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Abstract

Objectives: To develop a set of performance indicators to monitor the performance of emergency and urgent care systems in the Republic of Ireland.

Design: This study comprised of an update of a previously performed systematic review and a formal consensus development exercise.

Results: Initial literature searches yielded 2339 article titles. After further searches, sixty items were identified for full-text review. Following this review, fifty-seven were excluded. Three articles were identified for inclusion in the systematic review. These papers produced 42 unique indicators for consideration during the consensus development exercise. In total, 17 indicators had a median of greater than 7 following the meeting and met our pre-specified criterion for acceptable consensus.

Discussion: Using this systematic review and nominal group consensus development exercise, we have identified a set of 17 indicators, which a consensus of different experts regard as potentially good measures of the performance of urgent and emergency care systems in Ireland.
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Introduction

Emergency and urgent care consists of all the services which contribute to the management of people when immediate care is sought for a health condition. When patients need immediate care they can enter the health system through a range of services and will often use more than one. This can lead to a duplication of services, confusion about the most appropriate access point for individual patients and the danger of poorly co-ordinated care, especially at the point where patients transfer from one service to another. Emergency and urgent care services include pharmacy, primary care, minor injury units, acute medical assessment units, emergency departments, mental health services and all the services required to refer and transport patients to an appropriate treatment facility.

There is an increasing awareness that urgent and emergency care services should operate as whole systems of care for the populations they serve. Adopting such an approach requires individual service providers to be integrated into larger systems and to co-ordinate their activities accordingly. It is hoped that a systems approach will deliver a higher standard of quality, safety, efficiency, timeliness and overall patient experience without introducing inequity of access. Policy makers have a variety of tools at their disposal when attempting to engineer a systems approach to urgent and emergency care. These include the centralisation of care for high risk cases at high volume hospital units and the use of referral pathways and new facilities such as minor injury units to direct low-risk cases to settings that are appropriate for their condition. Other elements include the use of telemedicine to provide support to smaller facilities and the development of community services for patients with conditions that are sensitive to the quality of ambulatory care.

The Health Service Executive (HSE) is responsible for the provision of publicly funded health services in the Republic of Ireland. The HSE has attempted to foster a systems approach to urgent and emergency care services across the whole country, but the pace and nature of change is highly variable. In four peripheral regions (South, West, Mid-West, North-East) the reconfiguration process is at an advanced stage, but progress has been much slower in Dublin, the Midlands and the South-Eastern part of the country. This variation represents a natural experiment in policy making and is an opportunity to observe the impact of the changes that have been introduced before they are implemented across the whole country.

Existing indicators of urgent and emergency care performance focus on individual services and do not capture the performance of systems. The development of such indicators would allow policy makers to compare different models of care and evaluate the longitudinal impact of changes to service configuration. In light of this and considering the introduction of a system-based approach to urgent and emergency care by the HSE, the aim of this study was to develop a set of performance indicators to monitor the performance of emergency and urgent care systems in the Republic of Ireland.

Methods

Systematic review

This study comprised of an update of a previously performed systematic review and a formal consensus development exercise. The systematic review update was conducted in August 2014. Articles cited in PubMed over the period 2008 to 2014 were systematically searched by combining variations of the text terms ‘emergency’ and ‘indicator’ using the AND operator. Our search for novel indicators was supplemented by a review of the reference lists of articles selected for review and by contacting experts and organisations working on the assessment of urgent and emergency care performance. These included the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine (USA), the Centre for Medicare and Medical Services (USA), the Emergency Department Benchmarking Alliance (USA), the Canadian Association of Emergency Physicians, the European Society for Emergency Medicine, the Royal College of Surgeons England, the Pre-Hospital Emergency Care Council (Ireland) and relevant HSE Clinical Programme Directorates.

Articles were selected for review on the basis that they might contain definitions of system-level indicators of emergency and urgent care performance. Articles were excluded after review of the full text version if the indicators that they contained were already listed by the previous systematic review or if they focused on individual components of the urgent and emergency care system such as emergency department waiting times or ambulance response times. Non-English articles were also excluded.

The systematic review has been reported according to PRISMA (Supplementary File 1).

Consensus development exercise

The consensus development exercise comprised an online survey and a face-to-face nominal group meeting. A broad range of experts were recruited to the consensus development group. Experts were recruited by contacting professional representative bodies, policy making organisations, regulatory bodies and patient advocacy groups. The following clinical disciplines were recruited to the group: emergency nursing, acute medicine, minor injuries/urgent care nursing, anaesthesia/intensive care, emergency medicine, psychiatry, public health, paediatrics, pre-hospital care, general practice, pharmacy and geriatric medicine. The HSE quality improvement directorate, the Irish Department of Health, the Irish healthcare regulator (Health Information and Quality Authority) and two patient advocacy groups were also represented. Once individuals were highlighted as potential members, they were approached through email and phone calls to join the group. Interested parties were then sent a formal invitation letter to join the group. In total the group was composed of 17 national experts on urgent and emergency care in Ireland.
All novel indicators identified in the updated systematic review were combined with those identified in the original systematic review and grouped under the following headings in an online survey: outcome based indicators, process based indicators and structural indicators (see Supplementary File 2). The definitions of urgent and emergency conditions were adopted from those used in previous consensus development work performed by the University of Sheffield for the English NHS (see Supplementary File 3). The survey was designed and distributed to the consensus development group using the online tool, Survey Monkey. All members of the group were sent a link to the online survey and asked to complete it. Each member was asked to rate their agreement with the statement ‘this measure is likely to be a good indicator of the performance of the emergency and urgent care system’, on a Likert scale anchored by 1 (‘disagree strongly’) and 9 (‘agree strongly’). There was also space for members to add any comments. Participants were asked not to limit their views about the potential usefulness of an indicator by perceived difficulties in collecting or processing the data required to calculate them.

A face to face meeting was held in October 2014 and all members of the consensus group who had completed the online survey were asked to attend. Thirteen of the 14 invited members attended the meeting. Each participant was provided with the original questionnaire which now included a record of their individual responses to the online survey and the group’s median score and interquartile ranges. The meeting was conducted using a nominal group technique format. Once each participant had been given the opportunity to provide their opinion about an indicator, that indicator was ranked again by the members of the group. This procedure was followed for each individual indicator until all indicators had been discussed. Following the meeting, the performance indicators were ranked by their median score. Those with a median greater than 7 were classified as potentially good performance indicators. A second online survey was then created using the online tool, Survey Monkey. Those indicators which had scored a median greater than 7 were included and all participants were asked to rank these indicators in order of preference. This exercise was sent to the 13 members of the group who had attended the consensus development meeting and there was a 100% completion rate.

**Results**

The literature search strategy identified 2339 article titles. A title search reduced this to 150 articles and a review of the abstracts of these papers led to retrieval of 47 articles for a full-text review. A further seven articles were identified from the reference lists of the 47 full articles that were reviewed and six other documents from grey literature sources were selected for review. Two researchers reviewed the sixty items selected for full-text review (RD and JB). Following this review, fifty-seven were excluded for the following reasons: forty-four of the articles excluded at the full text stage were focused on service based indicators, seven reported on indicators that had been described by the previous systematic review and six were of a descriptive nature and not focused on specific indicators (Figure 1). This review led to three articles being identified for inclusion in the review.

The three articles included in the final review yielded four novel indicators that had not been presented in the previous systematic review. These were: patient reported experience of whole episodes of emergency and urgent care; mortality rates among inter-hospital transfer patients; inter-hospital transfer times; and time from decision to admit to transfer to an appropriate inpatient bed. The combination of these new indicators with those that had been identified in the previous systematic review produced 42 unique indicators for review by the consensus development group. In total, 17 indicators had a median of greater than 7 following the consensus meeting (see Supplementary File 4). Table 1 presents the median, mean and range of rankings for these 17 indicators that were produced by the second online survey.
Table 1. Final ranking of 17 indicators likely to be useful indicators of the performance of Irish urgent and emergency care systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median rank (range)</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (1–10)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Time from call to care for indicator conditions. E.g. for patients having thrombolysis, call to needle times. For patients having percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI), call to cath lab, for patients undergoing hip fracture repair, call to theatre</td>
<td>The aim of this indicator is to reduce times on patient journey through the EUCS to definitive care. It has been suggested that data for this indicator could be sourced from national and local recommendations for ‘definitive care’ for SEC and urgent conditions; service level linked data; ED data; AS patient report forms; and theatre books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (1–11)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Case fatality rates for serious, emergency conditions* for which a well-performing EUCS could improve chances of survival</td>
<td>This indicator is based on health outcomes and aims to reduce the proportion of patients with specified serious emergency conditions who die. This indicator could be calculated through HIPE and CSO Mortality Statistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (1–15)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adherence to any evidence-based good practice guidelines for serious emergency, and urgent conditions</td>
<td>The aim of this indicator is to encourage services within EUCS to adopt good practice in managing patient care in accordance with the best available research evidence in published guidelines. This indicator would be measured through the auditing of practice and procedures that are implemented in EUCS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (1–17)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Mortality rates among inter-hospital transfer patients for this group of conditions*</td>
<td>This indicator aims to examine the best practice process of transfer of patients from one hospital to another and the mortality rates associated with this process. Data for this indicator may be collected by accessing both ambulance and HIPE data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (3–16)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>For EUCS users with the following group of serious, emergency conditions*, who are admitted, the time from call to ambulance service to admission</td>
<td>This indicator aims to ensure that patients, who are admitted with serious emergency conditions, do so in an appropriate and timely manner. This data could be collected through HIPE, and ambulance data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (2–16)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Call to ambulance service to time on scene.</td>
<td>This indicator aims to examine the variations in outcomes or processes due to differences in access and availability of care. A well performing EUCS will deliver or be working to deliver the same processes of care at all times and in all places. In order to measure this indicator, data sources required would include National Ambulance Service, GP records and Patient Surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (1–17)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Patient reported experience of whole episodes of emergency and urgent care.</td>
<td>This can be measured through surveys similar to that which will be carried out as part of SIREN Work Package 4. The questionnaire addresses three domains of patient experience: entry into the system; progress through the system; and convenience of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (2–15)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Time from decision to admit to transfer of patient to appropriate in-patient bed.</td>
<td>This indicator aims to ensure that patients who are admitted are appropriately placed in an in-patient bed in a timely manner. The data collected should include times of first contact, assessment and critical points in the patient’s journey. It could be measured through patient surveys and hospital audits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (1–15)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Emergency re-admissions within 28 days as a proportion of all live discharges for the following group of urgent conditions**</td>
<td>This indicator focuses on the processes within the emergency and urgent care system and its aim is to encourage services to work collaboratively in order to manage care both in hospital and in the post-discharge period. Data for this indicator could be sources from HIPE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (3–16)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>For all of the serious emergency conditions* combined, the proportion of deaths that occur before admission (i.e. in pre-hospital or in the Emergency Department)</td>
<td>This indicator aims to examine those patients with serious emergency conditions who die before admission to either pre-hospital or an ED. Data could be obtained from GPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (3–16)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Hospital emergency admission rates for the following group of urgent conditions** whose exacerbations could be managed out of hospital or in ED’s without admission to an inpatient bed</td>
<td>This focuses on avoidable admissions for acute exacerbations of urgent conditions. This indicator aims to reduce hospital admission rates for episodes that could be managed out of hospital or in settings without admission to a hospital bed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (5–17)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>Time from patient arrival at referring hospital to making the decision to transfer</td>
<td>This focuses on the processes associated with patient transfer to a hospital setting. It could be calculated using ambulance data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion
Using a systematic review and nominal group consensus development exercise, we have identified a set of 17 indicators which a consensus of different experts regard as potentially good measures of the performance of urgent and emergency care systems in Ireland. This list is made up of twelve process and five outcome indicators. Four of the seventeen indicators were included in the top sixteen indicators produced by a previous consensus development exercise carried out in the UK and a further six were novel indicators which were identified through our systematic review.

This study was undertaken using standard systematic review and consensus development methods. The members of the consensus group were purposively chosen as they were identified as having a wide range of expertise and knowledge in relation to various aspects of emergency and urgent care. The online survey allowed the opinions of those members to be collected and aggregated, while the face to face meeting offered the opportunity for the members to consider the indicators in light of hearing the opinion of their colleagues, as well as enabling discussion among panellists on the wording and clarity of the performance indicators.

Study limitations
Our study has some limitations. No attempt was made to achieve unanimity so it is possible that some of the indicators may be controversial to certain stakeholder groups. We also requested that panel members did not consider the feasibility of collecting data required to calculate an indicator. This may mean that the chosen performance indicators are not immediately measurable; however, we are hopeful that progress in data collection may allow these performance indicators to be measured in the future.

In the next phase, the feasibility of the performance indicators needs to be addressed. This will involve identifying if it is achievable to currently collect data on the indicators. Secondly, a series of technical issues will need to be resolved around correctly coding the indicators in an Irish context, and defining the populations to which they apply. The performance indicators will also need to be piloted in order to determine if the can validly detect the signal of poor system performance and also that there are no unintended consequences which arise such as gaming, or neglecting aspects of urgent and emergency care that are not addressed by the indicators.

Ethical statement
Ethical approval for the study was granted by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee of the Cork Teaching Hospitals [ECM 4 (q) 02/07/13]. The process of participants proceeding to the survey and completing it constituted consent.
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Ellen Weber
Department of Emergency Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. It is nicely written and succinct. The research question is important and novel; there have several studies in the field of prehospital care and emergency medicine looking at performance indicators but they usually focus on service in the system. The idea of finding indicators that reflect the performance of the whole system is important and could lead to alignment of incentives that currently do not exist, in both Ireland and beyond. Overall the study is well-done. I have a few concerns about a few of the indicators representing (whole system) see later, but overall, the indicators seem to represent the goals the authors set out to achieve and many have not been emphasized previously.

I have several suggestions to strengthen the paper. First, the systematic review only goes to 2014. Since then there have been at least two other Delphi studies on indicators in emergency medicine. This is a limitation if the only indicators assessed were those found in these reviews (i.e. none submitted by the experts). Although I understand that the study rests on what was available at the time, I would improve the strength of the paper if the authors could do an updated literature review and see if there are any other indicators that might have been included had these newer articles been in the systematic review. Additionally, it would helpful if the authors could summarise the newly added articles in a list in an appendix with articles, dates, authors, location, service(s) involved, etc.

2) The methods by which the articles and the performance indicators were initially chosen is not well described. How many individuals were involved in the article selection, and how was the process of extracting the new indicators from the articles done. Was there any cross-checking among the investigators? I would imagine that there would be some areas of judgment here as to whether an indicator was new or differently stated, as well as whether it applied to the whole system. Was there any type of inter-rater reliability assessed?

3) The discussion should be expanded to include comparisons of this work with prior processes within emergency medicine to identify key performance indicators. You have a brief mention of the UK exercise, although this comes a bit too early in the discussion, and without much detail. (You also say that 6 were from your systematic review but you originally identified only 3 new ones compared with the prior review...) It would help to point out what indicators were novel, which part of the systematic review they originated in, and why you think your indicators were different. It would also help to a discussion of the pragmatic implications of this work – how have such performance indicators been use to evaluate systems of care and how do the authors imagine theirs being used in the context of Ireland’s reconfiguration.
A few other points that need clarity:

1. The description of the article search and selection does not readily match the flow diagram. EG the flow diagram doesn’t show the 150 articles that had abstracts read. And then the 47 articles that were reviewed.

2. How was the grey literature identified?

3. Were all experts from Ireland?

4. There were 17 experts in the total group, and you say that 13/14 attended the meeting. What happened to the other 3?

5. Could you explain the procedure at the meeting a bit more – did each of the 13 participants speak about each of the indicators. (Sounds like a very long day!) What is meant by a “nominal” group technique.

6. The lists of indicators both in the main text and the appendix are confusing. In Table 1 you have 17 indicators which you said had at least a median score of 7 in the meeting and they were then ranked in an on-line process. It is not clear how those with a median of 2 and 3 are included. I am also not sure the reader needs to see the “mean rank” but rather the final ranking order based on all responses. Even if you keep those ranks in, it would help to organize the table by ranking. Additionally, you could include a notation for which are process and outcome measures, and which (if any) were from the updated systematic review. In the appendix, it’s not clear you need to have two separate lists of all measures. Could you combine them, and present them according to type (process, structure, outcome).

7. I wonder if the authors would also care to discuss some of the indicators which don’t seem to this reviewer to represent “whole system.” Performance. E.g. Call to ambulance to time on scene. While this is described as being useful to measure variation, it is still very “service” specific – regarding the prehospital system. Similar question for “Time from onset of serious emergency condition to arrival at the receiving hospital”.

8. Abstract – The methods of the abstract should be expanded to explain a bit more about the updating of a prior review, and more about the consensus exercise, including the variety of experts. Provide a brief explanation of “nominal”.

Minor editorial issues:

Page 3, third paragraph – the last sentence – “This variation represents....” is probably unnecessary and takes the introduction a bit off topic.

Page 3, first sentence of methods – Please add the publication date of the first systematic review to the text so readers don’t have to search your references.

Page 4, second paragraph – should be indicators

Page, 4 end of third paragraph, the” This review led to three articles being identified for inclusion in the review” - might change to: This process led to …
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Your Discussion is rather short and poor, please elaborate more on the content of your findings, in combination with the existing literature and professional guidelines, not just restrict yourselves to a (too short) discussion on the methods. For instance, your recommendations on future steps about measurement are rather superficial. Perhaps reflect on a Registry, a quality system with feedback and improvement cycles, or other ways to incorporate performance indicators in the real work of professionals and managers in emergency care.

**Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?**
Yes

**Is the study design appropriate and is the work technically sound?**
Partly

**Are sufficient details of methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?**
Partly

**If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?**
Partly

**Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?**
No source data required

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?**
Yes

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.

I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.