

1 Staffing levels and hospital mortality in England: a national
2 panel study using routinely collected data

3
4
5 Bruna Rubbo¹, Christina Saville^{1,2}, Chiara Dall’Ora^{1,2}, Lesley Turner¹, Jeremy Jones¹, Jane
6 Ball¹, David Culliford², Peter Griffiths^{1,2*}

7
8 ¹Workforce Research Group, University of Southampton, Faculty of Environmental and Life
9 Sciences, Southampton, UK

10 ²National Institute for Health Research Applied Research Collaboration, Wessex
11

12 *Corresponding author

13 peter.griffiths@soton.ac.uk (PG)

14

15

16

17 Short title: Staffing levels and hospital mortality

18 Abstract

19 Background

20 Most studies investigating the association between hospital staff levels and mortality have
21 focused on single professional groups, in particular nursing. However, single staff group
22 studies might overestimate effects or neglect important contributions to patient safety from
23 other staff groups. We aimed to examine the association between multiple clinical staff levels
24 and case-mix adjusted patient mortality in English hospitals.

25 Methods and Findings

26 This retrospective observational study used routinely available data from all 138 National
27 Health Service hospital trusts that provided general acute adult services in England between
28 2015 and 2019. Standardised mortality rates were derived from the Summary Hospital level
29 Mortality Indicator dataset. Estimates for the effect of clinical staffing from the single staff
30 models were generally higher than estimates from models with multiple staff groups. Using a
31 multilevel negative binomial random effects model, hospitals with higher levels of medical
32 and allied healthcare professional (AHP) staff had significantly lower mortality rates (1.04,
33 95%CI 1.02 to 1.06, and 1.04, 95%CI 1.02 to 1.06, respectively), while those with higher
34 support staff had higher mortality rates (0.85, 95%CI 0.79 to 0.91 for nurse support, and
35 1.00, 95%CI 0.99 to 1.00 for AHP support), after adjusting for multiple staff groups and
36 hospital characteristics. Estimates of staffing levels on mortality were higher in magnitude
37 between- than within-hospitals, which were not statistically significant in a within-between
38 random effects model.

39 Conclusions

40 We showed the importance of considering multiple staff groups simultaneously when
41 examining the association between hospital mortality and clinical staffing levels. Despite not
42 being included in previous workforce studies, AHP and AHP support levels have a significant
43 impact on hospital mortality. As the main variation was seen between- as opposed to within-

- 44 hospitals, structural recruitment and retention difficulties coupled with financial constraints
- 45 could contribute to the effect of staffing levels on hospital mortality.

46 Introduction

47 Cost constraints and workforce shortages put pressure on health systems to find efficient
48 staffing models to meet rising demand for care. In some countries, such as England, this has
49 led to an increased reliance on support workforce to provide nursing care. Whilst reducing
50 the skill mix may create short-term savings, multiple observational studies provide evidence
51 of a risk of higher in-hospital mortality rates when registered nurse staffing levels are
52 lowered and skill mix is diluted (1-7).

53 Studies focussing on the impact of clinical staff other than nurses on hospital mortality rates
54 are relatively scarce. While some studies on medical staffing levels exist, indicating worse
55 outcomes with lower medical staffing levels (3), most focus on differing models of rostering
56 or deployment e.g. intensive care unit staffing models (8), physician caseload levels (9-11),
57 or the 'weekend effect', whereby worse outcomes for patients admitted over weekends have
58 been associated with having fewer experienced physicians rostered over weekend (12). To
59 our knowledge, no recent study has examined the potential effect of allied healthcare
60 professionals (AHP) staffing levels on clinical outcomes and only a few focused on in-
61 hospital pharmacists (13, 14).

62 A small number of studies assessed the simultaneous impact of multiple staff groups on
63 hospital mortality, even though in-hospital patient care is delivered by multidisciplinary staff
64 and no single staff group is solely responsible for patient outcomes. Of the studies that did
65 consider multiple staff groups, some found partial attenuation or complete absence of the
66 effect of single staff levels on mortality when adjusted for other professionally qualified staff,
67 indicating that uni-professional staffing estimates are potentially biased by confounding (3,
68 15).

69 In the face of enduring staffing shortages in some professional groups it is important to
70 understand the likely consequences on patient care and to identify priorities. A focus on
71 single professional groups risks unintended consequences through neglect of other

72 important contributions to patient safety and might lead to biased estimates. We therefore
73 aimed to examine the associations between staffing levels of multiple staff groups, and case-
74 mix adjusted patient mortality in hospitals.

75 Methods

76 Study design

77 This was a retrospective observational study using routinely available data on clinical
78 healthcare staffing and hospital mortality.

79 Study setting

80 We included all 138 National Health Service (NHS) hospital trusts providing general acute
81 adult inpatient services in England between April 2015 and March 2019. Hospital trusts are
82 defined as organisational units within the NHS that service a defined geographical area or
83 that provide a specialised function. One trust can therefore encompass several hospitals.

84 Data sources and linkage

85 We linked four data sources that provide trust-level datasets: a) NHS workforce, which
86 contains detailed information on trust staffing; b) bed availability and occupancy, which
87 contains data on trust-level available and occupied beds; c) Estates Returns Information
88 Collection (ERIC), which contains data on trust organisation and structure; and d) Summary
89 Hospital-level Mortality Indicator (SHMI), which contains data on observed and expected
90 deaths (S1 Table). These datasets are openly available and accessible on the NHS Digital
91 platform, along with the data dictionary (16, 17). We linked the datasets using the unique
92 hospital trust ID (*i.e.* “Org code”).

93 Study outcome

94 The main study outcome was all-cause mortality, with standardised mortality rates derived
95 from observed and expected deaths in the SHMI dataset (18). This is calculated and
96 reported for all trusts providing acute adult services in NHS England (19). Specialist trusts
97 that do not provide general acute care do not report SHMI and, therefore, were not included
98 in the study.

99 The SHMI includes all in-hospital deaths and those that occurred within 30-days of discharge
100 from patients admitted to non-specialist acute trusts. SHMI data are derived from the
101 Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) at the level of provider spells (*i.e.* total continuous stay of a
102 patient using a hospital bed at an NHS organisation under the care of one or more
103 consultants, or nursing episode or midwife episode), and the HES-Office of National
104 Statistics (ONS) linked mortality data (S1 Table) (20). The latter captures deaths that occur
105 outside of hospital. Data used to calculate the SHMI are submitted by each hospital trust.

106 SHMI expected deaths is calculated based on individual patient characteristics that can
107 affect the risk of mortality, including the patient's condition for hospitalisation, underlying
108 conditions (Charlson Comorbidity Index) (21), age, gender, method of admission to hospital,
109 and year of discharge. Logistic regression models estimate the risk for each provider spell,
110 with binary variable as outcome (*i.e.* died or survived). The SHMI model performs well with
111 early validation accounting for 81% of between-hospital variations with a c-statistic (area
112 under the receiver operator curve) of 0.9 (19). The models are based on the preceding three
113 years' data, with last year data used to calculate the SHMI (22). As SHMI data are published
114 monthly, we used the dataset that contains mortality data from April to March the following
115 year to report on annual hospital mortality level for each hospital trust included in this study.

116 Study variables

117 We obtained hospital staffing data by linking the medical and dental workforce dataset with
118 the non-medical workforce dataset. Bed occupancy data are published quarterly as
119 averages, with no estimate of monthly variation. For wards open overnight, occupied bed is
120 defined as when it is occupied at midnight on the day in question; for day-only wards,
121 occupied bed is a bed where at least one day case has taken place during the day. Trust
122 teaching status was derived from the ERIC dataset, which contains variables on trust profile.

123 Staffing variables are published monthly. We used full-time equivalent (FTE) values to
124 calculate the annual average available staff at each hospital trust from April to March the
125 following year, to align with the SHMI data. FTE data are based on the proportion of time
126 each staff are expected to work in a week, which would correspond to an FTE of 1 (*e.g.* 48
127 hours for doctors, 37.5h for nurses). Overtime and out-of-hour work are not recorded in
128 these datasets.

129 Clinical staff are classified according to occupation codes. We grouped staffing variables by
130 frequency and occupation as listed by NHS England, merging groups that had mean below 3
131 with others of a similar occupation in order to create 8 groups (*i.e.* medical, surgical, other
132 medical specialties, nurses, support to nurses, AHP, support to AHP, and scientific,
133 therapeutic, and technical (ST&T) staff) (see S1 Appendix for details).

134 We used the number of general acute occupied beds to calculate the bed-per-staff ratio.
135 Beds assigned to maternity, mental illness, and learning disabilities services were excluded;
136 however, general acute beds represented 96.2% of the total beds available across all
137 hospital trusts included in the study. We calculated the average number of occupied beds
138 overnight or day-only per trust per year, and then divided occupied beds per each staff group
139 to obtain the average bed-per-staff levels for each hospital trust per year.

140 Teaching affiliation was coded as yes or no according to the trust type recorded in the ERIC
141 dataset. Trust size was calculated based on the number of available general acute beds in
142 each trust. There was a median of 744.2 available general acute beds per trust (interquartile
143 range (IQR) 535.7 to 1009.4, range 143 to 2704). Hospital trusts in the upper tertile (*i.e.* the
144 upper third of trusts, ranked by size) were classified as large, while those in the lower tertile
145 were deemed small trusts, with the remaining classified as medium-sized hospital trusts.

146 Observations with missing data were removed from the analyses; however, hospital trusts
147 that reported at least one year of complete data were included. There were 540 observations
148 in the linked dataset, of which 519 (96%) contained data on all variables and were therefore
149 included in our analyses. There were 2 hospital trusts that did not report on medical staffing
150 in 2016, with 6 trusts not reporting these variables from 2017 onwards. For other clinical
151 staff, only 1 trust did not report staff numbers in 2016 and 2017, and two trusts in 2018, with
152 no missing data in 2019. One trust did not report the number of occupied general acute beds
153 in 2018. The number of hospital trusts that reported on complete data varied, with 137
154 included in 2016 and 2017, 135 in 2018, and 130 in 2019.

155 **Statistical analysis**

156 We initially explored the data using descriptive statistics. Continuous variables were
157 described as mean and standard deviation (SD) or median and IQR, depending on the
158 distribution of each variable. Categorical variables were described as frequencies and
159 proportions. Annual mortality rates were calculated by dividing the number of observed
160 deaths by the number of patient spells, across all hospital trusts each year. To explore the
161 relationship between staffing levels and hospital mortality, statistical modelling was
162 conducted at the hospital trust-level using multiple regression models on four years of data,
163 with standardised mortality rates regressed onto hospital level staffing levels (expressed as
164 the number of occupied beds-per-staff). We included expected deaths as an offset, as the

165 number of expected deaths is the number of times the event could have happened (*i.e.* the
166 exposure variable).

167 Multilevel models were adjusted for trust size and affiliation as a teaching hospital, with trust
168 included as a random effect to adjust for clustering. We considered a range of potential
169 models, with model selection based on minimising the Akaike information criterion (AIC), the
170 Bayesian information criterion (BIC) and the likelihood ratios (see S2 Table for alternative
171 frameworks considered). We report exponentiated coefficients (rate ratios) with 95%
172 confidence intervals (CI) for all estimates obtained from the models.

173 The best performing model (referred to as main model) was a negative binomial random
174 effects model that included all 8 clinical staff groups and hospital characteristics (*i.e.* trust
175 size and teaching status). To explore variations between and within hospital trusts, we also
176 constructed a within-between random effects model (WBRE), with trusts as random effect,
177 and staffing and hospital characteristics as fixed effects. These models can differentiate
178 between effects arising from staffing differences between hospital trusts and those that are
179 associated with annual changes of staffing levels within each hospital (23, 24).

180 We assessed potential collinearity between co-variates using correlation plots and
181 Spearman's correlation coefficient, and the overall multicollinearity for all predictors in the
182 models using generalised variance inflation factors (GVIF). All models had a GVIF<10. As a
183 sensitivity analysis, we reran the models after excluding any variables that had a GVIF
184 above 5 (25).

185 We performed data linkage, cleaning, coding, and analyses in R statistical software, version
186 4.0.2 (R Core Team, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria), using the
187 lme4 and glmer packages (v1.1-27.1, Bates et al, 2015), and the plm package (v2.4-3,
188 Croissant et al, 2021) (26).

189 Results

190 Descriptive statistics

191 Our final sample consisted of 519 observations of staffing, bed occupancy and mortality
 192 variables for the 4-year study period, clustered within 138 hospital trusts. The median
 193 number of acute general occupied beds per day was 674.0 (IQR 486.1 to 911.6). The mean
 194 annual observed deaths \pm SD was 2229 \pm 992 (range 525 to 7468), while the expected
 195 deaths were 2228 \pm 987.2 (range 665 to 7591). Annual mortality rates across all hospital
 196 trusts were 3.44% for 2016, 3.46% for 2017, 3.23% for 2018, and 3.31% for 2019. Forty-one
 197 (29.7%) hospital trusts were classified as teaching trusts.

198 Table 1 shows the distribution of staffing variables by their median, IQR, mean, and SD
 199 across all hospital trusts. There was considerable variation in staffing levels, with nurse staff
 200 levels showing least relative variation (SD 18.0% of the mean) and AHP support most (SD
 201 44.4% of the mean). By contrast, variations within trusts as a percentage of the mean were
 202 relatively low, with the within trust variation ranging from 4.9% for nurse staffing to 10.9% for
 203 AHP support.

204 Table 1. Frequency of occupied bed-per-staff variables across 138 hospital trusts

Staffing level variables	Q1	Median	Q3	Mean	SD	SD as % of mean	Mean within-trust SD	Within-trust SD as % of mean
Bed per medical	3.05	3.66	4.30	3.70	0.96	25.9%	0.28	7.6%
Bed per surgical	3.10	3.79	4.28	3.73	0.81	21.7%	0.22	5.9%
Bed per other medical specialties	3.26	3.96	4.69	3.94	1.01	25.6%	0.27	6.9%

Staffing level variables	Q1	Median	Q3	Mean	SD	SD as % of mean	Mean within-trust SD	Within-trust SD as % of mean
Bed per nurse adult service	0.54	0.61	0.68	0.61	0.11	18.0%	0.03	4.9%
Bed per nurse support	0.80	0.93	1.08	0.93	0.21	22.6%	0.07	7.5%
Bed per AHP	1.88	2.25	2.74	2.36	0.89	37.7%	0.18	7.6%
Bed per AHP support	7.91	10.03	13.01	11.07	4.91	44.4%	1.21	10.9%
Bed per ST&T	1.80	2.24	2.82	2.31	0.75	32.5%	0.16	6.9%

205

206 Q1: lower quartile, Q3: upper quartile, SD: standard deviation, AHP: allied healthcare professional, ST&T: scientific, therapeutic, and technical

207 Nurse staffing levels were strongly correlated with staffing levels in all medical staff groups
 208 ($\rho > 0.71$). Nurse support staff levels were correlated to RN ($\rho = 0.30$), as were AHP and
 209 AHP support ($\rho = 0.47$).

210 Staffing levels and hospital mortality

211 Table 2 shows results for the negative binomial random effect models, adjusted for hospital
 212 characteristics. In the single staff group models, hospital trusts that had lower staffing levels
 213 (*i.e.* more occupied beds per FTE staff) were associated with higher (standardised) mortality
 214 rates for all professionally qualified staff groups. The opposite effect was observed for
 215 nursing support and AHP support staff, where hospital trusts with lower staffing levels (*i.e.*
 216 more occupied beds per FTE staff) had lower mortality.

217 Table 2. Exponentiated estimates for hospital mortality from the multilevel negative binomial
218 random effect models, adjusted for hospital characteristics ($n = 138$)

Predictors	Estimates for single staff models	95% CI	Estimates for multiple staff model	95% CI
Bed per medical	1.05***	1.04 to 1.07	1.04***	1.02 to 1.06
Bed per surgical	1.04***	1.02 to 1.06	0.98	0.96 to 1.01
Bed per other medical specialties	1.05***	1.03 to 1.06	1.03*	1.00 to 1.06
Bed per nurse adult service	1.33***	1.15 to 1.54	1.07	0.88 to 1.31
Bed per nurse support	0.92*	0.86 to 0.98	0.85***	0.79 to 0.91
Bed per AHP	1.02*	1.00 to 1.04	1.04***	1.02 to 1.06
Bed per AHP support	0.99*	0.99 to 0.99	1.00**	0.99 to 1.00
Bed per ST&T	1.02**	1.00 to 1.04	0.99	0.98 to 1.05
Teaching (ref not teaching)	0.96*	0.92 to 0.99	1.01	0.98 to 1.05
Medium trust (ref small trust)	1.01	0.97 to 1.05	1.01	0.98 to 1.04
Large trust (ref small trust)	1.00	0.96 to 1.04	1.01	0.98 to 1.05

219

220 CI: confidence interval, AHP: allied healthcare professional, ST&T: scientific, therapeutic, and technical, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

221 In the main multivariable model including all staff groups, associations between medical
222 (1.04, 95%CI 1.02 to 1.06), other medical specialties (1.03, 95%CI 1.00 to 1.06), AHP (1.04,
223 95%CI 1.02 to 1.06), nurse support (0.85, 95%CI 0.79 to 0.91), and AHP support (1.00,
224 95%CI 0.99 to 1.00) FTE staffing levels and hospital mortality remained statistically
225 significant, with no change in direction of the effect compared to the single staff models
226 (Table 2). Higher mortality rates were observed in hospital trusts with lower levels of medical
227 and AHP staff. In contrast, hospital trusts with lower support staff levels per occupied bed
228 (*i.e.* nursing support and AHP support) had lower mortality rates. The association with RN
229 staffing was attenuated and no longer statistically significant (1.07, 95%CI 0.88 to 1.31),
230 although the observed effect remained relatively large compared to other associations (S1
231 Fig). Similarly, the association between hospital mortality and ST&T staff, observed in the

232 single staff groups models, were no longer statistically significant in the model adjusted for
233 all staff groups.

234 Although we noted correlation between staffing variables, our GVIF for all variables was <10
235 which is generally accepted as indicative of no evidence of multicollinearity (27). The GVIF
236 for beds per other medical specialties was 6.1 (S3 Table), and therefore over our threshold
237 of 5, so we ran the negative binomial random effects model omitting this variable as a
238 sensitivity analysis and found similar results (not shown; available from authors upon
239 request).

240 Within-between hospital trust variability

241 Between-hospital trust effects from the WBRE model were largely the same as those
242 obtained from the main model (*i.e.* between only). For example, the between-estimate from
243 WBRE for the FTE medical group was 1.04 (95%CI 1.02 to 1.07), similar to the estimates
244 obtained from the main model (1.04, 95%CI 1.02 to 1.06). However, even for staff groups
245 where between-hospital trusts effects were significant, the within-hospital effects were small
246 and not statistically significant. For example, the within-hospital estimate from the WBRE
247 model for the medical group was 0.99 (95%CI 0.97 to 1.01) (Fig 1). Despite potentially
248 providing additional information by decomposing the variability into between- and within-
249 estimates, the WBRE model did not improve fit compared to the main model (S2 Table).

250 Figure 1. Hospital mortality exponentiated estimates obtained from the within-between
251 random effect model (WBRE).

252 Discussion

253 After adjustment for hospital characteristics and including multiple clinical staff groups in our
254 models, we found that higher medical and AHP staffing levels were associated with lower
255 mortality rates in acute hospital trusts in England during the period of 2015 to 2019. In
256 contrast, hospitals with higher support staff per occupied bed had higher mortality rates.

257 Our study highlights the importance of simultaneously adjusting for multiple clinical staff
258 groups when investigating associations between staffing levels and mortality at the hospital-
259 level. In the single staff group models, significant effects on mortality rates were seen for all
260 staffing groups. However, when adjusted for multiple groups, effects for medical, other
261 medical specialties, AHP, nurse support, and AHP support staffing levels remained
262 statistically significant, but levels of surgical doctors, RN, and ST&T staff were no longer
263 significant.

264 Our findings are in line with previous research. Griffiths *et al* (15) reported that higher levels
265 of occupied beds per RN and per doctor were associated with increased mortality in the
266 single staff models, while the association was reversed for healthcare support workers.
267 However, there was a substantial attenuation in nurse staffing estimates when medical
268 staffing levels were included. Jarman *et al* (3) showed that the association between RN
269 staffing and mortality was no longer significant when adjusting for doctors-per-bed, with
270 higher levels of physician staffing significantly reducing hospital standardised mortality ratios.

271 Other studies have shown a reduction in hospital mortality when higher numbers of doctors
272 and nurses per bed were observed (12, 15, 28-33). In our study, although the largest
273 estimate of effect on patient mortality was for nurse staffing, this was not statistically
274 significant in the main model, which was adjusted for all clinical staff groups. Studies have
275 reported that much of the variation in nurse staffing occurs between wards within hospitals
276 (34, 35) and Keogh noted that hospital nurse staffing levels often bore little relationship to
277 staffing available to be deployed on wards in NHS hospitals (36), therefore hospital nurse
278 staffing per bed may be a poor indicator of the staffing levels experienced by inpatients.

279 Griffiths *et al* (15) found that when medical staffing levels were included in models,
280 significant nurse staffing effects were only observed in models using ward-based staffing
281 ratios as opposed to hospital-level staff-per-bed ratios. Longitudinal patient level studies of
282 exposure to variation in nurse staffing confirm that there is an adverse effect of low nurse
283 staffing when measured at this level (37-39).

284 In our study, high levels of nurse support staff were associated with higher mortality rates.
285 Bond *et al* (28) showed that higher staffing levels of medical residents, RN, pharmacists, and
286 medical technologists resulted in lower mortality rates, while nurse support and
287 administrators had the opposite effect. The reasons for the reverse effect of support staff on
288 mortality are unclear; however, they could include reduction of skill mix by increasing the
289 proportion of support staff in relation to professionally qualified staff, and increased workload
290 of professionally qualified staff due to additional supervisory tasks when support staff levels
291 are higher (40).

292 To our knowledge, this was the first study to include AHP and AHP support staff levels in
293 analysis. Higher levels of AHP staff had a protective effect at the hospital trust level while
294 more AHP support staff were detrimental to patient mortality, a finding that mirrors those
295 obtained for nursing support staff. While causality cannot be assumed for any of these
296 results, there is a potential that previous findings that have emphasised a link between nurse
297 staffing and patient safety could divert attention from the role that other staff groups may
298 play in delivering quality and preventing avoidable deaths.

299 We found that variations between hospital trusts in the 4-year study period were higher in
300 magnitude than within-hospital trusts estimates, which were not statistically significant for
301 any of the clinical staff groups at the hospital level. Structural recruitment and retention
302 difficulties, and financial constraints could be main contributors to inter-hospital trust
303 variations. There was relatively little year on year variation in staffing between trusts.
304 Reduced variability of staffing levels within hospitals might be due to the limited number of
305 funded posts in each organisation and could reflect historic staffing levels. Bjerregaard *et al*
306 (33), using a WBRE model, found staffing levels estimates were significant between wards,
307 while within-ward estimates had no significant effect on hospital mortality.

308 Strengths and limitations

309 This was a national study using 4 years of routinely available data. We considered the
310 effects of staffing by professionally qualified and support workers on in-hospital and 30-day
311 mortality rates. The inclusion of numerous clinical staffing groups simultaneously in the
312 models allowed us to estimate the effect of each staffing level on hospital mortality while
313 considering all other clinical staff levels and hospital trust characteristics.

314 We used a variety of models and selected the one that performed best on our data. The use
315 of different methodological approaches highlighted how different assumptions about the
316 distribution of staffing variables and the nature of staffing between and within hospitals can
317 impact model performance and findings derived from such models. Most studies
318 investigating clinical staffing levels and in-hospital mortality used fixed effects models, which
319 only evaluate within-hospital effects. While these might be useful when estimating the impact
320 of interventions on staffing levels within a hospital, they might not appropriately assess the
321 effect of different staffing levels based on variations between hospitals in hospital-level
322 observational studies. We showed that between-hospital effects are larger and generally
323 dictate the relationship between clinical staffing levels and mortality. In fact, some of the
324 estimates of within-hospital staffing levels had the opposite direction to the between-hospital
325 estimates on hospital mortality.

326 However, our study was limited by the relatively small sample size, as observations were
327 clustered on 138 hospital trusts. We therefore had to group some of the medical specialties
328 and were unable to unpack relatively heterogenous groups such as AHP. Furthermore, we
329 were unable to explore the effects of grade and experience for medical (e.g. junior doctors,
330 level of consultants) and RN (e.g. senior nurses) staff.

331 In our study, beds that were occupied by multiple patients in a single day were counted as
332 one single occupied bed per staff. Studies have shown that workload (e.g. number of
333 admissions, discharges, additional tasks) in high volume hospitals can lead to higher

334 mortality rates, even when levels of staffing are similar to those observed in low volume
335 hospitals. Occupied beds-per-staff might not be a good measure of staffing levels, as these
336 do not take into account temporary staff or staff absence due to sickness, maternity leave or
337 long-term leave. The extent to which staff are deployed to deliver services such as
338 ambulatory care or other services not delivered to inpatient beds is likely to vary (41).
339 Future studies should aim to capture different staffing levels responsible for delivering
340 patient care measured at the patient or ward-level, rather than at the hospital-level.
341 Although SHMI provides good control for patient risk and we controlled for a number of
342 hospital factors and multiple staff groups, the cross-sectional nature of our analysis means
343 that findings need to be interpreted as demonstrating association but not direct evidence of
344 causation.

345 Conclusion

346 In conclusion, our study highlights the importance of simultaneously considering multiple
347 staff groups when investigating the effect of clinical staffing levels and mortality at the
348 hospital-level. We showed that the number of AHP and AHP support per occupied beds
349 have a significant impact on patient mortality, yet these groups have largely not been
350 included in previous workforce studies, of which the majority focused exclusively on nursing
351 staff. We also found that hospitals with higher levels of medical staffing had lower mortality
352 rates, while higher levels of support workers were associated with higher hospital mortality.

353 References

- 354 1. Kutney-Lee A, Sloane DM, Aiken LH. An increase in the number of nurses with baccalaureate
355 degrees is linked to lower rates of postsurgery mortality. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2013;32(3):579-86.
- 356 2. Aiken LH, Clarke SP, Cheung RB, Sloane DM, Silber JH. Educational levels of hospital nurses
357 and surgical patient mortality. *Jama*. 2003;290(12):1617-23.
- 358 3. Jarman B, Gault S, Alves B, Hider A, Dolan S, Cook A, et al. Explaining differences in English
359 hospital death rates using routinely collected data. *Bmj*. 1999;318(7197):1515-20.
- 360 4. Kane RL, Shamliyan TA, Mueller C, Duval S, Wilt TJ. The association of registered nurse
361 staffing levels and patient outcomes: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medical Care*.
362 2007;45(12):1195-204.

- 363 5. Shekelle PG. Nurse-patient ratios as a patient safety strategy: A systematic review. *Annals of*
364 *Internal Medicine*. 2013;158(5 PART 2):404-9.
- 365 6. Griffiths P, Ball J, Drennan J, Dall'Ora C, Jones J, Maruotti A, et al. Nurse staffing and patient
366 outcomes: Strengths and limitations of the evidence to inform policy and practice. A review and
367 discussion paper based on evidence reviewed for the National Institute for Health and Care
368 Excellence Safe Staffing guideline development. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2016;63:213-25.
- 369 7. Blume KS, Dietermann K, Kirchner-Heklau U, Winter V, Fleischer S, Kreidl LM, et al. Staffing
370 levels and nursing-sensitive patient outcomes: Umbrella review and qualitative study. *Health Serv*
371 *Res*. 2021;56(5):885-907.
- 372 8. Pronovost PJ, Angus DC, Dorman T, Robinson KA, Dremsizov TT, Young TL. Physician staffing
373 patterns and clinical outcomes in critically ill patients: a systematic review. *Jama*.
374 2002;288(17):2151-62.
- 375 9. Lin HC, Lee HC. Caseload volume-outcome relation for pulmonary embolism treatment:
376 Association between physician and hospital caseload volume and 30-day mortality. *Journal of*
377 *Thrombosis and Haemostasis*. 2008;6(10):1707-12.
- 378 10. Ong M, Bostrom A, Vidyarthi A, McCulloch C, Auerbach A. House staff team workload and
379 organization effects on patient outcomes in an academic general internal medicine inpatient service.
380 *Archives of Internal Medicine*. 2007;167(1):47-52.
- 381 11. Coit MH, Katz JT, McMahon GT. The effect of workload reduction on the quality of residents'
382 discharge summaries. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2011;26(1):28-32.
- 383 12. Ricciardi R, Nelson J, Roberts PL, Marcello PW, Read TE, Schoetz DJ. Is the presence of
384 medical trainees associated with increased mortality with weekend admission? *BMC Medical*
385 *Education*. 2014;14:4.
- 386 13. Bond CA, Raehl CL, Franke T. Interrelationships among mortality rates, drug costs, total cost
387 of care, and length of stay in United States hospitals: summary and recommendations for clinical
388 pharmacy services and staffing. *Pharmacotherapy: The Journal of Human Pharmacology & Drug*
389 *Therapy*. 2001;21(2):129-41.
- 390 14. Lee H, Ryu K, Sohn Y, Kim J, Suh GY, Kim E. Impact on Patient Outcomes of Pharmacist
391 Participation in Multidisciplinary Critical Care Teams: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis*.
392 *Critical Care Medicine*. 2019;47(9).
- 393 15. Griffiths P, Ball J, Murrells T, Jones S, Rafferty AM. Registered nurse, healthcare support
394 worker, medical staffing levels and mortality in English hospital trusts: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ*
395 *Open*. 2016;6(2):e008751.
- 396 16. NHS Digital. National Workforce Data Set (NWD) and NHS occupational codes [Available
397 from: [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-collections-and-data-sets/data-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-collections-and-data-sets/data-sets/national-workforce-data-set-nwd-and-nhs-occupation-codes#top)
398 [sets/national-workforce-data-set-nwd-and-nhs-occupation-codes#top](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-collections-and-data-sets/data-sets/national-workforce-data-set-nwd-and-nhs-occupation-codes#top).
- 399 17. NHS England. NHS Data Model and Dictionary: NHS Digital; [updated September 2021].
400 Available from: <https://datadictionary.nhs.uk/index.html>.
- 401 18. NHS England. The processing cycle and HES data quality NHS Digital: NHS England;
402 [Available from: [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-tools-and-services/data-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-tools-and-services/data-services/hospital-episode-statistics/the-processing-cycle-and-hes-data-quality)
403 [services/hospital-episode-statistics/the-processing-cycle-and-hes-data-quality](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-tools-and-services/data-services/hospital-episode-statistics/the-processing-cycle-and-hes-data-quality).
- 404 19. Campbell MJ, Jacques RM, Fotheringham J, Maheswaran R, Nicholl J. Developing a summary
405 hospital mortality index: retrospective analysis in English hospitals over five years. *Bmj*.
406 2012;344:e1001.
- 407 20. Aylin P, Williams S, Bottle A, Jarman B. Counting hospital activity: spells or episodes? *BMJ*.
408 2004;329(7476):1207.
- 409 21. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic
410 comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J Chronic Dis*. 1987;40(5):373-83.
- 411 22. Campbell MJ, Jacques R. M., Fotheringham, J., Peatson, T., Maheswaran, R., Nicholl, J. An
412 evaluation of the Summary Hospital Mortality Index. The University of Sheffield; 2011 21/04/2011.

- 413 23. Bell A, Fairbrother M, Jones K. Fixed and random effects models: making an informed choice.
414 Quality & Quantity. 2019;53:1051-74.
- 415 24. Schunck R. Within and between Estimates in Random-Effects Models: Advantages and
416 Drawbacks of Correlated Random Effects and Hybrid Models. The Stata Journal. 2013;13:65 - 76.
- 417 25. O'Brien RM. A Caution Regarding Rules of Thumb for Variance Inflation Factors. Quality &
418 Quantity. 2007;41(5):673-90.
- 419 26. R Core Team. A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria: R
420 Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020.
- 421 27. James G WD, Hastie T, Tibshirani R. An Introduction to Statistical Learning: with Applications
422 in R. 1st ed. ed: Springer; 2013. 440 p.
- 423 28. Bond CA, Raehl CL, Pitterle ME, Franke T. Health care professional staffing, hospital
424 characteristics, and hospital mortality rates. Pharmacotherapy: The Journal of Human Pharmacology
425 & Drug Therapy. 1999;19(2):130-8.
- 426 29. Griffiths P, Jones S, Bottle A. Is "failure to rescue" derived from administrative data in
427 England a nurse sensitive patient safety indicator for surgical care? Observational study. Int J Nurs
428 Stud. 2013;50(2):292-300.
- 429 30. Ozdemir BA, Sinha S, Karthikesalingam A, Poloniecki JD, Pearse RM, Grocott MP, et al.
430 Mortality of emergency general surgical patients and associations with hospital structures and
431 processes. British Journal of Anaesthesia. 2016;116(1):54-62.
- 432 31. Chung W, Sohn M. The Impact of Nurse Staffing on In-Hospital Mortality of Stroke Patients in
433 Korea. Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing. 2018;33(1):47-54.
- 434 32. West E, Barron DN, Harrison D, Rafferty AM, Rowan K, Sanderson C. Nurse staffing, medical
435 staffing and mortality in Intensive Care: An observational study. International Journal of Nursing
436 Studies. 2014;51(5):781-94.
- 437 33. Bjerregaard U, Hølge-Hazelton, Bibi, Rud Kristensen, Søren, Rose Olsen, Kim. Nurse staffing
438 and patient outcomes: Analyzing within- and between-variation. DaCHE discussion papers. 2020;3.
- 439 34. Griffiths P, Ball J, Bloor K, Böhning D, Briggs J, Dall'Ora C, et al. Nurse staffing levels, missed
440 vital signs and mortality in hospitals: retrospective longitudinal observational study. Health Services
441 and Delivery Research 2018.
- 442 35. Van den Heede K, Sermeus W, Diya L, Clarke SP, Lesaffre E, Vleugels A, et al. Nurse staffing
443 and patient outcomes in Belgian acute hospitals: cross-sectional analysis of administrative data. Int J
444 Nurs Stud. 2009;46(7):928-39.
- 445 36. Keogh BE. Review into the quality of care and treatment provided by 14 hospitals trusts in
446 England: overview report. NHS England; 2013.
- 447 37. Dall'Ora C, Saville C, Rubbo B, Turner LY, Jones J, Griffiths P. Nurse staffing levels and patient
448 outcomes: a systematic review of longitudinal studies. medRxiv. 2021:2021.09.17.21263699.
- 449 38. Griffiths P, Maruotti A, Recio Saucedo A, Redfern OC, Ball JE, Briggs J, et al. Nurse staffing,
450 nursing assistants and hospital mortality: retrospective longitudinal cohort study. BMJ Quality
451 & Safety. 2019;28(8):609.
- 452 39. Needleman J, Buerhaus P, Pankratz VS, Leibson CL, Stevens SR, Harris M. Nurse staffing and
453 inpatient hospital mortality. New England Journal of Medicine. 2011;364(11):1037-45.
- 454 40. Griffiths P, Maruotti A, Recio Saucedo A, Redfern OC, Ball JE, Briggs J, et al. Nurse staffing,
455 nursing assistants and hospital mortality: Retrospective longitudinal cohort study. BMJ Quality and
456 Safety. 2019;28(8):609-17.
- 457 41. Ball J. Nurse staffing levels, care left undone, & patient mortality in acute hospitals [Thesis
458 for doctoral degree]. Stockholm, Sweden: Karolinska Institutet; 2017.

459

460 Supporting information captions

461 Table S1. NHS digital data sources

462 Table S2. Comparison of goodness-of-fit for model selection

463 Table S3. Multicollinearity test in the main model (*i.e.* negative binomial random effect)

464 Figure S1. Hospital mortality estimates obtained from the main model (*i.e.* negative binomial
465 random effect).



