

Title Page

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Title: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery reduced length of stay after colorectal surgery in a small rural hospital in Ontario

A prospective cohort study using retrospectively matched controls to assess the effect of Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS on Length of Stay (LOS).

Author names and affiliations:

Hector A. Roldan, MD,FRCS, FACS ^{1*}

Andrew R. Brown MD, CCFP ²

Jane Radey, RN, CPN(C), RNFA³

John C. Hogenbirk, MSc ⁴

Lisa R. Allen, PhD ⁵

¹ Chief of Surgery, Muskoka Algonquin Healthcare, 100 Frank Miller Drive, Huntsville, Ontario, P1H 1H7, Associate Professor, Northern Ontario Medical School, 935 Ramsey Lake Road, Sudbury, ON, Canada P3E 2C6

² Anesthesiologist, Muskoka Algonquin Healthcare, 100 Frank Miller Drive, Huntsville, Ontario, P1H 1H7, Assistant Professor, Northern Ontario Medical School, 935 Ramsey Lake Road, Sudbury, ON, Canada P3E 2C6

³ Register Nurse, RNFA, CPN(C), Muskoka Algonquin Healthcare, 100 Frank Miller Drive, Huntsville, Ontario, P1H 1H7

⁴ Research Tutor, Postgraduate Medical Education Office, Northern Ontario School of Medicine, Associate Director, Centre for Rural and Northern Health Research, Laurentian University, 935 Ramsey Lake Road, Sudbury, ON, Canada P3E 2C6

⁵ Research Coordinator, Huntsville Physicians, South Muskoka and Parry Sound Local Education Groups, Muskoka Algonquin Healthcare, 100 Frank Miller Drive, Huntsville, Ontario, P1H 1H7

Corresponding Author: Hector Roldan, 348 Muskoka District Road 3, Huntsville ON, P1H 1C4, 1-705-380-0874, hectorroldan@cogeco.ca

^{1,2,3,4,5} These authors contributed equally to this work

Conflict of Interest: There are no conflicts of interest to declare.

This work was supported by the Northern Ontario Academic Medical Association Clinical Innovation Fund.

33 **Short Title:** ERAS reduces LOS in a small rural hospital

34

35 **Abstract**

36 **Background:** Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) programs include preoperative, intraoperative
37 and postoperative clinical pathways to improve quality of patient care while reducing length of stay and
38 readmission. This study assessed the feasibility and outcomes of an ERAS protocol for colorectal surgery
39 implemented over two-years in a small, resource-challenged rural hospital.

40 **Study design:** A prospective cohort study used retrospectively matched controls to assess the effect of
41 ERAS on LOS in patients undergoing colorectal surgery in a small rural hospital in northern Ontario,
42 Canada. ERAS patients were matched to two patients in the control group based on diagnosis, age and
43 gender. Patients had open or laparoscopic colorectal surgeries, with those in the intervention group
44 treated per ERAS protocol and given instructions on pre- and post-operative self-care.

45 **Results:** Most ERAS patients reported adherence to ERAS protocols prior to surgery. Approximately one
46 quarter of patients chose not to complete the postoperative survey. Of those who completed the
47 survey, adherence to protocol was strongest for chewing gum in the days after surgery. Most patients
48 were sitting in a chair for their afternoon meal by the first day and most were walking down the hallway
49 by the second day. The control and ERAS patient groups did not differ significantly ($p \geq 0.07$) in age
50 ($\bar{x}=68.5$ years, $sd=13.1$), gender (52% male), nor in the Canadian Classification of Health Interventions 5-
51 character code. The control group significantly higher ($p < 0.001$) malignant neoplasm of colon (C18, 69%
52 vs 35%), and significantly lower malignant neoplasm of rectum (C20, 0% vs 5%), relative to the ERAS
53 group. The control group had an average ln-transformed LOS that was significantly longer
54 (exponentiated as 1.7 days) than ERAS patients (t-test, $p < 0.001$).

55 **Conclusion:** This study found that ERAS could be implemented in a small rural hospital and provided
56 evidence for a reduced LOS of approximately two days.

57 **Keywords:** Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS); length of stay (LOS); hospitals, rural; colorectal

58 surgery; Ontario; perioperative care.

59

60 **Abbreviations**

61 CCI= Canadian Classification of Health Interventions

62 EMR= electronic medical record

63 ERAS= Enhanced Recovery After Surgery

64 ICD-10-CA=International Classification of Diseases, 10th revision, Canadian modification

65 LOS= length of stay

66 RNFA=Registered Nurse First Assistant

67 HDMH=Huntsville District Memorial Hospital

68 MAHC=Muskoka Algonquin Healthcare

69

70 Background

71 Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) programs consist of preoperative, intraoperative and
72 postoperative clinical pathways to improve the quality of patient care while reducing the length of stay,
73 readmission rates and reduce the economic impact on the institution (1–6). By following the 15 – 20
74 interventions defined by ERAS, many large centers have shown significant improvement in patient
75 outcomes, fewer surgical site infections and lower rates of hospital acquired infection (2–4). However,
76 evidence is sparse for the effectiveness of ERAS in smaller, rural hospitals (7). This study reports on the
77 feasibility and selected outcomes of implementing the ERAS program in a small rural hospital located in
78 an underserved region of Ontario, Canada.

79 ERAS programs use evidence-based medicine to challenge traditional surgical practices; strict fasting
80 protocols replaced by carbohydrate loading, control and optimal goal-directed fluid therapy during
81 surgery, advances in anesthesia allow catered approaches to minimize opioid use and early mobilization
82 after surgery is encouraged (6–9).

83 ERAS also highlights the need for patient engagement in their own healing. Patients appreciated playing
84 a role in their recovery and were highly satisfied with all aspects of their procedure such as physician
85 skill level (technical and interpersonal), preoperative patient education and availability of staff to the
86 patients (6,10,11).

87 Patient education is a key component from the preoperative stage through to post-operative follow-up
88 (6,12). Patients are encouraged to take some responsibility for their post-surgical outcomes (13),
89 particularly related to smoking cessation; smoking increases risk factors for wound healing, anastomotic
90 leak, perioperative stroke and myocardial infarction. Consistent and correct information is crucial as
91 demonstrated by previous research where 90% of older adults adhere more strongly to ERAS protocols
92 when time is taken to ensure the patients understand the guidelines (10,11,13).

93 Conventionally, patients preparing to undergo gastrointestinal surgery would be in a fasting state for a
94 minimum of eight hours to reduce the risk of aspiration pneumonia (14,15). Additionally, patients would
95 undergo a bowel preparation, which may increase the risk of dehydration, particularly in the elderly
96 (6,14). Patients that smoke, have functional dyspepsia, psychological stress or have an increase in
97 female hormones are at increased risk for delayed gastric emptying (14).

98 ERAS preoperative procedures focus on patient engagement and optimal preparation for their surgical
99 procedure in four key areas; breathing (smoking cessation), movement (exercise), nutrition and
100 expectations (clear surgery date) (8,12). Intraoperatively the patient is maintained at the ideal
101 anesthesia depth, has active warming, and goal-directed fluid therapy, particularly for high-risk patients
102 (11). Patients are risk-stratified for nausea and vomiting and are given pre-emptive medication
103 accordingly. Postoperatively, pain is managed with multi-modal therapy, minimizing opioid use ; narcotic
104 use is a rate-limiting step in patients regaining bowel function, which directly influences LOS and can
105 result in further complications (5,8,9). Epidural anesthesia is often part of this approach. Nasal gastric
106 tubes, bladder catheters, drains and intravenous fluid are used sparingly and removed as soon as
107 possible (8). Enteral feeding and early mobility are introduced as soon as feasible after surgery and
108 routine screening for delirium is conducted for older adults (11).

109 Studies overwhelmingly suggest that adherence to the entire pathway produces the best patient
110 outcomes (1,7,8) and highlights the need for healthcare professionals to work as a multidisciplinary
111 team (2,7,11). The program requires input and support from all layers within the facility: hospital
112 administrators and senior leadership, clinicians including surgeons, anesthesiologists and nurses, and
113 allied health professionals such as physiotherapists and dietitians (3,16,17).

114 Successful execution of ERAS requires substantial changes from the traditional methodologies for
115 gastrointestinal surgeries. While ERAS protocols have been in place in urban centers for several years,

116 this may be a challenge in rural hospitals, which have fewer resources (7). The goal of this project was to
117 determine the feasibility of implementing an ERAS protocol for gastrointestinal procedures over two
118 years in a small rural hospital and to evaluate its impact on patient outcomes, LOS, morbidity and
119 readmission rate.

120 **Methods**

121 Study design and setting: A prospective cohort study, using retrospectively matched controls, was used
122 to assess the effect of ERAS on LOS in patients undergoing colorectal surgery in a small rural community
123 hospital situated in northern Ontario. Huntsville, Ontario has a stable population of 6482 and a
124 catchment area of just under 20,000 permanent residents quadrupling seasonally with tourists. Seniors
125 represent 27% of the population as it is also a retirement destination (Statistics Canada, 2016). The local
126 hospital, HDMH (one site of MAHC), has 37 acute care beds, dedicated for adult care. Children requiring
127 hospitalization are referred elsewhere for pediatric inpatient services. This study received ethics
128 approval from the Laurentian University Research Ethics Board (file number 2015-02-02) on April 10,
129 2015.

130 The surgical team involved the primary investigator HR, and two other surgeons, JM and RK. The study
131 educator and surgical assistant is a Registered Nurse First Assistant (RNFA). Anesthesia for all surgeries
132 was overseen by AB.

133 All patients undergoing routine colorectal surgery, either benign or malignant disease, were eligible for
134 the ERAS project. Consent for patients undergoing colorectal surgery was attained as per normal
135 procedure in the surgeon's office. Patients were educated regarding the surgical procedure and
136 expectations after which they had the opportunity to ask questions and have any aspect clarified. Family
137 members were included when possible. Smoking cessation was mandatory four weeks prior to all ERAS
138 procedures with patients receiving support aids if necessary. It was clarified that this was vital in

139 patient recovery for ERAS procedures and surgery would be rescheduled if patients were unable to
140 cease smoking. Participation was offered to all eligible patients between November 1, 2015 to
141 November 1, 2017. All patients who were invited to participate, enrolled in the study. Consent was
142 obtained for 47 patients.

143 ERAS Protocol: The RNFA and, when required, the on-call anesthetist conducted patient education
144 sessions in the day surgery unit. These visits lasted one to two hours. ERAS patients received detailed
145 information about how to prepare for surgery, what they would need in the hospital and at home for
146 their post-surgical care. Patients were sent home with the ERAS Patient Education Booklet.

147 Traditionally, patients would only attend the hospital pre-surgically if a consult was required. Surgical
148 instructions and pre-surgical medications would be provided by their surgeon when the procedure was
149 booked.

150 ERAS patients were advised to consume two carbohydrate drinks prior to their surgery (the night before
151 and four hours before surgery). They were asked to chew gum as soon after recovery as possible and
152 were encouraged to start eating solid food and drinking immediately after surgery. Mobility was
153 promoted the night immediately following surgery by having patients sit and dangle their legs over their
154 bed. Short walks were encouraged the day after surgery.

155 Traditionally patients are advised to take nothing by mouth from the evening prior to surgery until the
156 day after surgery, though clear fluids are permitted after patients leave recovery. Patients often remain
157 in their bed for an extended period, until they feel well enough to walk.

158 When ERAS patients were seen by their surgeon two to four-weeks prior to their surgery, they were
159 instructed to optimize their nutrition and improve their cardiovascular activity. Smoking cessation was
160 required four weeks prior to surgery. Prescriptions were provided for oral antibiotics and bowel
161 preparation at the surgeon's discretion. Upon completion of their presurgical appointment, patients

162 could be referred for a preoperative anesthesia and/or internal medicine consultation if not already
163 done. Patients were asked to bring their ERAS patient handbook to the hospital with them on the day of
164 their surgery with the preoperative questionnaire completed in advance.

165 *On the day of surgery*, patients were instructed to fast after midnight, except for clear fluids as desired
166 and a mandated liquid carbohydrate load four hours prior to surgery. Once in the operating room, a
167 surgical checklist was completed as per routine hospital procedure. Intravenous antibiotics, to help
168 prevent surgical site infection, were initiated one hour prior to surgery, and deep-vein thrombosis
169 prophylaxis treatment, including compression stockings and sequential compression devices, was used.
170 Patients were warmed during surgery with an air blanket device to maintain their body temperature
171 while actively monitoring their temperature throughout.

172 Each ERAS patient received thoracic epidural anesthesia prior to anesthetic induction. Induction of
173 general anesthesia was done via usual technique with opioids, propofol and rocuronium dosed
174 individually by the attendant physician. Immediately after induction, an esophageal doppler probe,
175 which generates individualized, estimated real-time cardiac output, was placed to facilitate
176 intraoperative goal-directed fluid therapy. Patients were monitored in the usual fashion during surgery
177 and transferred to the ICU for monitoring and care after surgery.

178 *After surgery*, while still in hospital, patients tracked their progress in their patient handbook. Many
179 wrote additional notes and comments in the margins of their handbook about their experience,
180 interaction with staff or how they were feeling. The patient handbook was left with the nursing staff to
181 be collected by the research team when the patient was discharged. ERAS post-operative
182 recommendations included early mobilization after surgery, chewing gum daily, early return to normal
183 diet and the optimal use of pain management.

184 Data collection and analyses: Patients were asked to complete the ERAS patient handbook pre-and

185 postoperatively. Questions were asked about the patient's role and expectations for recovery. Patients
186 were also asked to report their perceived pain using a 10-point visual analogue scale with 0 being no
187 pain and 10 being the highest pain they had experienced. Data were also collected from the hospital's
188 EMR including: sex, age (years), most responsible diagnosis (coded by International Statistical
189 Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 10th Revision, Canada, ICD-10-CA), principal
190 surgical procedure (coded by the Canadian Classification of Health Interventions, CCI), and LOS, in days.
191 Additional data were collected for patients who were enrolled in the ERAS program from November
192 2015 to November 2017. These data included presence of ileus, vomiting/nausea, urinary retention,
193 wound infection or dehiscence, deep vein thrombosis, pneumonia, anastomotic leak and readmission.
194 Of the 47 patients recruited to the study, seven patients were removed at the discretion of the
195 attending surgeon due to significant post-operative complications including complicated ileus,
196 substantial nausea and vomiting and a case of abdominal dehiscence that required re-suturing. These
197 complications were outlined in the ERAS order set at the beginning of the study.

198 An initial control group of 91 patients was obtained from the EMR for two years prior to implementation
199 of the ERAS program. Patients were matched on diagnosis, age and sex. A total of 11 patients were
200 removed from the control group because they experienced similar complications to those patients that
201 were excluded from the study (significant ileus, vomiting and diarrhea, surgical site complications).

202 The primary outcome was LOS, measured in whole days, with 80 patients in the control group and 40
203 patients in the ERAS group. The choice of statistical procedures was informed by Chazard et al. (2017)
204 who recommended Student's t-test on logarithmic transformed data or the Mann-Whitney (Wilcoxon)
205 test for two independent groups. Chazard's recommendations, developed for equal sample size, were
206 assumed to apply to this study with twice as many patients in the control group than in the ERAS group.
207 We also used Student's t-test and Fisher's test (using exact methods or Monte Carlo methods based on
208 10,000 randomly sampled tables) to look for differences in patients' age and sex, as well as ICD-10-CA

209 and CCI codes between the control and ERAS group. We used McNemar tests to look for differences in
210 self-reported pain scores from the night following the surgery to days 1, 2 and 3 post-surgery. All
211 analyses were conducted with IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 24.0 (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.).

212 Results

213 ERAS patients, protocol, and outcomes: Exactly 55% of ERAS patients were male and were somewhat
214 older, though not statistically significant, than female patients in this group (Chi-squared test, $p=0.57$)
215 (**Table 1**). At least 57% of patients had adhered to preoperative instructions to drink bowel preparation
216 and bring chewing gum with them (**Table 2**). Patients' recall of what was expected of them and their
217 expected LOS was 65% or higher with one exception; only 48% (19 of 40) of patients recalled being
218 informed that they would be able to consume solid foods the day after surgery.

219 On the night following surgery, 45% of the patients dangled their legs from the bed with help, 55%
220 completed their breathing exercises and 73% were offered clear fluids (**Table 2**). The day after surgery
221 between 38% and 53% of patients consumed breakfast or lunch while sitting in their chair, 73% reported
222 consuming liquids and 78% chewed gum at least once. Only 23% indicated they were 'peeing on their
223 own', while 40% reported they were passing gas. On day two post-surgery, 56% of patients ate one meal
224 in their chair and reported walking down the hall at least once, 45% were consuming solid food, 73%
225 were chewing gum, 47% were 'peeing on their own' and 47% were passing gas. Day three findings were
226 like day two.

227 The night of the surgery, 25% of patients reported moderately high pain (6-7) and 12% reported high
228 pain (8-10) (**Table 3**). On the day following surgery, 20% of patients reported moderately high pain and
229 25% reported high pain. On days two and three after surgery, patients indicated a trend towards lower
230 pain, though these day-to-day trends were not statistically significant (McNemar test, $p>0.27$).

231 Overall, up to 87% of patients completed the surveys in the ERAS patient handbooks, though response

232 rates for some questions were as low as 20%. Recalculating percentages by excluding missing data,
233 particularly for discharged patients, showed increased adherence to ERAS recommendations or
234 achievement of desirable outcomes.

235 ERAS patient complications: The most common complications included urinary retention or nausea and
236 vomiting (23%, 9/40 patients), and ileus (18%, 7 patients) (**Table 4**). Readmission was rare (8%, 3/40
237 patients), with one patient readmitted for general weakness, a second for myocardial infarction and a
238 third for pneumonia and surgical related complications. Exactly 60% of patients (24/40) had no
239 complications and only one patient had 3 or 4 complications.

240 ERAS patient comments: many patients added notes to their handbooks that included comments on the
241 reasons for their responses and about their experience. Retrospective feedback from staff indicated
242 that early removal of catheters was not well-received, particularly in patients that required multiple re-
243 catheterizations. Patients did report that they were highly satisfied with the ERAS procedures, staff and
244 being able to take part in their recovery. Written notes and comments were unanimously positive with
245 respect to patient education and the commitment demonstrated by the RNFA.

246 Patient comments: *“Very helpful to have meeting prior to surgery, Useful information on recovery”,*
247 *“Great to meet JR (RNFA) before surgery – put me at ease”, “Amazed by how quickly I felt good. Day 7*
248 *and no pain meds needed”, I feel good going home day 4”, “After my surgery I ate food and passed gas”,*
249 *“ERAS – amazing”, “I was happy to participate in the program”, “Great care in hospital”, “The program*
250 *was helpful and informative”.*

251 Control vs ERAS Patients: Average age of patients was 70.0 years (standard deviation, SD=12.5) in the
252 control group and 65.4 years (SD=14.0) in the ERAS patient group; this difference was not statistically
253 significant (t-test, p=0.07, mean difference=4.7, 95% confidence interval of the difference -0.3 to 9.6).
254 There was no statistically significant difference in the percentage of females (or males) between the

255 Control group (50.0%) and the ERAS group (45.0%) (Fisher's exact test, 2-sided $p=0.70$).

256 The control group had a significantly higher percentage (69% vs 35%, Fisher's exact test, $p<0.001$) of ICD-

257 10-CA code C18 (malignant neoplasm of colon), and significantly lower percentage (0% vs 5%) of C20

258 (malignant neoplasm of rectum), relative to the ERAS group (**Table 5**). There were no significant

259 differences between control and ERAS groups for 5-character CCI codes ($p=0.503$) (**Table 6**)(18).

260 For logarithm-transformed LOS data, Levene's test of equal variances was significant ($F=4.44$, $p=0.045$)

261 and therefore the independent samples Student's t-test that assumed unequal variances was used. This

262 test found that control patients had a LOS that was significantly longer than ERAS patients ($p<0.001$)

263 (**Table 7**). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test found a significant difference in the distribution of

264 untransformed or transformed LOS between Pre- and Post-ERAS patient groups ($p<0.001$). The mean

265 difference in logarithm-transformed LOS was 0.548, which was reverse transformed (exponentiated) as

266 a difference of 1.73 days. A test of medians found that median of the control patient group (median

267 LOS=6) was significantly higher than that of the ERAS patient group (median LOS=4) ($p=0.001$).

268 Removing 6 cases in the control group with extreme LOS (≥ 21 days, **Figure 1**) yielded similar statistical

269 test results. A detailed comparison of LOS is provided in **Appendix 1**.

270 Results Summary: Most ERAS patients reported adherence to ERAS protocols prior to surgery. Of those

271 who did complete the survey, adherence to the chewing gum protocol, in the days after surgery, was

272 strongest. Most patients were sitting in a chair for their afternoon meal by the first day and were

273 walking down the hallway by the second day. Control patients mean age, male/female percentages and

274 surgical procedures (based on the 3-character CCI code) were not significantly different from that of

275 ERAS patients. Comparison of ICD-10-CA found statistically significant differences between Control

276 group (more malignant neoplasm of colon) and the ERAS group (more malignant neoplasm of rectum).

277 ($p\leq 0.001$). The effect of these differences on LOS was not assessed.

278 All statistical tests on natural logarithm transformed LOS consistently found that Control LOS differed
279 from ERAS LOS. The best available evidence suggests that Control LOS was significantly longer (by 2
280 days) than ERAS LOS.

281 Discussion

282 ERAS programs using preoperative and postoperative clinical pathways to improve patient outcomes
283 were introduced more than two decades ago however, they are almost exclusively implemented in large
284 urban centers and associated with teaching hospitals. Studies have shown that incorporating ERAS
285 protocols can enhance patient outcomes, reduce the LOS for patients and offer cost savings for the
286 institution (1–7). However, implementing these protocols requires significant multidisciplinary
287 teamwork. Many of the ERAS protocols conflict with traditional practice, which can make uptake
288 difficult. The goal of this project was to demonstrate that ERAS can be performed in a small rural
289 hospital and positively impact patient outcomes.

290 Over the two-year study, 40 patients were included in the ERAS procedures for colon or rectal surgery.
291 Patients were asked to report on which of the ERAS principles they were informed about and which they
292 complied with. It was found that most patients (75%) consumed the presurgical carbohydrate and
293 chewed gum consistently after surgery. Patient mobility immediately after surgery was also noted, as
294 patients made efforts to both walk in the hallway and take their meals in their chair. Early consumption
295 of food post-operatively was not reported frequently and feedback from patients indicated that the use
296 of an anti-emetic may have improved this. Patients frequently reported feeling nauseous (23%), some to
297 the point of vomiting.

298 Urinary retention was also high among patients (28%). Comments indicated that early withdrawal of
299 catheters was not well-received, particularly when patients required multiple re-catheterizations.

300 Patients did, however, report that they were highly satisfied with the ERAS procedures and staff and

301 taking part in their recovery. Feedback in the form of written notes and comments were unanimously
302 positive, particularly with respect to patient education and the commitment demonstrated by the RNFA.
303 Huntsville, Ontario is a community with an aging population, which was evident in this study. Of the 40
304 patients treated, the average age was 65 years, equally represented by female and male patients.
305 Demonstrating improved patient outcomes and a reduced LOS is of importance in this age group as they
306 are predisposed to chronic conditions and susceptible to nosocomial infections.

307 **Limitations:**

308 While all patients were provided the ERAS patient handbook and were asked to complete the handbook
309 throughout their hospital stay, approximately one-quarter did not. Tasking hospital staff, volunteers or
310 research assistants to help patients complete these questionnaires would likely improve response rates,
311 perhaps improve adherence to protocols, and would help identify which ERAS procedures have a higher
312 impact on outcomes.

313 There are limitations to interpretation based on a matched case study design that uses historical
314 controls. For example, the matching process was conducted on three variables (age, gender and
315 diagnosis) and the effect on LOS of differences between the control and ERAS of these and other
316 variables is unknown. LOS was not adjusted by any method such as the National Surgical Quality
317 Improvement Program risk calculator (ACS 2020). To simplify analyses, the study used unadjusted LOS.

318 The study was conducted at a single site and results may not necessarily be applicable to other rural
319 hospitals. However, it is worth noting that the ERAS program was successfully implemented in a low-
320 resourced rural hospital, with an aging patient population and compounded by a strong seasonal influx
321 of tourists. Evidence of a reduction in LOS complements success in implementation.

322 **Conclusions:**

323 ERAS consists of a series of preoperative, intraoperative and postoperative clinical pathways aimed at

324 improving clinical care to improve the quality of patient care with patients as active partners in their
325 care. Patient compliance was highest for chewing gum and drinking carbohydrate liquids. Patient
326 outcomes were lowest for ‘peeing on their own’ with several patients requiring re-catheterization.
327 Similarly, the highest complications found in 20% – 30% of patients were urinary retention, nausea and
328 vomiting, and ileus. Pain scores were generally well controlled and overall patient feedback was positive,
329 appreciating that their participation impacted their post-operative recovery. This study found that ERAS
330 could be implemented in a small rural hospital and that LOS could be reduced by two days.

331 **Future Direction:**

332 Creating and implementing pre surgical, surgical and post-surgical electronic order sets for the ERAS
333 pathway is underway at the HDMH. The order sets and training developed through this study are being
334 shared and implemented at the sister site of MAHC, South Muskoka Memoria Hospital.

335 **Acknowledgements:** This work was supported by the Northern Ontario Academic Medical Association
336 Clinical Innovation Fund. We thank Jennifer Dart and Anca Pengilly for data abstraction, compilation of
337 control cases, assistance in organization and presentation of data for analyses. We also thank the
338 patients and staff of Muskoka Algonquin Healthcare for their participation and support of this study.

339 **Conflict of interest statement:** The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

340 References

- 341 1. Enhanced recovery after surgery in colorectal surgery: Impact of protocol adherence on patient
342 outcomes. - PubMed - NCBI [Internet]. [cited 2020 Feb 26]. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm-nih-gov-ezproxy-lakeheadu-ca.proxy.lib.nosm.ca/pubmed/30583114>
343
- 344 2. Enhanced recovery after surgery: implementing a new standard of surgical care. - PubMed - NCBI
345 [Internet]. [cited 2020 Feb 26]. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm-nih-gov-ezproxy-lakeheadu-ca.proxy.lib.nosm.ca/pubmed/31036609>
346
- 347 3. Gianotti L, Beretta S, Luperto M, Bernasconi D, Valsecchi MG, Braga M. Enhanced recovery
348 strategies in colorectal surgery: is the compliance with the whole program required to achieve the
349 target? *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 2014 Mar;29(3):329–41.
- 350 4. Gonzalez-Ayora S, Pastor C, Guadalajara H, Ramirez JM, Royo P, Redondo E, et al. Enhanced
351 recovery care after colorectal surgery in elderly patients. Compliance and outcomes of a
352 multicenter study from the Spanish working group on ERAS. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 2016
353 Sep;31(9):1625–31.
- 354 5. Rosenberg K, Kayyali A. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery in a Community Hospital. *AJN Am J Nurs.*
355 2014 Dec;114(12):69.
- 356 6. Philp S, Carter J, Pather S, Barnett C, D'Abrew N, White K. Patients' satisfaction with fast-track
357 surgery in gynaecological oncology. *Eur J Cancer Care (Engl).* 2015 Jul;24(4):567–73.
- 358 7. Tebala GD, Keane S, Osman A, Ip M, Khan AQ, Perrone L. Early Discharge After Colorectal
359 Resection: The Positive Impact of an Enhanced Recovery Program on a Rural Colorectal Surgery
360 Service. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech.* 2016 Dec;26(6):e137–44.
- 361 8. Soeters PB. The Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) program: benefit and concerns. *Am J Clin*
362 *Nutr.* 2017 Jul;106(1):10–1.
- 363 9. Gómez-Izquierdo JC, Trainito A, Mirzakandov D, Stein BL, Liberman S, Charlebois P, et al. Goal-
364 directed Fluid Therapy Does Not Reduce Primary Postoperative Ileus after Elective Laparoscopic
365 Colorectal Surgery: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Anesthesiology.* 2017;127(1):36–49.
- 366 10. Gillis C, Gill M, Marlett N, MacKean G, GermAnn K, Gilmour L, et al. Patients as partners in
367 Enhanced Recovery After Surgery: A qualitative patient-led study. *BMJ Open.* 2017
368 24;7(6):e017002.
- 369 11. Hegarty A, Shah N. Enhanced recovery: pathways to better care. *Br J Hosp Med.* 2017 Oct
370 2;78(10):597–597.
- 371 12. Nicolescu TO. Perioperative Surgical Home. Meeting tomorrow's challenges. *Romanian J Anaesth*
372 *Intensive Care.* 2016 Oct;23(2):141–7.
- 373 13. Schatz C. Enhanced Recovery in a Minimally Invasive Thoracic Surgery Program. *AORN J.* 2015
374 Nov;102(5):482–92.
- 375 14. Pogatschnik C, Steiger E. Review of Preoperative Carbohydrate Loading. *Nutr Clin Pract Off Publ*

- 376 Am Soc Parenter Enter Nutr. 2015 Oct;30(5):660–4.
- 377 15. Bozzetti F, Mariani L. Perioperative nutritional support of patients undergoing pancreatic surgery
378 in the age of ERAS. *Nutr Burbank Los Angel Cty Calif*. 2014 Dec;30(11–12):1267–71.
- 379 16. Aarts M-A, Rotstein OD, Pearsall EA, Victor JC, Okrainec A, McKenzie M, et al. Postoperative ERAS
380 Interventions Have the Greatest Impact on Optimal Recovery: Experience With Implementation of
381 ERAS Across Multiple Hospitals. *Ann Surg*. 2018 Jan 4;
- 382 17. Watson DJ. Nurse coordinators and ERAS programs. *Nurs Manag (Harrow)*. 2018 Jan;49(1):42–9.
- 383 18. ACS Risk Calculator - Home Page [Internet]. [cited 2020 Aug 4]. Available from:
384 <https://riskcalculator.facs.org/RiskCalculator/>
- 385 19. Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI), 2015a. Canadian classification of health
386 interventions. CIHI, Ottawa, ON, Canada.
387 https://www.cihi.ca/sites/default/files/cci_volume_three_2015_en_0.pdf
- 388 20. Chazard E, Ficheur G, Beuscart J-B, Preda C. 2017. How to Compare the Length of Stay of Two
389 Samples of Inpatients? A Simulation Study to Compare Type I and Type II Errors of 12 Statistical Tests.
390 *Value in Health*. 20(7): 992–998.
- 391 21. Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI), 2015b. International Statistical Classification of
392 Diseases and Related Health Problems, Tenth Revision, Canada. CIHI, Ottawa, ON,
393 Canada.https://www.cihi.ca/sites/default/files/icd_volume_one_2015_en_0.pdf
394

395 **Table 1.** Age-sex distribution of 40 ERAS patients

Age (years)	Male		Female		All Patients	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<60	6	27%	8	44%	14	35%
60-69	4	18%	4	22%	8	20%
70-79	7	32%	4	22%	11	28%
80-89	5	23%	2	11%	7	18%
Sub-total	22	100%	18	100%	40	100%

396

397

398 **Table 2:** ERAS Procedural Compliance as reported by patients pre-and post-operatively

Question	Yes	No	No Answer
Did you drink bowel preparation?	28 70%	3 8%	9 23%
Did you bring chewing gum with you?	24 57%	1 2%	17 40%
Were you informed that you are expected to dangle your legs out of bed within four hours of surgery?	26 65%	0 0%	14 35%
Were you informed that you are expected to chew gum after surgery to help you pass gas?	26 65%	0 0%	14 35%
Were you informed that you are expected to eat your meals in a chair, out of bed?	26 65%	0 0%	14 35%
Were you informed that you are able to consume solid foods the day after surgery?	19 48%	5 13%	16 40%
Were you informed that your LOS is expected to be three days (colon) or four days (rectal)?	30 75%	0 0%	10 25%
Were you encouraged to drink a high carbohydrate drink the night before your surgery?	31 78%	0 0%	9 23%
Were you encouraged to drink a high carbohydrate drink two hours before your surgery?	31 78%	0 0%	9 23%
Night of surgery (with help)			
I sat at the side of my bed for 10 – 15 minutes (with help).	18 45%	9 23%	13 33%
I did deep breathing exercises 10 times per hour when I was awake.	22 55%	10 25%	8 20%
I was offered sips of clear fluids	29 73%	3 8%	8 20%

399

Days After Surgery	Day 1			Day 2			Day 3		
	Yes	No	No Answer	Yes	No	No Answer	Yes	No	No Answer
I sat in the chair for my morning meal.	15 38%	13 33%	12 30%	23 58%	6 15%	11 28%	23 58%	7 18%	10 25%
I sat in the chair for my afternoon meal.	21 53%	9 23%	10 25%	22 55%	6 15%	12 30%	22 56%	5 13%	12 30%
I sat in my chair at other times throughout the day.	16 40%	9 23%	15 38%	23 58%	4 10%	13 33%	15 38%	4 10%	21 53%
I walked down the hall at least once.	17 41%	9 22%	15 37%	23 58%	2 5%	15 38%	23 58%	2 5%	15 37%
I had nothing to eat or drink	0 0%	30 75%	10 25%	3 8%	6 15%	31 78%	2 5%	6 15%	32 80%
I had liquids to eat/drink.	29	0	11	26	1	13	23	0	17

Days After Surgery	Day 1			Day 2			Day 3		
Question	Yes	No	No Answer	Yes	No	No Answer	Yes	No	No Answer
	73%	0%	28%	65%	3%	33%	58%	0%	43%
I had solid food.	17 43%	4 10%	19 48%	18 45%	3 8%	19 48%	19 38%	3 8%	28 70%
I chewed gum in the morning.	28 72%	2 5%	9 23%	28 72%	3 8%	8 21%	25 63%	3 8%	12 31%
I chewed gum in the afternoon.	31 78%	1 3%	8 20%	29 73%	2 5%	9 23%	22 55%	3 8%	15 38%
I chewed gum in the evening.	27 68%	2 5%	11 28%	29 73%	3 8%	8 20%	19 48%	3 8%	18 45%
My catheter came out today.	13 33%	16 40%	11 28%	14 35%	11 28%	15 38%	11 28%	11 28%	18 45%
I am peeing on my own.	9 23%	20 50%	11 28%	19 48%	10 25%	11 28%	22 55%	4 10%	14 35%
I am passing gas.	16 40%	14 35%	10 25%	21 53%	9 23%	10 25%	24 60%	3 8%	13 33%

400

401

402 **Table 3.** Number of ERAS patients and their self-reported daily pain measurement score. *†

Time relative to Surgery	Pain level 0	Pain level 1-3	Pain Level 4-5	Pain level 6-7	Pain level 8-10	No Answer
First Night after surgery	5 12%	4 10%	9 22%	10 24%	5 12%	8 20%
Day 1 after surgery	2 5%	3 8%	6 15%	8 20%	10 25%	11 28%
Day 2 after surgery	2 5%	7 18%	8 20%	8 20%	5 13%	10 25%
Day 3 after surgery	2 5%	6 15%	8 20%	6 15%	4 10%	14 35%

403 * McNemar tests did not find any evidence of a difference from one night or day to any of the next subsequent days ($p>0.27$)

404 † Pain was reported using a visual analog scale.

405

406

407 **Table 4:** Complications of 40 ERAS patients*

Complication	Yes	No
Nausea or Vomiting	9 23%	31 78%
Urinary Retention	9 23%	31 78%
Ileus	7 18%	33 83%
Wound Dehiscence	1 3%	39 98%
Deep Vein Thrombosis	1 3%	39 98%
Pneumonia	1 3%	39 98%
Wound Infection	0 0%	40 100%
Anastomotic Leak	0 0%	40 100%
Number of Patients with...		
No complications	24	60%
1 complication	7	18%
2 complications	7	18%
3 or 4 complications†	2	5%

408 * Three patients (8%) were re-admitted.

409 † One of these two patients had ileus, nausea or vomiting and urinary retention, while the second patient had these three
410 complications plus wound dehiscence.

411

412 **Table 5:** International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 10th Revision,
 413 Canada (ICD-10-CA) 3-character code for Control and ERAS patient groups.

ICD-10-CA *		Patient Group †		Total
		Control	ERAS	
C18	Count	55 ‡	14 §	69
	% within patient group	68.8%	35.0%	57.5%
C19	Count	3	0	3
	% within patient group	3.8%	0.0%	2.5%
C20	Count	0 §	2 ‡	2
	% within patient group	0.0%	5.0%	1.7%
D12	Count	9	8	17
	% within patient group	11.3%	20.0%	14.2%
K55	Count	0	1	1
	% within patient group	0.0%	2.5%	0.8%
K56	Count	3	1	4
	% within patient group	3.8%	2.5%	3.3%
K57	Count	4	6	10
	% within patient group	5.0%	15.0%	8.3%
K62	Count	1	2	3
	% within patient group	1.3%	5.0%	2.5%
N32	Count	1	2	3
	% within patient group	1.3%	5.0%	2.5%
Z43	Count	4	4	8
	% within patient group	5.0%	10.0%	6.7%
Total	Count	80	40	120
	% within patient group	100%	100%	100%

414 * The 23 full ICD-10-CA codes were collapsed to ten 3-character codes. Source: CIHI (2015a)

415 † Fisher's Test (2-sided), Monte Carlo method: p=0.004 (95% Confidence Intervals for p: 0.002 to 0.005).

416 ‡ The observed count was significantly higher than predicted by marginal totals.

417 § The observed count was significantly lower than predicted by marginal totals.

418

419

420 **Table 6:** Canadian Classification of Health Interventions (CCI) 5-character code for Control and ERAS
 421 patient groups.

CCI code *		Patient Group †		Total
		Control	ERAS ‡	
1.NM.82	Count	4	4	8
Reattachment, large intestine	% within patient group	5.0%	10.8%	6.8%
1.NM.87	Count	75	33	108
Excision partial, large intestine	% within patient group	93.8%	89.2%	92.3%
1.NQ.74	Count	1	0	1
Fixation, rectum	% within patient group	1.3%	0.0%	0.9%
Total	Count	80	37	117
	% within patient group	100%	100%	100%

422 * The full CCI codes were collapsed to three 5-character codes. Source: CIHI (2015b)

423 † Fisher's Test (2-sided), Monte Carlo method: p=0.503

424 ‡ CCI codes were missing for 3 ERAS patients.

425

426 **Table 7.** Independent samples t-test of the difference of the mean ln(LOS) between Control and ERAS
 427 patient groups.


Patient Group		N	Mean ln(LOS)	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of the Mean	
Control		80	1.93	0.611	0.0683	
ERAS		40	1.38	0.463	0.0732	
t-test for Equality of Means						
t	df	p-value (2-tailed)	Mean Difference ln(LOS)	Standard Error of the Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
5.62	97.9	<0.001	0.55	0.10	0.36	0.74
<i>Reverse-transformed *</i>			<i>1.73</i>	<i>1.10</i>	<i>1.43</i>	<i>2.10</i>

428 * Values were reverse transformed as e^x , with $e \sim 2.718$, and $x = \ln(\text{days})$.

429

430

431



432

433 **Figure 1.** Frequency of length of stay-LOS (days) for 80 Control patients and 40 ERAS patients.

434

435

436 **Appendix 1:** Length of stay (categories) by sex for control and ERAS patients.

	Control						ERAS					
	Male		Female		All Control Patients		Male		Female		All ERAS Patients	
LOS (days)	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
≤3	2	5	5	13	7	9	11	50	8	44	19	48
4-6	16	40	23	58	39	49	8	36	7	39	15	38
7-10	9	23	5	13	14	18	3	14	1	6	4	10
>10	13	33	7	18	20	25	0	0	2	11	2	5
Total	40	100	40	100	80	100	22	100	18	100	40	100
Percentile					LOS (days)						LOS (days)	
25 th					3						4	
50 th (median)*					4						6	
75 th					5						10	
Minimum					2						2	
Maximum					13						34	
Mean (sd)					8.44 (6.278)						4.45 (2.407)	

* Difference between medians (Median test) p=0.001.

437

438

439

440

441