1	Comparison of Japanese nurse practitioner-led care and physician
2	trainees-led care on patients' length of stay in a secondary emergency
3	department: A retrospective study
4	
5	short title
6	The efficiency of Japanese nurse practitioner-led care in a secondary emergency
7	department: A retrospective study
8	
9	Keiichi URANAKA <sup>1,2</sup> *, Hitoshi TAKAIRA <sup>3</sup> <sup>¶</sup> , Ryoji SHINOHARA <sup>4</sup> <sup>¶</sup> , Zentaro YAMAGATA <sup>5</sup> <sup>¶</sup>
10	
11	<sup>1</sup> Division of Nursing Postgraduate School, Tokyo Healthcare University, Japan
12	<sup>2</sup> Integrated Graduate School of Medicine, Engineering, and Agricultural Sciences, University of
13	Yamanashi, Chuo City, Japan
14	<sup>3</sup> National Hospital Organization Disaster Medical Center, Tokyo City, Japan
15	<sup>4</sup> Center for Birth Cohort Studies, University of Yamanashi, Chuo City, Japan
16	<sup>5</sup> Department of Health Science, Basic Science for Clinical Medicine, Division of Medicine,
17	Graduate School Department of Interdisciplinary Research, University of Yamanashi, Chuo
18	City, Japan
19	
20	* Corresponding author
21	Email: <u>k-uranaka@thcu.ac.jp</u> (KU)
22	<sup>¶</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work.
23	
24	

### 25 Abstract

#### 26 **Objectives**

27 We compared nurse practitioner-led care and physician trainees-led care on patients' length of

stay in a secondary emergency department in Japan.

### 29 Methods

30 This observational research utilized a secondary data analysis of medical records. Participants (N

31 = 1,419; mean age =  $63.9 \pm 23.4$  years; 52.3% men) were patients who were transferred to the

32 emergency department by an ambulance between April 2016 and March 2018 in western Tokyo.

33 Multiple linear regression analyses were performed with the length of stay as the dependent

34 variable and the factors related to the length of stay, including medical care leaders, as the

35 independent variable to compare Japanese nurse practitioner-led care and physician trainees-led

36 care on patients' length of stay.

### 37 **Results**

38 Approximately half of the patients (n = 763; 53.8%) received Japanese nurse practitioner-led

39 care. Patients' length of stay was significantly shorter by six minutes in the Japanese nurse

40 practitioner-led care group than the physician trainees-led care group.

#### 41 Conclusion

42 Patients' length of stay was significantly shorter by six minutes in the Japanese nurse practitioner 43 group than the physician trainees' group. This time difference suggests that the medical care led 44 by Japanese nurse practitioners is more efficient. In the future, the cost-effectiveness of Japanese 45 nurse practitioner medical care, safety, and patient satisfaction should be examined in a multi-

46 institutional joint study.

47

# 48 Introduction

49 Demand for emergency medicine is increasing annually, with an increase in the number of 50 presentations to hospitals [1]. However, owing to the uneven distribution of physicians and the 51 enforcement of work training time limits for trainee physicians [2–4], the workload of 52 emergency physicians is high. In addition, owing to the serious shortage of emergency 53 department staff, emergency departments (EDs) face problems such as increased waiting time 54 and length of stay for patients. The extension of the length of stay is associated with higher 55 mortality rates [5–7] and prolonged hospital length of stay [8], which increases patients' medical 56 costs and reduces patient satisfaction [9–10]. 57 To solve these problems, health services have been remodeled significantly in response to 58 healthcare demands. Increased public uptake of care provided by specialists, including nurse 59 practitioners (NPs), can reduce care latency [11]. In primary care and emergency medicine, NPs 60 are being introduced worldwide as a solution to these noted problems [12–14], and patients' 61 waiting time and dissatisfaction are declining [15]. 62 NPs are registered and certified nurses who have been educated to function autonomously and 63 cooperatively in advanced and extended clinical roles. The Advanced Practice Nursing 64 Regulations Consensus Model in 2008 provides primary, continuous, and comprehensive care-65 including comprehensive medical history; physical examinations and other health assessments and screening activities; the diagnosis, care, and management of acute and chronic patients and 66 67 diseases; order and conduct laboratory examinations and imaging examinations; interpret

68 examination results; prescribe drugs; use medical devices; and provide explanations to patients

69 [16]. The International Council of Nurses [17] also defines an NP as a registered nurse with 70 expert knowledge, complex decision-making skills, and clinical competence—with legislated 71 extensions for expanded practice. NPs have acquired advanced knowledge and skills regarding 72 pathophysiology, physical assessment, and pharmacology, which undergraduate programs in 73 many countries cover to some degree, but not in-depth as in the NP programs. They are clinically 74 trained, hold master's degrees, and are certified. The number of NPs is increasing annually: there 75 are 290,000 in the United States [18], 5,697 in Canada [19], and 1,839 in Australia [20]. In 76 addition, emergency care research has revealed that NPs provide a valuable, safe, and effective 77 service [21–23].

78 When patients receive care from NPs and physicians in EDs, their length of stay is shorter 79 than those who receive care from physicians only [12-14]. The claim in these studies was that 80 NPs had a beneficial effect on patients' length of stay in the ED. However, other previous studies 81 revealed no significant difference in patients' length of stay in the ED between an NP-provided 82 care group and a physician-provided care group [12,24]. Others demonstrated that the medical 83 hours of an emergency physician group were significantly shorter than that of an NP group 84 [25,26]. As such, there is no unified view on the relationship between NP-provided care and 85 patients' length of stay in EDs.

In Japan, emergency medicine faces new social issues owing to the rapidly aging population [27] and the increasing medical demand as in many countries. As a solution, Japanese nurse practitioners (JNPs) are assigned to the field of emergency care—often leading the medical care and sharing and shifting tasks with physicians. JNPs commenced education in 2008 in a postgraduate master's degree program [28]. JNP students will intensively study advanced medical and nursing education and acquire the ability to assist in a broader scope of practice than

92 nurses. Currently, 11 postgraduate schools are members of the Japanese Organization of Nurse 93 Practitioner Faculties, and the students must pass the certification qualification test to be certified 94 as a JNP. By March 2020, 487 nurses have been certified by the Japanese Organization of Nurse 95 Practitioner Faculties. However, in Japan, no formal legislative status has been established for 96 NPs [29], and JNP certification is not a national qualification. The scope of practice for JNPs is 97 similar to that of US NPs in restricted practice. Currently, JNP must not prescribe and practice 98 medicine without a physician's instructions. There are two types of physician's instructions: 99 specific instructions and comprehensive instructions. Nurses assist in medical action under the 100 physician's specific instructions. They must not take medical actions that carry the risk of 101 harming a person's health if it is not done by a physician. On the other hand, JNPs can perform 102 specific actions (e.g., arterial punctures, correction of dehydration by intravenous drip, and 103 adjusting the respiratory settings) based on comprehensive instructions from physicians and 104 procedures prepared by physicians. 105 In EDs, JNPs have acquired and practiced the knowledge, skills, and thought processes 106 necessary for medical care, such as physical examinations, clinical reasoning, differential 107 diagnosis, test selections, and the interpretation of test results. However, few previous studies 108 have examined the care outcomes of JNPs' care in the EDs. Although the scope of practice of 109 JNPs is not yet at an international standard, there is a need to generate evidence for the 110 development of JNPs under current law. Therefore, we evaluated these JNPs' efficiency in a

111 Japanese ED. The objective of this study was to compare JNP-led care and physician trainees-led

112 care on patients' length of stay in a secondary ED.

113

### 114 Methods

### 115 **Design**

116 This was an observational study with a secondary data analysis of medical records.

#### 117 Setting

118 This study was conducted in a medical institution in western Tokyo. At the target facility, the ED 119 was available 24 hours a day to accept emergency patients. The JNP care model at the target 120 facility is a collaborative model focusing on managing patients in a secondary ambulance 121 service. During day shifts, both a JNP and physician trainees involved in care under the 122 instruction and supervision of emergency physicians share patient information closely with 123 emergency physicians. Regarding the assignment of patients, it is determined based not on the 124 patients' disease or condition but on the rotation system of the medical team in the ED. There is 125 no waiting time and no triage because the patient arrived and the JNP or physician trainees-led 126 care of the patient began. Two nurses who were residents and in charge of the EDs worked with 127 JNP and physician trainees during the day shift.

#### 128 **Participants**

Key inclusion criteria were patients who were transferred to the secondary ED by an ambulance during the day shift (8:30 to 17:15) between April 2016 and March 2018. The reason for this criterion was that the ED at the target facility only accepted patients transported by ambulance. In addition, because the JNP worked only the day shift, we limited patients transported on the day shift to control for confounding due to differences in the work shift in which they were transported and excluded patients who were transferred on weekends and holidays.

### 135 Data collection

136 The date of this study ware collected from the medical records. The records described by JNPs

137 and physician trainees are officially recorded in patients' electronic medical records with the 138 approval of the emergency physicians. Electronic medical records are a platform used by medical 139 professionals as well as administrative and accounting staff. We extracted the data of patients' 140 characteristics: their admission time to the ED; the presence of trauma, testing, and medical care; 141 the discharge time from the ED; the number of tertiary emergency patients (TEPs) at the time of 142 the participants' arrival; and the consultations with other departments. These data were entered 143 into a research dataset. In addition, the data used in the analysis were verified among the co-144 authors for transcription errors from the medical records to ensure reliability.

#### 145 Measurements

#### 146 Length of stay

147 The length of stay was the primary outcome in this study. The length of stay in the ED was 148 calculated as the difference between the time the patients were admitted and discharged to the 149 ED in minutes. The admission time of patients was recorded by the ambulance team and entered 150 as the reception time in the patients' medical records. Patients' discharge time was recorded in 151 the medical record by the emergency nurses.

#### 152 Care leaders

Those who recorded the following initial practices were deemed to have led the care; clinical reasoning, differential diagnosis, test selection, interpretation of test results, tentative diagnosis, and decision on a course of treatment in the ED. The JNP had a rigorous checklist of patients assigned to initial care for annual activity reports to the hospital. We classified care leaders based on the checklist and reviewed the medical records with the researcher and JNP to verify the classification. As it is often urgent to treat a patient in an ED, the JNP may lead the care, and a physician trainee records it, and vice versa. Therefore, it does not matter who wrote the medical

160 record.

The JNP had 11 years of experience as a nurse and three years of experience as a JNP after completing the Japanese Organization of Nurse Practitioner Faculties -accredited postgraduate master's degree and was dedicated to the ED for the period under study. The physician trainees were licensed to practice medicine as a physician for less than two years and in charge of the ED during the rotation period. If the EDs were too crowded, physician trainees were in charge of the outpatients in parallel with the JNP. When a JNP was off duty or absent, physician trainees played the role of care on behalf of the JNP in the ED.

#### 168 **Other factors related to the length of stay**

169 For factors related to the length of stay, based on earlier research, we examined care leader type 170 [30,31]; patients' age and sex [31,32]; whether they received clinical tests test including x-ray 171 photographs (XPs), computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) [31], and 172 blood tests [33]; catheterization [34], endoscopy, and trauma [32] characteristics; outcomes (i.e., 173 return home or hospitalization, including transfers); the number of consultations with other 174 departments; and the number of tertiary emergency patients when the participants arrived at the 175 hospital. The number of tertiary emergency participants may affect the length of stay of 176 secondary emergency patients [35]. Tertiary emergency patients require hospitalization and human resources such as physicians and nurses, and they are given priority over secondary 177 178 emergency patients for testing. Therefore, secondary emergency patients often wait longer for 179 tests than tertiary emergency patients.

#### 180 Analysis

181 We calculated descriptive statistics, including a simple tabulation for each variable and mean ( $\pm$ 182 standard deviation) of the length of stay. The correlations between the variables were calculated

- using Spearman's correlation coefficients, the tetrachoric correlation coefficient [36], and the
- 184 point-biserial correlation coefficient [37] depending on the type of scale. In addition, simple
- 185 linear regression analyses were performed with the length of stay as the dependent variable and
- 186 the factors related to the length of stay as the independent variable. Then, a multiple linear
- regression analysis was performed. P-values < .05 were deemed significant. Stata version 15
- 188 (Stata Corp LLC, Lakeway, TX, USA) was used for all statistical analyses.

#### **Ethics Considerations**

190 This study received ethical approval from the Institutional Review Board of the hospital (no.

191 2018-24) and the university (no. 2072). Informed consent was obtained in the form of opt-out on

192 the hospital's website. No participants refused to participate.

193

### 194 **Results**

### 195 **Participants' characteristics**

196 The number of participants analyzed was 1,419, and the patients' length of stay ranged from 6 to

197 486 minutes (mean = 142.9, SD = 68.6 minutes; median = 134, interquartile range = 88 minutes).

198 Table 1 illustrates the participants' characteristics. Specifically, 52.3% were men, and 47.7%

199 were women. The patients' mean age was 63.9 (SD = 23.4) years. Further, 53.8% received JNP

- 200 care, and 46.2% did not, 62.9% of the participants were non-traumatic, and 37.1% were
- traumatic, and 1,052 (74.1%) had no TEPs when they arrived at the hospital. The outcomes were
- 202 50.0% for both returning home and hospitalization, including transfer to another hospital. There
- were 340 patients (24.0%) who did not see other departments, and most (88.6%) had blood tests.

- 204 In contrast, 0.2% had an endoscopy, 8.9% received an MRI test, and 0.4% received a
- 205 catheterization.
- 206 Table 1. Characteristics of the patients and length of stay in the ED

	<b>1</b>	U	~			
			0 /	length of stay (minutes)		
Vai	riables	n	%	Mean	SD	
Care leader	physician trainees	656	46.2	142.4	67.2	
	JNP	763	53.8	143.3	69.9	
Age <sup>a</sup>	year			63.9	23.4	
Sex	female	677	47.7	142.2	66.4	
	male	742	52.3	143.6	70.6	
Trauma	non-trauma	892	62.9	146.4	66.4	
	trauma	527	37.1	137.0	71.9	
ТЕР	0	1,052	74.1	141.5	68.1	
	1	308	21.7	145.4	67.3	
	2	51	3.6	166.3	82.3	
	3	8	0.6	90.3	40.2	
Outcomes	return home	710	50.0	124.9	64.4	
	hospitalization	709	50.0	160.9	68.0	
Consultation	0	340	24.0	130.1	57.5	
	1	806	56.8	137.8	69.2	
	2	225	15.9	169.6	72.4	
	3	42	3.0	194.4	62.7	
	4	6	0.4	191.8	25.1	
ХР	without	204	14.4	100.9	62.6	
	with	1,215	85.6	150.0	67.1	
СТ	without	489	34.5	111.6	58.4	
	with	930	65.5	159.4	67.9	
MRI	without	1,292	91.1	137.2	64.9	
	with	127	8.9	201.4	78.0	
Blood test	without	162	11.4	82.1	46.4	
	with	1,257	88.6	150.8	67.1	
Catheterization	without	1,413	99.6	143.1	68.6	
	with	6	0.4	97.0	43.6	
Endoscopy	without	1,391	98.0	142.5	68.5	
	with	28	0.2	165.4	72.1	

Table 1	Characteristics	of the	patients	and len	gth of	stay in	the ED	(N=1,419)
					<b>(</b> )	-1		

ED= emergency department, N and n= number, SD= standard deviation

JNP= Japanese nurse practitioner

TEP= tertiary emergency patients; number of tertiary emergency patients when the subjects arrived at the hospital XP=x-ray photography, CT= computerized tomography

MRI= magnetic resonance imaging

208

### 209 The relationship between the length of stay and care leader

- 210 Correlations between the independent variables were examined to avoid multicollinearity in the
- 211 multiple regression analysis. The variables that had a significant correlation with the length of
- stay were age, trauma, outcomes, consultation, and XP, CT, MRI, and blood tests. The
- 213 correlations ranged from -0.066 (p < .05) to 0.331 (p < .01; Table 2).
- 214 **Table 2. Correlation coefficient between variables**

Valiables	LOS	Cl	Age	Sex	Trauma	TEP	Oc	Cons	ХР	СТ	MRI	Bt	Cath
Care leader	0.006												
Age	0.244 <sup>b</sup>	0.013											
Sex	0.010	0.022	-0.069 <sup>b</sup>										
Trauma	-0.066 <sup>b</sup>	0.041	-0.259 <sup>b</sup>	-0.119 <sup>b</sup>									
TEP	0.033	0.032	-0.021	0.000	-0.034								
Outcomes	0.262 <sup>b</sup>	0.003	0.259 <sup>b</sup>	0.116 <sup>a</sup>	-0.192 <sup>b</sup>	-0.060 <sup>a</sup>							
Consultation	0.202 <sup>b</sup>	0.176 <sup>b</sup>	0.103 <sup>b</sup>	-0.012	0.152 <sup>b</sup>	-0.004	-0.018						
ХР	0.251 <sup>b</sup>	0.037	0.299 <sup>b</sup>	0.021	-0.010	-0.045	0.754 <sup>b</sup>	0.092 <sup>b</sup>					
СТ	0.331 <sup>b</sup>	0.053	0.206 <sup>b</sup>	0.085	-0.078	-0.056 <sup>a</sup>	0.364 <sup>b</sup>	0.186 <sup>b</sup>	0.223 <sup>b</sup>				
MRI	0.267 <sup>b</sup>	-0.014	0.898 <sup>b</sup>	0.028	-0.275 <sup>b</sup>	0.001	0.374 <sup>b</sup>	0.070 <sup>b</sup>	0.183 <sup>a</sup>	0.475 <sup>b</sup>			
Blood test	0.318 <sup>b</sup>	0.156 <sup>b</sup>	0.414 <sup>b</sup>	0.107	0.596 <sup>b</sup>	-0.041	0.860 <sup>b</sup>	0.034	0.552 <sup>b</sup>	0.581 <sup>b</sup>	0.427 <sup>b</sup>		
Catheterization	-0.044	-0.032	0.027	1.000 <sup>a</sup>	-1.000 <sup>a</sup>	0.022	1.000	0.001	1.000	-0.136	0.130	1.000	
Endoscopy	0.046	-0.002	0.043	0.126	-0.513 <sup>b</sup>	0.049	0.407	0.022	1.000 <sup>a</sup>	-0.233 <sup>a</sup>	-0.179	1.000	-1.000

 Table 2 Correlation coefficient between variables (N=1,419)

For the continuous variables, Spearman's correlation coefficient were calculated between them.

The continuous and binary variables were calculated Point-biserial correlations coefficients.

Binary variables and binary variables were calculated Tetrachoric correlation coefficient.

 ${}^{a}p < .05$ ,  ${}^{b}p < .01$ , bold: an absolute value of 0.500 or more

N= number, LOS= length of stay; minutes, Cl= Care leader, Oc= Outcomes, Cons= Consultation, Bt= Blood test, Cath= Catheterizaion

13

TEP= tertiary emergency patients; the number of tertiary emergency patients when the subjects arrived at the hospital.

XP= x-ray photography, CT= computerized tomography, MRI= magnetic resonance imaging

The reference of care leader variable was "physician trainees".

The reference of sex variable was "female".

The reference of trauma variable was "non-trauma".

The reference of outcomes variable was "return home".

217 To clarify the relationship between the length of stay and each variable, a simple linear 218 regression analysis was performed using the length of stay as the dependent variable. No 219 significant relationship was found between the length of stay and care leader (unstandardized 220 coefficient: 0.88; 95% CI: -6.29 to 8.05). The variables with significant associations were age, 221 consultation, MRI, blood test, trauma, outcomes, CT, and XP (Table 3). 222 A multiple linear regression analysis was performed to clarify the relationship between the 223 length of stay and care leader after adjusting for other variables. To avoid multicollinearity in the 224 multiple regression analysis, we built the models so that no variables with absolute values of 225 correlation coefficients greater than 0.500 were included concurrently. The length of stay was the 226 dependent variable, and the independent variables were care leader, age, sex, tertiary emergency 227 patients, endoscopy, consultation, MRI, and blood test. 228 The results of the multiple linear regression analysis demonstrated that there was a significant 229 relationship between the length of stay and the care leader. The length of stay of the patients was 230 significantly shorter by six minutes in the JNP group compared to the physician trainees' group 231 (-6.67; -13.21 to -0.13). The other significant variables were age (0.23; 0.08 to 0.38), TEPs (6.30; 232 0.62 to 11.99), consultation (17.60; 13.20 to 22.00), MRI (53.26; 41.96 to 64.56), and blood test 233 (56.47; 45.31 to 67.64; Table 3).

#### Table 3. Association of length of stay in the ED with care provider

Variables		n	crude	adjusted			
				Model 1	Model 2		
			B (95%CI)	B(95%CI)	B(95%CI)		
Care leader	physicians trainees	656	reference	reference	reference		
	JNP	763	0.88(-6.29 - 8.05)	-6.67(-13.210.13)	-6.76(-13.300.		
Age	year		0.66(0.51 - 0.81)	0.23(0.08 - 0.38)	0.25(0.10 - 0.41		
Sex	female	677	reference	reference	reference		
	male	742	1.33(-5.82 - 8.49)	0.08(-6.36 - 6.53)	0.51(-5.95 - 6.9		
ТЕР	person		4.16(-2.18 - 10.49)	6.30(0.62 - 11.99)	6.54(0.85 - 12.2		
Endoscopy	without	1391	reference	reference	reference		
	with	28	22.89(-2.7848.56)	14.23(-8.86 - 37.31)	16.05(-7.11 - 39.2		
Consultation	case		19.80(15.11 - 24.49)	17.60(13.20 - 22.00)	16.84(12.36 - 21.		
MRI	without	1292	reference	reference	reference		
	with	127	64.18(52.11 - 76.25)	53.26(41.96 - 64.56)	54.23(42.88 - 65.		
Blood test	without	162	reference	reference	reference		
	with	1257	68.62(57.96 - 79.27)	56.47(45.31 - 67.64)	58.73(47.29 - 70.		
Trauma	without	892	reference		reference		
	with	527	-9.37(-16.751.99)		6.44(-0.82 - 13.		
Outcomes	return home	710	reference				
	hospitalization	709	35.97(29.07 - 42.87)				
СТ	without	489	reference				
	with	930	47.77(40.67 - 54.86)				
ХР	without	204	reference				
	with	1215	49.10(39.24 - 58.97)				
Catheterization	without	1413	reference				
	with	6	-46.11(-101.15 - 8.92)				

Table 3	Association	of length	of stay ir	n the ED wit	h care provider (	N=1,419)
		<i>O</i> .				, ,

crude: simple linear regression analysis

adjusted: multiple linear regression analysis; the models that did not include all variables that were correlated above 0.5 at the same time.

Model1:  $R^2 = 0.20$ , VIF= 1.01~1.24, Model2:  $R^2 = 20.0$ , VIF= 1.01~1.30

dependent variable= Length of stay (minutes), ED= emergency department, N and n= number

B= unstandardized regression coefficient, CI= confidence interval for B, JNP= Japanese nurse practitioner

TEP= tertiary emergency patients; number of tertiary emergency patients when the subject arrives at the hospital

Consultation= number of consultations with departments other than the emergency department, MRI= magnetic resonance imaging

CT= computerized tomography, XP= x-ray photography

S1 Table, we showed the results of multiple linear regression analysis for exploring confounding factors for LOS and care providers.

16 S2 Table, we showed that in Model 2, replacing trauma with either Outcomes, CT, or XP variables did not change the sign of the care provider's coefficients.

236

# **Interacting factors with the care leader regarding the length of stay**

### and robustness of the sign of the care leader's coefficients

Due to the sign reversal in the crude and adjusted models for care leader, a multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to explore interacting factors with care leader regarding the length of stay. The sign of the care leader changed to negative only in the model with the inclusion of a consultation (S1 Table). We constructed Model 2 with the addition of trauma; however, the sign of the care leader coefficients did not change. Additionally, we demonstrated that, in Model 2, replacing trauma with outcomes, CT, or the XP variables did not change the sign of the care leaders' coefficients (S2 Table).

246

# 247 **Discussion**

248 This study demonstrated that patients' length of stay was significantly shorter by six minutes in 249 the JNP group than in the physician trainees group. In any of the multiple regression models that 250 trauma, outcomes, CT, and XP were entered into, the sign of care leaders' coefficient remained 251 the same and was negative. This suggests that the efficiency of JNP-led care is more efficient 252 than the care led by physician trainees. To our knowledge, this was the first study to demonstrate 253 the outcome of JNP-led care in a secondary ED in Japan. However, it should be noted that all 254 patients received care at a secondary ED during weekday shifts. 255 The allegation in the following studies was that the NPs had a beneficial effect on patients'

length of stay. A study conducted in the ED of a small city found that the median length of stay

- of the NP-provided patient group was 77 minutes, compared to the 174 minutes of the NP and

258 emergency physician-provided group [12]. Further, a cohort study in the ED of a community 259 hospital in an urban area revealed the following findings:  $85 \pm 56$  minutes in the physician group 260 and  $65 \pm 42$  in the emergency NP group [13]. A study of outpatients in the ED with levels 261 ranging from non-urgent to potentially life-threatening revealed a median length of stay of 94 262 minutes in the NP-provided care group and 170 minutes in the patient group who received 263 conventional care [14]. Although the results cannot be fully generalized because our study was 264 conducted in Japan and NPs' work styles and work contents may differ, our findings support 265 previous studies that NP-provided care is associated with shortened length of stay among ED 266 patients.

Concerning the method, some previous studies adjusted the bias of patients' severity and urgency by stratifying the NP-provided medical care group and physicians' medical care group by triage category [12,14,15]. Unlike previous studies, to address these biases, the current study limited participants to patients who were treated at a secondary ED. In addition, we adjusted for patients' characteristics and whether they received tests in the multivariate analyses, which still revealed that the NP-led group had a significantly shorter length of stay than the physician trainees-led group.

The following previous studies also suggest that NP-provided care is not inferior to physicianprovided care. A case-control study of 725 emergency outpatients who came home with orthopedic disease demonstrated that the median length of stay in the conventional system without NP was 137 minutes and 125 minutes with NP, which was non-significant [24]. Steiner et al. [12] found that the length of stay was 123 minutes for the emergency physician-provided patients and 125 minutes for those provided with care by the emergency physicians and NP, which was non-significant (p = .13). In contrast, in a study investigating patients who returned

281 home after visiting the ambulatory care clinic, the median length of stay for the physician-282 provided group was 143 minutes, and the NP-provided was 156 minutes, which was a significant 283 difference [15]. In one study that evaluated physicians' and NPs' care for minorly injured 284 patients in an emergency facility, the average care time of the physician group was 12 minutes 285 shorter than the NP group [25]. In these previous studies, the NP-provided group had a longer 286 length of stay than the physician-provided group in the ED, which contrasts our findings. We 287 cannot deny the existence of publication bias—that only favorable results concerning NPs are 288 published. However, our study suggests that there is no disadvantage to patients' length of stay 289 by receiving care from a JNP instead of a physician. 290 The length of stay is defined by the performance of four processes: medical care in the ED, 291 medical care of specialized medical departments, ward coordination, and movement. In 292 particular, the medical care in the ED includes the time related to interviews, physical 293 examinations, judgment and implementation of various tests, interpretation of test results, 294 provisional diagnosis, consultation with other departments, and treatment policy decisions. 295 Therefore, the length of stay reflects not only the power of the department in charge but also the 296 speed of cooperation among various departments within the hospital. 297 The results of our study, adjusted for patients' characteristics and whether medical tests were 298 conducted, suggested that the care led by the JNP could shorten patients' length of stay. As 299 illustrated in Appendix 1, the coefficients' direction was negative when the independent 300 variables were care leader and consultation variables. The JNP group tended to spend about four 301 minutes less time in the ED than the physician trainee group concerning consultations with other 302 departments. The shorter length of stay may be owing to the relationship between other 303 departments and other factors depending on the skill and experience of the individual JNP and

their ability to coordinate. This is probably because JNPs collaborate with various departments in the hospital more accurately and quickly than physician trainees. The JNPs are more likely to have more years of employment in hospitals than physician trainees, and they may be familiar with the hospital system and culture. The results suggest that JNPs are equivalent or greater to physician trainees in their efficiency and ability to manage patients.

309 A previous study compared NPs and nurses and examined patients' length of stay in the ED 310 [38]. In that study, the mean length of stay of patients with NP-led care was 73 minutes, while 311 that of patients with nurse-led care was 98 minutes. The NPs could assess the test order, interpret 312 test results, and provide medical care (including triage). Certainly, nurses may reduce patients' 313 length of stay in EDs by improving manuals, operations, and triage skills. However, NPs have a 314 better ability to understand pathological conditions, provide necessary tests, and provide 315 predictive care than nurses, and they are often involved in medical care. Therefore, it was 316 considered that they are directly involved in decreasing patients' length of stay. 317 Another advantage of introducing JNPs in the ED is that the quality of medical care is 318 improved. For example, NPs can lead medical care for patients with mild conditions, and 319 physicians can focus on treating patients with more severe and complicated diseases. In recent 320 years, there has been a shortage of emergency physicians owing to the uneven distribution of 321 physicians [39], and a work style reform law has promoted restrictions on physicians' ability to 322 work overtime [40]. Consequently, JNPs reduce emergency physicians' work-related burdens. In 323 addition, JNPs enable smoother collaboration and task sharing between physicians and nurses. 324 The introduction of JNPs will lead to investment in hospital organizations and benefit patients, 325 families, and team care [41]. Thus, policymakers should consider introducing JNP in secondary 326 emergency outpatients to address the limitations mentioned above in medical settings.

#### 327 Strengths

The strengths of this study are the number of participants and the use of objective medical record data. We assessed one JNP at one target facility; therefore, the internal validity is maintained. In addition, we can compare our results to those of previous studies conducted overseas.

#### 331 Limitations

332 As this was a retrospective survey, the accuracy and completeness of the data are lacking owing 333 to the difference in record keeping. Further, it is undeniable that the data may comprise typing 334 errors as it was extracted from the emergency outpatient transport patient records and entered 335 into the research dataset. Moreover, the external generalizability of our results is limited since 336 our data reflect the practice of one JNP working at one site. Patients were admitted during the 337 day on weekdays; therefore, data concerning nighttime and weekend/holiday cases were not 338 included. The results should thus be generalized with caution. Further, a multivariate analysis 339 was performed using nine variables. The coefficient of determination  $(R^2)$  of the multiple linear 340 regression analysis model in this study was 0.20. The remaining 80% of the length of stay was 341 explained by other factors that were not surveyed in this study. This study focused only on 342 outpatient time, and we did not consider other important outcomes. In addition, we were unable 343 to investigate the background of the physician trainees, including their years of experience.

344

# 345 **Conclusion**

The length of stay of patients was significantly shorter by six minutes in the JNP groupcompared to the physician trainees' group. This time difference suggests that the medical care

348 led by JNP is more efficient than that led by physician trainees. In the future, the cost-

349 effectiveness of JNP's medical care (e.g., salary and remuneration obtained from medical care),

350 safety (e.g., consistency between initial diagnosis and post-hospitalization diagnosis and return-

351 to-home rate of returning patients), and patient satisfaction should be examined in a multi-

institutional joint study.

353

### 354 Acknowledgments

Our special thanks to the patients who participated in the study. Special thanks are also extended
to the staff members of the Department of Health Sciences, University of Yamanashi, for their
any suggestions and advices to brush up on this study. We also thank Editage(www.editage.com)
for English language editing.

359

# 360 **References**

361 [1] Burkett E, Martin-Khan MG, Scott J, Samanta M, Gray LC. Trends and predicted trends in
 362 presentations of older people to Australian emergency departments: Effects of demand
 363 growth, population aging, and climate change. Aust Health Rev. 2017; 41(3): 246–253. doi:

364 10.1071/AH15165

365 [2] Garland A, Gershengorn HB. Staffing in ICUs: Physicians and alternative staffing models.

366 Chest. 2013 143: 214–221. doi: 10.1378/chest.12-1531

367 [3] Kleinpell R, Ward NS, Kelso LA, Mollenkopf FP Jr, Houghton D. Patient to provider ratios

368 for nurse practitioners and physician assistants in the ICU: Results from a national survey.

369 Am J Critical Care, 2015; 24: e16–e21. doi: 10.4037/ajcc2015274

370 [4] Ward NS, Afessa B, Kleinpell R, Tisherman S, Ries M, Howell M, Members of Society of

- 371 Critical Care Medicine Taskforce on ICU Staffing. Intensivist/patient ratios in closed ICUs:
- 372 A statement from the Society of Critical Care Medicine Taskforce on ICU Staffing. Critical
- 373 Care Medi, 2013; 41: 638–645. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e3182741478
- [5] Benjamin C, Renee Y, Robert Y, David Z, Li-Jung L, Woijuan H, et al. Effect of emergency
- department crowding on outcomes of admitted patients. Ann Emerg Medi, 2013 61(6):
- 376 605–611. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2012.10.026
- 377 [6] Chang AM, Cohen DJ, Lin A, Augustine J, Handel DA, Howell E, et al. Hospital strategies
- 378 for reducing emergency department crowding: A mixed-methods study. Ann Emerg Medi,
- 379 2018; 71(4): 497–505 e494. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2017.07.022
- 380 [7] Singer AJ, Thode HC Jr, Viccellio P, Pines JM. The association between length of
  381 emergency department boarding and mortality. Acad Emerg Medi, 2011; 18(12): 1324–
  382 1329. doi: 10.1111/j.1553-2712.2011.01236.x
- 383 [8] Drew BR. The access-block effect: Relationship between delay to reaching an inpatient
  384 bed and inpatient length of stay. Medi J Aust, 2002; 177: 492–495.
- Imperato J, Darren SM, Leon DS, Gary S. Improving patient satisfaction by adding a
  physician in triage. J Hosp Adm, 2013; 3: 7–13. doi: 10.5430/jha.v3n1p7
- [10] Pines JM, Iyer S, Disbot M, Hollander JE, Shofer FS, Datner EM. The effect of emergency
  department crowding on patient satisfaction for admitted patients. Acad Emerg Medi,
  2008; 15(9): 825–831. doi: 10.1111/j.1553-2712.2008.00200.x
- 390 [11] Fry M, Fong J, Asha S, Arendts G. A 12-month evaluation of the impact of transitional
- 391 emergency nurse practitioners in one metropolitan emergency department. Australas Emerg
- 392 Nurs J, 2011; 14(1): 4–8. doi: 10.1016/j.aenj.2010.10.001
- 393 [12] Steiner IP, Nichols DN, Blitz S, Tapper L, Stagg AP, Sharma L, et al. Impact of a nurse

- 394 practitioner on patient care in a Canadian emergency department. Can J Emerg Medi,
  395 2009; 11(3): 207–214. doi: 10.1017/s1481803500011222
- 396 [13] van der Linden C, Reijnen R, de Vos R. Diagnostic accuracy of emergency nurse
- 397 practitioners versus physicians related to minor illnesses and injuries. J Emerg Nurs, 2010;
- 398 36(4): 311–316. doi: 10.1016/j.jen.2009.08.012
- Jennings N, O'Reilly G, Lee G, Cameron P, Free B, Bailey M. Evaluating outcomes of the
   emergency nurse practitioner role in a major urban emergency department, Melbourne,
- 401 Australia. J Clin Nurs, 2008; 17(8): 1044–1050. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2702.2007.02038.x
- 402 [15] Middleton S, Gardner A, Gardner G, Della P. The status of Australian nurse practitioners:
- 403 The second national census. Aust Health Rev, 2011; 35: 448–454. doi: 10.1071/AH10987
- 404 [16] Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN) Consensus Group Work Group & the
- 405 National Council of State Boards of Nursing APRN Advisory Committee. Consensus
- 406 Model for APRN regulation: Licensure, Accreditation, Certification, and Education. 2008.
- 407 http://www.nonpf.org/associations/10789/files/APRNConsensusModelFinal09.pdf.
- 408 [17] International Council of Nurses. International Council of Nurses Nurse
- 409 Practitioner/Advanced Practice Nursing Network. Definition and characteristics of the role.
- 410 2020. http://international.aanp.org/Practice/APNRoles
- 411 [18] American Association of Nurse Practitioners. All about NPs. 2020.
- 412 https://www.aanp.org/about/all-about-nps/whats-a-nurse-practitioner
- 413 [19] Canadian Nurses Association. Nurse practitioners-untapped resource. 2018.
- 414 https://cna-aiic.ca/-/media/cna/page-content/pdf-en/2019-nurse-practitioners-untapped-
- 415 resource.pdf?la=en&hash=FD0A9731A2C7D00B3F0D23FE0A51BBF89858BC A4
- 416 [20] Australian College of Nurse Practitioners. Annual report. 2019.

417 https://www.acnp.org.au/client\_images/2142541.pdf

- 418 [21] McDevitt J, Melby V. An evaluation of the quality of emergency nurse practitioner services
- 419 for patients presenting with minor injuries to one rural urgent care centre in the UK: A
- 420 descriptive study. J Clin Nurs, 2015; 24(3/4): 523–535. doi: 10.1111/jocn.12639
- 421 [22] McDonnell A, Goodwin E, Kennedy F, Hawley K, Gerrish K, Smith C. An evaluation of
- 422 the implementation of advanced nurse practitioner (ANP) roles in an acute hospital setting.
- 423 J Adv Nurs, 2015; 71(4): 789–799. doi: 10.1111/jan.12558
- 424 [23] Pirret AM, Neville SJ, La Grow SJ. Nurse practitioners versus doctors diagnostic reasoning
- 425 in a complex case presentation to an acute tertiary hospital: A comparative study. Int J Nurs
- 426 Stud, 2015; 52(3): 716–726. doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2014.08.009
- 427 [24] Considine J, Martin R, Smit D, Winter C, Jenkins J. Emergency nurse practitioner care and
  428 emergency department patient flow: A case-control study. Emerg Medi Australas, 2006;

429 18(4): 385–390. doi: 10.1111/j.1742-6723.2006.00870.x

- 430 [25] Byrne G, Richardson M, Brunsdon J, Patel A. An evaluation of the care of patients with
- 431 minor injuries in emergency settings. Accid Emerg Nurs, 2000; 8(2): 101–109. doi:
  432 10.1054/aaen.2000.0102
- 433 [26] Middleton S, Gardner G, Gardner A, Considine J, Fitzgerald G, Christofis L, et al. Are 434 service and patient indicators different in the presence or absence of nurse practitioners?
- 435 The EDPRAC cohort study of Australian emergency departments. BMJ Open, 2019 9(7),
- 436 e024529. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-024529
- 437 [27] Statistics Bureau of Japan. Current population estimates as of October 1, 2019.
  438 https://www.stat.go.jp/english/data/jinsui/2019np/index.html
- 439 [28] Fukuda H, Miyauchi S, Tonai M, Ono M, Magilvy JK, Murashima S. The first nurse

- 440 practitioner graduate programme in Japan. Int Nurs Rev, 2014; 61: 487-490. doi: 441 10.1111/inr.12126
- 442 [29] Fougère B, Morley JE, Decavel F, Nourhashemi F, Abele P, Resnick B, et al. Development
- 443 and implementation of the advanced practice nurse worldwide with an interest in geriatric
- 444 care. J Am Medi Dir Assoc, 2016; 17(9): 782-788. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2016.05.009
- 445 [30] Erin D, Gerald ML, Kendall M. (2015). Impact of trainees on length of stay in the 446 emergency department at an academic medical center. South Medi J, 2015; 108(5): 245-447 248.
- 448 [31] Stephen DG, Stephen EL, Michael S, Elizabeth E, Darren S, Julian S. Why do 'fast track'
- patients stay more than four hours in the emergency department? An investigation of 450 factors that predict length of stay. Emerg Medi Australas, 2018; 30(5): 641-647. doi:
- 451 10.1111/1742-6723.12964

449

- 452 [32] Alexander B, Gil S, Yuri B, Dan H. The emergency department length of stay: Is the time 453 running out? Chin J Traumatol, 2019; 22(3): 125–128.
- 454 doi: 10.1016/j.cjtee.2019.01.008
- [33] Holland LL, Smith LL, Blick KE. Reducing laboratory turnaround time outliers reduces 455 emergency department patient length of stay: An 11 hospital study. Am J Clin Path, 2005; 456
- 457 124(5): 672–674. doi: 10.1309/E9QP-VQ6G-2FBV-MJ3B
- 458 [34] Umesh NK, Michele LJ, Curtis R, Monica BK, Randall T, Saeed RS, William JB. 459 Emergency department physician activation of the catheterization laboratory and 460 immediate transfer to an immediately available catheterization laboratory reduce door-to-
- 461 balloon time in ST-elevation myocardial infarction. Circulation, 2007; 116(1): 67–76.
- 462 doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.106.677401

- 463 [35] Kasagi M, Ohtomo Y, Kawahara K. Analysis of the diversity and problems of the
- 464 emergency medical system in Japan: from the viewpoint of a comparison with the North
- 465 America ER system. Journal of Japanese Assoc Acute Medi, 2009; 20: 349-60.
- 466 [36] Pearson E. Mathematical contribution to the theory of evolution. VII. On the correlation of
- 467 characters not quantitatively measurable. Philos Trans R Soc A, 1900; 195: 1–47. doi:
- 468 10.1098/rsta.1900.0022
- 469 [37] Sheskin DJ. (5th Ed). Handbook of parametric and nonparametric statistical procedures.
  470 Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC; 2011.
- 471 [38] Allerston J, Justham D. A case control study of the transit times through an accident and
- 472 emergency department of ankle injured patients assessed using the Ottawa Ankle Rules.

473 Accid Emerg Nurs, 2000; 8: 148–154. doi: 10.1054/aaen.2000.0104

474 [39] Matsumoto M, Inoue K, Takeuchi K. Quality of care in Japan: An additional strategy.

475 Lancet, 2011; 378(9807): e17. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(11)61841-2

- 476 [40] Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare. Outline of the act on the arrangement of related
- 477 acts to promote work style reform. 2019.
- 478 https://www.mhlw.go.jp/english/policy/employ-labour/labour-
- 479 standards/dl/201904kizyun.pdf
- [41] Kutzleb J, Rigolosi R, Fruhschien A, Reilly M, Shaftic AM, Fruhschien A, et al. Nurse
  practitioner care model: Meeting the health care challenges with a collaborative team. Nurs
- 482 Econ, 2015; 33(6): 297–305.
- 483

# 484 **Supporting information**

485 S1 Table. Association of length of stay in the ED with care provider and each variable.

- 486 S2 Table. Association of length of stay in the ED with care leader, replacing trauma with either
- 487 Outcomes, CT, or XP variables.