

1 **The impact of atypical intrahospital transfers on patient outcomes:**
2 **a mixed methods study**

3
4

5 Estera Mendelsohn^{1*}, Kate Honeyford², Andy Brittin³, Luca Mercuri,⁴ Robert Edward
6 Klaber^{5,6}, Paul Expert⁷, Céire Costelloe²

7
8
9

Paul Expert and Ceire Costelloe should be considered joint senior authors.

10 ¹Imperial College London, London, UK,

11 ²Institute of Cancer Research, London UK

12 ³Imperial College Healthcare Trust

13 ⁴Information Communications and Technology Department, Imperial College Healthcare
14 NHS Trust, London, UK

15 ⁵Department of Paediatrics, St Mary's Hospital, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust,
16 London, UK

17 ⁶Academic Centre for Paediatrics & Child Health, Imperial College London, London, UK

18 ⁷University College London, London UK

19

20 *e.mendelsohn18@imperial.ac.uk; ORCID:0000-0001-6552-8381

21

22 **ABSTRACT:**

23 **Background:** The architectural design of hospitals worldwide is centred around individual
24 departments, which require the movement of patients between wards. However, patients do
25 not always take the simplest route from admission to discharge, but can experience
26 convoluted movement patterns, particularly when bed availability is low. Few studies have
27 explored the impact of these rarer, atypical trajectories.

28
29 **Methods:** Using a mixed-method explanatory sequential study design, we firstly used three
30 continuous years of electronic health record data prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, from
31 55,152 patients admitted to a London hospital network to define the ward specialities by
32 patient type using the Herfindahl-Hirschman index. We explored the impact of 'regular
33 transfers' between pairs of wards with shared specialities, 'atypical transfers' between pairs
34 of wards with no shared specialities and 'site transfers' between pairs of wards in different
35 hospital site locations, on length of stay, 30-day readmission and mortality. Secondly, to
36 understand the possible reasons behind atypical transfers we conducted three focus groups
37 and three interviews with site nurse practitioners and bed managers within the same hospital
38 network.

39
40 **Results:** We found that at least one atypical transfer was experienced by 12.9% of patients.
41 Each atypical transfer is associated with a larger increase in length of stay, 2.84 days
42 (95%CI: 2.56-3.12), compared to regular transfers, 1.92 days (95%CI: 1.82-2.03). No
43 association was found between odds of mortality, or 30-day readmission and atypical
44 transfers after adjusting for confounders. Atypical transfers appear to be driven by complex
45 patient conditions, a lack of hospital capacity, the need to reach specific services and
46 facilities, and more exceptionally, rare events such as major incidents.

47
48 **Conclusion:** Our work provides an important first step in identifying unusual patient
49 movement and its impacts on key patient outcomes using a system-wide, data-driven
50 approach. The broader impact of moving patients between hospital wards, and possible
51 downstream effects should be considered in hospital policy and service planning.
52

53 BACKGROUND

54 The management of patients from hospital entry to exit is a major challenge in healthcare,
55 amid bed reductions and an aging population.[1] Secondary health systems are often
56 structured as wards within departmental disciplines, departments within hospitals, and
57 hospitals within multi-site organisational networks (or hospital 'trusts' in the UK). Patients
58 must move through various locations as their needs evolve, making intrahospital transfers a
59 daily practice in health systems worldwide. Many initiatives have attempted to optimise this
60 process, otherwise known as 'patient flow', [2], [3] typically by predicting demand on the most
61 commonly used patient pathways, and managing the points of 'constraint' (i.e. where
62 demand overwhelms the capacity) such as the emergency department (ED).[4]–[7] Often
63 trade-offs exist between admitting patients to the most appropriate ward and
64 accommodating all patients during peaks in bed demands. Patients can therefore undertake
65 convoluted movement patterns, particularly when bed availability is low. The impact of these
66 rarer, *atypical* trajectories is unclear. Despite the activity around expediting patient flow, few
67 studies have analysed hospital-wide patient movement with an etiological approach which
68 questions whether potential associations exist between specific transfer patterns and clinical
69 outcomes.[2], [8]

70

71 Several studies have examined the link between the number of intrahospital transfers
72 undergone by patients and adverse outcomes.[9] Taking a whole-system view of the patient
73 journey, they show that patients with more intrahospital movements have worse outcomes
74 with respect to length of stay (LOS), falls, infection risk and carers' perceptions of patient
75 discharge readiness.[10]–[16] However, intrahospital transfers occur for a variety of reasons,
76 (e.g. isolation due to infection, transfer to higher level-of-care, procedures, bed pressures
77 and patient preference) and this approach may overlook their unequal impacts on outcomes.
78 From a more targeted perspective, the outcomes of 'outlying', 'bed-spaced' or 'boarding'
79 individuals, which have been placed on clinically inappropriate wards have been
80 assessed.[17] The practice of outlying individuals into a ward outside of their home

81 speciality, resulting in transfers between inlier and outlier wards, can be a strategic decision
82 to reduce ED congestion, and is reported across health systems.[18]–[20] By definition such
83 patients deviate from the regular trajectory for their speciality. Some evidence suggests this
84 increases LOS, subsequent readmissions, and mortality.[17] However, outliers are usually
85 defined in a binary sense by whether the individual has been placed on an inappropriate
86 ward, without consideration to their movements up to and beyond the outlying ward. This
87 may be a significant source of unobserved confounding between outlying status and LOS,
88 with intrahospital transfers shown to double LOS in some populations.[11] A second
89 limitation is a lack of specificity in the definition of an outlying patient, which can be unclear,
90 or simplified to medical patients on a surgical ward.[17] Relying on predefined speciality
91 definitions may overlook occurrences where patients are on a suboptimal ward within their
92 overarching division,[21] or misclassify patients admitted to wards with multi-speciality staff.
93 These factors may lead to inaccurate effect estimates.

94
95 Patient movement connects many areas of the hospital and may lead to unintended
96 consequences, aligning with common characterisations of a complex system.[22] However,
97 while complexity can increase with the quantity and uniqueness of relationships between
98 components,[23] the literature taking a whole-system view of patient transfers has not
99 distinguished between transfer type, while the targeted outlier literature does not usually
100 consider the whole patient trajectory. A combination of these two approaches is needed,
101 which demarcates these more complex patient transfers from regular transfers, while
102 maintaining a view of the whole patient hospital journey. Guided by a data-driven definition
103 of ward specialities using EHR data, this two-strand study firstly defines atypical transfers as
104 movements between wards with no overlapping specialities and explores their association
105 with key patient outcomes. Secondly, to understand the nature of this novel exposure more
106 fully, we explore the causes of atypical transfers using in-depth qualitative interviews and
107 focus groups with site nurse practitioners and bed managers.

108

109 Objectives:

110 The overarching aim of this study is to understand the impact atypical transfers on patient
111 outcomes, and why these transfers occur. Fulfilling this aim therefore requires both
112 quantitative and qualitative data sources and is well suited to a mixed-methods
113 approach.[24] The specific objectives from the quantitative and qualitative strands of the
114 study are:

115 *Quantitative objectives:*

- 116 • To provide a systematic, data-driven definition of atypical transfers
- 117 • To explore the differential effects of atypical movement patterns on the patient
118 outcomes of: LOS, 30-day readmission and mortality


119 *Qualitative objectives:*

- 120 • To identify the possible causes of atypical transfers based on site nurse practitioners'
121 and bed managers' perceptions

122

123 **METHODS**

124 An explanatory sequential mixed-methods study design, with a quantitative focus, was
125 conducted using routinely collected quantitative EHR record hospital data and qualitative
126 semi-structured focus groups and interviews. The quantitative data were collected and
127 analysed under a retrospective cohort study design, while exploratory thematic content
128 analysis was used to describe the factors underlying the quantitative results. Quantitative
129 and qualitative findings were therefore integrated to generate an in-depth understanding of
130 the atypical transfers exposure. An overview of the study design is given in Figure 1.



131

132 **Figure 1:** Overview of study design. An explanatory sequential study design was used, with the
 133 qualitative and quantitative strand interacting at the data collection stage. The qualitative findings
 134 were used to explain and enrich the quantitative findings.

135

136 **Retrospective Cohort Study**

137 **Study setting and participants**


138 De-identified EHRs of patients admitted over a three-year period (falling between 2015 and
 139 2018) were extracted. The data included patient and spell unique identifiers, while dates of
 140 admission were fully anonymised. The data structure and setting are described in detail
 141 elsewhere.[14] A retrospective cohort study design was used to examine the association
 142 between atypical ward transfers and the outcomes of LOS, 30-day readmission, and in-
 143 hospital mortality. Aiming to compare the relative effects of different types of patient
 144 movements, we excluded patients who had been treated on one ward for their entire spell,
 145 meaning the minimum exposure was therefore one intrahospital transfer. Our quantitative
 146 analysis therefore asks the question: among patients who move, does moving atypically
 147 increase length of stay, odds of readmission, or mortality? Maternity and paediatric patients
 148 were excluded (see Supplementary Note 1a). Likewise, elective patients were excluded as
 149 planned admissions exhibit a different acuity profile to emergency patients. The full inclusion

150 criteria are shown in Supplementary Figure 1 and pre-analysis data processing is outlined in
151 Supplementary Figure 2.

152

153 **Exposure variables:**

154 Patient ward changes were defined as any change of location in the patients EHR including
155 temporary movements to procedure wards but excluding informal movements the
156 emergency department. The phrases patient transfer and movement are used
157 interchangeably. Three types of patient transfers were considered: atypical, regular and site
158 transfers (see Figure 2 for descriptions).



159 **Figure 2:** Decision tree flow chart outlining the criteria for the main exposures of interest: atypical
160 transfers, regular transfers, and site transfers.
161

162 **Ward specialities:**
163

164 We defined ward specialities based on the true hospital usage of the whole patient
165 population, including elective and day-only patients. A concise description of the patient's
166 condition was first obtained using Treatment Function Codes (TFCs), which refer to the
167 clinical division of the dominant healthcare professional responsible for the patient during an
168 episode of care.[25] TFCs are time-dependent, with broader admitting specialities (e.g.,
169 General Medicine) typically evolving into more specific descriptions (e.g., Cardiology) as
170 diagnoses and treatments are decided. The last recorded TFC was assumed to be the most
171 accurate summary of the patient's condition and selected for analysis. The patient's final
172 TFC was recorded against each unique ward entered during the spell, such that the patient
173 'deposited' their specialty at each stage of their journey through the hospital. Frequencies of
174 TFCs were generated per ward, and a commonly used measure of market competitiveness,
175 the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI),[26] was used to create a speciality diversity index,
176 defined as:

$$177 \quad HHI = \sum_{i=1}^N S_i^2$$

178 where S_i is the 'share' or proportion of patients admitted to a given ward from speciality i ,
179 and N is the total number of main specialities observed on the ward. The inverse of the HHI
180 index is a measure of the 'effective number of' groupings, or the equivalent market size
181 (EMS) corresponding to patient specialties ranked in descending order.[27] Each ward was
182 assigned a number of representative specialties corresponding to their EMS rounded to the
183 nearest integer. A high EMS indicates a multifunctional ward, while a low EMS indicates a
184 highly specialist ward. Wards assigned the same specialties are not necessarily equivalent
185 in function but could indicate a regular patient movement trajectory across two wards which
186 deliver different services.
187


188

189 **Atypical transfers:**

190 Atypical transfers were defined as a transfer between pairs of wards with no overlapping
191 specialties identified from their EMS (see Figure 3). We therefore use the term atypical

192 neutrally, reflecting the fact that such movements were uncommon given the speciality
193 profiles of the two wards, rather than an appraisal on the appropriateness of the transfer at
194 the individual patient level. To avoid inflating atypical transfer count by reciprocal trips to and
195 from one ward, wards which only admitted patients for an average of 6 hours or less were
196 verified and removed from the atypical transfer list if functioning as a temporary minor
197 procedure ward, such as endoscopy. All other transfers were regarded as regular (non-
198 atypical) transfers, with the exception site transfers (see Figure 2).

a) Examples of patients undertaking only *regular* ward-transfers b) Examples of patients undertaking some *atypical* ward-transfers



199

200 **Figure 3:** A depiction of a regular and atypical transfer movement. Ward pairs (i,k) , and (i,p) belong to
201 the same overarching speciality, making all transfers between them 'regular'. Similarly, ward pairs
202 (a,b) belong to an alternative overarching speciality and transfers between this pair are 'regular'.
203 Meanwhile, transfers between crossing specialities (such as (a,k) , and (i,b)) are classed as 'atypical'.
204

205 **Outcome variables:**

206 Three outcomes were investigated: LOS, 30-day readmission and in-hospital mortality. A
207 continuous variable for LOS was derived for each spell using the difference between
208 admission and discharge timestamps (recorded up to 15 minutes resolution) converted to
209 days and fraction of days. Unplanned readmissions were defined as emergency
210 readmissions for any reason (except for pregnancy) within 30 days of an index
211 hospitalisation. Index admissions were defined iteratively, such that each spell could
212 become an index admission if followed by a subsequent admission. The unit of analysis in
213 this regression was the index admission, and all covariates are taken from this spell. As all
214 hospital sites pertained to the same hospital network, readmissions to different sites were
215 included in the analysis (and distinguished from site transfers which were categorised under

216 the same spell ID).[28] If the index hospitalisation ended in death, it was excluded from the
217 analysis of readmission. Finally, in-hospital mortality was recorded as a binary variable if the
218 spell ended in the patient's death. The unit of analysis for all outcomes were hospital spells,
219 therefore patients could contribute more than one hospitalisation to the main model if it
220 fulfilled the selection criteria.

221

222 **Confounding variables:**

223 We aimed to control for available covariates which confounded the exposure-outcome
224 relationship.[29] Separate models were fitted for each outcome, and directed acyclic graphs,
225 were used to guide variable selection (Supplementary Figure 3). As acutely unwell patients
226 have been shown to have a higher number of transfers, and non-standard needs may be
227 more prone to taking uncommon routes through the hospital,[30] patient acuity and
228 complexity were considered confounders. We controlled for patient demographics and the
229 following variables in the modelling: Elixhauser comorbidity index, admission to an
230 ICU/critical care, weekend admissions and out of hours admissions (7pm-7am), the number
231 of primary ICD-10 codes (as an estimate of multi-morbidity.[31]) the major diagnostic
232 category of the first primary ICD-10 code recorded, discharge destination and severity of
233 surgical procedures (diagnostic, minor, intermediate, and major procedures using existing
234 code lists created by Abbott *et al.*, (see supplementary Note 1b) in addition to diagnostic
235 imaging.[32])

236

237 **Statistical Analysis**

238 Atypical transfers were explored using network analysis and depicted using a chord
239 diagram. Univariable regressions (see Supplementary Table 1a-c) and multivariable
240 regression models were fitted separately. The association between atypical transfers and
241 LOS was modelled by a generalized linear model (GLM) using a gamma distribution and a
242 log-link. Average marginal effects (AMEs) were computed with respect to the variables of
243 interest, holding all other variables constant.[33] It can be interpreted as the impact of a

244 change in a focal independent variable on predicted value of the outcome, holding other
245 variables constant.[34] AMEs were computed in R using the ‘margins’ command, specifying
246 ‘type = response’.[35] An interaction term between atypical transfers and age was explored
247 and found to be statistically insignificant. Logistic regressions were used to examine
248 associations for the outcomes of mortality and 30-day readmission. Clustered standard
249 errors by individual patient were implemented in all regression models using the Sandwich
250 package. No major collinearity existed between variables. Large LOS ‘outliers’ were not
251 removed, on the basis that these are true values in the data.[36], [37] Spells containing
252 incomplete information were removed as missingness was minimal. The DHARMA package
253 in R (Hartig 2018) was used to evaluate all model's fit.

254

255 **Sensitivity Analyses**

256 We performed 6 sensitivity analyses to examine the robustness of the results by altering
257 parameters related to the patient population, covariates exposure and model diagnostics
258 (Table 1).

259

260 **Table 1:** Summary of sensitivity analyses:

No.	Parameter	Modification
1	Patient population: discharged alive	We repeated the analysis of the impact of LOS with the exclusion of patients who did not survive their spell
2	Patient population: negative for infection or colonisation	We omitted patients who tested positive for any type of infection, as this can significantly increase LOS, risk of death and readmission, and result in atypical transfers specifically due to isolation procedures
3	Covariates: including approximate month of admission	The dates of admission anonymised and relative to a time 0, therefore seasonality effects could not be accurately investigated. Instead, an exploratory analysis was conducted to account for a possible seasonality effect via adjusting for a dummy variable created by binning every 30 days into 12 equal categories iterating over the three-year dataset
4	Covariates: including alternative surgical category	As no official categorisation of OPCS-4 surgical codes exists, a second analysis was conducted an alternative definition based on Bupa reimbursement code lists (see supplementary Note 1c for details)

5	Exposure definition: using first patient episode TFC	To understand the sensitivity of the atypical transfers definition, analyses were also repeated using the first TFC of the patient's admission.
6	Model diagnostics: excluding potentially influential outliers	We reported the main analyses with the exclusion of observations whose standardised residuals were above 3.[38]

261
262 Analyses were conducted using R version 4.2.1.

263

264 **Qualitative focus groups and interviews**

265 **Study population**

266 A purposeful sampling strategy was adopted whereby the clinical study lead sent an
267 invitation email to site nurse practitioners (clinical staff, denoted by prefix 'S' in participant
268 quotations) and bed managers (non-clinical staff, denoted by prefix 'B' in participant
269 quotations) of varying seniority at the study setting. Participants were prioritised by years of
270 experience, due to the quantitative data being historic (collected between 2015-2019) and by
271 familiarity with all three hospital sites. Three focus groups (consisting of 4 to 5 participants)
272 and three one-to-one interviews were conducted (totalling 16 participants). On average,
273 participants had 13.75 years of experience at the hospital trust. The number of focus groups
274 chosen was a pragmatic decision based on the availability of participants in this role during
275 the study period.

276

277 **Data collection**

278 All focus groups and interviews were conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams between 9
279 July 2022 and 29 October 2022. The focus groups duration was around 1 hour and
280 interviews 40 minutes. The decision to use online data collection methods was due to the
281 risk posed by the potential of Covid-19 transmission between participants, and the fact it
282 allowed participants to join from different sites while minimising disruption to their working
283 hours. A focus group topic guide which comprised visualisations of atypical transfer
284 pathways was pilot tested and revised.

285 **Data analysis**

286 Interviews and focus groups were visually recorded, transcribed and checked for accuracy
287 by EM. The thematic framework method was used to analyse the qualitative data content
288 surrounding atypical transfers. Codes were inductively generated from the data, with the
289 resulting codes used as the basis of a thematic framework. Subsequently, the framework
290 was used to index, chart, map and interpret the data within and between cases.[39] A
291 descriptive approach was taken, with themes remaining close to the participant's accounts,
292 and attention was paid to deviant cases which were included in the findings.[40] Annotation
293 and coding of transcripts were conducted using NVivo (Version 12, QSR International,
294 Burlington, Massachusetts, USA).

295

296 **Ethical approval**

297 This study was defined as service evaluation by the Health Service Research Authority and
298 therefore NHS Research Ethics Committee approval was not needed. The study was
299 approved as a service evaluation through Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust
300 (Ref:347/Ref:719) Ethical research practice standards were followed throughout, including
301 obtaining informed consent and right to withdraw from the study at any point.


302

303 **RESULTS**

304 **Patient characteristics:**

305 A total of 55,152 non-elective spells taking place during the 3-year study period met the
306 entry criteria for the study, of which 7,088 (12.9%) experienced at least one atypical transfer
307 between pairs of wards with no common main specialities (Figure 3). Of these, 5,844
308 (82.4%) undertook one atypical transfer, while 1,244 (17.6%) undertook two or more atypical
309 transfers. Meanwhile, 8.5% of all patients experienced at least one site transfer. Over half of
310 the population (54.2%) were transferred once during their spell (n=29,868). A breakdown of
311 transfer type for patients with multiple transfers is given in Supplementary Figure 4. Most of
312 the study population was male (52.9%), over 65-years old (55.2%), and 69.8% exhibited at

313 least one Elixhauser comorbidity. Out-of-hours admissions were common, with 48.0% of
314 admissions occurring between 7pm and 7am, while 23.8% of admissions occurred at
315 weekends. The median LOS was 7.2 days, and 3,022 (5.5%) of spells resulted in in-hospital
316 death.



317
 318 **Figure 4:** Chord diagrams depicting atypical transfers over the three hospital sites (A-C). Each sector in the outer track represents a ward, while each link
 319 between wards represents an atypical transfer. The thickness of the link is proportional to the volume of patients exchanged, between approximately 10 and
 320 360 patients. The label of the track reflects the top specialities of the patients residing on that ward based on the whole patient population, with a maximum of
 321 3 specialities.

322 Patients undertaking atypical transfers did not differ from those with no atypical transfers
 323 with respect to age, site transfers, Elixhauser comorbidities, or in-hospital death, with no
 324 statistically significant differences between non-atypical and atypical transfer patients (Table
 325 2). However, atypical transfer patients were more likely to be admitted at weekends and out
 326 of hours (25.3% vs 23.5% $p < 0.001$, and 52.0% vs 47.4% $p < 0.001$, respectively). Such
 327 patients also underwent more procedures of all categories (excluding major procedures), but
 328 had fewer admissions to the intensive care unit (ICU) (5.8% vs 6.9%, $p < 0.001$) (Table 2). A
 329 full descriptive characteristics table is given in Supplementary Table 2.

330
 331 **Table 2:** Descriptive characteristics of the patient population, stratified by whether they
 332 undertook at least one atypical transfer or not.
 333

	No atypical transfers (n=48,064)	At least one atypical transfer (n=7,088)	Total (n=55,152)	p-value
Regular ward transfers				< 0.001
Median	1	0	1	
Q1, Q3	1, 2	0, 2	1, 2	
Site transfers				0.677
Median	0	0	0	
Q1, Q3	0, 0	0, 0	0, 0	
Age (years)				0.245
18-39	6273 (13.1%)	906 (12.8%)	7179 (13.0%)	
40-65	15332 (31.9%)	2205 (31.1%)	17537 (31.8%)	
over 65	26459 (55.0%)	3977 (56.1%)	30436 (55.2%)	
Gender				< 0.001
Female	22419 (46.6%)	3589 (50.6%)	26008(47.2%)	
Male	25645 (53.4%)	3499 (49.4%)	29144 (52.8%)	
Length of stay (days)				< 0.001
Median	7.0	9.0	7.2	
Q1, Q3	3.3, 14.4	4.2, 19.6	3.5, 14.9	
Elixhauser comorbidities (n, %)				0.074
0	5254 (10.9%)	839(11.8%)	6093 (11.0%)	
1-4	33591 (69.9%)	4911 (69.3%)	38502 (69.8%)	
>=5	9219 (19.2%)	1338 (18.9%)	10557 (19.1%)	
Discharge destination				< 0.001
Not usual place of residence	7190 (15.0%)	1212 (17.1%)	8402 (15.2%)	
Usual place of residence	40874 (85.0%)	5876 (82.9%)	46750 (84.8%)	
Primary diagnosis count (n, %)				< 0.001
Mean (SD)	1.2 (0.4)	1.3 (0.5)	1.2 (0.4)	
Range	1.0 – 9.0	1.0 – 8.0	1.0 – 9.0	

Intensive Care Admission				< 0.001
No	44747 (93.1%)	6678 (94.2%)	51425 (93.2%)	
Yes	3317 (6.9%)	410 (5.8%)	3727 (6.8%)	
In-hospital mortality				0.187
No	45454 (94.6%)	6676 (94.2%)	52130 (94.5%)	
Yes	2610 (5.4%)	412 (5.8%)	3022 (5.5%)	
Weekend admission				0.001
No	36749 (76.5%)	5294 (74.7%)	42043 (76.2%)	
Yes	11315 (23.5%)	1794 (25.3%)	13109 (23.8%)	
Out of hours admission (7pm-7am)				< 0.001
No	25273 (52.6%)	3400 (48.0%)	28673 (52.0%)	
Yes	22791 (47.4%)	3688 (52.0%)	26479 (48.0%)	
Diagnostic imaging procedures (n, %)				< 0.001
0	23701 (49.3%)	2646 (37.3%)	26347 (47.8%)	
1-3	22206 (46.2%)	3891 (54.9%)	26097 (47.3%)	
4-6	1835 (3.8%)	440 (6.2%)	2275 (4.1%)	
Over 6	322 (0.7%)	111 (1.6%)	433 (0.8%)	
Minor surgical procedures (n, %)				0.008
0	40339 (83.9%)	5881 (83.0%)	46220 (83.8%)	
1-2	7193 (15.0%)	1103 (15.6%)	8296 (15.0%)	
3-5	473 (1.0%)	87 (1.2%)	560 (1.0%)	
Over 5	59 (0.1%)	17 (0.2%)	76 (0.1%)	
Major surgical procedures (n, %)				< 0.001
0	41334 (86.0%)	5857 (82.6%)	47191(85.6%)	
1-3	6198 (12.9%)	1168 (16.5%)	7366 (13.4%)	
4-6	453 (0.9%)	55 (0.8%)	508 (0.9%)	
Over 6	79 (0.2%)	8 (0.1%)	87 (0.2%)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuous variables were compared using the Kruskal–Wallis test, while categorical variables were compared by the chi-square test 				

334

335 **Atypical transfer characteristics:**

336 Across the three hospital sites, 805 unique atypical transfers ward pairs were identified.

337 While a small number of ward combinations account for the majority of atypical transfers,

338 many atypical transfer routes rarely used, with 78% of pairs being used 10 or less times

339 across the study period, and 29% of pairs only occurring once. Across all hospital sites the

340 most travelled atypical paths included short-term observation wards such as assessment

341 and clinical decision units (CDUs). While no transfers from A&E were recorded in the data,

342 CDUs which are short stay wards under the care of emergency medicine consultants,[41]

343 were labelled under the speciality A&E. This reflects the fact that most patients on this ward

344 were discharged before seeing another consultant. Only 1.6% of all transfers involved the

345 ICU or critical care ward, meaning that few atypical pathways are used to transport acutely
346 deteriorating patients

347


348 **Multivariable regression results:**

349 After adjusting for the listed confounders and averaging over all observations in the data
350 sample, each additional atypical transfer results in an estimated increase in LOS of 2.84
351 days (95% CI: 2.56-3.12). By comparison, regular ward transfers had an effect size of 1.92
352 days (95% CI: 1.82-2.03) increase in LOS for each additional transfer. Meanwhile, site
353 transfers showed the largest effect on LOS with an increase of 3.02 days in LOS (95%
354 CI:2.70-3.35) for each additional site transfer. Figure 5a summarises the AMEs from the
355 multivariable GLM used for the focal predictors LOS.

356

357 Atypical transfers and site transfers did not have a significant association with readmission in
358 the adjusted model (Figure 5b). However, there was weak evidence that regular transfers
359 are associated with a minor increase in odds of readmission (OR = 1.02, 95%CI 1.00-1.04).
360 Site transfers were associated with lower mortality (OR 0.72, 95%CI 0.64-0.80), with a
361 decrease of 28% in odds of death for each unit increase in site transitions (Figure 5c). No
362 relationship between atypical transfers or regular transfers and mortality was observed. Full
363 multivariable regression models are given in supplementary Tables 3-5.

364
365



366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382

Figure 5: Multivariable regression results. Panel A shows the multivariable GLM regression with a gamma distribution and log-link predicting hospital LOS (n = 55,152). Results are presented as adjusted average marginal effects in days. In addition to atypical transfers, regular transfers, site transfers, the regression is controlled for age, gender, ethnicity, Elixhauser comorbidities, weekend admission, out of hours admission, discharge destination, admission to an ICU/critical care ward, number of primary diagnoses, imaging procedures, minor, intermediate and major surgical procedures, and major diagnostic category. Panel B shows a multivariable logistic regression predicting emergency readmission (n = 52,125), with results presented as adjusted odds ratios. All spells ending in in-hospital death were removed from this regression (n = 3,022) and 5 remaining patients were removed from the major diagnostic category 'External causes of morbidity' to avoid violating the positivity assumption.[39] In addition to atypical transfers, regular transfers, site transfers, the regression is controlled for age, gender, ethnicity, Elixhauser comorbidities, weekend admission, out of hours admission, discharge destination, admission to an ICU/critical care ward, number of primary diagnoses, imaging procedures, minor, intermediate and major surgical procedures, major diagnostic category and length of stay. Panel C shows a multivariable logistic regression predicting in-hospital mortality (n = 55,000), with results presented as adjusted odds ratios. Patients under the major diagnostic categories 'external causes of morbidity' and 'factors influencing health status and contact with health services' (n = 152) were similarly removed due to the positivity assumption. Covariates included in the model were: atypical transfers, regular transfers, site transfers, the regression is controlled for age, gender, ethnicity, Elixhauser comorbidities, weekend admission, out of hours admission, admission to an ICU/critical care ward, number of primary diagnoses, imaging procedures, minor, intermediate and major surgical procedures, and major diagnostic category. All 95% confidence intervals are based on standard errors clustered at the patient level.

383 **Sensitivity analyses:**

384 The effect of atypical transfers was robust across the sensitivity analyses conducted, with
385 results remaining consistent. Redefining atypical transfers by using the TFC to determine
386 patient specialities reduced the number of patients undertaking at least one atypical transfer
387 by 22.8% (n=5,473). Nevertheless, effect sizes remained consistent, with the magnitude of
388 the impact of atypical transfers on LOS only marginally decreasing (AME = 2.58; 95%CI 2.28
389 – 2.87, p<0.001). Meanwhile, using an alternative categorisation of surgical procedures (See
390 Supplementary Note 1c) increased the effect size to 3.03 days (95%CI 2.75-3.32, p<0.001)
391 but attenuated the association between regular transfers and 30-day readmission (OR =
392 1.01; 95%CI 0.99-1.03, p=0.22). Removing influential outliers by large values of
393 standardised residuals resulted in 149 observations being dropped from the LOS model, 19
394 from the mortality model and none from the readmission model but did not meaningfully
395 change the main effects. All sensitivity analyses are presented in Supplementary Tables 6-8.

396

397 **Reasons underlying atypical transfers:**

398 Open coding identified 12 distinct reasons for atypical movements, classified under four
399 main themes: 'complex clinical journeys', 'non-clinical factors', 'a need for services and
400 facilities', and 'unusual pathways'. The four themes are outlined in the following section.
401 Table 3 details the codes and their descriptions, alongside illustrative quotations from the
402 data.

403

404 *Complex clinical journeys*

405 Participants highlighted the possibility that some patients have complex clinical journeys,
406 needing input from multiple specialities as their condition evolves. Co-occurring clinical
407 needs could therefore result in transfers across wards with differing but inter-related
408 specialities such as cardiology and renal wards, or stroke and vascular wards. Patients who
409 suffered from unexpected adverse events such as a stroke or a fall may likewise require
410 treatment across differing speciality wards equipped to treat their conditions. Participants

411 also discussed a population of patients whose clinical complexity meant that the most
412 appropriate speciality was unclear, resulting in multiple transfers as patients were assessed
413 and their treatment course decided. This group included patients being transferred from
414 clinical decisions units to in-hospital wards.

415

416 *Non-clinical factors*

417 A consistent explanation for atypical transfers offered across the data was the possibility
418 that atypical transfers occur for operational reasons. Patients could be outlied across
419 different divisions, such as medicine or surgery to create capacity for incoming patients. It is
420 important to note that these transfers could not always be clearly distinguished from those of
421 patients with complex journeys without additional patient-level information:

422 *Well two things, it could be typical or atypical. Typical if for example a patient is*
423 *coming with nausea and vomiting, [who] has developed a surgical problem - then*
424 *that would be a typical transfer, because ... it's not a medical problem anymore it's a*
425 *surgical...However, it becomes atypical if for example we're inundated with quite a*
426 *lot of medical patients in A&E... and they [surgical unit] have got something like 10*
427 *beds ... that they don't need... I would identify patients, with the help of the medical*
428 *team, to outlie patients into the spaces. It's because we need to deal with capacity*
429 *issues and safety of A&E. - Focus group 2, Participant S06*

430

431

432 Atypical transfer patients may also be moved within their overarching clinical division to
433 create bed spaces. While such transfers could still be classed as non-clinical, participants
434 typically distinguished these patients, who would remain in an appropriate overarching bed
435 base, from strict outlier patients. One participant highlighted that some speciality wards are
436 not able to admit patients out-of-hours, resulting in an intermediate general ward being used
437 to admit the patient.

438

439 *A need for services and facilities*

440 Another theme across the data involved atypical transfers to a specific service or facility.
441 These movements were distinct from complex clinical journeys in that they occurred in order
442 for the patient to reach a specific service, equipment or infrastructure, as opposed to more
443 broadly receive input from a second clinical speciality. A common example was the need for

444 rehabilitation services, which were offered on specific wards rather than as a mobile service.
445 In addition, cardiac monitoring was a scarce resource and usually required the patient to be
446 moved to a ward which provided this equipment. Similarly, if a patient became infected on
447 an open bay ward, a transfer would be required to an isolated single side-room, which are
448 only available in a minority of wards.

449

450 *Unusual pathways*

451 Finally, the 'unusual pathways' theme comprises a small number of atypical transfers which
452 participants highlighted as obscure, and possibly due to exceptional reasons. Unusual
453 reasons included major incidents, ward closures, and circumstances such as two individuals
454 being involved in a confrontation being admitted to the same trauma ward.

Table 3

Code and description	Illustrative quotes
Theme 1: Complex clinical journey	
<p>Co-occurring clinical needs</p> <p>The patient is moved between two different wards to receive input from a second speciality due to multimorbidity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “A lot of the renal patients that would have been there would also have been cardiology patients. Cause if you have a heart problem, you’re likely to have kidney problems and vice versa” – Interview 2, participant S12 • “So you need to remember the...stroke unit ... the national guidelines state they need to stay a certain percentage of their hospital stay in the acute stroke unit... [there are] usually patients who move out from there because they don’t, no longer require stroke care or because they need another speciality for example vascular, or if that’s causing a stroke, they need an intervention or a cardiology issue is causing them a stroke, so they tend to not have [an] atypical transfer.” - Focus group 2, participant S07
<p>Unexpected adverse event</p> <p>An unanticipated event results in a move to another speciality ward for treatment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “So the stroke units feeding into it could be anyone at anytime from A&E, or any of the inpatient wards can have a stroke while in hospital. So that could account for the transfers into them” – Interview 2, participant S12
<p>Uncertainty over clinical speciality</p> <p>A transfer taking place due to ambiguity over the most appropriate clinical speciality for a patient</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Previously [the CDU] was used to move people in there who may need to have fluids, who may need to have something else...So it could be that they were just moved because they weren’t ready, or it was not clear what speciality they needed to go to... You know, and then sometimes we would have people that were in there for days, but it was just to see ... if we could get them home from there, rather than going into an acute bed.” – Focus group 3, participant B03
Theme 2: Non-clinical factors	
<p>Creating capacity</p> <p>The patient is moved to an unrelated speciality to create bed capacity for an incoming patient on the ward</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “...[it] would be possible but unusual cause one is medicine or one is surgical so, yeah. I mean, it’s definitely possible, because the problem is we outline patients as well if there’s no capacity. So I’m guessing, you know, we’ve outlined orthopaedics and surgery on medicine.” – Interview 1, Participant S13 • “Because out of hours, oncology even though the patient is known under oncology, if we don’t have any capacity at all on the oncology wards, we normally put patients or place patients on the medical wards. Depending on the condition of the patients, because some of the oncology patients [need] cardiac monitoring for the acute phase.” – Focus group 3, participant S11

<p>Intra-divisional transfers</p> <p>A move to a speciality ward within the same overarching medical or surgical division to create bed capacity for an incoming patient</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “If for example, if they ran out of beds and because we cover quite a big area, we can't close services, so we need to be operational for 24 hours... we need to create capacity in this area. So very often we will speak with the stroke reg [registrar] who can identify people who are not in their acute phase, and they will be going to Ward S. Saying this, you wouldn't, kind of, <i>you</i> would say outlier, but its not – as [participant] said before because they're staying in the same division which is neuroscience” – Focus group 3, participant S09
<p>Admitting capability</p> <p>A temporarily placement on a ward out-of-hours</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Out of hours...for example, oncology, neurology, they don't admit patients. The patient is admitted under acute medicine and the speciality will take them over [the] next day” - Focus group 3, participant S09
<p>Correcting an incorrect placement</p> <p>The patient is returned to their home ward following a transfer for creating capacity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Some of the destinations of the atypical transfers aren't necessarily atypical destinations, they are the right destination, but they've gone from the wrong start point. So actually, its the ward they're going from is the atypical environment, and then actually we're almost correcting an incorrect placement. So if we put an orthopaedic patient on Ward L... that could actually be putting a patient back into the right place” - Focus group 1, participant S01
<p>Theme 3: Specific needs for services and facilities</p>	
<p>Rehabilitation services</p> <p>A transfer for the purposes of delivering rehabilitation services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “...a lot of our patients are admitted to the [acute medical unit] could be admitted with the fall from home, and where they need orthogeriatric input, even though they have fractures that don't need like surgical input, they might still need orthopaedic rehabilitation. So, we do get increasingly more patients on the [acute medical unit] that need the input that Ward J can offer them. So even though that's been flagged as a non-typical transfer, these days, I think more and more that's becoming a typical transfer because of [the] patients we're getting...[they] might be very elderly, not suitable for surgery. They might have like a broken arm and no one to look after them at home. So they need some rehab before they go home.” – Interview 2, participant S12 • “...that's your stroke journey, you know, if you don't recover well and you need rehab you go to neuro rehab. So that kind of, that's kind of the stroke wards feed neuro rehab, you wouldn't get anybody going - people shouldn't really be going there from many other locations other than stroke” – Focus group 1, participant S01
<p>Monitoring facilities</p> <p>The patient is moved to a ward which has cardiac monitoring equipment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “We don't have monitoring cardiac monitoring facilities in most...wards there apart from Ward J and ITU, so therefore if they become unwell, if they're needing a cardiac monitor then...there is the discussion between the medical team and then cardiology team, and maybe ... that would be an atypical transfer for them, because its not necessarily that the patient needs to be in the

	<p>cardiology wing...the patient could just been moved to a medical ward as well, with a cardiac monitoring facility.” – Focus group 2, participant S06</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “... patients who become unwell and need an acute bed...and monitoring. I suppose it’s atypical, but necessary. You know, you need to do things sometimes for the safety of patients.” – Interview 3, participant S13
<p>Side room availability</p> <p>The patient is moved to a ward with side room capacity for end-of-life care or to contain the spread of an infection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “... you mentioned about Ward Y. Cause obviously these are oncology patients, they tend to be neutropenic or end-of-life care, so they have quite limited side room available whereas Ward N has got 10 or 12 side rooms. So that’s why they tend to come to Ward N sometimes, they need a cardiac monitored side room, so that was clinically appropriate” – Focus group 2, participant S07 “...where you’ve got all specialities going in and not out, because the whole of ward is actually, they’re all side rooms, so where you have cases where people have developed diarrhoea, needing isolation immediately [its] usually the first port of call if they’re not requiring a monitored side room, so that’s where you probably see lots of the cases there” – Focus group 2, B01
<p>Theme 4: Unusual pathways</p>	
<p>Rare paths</p> <p>An obscure movement pattern with no clear explanation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Participant S01: ...that’s a very very odd move. And I’ll be really interested to know what the others think might be a reason for that, cause I’ve been trying to think why we would move someone into CDU from a ward. <p>Participant B01: So I definitely think I’ve never done it [laugh] but do you think it, again could be just that there’s no beds and there just trying to move them, and they’re waiting for transport or something -</p> <p>Participant S01: yeah, yeah, or we need a monitor somewhere</p> <p>Participant B01: Yeah, someone waiting to go home so I’ll just put them into CDU for now, while they wait, yeah.” – Focus group 1, Participants S01 and B01</p>
<p>Exceptional events</p> <p>A transfer relating to an exceptional incident</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Participant S04: Another transfer or move of patient...operational wise is the trauma patients that involves police escort and so it’s basically not clinical but we move them to separate all the trauma patients, due too, I don’t know, gang members. So we can’t put them in one ward, so specifically they are supposed to be all in Trauma because they are all trauma patients, but due to the safety of patients and staff, they have to be separated in order to, operationally make wards and staff safe. <p>Participant S01: That’s a very good point. So we deliberately sometimes have to outlie people for the safety of the wards because we often have both sides of a fracas in the streets of London, both come into our A&E department; you can’t put them on the same ward because there will be a fight... one of them ends up being an atypical transfer”– Focus group 1, participant S04 and S01</p>

456 DISCUSSION

457 **Principal findings**

458 An increasing evidence base associates intrahospital transfers with adverse outcomes.
459 However, our analysis shows that not all ward transfers are equal. In a large-scale
460 retrospective cohort study, we show the feasibility of a novel data-driven approach, which
461 leverages rich EHR data to characterise atypical transfers. We found that among
462 hospitalised patients who undertake at least one transfer during their spell, 12.9% use
463 'atypical' routes between uncommon pairs of wards for their speciality. Such patients
464 experience an approximate 2.8 day increase in LOS, after controlling for regular transfers,
465 site transfers and case-mix variables. The effect size was 0.9 days larger than that of a
466 regular intrahospital transfer to or from any other ward in the hospital (AME = 1.92; 95%CI
467 1.82-2.03). No relationships between atypical transfers and mortality or 30-day readmission
468 were observed. A secondary finding is that different types of patient movement have
469 differing effects. Transfers between hospital sites within one trust were associated with a
470 28% reduction in odds of mortality (OR = 0.72; 95%CI 0.64-0.80), and regular transfers with
471 a small increase in odds of readmission (OR = 1.02; 95%CI 1.00-1.04). Box 1 is an
472 illustrative fictitious example of an atypical patient's hospital journey, based on true
473 trajectories.

474
475

Box 1: Example atypical patient

An elderly patient was admitted to the acute medical unit at 3am over a weekend, with influenza. After 2 days of being treated by a general medicine consultant, they were moved during the night to a surgical ward, which typically treats trauma and neurosurgery patients. They remained on the ward another day before being transferred to a medical ward which usually sees general medicine, genitourinary medicine and respiratory medicine patients before being discharged. These two movements were deemed atypical because the wards have no overlapping specialities. The patient was in hospital for 10 days.

476 Qualitative focus groups and interviews with experienced site nurse practitioners and bed
477 managers revealed four overarching themes surrounding the decision making underlying
478 atypical transfers: complex patient journeys, meaning the patient did not fit into any common
479 groups of services (theme 1), a lack of capacity resulting in non-clinical transfers within and
480 across overarching major divisions (theme 2), or a particular clinical need triggering a
481 transfer to reach specific services and facilities (theme 3). More exceptionally, some
482 transfers had no clear explanation, and possibly arose because of a rare, unplanned event
483 (theme 4).

484

485 **Triangulation and interpretation in light of other evidence**

486 While our study did not directly explore the effect of placing patients on clinically
487 inappropriate wards (and excluded patients staying only on one ward), its findings are
488 consistent with several studies on the impact of outlying patients, which report increases in
489 LOS by 0.1 to 1 days.[18], [19], [42] Only one quantitative study has explored the topic of
490 outlying patients using UK hospital data, reporting an increase in LOS but no effect on
491 mortality.[18] The qualitative strand of the study suggests our approach captured ‘partial
492 outliers’ who move between appropriate and inappropriate wards, or vice versa (theme 2).
493 Quantitatively, we found that patients experiencing atypical transfers were more likely to be
494 admitted out-of-hours, which has been associated with outlying status in other studies.[43]
495 The effect of undergoing an atypical transfer cannot be separated from the subsequent
496 impact of being treated on a potentially inappropriate ward, which may account for increased
497 LOS. However, as clinical factors were also suggested as reasons underlying the transfers,
498 it is not the sole explanation of the effect. Therefore, while atypical transfers have a
499 comparable effect on LOS to outlying patients, they do not necessarily imply that the transfer
500 is clinically inappropriate.[18]

501

502 The qualitative component of the study highlighted two clinical reasons which may lead to
503 atypical transfers. The patient does not equivocally fit into commonly paired wards (theme

504 1), or the patient needed access to a specific service or facility (theme 3) such as the need
505 for cardiac monitoring paired with an orthopaedic condition, where the nursing skills to look
506 after both factors is seldom co-located in one ward. The quantitative strand of this study also
507 supports these explanations. Patients taking atypical routes were more likely to have
508 multiple primary ICD-10 codes during their spell, potentially reflecting a complex clinical
509 condition and generally experienced more procedures. The need for isolation due to
510 infection was discussed as a reason behind atypical transfers qualitatively, but quantitative
511 findings showed that removing infected patients from the analysis did not attenuate the
512 association with increased LOS, making infection control an unlikely driver of increased
513 LOS. In other literature, cases of population-capacity misalignment comparable to the first
514 theme have been described in qualitative work.[44]–[46] Kreindler *et al.*, highlight the
515 complexities faced by hospital managers in Canada when patients have significant co-
516 occurring needs, such as dementia and pneumonia.[47] The patient is then moved,
517 introducing them to a new team and extending their spell. Atypical routes also frequently
518 involved observation units, which have been associated with ad-hoc use where a lack of
519 alternative pathways exist.[41], [48]

520
521 An important distinction our study has made to previous literature is that it is exploring the
522 whole patient movement history, rather than a single location. This approach highlights the
523 outcomes of patients who experience transfers. Ward transfers are complex procedures,
524 both in the physical process required to move a patient, which can be destabilising,[49] and
525 the decision-making processes behind them. Transfers are a vulnerable time for patients
526 and can leave them feeling anxious, disorientated, and ‘forgotten’ by staff,[50], [51]
527 particularly on an inappropriate ward.[44] Transfers also require cooperation, negotiation,
528 and trust between the sending and receiving clinicians, which is strengthened by
529 familiarity.[52], [53]–[54] Clinical handovers can be prone to workarounds and communication
530 breakdowns even within one clinical team,[55] and exacerbated when occurring across
531 units, specialities and physical boundaries.[56] Patient movement may therefore be a

532 potential additional driver behind increased LOS, which should be considered in studies
533 exploring patient hospital locations.

534

535 It is also important to note that among patients with at least one transfer, each additional
536 regular transfer increased LOS by approximately 1.9 days, suggesting that even those
537 undertaking regular transfers experience an associated increase in LOS, after adjusting for
538 case-mix factors. However, this relationship may differ when considering patients unexposed
539 to movement. Others have reported large increases in LOS after intrahospital transfers,[11],
540 [57] highlighting the importance of avoiding transfers where possible. Similarly, while the
541 outcomes of patients following an inter-hospital transfer have been studied,[58], [59] the
542 impact of a transfer to a hospital within a single trust has been unexplored. Our finding that
543 such transfers are associated with a decrease in mortality suggests that localisation of
544 specialist and general hospitals within a trust is a successful model of care, in the context of
545 a large urban hospital trust. Our models controlled for the patient acuity variables available,
546 however it is possible that only patients most likely to survive are transferred between sites,
547 leading to residual confounding. The differences between NHS trusts which co-locate their
548 services in a single site, versus geographically dispersed sites are areas of possible future
549 investigation.

550

551 **Strengths and limitations**

552 A key strength of our study is the use of a data directed definition of ward specialities and
553 atypical transfers, coupled with a qualitative exploration of their meaning. The data driven
554 definition captures the functional use of wards, rather than a pre-defined, theoretical use.
555 This is an important strength, as the boundaries of a specific service can become blurred in
556 the day-to-day running of a hospital, particularly as bed pools shift over time, leading to
557 possible misclassification of outlying patients.[60] The task of matching specialities to patient
558 needs is highly complex and organisation dependent, and pre-defining ward specialities may
559 also overlook the fact that staff treating many outliers can become as familiar in caring for

560 them as an inlier patient. With some studies reporting as many as 40% of the patient
561 population to be outliers,[43] the causal hypothesis that outlier patients have increased
562 adverse outcomes because they are treated by a nursing team which is inexperienced with
563 their condition may not hold. Nevertheless, using a heuristic also draws arbitrary cut off
564 points, and speciality definitions vary depending on the chosen TFC, which can also be
565 subject to recording inconsistencies. While this limitation is mitigated by the large study size,
566 the fact that we removed erroneous spells on several criteria, and that consistent results
567 were obtained when using the first and last patient TFC, inaccuracies and inconsistencies
568 are a known limitation to retrospective EHR data analyses, which should be considered
569 when interpreting results.[61] Importantly, the qualitative strand of this study addresses
570 some of the weaknesses of the quantitative strand, by verifying ward specialities and
571 explaining the possible purposes underlying atypical transfers. Moreover, our quantitative
572 method can be applied to other routinely collected datasets for validation without the
573 considerable domain knowledge needed to allocate ward specialities manually. It is also
574 possible that atypical transfers are a marker of health system strain akin to outlying patients,
575 leading to residual confounding from broader health system factors such as understaffing,
576 which was not directly adjusted. While it is difficult to attribute causality between this
577 exposure and the environment in which it occurs, adjusting for weekend/out-of-hours
578 admissions when hospitals typically function with reduced staffing, as well as approximate
579 seasonality did not account for the effect on LOS.

580
581 It is also important to consider that the specific reasoning behind transfers cannot be
582 systematically analysed without patient notes, and that the qualitative data may be limited by
583 a small sample size. However, the qualitative strand had a narrow aim, and the participants
584 recruited held a large amount of knowledge and depth of experience relevant to this aim.
585 The principles of information power suggests such a study does not require a large sample
586 size.[62]

587 Finally, the generalisability of our findings is unclear. Three other studies have used network
588 analysis to explore patient transfers within hospitals and demonstrated that rare, low
589 frequency transfers also occur in these hospital environments,[30], [63], [64]. This suggests
590 atypical transfers (with respect to frequency) are not isolated to our setting; however,
591 authors did not link these to patient outcomes.

592

593 **Implications**

594 Our findings have implications for hospital design and future research. Firstly, we have
595 demonstrated the feasibility of a data-driven method to identify patients which, for any
596 reason, move between uncommon pairs of services using EHR data. These initial findings
597 support further exploration of ward movements, as well as the potential for hospital trusts to
598 leverage their own EHRs for optimising patient pathways in real-time. For example, the
599 identification of complex patients through atypical movements could guide the creation of
600 multi-condition services based on clusters of co-occurring needs.[47] Models of population
601 segmentation are an important complement to the shift from single conditions to integrated,
602 needs-based care systems,[65], [66] and can be supported by data-driven methods.[67]–[69]
603 While focus has been given to primary care interventions,[65] population segmentation
604 interventions in secondary care may improve hospital flow through the introduction of
605 integrated units which have fluid resources and wide eligibility criteria, to better
606 accommodate patients with a ‘shifting fuzzy set of needs’.[47] Atypical movements can be a
607 potential system focused metric used alongside others to develop segmentation logic. As the
608 UK government looks to expand hospital infrastructure,[70] such analyses have a place in
609 informing policy on the medical built environment, in combination with knowledge from
610 clinicians, hospital managers and healthcare architects.

611

612 Secondly, when patients must be moved due to non-clinical reasons, our analysis also
613 suggests that transfers to wards with a similar speciality profile reduces subsequent LOS. In
614 the highly complex, non-linear hospital system, it is important to consider the downstream

615 effects of policies which aim to rapidly decant the ED.[71], [72] These can result in more
616 patients placed on wards with any available space, increasing atypical transfers.[73] While
617 our findings show that atypical transfers do not increase mortality or readmission, their
618 relationship to increased LOS suggests that such strategies may exacerbate exit-block in the
619 long-term, as patients remain in hospital for longer. From a systems perspective, minimising
620 atypical transfers helps to sever the cycle of bed-blocking that occurs when patients on the
621 wrong ward spend extra days in hospital, thereby further diminishing access to beds.[74]
622 However, future work is needed to understand the generalisability of these findings, given
623 the heterogeneity of ward management practices across hospitals. It is also important to
624 consider that a suboptimal patient transfer for one patient may be crucial for the care of the
625 individual taking their bed space. Qualitative exploration to elucidate the challenges that bed
626 managers face, around which literature is limited.[75] Our analysis therefore provides a
627 starting point for identifying clusters of patients who have moved between unexpected pairs
628 of wards, with a view to optimise pathways for future patients.

629

630 **Conclusion:**

631 Routinely collected EHR data give us the opportunity to examine the true hospital usage and
632 evaluate deviant patient journeys, which may otherwise go undetected. Atypical ward
633 transfers are associated with a significant increase in the patient's LOS, which is detrimental
634 to both the individual and the wider health system. The physical movement, unfamiliarity
635 between services, and treatment of the patient on a potentially mismatched ward may be
636 factors contributing to this effect. The causes of atypical transfers, and the broader impact of
637 patient movement must be better understood and considered in hospital policy and design.
638 Our work provides an important first step in identifying unusual patient movement and its
639 impacts.

640

641

642 REFERENCES

- 643
- 644
- 645 [1] ‘What’s going on with A&E waiting times?’, *The King’s Fund*.
646 [https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/projects/urgent-emergency-care/urgent-and-emergency-](https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/projects/urgent-emergency-care/urgent-and-emergency-care-mythbusters)
647 [care-mythbusters](https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/projects/urgent-emergency-care/urgent-and-emergency-care-mythbusters) (accessed Jun. 24, 2022).
- 648 [2] S. A. Kreindler, ‘Planning without action and action without planning? Examining a
649 regional health system’s efforts to improve patient flow, 1998–2013’, *Int. J. Health*
650 *Plann. Manage.*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. e333–e343, 2018, doi:
651 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.2481>.
- 652 [3] S. Oredsson *et al.*, ‘A systematic review of triage-related interventions to improve patient
653 flow in emergency departments’, *Scand. J. Trauma Resusc. Emerg. Med.*, vol. 19, no. 1,
654 p. 43, Jul. 2011, doi: 10.1186/1757-7241-19-43.
- 655 [4] S. A. Kreindler, ‘Six ways not to improve patient flow: a qualitative study’, *BMJ Qual.*
656 *Saf.*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 388–394, May 2017, doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2016-005438.
- 657 [5] T. M. Abuhay, A. Mamuye, S. Robinson, and S. V. Kovalchuk, ‘Why Machine Learning
658 Integrated Patient Flow Simulation?’, *ArXiv210408203 Cs*, Apr. 2021, doi:
659 10.36819/SW21.041.
- 660 [6] N. C. Proudlove, ‘The 85% bed occupancy fallacy: The use, misuse and insights of
661 queuing theory’, *Health Serv. Manage. Res.*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 110–121, Aug. 2020,
662 doi: 10.1177/0951484819870936.
- 663 [7] D. Tlapa *et al.*, ‘Effects of Lean Healthcare on Patient Flow: A Systematic Review’,
664 *Value Health*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 260–273, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jval.2019.11.002.
- 665 [8] N. Proudlove, R. Boaden, and J. Jorgensen, ‘Developing bed managers: the why and the
666 how’, *J. Nurs. Manag.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 34–42, 2007, doi:
667 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2934.2006.00632.x>.
- 668 [9] A. A. Bristol, C. E. Schneider, S.-Y. Lin, and A. A. Brody, ‘A Systematic Review of
669 Clinical Outcomes Associated With Intrahospital Transitions’, *J. Healthc. Qual.*, doi:
670 10.1097/JHQ.0000000000000232.
- 671 [10] N. Blay, M. Roche, C. Duffield, and X. Xu, ‘Intrahospital transfers and adverse patient
672 outcomes: An analysis of administrative health data’, *J. Clin. Nurs.*, vol. 26, no. 23–24,
673 pp. 4927–4935, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1111/jocn.13976.
- 674 [11] J. Webster *et al.*, ‘Effects of frequent PATient moves on patient outcomes in a large
675 tertiary Hospital (the PATH study): a prospective cohort study’, *Aust. Health Rev.*, vol.
676 40, no. 3, pp. 324–329, Jun. 2016, doi: 10.1071/AH15095.
- 677 [12] M. F. Kanak, M. Titler, L. Shever, Q. Fei, J. Dochterman, and D. M. Picone, ‘The
678 effects of hospitalization on multiple units’, *Appl. Nurs. Res.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 15–22,
679 Feb. 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.apnr.2006.07.001.
- 680 [13] M. McHaney-Lindstrom, C. Hebert, J. Flaherty, J. E. Mangino, S. Moffatt-Bruce, and E.
681 Dowling Root, ‘Analysis of intra-hospital transfers and hospital-onset *Clostridium*
682 *difficile* infection’, *J. Hosp. Infect.*, vol. 102, no. 2, pp. 168–169, Jun. 2019, doi:
683 10.1016/j.jhin.2018.08.016.
- 684 [14] E. E. Boncea *et al.*, ‘Association between intrahospital transfer and hospital-acquired
685 infection in the elderly: a retrospective case–control study in a UK hospital network’,
686 *BMJ Qual. Saf.*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 457–466, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2020-
687 012124.
- 688 [15] H. Tahir *et al.*, ‘Relevance of intra-hospital patient movements for the spread of
689 healthcare-associated infections within hospitals - a mathematical modeling study’,
690 *PLOS Comput. Biol.*, vol. 17, no. 2, p. e1008600, Feb. 2021, doi:
691 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008600.

- 692 [16] A. A. Bristol *et al.*, ‘Mixed-methods study examining family carers’ perceptions of the
693 relationship between intrahospital transitions and patient readiness for discharge’, *BMJ*
694 *Qual. Saf.*, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2022-015120.
- 695 [17] M. La Regina *et al.*, ‘What Quality and Safety of Care for Patients Admitted to
696 Clinically Inappropriate Wards: a Systematic Review’, *J. Gen. Intern. Med.*, vol. 34, no.
697 7, pp. 1314–1321, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11606-019-05008-4.
- 698 [18] N. Stylianou, R. Fackrell, and C. Vasilakis, ‘Are medical outliers associated with worse
699 patient outcomes? A retrospective study within a regional NHS hospital using routine
700 data’, *BMJ Open*, vol. 7, no. 5, p. e015676, May 2017, doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-
701 015676.
- 702 [19] R. Kohn *et al.*, ‘Influence of bedspacing on outcomes of hospitalised medicine service
703 patients: a retrospective cohort study’, *BMJ Qual. Saf.*, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-
704 2019-010675.
- 705 [20] L. Perimal-Lewis, C. Bradley, P. H. Hakendorf, C. Whitehead, L. Heuzenroeder, and M.
706 Crotty, ‘The relationship between in-hospital location and outcomes of care in patients
707 diagnosed with dementia and/or delirium diagnoses: analysis of patient journey’, *BMC*
708 *Geriatr.*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 190, Nov. 2016, doi: 10.1186/s12877-016-0372-5.
- 709 [21] S. A. Kreindler *et al.*, ‘“Working Against Gravity”: The Uphill Task of Overcapacity
710 Management’, *Health Serv. Insights*, vol. 13, p. 1178632920929986, Jan. 2020, doi:
711 10.1177/1178632920929986.
- 712 [22] S. Johnson, *Emergence: The Connected Lives of Ants, Brains, Cities, and Software*.
713 Scribner, 2001.
- 714 [23] T. G. Kannampallil, G. F. Schauer, T. Cohen, and V. L. Patel, ‘Considering complexity
715 in healthcare systems’, *J. Biomed. Inform.*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 943–947, Dec. 2011, doi:
716 10.1016/j.jbi.2011.06.006.
- 717 [24] J. Cresswell and D. Cresswell, ‘Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative & Mixed
718 Methods Approaches’, vol. 5, London: SAGE edge, 2018.
- 719 [25] ‘Treatment Function and Main Specialty Standard - NHS Digital - Citizen Space’.
720 [https://nhs-digital.citizenspace.com/standards-assurance/treatment-function-and-main-](https://nhs-digital.citizenspace.com/standards-assurance/treatment-function-and-main-specialty-standard/)
721 [specialty-standard/](https://nhs-digital.citizenspace.com/standards-assurance/treatment-function-and-main-specialty-standard/) (accessed Jul. 17, 2020).
- 722 [26] S. A. Rhoades, ‘Market share inequality, the HHI, and other measures of the firm-
723 composition of a market’, *Rev. Ind. Organ.*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 657–674, Dec. 1995, doi:
724 10.1007/BF01024300.
- 725 [27] M. Laakso and R. Taagepera, ‘“Effective” Number of Parties: A Measure with
726 Application to West Europe’, *Comp. Polit. Stud.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 3–27, Apr. 1979,
727 doi: 10.1177/001041407901200101.
- 728 [28] C. H. Yam, E. L. Wong, F. W. Chan, F. Y. Wong, M. C. Leung, and E. Yeoh, ‘R E V I
729 E W Measuring and preventing potentially avoidable A R T I C L E hospital
730 readmissions: a review of the literature’, p. 7.
- 731 [29] T. J. VanderWeele, ‘Principles of confounder selection’, *Eur. J. Epidemiol.*, vol. 34, no.
732 3, pp. 211–219, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10654-019-00494-6.
- 733 [30] C. Zhang, T. Eken, S. B. Jørgensen, M. Thoresen, and S. Søvik, ‘Effects of patient-level
734 risk factors, departmental allocation and seasonality on intrahospital patient transfer
735 patterns: network analysis applied on a Norwegian single-centre data set’, *BMJ Open*,
736 vol. 12, no. 3, p. e054545, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-054545.
- 737 [31] M. Ruiz, A. Bottle, S. Long, and P. Aylin, ‘Multi-Morbidity in Hospitalised Older
738 Patients: Who Are the Complex Elderly?’, *PLOS ONE*, vol. 10, no. 12, p. e0145372,
739 Dec. 2015, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0145372.
- 740 [32] T. E. F. Abbott, A. J. Fowler, T. D. Dobbs, E. M. Harrison, M. A. Gillies, and R. M.
741 Pearse, ‘Frequency of surgical treatment and related hospital procedures in the UK: a

- 742 national ecological study using hospital episode statistics’, *BJA Br. J. Anaesth.*, vol.
743 119, no. 2, pp. 249–257, Aug. 2017, doi: 10.1093/bja/aex137.
- 744 [33] A. Agresti and C. Tarantola, ‘Simple ways to interpret effects in modeling ordinal
745 categorical data’, *Stat. Neerlandica*, vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 210–223, 2018, doi:
746 10.1111/stan.12130.
- 747 [34] T. D. Mize, L. Doan, and J. S. Long, ‘A General Framework for Comparing Predictions
748 and Marginal Effects across Models’, *Sociol. Methodol.*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 152–189,
749 Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1177/0081175019852763.
- 750 [35] ‘margins.pdf’. Accessed: Apr. 25, 2022. [Online]. Available: [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/margins/margins.pdf)
751 [project.org/web/packages/margins/margins.pdf](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/margins/margins.pdf)
- 752 [36] B. Mihaylova, A. Briggs, A. O’Hagan, and S. G. Thompson, ‘Review of Statistical
753 Methods for Analysing Healthcare Resources and Costs’, *Health Econ.*, vol. 20, no. 8,
754 pp. 897–916, Aug. 2011, doi: 10.1002/hec.1653.
- 755 [37] J. L. Moran, P. J. Solomon, and the ANZICS Centre for Outcome and Resource
756 Evaluation (CORE) of the Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Society
757 (ANZICS), ‘A review of statistical estimators for risk-adjusted length of stay: analysis
758 of the Australian and new Zealand intensive care adult patient data-base, 2008–2009’,
759 *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 68, May 2012, doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-12-
760 68.
- 761 [38] C. O. A. of Radiology *et al.*, ‘Outlier Detection and Effects on Modeling’, *Open Access*
762 *Libr. J.*, vol. 07, no. 09, Art. no. 09, 2020, doi: 10.4236/oalib.1106619.
- 763 [39] N. K. Gale, G. Heath, E. Cameron, S. Rashid, and S. Redwood, ‘Using the framework
764 method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research’, *BMC*
765 *Med. Res. Methodol.*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 117, Sep. 2013, doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-13-117.
- 766 [40] L. Doyle, C. McCabe, B. Keogh, A. Brady, and M. McCann, ‘An overview of the
767 qualitative descriptive design within nursing research’, *J. Res. Nurs.*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp.
768 443–455, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.1177/1744987119880234.
- 769 [41] T. Hassan, ‘Clinical decision units in the emergency department: old concepts, new
770 paradigms, and refined gate keeping’, *Emerg. Med. J. EMJ*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 123–125,
771 Mar. 2003, doi: 10.1136/emj.20.2.123.
- 772 [42] H. Song, A. L. Tucker, R. Graue, S. Moravick, and J. J. Yang, ‘Capacity Pooling in
773 Hospitals: The Hidden Consequences of Off-Service Placement’, *Manag Sci*, 2020, doi:
774 10.1287/MNSC.2019.3395.
- 775 [43] C. Alameda and C. Suárez, ‘Clinical outcomes in medical outliers admitted to hospital
776 with heart failure’, *Eur. J. Intern. Med.*, vol. 20, no. 8, pp. 764–767, Dec. 2009, doi:
777 10.1016/j.ejim.2009.09.010.
- 778 [44] L. Goulding, J. Adamson, I. Watt, and J. Wright, ‘Lost in hospital: a qualitative
779 interview study that explores the perceptions of NHS inpatients who spent time on
780 clinically inappropriate hospital wards’, *Health Expect.*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 982–994,
781 2015, doi: 10.1111/hex.12071.
- 782 [45] C. V. Caldicott, K. A. Dunn, and R. M. Frankel, ‘Can patients tell when they are
783 unwanted?: “Turving” in residency training’, *Patient Educ. Couns.*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp.
784 104–111, Jan. 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2003.12.014.
- 785 [46] S. A. Kreindler *et al.*, ‘Can facility-based transitional care improve patient flow?
786 Lessons from four Canadian regions’, *Healthc. Manage. Forum*, p. 0840470421995934,
787 Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1177/0840470421995934.
- 788 [47] S. Kreindler *et al.*, ‘How Do Health Systems Address Patient Flow When Services Are
789 Misaligned With Population Needs? A Qualitative Study’, *Int. J. Health Policy Manag.*,
790 p. 1, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.34172/ijhpm.2021.36.

- 791 [48] M. R. Anwar, B. H. Rowe, C. Metge, N. D. Star, Z. Aboud, and S. A. Kreindler,
792 ‘Realist analysis of streaming interventions in emergency departments’, *BMJ Lead.*, p.
793 leader, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1136/leader-2020-000369.
- 794 [49] A. Kulshrestha and J. Singh, ‘Inter-hospital and intra-hospital patient transfer: Recent
795 concepts’, *Indian J. Anaesth.*, vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 451–457, Jul. 2016, doi: 10.4103/0019-
796 5049.186012.
- 797 [50] L. Uhrenfeldt, H. Aagaard, E. O. C. Hall, L. Fegran, M. S. Ludvigsen, and G. Meyer, ‘A
798 qualitative meta-synthesis of patients’ experiences of intra- and inter-hospital
799 transitions’, *J. Adv. Nurs.*, vol. 69, no. 8, pp. 1678–1690, 2013, doi: 10.1111/jan.12134.
- 800 [51] W. Tadd, A. Hillman, M. Calnan, S. Calnan, S. Read, and A. Bayer, ‘From Right Place -
801 Wrong Person, to Right Place - Right Person: Dignified Care for Older People’, *J.*
802 *Health Serv. Res. Policy*, vol. 17, no. 2_suppl, pp. 30–36, Apr. 2012, doi:
803 10.1258/jhsrp.2011.011118.
- 804 [52] J. Abraham and M. C. Reddy, ‘Challenges to inter-departmental coordination of patient
805 transfers: A workflow perspective’, *Int. J. Med. Inf.*, vol. 79, no. 2, pp. 112–122, Feb.
806 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2009.11.001.
- 807 [53] H. Cleak, S. R. Osborne, and J. W. M. de Looze, ‘Exploration of clinicians’ decision-
808 making regarding transfer of patient care from the emergency department to a medical
809 assessment unit: A qualitative study’, *PLOS ONE*, vol. 17, no. 2, p. e0263235, Feb.
810 2022, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0263235.
- 811 [54] H. D. Germack, R. Fekieta, M. Campbell Britton, S. L. Feder, A. Rosenberg, and S. I.
812 Chaudhry, ‘Cooperation and conflict in intra-hospital transfers: A qualitative analysis’,
813 *Nurs. Open*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 634–641, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1002/nop2.434.
- 814 [55] K. M. Ernst, S. A. McComb, and C. Ley, ‘Nurse-to-nurse shift handoffs on medical-
815 surgical units: A process within the flow of nursing care’, *J. Clin. Nurs.*, vol. 27, no. 5–
816 6, pp. e1189–e1201, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1111/jocn.14254.
- 817 [56] B. Hilligoss and M. D. Cohen, ‘The Unappreciated Challenges of Between-Unit
818 Handoffs: Negotiating and Coordinating Across Boundaries’, *Ann. Emerg. Med.*, vol.
819 61, no. 2, pp. 155–160, Feb. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2012.04.009.
- 820 [57] H. Baek, M. Cho, S. Kim, H. Hwang, M. Song, and S. Yoo, ‘Analysis of length of
821 hospital stay using electronic health records: A statistical and data mining approach’,
822 *PLoS ONE*, vol. 13, no. 4, p. e0195901, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195901.
- 823 [58] R. L. Fan, M. Zhao, and D. X. Peng, ‘Differentiating Interhospital Transfer Types:
824 Varied Impacts and Diverging Coordination Strategies’, *Prod. Oper. Manag.*, vol. n/a,
825 no. n/a, doi: 10.1111/poms.13455.
- 826 [59] S. Mueller, J. Zheng, E. J. Orav, and J. L. Schnipper, ‘Inter-hospital transfer and patient
827 outcomes: a retrospective cohort study’, *BMJ Qual. Saf.*, vol. 28, no. 11, pp. e1–e1,
828 Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2018-008087.
- 829 [60] D. Allen, ‘Inside “bed management”: ethnographic insights from the vantage point of
830 UK hospital nurses’, *Sociol. Health Illn.*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 370–384, 2015, doi:
831 10.1111/1467-9566.12195.
- 832 [61] K. Honeyford *et al.*, ‘Challenges and recommendations for high quality research using
833 electronic health records’, *Front. Digit. Health*, vol. 4, 2022, Accessed: Dec. 14, 2022.
834 [Online]. Available: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fgdth.2022.940330>
- 835 [62] K. Malterud, V. D. Siersma, and A. D. Guassora, ‘Sample Size in Qualitative Interview
836 Studies: Guided by Information Power’, *Qual. Health Res.*, vol. 26, no. 13, pp. 1753–
837 1760, 2016, doi: 10.1177/1049732315617444.
- 838 [63] D. M. Bean, C. Stringer, N. Beeknoo, J. Teo, and R. J. B. Dobson, ‘Network analysis of
839 patient flow in two UK acute care hospitals identifies key sub-networks for A&E
840 performance’, p. 21.

- 841 [64] K. Kohler and A. Ercole, ‘Can network science reveal structure in a complex healthcare
842 system? A network analysis using data from emergency surgical services’, *BMJ Open*,
843 vol. 10, no. 2, p. e034265, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-034265.
- 844 [65] J. L. Chong, K. K. Lim, and D. B. Matchar, ‘Population segmentation based on
845 healthcare needs: a systematic review’, *Syst. Rev.*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 202, Aug. 2019, doi:
846 10.1186/s13643-019-1105-6.
- 847 [66] V. Si, M. Ek, and D. A, ‘Patient Segmentation Analysis Offers Significant Benefits For
848 Integrated Care And Support’, *Health Aff. Proj. Hope*, vol. 35, no. 5, Jan. 2016, doi:
849 10.1377/hlthaff.2015.1311.
- 850 [67] K. Aitchison, H. McGeown, B. Holden, M. Watson, R. E. Klaber, and D. Hargreaves,
851 ‘Population child health: understanding and addressing complex health needs’, *Arch.*
852 *Dis. Child.*, vol. 106, no. 4, pp. 387–391, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.1136/archdischild-2019-
853 317373.
- 854 [68] A. Clegg *et al.*, ‘Development and validation of an electronic frailty index using routine
855 primary care electronic health record data’, *Age Ageing*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 353–360,
856 May 2016, doi: 10.1093/ageing/afw039.
- 857 [69] S. I. Vuik, E. Mayer, and A. Darzi, ‘A quantitative evidence base for population health:
858 applying utilization-based cluster analysis to segment a patient population’, *Popul.*
859 *Health Metr.*, vol. 14, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Dec. 2016, doi: 10.1186/s12963-016-0115-z.
- 860 [70] ‘Health Infrastructure Plan: A new, strategic approach to improving our hospitals and
861 health infrastructure’, Department of Health and Social Care. [Online]. Available:
862 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/835657/health-infrastructure-plan.pdf)
863 [_data/file/835657/health-infrastructure-plan.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/835657/health-infrastructure-plan.pdf)
- 864 [71] ‘A&E: Move patients to wards regardless of bed capacity, to spread risk, says royal
865 college | The BMJ’.
866 [https://www.bmj.com/content/379/bmj.o2557?utm_source=etoc&utm_medium=email&](https://www.bmj.com/content/379/bmj.o2557?utm_source=etoc&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=tbmj&utm_content=weekly&utm_term=20221028)
867 [utm_campaign=tbmj&utm_content=weekly&utm_term=20221028](https://www.bmj.com/content/379/bmj.o2557?utm_source=etoc&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=tbmj&utm_content=weekly&utm_term=20221028) (accessed Nov. 02,
868 2022).
- 869 [72] ‘Should emergency departments move patients to other wards even when there’s no bed
870 space available?’, *The Nuffield Trust*, Oct. 13, 2022.
871 [https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/news-item/should-emergency-departments-move-](https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/news-item/should-emergency-departments-move-patients-to-other-wards-even-when-there-s-no-bed-space-available)
872 [patients-to-other-wards-even-when-there-s-no-bed-space-available](https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/news-item/should-emergency-departments-move-patients-to-other-wards-even-when-there-s-no-bed-space-available) (accessed Nov. 02,
873 2022).
- 874 [73] L. K. Vaughan and S. Bruijns, ‘Continuous flow models in urgent and emergency care’,
875 *BMJ*, vol. 379, p. o2751, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.1136/bmj.o2751.
- 876 [74] M. E. T. McMurdo and M. D. Witham, ‘Unnecessary ward moves’, *Age Ageing*, vol. 42,
877 no. 5, pp. 555–556, Sep. 2013, doi: 10.1093/ageing/aft079.
- 878 [75] E. Benjamin, ‘Understanding the work and decision-making strategies of bed
879 management nurses: a systematic review’, *Nurs. Manag. Harrow Lond. Engl. 1994*, vol.
880 29, no. 2, pp. 25–31, Apr. 2022, doi: 10.7748/nm.2021.e2016.

881

882 **Acknowledgements:**

883 This research has been completed using the National Institute for Health Research
884 Health Informatics Collaborative (NIHR HIC) data resources and supported by the
885 Imperial Clinical Analytics Research and Evaluation (iCARE) team. Data
886 management (and analytical support) was provided by the Big Data and Analytical
887 Unit (BDAU) at the Institute of Global Health Innovation (IGHI). Imperial College
888 London is grateful for the support from the North West London NIHR Applied
889 Research Collaboration.

890

891 We thank Dr Erik Mayer and Dr Benjamin Post for the helpful discussions on the
892 data analysis and clinical interpretation of the findings.

893

894 **Author Contributions:**

895 EM, PE and CC conceptualised the research question. EM, overseen by PE and CC,
896 conducted the data analysis. EM wrote and revised the manuscript. LM conducted
897 the data curation and anonymisation KH, AB, RK, provided expert advice and critical
898 review of the paper prior to submission. The corresponding author attests that all
899 listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have
900 been omitted.

901

902 **Data availability statement:**

903 Data may be obtained from a third party and are not publicly available. Deidentified
904 patient data cannot be made publicly available due to information governance
905 restrictions. Access to the data sets used in this paper via a secure environment will
906 be reviewed on request by Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust.

907

908 **Disclaimer:**

909 This article presents independent research commissioned by the National Institute
910 for Health Research (NIHR) under the Applied Research Collaboration (ARC)
911 programme for Northwest London. The views expressed in this publication are those
912 of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department
913 of Health and Social Care.

914

915 **Funding:**

916 This research was co-funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)
917 Imperial Biomedical Research Centre (BRC) and the Economic and Social Research
918 Council (ESRC). EM is supported by the ESRC (grant number ES/ P000703/1) as
919 part of the ESRC London Interdisciplinary Social Science Doctoral Training
920 Partnership. PE is partially supported by the National Institute for Health Research
921 (NIHR) Imperial Biomedical Research Centre (BRC) (grant number NIHR-BRC-
922 P68711). KH is supported by the NIHR [HS&DR] Project: NIHR129082.