

1 Triaging and Referring In Adjacent General and 2 Emergency Departments (the TRIAGE trial): a cluster 3 randomised controlled trial 4

5 Stefan Morreel^{1*}, #a, Hilde Philips¹, Diana De Graeve², Koenraad G Monsieurs^{3,4}, Jarl K Kampen⁵,
6 Jasmine Meysman², Eva Lefevre², and Veronique Verhoeven¹
7

8 ¹Department of Family and Population Health, University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

9 ²Department of Economics, University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

10 ³Department ASTARC, University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

11 ⁴Emergency Department, Antwerp University Hospital, Antwerp, Belgium

12 ⁵Department of Epidemiology and Medical Statistics, Antwerp University Hospital, Antwerp, Belgium

13 * Corresponding author:

14 E-mail: stefan.morreel@uantwerpen.be (SM)

15 Abstract

16 **Objectives:** To determine the effectiveness and safety of a tool diverting low urgency patients
17 eligible for primary care from an emergency department (ED) to the adjacent general practitioner
18 cooperative (GPC).

19 **Methods:** Unblinded, randomised controlled trial with weekends serving as clusters (three
20 intervention clusters for each control). The intervention was nurse-led triage using a new tool
21 assigning patients to either ED or GPC. During intervention weekends, patients were encouraged to
22 follow this assignment while it was not communicated to the patients during control weekends (they
23 remained at the ED). The primary outcome was the proportion of patients assigned to and handled
24 by the GPC during intervention weekends. The trial was randomised for the secondary outcome: the
25 proportion of patients assigned to the GPC during intervention and control weekends. Additional
26 outcomes were association of these outcomes with possible confounders (study tool parameters,
27 nurse, and patient characteristics), proportion of patients referred back to the ED by the GPC,
28 hospitalisations, and performance of the study tool to detect primary care eligible patients (with the
29 opinion of the treating physician as the gold standard).

30 **Results:** In the intervention group, 838/6374 patients (13.3%, 95% CI 12.5 to 14.2) were assigned to
31 the GPC (secondary outcome), in the control group 431/1744 (24.7%, 95% CI 22.7 to 26.8). In the
32 intervention group, 599/6374 patients (9.5%, 95% CI 8.8 to 10.3) experienced the primary outcome
33 which was influenced by the chosen MTS presentational flowchart, patient's age, and the nurse.
34 24/599 patients (4.0%, 95% CI 2.7 to 5.9) patients were referred back to the ED of which three were
35 hospitalised. Positive and negative predictive values of the studied tool during intervention
36 weekends were 0.96 (95%CI 0.94 to 0.97) and 0.60 (95% CI 0.58 to 0.62). Out of the patients assigned
37 to the GPC, 2.4% (95% CI 1.7 to 3.4) were hospitalised.

38 **Conclusions:** ED nurses using a new tool safely diverted 9.5% of the included patients to primary
39 care.

40 **ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier:** [NCT03793972](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT03793972)

41 **Funding:** Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO)

42 **Introduction**

43 In many countries, Out-of-hours (OOH) primary care is increasingly organised in General Practitioner
44 Cooperatives (GPCs), and simultaneously, emergency care is provided by emergency departments
45 (EDs) in hospitals. Although there is no clear definition of ‘appropriate’ or ‘inappropriate’ use of the
46 ED, several authors reported that many medical problems presented at the ED could be managed in
47 a primary care setting.[1-4] In the United States, primary care office visits for acute care dropped
48 sharply in 2002-15, while ED visits increased modestly.[5] In Belgium, an ED has the legal obligation
49 to assess and to treat all patients with an emergency medical condition regardless of an individual's
50 ability to pay, which is very similar to the Emergency Medical Treatment & Labor Act in the United
51 States.[6] Patients choose a service based on previous experiences, ease of access, explanation by
52 the doctor about the illness and treatment, the anticipated waiting time, their relationship with their
53 general practitioner (GP), and the perceived nature of the complaint.[7] Diverting patients in
54 emergency departments to primary care services helps patients to make this choice, but little is
55 known about its safety and effectivity.[8-10] Both patients and physicians in Belgium are in favour of
56 co-locating these services.[11] Improved access to OOH primary care was associated with increased
57 primary care utilisation, but did not necessarily lead to a decrease of workload at the ED.[9]

58 Triage is defined as the sorting out and classification of patients or casualties to determine priority of
59 need (urgency classification) and proper place of treatment (in the current study assignment to ED or
60 GPC).[12] Before this trial, almost all EDs in Belgium used nurse triage to determine priority and place
61 of treatment within the hospital but diverting patients to a GPC was only done in experimental
62 settings.[13] The Manchester Triage System (MTS) is one of the few triage systems with a moderate
63 to good validity, it is used worldwide.[13] Three small non randomised trials about the MTS and
64 diversion to primary care revealed promising results.[14-16] An awareness-raising campaign was
65 conducted as a pilot for the current study in order to collect baseline data, to assess the feasibility of
66 local cooperation and to estimate the needed sample size.[18]

67 The objective of the current study was to determine the effectiveness and safety of a nurse triage
68 tool diverting low-risk patients who presented at an ED during OOH care to the adjacent GPC. The
69 trial design is a clustered randomised trial with weekends and bank holidays (from here out we refer
70 to weekends and bank holidays as weekends) serving as units of randomisation and patients as units
71 of analysis. Individual randomisation was not desirable because the triage process is by nature
72 applied to a longer period of at least one working shift. A process and economic analysis of the
73 present trial will be published separately.

74 **Material and Methods**

75 **Study design, setting and participants**

76 Single centre randomised controlled trial from 01/03/2019 to 30/12/2019. Weekends (7.00 PM
77 Friday to 6.00 AM Monday) served as units of randomisation (approximately 200 participants each)
78 and patients as units of analysis. A preparation period of two months for adapting the software,
79 testing procedures, and training the staff was followed by the actual study (01/03/2019 to
80 30/12/2019).

81 This study was performed in the ED of a general hospital staffed by approximately 25 nurses and 10
82 physicians handling 36 743 contacts in 2018. The adjacent GPC, which is open during OOH care,
83 covers a population of 145 000 inhabitants and handled 10 586 consultations in 2018. All 110 GPs
84 working in the area covered by this GPC are obliged to work there approximately one shift per
85 month. The surrounding area is ethnically diverse with a mix of middle-income and socially deprived
86 neighbourhoods. The Belgian healthcare system is organised into primary, secondary, and tertiary
87 care, with open access for patients to all levels. It is mainly organised as a fee-for-service system.

88 All patients with a national insurance number triaged by a nurse at the ED were included. Patients
89 arriving at the ED by an ambulance staffed with a doctor or nurse, patients already admitted to the
90 hospital, and patients referred to the ED by a doctor were excluded because they already underwent

91 triage. See **S12 Research Protocol**. for the entire study protocol and **S13 Minor changes to the study**
92 **protocol**.

93 **Study tool**

94 The MTS (version 3.6) is a tool for prioritisation in the ED. When using the MTS, the nurse chooses
95 one out of 53 presentational flowcharts (e.g., abdominal pain in children). A flowchart consists of a
96 list of discriminators (e.g., mild pain), the presence of which has to be checked in a top-down order.
97 Each discriminator is linked to an urgency category ranging from one (immediate care necessary) to
98 five (non-urgent).

99 For the current study, an extended version of the MTS (eMTS) was created. First, a questionnaire was
100 distributed to a working group consisting of three GPs, two ED-nurses, and two ED physicians. Next,
101 the working group drafted the eMTS during five consensus meetings. The aim of this tool is to
102 identify low-urgency patient eligible for primary care. Due to legal concerns, only patients in urgency
103 categories four and five were allowed to be assigned to the GPC but not all of them are eligible for
104 primary care as some might need hospital care (radiology, complex interventions, hospitalisation. For
105 example, a patient with a deformed joint with mild pain probably needs hospital care (radiology) but
106 has a low urgency category. The working group chose to allow assignment to the GPC when an
107 expected 90% of the GPs would be able to safely help the patient. Wounds requiring sutures for
108 example were assigned to the ED. Babies less than three months old were always assigned to the ED,
109 as some of the GPs might not have enough paediatric experience.

110 Nine MTS flowcharts were not extended. In 18 flowcharts, additional discriminators were created
111 which had to be assessed whenever the urgency category was four or five. Presence of one of these
112 additional discriminators means an assignment to the ED (see Fig 1 for an example). In 26 flowcharts,
113 the only added discriminator was “GP Risk”, defined as an unspecified risk to assign the patient to
114 the GPC according to the opinion of the triaging nurse, or because of age less than three months. The
115 eMTS was integrated into a computer decision support system (E.care ED 4.1) that showed “assign to

116 GPC” when appropriate. The nurses were allowed to overrule the result of this automated eMTS
117 assignment. The eMTS is available upon request.

118 **Fig 1. Example of a Manchester Triage System presentational flowchart with the studied**
119 **extension**

120 GP: General Practitioner

121 PV: Per Vaginam

122 Image based on Emergency Triage: Mackway-Jones K, Marsden J, Windle J, Manchester

123 Triage Group. Emergency triage. Third edition. Ed, 2014, ISBN 9781118299067 p. 66 with kind
124 permission

125

126 **Intervention**

127 All patients presenting at the ED were triaged by an experienced nurse using the eMTS, resulting in
128 an urgency level (one to five) and an assignment (to GPC or to ED). The study was only conducted

129 during OOH care as there were no centralised primary care services available during working hours.

130 In a Belgian observational study, only 1.7% of the GPC patients were in need of urgent hospital care

131 so patients presenting at the GPC were not triaged in the current study.[19] During control weekends

132 the assignment was not communicated to the patients, they all remained at the ED. During

133 intervention weekends patients were encouraged to comply to the assignment but were allowed to

134 refuse it. Patients were informed in the ED about the study using flyers, posters, and a presentation

135 broadcasted on a screen. During intervention weekends, this presentation contained additional

136 information in five languages about the possibility of being assigned to the GPC. All nurses followed a

137 twelve-hour training on using the eMTS, patient communication skills, and the study protocol. In

138 one-hour sessions, the researchers informed emergency physicians (participation 80%) and GPs

139 (participation 33%) about the study.

140 **Outcomes**

141 The primary outcome (effectiveness) was the proportion of patients assigned to the GPC and handled
142 by the GPC during intervention weekends. The secondary outcome was the proportion of patients
143 assigned to the GPC during intervention and control weekends. Additional outcomes were the
144 proportion of patients who did not comply to the assignment; the association between the primary
145 and secondary outcomes and possible confounders (study tool parameters, nurse, patient
146 characteristics, and timing of presentation); proportion of patients within the primary outcome
147 referred back to the ED; admissions to the study hospital; and performance of the eMTS as an
148 instrument to detect patients primary care patients (i.e., a low risk of hospital care). The exploration
149 of the primary outcome after the trial ended was the only outcome not pre-specified, it was added to
150 exclude a Hawthorne effect (the changes in behaviour found are caused by the impact of being
151 studied, not by the intervention).[20]

152 **Sample Size**

153 The impact size of the determinants of the primary and secondary outcomes were unknown prior to
154 this study but were estimated to be in the order of 10-20%. Therefore, based on known volumes of
155 inflow of patients, two weekends (one intervention and one control) would have been sufficient to
156 provide empirical evidence of a statistically significant shift of patients from the ED to the GPC.
157 However, multivariate analyses of the primary and secondary outcome, the additional outcomes
158 (safety), monitoring of serious adverse events and assessment of a possible learning curve required
159 data collection over a longer period of time. Consequently, a convenience sample of 48 weekends
160 months was selected.

161 **Randomisation**

162 Because the primary outcome did not apply to the control group (the study needed randomisation
163 for the secondary outcome and for future financial and process analysis), and because more data on
164 the intervention weekends were needed to assess the additional outcomes, a ratio of three
165 intervention weekends for each control was chosen. The trial intentionally started with two

166 intervention weekends. The authors used an algorithm in Microsoft Excel 2016 to generate random
167 allocation stratified for bank and school holidays, while no more than five consecutive intervention
168 weekends were allowed. The head nurse and one assistant were aware of the randomisation. The ED
169 staff were informed a few hours before their shift. The GPC staff were not informed but could find
170 out during their shift. Patients were not blinded.

171 **Data collection**

172 The following patient characteristics were collected: sex; birthyear; postal code; socioeconomic
173 status (reimbursement status of the Belgian health insurance: increased reimbursement or not); type
174 of admission to the ED (walk-in, arrived by ambulance, or already admitted to hospital); origin (self-
175 referral, referral by GP, referral by specialist); ED physician's post hoc opinion on assignment (to GP
176 or to ED); GP referral back to the ED; admission to the study hospital, and triaging nurse (anonymous
177 identifier ranging from one to 22). After triage, the following study tool parameters were collected:
178 MTS flowchart (52 flowcharts reported in 15 categories); eMTS discriminator; MTS urgency level (one
179 to five), and assignment (ED or GPC). The timing of presentation was registered both at the ED and,
180 when applicable, at the GPC. It had three characteristics: weekend identifier, time period (day,
181 evening, or night), and subjective crowding at the ED (quiet, normal, and busy). Except the subjective
182 crowding, all variables were part of the routine medical records.

183 In order to calculate the complete number of exclusions, the number of patients without a national
184 insurance number was extracted from the ED's software. All other data were collected using
185 iCAREdata, a database for OOH care.[20, 21] iCAREdata links data from the ED and the GPC to each
186 other using the pseudonymised national insurance number.

187 The studied intervention continued after the trial upon request of the participating sites, but a
188 decline in the quality of the ED registrations made some registrations unreliable. To explore the
189 primary outcome after the trial ended, the number of patients originating from the ED as noted by
190 the GPC receptionist was extracted from the GPC's software (Mediris 2.4) both for the study period

191 and one year afterwards. Because the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the Belgian healthcare system
192 mainly during two waves, the months April, November, and December 2020 were excluded.[22]

193 **Ethics**

194 Ethical clearance waiving individual informed consent was obtained from the ethics committee of
195 Antwerp University Hospital (reference 18/37/410) and from the local ethics committee of AZ
196 Monica Deurne (reference 367).

197 **Monitoring**

198 One and six months after the start of the trial, the research team presented interim results to the
199 working group that prepared the study. All staff members and the hospital's ombudsperson were
200 asked to report all serious adverse events possibly related to the study.

201 **Patient and public involvement**

202 A lay person volunteering at the ED of a hospital not participating in this study was involved in the
203 study design, she gave advice about the study protocol and tool. An advisory board with stakeholders
204 from EDs, GPCs and universities gave advice about the study design, discussed the interim analysis,
205 and gave feedback on the results.

206 **Analysis**

207 Bivariate logistic regression was used to calculate odds ratios (OR) of the dichotomous outcomes
208 across multilevel categorical independent variables. Those variables found significant ($\alpha = 0.05$)
209 in the bivariate analysis were incorporated in the multivariate analysis. This multivariate analysis was
210 started by creating three chi-square automatic interaction detection (CHAID) decision trees.[23, 24]
211 Decision tree methodology is a data mining method used for developing prediction algorithms of a
212 dichotomous target variable taking into account the interactions of the independent variables. The
213 algorithm is non-parametric, can efficiently deal with large, complicated datasets, and can accept
214 missing values. Decision trees based on Bonferroni-Holms corrected chi-square tests were
215 constructed separately for the study tool parameters, patient characteristics and timing of

216 presentation (weekend, time period, subjective crowding). K-fold cross validation was used to
217 protect against overfitting. A final decision tree was fitted using the significant variables as they
218 turned out in the three separate analyses. The significant variables in the decision trees were entered
219 in a generalised mixed model considering that observations are nested in nurses, that is, with the
220 nurse as a random intercept. To compare the primary outcome during the study period to the year
221 2020, an unpaired samples student's t-test was used. Details about the statistical analysis and data
222 cleaning can be found in **S14 Statistical Analysis Plan**.

223 IBM SPSS version 26 was used for the CHAID analysis. The generalised linear model was created in
224 Jamovi version 1.6 using the GAMLj module.[26] The epiR package in R version 4.0 was used to
225 calculate predictive values with a 95% CI.[27] For all other analysis, JMP pro version 15 was used.

226 **Results**

227 **Study population**

228 In this study, 9964 patients were assessed for eligibility, of which 1806 patients were excluded
229 mostly because of the lack of a national insurance number or because they were already triaged (Fig
230 2). The intervention group consisted of 6374 patients (78.1%) clustered in 37 weekends. The control
231 group consisted of 1784 (21.9%) patients clustered in 10 weekends. On one bank holiday allocated to
232 the intervention group, the study was unintentionally not conducted. The baseline characteristics of
233 the patients in the intervention and in the control group were similar except for the subjective
234 crowding at the ED (Table 1).

235 **Fig 2. Patient flow through the study (CONSORT flowchart)**

236 ED: Emergency Department

237 GPC: General Practice Cooperative

238 GP: General Practitioner

239 LWBS: Left Without Being Seen

240

241 **Table 1. Baseline characteristics of participants. Values are numbers (percentages).**

Characteristics	Intervention group (%) (n=6374)	Control group (%) (n=1784)	P
Mean age in years (standard deviation)	38 (25)	39 (24)	0.11
Sex			0.95
Women	3149 (49)	880 (49)	
Men	3225 (51)	904 (51)	
Residence			0.14
Nearby*	4481 (70)	1217 (68)	
Others	1873 (29)	558 (31)	
Missing	20 (0)	9 (0)	
Socioeconomic Status			0.18
Low	1642 (26)	494 (28)	
Not low	3716 (58)	1027 (58)	
Missing	1016 (16)	263 (15)	
Manchester Triage System urgency category			0.06
One or two (max. waiting time ten minutes)	413 (6)	104 (6)	
Three (max. waiting time one hour)	2146 (34)	552 (31)	
Four (max. waiting time two hours)	3726 (58)	1097 (61)	
Five (max. waiting time four hours)	89 (1)	31 (2)	
Subjective crowding at the ED			<0.01
Quiet	272 (4)	58 (3)	
Normal	2127 (33)	383 (21)	
Busy	344 (5)	92 (5)	
Missing	3631 (57)	1251 (70)	
Admission to the study hospital	1018 (16)	293 (16)	0.65
Mean number of included patients per weekend (standard deviation)	172 (39)	178 (34)	0.63

242 **Within the four communities covered by the GPC*

243 *ED: Emergency Department*

244 Out of the 22 nurses, five nurses worked significantly less during control weekends (lowest OR, 0.12
245 95%CI 0.04 to 0.38, $p < 0.01$) and seven worked significantly more (highest OR, 3.63 95%CI 2.91 to
246 4.68).

247 **Primary outcome**

248 For 80 out of the 6374 participants in the intervention group the assignment was unknown; almost
249 half of them ($n=34$) left without being seen, the others were seen at the ED. These 80 patients were
250 excluded from the following analysis. Out of the remaining patients, 838/6294 (13.3%, 95% CI 12.5 to
251 14.2) were assigned to the GPC, 196/838 (23.4 %, 95%CI 20.6 to 26.4) refused this assignment,
252 43/642 (6.7% 95%CI 5.0 to 8.9) accepted the assignment but left without being seen. The primary
253 outcome was 599/6374 (9.5%, 95% CI 8.8 to 10.3). See Table 2 for the bivariate analysis of the
254 primary outcome.

255 **Table 2. Bivariate analysis of the primary outcome (all participants in the intervention weekends, excluding those with a missing assignment). For**
 256 **categorical variables with more than four categories, the categories with the highest and lowest primary outcome are reported.**

Determinant	N	Mean primary outcome	DF	Category	Estimate	Wald Chi ²	P-value	Odds ratio (95%CI)
Study tool parameters								
MTS urgency category*	3735	16.0%	1	4: Standard				1
				5: Non-urgent	1.1	15.5	<0.01	2.96 (1.73 to 5.08)
MTS flowchart category	6238	9.4%	14	Unwell adult				1
				ORL Complaints	1.4	51.9	<0.01	3.91 (2.70 to 5.68)
				Chest pain	-3.0	8.5	<0.01	0.05 (0.01 to 0.38)
Patient characteristics								
Age	6294	9.5%	5	0-7 years	0.3	4.0	<0.01	1.34 (1.00 to 1.79)
				8-24 years	0.3	3.7	0.05	1.29 (1.00 to 1.68)
				25-39 years	0.1	0.96	0.33	1.14 (0.88 to 1.48)
				40-54				1
				55-74	-0.5	10.1	<0.01	0.58 (0.41 to 0.81)
				>74	-1.1	22.6	<0.01	0.33 (0.21 to 0.52)
Admission type	6291	9.5%	1	Walk-in				1
				Arrived by ambulance	-2.32	62.6	<0.01	0.10 (0.06 to 0.17)
Sex	6294	9.5%	1	Female				1
				Male	-0.16	3.54	0.06	0.85 (0.72 to 1.01)
Residence	6275	9.5%	1	Nearby				1
				Not living nearby	-0.47	20.4	<0.01	0.63 (0.51 to 0.77)
Socioeconomic	5293	10.4%	1	Normal				1

status				Low		14.7	<0.01	1.42 (1.18 to 1.71)
Timing of presentation								
Weekend	6294	9.5%	36	30/08/2019-02/09/2019				1
				11/10/2019-14/10/2019	0.67	4.12	0.04	1.94 (1.02 to 3.70)
				23/08/2019-26/08/2019	-0.86	3.29	0.07	0.42 (0.17 to 1.07)
Time period	6294	9.5%	2	Day				1
				Evening	-0.31	8.05	<0.01	0.73 (0.59 to 0.91)
				Night	0.35	10.9	<0.01	1.42 (1.15 to 1.76)
Subjective crowding at the ED	2743	8.6%	2	Normal				1
				Quiet	0.76	16.6	<0.01	2.16 (1.49 to 3.12)
				Busy	0.25	1.6	0.21	1.29 (0.87 to 1.91)
Nurse								
Nurse	5967	9.9%	21	Nurse 9				1
				Nurse 4	1.27	25.4	<0.01	3.56 (2.17 to 5.83)
				Nurse 20	-1.06	2.02	1	0.35 (0.08 to 1.49)

257 *DF: degrees of freedom*
 258 *MTS: Manchester Triage System*
 259 *ED: Emergency Department*
 260 *ORL: Otorhinolaryngology*
 261 **: Only for urgency categories four and five because the primary outcome was zero in the other category*

262 The most important determinants of the primary outcome were MTS urgency category (non-urgent
263 versus standard, OR 2.96), MTS flowchart category (ORL (otorhinolaryngology) complaints versus
264 unwell adult OR 3.91), patient's age (above 74 years versus 40-54 years, OR 0.33), admission type
265 (arrived by ambulance versus walk-in OR 0.05), subjective crowding at the ED (quiet versus normal
266 OR 2.16), and nurse (nurse four versus nurse nine OR 3.56).

267 CHAID analysis of the study tool parameters (**S1 Supplementary Figure 1**) showed that the urgency
268 category was primordial: none of the patients in the three highest urgency categories was seen at the
269 GPC, and more patients from urgency category five were diverted to the GPC as compared to
270 urgency category four. Within urgency category four, the flowchart category became a determining
271 factor. Abdominal complaints, ORL complaints, neurological complaints, respiratory complaints,
272 children, unwell adult, and back neck pain led to the GPC in more than 30% of the cases, while limb
273 problems, wounds, chest pain, eye problems, and mental complaints led to the GPC in 5.2% of the
274 low urgency cases. CHAID analysis of the patient characteristics (**S1 Supplementary Figure 2**)
275 revealed admission type as the crucial factor, followed by socioeconomic status, residence, and age
276 as the least determining variable. Finally, CHAID analysis of the timing of presentation (see **S3**
277 **supplementary Figure 3**) showed that during the day, the proportion of the primary outcome was
278 lower when the subjective crowding was normal (7.5%) compared to quiet and busy ED (10.7%). A
279 combined CHAID tree (Fig 3) demonstrates the pivotal role of the study tool components. Only in a
280 selection of flowcharts the admission type and the time period played a significant role.

281 **Fig 3 Combined Chi Square Aided Interaction Detection (CHAID) tree for the primary**
282 **outcome**

283 ORL: Otorhinolaryngology

284 <blank>: no MTS flowchart was registered

285 A comparison of the fixed effects generalised linear model (deviance 2200.6, df 53, AIC 2306.8, BIC
286 2636.7) with the generalised mixed model (deviance 2523.6, df 27, AIC 2577.6, BIC 2745.7) led to

287 rejection of the nurse's random effect in favour of the fixed effects model. In the generalised linear
288 model (for patients within the urgency categories four and five only, N= 3735, mean primary
289 outcome 16%), all variables had a significant effect on the primary outcome (pseudo R-squared .22),
290 with the largest contribution by the MTS flowchart category (**S10 Supplementary table 3**).

291 **Secondary outcome**

292 During the intervention weekends, assignment to the GPC was recorded for 838 out of 6294 patients
293 (13.3%, 95% CI 12.5 to 14.2); during control weekends this proportion was almost twice as high:
294 431/1744 (24.7%, 95% CI 22.7 to 26.8). Bivariate analysis (**S8 Supplementary table 1**) and CHAID
295 analysis (**S4-S6 Supplementary figure 4-6**) of the secondary outcome gave results similar to the
296 primary outcome, but the intervention became the most important determinant after the study tool
297 components. The nurses overruled the automated eMTS assignment in 4.2% (95% CI 3.6-4.7) of the
298 cases within urgency category four and five.

299 **Other outcomes**

300 **Patients within the primary outcome referred back to the ED**

301 Out of the 599 patients within the primary outcome, the GPs referred 24 patients (4.0%, 95% CI 2.7
302 to 5.9) back to the ED (**S9 Supplementary table 2**). The proportion of these referrals was not
303 significantly influenced by the triaging nurse, the patient's characteristics, or the weekend. Four out
304 of the 19 patients with a presentational flowchart category 'neurological complaints' were referred
305 back to the ED, which was significantly higher compared to the reference category 'unwell adult' (OR
306 7.2 95% CI 1.2 to 43.2).

307 One potential serious adverse event was reported, a middle-aged male complaining of mild back pain
308 presented at the ED at 2.00 PM. He was diverted to the GP who prescribed an analgesic and
309 reassured him. Thirty minutes later a taxi brought the patient, who was having a cardiac
310 arrest, back to the ED. During unsuccessful resuscitation a ruptured abdominal aneurysm was
311 diagnosed. After assessing the records of this patient and an interview with the involved staff, the

312 working group judged that the management of this patient would not have been different if he had
313 been assigned to the ED.

314 **Admissions to the study hospital**

315 The overall proportion of hospitalised patients was 1309/8038 (16.3% 95% CI 15.5 to 17.1). This
316 proportion was 31/1236 (2.4% 95% CI 1.7 to 3.4) among patients with an assignment to the GPC. It
317 was not influenced by the intervention ($P=0.56$). Among the 599 patients in the primary outcome,
318 three (0.5% 95% CI 0.2 to 1.5) were admitted to the hospital.

319 **Performance of the study tool to detect primary care patients**

320 Patients without a known assignment to GPC or ED ($n=120$) were excluded from this analysis. During
321 intervention weekends, patients who refused the assignment ($n=200$) were also excluded. For
322 patients within the primary outcome ($n=599$), the gold standard was referral by the GP. Patients
323 referred back to the ED were considered “false positive” ($n=24$), the others true positives ($n=575$)
324 leading to a positive predictive value of 0.96 (95% CI 0.94, 0.97). For patients who accepted
325 assignment to the ED ($n=5452$), the gold standard was the opinion of the ED physician: false negative
326 when these patients were eligible for primary care ($n=797$) or true negative when these patients
327 were not ($n=1196$). The negative predictive value was 0.60 (95% CI 0.58, 0.62).

328 During control weekends the gold standard was the opinion of the ED physician. The positive and
329 negative predictive values were 0.84 (95% CI 0.78, 0.90) and 0.56 (95% CI 0.51, 0.60) respectively.
330 The opinion of the ED physician was not registered at the ED in 4549/7196 (63%) of the patients.
331 Eight out of the 24 physicians provided 94% of the values.

332 **Exploration of the primary outcome after the trial ended**

333 The primary outcome during the intervention weekends calculated on the GPC data was 645, on
334 average 16 patients (standard deviation 8.8) per weekend. In 2020, it remained 16 (standard
335 deviation 6.4, $p=0.43$).

336 Discussion

337 In this trial, 838 (13%) out of the 6374 included patients in the intervention group were assigned to
338 the GPC, of which 599 (71%) were seen at the GPC. Four percent of these patients were referred
339 back to the ED. The primary outcome was mostly influenced by the study tool parameters: urgency
340 category and chosen presentational flowchart. The remaining variability can be explained by factors
341 related to the patient (mostly arriving by ambulance), the triaging nurse, and the timing of
342 presentation. The secondary outcome was roughly influenced by the same determinants. During
343 control weekends, this secondary outcome doubled. The positive and negative predictive values of
344 the studied tool for detecting primary care patients were 0.96 and 0.60 during intervention
345 weekends. The effectiveness remained unchanged after the trial, suggesting that the study induced
346 longer-lasting structural changes in the triage and referral processes.

347 This study was the first cluster-randomised trial about diverting ED patients to primary care. Its
348 strengths lie in the large number of included patients, its real live setting, and its long study period.

349 This study has the universal limitations of a cluster-randomised trial, such as the possibility of
350 undetected imbalance among the study groups, interactions between individuals triaged after each
351 other, and clustering of population characteristics on certain weekends. It was conducted in a single
352 centre adapted to some local habits. The working group was not an independent data monitoring
353 committee as they all worked in the studied services. The opinion of the ED physician about the
354 assignment was well registered, but by a minority of the physicians, making the calculated predictive
355 values prone to observer bias. There was an imbalance between intervention and control groups for
356 the subjective crowding at the ED. This was probably due to a difference in motivation to register this
357 parameter rather than due to an actual difference. An important difference between the studied tool
358 and the original MTS is the discriminator GP Risk which allows a subjective judgment of the triaging
359 nurse, this might reduce generalisability although it resembles every day practice where nurses use
360 their gut feelings.[28]

361 A large study found a 22% increase of the proportion of patients attending the GP with a close
362 collaboration with the ED as compared to the usual care setting, while another study found a decline
363 in the number of patients treated at the ED by 20% after the introduction of a nearby GPC.[28, 29]
364 These results are similar to the secondary, but not the primary, outcome of the current study, so the
365 effectiveness of the studied tool was rather low. Whether or not it is desirable to increase this
366 primary outcome depends on whether the perspective is from the third-party payer, the patient, the
367 service, or the healthcare professionals. This question will be answered in the upcoming process and
368 financial analysis of the current study. Diverting 10% of the included patients to primary care reduced
369 the workload at the ED, but the current study does not allow quantification of this impact. It might
370 influence patient and staff satisfaction; a qualitative study about this aspect will be reported in the
371 near future. The intervention might influence the long-term health seeking behaviour of patients as it
372 is know that patients who were given the opportunity to be treated at a primary care clinic instead of
373 an ED have increased future primary care follow-up compared with standard ED referral
374 practices.[31] The higher primary outcome when the subjective crowding at the ED is quiet indicates
375 that the ability of the studied tool to reduce crowding at the ED might be lower when it is needed the
376 most.

377 The referral rate of patients in the primary outcome to the ED (4%) was similar to the referral rate of
378 the studied GPC for untriaged patients (6%) and in general practice OOH services in the United
379 Kingdom (8.1%). A retrospective study in which all self-referred, low-urgency patients were diverted
380 to the GPC, found a referral rate back to the ED of 20%.[31] The lower referral rate in the current
381 study is probably due to the design of the studied tool. The power of the analysis of the patients
382 referred back to the ED was limited due to their small number. The very low admission rate, both for
383 patients within the primary outcome as for patients with an assignment to the GPC is an indicator of
384 safety. The positive predictive value for an assignment to the GPC of 0.96 in the intervention and
385 0.84 in the control group is another indicator of safety. Because the studied tool seems safe for
386 patients refusing an assignment to the GPC, it might be interesting to study the possibility to oblige

387 patients to follow an assignment to the GPC. Long-term multicentre studies are necessary to confirm
388 these safety findings in larger populations.

389 During intervention weekends, the number of patients left without being seen was higher in the
390 group assigned to the GPC than in the group assigned to the ED. The authors received some
391 anecdotal information about patients attending their own GP after the weekend but were not able to
392 study what happened to all of these patients.

393 Most of the risk factors for the primary outcome (age, presentational flowchart, and timing of
394 presentation) found in the multivariate analysis cannot be influenced by policy so the tool itself
395 should be the focus for improvement. This seems feasible as the nurses followed the studied tool in
396 96% of the cases. The presentational flowchart 'limb problems' has the greatest potential as the
397 nurses indicated a risk for referral to the GP in 1322/1803 (73%) low urgency cases mostly because
398 they thought the patient needed radiology or sutures. In contrast to walk-in patients, those arriving
399 with an ambulance had telephone triage before arriving at the ED. The low proportion of the primary
400 and secondary outcome in these patients implies that is not useful to use studied tool afterwards.
401 The differences in the primary outcome among nurses should be studied further and can be
402 addressed by training. The higher primary outcome during the night demands further study: is it
403 related to patient or nurse factors?

404 The secondary outcome was much higher in the control group than in the intervention group. It is
405 probably easier for a nurse to write down a theoretical assignment to the GPC compared to
406 discussing it with the patient. Qualitative and quantitative follow-up studies about this aspect will be
407 reported soon. Training of the nurses might improve their ability to engage with patients to discuss
408 the proper place of treatment.

409 Only one serious adverse event was reported but it had a fatal outcome so further safety monitoring
410 of the studied intervention is necessary.

411 **Conclusion**

412 In this randomised trial about triaging patients to primary care, ED nurses using a new tool safely
413 diverted 9.5% of the included ED patients to the GPC. Young patients arriving without an ambulance
414 with a typical primary care presentation were more often assigned to the GPC. These results
415 remained stable after the end of the trial.

416 **Acknowledgments**

417 The authors would like to thank Carolyn Daher for proofreading the manuscript, all participating
418 healthcare providers at the emergency department of AZ Monica Deurne, the staff of the general
419 practice cooperative Antwerp East and specially Sander Naeyaert, Ragna Verlent, Joo-Ree Melis,
420 Marc Timmermans, Arnoud Bonemeyer, Edwin Vanbeveren, Lotte Fizev and Guido Michielsen for
421 their extensive help and advice.

422

423

424 References

- 425 1. Kraaijvanger N, Rijpsma D, van Leeuwen H, van Dijk N, Edwards M. Self-referrals in a Dutch
426 Emergency Department: how appropriate are they? *Eur J Emerg Med.* 2016;23(3):194-202. doi:
427 10.1097/MEJ.000000000000216. PubMed PMID: 25380319.
- 428 2. Derlet RW, Ledesma A. How do prudent laypeople define an emergency medical condition?
429 *The Journal of emergency medicine.* 1999;17(3):413-8. Epub 1999/05/25. PubMed PMID: 10338230.
- 430 3. Carret ML, Fassa AG, Kawachi I. Demand for emergency health service: factors associated
431 with inappropriate use. *BMC health services research.* 2007;7:131. Epub 2007/08/21. doi:
432 10.1186/1472-6963-7-131. PubMed PMID: 17705873; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2034385.
- 433 4. Durand A-C, Gentile S, Devictor B, Palazzolo S, Vignally P, Gerbeaux P, et al. ED patients: how
434 nonurgent are they? Systematic review of the emergency medicine literature. *The American journal*
435 *of emergency medicine.* 2011;29(3):333-45.
- 436 5. Chou SC, Venkatesh AK, Trueger NS, Pitts SR. Primary Care Office Visits For Acute Care
437 Dropped Sharply In 2002-15, While ED Visits Increased Modestly. *Health affairs (Project Hope).*
438 2019;38(2):268-75. Epub 2019/02/05. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2018.05184. PubMed PMID: 30715979.
- 439 6. Hyman DA, Studdert DM. Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act: What Every
440 Physician Should Know About the Federal Antidumping Law. *Chest.* 2015;147(6):1691-6. doi:
441 <https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.14-2046>.
- 442 7. Hong M, Thind A, Zaric GS, Sarma S. The impact of improved access to after-hours primary
443 care on emergency department and primary care utilization: A systematic review. *Health policy*
444 *(Amsterdam, Netherlands).* 2020;124(8):812-8. Epub 2020/06/10. doi:
445 10.1016/j.healthpol.2020.05.015. PubMed PMID: 32513447.
- 446 8. Cooper A, Carson-Stevens A, Hughes T, Edwards A. Is streaming patients in emergency
447 departments to primary care services effective and safe? *BMJ.* 2020;368:m462. doi:
448 10.1136/bmj.m462.
- 449 9. Cooper A, Davies F, Edwards M, Anderson P, Carson-Stevens A, Cooke MW, et al. The impact
450 of general practitioners working in or alongside emergency departments: a rapid realist review. *BMJ*
451 *open.* 2019;9(4):e024501-e. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-024501. PubMed PMID: 30975667.
- 452 10. Goncalves-Bradley D, Khangura JK, Flodgren G, Perera R, Rowe BH, Shepperd S. Primary care
453 professionals providing non-urgent care in hospital emergency departments. *The Cochrane database*
454 *of systematic reviews.* 2018;2:CD002097. Epub 2018/02/14. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD002097.pub4.
455 PubMed PMID: 29438575; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6491134.
- 456 11. Schoenmakers B, Van Criekeing J, Boeve T, Wilms J, Van Der Mullen C, Sabbe M. Co-location
457 of out of hours primary care and emergency department in Belgium: patients' and physicians' view.
458 *BMC health services research.* 2021;21(1):282. Epub 2021/03/28. doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-06281-y.
459 PubMed PMID: 33771152; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7995743.
- 460 12. 1991. MeSH subject heading scope]. Available from:
461 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/68014218>.
- 462 13. Morreel S, Colliers A, Remmen R, Verhoeven V, Philips H. How accurate is telephone triage in
463 out-of-hours care? An observational trial in real patients. *Acta clinica Belgica.* 2020:1-6. Epub
464 2020/10/31. doi: 10.1080/17843286.2020.1839719. PubMed PMID: 33124524.
- 465 14. Zachariasse JM, Seiger N, Rood PP, Alves CF, Freitas P, Smit FJ, et al. Validity of the
466 Manchester Triage System in emergency care: A prospective observational study. *PLoS One.*
467 2017;12(2):e0170811. Epub 2017/02/06. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0170811. PubMed PMID:
468 28151987; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5289484.
- 469 15. van Veen M, Steyerberg EW, Lettinga L, Ruijs M, van Meurs AH, van der Lei J, et al. Safety of
470 the Manchester Triage System to identify less urgent patients in paediatric emergency care: a
471 prospective observational study. *Arch Dis Child.* 2011;96(6):513-8. doi: 10.1136/adc.2010.199018.
472 PubMed PMID: 21388968.
- 473 16. van der Straten LM, van Stel HF, Spee FJ, Vreeburg ME, Schrijvers AJ, Sturms LM. Safety and
474 efficiency of triaging low urgent self-referred patients to a general practitioner at an acute care post:

- 475 an observational study. *Emergency medicine journal : EMJ*. 2012;29(11):877-81. Epub 2011/12/14.
476 doi: 10.1136/emered-2011-200539. PubMed PMID: 22158535.
- 477 17. Dias RD, Rios IC, Canhada CL, Fernandes MD, Letaif LS, Bonfa E, et al. Using the Manchester
478 triage system for refusing nonurgent patients in the emergency department: A 30-day outcome
479 study. *Journal of emergency management (Weston, Mass)*. 2016;14(5):349-64. doi:
480 10.5055/jem.2016.0300. PubMed PMID: 27873299.
- 481 18. Morreel S, Philips H, Verhoeven V. Self-triage at an urgent care collaboration with and
482 without information campaign. *Journal of emergency management (Weston, Mass)*. 2019;17(6):511-
483 6. Epub 2020/01/07. doi: 10.5055/jem.2019.0443. PubMed PMID: 31903540.
- 484 19. Philips H, Van Bergen J, Huibers L, Colliers A, Bartholomeeusen S, Coenen S, et al. Agreement
485 on urgency assessment between secretaries and general practitioners: an observational study in out-
486 of-hours general practice service in Belgium. *Acta clinica Belgica*. 2015;70(5):309-14. Epub
487 2015/03/31. doi: 10.1179/2295333715y.0000000017. PubMed PMID: 25819448.
- 488 20. McCambridge J, Witton J, Elbourne DR. Systematic review of the Hawthorne effect: New
489 concepts are needed to study research participation effects. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*.
490 2014;67(3):267-77. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.08.015.
- 491 21. Colliers A, Bartholomeeusen S, Remmen R, Coenen S, Michiels B, Bastiaens H, et al.
492 Improving Care And Research Electronic Data Trust Antwerp (iCAREdata): a research database of
493 linked data on out-of-hours primary care. *BMC research notes*. 2016;9:259. doi: 10.1186/s13104-
494 016-2055-x. PubMed PMID: 27142361; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4855754.
- 495 22. Bartholomeeusen Stephaan PH, Van Royen Paul, Remmen Roy, Coenen Samuel. iCAREdata:
496 Improving Care And Research Electronic Data Trust Antwerp. In: Zenodo, editor. 2017.
- 497 23. Morreel S, Philips H, Verhoeven V. Organisation and characteristics of out-of-hours primary
498 care during a COVID-19 outbreak: A real-time observational study. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(8):e0237629.
499 Epub 2020/08/14. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0237629. PubMed PMID: 32790804; PubMed Central
500 PMCID: PMCPMC7425859.
- 501 24. Kass GV. An Exploratory Technique for Investigating Large Quantities of Categorical Data.
502 *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*. 1980;29(2):119-27. doi:
503 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2986296>.
- 504 25. Lemon SC, Roy J, Clark MA, Friedmann PD, Rakowski W. Classification and regression tree
505 analysis in public health: methodological review and comparison with logistic regression. *Annals of*
506 *behavioral medicine : a publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*. 2003;26(3):172-81. Epub
507 2003/12/04. doi: 10.1207/s15324796abm2603_02. PubMed PMID: 14644693.
- 508 26. The Jamovi Project. Jamovi. 1.6 ed2021.
- 509 27. R development Core Team. R: A language and environnement for statistical computing. 4.0
510 ed: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021.
- 511 28. Roscoe LA, Eisenberg EM, Forde C. The Role of Patients' Stories in Emergency Medicine
512 Triage. *Health Communication*. 2016;31(9):1155-64. doi: 10.1080/10410236.2015.1046020.
- 513 29. van Veelen MJ, van den Brand CL, Reijnen R, van der Linden MC. Effects of a general
514 practitioner cooperative co-located with an emergency department on patient throughput. *World*
515 *journal of emergency medicine*. 2016;7(4):270-3. doi: 10.5847/wjem.j.1920-8642.2016.04.005.
516 PubMed PMID: 27942343.
- 517 30. van Gils-van Rooij ES, Yzermans CJ, Broekman SM, Meijboom BR, Welling GP, de Bakker DH.
518 Out-of-Hours Care Collaboration between General Practitioners and Hospital Emergency
519 Departments in the Netherlands. *J Am Board Fam Med*. 2015;28(6):807-15. doi:
520 10.3122/jabfm.2015.06.140261. PubMed PMID: 26546658.
- 521 31. Doran KM, Colucci AC, Hessler RA, Ngai CK, Williams ND, Wallach AB, et al. An Intervention
522 Connecting Low-Acuity Emergency Department Patients With Primary Care: Effect on Future Primary
523 Care Linkage. *Annals of emergency medicine*. 2013;61(3):312-21.e7. doi:
524 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2012.10.021.
- 525 32. Rutten M, Vrielink F, Smits M, Giesen P. Patient and care characteristics of self-referrals
526 treated by the general practitioner cooperative at emergency-care-access-points in the Netherlands.

527 BMC Fam Pract. 2017;18(1):62. doi: 10.1186/s12875-017-0633-1. PubMed PMID: 28499354; PubMed
528 Central PMCID: PMC5429563.
529

530 **Supporting information captions**

531 **S1 Supplementary Figure 1. Primary Outcome - Chi-square automatic interaction detection**

532 **(CHAID) decision tree of the study tool parameters**

533 MTS: Manchester Triage System

534 ORL: Otorhinolaryngology

535 **S2 Supplementary Figure 2. Primary Outcome - Chi-square automatic interaction detection (CHAID)**

536 **decision tree of the patient characteristics**

537 **S3 Supplementary figure 3. Primary Outcome - Chi-square automatic interaction detection (CHAID)**

538 **decision tree of the timing of presentation**

539 **S4 Supplementary figure 4. Secondary Outcome - Chi-square automatic interaction detection**

540 **(CHAID) decision tree of the study tool parameters**

541 ED: Emergency Department

542 GP: General Practice

543 MTS: Manchester Triage System

544 ORL: Otorhinolaryngology

545 **S5 Supplementary figure 5. Secondary Outcome - Chi-square automatic interaction detection**

546 **(CHAID) decision tree of the patient characteristics**

547 ED: Emergency Department

548 GP: General Practice

549 **S6 Supplementary figure 6. Secondary Outcome - Chi-square automatic interaction detection**

550 **(CHAID) decision tree of the timing of presentation**

551 ED: Emergency Department

552 GP: General Practice

553 **S7 Supplementary figure 7. Secondary Outcome - Chi-square automatic interaction detection**

554 **(CHAID) combined decision tree**

555 ED: Emergency Department

556 GP: General Practice

557 MTS: Manchester Triage System

558 ORL: Otorhinolaryngology

559 **S8 Supplementary table 1. Bivariate analysis of the secondary outcome (all participants excluding**

560 **those with a missing triage advice). For categorical variables with more than four categories, the**

561 **categories with the highest and lowest secondary outcome are reported.**

562 DF: degrees of freedom

563 MTS: Manchester Triage System

564 ED: Emergency Department

565 ORL: Otorhinolaryngology

566 *: Only for urgency categories four and five because the primary outcome was zero in the other

567 categories

568 **S9 Supplementary table 2. Characteristics of patients referred back to the ED after triage to the**

569 **GPC.**

570 ED: Emergency Department

571 GP: General Practitioner

572 MTS: Manchester Triage System

573 **S10 Supplementary table 3. Generalised Mixed Model for the primary outcome.**

574 MTS: Manchester Triage System

575 Df: degrees of freedom

576 **S11 Supplementary table 4. Presentational flowchart categories.**

577 ORL: Otorhinolaryngology

578 **S12 Research Protocol. Original research protocol.**

579 **S13 Minor changes to the study protocol. Overview of the minor changes made to the study**

580 **protocol after trial registration.**

581 **S14 Statistical Analysis Plan.**

All patients triaged at the ED
9964

Presented during 37 intervention weekends
7786

Presented during 10 control weekends
2178

No national insurance number: 391
Declined to participate, opting out: 0
Arriving by an ambulance staffed with doctor or nurse: 339
Patient already admitted to hospital: 9
Referred by GP or specialist: 673

No national insurance number: 107
Declined to participate, opting out: 0
Arriving by an ambulance staffed with doctor or nurse: 89
Patient already admitted to hospital: 3
Referred by GP or specialist: 195

Intervention group
6374

Control Group
1784

Advice missing
80

Advice missing
40

LWBS
34

Handled by ED
46

Triage to GPC
431

Triage to ED
1313

Triage to GPC
838

Triage to ED
5456

Refuses
196

Accepts
642

Accepts
5452

Refuses
4

LWBS
13

LWBS
43

LWBS
62

LWBS
2

Handled by ED
183

Handled by GPC
599

Handled by ED
5390

Handled by GPC
2


medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.16.21261782>; this version posted August 18, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Primary Outcome



Node 0		
Category	%	n
0	90,5	5695
1	9,5	599
Total	100,0	6294

MTS urgency category
Adj. P-value=0,000, Chi-square=681,
527, df=2



MTS flow chart category
Adj. P-value=0,000, Chi-square=526,
354, df=3

Limb Problems; Wounds; Chest pain;
Eye problems; Mental complaints

Abdominal complaints; DRL
complaintss; Neurological complaints

Respiratory complaints; Children;
Unwell Adult; Others; Back and neck
pain

Urinary or gynaecological complaints;
<blank>; Trauma and accidents

Node 4		
Category	%	n
0	94,8	2103
1	5,2	115
Total	35,2	2218

Node 5		
Category	%	n
0	58,5	249
1	41,5	177
Total	6,8	426

Node 6		
Category	%	n
0	67,9	512
1	32,1	242
Total	12,0	754

Node 7		
Category	%	n
0	84,2	234
1	15,8	44
Total	4,4	278

Admission type
Adj. P-value=0,016, Chi-square=7,
720, df=1

Admission type
Adj. P-value=0,000, Chi-square=38,
543, df=1

Walk-in

Arrived by ambulance; <missing>

Walk-in; <missing>

Arrived by ambulance

Node 8		
Category	%	n
0	94,5	1943
1	5,5	113
Total	32,7	2056

Node 9		
Category	%	n
0	98,8	160
1	1,2	2
Total	2,6	162

Node 10		
Category	%	n
0	64,7	437
1	35,3	238
Total	10,7	675

Node 11		
Category	%	n
0	94,9	75
1	5,1	4
Total	1,3	79

Time Period
Adj. P-value=0,000, Chi-square=22,
611, df=1

Day; Night

Evening

Node 12		
Category	%	n
0	59,0	275
1	41,0	191
Total	7,4	466

Node 13		
Category	%	n
0	77,5	162
1	22,5	47
Total	3,3	209

Abdominal pain in children (2)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.16.21261782>; this version posted August 18, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

