

TITLE PAGE

Title

The association between major trauma centre care and outcomes of adult patients injured by low falls in England and Wales.

Short Title

Major trauma centre care for low falls.

Authors

Dr Michael Tonkins, MA, MSc, MBChB, MRCP
School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
m.tonkins@sheffield.ac.uk

Dr Omar Bouamra, PhD
Trauma Audit and Research Network, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
omar.bouamra@manchester.ac.uk

Dr Fiona Lecky, MB Ch B, FRCS, DA, MSc, PhD, FCEM
School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
f.e.lecky@sheffield.ac.uk

Corresponding Author

Dr Michael Tonkins
School of Health and Related Research, 30 Regent Street, Sheffield, UK, S1 4DA
m.tonkins@sheffield.ac.uk

Key Words

Wounds and injuries, accidental falls, trauma centers

Word Count

3010

DECLARATIONS

Competing interests

Professor Lecky is Research Director of the Trauma Audit and Research Network (TARN) at the University of Manchester.

Funding

Dr Tonkins is supported by a National Institute of Health Research Academic Clinical Fellowship

Ethical approval

TARN has UK Health Research Authority Confidentiality Advisory Group approval for research using patient data under Section 251 of the NHS Act (2006). Ethical approval for the use of anonymised clinical data were approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Sheffield (application reference number 037465).

Guarantor

Professor Lecky is guarantor of this work.

Contributorship

MT and FL conceived and designed this work. MT performed data cleaning and analysis in conjunction with OB. MT drafted the article. All authors contributed to critical revision and final approval of this manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the essential work by Shiraz Ahmed and Laura White of TARN in preparing and supplying the data.

ABSTRACT

Background

Disability and death due to low falls is increasing worldwide and disproportionately affects older adults. Current trauma systems were not designed to suit the needs of these patients. This study assessed the effectiveness of major trauma centre care in adult patients injured by low falls.

Methods

Data were obtained from the Trauma Audit and Research Network on adult patients injured by falls from <2 metres between 2017-2019 in England and Wales. 30-day survival, length of hospital stay and discharge destination were compared between major trauma centres (MTCs) and trauma units or local emergency hospitals (TU/LEHs).

Results

127,334 patients were included of whom 27.6% attended an MTC. The median age was 79.4 years (IQR 64.5-87.2 years), and 74.2% of patients were aged >65 years. MTC care was not associated with improved 30-day survival (adjusted odds ratio [AOR] 0.91, 95% CI 0.87-0.96). Transferred patients had a significant impact upon the results. After excluding transferred patients, the AOR for survival in MTCs was 1.056 (95% CI 1.001-1.113).

Conclusion

TU/LEH care is at least as effective as MTC care due to the facility for secondary transfer from TU/LEHs to MTCs. In patients who are not transferred, MTCs are associated with greater odds of 30-day survival in the whole cohort and in the most severely injured patients. Future research must determine the optimum means of identifying patients in need of higher-level care; the components of care which improve patient outcomes; and develop patient-focused outcomes which reflect the characteristics and priorities of contemporary trauma patients.

KEY MESSAGES

What is already known on this topic

- Current trauma systems were not designed to manage rising numbers of elderly patients injured by low falls.
- Previous evidence for the role of major trauma centre (MTC) care in such patients yielded conflicting results.

What this study adds

- This study demonstrates that non-trauma centre care is no worse than MTC care, as long as the possibility of transfer exists.
- Therefore MTCs do have a role in the management of elderly adults injured by low falls, particularly the severely injured.

How this study might affect research, policy or practice

- Research must identify those patients who need transfer, the most effective components of care, and patient-centric outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

Trauma networks were established across England and Wales in 2012 using a 'hub and spoke' model in which peripheral Trauma Units (TUs) and Local Emergency Hospitals (LEHs) worked with Major Trauma Centres (MTCs) to provide trauma care to a geographically defined population.¹ The inception of trauma networks was associated with a 19% increase in the adjusted odds of survival among severely injured patients.¹

However, between 2000 and 2019 the mean age of a major trauma patient in England and Wales rose from 38.6 years to 61.7 years, the predominant mechanism of injury became falls from less than 2 metres (52.6%) and the prevalence of comorbidities and frailty rose.² These changes represent an emerging cohort of elderly patients who sustain severe injuries in falls from standing height. Similar findings have been reported in other economically developed nations.³⁻⁶ There is evidence that the emerging cohort are at greater risk of being under-triaged,^{7,8} are less likely to receive care at a higher-level trauma facility,^{9,10} are more likely to be treated by junior clinicians, more likely to have longer waits for CT scans, and are less likely to be transferred to a neurosciences unit.^{11,12}

A recent systematic review has demonstrated that higher-level trauma centres are associated with lower mortality than lower-level trauma centres in patients with major trauma (adjusted odds ratio, AOR, 0.77; 95% CI 0.69-0.87).¹³ However it is unknown whether higher-level trauma centres confer the same benefit in the emerging cohort of trauma patients. The three studies that have been published on this topic were all conducted in the USA and reported divergent results.¹⁴⁻¹⁶

Therefore, the aim of this study was to establish whether there is an association between MTC care and patient outcomes after falls from less than 2 metres compared to care in a TU or LEH.

METHODS

Design and Setting

Data from the Trauma Audit and Research Network (TARN) covering England and Wales were analysed from 1 January 2017 - 31 December 2019. The dates were chosen to allow time for trauma network maturation and provide recent complete data.

Population

Adult patients (aged >16 years) were eligible for inclusion if (a) they met standard TARN inclusion criteria and (b) were injured by a fall from <2 metres.

Standard TARN inclusion criteria are: admission for 3 or more nights, admission to critical care, in-hospital and emergency department deaths following trauma, and transfer to another hospital for specialist care. Important TARN exclusion criteria are: transfer for rehabilitation purposes only, isolated neck of femur or trochanteric fractures in patients aged over 65 years, and isolated closed limb fractures (except femoral fractures).

Falls from <2 metres is the TARN method of operationalising the concept of a 'low fall', including falls from standing height. Throughout this study reference is made to 'older patients': the most common threshold for 'older' is 65 years, and therefore this will be employed in the present study.^{17,18}

Intervention and Comparison

The intervention was care at a major trauma centre, compared to TU/LEH. Patients were classified as receiving MTC vs TU/LEH care according to the status of the first hospital they attended. Therefore patients who attended a TU with subsequent transfer to an MTC were considered in the TU cohort, and patients who attended an MTC with subsequent transfer to a TU were be considered in the MTC cohort. This is consistent with previous studies.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ The authors were not blinded to the patient group.

Outcomes

The primary outcome was 30-day survival. 30-day survival is collected by local TARN data coordinators until hospital discharge. Deaths which occur after discharge but within 30 days of injury (the 'true' 30-day survival) are captured using data from the Office of National Statistics.¹⁹

The secondary outcomes were length of hospital stay and discharge destination. Both outcomes are recorded by local TARN data analysts at time of discharge. Length of hospital stay was measured in whole days. Discharge to the patient's own home was compared to discharge to a

location for formal or informal care (nursing home, social care, rehabilitation, other institution, home of a relative).

Data Collection

TARN-eligible patients are identified at hospital level by local data coordinators. Patient data are prospectively captured by local coordinators using an internet-based system then checked for accuracy and completeness by trained analysts before entering the TARN database.

Statistical Analysis

The null hypothesis for this study was that there was no association between study outcomes and MTC vs TU/LEH care.

The primary outcome of 30-day survival was analysed using binary multiple logistic regression. The regression model used the variables of TARN's previously validated Probability of Survival (Ps) model for trauma severity: age, gender, and age x gender interaction, the modified Charlson Comorbidity Index (mCCI), the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS), and the Injury Severity Score (ISS).¹⁹ Three other variables known to be associated with mortality in older trauma patients were also included in the model.^{17,20} These were the most injured body area, anticoagulation, and hypotension (systolic blood pressure <110mmHg).

The ISS is the sum of the squares of the three most severely injured body regions using the Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS).²¹ Because the ISS is non-linear, fractional polynomial transformation was undertaken to avoid violating the assumptions of logistic regression.^{19,22}

Hospital length of stay was compared in patients who were discharged to a known location. Patients who died, were transferred to another acute hospital, were discharged to no fixed abode or for whom the discharge destination was unknown were excluded. Length of stay was curtailed at 365 days to reduce the influence of outliers. Cox regression was used to adjust for the casemix between MTCs and TU/LEHs using the same predictor variables employed in the primary logistic regression model, because these are also known to be associated with hospital length of stay.^{23–28} The assumption of proportional hazards was checked by visual inspection of the survival curves.

Discharge destination was dichotomised into 'own home' versus any form of formal or informal care. Patients who died, remained in hospital, whose discharge destination is unknown or of no fixed abode, and those who were transferred to another facility were excluded. Binary multiple logistic regression was used to establish whether trauma centre status is associated with discharge destination. Based on previous evidence, the same predictor variables employed in the primary outcome logistic regression model were used in the discharge destination model.^{26,29,30}

Missing data were imputed using multiple imputation under the assumption of missingness at random and applying Rubin's rule on the 10 imputed sets.

Sensitivity and Subgroup Analyses

Transfer from lower- to higher-level care has been observed to confer a survival benefit compared to remaining in lower-level care.^{31,32} Therefore a sensitivity analysis restricted to all patients who were *not* transferred between hospitals was performed in order to investigate the impact of inter-hospital transfer within trauma networks.

Most patients hospitalised due to injuries caused by low falls are aged 65 years and above, and these patients are most representative of the 'emerging cohort' of trauma patients discussed above. Therefore, a subgroup analysis restricted to all patients aged 65 years and above was performed.

An ISS of >15 is the most common threshold for 'major trauma'. Strong evidence exists that higher-level care within a trauma system is associated with improved outcomes in patients with an ISS >15.¹³ Therefore this subgroup analysis was performed to establish whether MTC care continues to afford a survival advantage in the most severely injured patients who fell from <2m.

Statistical Software

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS (version 26, IBM Corporation; Armonk, New York).

Patient and Public Involvement

Two recent consensus-building exercises involving patients and the public report that identifying which patients benefit from major trauma centre care is an important emergency medicine research priority.^{33,34} This study was authorised by the TARN research committee which reports to the TARN Board where there is standing PPI presence.

Ethical Approval

TARN has UK Health Research Authority Confidentiality Advisory Group approval for research using patient data under Section 251 of the NHS Act (2006). Ethical approval for the use of anonymised clinical data were approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Sheffield (application reference number 037465).


RESULTS

Data Completeness

Data were 98.9% complete. Missing values were distributed across 10 variables. With the exception of the Glasgow Outcome Score, the difference in missingness between MTCs and TU/LEHs was <1%. Missingness of outcome data was 1.5% for 30-day survival and 0.3% for discharge destination. Length of stay was complete for all patients.

Demographic Data and Unadjusted Outcomes

127,334 patients were included of whom 35,175 (27.6%) attended a MTC (n=29) and 92,159 (72.4%) attended a TU (n=140) or LEH (n=26) - see Figure 1. The median age was 79.4 years (IQR 64.5-87.2 years), and 74.2% of patients were aged >65 years. Most patients were female (59.1%).



Between-group differences are presented in Table 1. MTC patients tended to be slightly younger, were more likely to be male, more severely injured, and suffer a higher proportion of head injuries. MTC patients were more likely to trigger trauma team activation and to undergo CT scanning, surgery, to be admitted to critical care and to receive a rehabilitation prescription.

In the unadjusted analysis of non-imputed data the odds ratio (OR) for survival in an MTC were 0.69 (95% confidence interval [CI] 0.66-0.73, χ^2 $p < 0.001$) compared to TU care. In MTCs, patients spent a median duration of 1 day more in hospital, and 1.2% more patients were discharged to their own home.

30-day Survival

In the logistic regression model the Adjusted Odds Ratio (AOR) of 30-day survival in MTCs compared with TU/LEHs were 0.91 (95% CI 0.87-0.96, $p < 0.001$). This can be interpreted as a 9% decreased odds of 30-day survival in MTCs compared to TU/LEHs. The C-statistic (Area Under the Receiving Operator Characteristic Curve, AUROC) was 0.83 (95% CI 0.82-0.83, $p < 0.001$), indicating a strong model. The full model and ROC curve are available in the supplementary material.

Patients aged over 65 years comprised 74.2% ($n=32823$) of the whole cohort. These patients had higher rates of comorbidity and anticoagulation. Full details are available in Supplementary Table 7. The unadjusted odds ratio for 30-day survival in patients aged >65 years who received MTC care was 0.715 (95% CI 0.683-0.749, $p < 0.001$). The adjusted odds ratio of survival in patients aged >65 years who received MTC care was 0.929 (95% CI 0.880-0.980, $p=0.007$), AUROC 0.794 (95% CI 0.789-0.799).

Patients with an ISS >15 comprised 29.0% ($n=36974$) of the whole cohort. Their 30-day mortality was higher at 15.6% compared to 7.8% in the whole cohort. Full details are available in Supplementary Table 7. The unadjusted odds ratio of 30-day survival in patients with ISS >15 who received MTC care was 0.702 (95% CI 0.663-0.744, $p < 0.001$). The adjusted odds ratio of survival in patients with an ISS >15 who received MTC care was 0.852 (95% CI 0.974-0.915, $p < 0.001$), AUROC 0.821 (95% CI 0.815-0.827).

Table 1: Cohort characteristics by trauma centre level							
		Trauma Unit or LEH		Major Trauma Centre		Comparison	
		92,159 (72.4%)		35,175 (27.6%)			
		N	%	N	%	Difference*	Significance
Age (years). Median, IQR		79.8	65.0 - 87.4	78.3	63.3 - 86.7	+1.5 years	<0.001 [‡]
Female		55423	60.1%	19866	56.5%	+3.6%	<0.001
mCCI band	mCCI 0	26729	29.6%	9998	28.8%	+0.8%	<0.001 [‡]
	mCCI 1-5	41809	46.3%	15502	44.6%	+1.7%	
	mCCI 6-10	17289	19.1%	7054	20.3%	-1.2%	
	mCCI >10	4554	5.0%	2185	6.3%	-1.3%	
Prescribed anticoagulation		12443	13.5%	4685	13.3%	+0.2%	0.398
Patients aged 65 and over		69120	75.0%	25415	72.3%	+2.7%	
ISS band	ISS 1-8	22445	24.4%	7010	19.9%	+4.5%	<0.001 [‡]
	ISS 9-15	44930	48.8%	15975	45.4%	+3.4%	
	ISS >15	24784	26.9%	12190	34.7%	-7.8%	
GCS band	GCS 3	466	0.5%	669	2.0%	-1.5%	<0.001 [‡]
	GCS 4-5	240	0.3%	304	0.9%	-0.6%	
	GCS 6-8	603	0.7%	578	1.7%	-1.0%	
	GCS 9-12	1964	2.3%	1372	4.1%	-1.8%	
	GCS 13-14	11804	13.5%	5169	15.4%	-1.9%	
	GCS 15	72117	82.7%	25486	75.9%	+6.8%	
Most severely injured body region	Abdomen	554	0.6%	228	0.6%	0.0%	<0.001
	Chest	13402	14.5%	4877	13.9%	+0.6%	
	Face	576	0.6%	277	0.8%	-0.2%	
	Head	21719	23.6%	9629	27.4%	-3.8%	
	Limbs	37288	40.5%	13593	38.6%	+1.9%	
	Multiple	5257	5.7%	2153	6.1%	-0.4%	
	Other	54	0.1%	43	0.1%	0.0%	
Spine	13309	14.4%	4375	12.4%	+2.0%		
Patients with head injuries		24855	27.0%	11571	32.9%	-5.9%	<0.001
Shock (SBP <110mmHg)		12447	13.5%	5367	15.3%	-1.8%	<0.001
Had trauma team		3745	4.1%	6302	17.9%	-13.8%	<0.001
Had CT scan		60811	66.0%	25647	72.9%	-6.9%	<0.001
Had surgery		25964	28.2%	13036	37.1%	-8.9%	<0.001
Had interventional radiology		50	0.1%	106	0.3%	-0.2%	<0.001
Intubated and ventilated		1093	1.2%	1787	5.2%	-4.0%	<0.001
Admitted to critical care		3749	4.1%	4155	12.0%	-7.9%	<0.001
Patient underwent transfer		8344	9.1%	1184	3.4%	+5.7%	<0.001
Rehabilitation prescription		15474	23.3%	23229	85.0%	-61.7%	<0.001
Survived to 30 days		85660	92.9%	31708	90.1%	+2.8%	<0.001
Length of stay in hospital (days)		10	5 - 19	11	6 - 21	-1	<0.001 [‡]
Length of stay in critical care (days)		2	1 - 5	3	1 - 9	-1	<0.001 [‡]
Discharged to own home		52635	69.10%	21012	70.30%	-1.2%	<0.001

Hypothesis tests are Chi-squared with Yates' Continuity Correction unless otherwise specified. *TU-MTC †Mann-Whitney U Test.

Patients who did not undergo transfer comprised 92.5% (n=117806) of the whole cohort. Compared to transferred patients, their rate of 30-day survival was lower (91.6% compared to 99.4%). Full details are available in Supplementary Table 8. Most transfers (69.8%) were TU-to-MTC, among whom the rate of 30-day survival was 99.2%. In the sensitivity analysis excluding transferred patients, the AOR of 30-day survival in MTCs compared with TU/LEHs were 1.056 (95% CI 1.001-1.113, p 0.044). Model performance (AUROC) was 0.83 (95% CI 0.829-0.838). This represents a statistically significant reversal of the primary analysis.

Given the impact of transferred patients upon the primary outcome, a post-hoc analysis was conducted in which transferred patients were excluded from the >65 years and ISS >15 subgroups. In both subgroups the result changed. Once transfers were excluded, MTC care was no longer associated with a statistically significant difference in 30-day survival in patients aged >65 years. Conversely, in patients with an ISS >15 MTC care was found to be associated with improved odds of 30-day survival (AOR 1.126, 95% CI 1.033-1.215, p 0.002). Table 2 summarises the results of all analyses and the impact of transfers upon them.

Table 2: Impact of excluding transfers on the primary and secondary outcomes						
	Transfers included			Transfers excluded		
	AOR	95% CI	Sig	AOR	95% CI	Sig
Complete case analysis	0.908	0.865-0.956	<0.001	1.056	1.001-1.113	0.044
Age >65	0.929	0.880-0.980	0.007	1.038	0.982-1.097	0.184
ISS >15	0.852	0.794-0.915	<0.001	1.126	1.044-1.215	0.002
Length of stay	0.912*	0.900-0.925	<0.001	0.906*	0.894-0.918	<0.001
Discharge destination	1.065	1.032-1.100	<0.001	1.066	1.033-1.101	<0.001

AOR: adjusted odds ratio. **Sig:** significance. *Hazard ratio.


Length of Stay

Overall, 83.3% of patients (n=106,014) were discharged alive to a known location within 365 days. In unadjusted analyses the median time to discharge in TUs was 11 days (IQR 6-19 days) and in MTCs was 12 days (IQR 6-21 days). In the adjusted analysis the hazard ratio for MTC care was 0.912 (95% CI 0.900-0.925, p <0.001). Exclusion of transferred patients did not produce a statistically significant result.

Discharge Destination

Overall, 83.3% of patients were discharged either home or to an informal or formal care location. The unadjusted odds ratio for discharge home from an MTC was 1.06 (95% CI 1.029-1.091, p <0.001). After adjusting for casemix, the adjusted odds ratio of patient discharge to their own home

from an MTC was 1.065 (95% CI 1.032-1.100, $p < 0.001$). The AUROC was 0.744 (95% CI 0.739 - 0.745). Exclusion of transferred patients did not produce a statistically significant result.



DISCUSSION

Summary of Results

This study demonstrates lower adjusted odds of 30-day survival in adult patients injured by low falls who attended MTCs, compared to those who attended TU/LEHs (AOR 0.908, 95% CI 0.865-0.956) as the first hospital. This result persisted in patients who were over 65 years of age (AOR 0.715, 95% CI 0.683-0.749, $p < 0.001$), and patients who had an ISS > 15 (AOR 0.852, 95% CI 0.974-0.915, $p < 0.001$).

Once transferred patients were excluded, the adjusted odds of 30-day survival were higher in MTCs than TU/LEHs (AOR 1.056, 95% CI 1.001-1.113, $p = 0.044$). Excluding transferred patients also affected the results of patients aged > 65 years, in whom MTC care was no longer associated with a statistically significant difference in odds of 30-day survival (AOR 1.038, 95% CI 0.982 - 1.097, $p = 0.184$). The result for patients with ISS > 15 also changed, and MTC care was found to be associated with higher odds of 30-day survival (AOR 1.126, 95% CI 1.044-1.215).

Interpretation of Results

The primary analysis demonstrates that TU/LEH care is at least as effective as MTC care. However, patients who were transferred between centres had a significant impact upon the results. Most transfers (69.8%) were TU/LEH-to-MTC, and the very high rate of 30-day survival (99.2%). In the primary analysis these patients were mostly attributed to TU/LEH care, thereby censoring the input of care from further hospitals.

Excluding transferred patients reveals a more precise analysis of the association between level of care and patient outcomes. Doing so demonstrates that higher-level care is associated with improved odds of survival in the whole cohort and in the most severely injured, but not in those over 65 years old. The high rate of survival among transferred patients illustrates that initial attendance at an MTC is not necessary, providing that the option to access MTC care via secondary transfer remains. This finding demonstrates the importance of early injury identification, collaboration between care providers and capacity planning within trauma systems.

Relation to Previous Research

The results of this study are concordant with the recent systematic review by Van Ditschuijzen et al.¹³ Firstly, in the primary analysis higher-level (MTC) care was not found to be associated with a survival benefit in the general population. Secondly, failure to exclude transferred patients results in underestimation of the survival benefit at higher-level care. Thirdly, higher-level care is associated with a survival benefit for patients with major trauma (ISS > 15).

The lack of a statistically significant association between MTC care and 30-day survival in patients aged >65 years suggests that the benefits of MTC care become attenuated with increasing age. This is concordant with the results of Ahmed et al¹⁶, who found no association between higher-level care and survival in patients aged >65 years injured by ground-level falls. It is probable that the accumulated mortality risk attributable to age, comorbidities and frailty is a major cause for this finding. However, in the face of widespread evidence that older patients receive suboptimal care at multiple points in their pathway, it is likely that there are opportunities to improve outcomes in this patient group.

Implications for Future Research

The results of this study highlight three areas for further research. Firstly, tools to identify which patients benefit from MTC care must be developed and validated with associated decision-analytic modelling. Secondly, the components and characteristics of MTC care associated with a survival benefit should be identified, developed, and where possible distributed throughout trauma networks. Thirdly, specific outcome measures for older trauma patients must be developed.

Strengths and Weaknesses

This is the first study in England and Wales to examine outcomes of patients injured in falls from standing height cared for at MTCs compared to TU/LEHs. The result of this study provides evidence for the evaluation of the role of MTC care for these patients.

The results of this study remain at risk of selection bias and confounding due to unmeasured baseline factors including patient frailty. However, as there was no clinically significant difference in age or comorbidity (both strongly associated with frailty measures) between the comparator groups this may not be a serious flaw. No statistical analysis plan was made publicly available in advance beyond the TARN Research Committee, impacting the transparency of the study and increasing risk of reporting bias. The investigators were not blinded to the treatment group. However, the data were supplied under a data sharing agreement from TARN for the study objectives. Beyond imputation for missing variables the dataset was not amended.

CONCLUSION

By focusing upon adult patients who fall from standing height, this study has sought to capture the overlapping characteristics of mechanism, age and comorbidities which defines the emerging cohort of trauma patients and thereby to determine, in part, the role of MTCs in their care. In the primary analysis, TU/LEH care was found to be at least as effective as MTC care due to the facility within trauma networks for secondary transfer from lower-level to higher-level care. In patients who were not transferred, MTCs were found to be associated with greater odds of 30-day survival in the whole cohort and in the most severely injured patients, but here was no association between MTC care and improved 30-day survival in patients aged >65 years.

REFERENCES

1. Moran CG, Lecky F, Bouamra O, Lawrence T, Edwards A, Woodford M, et al. Changing the System - Major Trauma Patients and Their Outcomes in the NHS (England) 2008–17. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2018 Aug 1;2:13–21.
2. Trauma Audit and Research Network. Unpublished data. 2021. This data is available upon request (support@tarn.ac.uk). This data is also currently being prepared for publication.
3. Søreide K, Krüger AJ, Vårdal AL, Ellingsen CL, Søreide E, Lossius HM. Epidemiology and Contemporary Patterns of Trauma Deaths: Changing Place, Similar Pace, Older Face. *World J Surg*. 2007 Nov 1;31(11):2092–103.
4. Dinh MM, Roncal S, Byrne CM, Petchell J. Growing trend in older patients with severe injuries: mortality and mechanisms of injury between 1991 and 2010 at an inner city major trauma centre. *ANZ J Surg*. 2013;83(1):65–9.
5. Jiang L, Zheng Z, Zhang M. The incidence of geriatric trauma is increasing and comparison of different scoring tools for the prediction of in-hospital mortality in geriatric trauma patients. *World J Emerg Surg* [Internet]. 2020 Oct 19 [cited 2021 Feb 16];15(59). Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7574576/>
6. Spering C, Lefering R, Bouillon B, Lehmann W, von Eckardstein K, Dresing K, et al. It is time for a change in the management of elderly severely injured patients! An analysis of 126,015 patients from the TraumaRegister DGU®. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg*. 2020 Jun 1;46(3):487–97.
7. Ma MH, MacKenzie EJ, Alcorta R, Kelen GD. Compliance with prehospital triage protocols for major trauma patients. *J Trauma*. 1999 Jan;46(1):168–75.
8. Rogers A, Rogers F, Bradburn E, Krasne M, Lee J, Wu D, et al. Old and undertriaged: a lethal combination. *Am Surg*. 2012 Jun;78(6):711–5.
9. Fuller G, Pandor A, Essat M, Sabir L, Buckley-Woods H, Chatha H, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of prehospital triage tools for identifying major trauma in elderly injured patients: A systematic review. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg*. 2021 Feb;90(2):403–12.
10. Alshibani A, Alharbi M, Conroy S. Under-triage of older trauma patients in prehospital care: a systematic review. *Eur Geriatr Med Publ Online* [Internet]. 2021 Jun 10 [cited 2021 Aug 17]; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41999-021-00512-5>
11. Lane P, Sorondo B, Kelly JJ. Geriatric trauma patients-are they receiving trauma center care? *Acad Emerg Med*. 2003 Mar;10(3):244–50.
12. Trauma Audit and Research Network. Major Trauma in Older People [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2020 Aug 26]. Available from: <https://www.tarn.ac.uk/Content.aspx?c=3793>
13. Van Ditschuijzen JC, Van Den Driessche CRL, Sewalt CA, Van Lieshout EMM, Verhofstad MHJ, Den Hartog D. The association between level of trauma care and clinical outcome measures: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg*. 2020;89(4):801–12.
14. Cook A, Cade A, King B, Berne J, Fernandez L, Norwood S. Ground-Level Falls: 9-Year Cumulative Experience in a Regionalized Trauma System. *Bayl Univ Med Cent Proc*. 2012 Jan 1;25(1):6–12.
15. Roubik D, Cook AD, Ward JG, Chapple KM, Teperman S, Stone ME Jr, et al. Then we all fall down: fall mortality by trauma center level. *J Surg Res*. 2017;217:36-44.e2.

16. Ahmed N, Greenberg P. Examining outcomes in cases of elderly patients who fell from ground level at home with normal vital signs at the scene: An analysis of the National Trauma Data Bank. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg.* 2019;87(3):672–7.
17. Sammy I, Lecky F, Sutton A, Leaviss J, O’Cathain A, O’Cathain A. Factors affecting mortality in older trauma patients-A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Injury.* 2016 Jun;47(6):1170–83.
18. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Falls in older people: assessing risk and prevention (NICE Clinical Guideline 161) [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2021 Mar 12]. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg161>.
19. Bouamra O, Jacques R, Edwards A, Yates DW, Lawrence T, Jenks T, et al. Prediction modelling for trauma using comorbidity and ‘true’ 30-day outcome. *Emerg Med J.* 2015 Dec 1;32(12):933–8.
20. Hashmi A, Ibrahim-Zada I, Rhee P, Aziz H, Fain MJ, Friese RS, et al. Predictors of mortality in geriatric trauma patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg.* 2014 Mar;76(3):894–901.
21. Baker SP, O’neill B, Haddon WJ, Long WB. The injury severity score: a method for describing patients with multiple injuries and evaluating emergency care. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg.* 1974 Mar;14(3):187–96.
22. Royston P, Ambler G, Sauerbrei W. The use of fractional polynomials to model continuous risk variables in epidemiology. *Int J Epidemiol.* 1999 Oct 1;28(5):964–74.
23. Weingarten MS, Wainwright ST, Sacchetti AD. Trauma and aging effects on hospital costs and length of stay. *Ann Emerg Med.* 1988 Jan;17(1):10–4.
24. Shafi S, Barnes S, Nicewander D, Ballard D, Nathens AB, Ingraham AM, et al. Health care reform at trauma centers -mortality, complications, and length of stay. *J Trauma.* 2010 Dec;69(6):1367–71.
25. Moore L, Stelfox HT, Turgeon AF, Nathens A, Bourgeois G, Lapointe J, et al. Hospital length of stay after admission for traumatic injury in Canada: a multicenter cohort study. *Ann Surg.* 2014 Jul;260(1):179–87.
26. Brotemarkle RA, Resnick B, Michaels K, Morton P, Wells C. Length of hospital stay and discharge disposition in older trauma patients. *Geriatr Nur (Lond).* 2015 Apr;36(2 Suppl):S3-9.
27. Tan STS, Tan WPM, Jaipaul J, Chan SP, Sathappan SS. Clinical outcomes and hospital length of stay in 2,756 elderly patients with hip fractures: a comparison of surgical and non-surgical management. *Singapore Med J.* 2017 May;58(5):253–7.
28. Kashkooe A, Yadollahi M, Pazhuheian F. What factors affect length of hospital stay among trauma patients? A single-center study, Southwestern Iran. *Chin J Traumatol.* 2020 Jun;23(3):176–80.
29. Aitken LM, Burmeister E, Lang J, Chaboyer W, Richmond TS. Characteristics and outcomes of injured older adults after hospital admission. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2010;58(3):442–9.
30. Beaulieu RA, McCarthy MC, Markert RJ, Parikh PJ, Ekeh AP, Parikh PP. Predictive factors and models for trauma patient disposition. *J Surg Res.* 2014 Jul 1;190(1):264–9.
31. Patel H, Bouamra O, Woodford M, King A, Yates D, Lecky F. Trends in head injury outcome from 1989 to 2003 and the effect of neurosurgical care: an observational study. *The Lancet.* 2005 Oct 29;366(9496):1538–44.

32. Prosser CJ, Edwards D, Boumara O, Fuller G, Holliman D, Lecky F. Bypassing the nearest emergency department for a more distant neurosurgical centre in traumatic brain injury patients. *Br J Neurosurg*. 2020 Dec 16;1–7.
33. Smith JE, Morley R. The emergency medicine research priority setting partnership. *Emerg Med J*. 2015 Nov 1;32(11):830–830.
34. Alshibani A, Banerjee J, Lecky F, Coats TJ, Prest R, Mitchell Á, et al. A consensus building exercise to determine research priorities for silver trauma. *BMC Emerg Med*. 2020 Aug 21;20(1):63.