

Important declarations

Please remove this info from manuscript text if it is also present there.

Associated Data

Data supplied by the author:

We upload: + Supporting data + Stata script to perform interrupted time-series analysis

Required Statements

Competing Interest statement:

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding statement:

The authors received no funding for this work.

COVID-19 and regional differences in the timeliness of hip-fracture surgery: an interrupted time-series analysis

Davide Golinelli ^{Corresp., 1}, Jacopo Lenzi ¹, Emanuele Adorno ¹, Maria Michela Gianino ², Maria Pia Fantini ¹

¹ Department of Biomedical and Neuromotor Sciences, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

² Department of Public Health Sciences and Pediatrics, University of Turin, Turin, Italy

Corresponding Author: Davide Golinelli
Email address: davide.golinelli@unibo.it

Background. It is of great importance to examine the impact of the healthcare reorganization adopted to confront the COVID-19 pandemic on the quality of care provided by healthcare systems to non-COVID-19 patients. The aim of this study is to assess the impact of the COVID-19 national lockdown (March 9, 2020) on the quality of care provided to patients with hip fracture (HF) in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna, 2 large regions of northern Italy severely hit by the pandemic.

Methods. We calculated the percentage of HF patients undergoing surgery within 2 days of hospital admission. An interrupted time-series analysis was performed on weekly data from December 11, 2019 to June 9, 2020 (≈ 6 months), interrupting the series in the 2nd week of March. The same data observed the year before were included as a control time series with no “intervention” (lockdown) in the middle of the observation period.

Results. Before the lockdown, 2-day surgery was 69.9% in Piedmont and 79.2% in Emilia-Romagna; after the lockdown, these proportions were equal to 69.8% (-0.1%) and 69.3% (-9.9%), respectively. While Piedmont did not experience any drop in the amount of surgery, Emilia-Romagna exhibited a significantly decline at a weekly rate of -1.29% (95% CI = -1.71 to -0.88). Divergent trend patterns in the 2 study regions reflect local differences in pandemic timing as well as in healthcare services capacity, management, and emergency preparedness.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

COVID-19 and regional differences in the timeliness of hip-fracture surgery: an interrupted time-series analysis

Davide Golinelli¹, Jacopo Lenzi¹, Emanuele Adorno¹, Maria Michela Gianino²†, Maria Pia Fantini¹†

¹ Department of Biomedical and Neuromotor Sciences, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

² Department of Public Health Sciences and Pediatrics, University of Turin, Turin, Italy

†Professors Gianino and Fantini contributed equally to this work.

Corresponding Author:

Davide Golinelli¹

Via San Giacomo 12, 40126 Bologna, Italy

Email address: davide.golinelli@unibo.it

24 **Abstract**

25 **Background.** It is of great importance to examine the impact of the healthcare reorganization
26 adopted to confront the COVID-19 pandemic on the quality of care provided by healthcare
27 systems to non-COVID-19 patients. The aim of this study is to assess the impact of the COVID-
28 19 national lockdown (March 9, 2020) on the quality of care provided to patients with hip
29 fracture (HF) in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna, 2 large regions of northern Italy severely hit by
30 the pandemic.

31 **Methods.** We calculated the percentage of HF patients undergoing surgery within 2 days of
32 hospital admission. An interrupted time-series analysis was performed on weekly data from
33 December 11, 2019 to June 9, 2020 (≈ 6 months), interrupting the series in the 2nd week of
34 March. The same data observed the year before were included as a control time series with no
35 “intervention” (lockdown) in the middle of the observation period.

36 **Results.** Before the lockdown, 2-day surgery was 69.9% in Piedmont and 79.2% in Emilia-
37 Romagna; after the lockdown, these proportions were equal to 69.8% (-0.1%) and 69.3% ($-$
38 9.9%), respectively. While Piedmont did not experience any drop in the amount of surgery,
39 Emilia-Romagna exhibited a significantly decline at a weekly rate of -1.29% (95% CI = -1.71 to
40 -0.88).

41 Divergent trend patterns in the 2 study regions reflect local differences in pandemic timing as
42 well as in healthcare services capacity, management, and emergency preparedness.

43

44 **KEYWORDS**

45 Hip Fractures, COVID-19, Frail Elderly, Osteoporosis, Interrupted Time Series Analysis, Italy

46

47

48 **Introduction**

49 Worldwide, hip fracture (HF) represents an important public health concern that determines
50 relevant functional impairments in the individuals who experience it, especially the elderly [1, 2].

51 Due to the increasing incidence of osteoporosis, the global number of HFs will reach

52 approximately 8.2 million in 2050 [3]. In Italy, HFs accounted for 99,103 hospitalizations,

53 1,122,714 occupant days and 77,543 surgical procedures in 2018.

54 The growing burden that HF causes on healthcare systems also has to do with the intensive
55 use of healthcare resources required by this condition [4, 5]. HF patients represent a particularly

--

56 challenging patient population [6, 7], due to the high post-operative mortality rate caused by
57 surgery, functional impairment, and limited mobility [4, 5, 8].

58 Timely surgery within 48 hours of hospital admission for HF is a well-established strategy
59 that leads to better functional outcomes and lower mortality rates [7, 9, 10]. The UK National
60 Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and other international guidelines indicate 48
61 hours as the ideal time to operate on a patient with HF. Scientific evidence points out that the
62 earlier the surgery, the better the outcomes in terms of mortality, complications, length of
63 hospital stay, time required for rehabilitation, and patient quality of life [11–13]. For this reason,
64 the percentage of surgical interventions performed within 2 days of hospital admission has
65 become one of the most used health indicators to assess the performance and quality of care. In
66 Italy, specifically, this indicator is used by the *Programma Nazionale Esiti* (National Outcomes
67 Program) to measure and monitor healthcare facilities' performance and standards of care [14].

68 In Europe, more than three quarters (76%) of HF patients aged 65 and over underwent
69 surgery within 48 hours of hospital admission in 2017. In Denmark and the Netherlands, this
70 proportion was greater than 95%, while in Latvia and Portugal this percentage was around 40%
71 [15]. In Italy, this indicator has progressively improved in recent years, reaching a national
72 average of around 70% in 2017 [14].

73 In late February of 2020, the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) [16, 17] started to
74 spread aggressively around many bordering provinces of the largest and most productive regions
75 of northern Italy: Lombardy, Emilia-Romagna, Veneto, and Piedmont.

76 The COVID-19 outbreak had a huge impact on the Italian healthcare system: usual
77 treatment pathways were disrupted, and hospitals were reorganized to face this challenge using
78 the limited healthcare resources available [18]. The Italian National Health Service (*Servizio*
79 *Sanitario Nazionale* [SSN]) struggled to maintain and enhance the surge capacity of services,
80 goods and healthcare workers in order to preserve high standards of care both to COVID-19 and
81 non-COVID-19 patients.

82 To keep COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 patients separated, “Hub and Spoke” models were
83 created [19], and COVID-19-dedicated hospitals were set up to isolate contagious patients.
84 Especially during the national lockdown from March 9 to May 4, elective surgery was cancelled,
85 and only trauma, oncologic and urgent surgeries were allowed [18].

86 As such, we believe that it is of great importance to examine the impact of the healthcare
87 reorganization adopted to confront the COVID-19 pandemic on the quality of care provided by
88 Italy's SSN for conditions of major public concern such as HF. In this study, we assessed
89 whether the imposition of the national lockdown on March 9, 2020, resulted in a shift in the
90 percentage of patients who received timely surgery for HF compared with that of the pre-
91 lockdown period. Separate analyses were performed on two of the regions of northern Italy most
92 hit by the spread of SARS-CoV-2: Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna, with 4.4 and 4.5 million
93 inhabitants, respectively, as of 2019. Identifying similarities and differences in how the two
94 regions faced this unprecedented crisis can be helpful for setting health priorities and identifying
95 entry points to enhance health-system responsiveness [20].

96

97 **Context and setting of the study**

98 Italy's SSN was created in 1978; inspired by the UK national health service, it is funded through
99 general taxation. The 21 regional governments are responsible for providing "essential levels of
100 assistance" to the population through autonomous planning and delivery of healthcare services,
101 making the SSN a "galaxy" of different healthcare systems [21].

102 The regional health system of Emilia-Romagna includes 8 local health trusts (LHTs) with
103 first- and second-level hospitals, 4 university hospitals, 4 research hospitals, and 1 general
104 hospital trust. In the last decade, the region has improved the management of patients with HF by
105 issuing policies and guidelines aimed at reducing the delay of surgery and by implementing
106 specific provisions for postoperative rehabilitation. The regional health system of Piedmont
107 includes 12 LHTs, 3 university hospitals, and 3 general hospital trusts. On average, the
108 catchment areas of Piedmont's LHTs are smaller than those of Emilia-Romagna ($\approx 362,000 \pm$
109 $217,000$ versus $\approx 558,000 \pm 329,000$ inhabitants, respectively) [22].

110 The first cluster of COVID-19 in Italy was detected in Lombardy on February 21, 2020. In
111 the following days, the government adopted an increasing number of decrees to limit large social
112 gatherings, closing schools, universities, bars, and restaurants. Following the decree of March 9,
113 2020, all non-essential business and services were closed. With a national stay-at-home decree,
114 the entire country was put under lockdown.

115 As illustrated in Supplementary Figure S1, Emilia-Romagna and Piedmont were among the
116 regions of Italy earliest and hardest affected by COVID-19. In particular, the province of

117 Piacenza, Emilia-Romagna, was one of the areas of Italy hardest hit by the pandemic due to its
118 proximity to the epicenter of the first outbreak in Lombardy [16, 23, 24].

119

120

121 **Materials & Methods**

122 We collected the hospital discharge records (HDRs) of all patients admitted to the hospitals of
123 Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna with a principal or secondary diagnosis of hip fracture (ICD-9-
124 CM code 820). In keeping with the specification of the indicator adopted by Italy's National
125 Outcomes Program [14], HDRs were excluded from the analysis if any of the following criteria
126 was met:

- 127 • Non-urgent hospital admission;
- 128 • Daytime hospital care, known in Italy as “day hospital admission”, which consists in a one-
129 day admission to the hospital without overnight stay to perform diagnostic procedures and/or
130 surgical, therapeutic or rehabilitative care [25];
- 131 • Transfer from other hospital;
- 132 • Age <65 or >100 years;
- 133 • Polytrauma (diagnosis-related group 484–487);
- 134 • Diagnosis or medical history of malignant tumors (principal/secondary ICD-9-CM code
135 140.0–208.9, 238.6, V10);
- 136 • Death within 1 day of hospital admission and no surgery to repair HF;
- 137 • Admission to a spinal injury unit, rehabilitation hospital or long-term care facility.

138 Hospitalization rates were obtained as the number of hospital admissions for HF in the
139 resident population aged ≥ 65 years per 100,000 inhabitants. Population data were retrieved from
140 the Italian National Institute of Statistics (http://demo.istat.it/index_e.html).

141 Timely HF surgery among the cases described above was defined as any of the following
142 procedures initiated within 2 calendar days after admission to the hospital: closed reduction of
143 fracture without internal fixation (ICD-9-CM codes 79.00, 79.05); closed reduction of fracture
144 with internal fixation (79.10, 79.15); open reduction of fracture without internal fixation (79.20,
145 79.25); open reduction of fracture with internal fixation (79.30, 79.35); total or partial hip
146 replacement (81.51, 81.52). We also investigated the percentage of cases surgically treated the
147 next day (day 1) and on the same day as hospital admission (day 0).

148 Hospital admission rates were standardized by sex and age (<80, 80–84, 85–89, ≥90 years)
 149 with direct standardization to Italy’s 2020 elderly population. Percentages of surgery were
 150 standardized by sex, age and enhanced Charlson index score (0, 1, ≥2) [26], with direct
 151 standardization to the overall population of HFs observed in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna over
 152 the study period.

153 For descriptive purposes, we also gathered some characteristics of the admitting hospitals;
 154 more specifically, we collected hospital type/ownership, hospital location, and average annual
 155 caseload of hip fractures.

156

157 **Statistical analysis**

158 Owing to the availability of multiple weekly observations in the pre-lockdown and post-
 159 lockdown period, we performed an interrupted time-series analysis (ITSA), a quasi-experimental
 160 design that represents a robust alternative to randomized studies when the latter are not feasible
 161 [27]. Lockdown-period data were collected from March 11, 2020, to June 9, 2020 (13 weeks, i.e.
 162 ≈ 3 months), while pre-lockdown data were collected from December 11, 2019 to March 10,
 163 2020 (13 weeks). To reduce any confounding factors, the same data observed in Piedmont and
 164 Emilia-Romagna the year before, i.e. between December 11, 2018 and June 10, 2019 (26 weeks),
 165 were included as a control time series with no intervention in the middle of the observation
 166 period.

167 A two-group ITSA regression model can be specified as:

$$168 \quad Y_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 T_t + \alpha_2 X_t + \alpha_3 X_t T_t + \alpha_4 Z + \alpha_5 Z T_t + \alpha_6 Z X_t + \alpha_7 Z X_t T_t + \epsilon_t$$

169 where Y_t is an aggregated outcome variable measured at each time point t , T_t is time since the
 170 start of the study, X_t is a dummy variable representing the intervention (pre = 0, post = 1), Z is a
 171 dummy variable to denote the cohort assignment (“treatment” or control), and ϵ_t is the random
 172 error term. Here is the interpretation of the seven parameters that constitute the linear model:

- 173 • α_0 = intercept of the outcome variable in the control group;
- 174 • α_1 = slope of the outcome in the control group until the introduction of the intervention;
- 175 • α_2 = change in the level of the outcome that occurs in the period immediately following
 176 the introduction of the intervention in the control group;

- 177 • $\text{CE} \leq_3$ = difference between preintervention and postintervention slopes of the outcome in
178 the control group;
- 179 • $\text{CE} \leq_4$ = difference in the level between “treatment” and control prior to intervention;
- 180 • $\text{CE} \leq_5$ = difference in the slope between “treatment” and control prior to intervention;
- 181 • $\text{CE} \leq_6$ = difference-in-differences of the change of level between “treatment” and control;
- 182 • $\text{CE} \leq_7$ = difference-in-differences of slopes between “treatment” and control.

183 As anticipated by the definitions of $\text{CE} \leq_6$ and $\text{CE} \leq_7$, causal inference is provided using the
184 difference-in-differences approach, in which between-period changes in a
185 “treatment”/experimental cohort are compared with changes in a control cohort over a similar
186 timeframe. The two parameters $\text{CE} \leq_4$ and $\text{CE} \leq_5$ are useful to establish whether the “treatment”
187 and control series are balanced on the level and the trajectory of the outcome variable in the pre-
188 intervention period; if $\text{CE} \leq_4$ and $\text{CE} \leq_5$ are significantly different from 0, conclusions drawn
189 from $\text{CE} \leq_6$ and $\text{CE} \leq_7$ are likely to be biased. A visual exemplification of ITSA is provided in
190 Linden and Adams [28].

191 We computed robust (heteroscedasticity-consistent) standard errors to make valid inference
192 about the regression coefficients. According to the Cumby–Huizinga test [29], there was no
193 evidence of autocorrelation.

194 In keeping with the specification of the indicator adopted by the Organization for Economic
195 Co-operation and Development, a sensitivity ITSA was performed on HF surgery after excluding
196 HDRs with a diagnosis of hip fracture in secondary position. All analyses were performed using
197 Stata version 15 (StataCorp. 2017. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 15*. College Station, TX:
198 StataCorp LP) [30]. The significance level was set at 5%, and all tests were two-sided.

199

200 Ethical approval to undertake this research was granted from the *Comitato Etico di Area Vasta*
201 *Emilia Centro* (Submission Number IDECOdE-R (233/2019/0SS/AOUBo)). Access to
202 administrative data was conducted in conformity with the Italian Privacy Code (Legislative
203 decree 196/2003, amended by Legislative Decree 101/2018), which exempts from the obligation
204 to seek written informed consent when using pseudonymized data that are primarily collected for
205 healthcare management and healthcare quality evaluation and improvement. According to
206 Articles 99–110-bis on medical, biomedical, and epidemiological research (Legislative Decree

207 101/2018), when investigators use data collected by healthcare systems or previous studies,
208 consulting all the participants would represent a disproportionate effort, considering that
209 safeguards such as key-coding (pseudonymization) are in place to protect the data.

210

211

212 Results

213 Hospital admissions for HF in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna in the control cohort
214 (December 11, 2018, to June 10, 2019) and in the “treatment” cohort (December 11, 2019 to
215 June 9, 2020) are summarized in Table 1.

216 Both regions experienced a drop in the number of hospitalizations in the 13 weeks following
217 the imposition of the first national lockdown as compared to the previous 13 weeks, although the
218 reduction was more pronounced in Piedmont (Piedmont: 148.8 to 121.6 $\times 100,000$; Emilia-
219 Romagna: 152.2 to 128.7 $\times 100,000$). We registered an increased concentration of admissions to
220 research and university hospitals (Piedmont: 24.0% to 31.4%; Emilia-Romagna: 27.3% to
221 34.3%), combined with a decrease in the relative number of admissions to LHT and private
222 hospitals (Piedmont: 76.0% to 68.6%; Emilia-Romagna: 72.7% to 65.7%). A summary of
223 hospital characteristics before and after the lockdown is provided in Supplementary Table S1.

224 Results of the ITSA on HF hospitalization rates are presented in Table 2 and Figure 1. In
225 Piedmont, in the second week of March 2020 a strong decrease in weekly hospital admissions for
226 HF was observed as compared to the same week of 2019 ($\text{CE} \leq \epsilon = [7.95-10.89] - [11.21-11.93]$
227 $= -2.22 \times 100,000$, 95% CI = -4.88 to 0.44), although this difference failed to achieve statistical
228 significance (P -value = 0.100). In Emilia-Romagna, this difference-in-differences of change of
229 level was weaker ($\text{CE} \leq \epsilon = [8.43-10.56] - [10.37-10.98] = -1.52 \times 100,000$, 95% CI = -3.69 to
230 0.65 , P -value = 0.164). In Piedmont, the drop in the number of hospital admissions was followed
231 by a weekly significant increase in the hospitalization rate ($+0.23 \times 100,000$, 95% CI = 0.03 to
232 0.43 , P -value = 0.027), although the difference-in-differences of slopes was not significant (
233 $\text{CE} \leq \gamma = [0.23+0.10] - [0.06+0.06] = 0.21 \times 100,000$, 95% CI = -0.18 to 0.60 , P -value = 0.291).
234 Similarly, in Emilia-Romagna the hospitalization rate increased weekly ($+0.22 \times 100,000$, 95%
235 CI = 0.11 to 0.34 , P -value < 0.001), but the difference-in-differences of slopes was once again
236 not significant ($\text{CE} \leq \gamma = [0.22+0.21] - [0.20+0.17] = 0.06 \times 100,000$, 95% CI = -0.20 to 0.32 , P -
237 value = 0.629).

238 Percentages of timely HF surgery in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna in the control cohort
239 (December 11, 2018 to June 10, 2019) and in the “treatment” cohort (December 11, 2019 to June
240 9, 2020) are illustrated in Figure 2.

241 In all the study periods preceding the national lockdown, the percentage of surgery initiated
242 within 2 days after hospital admission was higher in Emilia-Romagna than in Piedmont, while
243 between March 11 and June 9, 2020 the standardized percentages of the two regions were similar
244 and just below 70% (Piedmont: 69.8%; Emilia-Romagna: 69.3%).

245 A visual inspection of the ITSA in Figure 3 shows that the pattern of change in weekly
246 percentages of surgical care for HF after the imposition of the national lockdown was different in
247 the two study regions.

248 As confirmed by the regression coefficient estimates presented in Table 3, Piedmont did not
249 experience any raise or drop in the amount of surgery from the second week of March 2020.

250 In Emilia-Romagna, on the contrary, after an initial period of stable or even increased
251 timeliness of surgical care, there was a significant decline at a weekly rate of -1.29% for 2-day
252 surgery (95% CI = -1.71 to -0.88 , P -value < 0.001), -2.27% for 1-day surgery (95% CI = -3.01
253 to -1.54 , P -value < 0.001), and -1.07% for same-day surgery (95% CI = -1.68 to -0.45 , P -value
254 = 0.001). As shown in Table 3, the difference-in-differences of slopes reached statistical
255 significance for 2-day surgery ($CE \leq \gamma = [-1.29-1.28] - [-0.19-0.59] = -1.79\%$, 95% CI = -3.37
256 to -0.22 , P -value = 0.027), 1-day surgery ($CE \leq \gamma = [-2.27-1.61] - [0.07+0.08] = -4.04\%$, 95%
257 CI = -5.59 to -2.49 , P -value < 0.001) as well as same-day surgery ($CE \leq \gamma = [-1.07-0.59] -$
258 $[0.16+0.34] = -2.15\%$, 95% CI = -3.15 to -1.16 , P -value < 0.001).

259 Results were virtually unchanged after excluding secondary diagnoses of HF
260 (Supplementary Table S2 and Figure S2).

261
262

263 Discussion

264 This ITSA was designed to evaluate whether the quality of care received by HF patients changed
265 after the imposition of the COVID-19 national lockdown on early March 2020. Our analysis was
266 restricted to Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna, two large regions of northern Italy severely hit by
267 the pandemic. By identifying similarities and differences in how the two study regions faced this
268 unprecedented crisis, helpful information can be provided for setting health priorities and

269 identifying entry points for health-system improvement in case of future recurrences of the
270 pandemic, in Italy as in other countries. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, there are no
271 published studies that adopted a quasi-experimental design to discern any changes in the quality
272 of HF care during the pandemic.

273 Our findings show that HF hospital admissions declined in both regions during the first
274 weeks of the lockdown, although the difference-in-differences of change of level was slightly
275 more pronounced in Piedmont ($-2.22 \times 100,000$) than in Emilia-Romagna ($-1.52 \times 100,000$). This
276 coherent reduction in hospital admissions suggests that the overall impact of the pandemic was
277 similar in the elderly HF populations of the two study regions. This decline has several possible
278 explanations.

279 Due to the uncontrolled spread of the epidemic across the regions of northern Italy, the
280 central government declared the national lockdown on March 9, 2020. Lifestyle changes, fear of
281 the contagion and sense of civic responsibility [31] may have determined an overall reduction in
282 the number of patients accessing emergency departments (EDs) and hospitals, as confirmed by
283 previous research conducted in Italy and other countries [32, 33]. Moreover, by confining people
284 at home, interrupting work activities and reducing road traffic, the frequency of travel- and work-
285 related injuries dropped [34]; as a consequence, ED visits and hospitalizations for trauma have
286 decreased. Some authors report that domestic accidents had a relative increase of 94% on the
287 total accesses to trauma facilities [35], determining an increase in the proportion of
288 hospitalizations for HF in the age group ≥ 65 [36, 37] during the first wave of the pandemic.
289 However, in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna, despite the continued occurrence of domestic
290 accidents, the reduction in overall mobility due to the lockdown led to a decline in the number of
291 HFs and consequent hospitalizations.

292 We found a relative increase in HF hospital admissions to third-level hospitals. We expect
293 this to be the consequence of the reorganization of the healthcare services of both regions. HF
294 and traumas activities were shifted to dedicated hubs, chosen at the regional level among those
295 with more experience and treatment capacity/volumes, in order to maintain high-performance
296 levels even under stressful situations [18, 34, 38]. These decisions were made to ensure a rapid
297 increase in the number of intensive care units (ICUs), allowing recruitment as well as
298 replacement for healthcare workers to better assist COVID-19 patients.

299 The most important result of our study is that the percentage of timely surgery for HF (i.e.,
300 within 2 days of hospital admission) remained virtually unchanged in Piedmont after the
301 imposition of the national lockdown, while the Emilia-Romagna system, although performing
302 better than Piedmont before the pandemic, worsened sharply at a weekly rate of -1.29% (95% CI
303 $= -1.71$ to -0.88) until reaching a proportion of timely surgery below 70% between May and
304 June 2020. It should be noted that, despite this decline, both regions still maintain performances
305 above the 60% threshold established by the Italian Ministry of Health with the Decree 70/2015,
306 defining the qualitative, structural, technological and quantitative standards of hospital care.
307 According to our ITSA, in Emilia-Romagna the change in trend after the national lockdown was
308 significantly larger than that observed the year before ($[-1.29-1.28] - [-0.19-0.59] = -1.79\%$,
309 95% CI $= -3.37$ to -0.22). This remarkable finding requires an explanation that might be sought
310 in the different capacity and capability of the two regional healthcare systems to respond to the
311 emergency, as well as in the local timing of the epidemic onset.

312 We acknowledge that the ability to intervene in time on HF's relies both on patients' clinical
313 condition, such as comorbidities or clinical instability management (e.g. coagulation problems)
314 [39], and healthcare services' organization [39–41]. However, possible reasons for interregional
315 differences should be attributed to organizational rather than clinical aspects of care; indeed,
316 Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna have slightly different health systems. Like neighboring
317 Lombardy, Piedmont has a hospital-focused system that struggled in the first months to catch up
318 with SARS-CoV-2 infections, due to the lack of a strong primary care system, but that might
319 have ensured high standards of care for non-COVID-19 patients requiring specialized acute
320 settings [22]. Emilia-Romagna relies on a mixed healthcare system, with strong hospital facilities
321 and a well-developed primary care network.

322 That said, the pandemic hit Emilia-Romagna harder and earlier than Piedmont. Official data
323 report that Piedmont surpassed Emilia-Romagna's hospital burden of COVID-19 on April 10,
324 2020, about one month after the imposition of the national lockdown, and that reached Emilia-
325 Romagna in terms of cumulative incidence of COVID-19 on April 22, 2020, about 6 weeks after
326 (Supplementary Figure S1) [16, 23, 24, 42]. This may suggest that Piedmont had more time than
327 Emilia-Romagna to organize a proper response to the crisis.

328 Given these considerations, for the first time since data recording began, the percentage of
329 timely HF surgery in Emilia-Romagna dropped off. This is most likely due to organizational

330 issues related to the emergency, such as the management of testing procedures or the
331 enhancement of the overall capacity of the healthcare facilities. The need for COVID-19 testing
332 procedures before being admitted to the operating room (OR) is an organizational factor that may
333 have increased waiting times. Similarly, waiting for preoperative cardiac tests and other
334 laboratory results may have played a role in delaying surgery [40]. A recent study describes how
335 in Lombardy's hospitals, for instance, patients were isolated at admission and sent to a "filtering"
336 ward until the result of nasopharyngeal swabs became available, with a mean response delay, at
337 that time, of 12 to 24 hours [43]. However, our findings cannot be generalized to non-elderly
338 populations and to conditions other than HF, given that a number of treatment pathways
339 succeeded to maintain high standards of care in Emilia-Romagna. For instance, although overall
340 hospital admissions decreased in a way similar to those for HF, management and outcomes of
341 patients hospitalized with acute myocardial infarction during the same period remained
342 unchanged [44].

343 Another aspect to be considered is the workforce surge capacity of healthcare facilities
344 during the pandemic. After the transfer of human resources to sustain ICUs, anesthesiologists
345 may have been under pressure to divide their time between ICUs and ORs, orthopedic surgeons
346 may have been underused or assigned to internal medicine activities in COVID-19 wards, and
347 nurses may have had to adapt to different surgical procedures [43]. Furthermore, donning
348 personal protective equipment and observing COVID-19-related safety protocols are time-
349 consuming activities that may have created further delays in providing urgent orthopedic care.
350 As a matter of fact, this has an impact on ORs' capacity and readiness, increasing both the "first-
351 case delay", which is an indicator of the delay from the scheduled time for skin incision on the
352 first patient of the day, and the "turnover time", which is the time required for the exit of the
353 patient from the OR, the removal of waste and contaminated surgical instruments, room
354 cleaning, and the entrance of the next patient [43].

355 All these critical aspects might be responsible for the delay in the treatment of patients with
356 HF in Emilia-Romagna after the pandemic outbreak. This highlights the importance of pandemic
357 preparedness and response plans that should include healthcare management issues to respond
358 not only to patients directly affected by the pathogen but also to other patients needing healthcare
359 assistance, such as those with HF or other acute and chronic diseases.

360

361 **Strengths and limitations**

362 The results of this study should be interpreted considering its strengths and limitations. ITSA is a
363 quasi-experimental research design with a potentially high degree of internal validity, and the
364 addition of a control group (i.e., 2018/19 data) strengthens the causal inference that can be drawn
365 from its results [45]. By standardizing rates, we also accounted for individual-level confounding
366 differences to evaluate the outcomes of interest at the population level, but ITSA does not allow
367 inferences about the patients that make up the experimental and control cohorts. Another
368 limitation to our study is that we did not have access to the hospital reorganization protocols of
369 Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna, so we could not test which one of several potential factors
370 played the leading role in determining our findings. Other limitations are common to all studies
371 based on healthcare administrative data, including lack of accuracy and differences in the coding
372 criteria over time as well as across individuals and institutions. However, there is no reason to
373 believe that such potential source of information bias might have significantly affected our
374 difference-in-differences estimates.

375

376

377 **Conclusions**

378 In this quasi-experimental study, we found that the COVID-19 pandemic had a similar impact on
379 the HF hospitalization rates of Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna, two of the regions hit earliest and
380 hardest by the virus in Europe, with a coherent relative reduction in HF-related hospitalizations.
381 Conversely, the healthcare services response was different: Piedmont managed to maintain pre-
382 pandemic standards of care, while Emilia-Romagna performed worse despite starting from a
383 better performance level.

384 Our findings show to what extent the percentage of timely surgery for HF was modified by
385 the pandemic, reflecting local differences in terms of healthcare management, emergency
386 preparedness and response factors. Although there is urgent need for timely and effective
387 management of COVID-19 patients, it is essential not to forget about other acute and chronic
388 diseases, such as HF's. This draws attention to the enhancement of health services' capacity
389 during emergencies, focusing on the prevention of collateral damage to patients with other
390 diseases, which should be an integral part of any preparedness and response plan aiming to tackle
391 health crises.

392
393
394

395 **References**

- 396 1. Tedesco D, Gibertoni D, Rucci P, et al (2018) Impact of rehabilitation on mortality and
397 readmissions after surgery for hip fracture. *BMC Health Serv Res* 18:701.
398 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-018-3523-x>
- 399 2. Svedbom A, Hernlund E, Ivergård M, et al (2013) Osteoporosis in the European Union: A
400 compendium of country-specific reports. *Arch Osteoporos* 8:.
401 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11657-013-0137-0>
- 402 3. Sambrook P, Cooper C (2006) Osteoporosis. *Lancet* (London, England) 367:2010–8.
403 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(06\)68891-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(06)68891-0)
- 404 4. Beaupre LA, Khong H, Smith C, et al (2019) The impact of time to surgery after hip
405 fracture on mortality at 30- and 90-days: Does a single benchmark apply to all? *Injury*
406 50:950–955. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2019.03.031>
- 407 5. Haentjens P, Magaziner J, Colón-Emeric CS, et al (2010) Meta-analysis: excess mortality
408 after hip fracture among older women and men. *Ann Intern Med* 152:380–90.
409 <https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-152-6-201003160-00008>
- 410 6. Hansen L, Mathiesen AS, Vestergaard P, et al (2013) A health economic analysis of
411 osteoporotic fractures: who carries the burden? *Arch Osteoporos* 8:126.
412 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11657-013-0126-3>
- 413 7. Moja L, Piatti A, Pecoraro V, et al (2012) Timing Matters in Hip Fracture Surgery:
414 Patients Operated within 48 Hours Have Better Outcomes. A Meta-Analysis and Meta-
415 Regression of over 190,000 Patients. *PLoS One* 7:.
416 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0046175>
- 417 8. Braithwaite RS, Col NF, Wong JB (2003) Estimating Hip Fracture Morbidity, Mortality
418 and Costs. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 51:364–370. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1532-5415.2003.51110.x>
- 420 9. Carretta E, Boichichio V, Rucci P, et al (2011) Hip fracture: effectiveness of early surgery
421 to prevent 30-day mortality. *Int Orthop* 35:419–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-010-1004-x>
- 423 10. Shiga T, Wajima Z, Ohe Y (2008) Is operative delay associated with increased mortality
424 of hip fracture patients? Systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression. *Can J*
425 *Anesth* 55:146–154. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03016088>

- 426 11. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) (2017) The management of hip
427 fracture in adults. *Natl. Clin. Guidel. Cent.* 1–628
- 428 12. SIOT (2021) Linee Guida - Fratture del Femore Prossimale nell'Anziano
- 429 13. Bhandari M, Swiontkowski M (2017) Management of Acute Hip Fracture. *N Engl J Med*
430 377:2053–2062. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMcp1611090>
- 431 14. Ministero della Salute - Agenas (2019) Programma Nazionale Esiti – PNE Edizione 2019
- 432 15. OECD/European Union (2020) Health at a Glance: Europe 2020. OECD
- 433 16. Gibertoni D, Adja KYC, Golinelli D, et al (2021) Patterns of COVID-19 related excess
434 mortality in the municipalities of Northern Italy during the first wave of the pandemic.
435 *Health Place* 67:102508. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2021.102508>
- 436 17. Lavezzo E, Franchin E, Ciavarella C, et al (2020) Suppression of a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak
437 in the Italian municipality of Vo'. *Nature* 584:425–429. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2488-1)
438 020-2488-1
- 439 18. Placella G, Salvato D, Delmastro E, et al (2020) CoViD-19 and ortho and trauma surgery:
440 The Italian experience. *Injury* 51:1403–1405
- 441 19. Regione Emilia - Romagna Direzione Generale Cura della Persona Salute e Welfare
442 (2020) Piano di riorganizzazione per i ricoveri in regime di terapia intensiva e in aree di
443 assistenza ad alta intensità di cura
- 444 20. Williams GA, Maier CB, Scarpetti G, et al (2020) What strategies are countries using to
445 expand health workforce surge capacity during the Covid-19 pandemic? *TEN* 26:51
- 446 21. Golinelli D, Toscano F, Bucci A, et al (2017) Health Expenditure and All-Cause Mortality
447 in the 'Galaxy' of Italian Regional Healthcare Systems: A 15-Year Panel Data Analysis.
448 *Appl Health Econ Health Policy* 15:773–783. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40258-017-0342-x>
- 449 22. Casula M, Terlizzi A, Toth F (2020) I servizi sanitari regionali alla prova del COVID-19.
450 *Riv Ital di Polit Pubbliche* XV:307–336. <https://doi.org/10.1483/98732>
- 451 23. Gatto M, Bertuzzo E, Mari L, et al (2020) Spread and dynamics of the COVID-19
452 epidemic in Italy: Effects of emergency containment measures. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*
453 117:10484–10491. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2004978117>
- 454 24. Riviaccio BA, Luconi E, Boracchi P, et al (2020) Heterogeneity of covid-19 outbreak in
455 italy. *Acta Biomed* 91:31–34. <https://doi.org/10.23750/abm.v91i2.9579>
- 456 25. Lenzi J, Luciano L, McDonald KM, et al (2014) Empirical examination of the indicator

- 457 'pediatric gastroenteritis hospitalization rate' based on administrative hospital data in
458 Italy. *Ital J Pediatr* 40:14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1824-7288-40-14>
- 459 26. Quan H, Sundararajan V, Halfon P, et al (2005) Coding Algorithms for Defining
460 Comorbidities in ICD-9-CM and ICD-10 Administrative Data. *Med Care* 43:
- 461 27. Shadish WR, Cook TD, Campbell DT (2002) Quasi-experiments: interrupted time-series
462 designs. In: *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal*
463 *inference*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, USA, pp 171–206
- 464 28. Linden A, Adams JL (2011) Applying a propensity score-based weighting model to
465 interrupted time series data: improving causal inference in programme evaluation. *J Eval*
466 *Clin Pract* 17:1231–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01504.x>
- 467 29. Cumby RE, Huizinga J (1992) Testing the Autocorrelation Structure of Disturbances in
468 Ordinary Least Squares and Instrumental Variables Regressions. *Econometrica* 60:185–
469 195. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2951684>
- 470 30. Linden A (2015) Conducting Interrupted Time-series Analysis for Single- and Multiple-
471 group Comparisons. *Stata J* 15:480–500. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536867X1501500208>
- 472 31. Rosenbaum L (2020) The Untold Toll — The Pandemic's Effects on Patients without
473 Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 382:2368–2371. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMms2009984>
- 474 32. Jeffery MM, D'Onofrio G, Paek H, et al (2020) Trends in Emergency Department Visits
475 and Hospital Admissions in Health Care Systems in 5 States in the First Months of the
476 COVID-19 Pandemic in the US. *JAMA Intern Med* 180:1328.
477 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3288>
- 478 33. Santi L, Golinelli D, Tampieri A, et al (2020) Non-COVID-19 patients in times of
479 pandemic: Decreased emergency department visits and increased out-of-hospital mortality
480 in Northern Italy. *medRxiv* 2020.11.10.20229237
- 481 34. Dolci A, Marongiu G, Leinardi L, et al (2020) The Epidemiology of Fractures and
482 Muskulo-Skeletal Traumas During COVID-19 Lockdown: A Detailed Survey of 17.591
483 Patients in a Wide Italian Metropolitan Area. *Geriatr Orthop Surg Rehabil* 11:.
484 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2151459320972673>
- 485 35. Maniscalco P, Poggiali E, Quattrini F, et al (2020) Proximal femur fractures in covid-19
486 emergency: The experience of two orthopedics and traumatology departments in the first
487 eight weeks of the Italian epidemic. *Acta Biomed* 91:89–96.

- 488 <https://doi.org/10.23750/abm.v91i2.9636>
- 489 36. Nuñez JH, Sallent A, Lakhani K, et al (2020) Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on an
490 Emergency Traumatology Service: Experience at a Tertiary Trauma Centre in Spain.
491 *Injury* 51:1414–1418. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2020.05.016>
- 492 37. Ogliari G, Lunt E, Ong T, et al (2020) The impact of lockdown during the COVID-19
493 pandemic on osteoporotic fragility fractures: an observational study. *Arch Osteoporos*
494 15:156. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11657-020-00825-1>
- 495 38. Grassi A, Pizza N, Tedesco D, Zaffagnini S (2020) The COVID-19 outbreak in Italy:
496 perspectives from an orthopaedic hospital. *Int Orthop* 44:1543–1547.
497 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-020-04617-7>
- 498 39. Fantini MP, Fabbri G, Laus M, et al (2011) Determinants of surgical delay for hip
499 fracture. *Surgeon* 9:130–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surge.2010.11.031>
- 500 40. Lizaur-Utrilla A, Gonzalez-Navarro B, Vizcaya-Moreno MF, et al (2019) Reasons for
501 delaying surgery following hip fractures and its impact on one year mortality. *Int Orthop*
502 43:441–448. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-018-3936-5>
- 503 41. Sheehan KJ, Sobolev B, Villán Villán YF, Guy P (2017) Patient and system factors of
504 time to surgery after hip fracture: a scoping review. *BMJ Open* 7:e016939.
505 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016939>
- 506 42. Italian Civil Protection Department (2020) Official Italian data about COVID-19. In:
507 Online. <https://github.com/pcm-dpc/COVID-19>. Accessed 28 Feb 2021
- 508 43. Andreato M, Faraldi M, Bucci E, et al (2020) Operating room efficiency and timing
509 during coronavirus disease 2019 outbreak in a referral orthopaedic hospital in Northern
510 Italy. *Int Orthop* 44:2499–2504. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-020-04772-x>
- 511 44. Campo G, Fortuna D, Berti E, et al (2021) In- and out-of-hospital mortality for myocardial
512 infarction during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in Emilia-Romagna, Italy: A
513 population-based observational study. *Lancet Reg Heal - Eur* 100055.
514 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanpe.2021.100055>
- 515 45. Bärnighausen T, Tugwell P, Röttingen JA, et al (2017) Quasi-experimental study designs
516 series—paper 4: uses and value. *J Clin Epidemiol* 89:21–29.
517 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.03.012>
- 518

519 **TABLES**

520

521 **Table 1** Hospital admissions for hip fracture ($\times 100,000$ inhabitants) in Piedmont and Emilia-
522 Romagna, Italy, by 13-week observation period.

523

524 **Table 2** Regression table of interrupted time-series analysis on weekly sex- and age-standardized
525 hip-fracture hospitalization rates in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna before and after Italy's
526 COVID-19 national lockdown; data observed the year before (2018/19) are used for comparison.

527

528 **Table 3** Regression table of interrupted time-series analysis on weekly sex-, age- and
529 comorbidity-standardized percentage of surgery for hip fracture in Piedmont and Emilia-
530 Romagna in the 13 weeks before and after Italy's COVID-19 national lockdown; data observed
531 the year before (2018/19) are used for comparison.

532

533 **FIGURES**

534

535 **Fig. 1** Interrupted time-series analysis of weekly sex- and age-standardized hip-fracture
536 hospitalization rates in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna in the 13 weeks before and after Italy's
537 COVID-19 national lockdown (dashed vertical line); data observed the year before (2018/19) are
538 used for comparison

539 *Note:* The last day of the control period is June 10, 2019, because 2019 is a common (non-leap) year.

540

541 **Fig. 2** Hip-fracture surgery initiated within 2 days, within 1 day and on the same day as hospital
542 admission in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna, Italy, by 13-week observation period

543 *Note:* All the rates are standardized by sex, age and enhanced Charlson index with direct standardization
544 to the overall composition of hip fractures included in the study.

545

546 **Fig. 3** Interrupted time-series analysis of weekly sex-, age- and comorbidity-standardized
547 percentages of hip-fracture surgery in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna in the 13 weeks before and
548 after Italy's COVID-19 national lockdown (dashed vertical line); data observed the year before
549 (2018/19) are used for comparison

550 *Note:* The last day of the control period is June 10, 2019, because 2019 is a common (non-leap) year.

551

552 **SUPPLEMENTS**

553

554 **Fig. S1** Prevalence of COVID-19-associated hospitalizations and cumulative incidence of
555 COVID-19 cases ($\times 100,000$ population) in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna and Italy between
556 February 24, 2020 and June 9, 2020.

557

558 **Table S1** Characteristics of the admitting hospitals in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna between
559 November 20, 2019 and June 30, 2020, by 13-week period; values are counts (percentages).

560

561 **Table S2** Hip-fracture surgery (%) initiated within 2 days, within 1 day and on the same day as
562 hospital admission in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna, Italy, by 13-week observation period;
563 secondary diagnoses of upper femur fracture are excluded (153 in Piedmont and 125 in Emilia-
564 Romagna).

565

566 **Fig. S2** Interrupted time-series analysis of weekly sex-, age- and comorbidity-standardized
567 percentages of hip-fracture surgery in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna in the 13 weeks before and
568 after Italy's COVID-19 national lockdown (dashed vertical line); data observed the year before
569 (2018/19) are used for comparison. Secondary diagnoses of upper femur fracture are excluded
570 (153 in Piedmont and 125 in Emilia-Romagna).

571

572

573

574

Table 1 (on next page)

Tables

1 **TABLES**

2

3 **Table 1** Hospital admissions for hip fracture ($\times 100,000$ inhabitants) in Piedmont and Emilia-
4 Romagna, Italy, by 13-week observation period

Thirteen-week observation period	Piedmont			Emilia-Romagna		
	<i>n</i>	Crude rate	Standardized rate ^a	<i>n</i>	Crude rate	Standardized rate ^a
Dec-11-2018 to Mar-11-2019	1788	161.4	159.5	1720	160.5	153.3
Mar-12-2019 to Jun-10-2019	1687	152.3	150.8	1731	161.6	154.6
Dec-11-2019 to Mar-10-2020	1698	152.2	148.8	1730	160.3	152.2
Mar-11-2020 to Jun-09-2020	1388	124.4	121.6	1465	135.7	128.7

5 ^a By sex and age with direct standardization to Italy's 2020 elderly population (≥ 65 years).

- 6 **Table 2** Regression table of interrupted time-series analysis on weekly sex- and age-standardized
 7 hip-fracture hospitalization rates in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna before and after Italy’s
 8 COVID-19 national lockdown; data observed the year before (2018/19) are used for comparison

Variable	Piedmont		Emilia-Romagna	
	Coefficient (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value	Coefficient (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value
Intercept	12.59 (11.07, 14.12)	<0.001	12.99 (12.12, 13.87)	<0.001
T_t	-0.06 (-0.24, 0.13)	0.546	-0.17 (-0.29, -0.04)	0.010
X_t	-0.71 (-2.34, 0.91)	0.379	-0.61 (-2.46, 1.24)	0.510
X_tT_t	0.12 (-0.14, 0.38)	0.353	0.37 (0.15, 0.58)	0.001
Z	-0.55 (-2.73, 1.64)	0.616	0.04 (-1.08, 1.15)	0.949
ZT_t	-0.04 (-0.32, 0.24)	0.770	-0.04 (-0.19, 0.12)	0.627
ZX_t	-2.22 (-4.88, 0.44)	0.100	-1.52 (-3.69, 0.65)	0.164
ZX_tT_t	0.21 (-0.18, 0.60)	0.291	0.06 (-0.20, 0.32)	0.629

- 9 *Notes:* T_t is time since the start of the study (December 11), X_t is an indicator variable that equals 1 in the
 10 weeks 11 to 23 of the tropical year (March 11, 2020/March 12, 2019 to June 9, 2020/June 10, 2019), and
 11 Z is an indicator variable that equals 1 in the “experimental” time series (December 11, 2019 to June 9,
 12 2020). The post-lockdown trend between March 11, 2020 and June 9, 2020 can be obtained as $\beta(T_t) + \beta$
 13 $(ZT_t) + \beta(X_tT_t) + \beta(ZX_tT_t)$.
 14 *Abbreviations:* *CI*, confidence interval.

15 **Table 3** Regression table of interrupted time-series analysis on weekly sex-, age- and
 16 comorbidity-standardized percentage of surgery for hip fracture in Piedmont and Emilia-
 17 Romagna in the 13 weeks before and after Italy’s COVID-19 national lockdown; data observed
 18 the year before (2018/19) are used for comparison

Variable	Piedmont		Emilia-Romagna	
	Coefficient (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value	Coefficient (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value
<i>Surgery within 2 days</i>				
Intercept	72.36 (64.95, 79.77)	<0.001	72.73 (65.55, 79.91)	<0.001
T_t	-0.59 (-1.58, 0.40)	0.238	0.59 (-0.25, 1.43)	0.166
X_t	1.37 (-4.99, 7.72)	0.667	-4.39 (-11.21, 2.42)	0.201
X_tT_t	0.80 (-0.25, 1.86)	0.133	-0.78 (-1.80, 0.25)	0.133
Z	-6.84 (-16.14, 2.45)	0.145	-3.11 (-14.56, 8.34)	0.587
ZT_t	1.10 (-0.35, 2.56)	0.133	0.69 (-0.71, 2.09)	0.328
ZX_t	-8.53 (-21.31, 4.26)	0.186	-4.56 (-13.73, 4.60)	0.321
ZX_tT_t	-1.04 (-2.75, 0.67)	0.227	-1.79 (-3.37, -0.22)	0.027
<i>Surgery within 1 day</i>				
Intercept	46.62 (38.34, 54.90)	<0.001	42.23 (35.33, 49.13)	<0.001
T_t	-0.30 (-1.35, 0.74)	0.559	-0.08 (-0.93, 0.78)	0.858
X_t	-2.49 (-8.94, 3.96)	0.441	0.57 (-8.19, 9.33)	0.897
X_tT_t	0.68 (-0.42, 1.77)	0.220	0.15 (-1.02, 1.32)	0.795
Z	-6.24 (-16.29, 3.80)	0.217	-5.50 (-14.36, 3.35)	0.217
ZT_t	0.95 (-0.49, 2.39)	0.192	1.69 (0.58, 2.80)	0.004
ZX_t	0.28 (-15.01, 15.57)	0.971	0.66 (-11.20, 12.53)	0.911
ZX_tT_t	-1.40 (-3.34, 0.53)	0.151	-4.04 (-5.59, -2.49)	<0.001
<i>Surgery on the same day</i>				
Intercept	15.77 (11.47, 20.08)	<0.001	10.41 (6.73, 14.10)	<0.001
T_t	-0.51 (-1.03, 0.01)	0.053	-0.34 (-0.85, 0.17)	0.181
X_t	2.99 (0.01, 5.98)	0.050	1.27 (-3.22, 5.75)	0.572
X_tT_t	0.61 (0.05, 1.17)	0.032	0.50 (-0.08, 1.08)	0.088
Z	-4.08 (-9.17, 1.01)	0.113	-3.62 (-8.56, 1.33)	0.147
ZT_t	0.64 (0.01, 1.27)	0.048	0.93 (0.19, 1.67)	0.015
ZX_t	-5.80 (-11.37, -0.22)	0.042	0.30 (-7.51, 8.11)	0.938
ZX_tT_t	-0.57 (-1.37, 0.22)	0.154	-2.15 (-3.15, -1.16)	<0.001

19 Notes: T_t is time since the start of the study (December 11), X_t is an indicator variable that equals 1 in the
 20 weeks 11 to 23 of the tropical year (March 11, 2020/March 12, 2019 to June 9, 2020/June 10, 2019), and
 21 Z is an indicator variable that equals 1 in the “experimental” time series (December 11, 2019 to June 9,
 22 2020). The post-lockdown trend between March 11, 2020 and June 9, 2020 can be obtained as $\beta(T_t) + \beta$
 23 $(ZT_t) + \beta(X_tT_t) + \beta(ZX_tT_t)$.

24

Figure 1

Figure 1. Interrupted time-series analysis of weekly sex- and age-standardized hip-fracture hospitalization rates in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna.

Weekly sex- and age-standardized hip-fracture hospitalization rates in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna in the 13 weeks before and after Italy's COVID-19 national lockdown (dashed vertical line); data observed the year before (2018/19) are used for comparisons. *Note:* The last day of the control period is June 10, 2019, because 2019 is a common (non-leap) year.




Figure 2

Hip-fracture surgery initiated within 2 days, within 1 day and on the same day as hospital admission in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna, Italy, by 13-week observation period.

Note: All the rates are standardized by sex, age and enhanced Charlson index with direct standardization to the overall composition of hip fractures included in the study.




Figure 3

Interrupted time-series analysis of weekly sex-, age- and comorbidity-standardized percentages of hip-fracture surgery in Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna.

Weekly sex-, age- and comorbidity-standardized percentages of hip-fracture surgery in the 13 weeks before and after Italy's COVID-19 national lockdown (dashed vertical line); data observed the year before (2018/19) are used for comparison. *Note:* The last day of the control period is June 10, 2019, because 2019 is a common (non-leap) year.

