

Impact of COVID-19 on EMS Utilization

1

1 Impact of COVID-19 on Emergency Medical Services Utilization and Severity in the U.S. Upper
2 Midwest

3 Running head: Impact of COVID-19 on EMS Utilization

4 Brett Boggust, BS,¹ Moshe Shalom,² M. Carson Rogerson IV, MAS³ Lucas A. Myers, BAH
5 NRP,⁴ Rozalina G. McCoy, MD MS³⁻⁵

6 1. Creighton University School of Medicine, Omaha, Nebraska, USA

7 2. Tel Aviv University Sackler School of Medicine, Tel Aviv, Israel

8 3. Mayo Clinic Ambulance, Rochester, MN, USA

9 4. Division of Endocrinology, Diabetes, and Nutrition, Department of Medicine, University of
10 Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA

11 5. University of Maryland Institute for Health Computing, Bethesda, MD, USA

12

13 Corresponding author: Rozalina G. McCoy, MD MS. Division of Endocrinology, Diabetes, and
14 Nutrition, Department of Medicine, University of Maryland School of Medicine. 670 West
15 Baltimore Street, Health Sciences Facility III, Room 4050, Baltimore, MD 21201. Phone: 410-
16 706-7167. Fax:410-706-4060. Email: Rozalina.McCoy@som.umaryland.edu. ORCID 0000-
17 0002-2289-3183

18

19 Word Count: Text 3274 words, 2 Tables, 3 Figures, 36 References

20

21 Key Words: COVID-19, emergency medical services, pandemic, prehospital care, overdose,
22 intoxication, motor vehicle collision

23

24 **ABSTRACT**

25 The COVID-19 pandemic has claimed nearly one million lives and has drastically changed how
26 patients interact with the healthcare system. Emergency medical services (EMS) are essential for
27 emergency response, disaster preparedness, and responding to everyday emergencies. We
28 therefore examined differences in EMS utilization and call severity in 2020 (pandemic period)
29 compared to trends from 2015-2019 (pre-pandemic period) in a large, multi-state advanced life
30 support EMS agency serving the U.S. Upper Midwest. Specifically, we analyzed all 911 calls
31 made to Mayo Clinic Ambulance, the sole advanced life support EMS provider serving a large
32 area in Minnesota and Wisconsin, in 2020 compared to those made between 2015-2019. We
33 compared the number of emergency calls made in 2020 to the number of calls expected based on
34 trends from 2015-2019. We similarly compared caller demographics, call severity, and
35 proportions of calls made for overdose/intoxication, behavioral health, and motor vehicle
36 accidents. Subgroup analyses were performed for rural vs. urban areas. We identified 262,232
37 emergent EMS calls in the pre-pandemic period and 53,909 calls in the pandemic period,
38 corresponding to a decrease of 28.7% in call volume during the pandemic period. Caller
39 demographics shifted towards older patients (mean age 59.7 [SD, 23.0] vs. 59.1 [SD, 23.7] years;
40 $p<0.001$) and to rural areas (20.4% vs. 20.0%; $p=0.007$). Call severity increased, with 95.3% of
41 calls requiring transport (vs. 93.8%; $p<0.001$) and 1.9% resulting in death (vs. 1.6%; $p<0.001$).
42 The proportion of calls for overdose/intoxication increased from 4.8% to 5.5% ($p<0.001$), while
43 the proportion of calls for motor vehicle collisions decreased from 3.9% to 3.0% ($p<0.001$). All
44 changes were more pronounced in urban areas. These findings underscore the extent to which the
45 COVID-19 pandemic impacted healthcare utilization, particularly in urban areas, and suggest
46 that patients may have delayed calling EMS with potential implications on disease severity and

47 risk of death.

48 **Introduction**

49 The Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, caused by the viral agent SARS-CoV-2,
50 has affected nearly 90 million Americans and claimed more than one million lives in the United
51 States as of February, 2023. [1] COVID-19 most often presents as an acute respiratory
52 syndrome, with higher risk of severe disease among individuals who are older,
53 immunocompromised, or with multiple comorbid conditions. [2] High rates of COVID-19 cases,
54 as well as mitigation efforts implemented by governments and private entities to curb the spread
55 of the disease, have led to widespread disruptions across all sectors of life. [3] Several studies
56 have observed decreases in hospital utilization for conditions other than COVID-19 infection
57 throughout the pandemic, particularly during peaks of case incidence. [4-6] Health systems’
58 deferral of elective surgical procedures and preventive medical encounters early during the
59 pandemic, as well as patient avoidance of hospitals and clinics due to fear of contracting
60 COVID-19 or concerns about inadequate capacity of the healthcare system to address less urgent
61 concerns, likely contributed to these observed decreases. [4, 5] As a result, mortality due to both
62 COVID-19 and unrelated causes increased significantly during the pandemic, particularly during
63 its first year for which robust population-level data are now available. [7] Emergency medical
64 services (EMS) are a core component of the U.S. healthcare system and serve as a first line of
65 response in times of crisis. However, data on changes in EMS utilization, including call volume
66 and acuity, during the pandemic are limited. This is particularly true in rural areas, where
67 reliance on EMS may be greater and availability of alternative sources of healthcare may be
68 more limited.

69 EMS plays an important role in the medical care of acutely ill and injured patients. For
70 high acuity calls, such as acute myocardial infarction, stroke, and trauma, EMS transport to the

71 emergency department (ED) is associated with reduced time to treatment, timely receipt of
72 definitive therapy and reduced mortality. [8-13] Two recent studies described the impact of
73 COVID-19 on EMS utilization, suggesting that call volumes may have decreased early in the
74 pandemic. [14, 15] One study, conducted in Western Pennsylvania in the spring of 2020 when
75 COVID-19 first emerged in the U.S., showed that there was a significant decrease in EMS
76 response, but 911 callers comprised an overall sicker patient population than before the
77 pandemic as gauged by greater prevalence of abnormal vital signs. However, there was also an
78 increase in non-transport cases, suggesting that lower acuity calls may have also increased. [15]
79 A French study conducted during the same early period of the pandemic similarly found an
80 overall decrease in calls, but the number of calls related to infection, chest pain, and breathing
81 difficulty increased. [14] However, data on EMS call volumes during later periods of the
82 pandemic are scarce. Moreover, prior studies have not focused on rural areas of the U.S., where
83 EMS utilization patterns, patient populations, and response to the COVID-19 pandemic may
84 differ from the more studied urban areas.

85 As the COVID-19 pandemic continues through its third year, and new variants yield new
86 spikes in disease spread, it is important to understand the impact of the pandemic – in its
87 different phases – on EMS utilization. Leveraging contemporary data from a large, advanced life
88 support (ALS) ambulance organization serving rural and urban communities across two states in
89 the U.S. Upper Midwest, we compare the volumes and severity of EMS calls during the
90 pandemic (2020, “COVID-19 period”) to those at a baseline period between 2015-2019 (“pre-
91 COVID-19 period”). We further probe for potential differences in call volume and severity as a
92 function of rurality, as there is evidence of differences in COVID-19 prevalence between urban
93 and rural communities. [16, 17] We hypothesized that EMS call volumes have decreased, while

94 severity increased, reflecting the general public’s underlying avoidance of hospitals and deferral
95 of ambulatory care. Furthermore, we hypothesized that calls to EMS in rural areas decreased to a
96 lesser extent than in urban areas, as rural communities are often more reliant on EMS than urban
97 communities.

98

99 **Methods**

100 ***Study Design***

101 This cross-sectional study was conducted using the Patient Care Record (PCR) of Mayo Clinic
102 Ambulance. It was deemed exempt from review by the Mayo Clinic Institutional Review Board
103 as it involved analysis of de-identified patient data. The study was conducted and is reported in
104 accordance with STROBE guidelines for observational cohort studies. [18]

105 ***Study Population and Setting***

106 We used Mayo Clinic Ambulance PCR to identify all EMS encounters between January 1, 2015
107 and December 31, 2020. EMS encounters included 911 activation, patient presentation to an
108 EMS station (i.e., “walk-ups”), and requests for service from other public safety agencies such as
109 law enforcement and fire agencies. The period before 2020 was considered to be the “pre-
110 COVID-19 period”, while the time after was considered the “COVID-19 period”. Non-emergent
111 requests for service (i.e., interfacility transports) were excluded.

112 Mayo Clinic Ambulance is an ALS provider and the primary response, treatment, and
113 transport service for 14 locations throughout Minnesota and Western Wisconsin, covering 6,894
114 square miles of urban, suburban, and rural areas. Mayo Clinic Ambulance is staffed by
115 paramedics and emergency medical technicians, and responds to approximately 100,000 requests
116 for service annually, including 75,000 emergent 911 calls, excluding calls for inter-facility

117 transport.

118 ***Outcome Variables***

119 EMS activations were categorized based on outcome, severity, primary impression, and location
120 using structured data in the PCR. Each call had two possible outcomes: transport to the ED vs.
121 no transport. If the patient was transported, the urgency of transport was also categorized, with
122 lights and sirens use as one measure of perceived urgency. To assess severity, calls were
123 categorized as (1) no transport, which includes both ‘treat, no transport’ and ‘no treatment or
124 transport needed’ as in some situations these two categories can be used interchangeably; (2)
125 refusal of transport against medical advice (AMA); (3) treat, routine transport; (4) treat, transport
126 with lights and sirens; and (5) any call with death prior to ED arrival. High call severity was also
127 gauged by requirement for cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) while on scene or during
128 transport.

129 The decision to use lights and sirens is made by the EMS provider based on a
130 combination the patient care guideline (PCG) developed and maintained by Mayo Clinic
131 Ambulance medical direction, as well as the EMS provider’s clinical judgement. The PCG
132 advises that, at the discretion of the ambulance crew, transport with emergency lights and sirens
133 may be considered if the following clinical conditions or circumstances exist: (1) difficulty in
134 addressing issues related to airway, breathing or circulation; (2) severe trauma; (3) severe
135 neurological or cardiac conditions; (4) obstetrical emergencies; or (5) for patients who pose a
136 safety threat to themselves or the crew after reasonable attempts to control the situation or the
137 patient have been attempted and failed. Providers are encouraged to minimize use of lights and
138 sirens to enhance safety for the patient, caregivers, passengers, and general community, and are
139 required to document the rationale for using lights and sirens in the PCR when they have done

140 so. Thus, the decision to use lights and sirens is influenced by the patient’s clinical situation,
141 distance to the ED and traffic conditions while en route, and the EMS providers’ experience and
142 resources available at the time of the call.

143 We also queried the primary impression of the call as documented by the EMS provider
144 in the PCR at the conclusion of the call. Our primary analyses considered all calls, while
145 secondary analyses focused specifically on calls with the primary impressions of motor vehicle
146 collision, overdose or intoxication, and behavioral health. These subgroup analyses were chosen
147 on the basis of emerging evidence that these COVID-19-unrelated events as well as deaths for
148 these conditions may have been strongly influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic.

149 *Independent Variables*

150 Patient demographics were ascertained from the PCR at the time of each call and included
151 patient age, sex, and address of the pick-up location (to assign state and determine rurality). Call
152 location was categorized as rural vs. urban based on the pick-up location documented in the
153 PCR. Rural status was categorized as rural vs. urban using rural-urban commuting area (RUCA)
154 codes, where metropolitan areas were classified as urban, while micropolitan areas, small towns,
155 and rural areas were classified as rural. [19-21] Race and ethnicity data are not routinely
156 collected during calls and were therefore not included. Missing values for each variable are
157 presented as a separate category (‘unknown’) and included in the analyses; the rate of missing
158 data was <1% for all included variables.

159 *Statistical Analyses*

160 Baseline patient characteristics were descriptively summarized at the call level and compared
161 between the pre-COVID-19 and COVID-19 periods using the Chi Square test or the Wilcoxon
162 two-sample test, as appropriate. Each quarter of 2020 was compared to the same quarter of the

163 combined previous 5 years. Two-sided p-value <0.05 was determined to be significant.

164 To visualize the geographic distribution of EMS call volumes before and during the
165 pandemic, we graphed the number of calls per county during the pre-COVID-19 and COVID-19
166 periods using Tableau Software. Call numbers were superimposed over a map of Minnesota and
167 Wisconsin with population estimates based on 2018 American Community Survey data.

168 Call volume was modeled as a function of time using simple linear regression with call
169 volumes between January 1, 2015 and February 28, 2020. The dependent variable in this model
170 was the number of 911 calls which occurred in a calendar month, and the independent variable
171 was the ordinal number of the month in the progression between the start and finish of this
172 timeframe. Coefficients from this model were used to calculate the expected call volume after
173 March 1, 2020. Goodness of fit was assessed using the R-Square (0.6463), Root MSE (233.64),
174 and ANOVA (p<0.001) on model statistics generated in SAS. We then compared expected call
175 volumes with those observed during the COVID-19 period by calculating the absolute difference
176 between expected and observed call numbers (modeled volume minus observed volume) and
177 also relative difference between the two.

178 Overall and for each calendar year quarter of the pre-COVID-19 and COVID-19 periods,
179 we compared the difference in the distribution of call outcomes, severity, rurality, and primary
180 impressions using the Chi Square test. Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons was used.

181 All data management and analyses were carried out using SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc.
182 Cary, NC).

183

184 **Results**

185 There were 262,232 EMS activations during the pre-COVID-19 period and 53,909 during the

186 COVID-19 period. The mean number of calls per month over the study period was 4,391 (SD,
187 287.1) Considering the anticipated changes in call volumes over time, this corresponds to an
188 observed relative decrease of 5.3% during the pandemic compared to before the pandemic. This
189 decrease was more pronounced in urban areas (6.8% decrease) compared to rural areas (0.05%
190 decrease) (**Figure 1**). Call volumes declined the most early in the COVID-19 study period,
191 decreasing 28.71% in April 2020 and 14.83% in May 2020. We also observed small, but
192 statistically significant, demographic shifts in patients during the COVID-19 period (**Table 1**).
193 Compared to the pre-COVID-19 period, EMS activations during the COVID-19 period were for
194 patients slightly older (mean age, 59.72 (\pm 23.71) vs. 59.05 (\pm 23.71) years; $p < 0.001$) and were
195 more often men (49.57% vs. 47.94%; $p < 0.001$). The geographic distribution of calls overlaid on
196 a population density map of Mayo Clinic Ambulance service areas during the pre-COVID-19
197 and COVID-19 periods is depicted in **Figure 2**.

198

199 **Figure 1. EMS Call Volumes: Total, Urban, and Rural.** Changes in call volumes per month
200 for all regions included in the study, overall (upper graph) and subset by rural status of the call
201 originating location (bottom graph).

202

203 **Figure 2. Volumes and Geographic Distributions of EMS Calls Before and During the**
204 **COVID-19 Pandemic.** Population data are mapped by ZIP code as of 2018, while EMS call
205 volume data are shown by county.

206

207 **Table 1: Study Population.** Description of EMS calls included in this study, subset based on
208 study period as occurring before or after COVID-19.

| | Pre-COVID-19 Period (2015-2019) | COVID-19 Period (2020) | p-value |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| Total call number | 262,232 | 53,909 | |
| Patient age, years, mean (SD) | 59.05 (23.71) | 59.72 (22.98) | <0.001 |
| Patient age, years, category, N (%) | | | |
| <18 | 12,416 (4.73%) | 2,081 (3.86%) | <0.001 |
| 18-29 | 26,175 (9.98%) | 4,896 (9.08%) | <0.001 |
| 30-44 | 32,813 (12.51%) | 7,209 (13.37%) | <0.001 |
| 45-59 | 47,534 (18.13%) | 9,380 (17.40%) | <0.001 |
| 60-74 | 60,641 (23.12%) | 13,369 (24.80%) | <0.001 |
| ≥75 | 81,364 (31.03%) | 16,725 (31.02%) | 0.96 |
| Unknown | 1,289 (0.49%) | 249 (0.46%) | |
| Gender, N (%) | | | |
| Women | 134,256 (51.20%) | 26,780 (49.68%) | <0.001 |
| Men | 125,709 (47.94%) | 26,724 (47.57%) | |
| Other or unknown | 2,267 (0.86%) | 405 (0.75%) | |
| Rurality of location, N (%) | | | |
| Rural | 52,342 (19.96%) | 11,021 (20.44%) | 0.007 |
| Urban | 209,451 (79.87%) | 42,733 (79.27%) | |
| Unknown | 439 (0.17%) | 155 (0.29%) | |

209

210 While the overall observed number of EMS activations decreased during the COVID-19

211 pandemic, the proportion of calls requiring transport to the ED increased from 93.77% to 95.33%

212 (p<0.001) (**Table 2**). The proportion of calls with AMA refusal of transport decreased during the

213 pandemic, from 1.43% to 1.20% (p<0.001). The proportion of calls requiring initiation of CPR

214 also increased from 1.03% to 1.39% (p<0.001), while the proportion of calls involving death

215 increased from 1.59% to 1.93% (p<0.001). The proportion of observed calls involving death was

216 most increased above expected in Q2 (from 1.53% to 2.08%, p<0.001) and Q4 (from 1.65% to

217 2.08%, p<0.001) of the COVID-19 period, which correspond to April through June 2020 (Q2)

218 and October through December 2020 (Q4). Notably, a greater than expected proportion of

219 activations were transported to the ED without lights and sirens, with lights and siren use

220 decreasing from 4.15% to 3.01% ($p < 0.001$).

221 **Table 2: Severity and Characteristics of Calls during the Pre-COVID-19 (2015-2019) and COVID-19 (2020) Periods.** All
 222 values, except for p-values, are listed as percentages of the total call volume during that quarter. Quarter 2 of 2020 (April through
 223 June, 2020) corresponds to the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic in Minnesota and Wisconsin, U.S.A. AMA, against medical
 224 advice. CPR, cardiopulmonary resuscitation. ED, emergency department.

| | Q ₁ | | | Q ₂ | | | Q ₃ | | | Q ₄ | | | Total Q ₁ -Q ₄ | | |
|---|----------------|--------|----------------|----------------|--------|----------------|----------------|--------|----------------|----------------|--------|----------------|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|
| | Pre-2020 | 2020 | P [†] | Pre-2020 | 2020 | P [†] | Pre-2020 | 2020 | P [†] | Pre-2020 | 2020 | P [†] | Pre-2020 | 2020 | P |
| Transport Category | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Transport (vs. no transport) | 93.99% | 94.96% | <0.001 | 93.40% | 95.46% | <0.001 | 93.59% | 95.20% | <0.001 | 94.11% | 95.73% | <0.001 | 93.77% | 95.33% | <0.001 |
| Lights & sirens (vs. without) ¹ | 3.67% | 3.00% | <0.001 | 4.18% | 2.97% | <0.001 | 4.48% | 3.29% | <0.001 | 4.26% | 2.79% | <0.001 | 4.15% | 3.01% | <0.001 |
| Call Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Treat, no transport | 4.60% | 3.83% | <0.001 | 5.10% | 3.18% | <0.001 | 4.76% | 3.08% | <0.001 | 3.97% | 3.02% | <0.001 | 4.6% | 3.28% | <0.001 |
| AMA Treat, no transport | 1.23% | 1.02% | .04 | 1.31% | 1.17% | .02 | 1.44% | 1.52% | .47 | 1.74% | 1.08% | <0.001 | 1.43% | 1.20% | <0.001 |
| Treat, routine transport | 89.49% | 90.92% | <0.001 | 88.56% | 91.17% | <0.001 | 88.46% | 90.92% | <0.001 | 89.07% | 91.55% | <0.001 | 88.90% | 91.14% | <0.001 |
| Treat, transport with lights & sirens ² | 3.07% | 2.43% | <0.001 | 3.50% | 2.40% | <0.001 | 3.75% | 2.70% | <0.001 | 3.58% | 2.27% | <0.001 | 3.48% | 2.45% | <0.001 |
| Call with death prior to ED arrival | 1.60% | 1.79% | 0.10 | 1.53% | 2.08% | <0.001 | 1.59% | 1.78% | 0.12 | 1.65% | 2.08% | <0.001 | 1.59% | 1.93% | <0.001 |
| Need for CPR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CPR (vs. No CPR) | 1.01% | 1.29% | <0.001 | 1.00% | 1.40% | <0.001 | 1.04% | 1.26% | 0.02 | 1.08% | 1.62% | <0.001 | 1.03% | 1.39% | <0.001 |
| CPR (in rural areas) | 1.41% | 1.87% | 0.07 | 1.27% | 1.63% | 0.14 | 1.40% | 1.89% | 0.05 | 1.47% | 2.04% | 0.02 | 1.39% | 1.87% | <0.001 |
| CPR (in urban areas) | 0.90% | 1.15% | 0.01 | 0.93% | 1.34% | <0.001 | 0.95% | 1.10% | 0.14 | 0.99% | 1.51% | <0.001 | 0.94% | 1.27% | <0.001 |
| Location of the Call | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Urban (vs. rural areas) ³ | 79.74% | 80.88% | 0.002 | 80.07% | 78.29% | <0.001 | 80.06% | 79.75% | 0.40 | 80.15% | 78.90% | <0.001 | 80.01% | 79.50% | 0.007 |
| Reason for Call (as a proportion of all calls) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overdose/intoxication (total) | 4.13% | 4.51% | 0.04 | 5.03% | 6.83% | <0.001 | 5.52% | 6.08% | 0.01 | 4.67% | 4.66% | 0.98 | 4.84% | 5.46% | <0.001 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Overdose/intoxication (in rural areas) | 2.91% | 3.15% | 0.50 | 4.12% | 5.17% | 0.02 | 4.01% | 4.86% | 0.04 | 3.23% | 3.05% | 0.62 | 3.56% | 4.03% | 0.02 |
| Overdose/intoxication (in urban areas) | 4.44% | 4.83% | 0.07 | 5.27% | 7.27% | <0.001 | 5.90% | 6.39% | 0.05 | 5.02% | 5.08% | 0.78 | 5.16% | 5.83% | <0.001 |
| Behavioral (total) | 10.62% | 10.49% | 0.64 | 11.99% | 12.40% | 0.20 | 12.42% | 12.56% | 0.65 | 11.21% | 9.73% | <0.001 | 11.56% | 11.24% | 0.03 |
| Behavioral (in rural areas) | 9.39% | 9.41% | 0.98 | 11.08% | 11.71% | 0.36 | 11.38% | 11.83% | 0.50 | 10.01% | 8.08% | 0.001 | 10.46% | 10.20% | 0.41 |
| Behavioral (in urban areas) | 10.94% | 10.73% | 0.52 | 12.21% | 12.57% | 0.33 | 12.68% | 12.75% | 0.85 | 11.51% | 10.21% | <0.001 | 11.84% | 11.52% | 0.06 |
| Motor vehicle collision (total) | 3.32% | 2.18% | <0.001 | 4.13% | 3.27% | <0.001 | 4.29% | 3.66% | <0.001 | 3.91% | 2.94% | <0.001 | 3.91% | 3.00% | <0.001 |
| Motor vehicle collision (in rural areas) | 4.05% | 2.62% | <0.001 | 5.02% | 4.43% | 0.21 | 5.34% | 4.57% | 0.10 | 5.11% | 3.65% | 0.001 | 4.88% | 3.82% | <0.001 |
| Motor vehicle collision (in urban areas) | 3.10% | 2.03% | <0.001 | 3.68% | 2.93% | <0.001 | 3.99% | 3.42% | 0.005 | 3.58% | 2.77% | <0.001 | 3.63% | 2.78% | <0.001 |

225 ¹ Denominator is the total number of transports

226 ² Denominator is total number of calls in the specified time frame.

227 ³ Rurality was missing in fewer than 0.2% calls, and was not taken into consideration when running chi-square test

228 ⁴ P-values are as-reported, but are compared to a Bonferroni-corrected critical p-value for each category

229

230 The proportion of calls for overdose or intoxication increased during the COVID-19
231 period (5.46%) when compared to pre-COVID-19 period (4.84%); $p < 0.001$ (**Table 2; Figure 3**).
232 This increase was significant in both urban and rural areas, though rates were higher in urban
233 areas during both time periods. In contrast, the proportion of calls for motor vehicle collisions
234 decreased significantly, from 3.91% during the pre-COVID-19 period to 3.00% during the
235 COVID-19 period; $p < 0.001$ (**Table 2; Figure 2**). This change was larger in urban than rural
236 areas, though motor vehicle collisions made up a higher proportion of calls in rural than urban
237 areas.

238

239 **Figure 3. EMS Calls for Overdose/Intoxication: Total, Urban, and Rural.** Changes in call
240 volumes per month for all regions included in the study, overall (upper graph) and subset by
241 rural status of the call originating location (bottom graph).

242

243 **Discussion**

244 Analysis of nearly 54,000 EMS calls made in 2020 in the U.S. Upper Midwest, compared to over
245 262,000 calls made between 2015 and 2019, revealed that while EMS call volumes were lower
246 in 2020 than expected based on historic trends, the severity of calls increased, including the
247 proportion of calls with a fatal outcome. The decrease in call volumes was greater in urban than
248 rural areas. Additionally, the proportion of calls for overdose or intoxication increased, while the
249 proportion of calls for motor vehicle collisions decreased, reflecting the impact of the COVID-19
250 pandemic on different aspects of society.

251 Recent studies of hospital use during the COVID-19 pandemic found that hospital
252 admissions decreased by up to 50% during the early months of the pandemic, especially during

253 the April 2020 peak in case incidence in the Northeast region of the U.S [4, 5]. In Minnesota,
254 all-cause mortality increased 11.8% in 2020 relative to prior years, with greatest increases in
255 deaths from assault by firearms (68% increase), overdose (49% increase), alcoholic liver disease
256 (26% increase), cirrhosis (28% increase), and malnutrition (48%) increase; COVID-19
257 comprised 9.9% of all deaths in the state. Our findings build on this emerging body of evidence
258 by examining the impact of the pandemic on pre-hospital emergency care. We hypothesize that
259 there are several potential explanations for the observed decline in EMS activation and the
260 concurrent increases in patient severity and adverse outcome. Early in the pandemic,
261 corresponding to Q2 of 2020, rates of COVID-19 infection were low in Minnesota and
262 Wisconsin (Minnesota positive test rates did not exceed 5% until the week of May 10th, 2020)
263 [22]. Nevertheless, facing an emergence of a poorly understood virus and rising death rates in
264 other areas of the U.S., hospitals suspended elective surgeries and procedures, while clinics
265 deferred preventive visits and transitioned many other encounters to virtual platforms. Fewer
266 surgeries, procedures, and other interventions may have resulted in fewer acute health events that
267 could have prompted an EMS call. Worried about the risk of exposure and heeding social
268 distancing guidelines, people may have deferred seeking both routine and urgent care for lower
269 acuity conditions. Thus, while there were fewer EMS activations overall, those that did occur
270 were more likely to be for more serious conditions requiring ED transport, with some of the
271 deferred activations being for lower acuity conditions that would not have required transport.
272 Simultaneously, the higher proportion of activations with death as an outcome during the
273 pandemic also suggests that at least some of the deferred calls should have been made earlier but
274 were deferred with a fatal outcome.

275 Compared to urban areas, rural areas saw a smaller impact on EMS activation volume

276 and severity. There are several potential explanations for this. It has been reported that in the
277 beginning of the pandemic, COVID-19 impacted rural communities less than urban centers due
278 to the virus arriving in cities first and the challenges to social distancing posed by high
279 population density in urban areas. [16, 23] The difference in population-adjusted COVID-19
280 cases and mortality rates shifted as the pandemic progressed, with both fatality and incidence in
281 rural areas surpassing those in urban areas by the end of 2020. [24-26] Rural communities were
282 found to be less likely to change their behavior, such as wearing masks, abiding by stay-at-home
283 orders, or practicing social distancing, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. [26, 27] Lack of
284 nearby care and distance from definitive care necessitates the use of EMS for many patients in
285 rural communities. [19, 28] Therefore, patients in rural areas may have been less likely to change
286 their healthcare utilization patterns. It will be important to build upon our findings to examine
287 differences in ED and hospital utilization in rural as compared to urban areas throughout the
288 pandemic. EMS is also more utilized in urban areas. [29] with potential for a greater proportion
289 of low acuity activations that could have been eliminated while rationing care in the setting of
290 COVID-19. In contrast, rural areas rely more heavily on EMS for transportation to the ED and as
291 a source of medical care than do urban populations, ensuring that EMS utilization does not
292 decline despite potential external pressures. [16, 17]

293 We also observed a significant decrease in EMS activations related to motor vehicle
294 collisions. This observation is consistent with previous reports of decreased automobile traffic
295 and accidents during the pandemic, as people were less likely to travel. [30-33] On the other
296 hand, we observed an overall increase in overdose or intoxication-related EMS activations
297 during the COVID-19 pandemic, also consistent with emerging literature from other settings.
298 [34, 35] Possible explanations include stress from lockdown restrictions, loss of employment,

299 and uncertainties regarding the pandemic's course, all of which can lead to increased alcohol and
300 substance use. [36] The increase in overdose or intoxication-related EMS activations was more
301 pronounced in urban areas, reflecting the profound impact of the pandemic and associated
302 economic and social changes on urban residents.

303 This study is strengthened by the availability of granular activation-level data from a
304 multi-state ALS ambulance agency that serves both rural and urban areas. However, limitations
305 do exist. Mayo Clinic Ambulance Service serves communities in the U.S. Upper Midwest, and
306 our findings may not generalize to other areas of the U.S. While included service areas represent
307 both rural and urban populations, the largest included cities have fewer than 120,000 residents.
308 The impact of COVID-19 on EMS utilization in larger metropolitan areas may not be
309 generalizable from these findings. However, data on the pandemic's impact on healthcare
310 delivery in smaller, Midwest, and rural areas have been scarce, increasing the impact and
311 significance of our findings. The collected data are limited to what is available in EMS patient
312 care records and lacks patient-level clinical information and outcomes data, as would be
313 available within a health system, because these data and services are outside the scope of EMS.
314 Nevertheless, the use of activation-level EMS data of a sole ALS ambulance provider in the
315 covered geographic areas ensures complete capture of EMS utilization by people living in this
316 geography; such capture may not be possible if relying on health system electronic health record
317 data. There is no gold standard for categorizing EMS activation severity, and we relied on the
318 use of lights and sirens during transport to indicate EMS activations as higher acuity. However,
319 the decision to use lights and sirens is influenced both by the objective severity of the patient's
320 illness as well as by subjective factors such as the EMS providers' experience and comfort level
321 managing the patient, resources available on scene, distance to the ED, and traffic conditions en

322 route. Finally, EMS activation volumes presented here are not population-adjusted, but we
323 accounted for this by considering temporal trends from the previous five-year period to compare
324 EMS utilization trends from the same population.

325

326 **Conclusion**

327 EMS activation volume and severity were affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. EMS activation
328 volume decreased, particularly in urban areas, while severity of activations increased, suggesting
329 deferral of lower acuity care and potentially delayed EMS activation. We observed a
330 disproportionate increase in activations for overdose or intoxication, reflecting the increase in
331 drug-related morbidity and mortality observed during the COVID-19 period. We also observed a
332 decrease in motor vehicle accidents, reflecting the decreased travel amongst stay-at-home orders
333 during the COVID-19 period. Further research is needed to fully understand the impact of
334 deferred EMS care on patient outcomes.

335

336 **Acknowledgements**

337 Author contributions: MS and BB drafted the manuscript. MCR collected and analyzed the data
338 and reviewed/revised the manuscript. LAM designed the study and reviewed/revised the
339 manuscript. RGM designed the study, reviewed/revised the manuscript, supervised the study,
340 and secured funding.

341 Funding source: This effort was funded by the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and
342 Kidney Diseases (NIDDK) of the National Institute of Health (NIH) National Institute of
343 Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK) grant number R03DK127010.

344 Conflicts of interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose. In the last 36 months,

345 RGM has received unrelated research support from NIDDK, National Institute on Aging (NIA)
346 of the NIH, Patient Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI), and the National Center for
347 Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS). She also serves as a consultant to Emmi® (Wolters
348 Kluwer) on developing patient education materials related to diabetes.

349 Role of the sponsor: Study contents are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not
350 necessarily represent the official views of NIH.

351

352 **References**


- 353 1. Prevention CfDca. COVID Data Tracker Internet: Centers for Disease Control and
354 Prevention; 2020 [cited 2023]. Available from: [https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#datatracker-home)
355 [tracker/#datatracker-home](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#datatracker-home).
- 356 2. Mohammed AH, Blebil A, Dujaili J, Rasool-Hassan BA. The Risk and Impact of
357 COVID-19 Pandemic on Immunosuppressed Patients: Cancer, HIV, and Solid Organ Transplant
358 Recipients. *AIDS Rev.* 2020;22(3):151-7. doi: 10.24875/AIDSRev.20000052. PubMed PMID:
359 33118527.
- 360 3. Nicola M, Alsafi Z, Sohrabi C, Kerwan A, Al-Jabir A, Iosifidis C, et al. The socio-
361 economic implications of the coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19): A review. *Int J Surg.*
362 2020;78:185-93. Epub 20200417. doi: 10.1016/j.ijssu.2020.04.018. PubMed PMID: 32305533;
363 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7162753.
- 364 4. Birkmeyer JD, Barnato A, Birkmeyer N, Bessler R, Skinner J. The Impact Of The
365 COVID-19 Pandemic On Hospital Admissions In The United States. *Health Aff (Millwood).*
366 2020;39(11):2010-7. Epub 20200924. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00980. PubMed PMID:
367 32970495; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7769002.
- 368 5. Blecker S, Jones SA, Petrilli CM, Admon AJ, Weerahandi H, Francois F, Horwitz LI.
369 Hospitalizations for Chronic Disease and Acute Conditions in the Time of COVID-19. *JAMA*
370 *Intern Med.* 2021;181(2):269-71. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3978. PubMed PMID:
371 33104158; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7589070.
- 372 6. Portela MC, de Aguiar Pereira CC, Lima SML, de Andrade CLT, Martins M. Patterns of
373 hospital utilization in the Unified Health System in six Brazilian capitals: comparison between
374 the year before and the first six first months of the COVID-19 pandemic. *BMC Health Serv Res.*
375 2021;21(1):976. Epub 20210917. doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-07006-x. PubMed PMID: 34535135;
376 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC78445784.
- 377 7. McCoy RG, Campbell RL, Mullan AF, Bucks CM, Clements CM, Reichard RR, Jeffery
378 MM. Changes in all-cause and cause-specific mortality during the first year of the COVID-19
379 pandemic in Minnesota: population-based study. *BMC Public Health.* 2022;22(1):2291. Epub
380 20221207. doi: 10.1186/s12889-022-14743-z. PubMed PMID: 36474190; PubMed Central
381 PMCID: PMC9727873.

- 382 8. Alabdali A, Yousif S, Alsaleem A, Aldhubayb M, Algerian N. Can Emergency Medical
383 Services (EMS) Shorten the Time to Stroke Team Activation, Computed Tomography (CT), and
384 the Time to Receiving Antithrombotic Therapy? A Prospective Cohort Study. *Prehosp Disaster*
385 *Med.* 2020;35(2):148-51. Epub 20200214. doi: 10.1017/s1049023x20000126. PubMed PMID:
386 32054556.
- 387 9. Alrawashdeh A, Nehme Z, Williams B, Stub D. Emergency medical service delays in
388 ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a meta-analysis. *Heart.* 2020;106(5):365-73. Epub
389 20190628. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2019-315034. PubMed PMID: 31253694.
- 390 10. De Luca G, Suryapranata H, Ottervanger JP, Antman EM. Time delay to treatment and
391 mortality in primary angioplasty for acute myocardial infarction: every minute of delay counts.
392 *Circulation.* 2004;109(10):1223-5. Epub 20040308. doi: 10.1161/01.Cir.0000121424.76486.20.
393 PubMed PMID: 15007008.
- 394 11. Harmsen AM, Giannakopoulos GF, Moerbeek PR, Jansma EP, Bonjer HJ, Bloemers FW.
395 The influence of prehospital time on trauma patients outcome: a systematic review. *Injury.*
396 2015;46(4):602-9. Epub 20150116. doi: 10.1016/j.injury.2015.01.008. PubMed PMID:
397 25627482.
- 398 12. Kobayashi A, Misumida N, Aoi S, Steinberg E, Kearney K, Fox JT, Kanei Y. STEMI
399 notification by EMS predicts shorter door-to-balloon time and smaller infarct size. *Am J Emerg*
400 *Med.* 2016;34(8):1610-3. Epub 20160607. doi: 10.1016/j.ajem.2016.06.022. PubMed PMID:
401 27317481.
- 402 13. Nielsen VM, DeJoie-Stanton C, Song G, Christie A, Guo J, Zachrisson KS. The
403 Association between Presentation by EMS and EMS Prenotification with Receipt of Intravenous
404 Tissue-Type Plasminogen Activator in a State Implementing Stroke Systems of Care. *Prehosp*
405 *Emerg Care.* 2020;24(3):319-25. Epub 20191002. doi: 10.1080/10903127.2019.1662862.
406 PubMed PMID: 31490714; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7113086.
- 407 14. Penverne Y, Jenvrin J, Montassier E. EMS dispatch center activity during the COVID-19
408 containment. *Am J Emerg Med.* 2021;46:654-5. Epub 20200805. doi:
409 10.1016/j.ajem.2020.07.083. PubMed PMID: 32826107; PubMed Central PMCID:
410 PMC7403864.
- 411 15. Satty T, Ramgopal S, Elmer J, Mosesso VN, Martin-Gill C. EMS responses and non-
412 transports during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Am J Emerg Med.* 2021;42:1-8. Epub 20201231.
413 doi: 10.1016/j.ajem.2020.12.078. PubMed PMID: 33429185; PubMed Central PMCID:
414 PMC7836527.
- 415 16. Karim SA, Chen HF. Deaths From COVID-19 in Rural, Micropolitan, and Metropolitan
416 Areas: A County-Level Comparison. *J Rural Health.* 2021;37(1):124-32. Epub 20201106. doi:
417 10.1111/jrh.12533. PubMed PMID: 33155723.
- 418 17. Kitchener S. Rural-related epidemiology of COVID-19 cases in Queensland. *Aust J Rural*
419 *Health.* 2020;28(6):634-5. doi: 10.1111/ajr.12681. PubMed PMID: 33382476.
- 420 18. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The
421 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement:
422 guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Ann Intern Med.* 2007;147(8):573-7. doi:
423 10.7326/0003-4819-147-8-200710160-00010. PubMed PMID: 17938396.
- 424 19. Uva JL, Wagner VL, Gesten FC. Emergency department reliance among rural children in
425 Medicaid in New York State. *J Rural Health.* 2012;28(2):152-61. Epub 20110427. doi:
426 10.1111/j.1748-0361.2011.00377.x. PubMed PMID: 22458316.

- 427 20. Center WRHR. Rural Urban Commuting Area Codes Data WWAMI Rural Health
428 Research Center; 2020 [cited 2023]. Available from: [https://depts.washington.edu/uwruca/ruca-](https://depts.washington.edu/uwruca/ruca-uses.php)
429 [uses.php](https://depts.washington.edu/uwruca/ruca-uses.php).
- 430 21. Morrill R, Cromartie J, Hart G. METROPOLITAN, URBAN, AND RURAL
431 COMMUTING AREAS: TOWARD A BETTER DEPICTION OF THE UNITED STATES
432 SETTLEMENT SYSTEM. *Urban Geography*. 1999;20(8):727-48. doi: 10.2747/0272-
433 3638.20.8.727.
- 434 22. Health MDo. Situation Update for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Internet:
435 Minnesota Department of Health; 2020 [cited 2023]. Available from:
436 <https://www.health.state.mn.us/diseases/coronavirus/situation.html>.
- 437 23. S.J. Goetz ZT, C. Schmidt, D. Meadowcroft. Rural COVID-19 Cases Lag Urban Areas
438 but Are Growing Much More Rapidly Internet: Northeast Regional Center for Rural
439 Development; 2020 [cited 2023]. Available from: [https://aese.psu.edu/nercrd/publications/covid-](https://aese.psu.edu/nercrd/publications/covid-19-issues-briefs/rural-covid-19-cases-lag-urban-areas-but-are-growing-much-more-rapidly)
440 [19-issues-briefs/rural-covid-19-cases-lag-urban-areas-but-are-growing-much-more-rapidly](https://aese.psu.edu/nercrd/publications/covid-19-issues-briefs/rural-covid-19-cases-lag-urban-areas-but-are-growing-much-more-rapidly).
- 441 24. Cuadros DF, Branscum AJ, Mukandavire Z, Miller FD, MacKinnon N. Dynamics of the
442 COVID-19 epidemic in urban and rural areas in the United States. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2021;59:16-
443 20. Epub 20210422. doi: 10.1016/j.annepidem.2021.04.007. PubMed PMID: 33894385; PubMed
444 Central PMCID: PMCPMC8061094.
- 445 25. Pro G, Hubach R, Wheeler D, Camplain R, Haberstroh S, Giano Z, et al. Differences in
446 US COVID-19 case rates and case fatality rates across the urban-rural continuum. *Rural Remote*
447 *Health*. 2020;20(3):6074. Epub 20200819. doi: 10.22605/rrh6074. PubMed PMID: 32811154;
448 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7583661.
- 449 26. Jiang DH, Roy DJ, Pollock BD, Shah ND, McCoy RG. Association of stay-at-home
450 orders and COVID-19 incidence and mortality in rural and urban United States: a population-
451 based study. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(4):e055791. Epub 20220407. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-
452 055791. PubMed PMID: 35393311; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8990263.
- 453 27. Callaghan T, Lueck JA, Trujillo KL, Ferdinand AO. Rural and Urban Differences in
454 COVID-19 Prevention Behaviors. *J Rural Health*. 2021;37(2):287-95. Epub 20210222. doi:
455 10.1111/jrh.12556. PubMed PMID: 33619836; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8013340.
- 456 28. Morrisey MA, Ohsfeldt RL, Johnson V, Treat R. Rural emergency medical services:
457 patients, destinations, times, and services. *J Rural Health*. 1995;11(4):286-94. doi:
458 10.1111/j.1748-0361.1995.tb00426.x. PubMed PMID: 10153688.
- 459 29. Hegenberg K, Trentzsch H, Gross S, Prückner S. Use of pre-hospital emergency medical
460 services in urban and rural municipalities over a 10 year period: an observational study based on
461 routinely collected dispatch data. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*. 2019;27(1):35. Epub
462 20190402. doi: 10.1186/s13049-019-0607-5. PubMed PMID: 30940157; PubMed Central
463 PMCID: PMCPMC6444540.
- 464 30. Keays G, Friedman D, Gagnon I. Injuries in the time of COVID-19. *Health Promot*
465 *Chronic Dis Prev Can*. 2020;40(11-12):336-41. Epub 20200911. doi:
466 10.24095/hpcdp.40.11/12.02. PubMed PMID: 32924925; PubMed Central PMCID:
467 PMCPMC7745832.
- 468 31. Levin MW, Shang M, Stern R. Effects of short-term travel on COVID-19 spread: A
469 novel SEIR model and case study in Minnesota. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(1):e0245919. Epub
470 20210122. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0245919. PubMed PMID: 33481956; PubMed Central
471 PMCID: PMCPMC7822539.

- 472 32. Xiang J, Austin E, Gould T, Larson T, Shirai J, Liu Y, et al. Impacts of the COVID-19
473 responses on traffic-related air pollution in a Northwestern US city. *Sci Total Environ*.
474 2020;747:141325. Epub 20200728. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141325. PubMed PMID:
475 32771792; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7386255.
- 476 33. Yasin YJ, Grivna M, Abu-Zidan FM. Global impact of COVID-19 pandemic on road
477 traffic collisions. *World J Emerg Surg*. 2021;16(1):51. Epub 20210928. doi: 10.1186/s13017-
478 021-00395-8. PubMed PMID: 34583713; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8478263.
- 479 34. Imtiaz S, Nafeh F, Russell C, Ali F, Elton-Marshall T, Rehm J. The impact of the novel
480 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic on drug overdose-related deaths in the United States
481 and Canada: a systematic review of observational studies and analysis of public health
482 surveillance data. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy*. 2021;16(1):87. Epub 20211129. doi:
483 10.1186/s13011-021-00423-5. PubMed PMID: 34844624; PubMed Central PMCID:
484 PMCPMC8628272.
- 485 35. Slavova S, Rock P, Bush HM, Quesinberry D, Walsh SL. Signal of increased opioid
486 overdose during COVID-19 from emergency medical services data. *Drug Alcohol Depend*.
487 2020;214:108176. Epub 20200710. doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2020.108176. PubMed PMID:
488 32717504; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7351024.
- 489 36. Killgore WDS, Cloonan SA, Taylor EC, Lucas DA, Dailey NS. Alcohol dependence
490 during COVID-19 lockdowns. *Psychiatry Res*. 2021;296:113676. Epub 20201225. doi:
491 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113676. PubMed PMID: 33385782; PubMed Central PMCID:
492 PMCPMC9754813.
493

Total Call Volume



Urban vs Rural Volume





Figure 1

A. EMS Call Volumes and Geographic Distribution Prior to COVID-19.



B. EMS Call Volumes and Geographic Distribution During COVID-19.






Figure 2

Overdose/Intoxication Call Volume



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.15.24302863>; this version posted February 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Overdose/Intoxication Call Volume - Urban vs Rural



■ Rural Overdose-Diff ■ Urban Overdose-Diff — urbanoverdose
— Urban Overdose Modeled — ruraloverdose — Rural Overdose Modeled

Figure 3