# Utility of quality statements for the emergency department (ED) management of patients with hip fractures: Retrospective analysis of administrative data

OF NEW BRUNSWIC

Sarah Filiatreault RN, MN<sup>1</sup>, PhD(student)<sup>2</sup>, Marilyn Hodgins RN, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Rose McCloskey RN, PhD<sup>3</sup>, Nicole Moore RN, MN<sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup>University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, <sup>2</sup>University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, <sup>3</sup>University of New Brunswick, Saint John, <sup>4</sup>Horizon Health Network - Dr. Everett Chalmers Regional Hospital, Fredericton

## BACKGROUND

り	Hip fractures are one of the n	nost serious i	injuries experi	enced
	by older adults.			

- Approximately 30,000 Canadians experience a hip fracture each year
- Following hip fracture, older adults are more likely to experience loss of independence, institutionalization and even death.

A Because most people who experience a hip fracture present to the ED and spend a large portion of the pre-operative period in this setting, it is important to examine the care received and establish quality

#### **Quality Statement Attainment**

Large variability in percentage of attainment for the quality statements

#### A patient presenting to the ED with a suspected hip fracture will:

receive surgery within 48 hours $^{\delta}$ (n = 185)	74.6%
have a complete set of vital signs within 30 minutes $^{\delta}$	<b>88.0%</b> *highest
have a capillary blood glucose within 30 minutes $^{\delta}$	2.6%
be assessed for pain within 30 minutes $^{\delta}$	52.4%
be assessed for pain 30 minutes after receiving analgesia (n = 142)	4.9%
receive analgesia within 60 minutes $^{\delta}$	29.8%
have a cognitive status assessment in the ED	0.5%*lowest
receive care based on a pre-established multidisciplinary clinical pathway or protocol that can be initiated by nurses	N/A
be assessed for pressure injury risk during the ED stay	N/A
Note: $\delta$ = of arrival to the ED; % = valid percent; N/A = not able to examine due to lack of relevant data fields	



- statements.
- **Quality statements:** 
  - Explicate what constitutes quality care
  - Provide criteria for monitoring & evaluating current practice
  - Supports efforts to improve healthcare delivery and patient outcomes

## **QUALITY STATEMENT DEVELOPMENT**

**Step 1** - Evidence synthesis (Umbrella Review) of clinical practice guidelines conducted to appraise quality and synthesize recommendations for the pre-operative period\*.

**Step 2** - 7 Quality Statements <u>sensitive to nursing intervention in the ED</u> developed based on synthesized recommendations addressing 5 priority categories:

- Timely Surgery
- Multidisciplinary Approach to Care
- Identify & Treat Correctable Co-Morbidities
- Pain Management (2)
- Measures to Prevent Common Complications (2)

#### Multiple Logistic Regression Examining Predictors of Attainment

Timely Su OR	urgery (n = 185)	Initial Pain	Assess (N = 191)	Initial Ana	algesia (N = 191)
OR					
	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
0.86	0.44 to 1.70	1.62	0.89 to 2.94	1.24	0.65 to 2.39
0.74	0.34 to 1.59	0.66	0.33 to 1.33	0.82	0.37 to 1.80
0.85	0.39 to 1.80	2.68	1.38 to 5.20	4.69	1.87 to 11.77
1.40	0.66 to 2.96	0.78	0.41 to 1.46	0.69	0.33 to 1.43
1.91 (d	lf 4), p = .377	13.94 (	df 4), p = .004	16.70 (	(df 4), p = .001
Nagelke	erke R <sup>2</sup> = 1.5%	Nagelke	erke R <sup>2</sup> = 9.4%	Nagelke	erke R <sup>2</sup> = 11.9%
	0.74 0.85 1.40 1.91 (c Nagelke	0.74 0.34 to 1.59 0.85 0.39 to 1.80 1.40 0.66 to 2.96 1.91 (df 4), p = .377 Nagelker ke R <sup>2</sup> = 1.5%	0.74 $0.34$ to $1.59$ $0.66$ $0.85$ $0.39$ to $1.80$ $2.68$ $1.40$ $0.66$ to $2.96$ $0.78$ $1.91$ (df 4), p = .377 $13.94$ (d)	0.74 $0.34$ to $1.59$ $0.66$ $0.33$ to $1.33$ $0.85$ $0.39$ to $1.80$ $2.68$ $1.38$ to $5.20$ $1.40$ $0.66$ to $2.96$ $0.78$ $0.41$ to $1.46$ $1.91$ (df 4), p = .377 $13.94$ (df 4), p = .004Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup> = $1.5%$	0.74 $0.34$ to $1.59$ $0.66$ $0.33$ to $1.33$ $0.82$ $0.85$ $0.39$ to $1.80$ $2.68$ $1.38$ to $5.20$ $4.69$ $1.40$ $0.66$ to $2.96$ $0.78$ $0.41$ to $1.46$ $0.69$ $1.91$ (df 4), p = .377 $13.94$ (df 4), p = .004 $16.70$ ( Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup> = $1.5%$ Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup> = $9.4%$ Nagelkerke

Patients triaged as more acute were more likely to have an initial pain assessment in < 30 minutes and to receive analgesia in < 60 minutes

### DISCUSSION

Care received in the ED is an important area of research

		CTAS Scor	res
			See patient:
	CTAS 1	Resuscitation	Immediate
า	CTAS 2	Emergent	≤ 15 minutes
	CTAS	Urgent	<mark>≤</mark> 30 minutes

\*Filiatreault S, Hodgins M, Witherspoon R. An umbrella review of clinical practice guidelines for the management of patients with hip fractures and a synthesis of recommendations for the pre-operative period. Journal of Advanced Nursing [Internet]. 2018;74(6):1278-88. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13550

## **PURPOSE**

Examine feasibility of using the developed quality statements to monitor & evaluate care received by patients with hip fractures in the ED.

## METHOD

Retrospective analysis of electronic clinical data from facility identified as 'Centre of Expertise' for orthopedic surgery in one Atlantic province for the fiscal year of 2016-2017 in order to:

- Generate frequencies to determine proportion of cases in which quality statements were met individually and as a set
- Conduct multiple logistic regressions to examine if those who were younger (< 80 years), male, assigned a more acute triage score (CTAS 2 or 3), and arrived on a weekday-day shift were more likely to attain the quality statements.



Triage assessment & assigning appropriate triage scores is important because it sets the care trajectory in the ED. CTAS

Less Urgent < 60 minutes < 120 minutes Non Urgent

Vague presenting complaints (confusion, weakness and/or pain), age-related changes, as well as incomplete history puts patients with hip fractures as risk for **under-triage\*** \*under recognition of injury or underestimation of patient acuity

'Frailty Modifier' introduced into Canadian triage system in 2016 in attempt to address the general issue of under-triage. Factors that may apply to patients with hip fractures include:

Older age (>80yrs)

- General weakness Pain
- Cognitive impairment
- Immobility

Traditional focus of ED care - rapid triage, initial stabilization and *disposition of patients -* may not be sufficient to address needs of patients with hip fractures

By broadening the focus of care & enacting the quality statements, ED nurses can play a pivotal role in optimizing short and long-term outcomes

Implementation & evaluation of quality statements would be facilitated by:

- Creation of fixed-format data entry fields in electronic ED record
- Establish mechanisms to aggregate retrieval and examination

#### RESULTS

#### **Sample Characteristics**

Characteristics of **191** patients admitted through the ED with a diagnosis of hip fracture who were 18 years of age or older with CTAS 2 to 5:

- Median age 81 years (range 51 to 101)
- 75% female
- 97% received surgical intervention
- 67% arrived on a weekday •
- 53% arrived during evening/night shift
- 58% triaged as 'Urgent' (CTAS 3)
- > 29% triaged as 'Less or Non-Urgent' (CTAS 4 or 5)

#### **Time Spent in the ED**

Length of ED stay ranged from less than one hour to almost 30 hours

A Half of patients spent over **7.5hrs** & 4 spent over 24hrs

#### Benchmarks could then be established in collaboration with ED nurses

### CONCLUSION

This study makes a unique contribution because it examined a set of quality statements that are sensitive to nursing intervention.

It is the first known Canadian study to move beyond targets for timely surgery in an attempt to examine the quality of care patients with hip fracture receive in the ED.

Establishing feasibility of creating evidence-based quality statements and evaluating their level of attainment in the practice setting is an important first step in improving ED care for this vulnerable population.