 (20.2096)0.01 (20.0006) </td <td>Sex</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.09 (-0.01, 0.20)</td> <td>0.09</td>	Sex			0.09 (-0.01, 0.20)	0.09
Include44 (62.25%)44 (62.05%)	Male	226 (32.75%)	256 (37.10%)		
Gecursion0.12 (0.01, 0.22)0.09Retirement4.12 (6.03/16)1.14 (6.003/16)1.14 (6.003/16)Ghlar1.2 (7.0.49/16)1.16 (16.81)1.14 (16.81)Other1.2 (7.0.49/16)0.03 (0.00, 0.1.3)0.61/1Nitsery of allergy1.7 (2.4.9/10)0.02 (2.0.9/16)0.03 (0.00, 0.1.3)0.13 (10.11)Talling6.75 (07.03/16)0.02 (0.01)0.13 (10.00, 0.22)0.13 (10.0	Female	464 (67.25%)	434 (62.90%)		
herement42 (46,06%)41 (4000%)41 (60.0%)Farmer127 (12.84%)160 (23.19%)0.03 1-0.08,0.13)0.61 (7Hater0.03 1-0.08,0.13)0.61 (70.03 1-0.08,0.13)0.61 (7No673 07.24%)0.02 0.0%11Yos0.73 (97.28%)0.70 (97.10%)0.31 (0.08,0.13)0.31 (0.08,0.13)Accident10.10%0.02 0.0%11Accident10.10%7.01 (0.60)11Accident10.10%7.01 (0.60)11Intertorcharteric facture511 (24.08%)0.087%11Facture511 (24.08%)13.18.8%14.00 (7.39%)1Intertorcharteric facture11 (0.08,91)3.11.8%11Accident14 (2.03%)10.10.08/1011Accident14 (2.03%)10.10.08/1011Accident14 (2.03%)10.00.2%11Accident14 (2.03%)10.00.2%11Accident10.00.2%10.00.2%11Accident10.00.2%10.00.2%11Accident10.00.2%10.00.2%11Accident10.00.2%10.00.2%11Accident10.00.2%10.00.2%11Accident10.00.2%10.00.0%11Accident10.00.2%10.00.0%11Accident10.00.0%10.00.0%11Accident10	Occupation			0.12 (0.01, 0.22)	0.09
Fammer12 (17.54%)16 (12.39%)	Retirement	442 (64.06%)	414 (60.00%)		
Other121 (17.5%)116 (16.81%)History	Farmer	127 (18.41%)	160 (23.19%)		
History of allergy	Other	121 (17.54%)	116 (16.81%)		
No 673 (97,54%) 670 (97,10%) 20 (2.97%) Yes 17 (2,4%) 20 (2.97%) 0.31 4 Falling 675 (97,83%) 677 (98,72%) 0.31 4 Accident 10 (7.4%) 7 (10.1%) 0.11 (0.00, 0.22) 0.12 3 Intertorchanteric fracture 3 (0.43%) 6 (0.87%) 0.11 (0.00, 0.22) 0.12 3 Intertorchanteric fracture 17 (1.24%) 14 (0.02%) 0.02 8, 0.49) 0.02 8 Subtrochanteric fracture 17 (1.24%) 14 (0.02%) 0.02 8, 0.49) 0.02 8 Subtrochanteric fracture 17 (1.24%) 13 (1.88%) 0.39 (0.28, 0.49) 0.001* 4C 20 (0.29%) 14 (0.20%) 13 (1.88%) 0.39 (0.28, 0.49) 0.001* 5 14 (2.03%) 73 (10.58%) 14 (0.26%) 14 (0.26%) 14 (0.26%) 14 (0.26%) 14 (0.26%) 14 (0.26%) 14 (0.26%) 14 (0.26%) 14 (0.26%) 14 (0.26%) 14 (0.26%) 14 (0.26%) 14 (0.27%) 14 (0.27%) 14 (0.27%) 14 (0.27%) 14 (0.27%) 14 (0.27%) 14 (0.27%) 14	History of allergy			0.03 (-0.08, 0.13)	0.617
YesI7 (2.46%)20 (2.90%)Injury mechanism0.57 (93.19%)0.314Falling675 (97.39%)677 (98.19%)Accidant12 (1.74%)7 (1.01%)Other3 (0.34%)6 (0.97%)Fracture classificatiom11 (0.40%)534 (77.39%)Fremoin lenck fracture8 (1.16%)534 (77.39%)Subtrochanteric fracture8 (1.16%)13 (1.88%)aCC20 (0.29%)30 (0.28,0.49)aCC0.123aCC0.129%)30 (3.43.01%)417 (45.04%)30 (3.43.01%)524 (6.05%)20 (0.02%)616 (1.24%)20 (3.02%)716 (1.74%)30 (2.30%)820 (0.29%)20 (3.04%)716 (2.74%)344 (9.02%)820 (0.29%)30 (4.30%)716 (2.74%)344 (9.02%)716 (2.74%)344 (9.02%)716 (2.74%)344 (9.02%)716 (2.74%)344 (9.02%)716 (2.74%)30 (4.49%)716 (2.74%)30 (4.49%)716 (4.58%)307 (4.44%)717 (4.94%)30 (4.44%)717 (4.94%)30 (4.44%)713 (4.54%)30 (4.44%)716 (4.58%)307 (4.44%)716 (4.58%)307 (4.44%)716 (4.58%)307 (4.44%)716 (4.58%)307 (4.44%)716 (4.58%)307 (4.44%)716 (4.58%)307 (No	673 (97.54%)	670 (97.10%)		
injury mechanism0.08 (-0.02, 0.19)0.11Falling67 (98.2%)677 (98.1%)77 (0.0.1%)Accident12 (1.7.4%)6 (0.87%)77 (0.0.1%)Dither3 (0.43%)6 (0.87%)71 (0.0.0, 0.22)0.123Finetruc classificature13 (1.6%)143 (0.20%)71 (0.4.7%)71 (0.4.7%)Femoral neck facture8 (1.16%)13 (1.88%)71 (0.4.7%)71 (0.5%)Subtrochanteric fracture8 (1.16%)73 (1.5%%)71 (0.5%%)71 (0.5%%)AC73 (1.5%%)73 (1.5%%)71 (0.5%%)71 (0.5%%)71 (0.5%%)A17 (4.5.4%)203 (0.29%)71 (0.5%%)71 (0.5%%)71 (0.5%%)A17 (4.5.4%)203 (0.29%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.5%%)71 (0.7%%)A12 (1.7%%)202 (2.0%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)A12 (1.7%%)202 (2.0%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)A12 (1.7%%)202 (2.0%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)A12 (1.7%%)202 (2.0%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)A13 (1.2%%)34 (4.968/%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)No13 (1.5%%)34 (4.968/%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)No13 (1.5%%)13 (1.6%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)No13 (1.5%%)13 (1.6%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)71 (0.7%%)No14 (1.2%%)14 (1.0%%)14 (1.0%%)71	Yes	17 (2.46%)	20 (2.90%)		
rating 675 (97.83%) 677 (98.12%) reaction Accident 12 (1.7%) 7 (10.1%) 7 (10.1%) Chrier 3 (0.4%) 6 (0.87%)	Injury mechanism			0.08 (-0.02, 0.19)	0.314
Accident 12 (1.74%) 7 (1.01%) Othor 3 (0.43%) 6 (0.27%) Texture classification 0.11 (0.00.0.22) 0.123 Intertrochanteric fracture 51 (74.06%) 534 (77.39%) 0.123 Femoral neck fracture 10 (1.04.06%) 134 (20.27%) 0.123 Subtrochanteric fracture 81.10%) 134 (20.27%) 0.023 Subtrochanteric fracture 8 (1.01%) 134 (20.27%) 0.001* 3 14 (2.03%) 73 (10.5%) 0.001* 0.001* 4 317 (45.04%) 303 (43.01%) 0.001* 0.001* 5 0 (0.29%) 303 (43.01%) 0.001* 0.001* 6 15 (1.24%) 74 (10.27%) 0.001* 0.001* 7 15 (2.17%) 20 (2.9%) 0.01* 0.001* 8 0.029(0.02%) 0.01* 0.025 8 0.029(0.01%) 0.01* 0.025 8 0.029%) 0.025 0.05 8 0.029%) 0.025 0.05 <t< td=""><td>Falling</td><td>675 (97.83%)</td><td>677 (98.12%)</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Falling	675 (97.83%)	677 (98.12%)		
Other 30,4390 6 (0.87%) Fracture classification 0.11 (0.00, 0.22) 0.123 Intertitochanteine fracture 171 (24,78%) 134 (20,72%) 0.123 Subtrochanteric fracture 171 (24,78%) 143 (20,72%) 0.000 (0.28, 0.49) <0.001*	Accident	12 (1.74%)	7 (1.01%)		
Fracture classification 0.11 (0.00, 0.22) 0.123 Interrochanteric fracture 11 (74,06%) 534 (77,39%) 54 Subtrochanteric fracture 8 (1.16%) 134 (20.27%) 54 Subtrochanteric fracture 8 (1.16%) 13 (1.89%) <009 (0.28, 0.49)	Other	3 (0.43%)	6 (0.87%)		
Intertrochanteric fracture 511 (74.06%) 534 (77.39%) 14.00.000000000000000000000000000000000	Fracture classification			0.11 (0.00, 0.22)	0.123
Femoral neck fracture 171 (24.78%) 143 (20.72%) Subtrochanteric fracture 0.116%) 13 (1.89%) aCC 0.39 (0.28, 0.49) <001**	Intertrochanteric fracture	511 (74.06%)	534 (77.39%)		
Subtrochanteric fracture 8 (1.16%) 13 (1.88%) aCC 0.39 (0.28, 0.49) <.0001* aCC 0.39 (0.28, 0.49) <.0001* 2 2 (0.29%) 8 (1.16%) <.001* <.001* 3 14 (2.03%) 73 (10.58%) <.105 <.001* 4 317 (45.94%) 303 (43.91%) <.101 <.101 5 25 (26.81%) 209 (20.29%) <.101 <.101 6 86 (12.46%) 74 (10.72%) <.101 <.101 7 15 (2.17%) 20 (2.90%) <.105 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.36 8 20.029% 30 (43.93%) 344 (49.86%) <.101 <.101 No 329 (47.68%) 346 (50.14%) 346 (49.86%) <.101 <.101 No 329 (47.68%) 346 (50.14%) 346 (1.98.06%) <.101 <.101 No 329 (47.68%) 329 (47.68%) 329 (47.88%) 329 (47.88%) 329 (47.88%) 329 (47.88%) No 329 (47.68%) 329 (47.68%) 329 (47.88%)	Femoral neck fracture	171 (24.78%)	143 (20.72%)		
aCC 0.39 (0.28, 0.49) <0.01*	Subtrochanteric fracture	8 (1.16%)	13 (1.88%)		
2 2 0.29% 8 1.16% 1.16% 3 14 (2.03%) 73 (10.58%)	aCCI			0.39 (0.28, 0.49)	< 0.001*
3 14.203%) 73 (10.58%) 4 17 (45.94%) 303 (43.91%) 5 254 (36.81%) 209 (30.90%) 5 264 (36.81%) 209 (20.90%) 6 20 (20.90%) 20 (20.90%) 8 20 (20.90%) 304 (30.1%) Most (12.40%) 20 (20.90%) 8 20 (20.90%) 316 (50.14%) Yes 361 (52.32%) 344 (49.86%) Yes 361 (52.32%) 344 (49.86%) Yes 316 (52.32%) 32 (19.13%) No 55 (80.87%)	2	2 (0.29%)	8 (1.16%)		
4317 (45.94%)303 (43.91%)	3	14 (2.03%)	73 (10.58%)		
5 254 (36.81%) $20 (30.29\%)$ 6 86 (12.46%) 74 (10.72%) 7 15 (2.17%) 20 (2.03%) 8 20 (2.03%) 20 (2.03%) 8 329 (47.68%) 346 (50.14%) Yes 315 (2.32%) 344 (49.66%) 0.45 (0.07,0.15) No 547 (79.28%) 58 (80.87%) 0.45 (0.07,0.15) No 547 (79.28%) 58 (80.87%) 0.45 (0.07,0.15) Yes 143 (20.72%) 58 (80.87%) 0.45 (0.07,0.15) No 547 (79.28%) 558 (80.87%) 0.45 (0.07,0.15) Yes 143 (20.72%) 132 (19.13%) 0.45 (0.08,0.13) Yes 316 (45.80%) 332 (19.13%) 0.626 No 547 (45.20%) 383 (55.51%)	4	317 (45.94%)	303 (43.91%)		
a a a a 6 6 (12,46%) 74 (10,72%) 20 (2,90%) 8 2 (02,90%) 30 4 0 (2,90%) 30 8 0 (2,90%) 30 Hypertension 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.36 No 329 (47,68%) 346 (50.14%)	5	254 (36.81%)	209 (30,29%)		
n n n n n 7 15 (2,17%) 20 (2,9%) 3 (0.43%)	6	86 (12 46%)	74 (10 72%)		
8 2 (0.29%) 3 (0.43%) Hypertension 2 (0.29%) 3 (0.43%) No 329 (47.68%) 34 (50.14%)	7	15 (2.17%)	20 (2.90%)		
Hypertension 0.05 (-0.05, 0.15) 0.36 No 329 (47.68%) 346 (50.14%)	8	2 (0.29%)	3 (0.43%)		
No 329 (47.68%) 346 (50.14%)	Hypertension	_ (())		0.05 (-0.06, 0.15)	0.36
Yes Jaft (53.2%) J44 (49.6%) Diabetes 0.04 (-0.07, 0.15) 0.459 No 547 (79.28%) 558 (80.8%)	No	329 (47.68%)	346 (50.14%)		
Diabetes 0.04 (-0.07, 0.15) 0.459 No 547 (79.28%) 558 (80.87%)	Yes	361 (52.32%)	344 (49.86%)		
No 547 (79.28%) 558 (80.87%) 11 Yes 143 (20.72%) 132 (19.13%) 0.626 CHD 0.03 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.626 No 316 (45.80%) 307 (44.49%) 12 Yes 374 (54.20%) 383 (55.51%) 12 Arrhythmia 0.000 (-0.10, 0.11) 0.955 No 449 (65.07%) 448 (64.93%) 12 Yes 241 (34.93%) 242 (35.07%) 1 Hemorrhagic stroke 0.000 (-0.11, 0.11) 1 No 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) 12 Yes 12 (1.74%) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.688 No 678 (98.26%) 469 (67.97%) 12 Yes 12 (1.74%) 1 1 No 626 (66.96%) 469 (67.97%) 12 Yes 28 (33.04%) 221 (32.03%) 0.688 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) 12 Yes 28 (33.04%) 21 (32.03%) 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) 12 Yes 23 (3.33%) 30 (4.35%) 12 Yes 23 (3.39%) 61 (94.35%) 12 Yes 23 (3.39%) 61 (94.35%) 13 <	Diabetes			0.04 (-0.07, 0.15)	0.459
No 143 (20.72%) 132 (19.13%) Yes 143 (20.72%) 132 (19.13%) CHD 0.03 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.626 No 316 (45.80%) 307 (44.49%) 1 Yes 374 (54.20%) 383 (55.51%) 1 Arrhythmia 0.00 (-0.10, 0.11) 0.955 No 449 (65.07%) 448 (64.93%) 1 Yes 0.00 (-0.11, 0.11) 0.955 No 449 (65.07%) 242 (35.07%) 1 No 678 (98.26%) 20.00 (-0.11, 0.11) 1 No 678 (98.26%) 20.00 (-0.05, 0.13) 0.688 No 462 (66.96%) 469 (67.97%) 20.20 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) 20.05 (-0.05, 0.15) 0.337 </td <td>No</td> <td>547 (79 28%)</td> <td>558 (80 87%)</td> <td></td> <td></td>	No	547 (79 28%)	558 (80 87%)		
CHD 0.03 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.626 No 316 (45.80%) 307 (44.49%) 383 (55.51%)	Yes	143 (20.72%)	132 (19.13%)		
No 316 (45.80%) 307 (44.49%) 1000 (1000) 1000 (1000) Yes 374 (54.20%) 333 (55.51%) 1000 (-0.10, 0.11) 0.955 Arrhythmia 0.000 (-0.10, 0.11) 0.955 1000 (-0.11, 0.11) 0.955 No 449 (65.07%) 448 (64.93%) 1000 (-0.11, 0.11) 0.955 Yes 241 (34.93%) 242 (35.07%) 1000 (-0.11, 0.11) 1 No 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) 12 (1.74%) 12 (1.74%) 1000 (-0.11, 0.11) 1 No 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) 2000 (-0.11, 0.11) 1 1 No 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) 2000 (-0.01, 0.11) 1 No 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) 2000 (-0.01, 0.11) 1 No 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) 2000 (-0.02, 0.13) 0.688 Yes 228 (3.04%) 221 (3.20%) 2000 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) 2000 (-0.05, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) </td <td>CHD</td> <td> (,</td> <td></td> <td>0.03 (-0.08, 0.13)</td> <td>0.626</td>	CHD	(,		0.03 (-0.08, 0.13)	0.626
Yes 374 (54.20%) 383 (55.1%) Arrhythmia 0.00 (-0.10, 0.11) 0.955 No 449 (65.07%) 448 (64.93%) 12 Yes 241 (34.93%) 242 (35.07%) 1 Hemorrhagic stroke 0.00 (-0.11, 0.11) 1 No 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) 1 Yes 12 (1.74%) 1 1 Ischemic stroke 0.02 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.688 No 662 (66.66%) 469 (67.97%) 1 Yes 228 (33.04%) 221 (32.03%) 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) 0.327 Yes 23 (3.33%) 30 (4.35%) 0.373 Yes 23 (3.39%) 30 (4.35%) 0.55 (0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 667 (96.67%) 651 (94.35%) 0.55 (0.06, 0.15) 0.373 Yes 30 (3.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.55 (0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.55 (0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%) 0.55 (0.05, 0.16) 0.297	No	316 (45.80%)	307 (44,49%)		
Arrhythmia 0.00 (-0.10, 0.11) 0.955 No 449 (65.07%) 448 (64.93%) 1 Yes 241 (34.93%) 242 (35.07%) 1 Hemorrhagic stroke 0.00 (-0.11, 0.11) 1 No 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) 12 (1.74%) Yes 12 (1.74%) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.688 Schemic stroke 0.02 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.688 No 462 (66.96%) 469 (67.97%) 6.688 Yes 28 (3.04%) 221 (32.03%)	Yes	374 (54.20%)	383 (55.51%)		
No 449 (65.07%) 448 (64.93%) 1.00 (-0.11, 0.11) 1 Yes 241 (34.93%) 242 (35.07%) 1 Hemorrhagic stroke 0.00 (-0.11, 0.11) 1 No 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) 12 (1.74%) Yes 12 (1.74%) 12 (1.74%)	Arrhythmia			0.00 (-0.10, 0.11)	0.955
Yes 241 (34.93%) 242 (35.07%) Hemorrhagic stroke 0.00 (-0.11, 0.11) 1 No 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) Yes 12 (1.74%) 12 (1.74%) Ischemic stroke 0.02 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.688 No 462 (66.96%) 469 (67.97%) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.688 Yes 228 (33.04%) 221 (32.03%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 Cancer 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) 0.327 0.373 Yes 23 (3.33%) 30 (4.35%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%) 0.297 0.297	No	449 (65.07%)	448 (64,93%)		
Hemorrhagic stroke 0.00 (-0.11, 0.11) 1 No 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) 12 Yes 12 (1.74%) 12 (1.74%) 12 Ischemic stroke 0.02 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.688 No 462 (66.96%) 469 (67.97%) 0.5 Yes 228 (33.04%) 221 (32.03%) 1 Cancer 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) 0.35 Yes 23 (3.33%) 30 (4.35%) 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%) 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297	Yes	241 (34.93%)	242 (35.07%)		
No 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) 678 (98.26%) Yes 12 (1.74%) 12 (1.74%) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.688 Ischemic stroke 0.02 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.688 No 462 (66.96%) 469 (67.97%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 Yes 228 (33.04%) 221 (32.03%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 667 (96.67%) 661 (94.35%) 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297	Hemorrhagic stroke	(0 0)	(**********************************	0.00 (-0.11, 0.11)	1
Yes 12 (1.74%) 12 (1.74%) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.688 No 462 (66.96%) 469 (67.97%) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.688 Yes 228 (33.04%) 221 (32.03%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 Cancer 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 Yes 23 (3.33%) 30 (4.35%) 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%) 0.02 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297	No	678 (98 26%)	678 (98 26%)		·
Ischemic stroke 0.02 (-0.08, 0.13) 0.688 No 462 (66.96%) 469 (67.97%) Yes 228 (33.04%) 221 (32.03%) Cancer 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) Yes 23 (3.33%) 30 (4.35%) Associated injuries 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) Yes 47 (6.81%) 39 (5.65%) Dementia 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%)	Yes	12 (1 74%)	12 (1 74%)		
No 462 (66.96%) 469 (67.97%) 000 (00.05, 0.16) 000 (00.05, 0.16) Yes 228 (33.04%) 221 (32.03%) 000 (0.05, 0.16) 0.327 Cancer 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 Yes 23 (3.33%) 30 (4.35%) 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.373 Yes 47 (6.81%) 39 (5.65%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297	Ischemic stroke	12 (11) 170)	12 (11) 170)	0.02 (-0.08 0.13)	0.688
Yes 228 (33.04%) 221 (32.03%) Cancer 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) Yes 23 (3.33%) 30 (4.35%) Associated injuries 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 Yes 47 (6.81%) 39 (5.65%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 Dementia 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297	No	462 (66.96%)	469 (67.97%)	0.02 (0.00, 0.10)	0.000
Cancer 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.327 No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) 7 Yes 23 (3.33%) 30 (4.35%) 7 Associated injuries 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.373 Yes 47 (6.81%) 39 (5.65%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 Dementia 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297	Yes	228 (33.04%)	221 (32.03%)		
No 667 (96.67%) 660 (95.65%) Yes 23 (3.33%) 30 (4.35%) Associated injuries 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.373 Yes 47 (6.81%) 39 (5.65%) 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%) 0.05 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297	Cancer	(,		0.05 (-0.05, 0.16)	0.327
Yes 23 (3.33%) 30 (4.35%) Associated injuries 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) Yes 47 (6.81%) 39 (5.65%) Dementia 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%)	No	667 (96.67%)	660 (95.65%)		
Associated injuries 0.05 (-0.06, 0.15) 0.373 No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) Yes 47 (6.81%) 39 (5.65%) Dementia 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%)	Yes	23 (3.33%)	30 (4.35%)		
No 643 (93.19%) 651 (94.35%) 651 (94.35%) Yes 47 (6.81%) 39 (5.65%) 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 Dementia 0.06 (93.62%) 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297	Associated injuries			0.05 (-0.06, 0.15)	0.373
Yes 47 (6.81%) 39 (5.65%) Dementia 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%)	No	643 (93.19%)	651 (94.35%)		
Dementia 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297 No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%) 0.06 (-0.05, 0.16) 0.297	Yes	47 (6.81%)	39 (5.65%)		
No 655 (94.93%) 646 (93.62%)	Dementia			0.06 (-0.05, 0.16)	0.297
	No	655 (94.93%)	646 (93.62%)	- · · ·	

Table 6 (continued)

Variables	Survival (690)	Mortality (690)	Standardized difference	<i>P</i> value
Yes	35 (5.07%)	44 (6.38%)		
COPD			0.03 (-0.08, 0.13)	0.602
No	643 (93.19%)	638 (92.46%)		
Yes	47 (6.81%)	52 (7.54%)		
Hepatitis			0.00 (-0.11, 0.11)	1
No	665 (96.38%)	665 (96.38%)		
Yes	25 (3.62%)	25 (3.62%)		
Gastritis			0.00 (-0.11, 0.11)	1
No	677 (98.12%)	677 (98.12%)		
Yes	13 (1.88%)	13 (1.88%)		
Time to admission (h)	94.38±314.44	85.11±157.26	0.04 (-0.07, 0.14)	0.489
Operation			0.09 (-0.01, 0.20)	0.236
ORIF	508 (73.62%)	535 (77.54%)		
HA	180 (26.09%)	153 (22.17%)		
THA	2 (0.29%)	2 (0.29%)		
Operation time (mins)	90.04 ± 32.51	91.54 ± 33.14	0.05 (-0.06, 0.15)	0.394
Blood loss (mL)	237.07±157.23	242.80 ± 142.73	0.04 (-0.07, 0.14)	0.479
Infusion (mL)	1502.74±345.87	1509.04 ± 371.50	0.02 (-0.09, 0.12)	0.744
Transfusion (U)	1.24 ± 1.25	1.30 ± 1.24	0.05 (-0.06, 0.15)	0.377
Time to operation (d)	4.26±2.41	4.51 ± 2.85	0.09 (-0.01, 0.20)	0.082

* Variables were not successfully matched

Table 7 Multivariate results by Cox regression
--

Exposure	Non-adjusted model	Minimally-adjusted model	Fully-adjusted model	PSM model	PSM-adjusted model
Admission albumin	0.91 (0.89, 0.92) < 0.0001	0.93 (0.91, 0.95) < 0.0001	0.94 (0.92, 0.96) < 0.0001	0.96 (0.93, 0.99) 0.0046	0.95 (0.92, 0.98) 0.0042

Data in table: HR (95% CI) P-value

Outcome variable: mortality

Exposed variables: albumin

Adjust variables in the PSM-adjusted model: age, aCCI

prognosis [48, 49]. During the analysis, to explore the real relationship between the two factors, we not only carried out linear regression using different adjusted models but also changed the continuous variable of albumin to a categorical variable or performed a trend test for the result. Additionally, we considered confounders in earlier studies [14, 30, 50], adjusted the factor of P < 0.1 in the univariate analysis, and comprehensively considered the variables that needed adjustment. The age-stratified analysis showed that the preoperative albumin level was not associated with mortality in $65 \le age < 75$ patients but associated with mortality in patients $75 \leq age$. Phillips reported that in middle-aged men, serum albumin decreased with age [50]. In this study, there were 583, 1226, and 578 patients in $65 \le age < 75$, $75 \le age < 85$, and $age \ge 85$ subgroups, and the mean albumin levels were 39.0 ± 4.3 , 37.8 ± 3.8 , 36.4 ± 3.9 g/L and the mortality rates were 101 (17.3%), 395 (32.2%) and 291 (50.3%), respectively. The higher age with lower albumin level was associated with higher mortality.

In addition, we explored the association with the curve relationship and found no threshold or saturation effect, which supplements the stability of the linear association. We also performed sensitivity analysis using PSM to test the robustness of our results. One thousand three hundred eighty patients were matched successfully, and the results remained stable.

It was noted that there were 195 patients received conservative treatment, and there were 130 (66.7%) deaths. The reasons for conservative treatment were the poor status to support operation or the refusal of operation from patients' families. Therefore, surgery-specific variables (e.g., time to operation, operation time, blood loss, infusion, transfusion, etc.) are unsuitable for conservative cases. When we excluded these conservative patients, the adjusted model also showed a mortality risk decrease of 6% (HR = 0.94) when albumin increased by 1 g/L.

Our study had some limitations. First, because of the retrospective design, loss to follow-up was inevitable. To obtain a prognosis, we attempted thrice to



Fig. 3 The PSM of two groups under propensity score based on the Cox model

establish contact with the patients who failed to return for follow-up. Second, our analysis had many potential confounders related to mortality. However, these data did not include body mass index, C-reactive protein, pre-injury walking level, or other reported mortalityrelated factors. The reason was that we did not get the data in the early digital medical system (body mass index and pre-injury walking level), or the surgeons did not have the C-reactive protein test at admission. It is important to analyze whether hypoalbuminemia is the cause or an intermediate factor, including various variables, in order to establish appropriate treatment in the future. Third, our study was designed as a single center, and the external validity of the results needs to be considered in the future.

In conclusion, albumin concentration is associated with mortality in geriatric patients with hip fractures, and it could be considered a predictor for the risk of mortality.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Author contributions

According to the definition given by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), the authors listed above qualify for authorship based on making one or more of the substantial contributions to the intellectual content of the following: Conceived and designed the study: Yao Liu, Bin-Fei Zhang. Performed the study: Hai Huang, Bin-Fei Zhang. Analyzed the data: Hai Huang, Yao Liu, Bin-Fei Zhang. Wrote the manuscript: Hai Huang. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the Foundation of the Xi'an Municipal Health Commission (Grant Number: 2024ms15).

Data availability

Xi'an Honghui Hospital implemented the data. According to relevant regulations, the data could not be shared but could be requested from the correspondence author.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Honghui Hospital, Xi'an Jiaotong University (No. 202201009).

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Consent to publish

The work described has not been published before (except in the form of an abstract or as part of a published lecture, review, or thesis); it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere, and all co-authors have approved its publication.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Registered information

This study is registered on the website of the Chinese Clinical Trial Registry (ChiCTR: ChiCTR2200057323).

Received: 1 February 2025 / Accepted: 29 April 2025 Published online: 19 May 2025

References

- 1. Maffulli N, Aicale R. Proximal femoral fractures in the elderly: a few things to know, and some to forget. Med (Kaunas). 2022;58(10):1314.
- Chen YP, Kuo YJ, Hung SW, et al. Loss of skeletal muscle mass can be predicted by sarcopenia and reflects poor functional recovery at one year after surgery for geriatric hip fractures. Injury. 2021;52(11):3446–52.
- Dong Y, Zhang Y, Song K, et al. What was the epidemiology and global burden of disease of hip fractures from 1990 to 2019? Results from and additional analysis of the global burden of disease study 2019. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2023;481(6):1209–20.
- Sing CW, Lin TC, Bartholomew S, et al. Global epidemiology of hip fractures: secular trends in incidence rate, post-fracture treatment, and all-cause mortality. J Bone Mineral Res. 2023;38(8):1064–75.
- Downey C, Kelly M, Quinlan JF. Changing trends in the mortality rate at 1-year post hip fracture - a systematic review. World J Orthop. 2019;10(3):166–75.
- Quaranta M, Miranda L, Oliva F, et al. Haemoglobin and transfusions in elderly patients with hip fractures: the effect of a dedicated orthogeriatrician. J Orthop Surg Res. 2021;16(1):387.
- Chen M, Li Y, Yang Y, et al. Analysis of the risk factors for contralateral refracture after hip fracture surgery in elderly individuals: a retrospective study. J Orthop Surg Res. 2024;19(1):681.
- Cabrerizo S, Cuadras D, Gomez-Busto F, et al. Serum albumin and health in older people: review and meta analysis. Maturitas. 2015;81(1):17–27.
- Gom I, Fukushima H, Shiraki M, et al. Relationship between serum albumin level and aging in community-dwelling self-supported elderly population. J Nutritional Sci Vitaminology. 2007;53(1):37–42.
- Singer P, Blaser AR, Berger MM, et al. ESPEN practical and partially revised guideline: clinical nutrition in the intensive care unit. Clin Nutr. 2023;42(9):1671–89.
- Sze S, Pellicori P, Zhang J, et al. The impact of malnutrition on short-term morbidity and mortality in ambulatory patients with heart failure. Am J Clin Nutr. 2021;113(3):695–705.
- 12. Jin X, Xiong S, Ju SY, et al. Serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D, albumin, and mortality among Chinese older adults: a population-based longitudinal study. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2020;105(8):2762–70.
- Hebeler KR, Baumgarten H, Squiers JJ, et al. Albumin is predictive of 1-year mortality after transcatheter aortic valve replacement. Ann Thorac Surg. 2018;106(5):1302–7.
- 14. Pan L, Ning T, Wu H, et al. Prognostic nomogram for risk of mortality after hip fracture surgery in geriatrics. Injury. 2022;53(4):1484–9.
- Vincent JL, Dubois MJ, Navickis RJ, et al. Hypoalbuminemia in acute illness: is there a rationale for intervention? A meta-analysis of cohort studies and controlled trials. Ann Surg. 2003;237(3):319–34.
- Malafarina V, Reginster JY, Cabrerizo S, et al. Nutritional status and nutritional treatment are related to outcomes and mortality in older adults with hip fracture. Nutrients. 2018;10(5):555.
- Bohl DD, Shen MR, Hannon CP, et al. Serum albumin predicts survival and postoperative course following surgery for geriatric hip fracture. J Bone Joint Surg (American Volume). 2017;99(24):2110–8.
- 18. Li S, Zhang J, Zheng H, et al. Prognostic role of serum albumin, total lymphocyte count, and mini nutritional assessment on outcomes after geriatric

hip fracture surgery: a meta-analysis and systematic review. J Arthroplasty. 2019;34(6):1287–96.

- Mathew G, Agha R, Albrecht J, et al. STROCSS 2021: strengthening the reporting of cohort, cross-sectional and case-control studies in surgery. Int J Surg. 2021;96:106165.
- Marsillo E, Pintore A, Asparago G, et al. Cephalomedullary nailing for reverse oblique intertrochanteric fractures 31A3 (AO/OTA). Orthop Rev (Pavia). 2022;14(6):38560.
- 21. Gargano G, Poeta N, Oliva F, et al. Zimmer natural nail and ELOS nails in pertrochanteric fractures. J Orthop Surg Res. 2021;16(1):509.
- 22. Schulz AP, Munch M, Barth T, et al. Initial construct stability of long cephalomedullary nails with superior locking for a complex trochanteric fracture model AO31A2.2- a biomechanical study. J Orthop Surg Res. 2024;19(1):728.
- Huang J, Lin L, Lyu J, et al. Hip arthroplasty following failure of internal fixation in intertrochanteric femoral fractures: classification decision-making for femoral stem selection and clinical validation. J Orthop Surg Res. 2024;19(1):671.
- 24. Liu T, Zhang X, Zhang J, et al. Effect of the orthogeriatric co-management on older hip fracture patients with multimorbidity: a post-hoc exploratory subgroup analysis of a non-randomised controlled trial. J Orthop Surg Res. 2024;19(1):780.
- 25. Zhang DL, Cong YX, Zhuang Y, et al. Age-adjusted Charlson comorbidity index predicts postoperative mortality in elderly patients with hip fracture: a prospective cohort. Front Med (Lausanne). 2023;10:1066145.
- Han X, Han L, Chu F, et al. Predictors for 1-year mortality in geriatric patients following fragile intertrochanteric fracture surgery. J Orthop Surg Res. 2024;19(1):701.
- Lizaur-Utrilla A, Gonzalez-Navarro B, Vizcaya-Moreno MF, et al. Altered seric levels of albumin, sodium and parathyroid hormone may predict early mortality following hip fracture surgery in elderly. Int Orthop. 2019;43(12):2825–9.
- 28. Pimlott BJ, Jones CA, Beaupre LA, et al. Prognostic impact of pre-operative albumin on short-term mortality and complications in patients with hip fracture. Archives Gerontol Geriatr. 2011;53(1):90–4.
- 29. Miyanishi K, Jingushi S, Torisu T. Mortality after hip fracture in Japan: the role of nutritional status. J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong). 2010;18(3):265–70.
- Demirel E, Sahin A. Predictive value of blood parameters and comorbidities on three-month mortality in elderly patients with hip fracture. Cureus. 2021;13(10):e18634.
- Frandsen CF, Glassou EN, Stilling M, et al. Malnutrition, poor function and comorbidities predict mortality up to one year after hip fracture: a cohort study of 2800 patients. Eur Geriatr Med. 2022;13(2):433–43.
- Ko Y, Baek SH, Ha YC. Predictive factors associated with mortality in Korean elderly patients with hip fractures. J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong). 2019;27(2):2309499019847848.
- Dhingra M, Goyal T, Yadav A, et al. One-year mortality rates and factors affecting mortality after surgery for fracture neck of femur in the elderly. J Midlife Health. 2021;12(4):276–80.
- Fu H, Liang B, Qin W, et al. Development of a prognostic model for 1-year survival after fragile hip fracture in Chinese. J Orthop Surg Res. 2021;16(1):695.
- 35. Wilson JM, Boissonneault AR, Schwartz AM, et al. Frailty and malnutrition are associated with inpatient postoperative complications and mortality in hip fracture patients. J Orthop Trauma. 2019;33(3):143–8.
- 36. Wang X, Dai L, Zhang Y, et al. Gender and low albumin and oxygen levels are risk factors for perioperative pneumonia in geriatric hip fracture patients. Clin Interv Aging. 2020;15:419–24.
- Peng X, Hao X, Zhu T. A nomogram to predict postoperative infection for older hip fracture patients. Archives Orthop Trauma Surg. 2023;143(2):847–55.
- Sahyoun NR, Jacques PF, Dallal G, et al. Use of albumin as a predictor of mortality in community dwelling and institutionalized elderly populations. J Clin Epidemiol. 1996;49(9):981–8.
- Salive ME, Cornoni-Huntley J, Phillips CL, et al. Serum albumin in older persons: relationship with age and health status. J Clin Epidemiol. 1992;45(3):213–21.
- Liu Y, Sun Y, Fan L, et al. Perioperative factors associated with hidden blood loss in intertrochanteric fracture patients. Musculoskelet Surg. 2017;101(2):139–44.
- 41. Sha S, Gwenzi T, Chen LJ, et al. About the associations of vitamin D deficiency and biomarkers of systemic inflammatory response with all-cause and cause-specific mortality in a general population sample of almost 400,000 UK biobank participants. Eur J Epidemiol. 2023;38(9):957–71.
- 42. Jayanama K, Theou O, Blodgett JM, et al. Frailty, nutrition-related parameters, and mortality across the adult age spectrum. BMC Med. 2018;16(1):188.

- Don BR, Kaysen G. Serum albumin: relationship to inflammation and nutrition. Semin Dial. 2004;17(6):432–7.
- 44. Fanali G, di Masi A, Trezza V, et al. Human serum albumin: from bench to bedside. Mol Aspects Med. 2012;33(3):209–90.
- Seidu S, Kunutsor SK, Khunti K. Serum albumin, cardiometabolic and other adverse outcomes: systematic review and meta-analyses of 48 published observational cohort studies involving 1,492,237 participants. Scand Cardiovasc J. 2020;54(5):280–93.
- Li H, Liu J, Yao J, et al. Fracture initiates systemic inflammatory response syndrome through recruiting polymorphonuclear leucocytes. Immunol Res. 2016;64(4):1053–9.
- Moldovan F, Ivanescu AD, Fodor P, et al. Correlation between inflammatory systemic biomarkers and surgical trauma in elderly patients with hip fractures. J Clin Med. 2023;12(15):5147.
- Okike K, Chan PH, Navarro RA, et al. Hip fracture surgery volumes among individuals 65 years and older during the COVID-19 pandemic. JAMA. 2022;327(4):387–8.

- Zhong H, Poeran J, Liu J, et al. Hip fracture characteristics and outcomes during COVID-19: a large retrospective national database review. Br J Anaesth. 2021;127(1):15–22.
- Phillips A, Shaper AG, Whincup PH. Association between serum albumin and mortality from cardiovascular disease, cancer, and other causes. Lancet. 1989;2(8677):1434–6.

Publisher's note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.