ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Impact on patient outcome of emergency department length of stay prior to ICU admission
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Abstract
Objective: The favorable evolution of critically ill patients is often dependent on time-sensitive care intervention. The timing of transfer to the intensive care unit (ICU) therefore may be an important determinant of outcomes in critically ill patients. The aim of this study was to analyze the impact upon patient outcome of the length of stay in the Emergency Care Department.

Design: A single-center ambispective cohort study was carried out.

Setting: A general ICU and Emergency Care Department (ED) of a single University Hospital.

Patients: We included 269 patients consecutively transferred to the ICU from the ED over an 18-month period.

Interventions: Patients were first grouped into different cohorts based on ED length of stay (LOS), and were then divided into two groups: (a) ED LOS ≤5 h and (b) ED LOS >5 h.

Variables: Demographic, diagnostic, length of stay and mortality data were compared among the groups.

Results: Median ED LOS was 277 min (IQR 129–622). Patients who developed ICU complications had a longer ED LOS compared to those who did not (349 min vs. 209 min, p < 0.01). A total of 129 patients (48%) had ED LOS >5 h. The odds ratio of dying for patients with ED LOS >5 h was 2.5 (95% CI 1.3–4.7). Age and sepsis diagnosis were the risk factors associated to prolongation of ED length of stay.
Introduction

The time lapse between the onset of organ dysfunction and the initiation of appropriate treatment may play a decisive role in outcome for critically-ill patients. In fact, patients who have already developed multiple organ dysfunction syndrome (MODS) predict a very poor outcome, and a subsequent intensive care unit (ICU) admission may well prove futile. Successful evolution of these patients often depends on time-sensitive care interventions capable of repairing the damaged organs. Among such interventions are aggressive resuscitation after major trauma, thrombolytic agent therapy in stroke patients, early rapid fluid resuscitation and appropriate antibiotics in septic shock, or artery revascularization in myocardial infarction. Thus the timing of transfer to the ICU to receive life-sustaining therapies may be an important determinant of outcome for criticallyill patients admitted to the emergency department (ED). Delayed ICU admissions have been associated with higher mortality. Delays of four or more hours in ICU transfers following physiological deterioration have been associated with a 3.5 times higher mortality rate.

Few studies have investigated the impact on critically-ill patients of ED length of stay prior to ICU admission. However, solid data exist concerning already severely-ill patients having to wait in the emergency department for ICU bed availability. These studies confirm that waiting time is associated with poorer outcome, although there is still little data to support the use of any particular time frame as an indicator of quality of care. Outside of the ICU and postoperative care areas, critical care is more frequently delivered in the emergency department than in any other area in the hospital. Hence the increasing focus on "critical care without walls", whereby critically-ill patients are increasingly being cared for in the emergency department.

For emergency department patients, the timing of transfer to the ICU may be an important determinant of outcomes. Therefore, the purposes of this study were to identify factors likely to increase emergency department length of stay, and analyze the relationship between ED length of stay and the clinical course of disease in patients subsequently admitted to the ICU.
Impact of the emergency department length of stay

Patients and methods

Study design and study population

We present a prospective cohort study of all patients consecutively transferred to the ICU from the emergency department from October 2011 to March 2013.

During the study period, there were 782 ICU admissions. We excluded the following patients: (a) patients transferred directly by the pre-hospital emergency medical services to the ICU (n = 93); (b) inter-hospital transfers (n = 84); (c) transfers from wards (n = 202); and (d) transfers from operating rooms (n = 114). A total of 289 patients from the emergency department were considered as potential candidates for inclusion in the final analysis. However, the following exclusions criteria were applied: (a) patients transferred to a ward within 24 h of ICU admission (n = 14) and (b) and incomplete follow-up patients (n = 4). Thus 269 patients made up the final study population.

Our ICU is a closed 17-bed unit staffed by seven highly-trained intensivists. The emergency department area consists of a 37-bed main unit, a 40-bed observation unit and a two-bed urgent care unit. ED patients are treated by trained physicians and consultants from different medical or surgical specialties. Intensivists are consulted when patients need intensive therapies of the ICU, and the final decision regarding ICU admission is then made by the senior intensivist. Patients are treated by intensivists, according to ICU protocols, when they arrived in the intensive care unit.

The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of our institution, and the informed consent requirement was waived. Patient anonymity was protected at all times throughout the study period.

Data collection

All interventions subsequent to ICU admission were prospectively recorded. ED admission data were obtained from the emergency department records. Follow-up continued until hospital discharge.

The following data were collected: day of ICU admission; age; sex; comorbidities (artrial hypertension, diabetic, cardiovascular, respiratory, renal or hepatic chronic disease, acquired immunosuppression and solid or hematological cancer); procedures or treatment in the ICU (mechanical ventilation, central venous catheterisation, dialysis, vasoactive drugs, sedation longer than 24 h, and urgent surgical intervention); and diagnostic category classified as: (a) sepsis; (b) neurocrict (intracranial hemorrhage, stroke, status epilepticus, other); (c) respiratory (acute exacerbation of asthma or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, pulmonary embolism, other); (d) gastrointestinal (pancreatitis, gastrointestinal bleeding, acute hepatitis or liver complications); (e) renal/metabolic (acute renal failure, diabetic ketoacidosis, other metabolic decompensation); and (d) miscellaneous. All physiological and laboratory data needed to calculate the Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) II score within the first 24 h of ICU admission were recorded.

Outcome measurements were as follows: (a) ICU complications [shock (when vasoactive drugs are needed to avoid tissue hypoperfusion), acute heart failure (according to chest radiography image and/or monitoring of ventricular filling pressures or cardiac index), acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) or acute renal failure based on definitions previously used,\(^\text{18,19}\) coagulopathy based on local laboratory tests, and multiple organ failure]; (b) ICU and hospital length of stay (LOS); and (c) ICU and hospital mortality.

Emergency department length of stay, defined as the period from the patient’s ED arrival to their ICU arrival, was measured in minutes by the ICU team and recorded for all patients. The relationship between ED LOS and outcome was examined in two ways. Firstly, patients were grouped into six cohorts according to the number of hours spent in the emergency department: 0–2, 2–4, 4–6, 6–12, 12–24, and more than 24 h. Secondly, patients were divided into two groups according to the median ED LOS: (a) those with an ED LOS ≤ 5 h and (b) those with an ED LOS > 5 h.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis of data was performed using STATA/SE statistical package, version 10.0. Continuous variables were presented as mean and standard deviation (SD) if normally distributed, otherwise as median with interquartile range (IQR). Categorical variables were presented as a percentage. Normality of distribution was tested with the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. Continuous variables were compared using the Student’s t or Mann-Whitney U tests, as appropriate. Categorical variables were compared using a chi-squared test or Fisher’s exact test for non-normally distributed data. Multivariate stepwise logistic regression (backward elimination) approach was used to identify potential risk factors associated with prolonged emergency department length of stay. The median value of ED LOS (5 h approximately) was used as a cut-off to transform the data into categorical variables. Only variables with p < 0.20 in the univariate analysis were included in the multivariate analysis, and results are presented as odds ratio with 95% confidence interval. A Kaplan–Meier curve was performed to analyze patient survival. All two-sided p-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Results

A total of 269 patients was the final study population. Patients were mainly male (59%), with a mean age of 53 ± 17 years and a mean APACHE II score of 16 ± 7 points. Median time spent in the emergency department before ICU transfer was 277 min (IQR 129–622). Patients were grouped into six cohorts based on ED LOS as follows: 61 patients (23%) under 2 h, 60 patients (22%) from 2 to 4 h, 30 patients (11%) from 4 to 6 h, 62 patients (23%) from 6 to 12 h, 45 patients (17%) from 12 to 24 h, and 11 patients (4%) more than 24 h. The majority of ICU admissions occurred in the daytime (72%, 195/269) and on a week day (66%, 178/269).

Fig. 1 shows the relation between ED length of stay and different diagnoses. As can be seen, patients with sepsis or gastrointestinal diagnoses were more likely to have longer ED LOS (p < 0.001). Neither the day of ICU admission (weekday vs. weekend) nor the shift (day vs. night) were associated with ED length of stay: weekday 276 min (IQR
Table 1  ICU organ support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of support</th>
<th>Patient with ICU support</th>
<th>Patient without support</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Median ED LOS</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical ventilation</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>261 (120–576)</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasoactive drugs</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>364 (175–693)</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialysis</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>420 (201–678)</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedation longer than 24h</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>275 (132–632)</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central venous catheter</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>307 (140–670)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent surgery</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>228 (133–522)</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shown as n (number of patients) and median of minutes (IQR). ED LOS: emergency department length of stay.

Table 2  ICU time-dependent complications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complication category</th>
<th>Patient with complication</th>
<th>Patient without complication</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Median ED LOS</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any complication</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>349 (147–719)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>413 (178–768)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute heart failure</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>420 (177–779)</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>379 (147–583)</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal failure</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>480 (203–888)</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coagulopathy</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>480 (262–892)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple organ failure</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>470 (203–910)</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shown as n (number of patients) and median of minutes (IQR). ED LOS: emergency department length of stay; ARDS, acute respiratory distress syndrome.
Figure 2  Time-dependent complication rate among critically-ill patients grouped by emergency department length of stay prior to ICU admission. These figures show increase in complication rates according to ED waiting time. (A) There is a tendency of increase in shock rate with longer ED LOS (but no significant, $p = 0.10$). (B) There is a significant tendency of increase in renal failure rate with longer ED LOS ($p = 0.001$). (C) There is a significant tendency of increase in coagulopathy rate with longer ED LOS ($p < 0.001$). (D) There is a significant tendency of increase in multiple organ failure rate with longer ED LOS ($p = 0.009$).

Discussion

The present study demonstrates that approximately 20% of critically-ill patients spend more than 12 h in the emergency department before being admitted to the ICU. Our results suggest that prolonged emergency department boarding times (>5 h) are associated with poor clinical patient outcomes such as time-dependent complications and reduced hospital survival. Critically-ill patients constitute a significant and growing proportion of emergency department practice. These patients are likely to remain in the emergency department for significant periods of time. Previous articles have associated emergency department length of stay and poor outcomes in critically-ill patients with long waiting times in the emergency department due to ED crowding\(^1\)\(^-\)\(^3\)\(^,\)\(^4\) or non-availability of ICU beds.\(^7\)\(^,\)\(^9\)\(^,\)\(^12\)\(^,\)\(^13\) In those cases, patients tended to stay in the ED longer and timely therapeutic interventions were delayed with an increased severity of illness as a result.\(^7\)\(^,\)\(^21\) In our study, hospital survival rates were higher among patients with an ED length of stay of under 5 h ($p < 0.019$). Likewise, patients spending over 5 h in the emergency department before being admitted to ICU had a nearly three times greater risk of dying than those with a shorter ED stay. In a previous study, Cardoso et al.\(^9\) demonstrated that each hour of waiting prior to ICU admission was independently associated with a 1.5% increased risk of ICU death. In their study, nearly 70% of ICU admissions were referrals from the emergency department.

Figure 3  Survival curve of patients admitted to the ICU from the emergency department according to ED LOS using the Kaplan-Meier method. Vertical axis represents estimated probability of survival. Horizontal axis represents time in days after ICU admission. Blue line indicates patients with ED LOS <5 h and red line indicates patients with ED LOS >5 h (log-rank $p < 0.019$).

Thus, to some extent, emergency department length of stay can be used as a surrogate marker for adverse outcome in critically-ill medical patients subsequently transferred to the ICU.
Table 3  Characteristics and outcome patients using a 5 h cut-off. Multivariable analysis to identify factors associated with ED LOS ≥5 h.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical characteristics</th>
<th>ED LOS &lt;5h (n = 140)</th>
<th>ED LOS ≥5h (n = 129)</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>50 ± 17</td>
<td>57 ± 16</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: male</td>
<td>81 (58%)</td>
<td>77 (60%)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APACHE II (points)</td>
<td>15 ± 7</td>
<td>16 ± 8</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comorbidities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial hypertension</td>
<td>48 (34%)</td>
<td>46 (36%)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
<td>22 (17%)</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetic</td>
<td>23 (16%)</td>
<td>19 (15%)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory</td>
<td>28 (20%)</td>
<td>30 (23%)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatic disease</td>
<td>17 (12%)</td>
<td>22 (17%)</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
<td>21 (16%)</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired immunosuppression</td>
<td>18 (13%)</td>
<td>19 (15%)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepsis</td>
<td>36 (26%)</td>
<td>65 (50%)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurocritic</td>
<td>49 (35%)</td>
<td>19 (15%)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory</td>
<td>25 (18%)</td>
<td>27 (21%)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal</td>
<td>9 (6%)</td>
<td>12 (9%)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal-metabolic</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend day admission</td>
<td>46 (33%)</td>
<td>45 (35%)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time admission</td>
<td>34 (24%)</td>
<td>40 (31%)</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical ventilation</td>
<td>80 (57%)</td>
<td>61 (74%)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of MV</td>
<td>3 (1–9)</td>
<td>6 (3–12)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialysis</td>
<td>16 (11%)</td>
<td>27 (21%)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasoactive drugs</td>
<td>57 (41%)</td>
<td>69 (54%)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any complication</td>
<td>78 (56%)</td>
<td>95 (74%)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock</td>
<td>31 (22%)</td>
<td>46 (36%)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart failure</td>
<td>22 (16%)</td>
<td>28 (22%)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDS</td>
<td>19 (14%)</td>
<td>22 (17%)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal failure</td>
<td>27 (19%)</td>
<td>56 (43%)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coagulopathy</td>
<td>23 (16%)</td>
<td>46 (36%)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple organ failure</td>
<td>18 (13%)</td>
<td>37 (29%)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU LOS (days)</td>
<td>4 (2–9)</td>
<td>5 (3–9)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital LOS (days)</td>
<td>15 (9–27)</td>
<td>16 (10–25)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU mortality</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
<td>23 (18%)</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital mortality</td>
<td>12 (9%)</td>
<td>28 (22%)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Odds ratio: 95% CI; p-Value

Multivariate analysis of factors associated with ED LOS ≥5 h

| Age                        | 1.02 | 1.0–1.1 | 0.004 |
| Sepsis diagnosis           | 2.63 | 1.6–4.5 | <0.001 |

Data shown as number of patients (percentage), mean (SD) or median (IQR).

Multivariate analysis: (*) variables included in the analysis; CI: confidence interval; APACHE: Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation; MV: mechanical ventilation; ARDS: acute respiratory distress syndrome; ED LOS: emergency department length of stay; ICU: intensive care unit.

We found that patients with longer wait times in the emergency department experienced greater delays in the initiation of advanced organ support, such as vasoactive drugs or dialysis, in the ICU. This treatment delay may have contributed to the development of time-dependent complications and a subsequently higher ICU mortality rate. Shock, renal failure, coagulopathy and multiple organ failure are the complications associated with a prolonged stay in the emergency department. The care provided for critically-ill patients during their emergency department stay and subsequently in the ICU impacts on the progression of organ failure and mortality. Though the ED stay is relatively short
compared with the overall length of hospitalization, our
data emphasize the idea that time to treatment in the ICU
has a profound effect on outcome. Our results are consistent
with previous studies which demonstrate the importance
of providing early specialized intervention to prevent organ
dysfunction. An aggressive resuscitation performed during
the “golden hour” after a major trauma, for example,
offers the highest chance of an improved outcome. Simi-
larly, early goal-directed therapy and early administration
of appropriate antibiotics in septic patients are strategies
which reduce mortality. Finally, early reperfusion ther-
apies may improve outcome in patients with acute myocardial
infarction or ischemic cerebrovascular events. Thus out-
comes for critically-ill patients are influenced by whether or
not optimal intensive care is delivered in a timely manner,
which in turn is determined by how long the patient waits
in the emergency department for admission to the ICU.

As has been shown, ED length of stay is associated with
patient outcome. However, other than ED crowding and non-
availability of ICU beds, factors associated with prolonged
time in the emergency department are not well known. We
selected a subgroup of prolonged ED stays using a 5-h cut-
off. This threshold was determined according to the median
ED length of stay among our population of approximately
5 h. Prolonged emergency department length of stay (>5 h)
was associated with the age and the type of procedure. Fifty
percent of the ICU transfers whose ED stay was longer than
5 h were septic patients; moreover, the median ED length
of stay for these septic patients was 8 h. These results are
consistent with previous studies which focused on delayed
ICU transfers. It is noteworthy that septic patients were
among those that experienced longer stays in the emergency
department, despite previous studies having suggested that
septic patients benefit from early recognition, timely admin-
istration of antibiotics, and resuscitation with intravenous
fluids and vasoactive drugs, all of which are care interven-
tions frequently directed by critical care specialists. This
suggests that, in our institution, sepsis may not yet be
perceived as a highly time-sensitive process. Respect to
the age, it is difficult to explain its relationship with a pro-
longed emergency department length of stay. However, we
think that this factor could also be related with the type
of illness, because sepsis was the most frequent diagnosis
in older patients (above 65 years), and septic patients are
probably associated with a delay in the ICU admission. Ne-
evertheless, additional studies would be needed to support
this statement. Finally, although resources and staffing levels
are usually reduced at weekends and during the night, nei-
ter the day of the week nor the shift had any correlation
with prolongation of ED stay and ICU admission among our
study population. This might be explained by having onsite
qualified intensivists coverage to ensure continuity of care.

The limitations of our study must be considered. Firstly,
data from a single center was analyzed. External valid-
ity is low, therefore, and further multicentre studies are
needed to corroborate our results and identify risk factors
for prolonged ED stays. Secondly, the presence of others
confounding factors, such as ICU occupancy rate or ED occu-
pancy rate at the moment of ICU admission, were not taken
into account. Future work will need to assess whether these
and other related factors are associated with ED length of
stay. Finally, there is a degree of diagnostic heterogeneity
and this is a factor that could have influenced the observed
results. Trauma, obstetrics and coronary artery disease
patients were not included, however, due to the existence
of specialist ICUs for these pathologies in our institution.

In conclusion, a prolonged emergency department stay
prior to ICU admission is related to worse outcomes, includ-
ing the development of time-dependent complications and
increased mortality. Our findings suggest a possible bene-
fit from earlier ICU transfers and the initiation of organ
support without delay. The diagnostic category was the prin-
cipal factor associated with the prolongation of emergency
department length of stay. Emergency department physi-
cians can have a significant impact through early recognition
of illness severity and facilitation of access to intensive care
for the initiation of proper therapeutic interventions.
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