

## **Emergency Medical Service Response Times and Fatal Fall Injuries Among US Older Adults: Analysis of the 2015 – 2020 National Trauma Data Bank**

Oluwaseun Adeyemi, MBCh.B, MSurg., Ph.D.,<sup>1</sup> Charles DiMaggio, Ph.D.,<sup>2,3</sup> Corita Grudzen, MD, MSHS, FACEP,<sup>4</sup> Cuthel Allison, MPH,<sup>1</sup> Kaitlyn Van Allen, MPH<sup>1</sup>, Joshua Chodosh, MD, MSHS, FACP<sup>5,6</sup>

### **Affiliations**

1. Ronald O Perelman Department of Emergency Medicine, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, USA
2. Department of Surgery, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, USA
3. Department of Population Health, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, USA
4. Department of Medicine, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, USA
5. Division of Geriatric Medicine and Palliative Care, Department of Medicine, New York University School of Medicine, New York, NY, United States.
6. Medicine Service, Veterans Affairs New York Harbor Healthcare System, New York, NY, United States

### **Corresponding Author**

Oluwaseun J. Adeyemi, MBCh.B, MWACS, MS, Ph.D  
Ronald O Perelman Department of Emergency Medicine,  
New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York  
Email: [oluwaseun.adeyemi@nyulangone.org](mailto:oluwaseun.adeyemi@nyulangone.org)  
Phone: 980-939-9764

**Funding:** This study was not funded.

**Acknowledgment:** The authors appreciate the Committee on Trauma, American College of Surgeons for providing the National Trauma Data Bank for use.

Committee on Trauma, American College of Surgeons. NTDB Admission Year 2015 - 2020  
Chicago, IL.

The content reproduced from the applications remains the full and exclusive copyrighted property of the American College of Surgeons. The American College of Surgeons is not responsible for any ancillary or derivative works based on the original data, text, tables, or figures.

**Disclosures:** The authors declare no competing interests.

## Key Points:

**Question:** What is the association between EMS response time and fatal fall injuries among US older adults?

**Findings:** In this retrospective cohort analysis, delay in EMS response time was associated with fatal fall injury in a dose-response pattern among male and female older adults.

**Meaning:** Strengthening the EMS infrastructure may improve outcomes from fatal fall injuries among older adults.

## Abstract

**Background:** Falls are the leading injury-related cause of death among older adults but rapid emergency care may reduce fatal complications. To estimate the strength of the association between EMS response times and fatal fall injuries among older adults and measure how this association differs by sex.

**Methods:** For this retrospective cohort study, we pooled 2015 – 2020 data from the National Trauma Data Bank on patients 65 years and older with fall injuries transferred to U.S. trauma centers (N=705,491). The main outcome was fatal fall injuries. The main predictor was EMS response time, measured as continuous and four-level categorical variables (multiples of the standard nine-minute benchmark). Age, sex, race/ethnicity, and diagnoses of COPD, diabetes, and hypertension were covariables. We performed a mixed-effect multivariable logistic regression, using the trauma center designation level as a random effect variable, and EMS response time and mortality as fixed effect variables. We report the unadjusted and adjusted odds ratio (AOR) plus 95% confidence intervals (CI). We also created an interaction model comprising of response time and sex and reported the predicted probabilities (plus 95% CI) of fatal fall injury by sex and response time categories.

**Results:** The case fatality rate of fatal fall injuries among adults 65 years and older was 4.4%. The median (Q1, Q3) EMS response time was 8 minutes (5.0, 13.0), with 60% of patients experiencing the nine-minute benchmark. In the adjusted model, a minute delay in EMS response time was associated with a 1% increased odds of fatal fall injury (AOR: 1.01; 95% CI: 1.01 – 1.01). Older adults who experienced a response time between 18 and 27 minutes, and more than 27 minutes had 1.33 (95% CI: 1.28 - 1.39), and 1.41 (95% CI: 1.35 - 1.47) times the odds of fatal fall injuries. The predicted probabilities of male and female fatal fall injuries were 5.1% (95% CI: 3.51 – 6.75) and 2.4% (95% CI: 1.64 – 3.23), respectively.

**Conclusion:** Delayed EMS response time, especially when above twice the standard benchmark, is associated with increased odds of fatal fall injuries among older adults.

## Introduction

In the United States (US), falls are the leading cause of injury-related deaths among adults 65 years and older.<sup>1</sup> Every year, one in four older adults falls, and 20 percent of such falls result in serious injuries such as hip fractures and head injuries.<sup>2,3</sup> Fall injuries account for over 32,000 deaths yearly, three million emergency department visits, and 800,000 hospitalizations.<sup>2</sup> As of 2016, the age-adjusted fatal fall injury rate was 16 per 100,000 among adults 65 to 74 years and 258 per 100,000 among adults 85 years and older.<sup>4</sup> While falls occur more commonly among women,<sup>5</sup> the age-adjusted fatal fall injuries are 30 percent higher among men compared to women.<sup>4</sup>

The Emergency Medical Service (EMS), a specialized unit of highly skilled healthcare providers trained in the art of delivering pre-hospital care to acutely and critically ill patients,<sup>6</sup> is often the immediate healthcare access point among older adults with fall injuries. Earlier studies have reported that falls accounted for 17% of EMS calls involving older adults with approximately 80 to 85 percent requiring transport.<sup>7,8</sup> Compared to adults 65 years and older, those aged 85 years and older were more likely to be transported to levels I and II trauma centers.<sup>7,8</sup> Also, women and those who sustain fall injuries in residential institutions or healthcare facilities were more likely to be transported by the EMS.<sup>7,8</sup> While patient transportation is a critical service delivered by EMS, EMS workers also provide life-saving interventions, which makes such pre-hospital care a pivotal part of critical and acute care delivery.

EMS response can be conceptualized as occurring in four non-overlapping phases: from injury occurrence to EMS notification, EMS notification to chute initiation, chute initiation to arrival at the injury scene, and injury scene to hospital arrival.<sup>9,10</sup> Earlier studies have reported that the duration from chute initiation to arrival at the injury scene is the most predictive measure of decreased injury fatality.<sup>11,12</sup> Also, a minute increase in the time to arrive at the site where care is needed has been associated with increased odds of death from myocardial infarction,<sup>13</sup> drowning,<sup>14</sup> deaths at motor vehicle crash scene,<sup>9</sup> and county-level crash mortality rate ratios.<sup>11,12</sup> No study has explored the relationship between any of the phases of EMS response times and fatal fall injuries.

Since falls account for over 70 percent of injuries among older adults<sup>15</sup> and over 10,000 US adults turn 65 years daily,<sup>16</sup> understanding the relationship between EMS response and fatal fall injuries is essential. The knowledge of the relationship between fall injuries and EMS response in older adults may provide information that will strengthen the EMS care delivery system and guide policies that will improve the care of older adults with fall injuries. Our aim, therefore, is to estimate the strength of the association between EMS response times and fatal fall injuries among older adults and measure how this association differs by sex.

## Methods

### Study Design and Population

For this retrospective cohort study, we pooled six years of data (2015 to 2020) from the American College of Surgeons' National Trauma Data Bank (NTDB).<sup>17</sup> The NTDB is the largest trauma registry in the United States (US), collecting data on trauma-related hospital admissions from over 700 trauma centers across the US.<sup>17</sup> Each year of privately released data, following an approved request, contains over 3 million de-identified trauma patients managed across trauma-center levels I to V as well as non-designated trauma centers across the US.<sup>17</sup>

## Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Across selected years, we identified adults 65 years and older (N=1,796,410) (Figure 1). We limited the data to older adults who presented to an emergency department (ED) with ICD 10 codes W01 -W19 (“Falls”), Y01 (“Assault by pushing from a high place”), and Y30 (“Falling, jumping or pushed from a high place, undetermined intent”) indicating fall-related injuries (N=1,395,024). We excluded patients whose mortality status was not known (n = 116,150; 6.5% of 1,796,410) and patients without recorded EMS response time (n = 374,496; 20.8% of 1,796,410). We also excluded patients whose response time exceeded 60 minutes since such cases are typically associated with unusual circumstances (n=54,606; 3.0% of 1,796,410). For example, an EMS response time of over 6 hours was documented in Alabama on March 3, 2019, but it occurred during a tornado that involved more than 40 locations.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, we excluded patients whose trauma center designation was not known (n=144,351; 8.0% of 1,796,410) and whose sex was not recorded (n=70; <0.01% of 1,796,410). The final dataset, therefore, was 705,491 (39.3% of 1,796,410) adults 65 years and older with fall injuries that were transported to levels I to V trauma centers.

## Fatal Fall Injury

The outcome variable was fatal fall injury defined as fall-related mortality that occurred during pre-hospital care, ED admission, or during the index hospital stay. Fatal fall injury was measured as a binary variable.

## EMS Response Time

The predictor variable was the EMS response time defined as the EMS travel time – the duration of departure from the base station to the scene of injury. EMS response time was measured as both a continuous measure and as a categorical variable. We created meaningful categories based on the less-than-nine-minute EMS travel time benchmark set by the Fire and EMS Department<sup>19</sup> and the National Fire Protection Agency.<sup>20</sup> We defined these categories as follows: Less than nine minutes, nine to 17.59 minutes, 18 to 26.59 minutes, and 27 minutes or higher.

## Trauma Level Designation

We used trauma center level designation as a random effect variable. Trauma center designation is defined as levels I to V. A level I trauma center is a tertiary care facility that provides the highest level of trauma care, serves as a regional trauma facility, and has 24-hour in-hospital coverage by general surgeons and surgery specialties.<sup>21, 22</sup> A level II trauma center has 24-hour in-hospital coverage by a general surgeon but can refer specialized cases such as cardiac and microvascular surgery to level I trauma centers. A level III trauma center has 24-hour in-hospital coverage by emergency physicians, transfers cases to either level I or II trauma centers, and serves as a backup trauma care center for rural and community hospitals. A level IV trauma center provides advanced trauma life support, stabilizes trauma patients, and refers to higher-level trauma centers. A level V trauma center contains basic emergency department facilities and stabilizes patients for transfer to levels I to III trauma centers. The NTDB has no entry for level V trauma center.

## Control Variables

We controlled for age, sex, race/ethnicity, and the presence of coexisting comorbidities. Age was measured as a continuous variable while sex was measured as a binary variable. We defined race/ethnicity as a four categorical level comprising of non-Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Blacks, Hispanics, and other races. The comorbidities we measured were diagnoses of hypertension, diabetes, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).

## Data Analysis

We report the frequency distribution and summary statistics (mean, standard deviation (SD), median, and first and third quantile (Q1, Q3)) for categorical and continuous variables as appropriate. We computed the yearly fall case fatality rate by dividing the number of fatal fall counts by the population of older adults with fall injuries for each year. We assessed the statistical significance of differences between fall-related mortality and the patients' sociodemographic, health, and injury characteristics using the chi-square test, independent sample t-test, and Mann-Whitney U test as appropriate. We report the unadjusted and adjusted odds (plus 95% confidence interval (CI)) of fall-related mortality from a mixed multivariable logistic regression model. For the mixed model, we used the EMS response time, sociodemographic and health characteristics as fixed effect measures, and the trauma level designation as a random effect measure. We also created an interaction model comprising of EMS response time and sex, and we reported the predicted probabilities (plus 95% CI) of these two variables while holding other variables constant at their mean values. Data were analyzed using R (version 4.2.1)/RStudio<sup>23, 24</sup> and STATA version 17.<sup>25</sup>

## Results

Of 705,941 older adults in the study population, the mean (SD) age was 78.1 (7.1) years (Table 1). The population was predominantly female (60%) and non-Hispanic White (82%). Sixty-eight percent had a diagnosis of hypertension while the proportion of the sample population that had diabetes mellitus and COPD was 26% and 15%, respectively. Most patients were managed in level I (44%) and level II (42%) trauma centers. The median (Q1, Q3) EMS response time was 8 minutes (5.0, 13.0) and 60% of the patients experienced an EMS response time of less than nine minutes.

The fall case fatality rate was 4.4% and across the study years, the yearly case fatality rate ranged from 4.1% to 4.6% (Figure 2). Among male older adult patients, the fall case fatality rate was 6.4% and the yearly case fatality rate ranged from 6.0% to 6.9%. Among female older patients, the fall case fatality rate was 3.1% and the yearly fall case fatality rate ranged from 2.9% to 3.3%. Fatal fall injury was significantly associated with age, sex, race/ethnicity, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, COPD, and trauma level designation ( $p < 0.001$  for all) (Table 1). Fifty-seven percent of older adults who died had an EMS response time of less than 9 minutes, compared to 60% of those who survived ( $p < 0.001$ ).

In the unadjusted model, age, sex, being Hispanic or of other races, and having diagnoses of hypertension, diabetes, or COPD were associated with fatal fall injuries (Table 2). In the adjusted model (Model 1), males had 2.2 times the odds of fatal fall injuries compared to females (OR: 2.18; 95% CI: 2.05 - 2.32). Also, a minute increase in EMS response time was associated with a 1% increased odds of fatal fall injury (OR: 1.01; 95% CI: 1.01 - 1.01) (Model 1). Compared to patients who experienced EMS response time of less than nine minutes, those who experienced EMS response of 18 to 26.59 minutes, and 27 minutes or higher had 33% (Adjusted OR (AOR): 1.33; 95%: 1.28 - 1.39) and 41% (AOR: 1.41; 95%: 1.35 - 1.47) increased odds of fatal fall injuries (Model 2). In the interaction model, EMS response times

of 9 to 17.59 minutes, 18 to 26.59 minutes, and 27 minutes or higher were associated with 1.1 (AOR: 1.06; 95% CI: 1.01 - 1.10), 1.4 (AOR: 1.37; 95% CI: 1.29 - 1.46), and 1.5 (AOR:1.52; 95% CI: 1.42 - 1.62) times the odds of fatal fall injuries, respectively.

The predicted probability of fatal fall injury was 3.3% (95% CI: 2.22 – 4.35) while the predicted probability of fatal fall injury among male and female older adults was 5.1% (95% CI: 3.51 – 6.76) and 2.4% (95% CI: 1.64 – 3.22), respectively (Figure 3). Among male older adults, the predicted probability of fatal fall injury was lowest at 5.0% (95% CI: 3.40 – 6.54) when the EMS response time was less than nine minutes and the predicted probability increased to a high of 6.5% (95% CI: 4.46 – 8.54) when EMS response time was 27 minutes or higher. Among female older adults, the predicted probability of fatal fall injury was lowest at 2.3% (95% CI: 1.54 – 3.03) when the EMS response time was less than nine minutes and the predicted probability increased to a high of 3.4% (95% CI: 2.30 – 4.55) when EMS response time was 27 minutes or higher.

## Discussion

To our knowledge, this nationally representative cross-sectional study is the first to report the dose-response relationship between EMS response time and fatal fall injuries among older adults. Additionally, this study adds to the existing fatal fall injury epidemiology by reporting the fall-related case fatality rates among older US adults who were transported by the EMS to trauma centers. While earlier studies have reported population-based age-standardized geriatric fatal fall rates of 62 per 100,000,<sup>1, 4</sup> we have provided hospital-based case fatality rates that show that four of every 100 older adults transported by the EMS to trauma centers die from fall injuries.

Earlier studies have reported the association between advanced age, frailty, co-morbid conditions, and fall-related mortality.<sup>5, 26-28</sup> All of these indicators are essentially non-modifiable. Our study identifies an important modifiable factor by establishing EMS response time as a predictor of fall-related mortality in older persons. Rather than translating this result into a call for increased driving speed by ambulance drivers, we believe a greater acceptance and increased use of technology in EMS delivery can shave precious minutes off response times and result in fewer deaths. Medical drones, for example, can shorten travel time and complement EMS workers in delivering care, especially in areas where achieving the EMS response benchmark is logistically impossible.<sup>29</sup> Currently, medical drones can transport medications and blood, engage in search and rescue missions, transport patients, and provide telemedicine services.<sup>30</sup> Increased acceptance, utilization, and integration of medical drones into EMS will encourage further adaptation of the device for additional acute and critical care-related tasks.

Among older adults with fall injuries, the median EMS response time was eight minutes and approximately 60% of these patients experienced a less-than-nine-minute EMS response time. The NFPA Standard 1710 had set a benchmark of less than eight minutes 90% of the time for cases with low to medium hazard risk and less than 10 minutes 90% of the time for cases with high hazard risk.<sup>19, 31</sup> While EMS has achieved these standards with a median response time of 8 minutes, this benchmark was met 60% of the time. Achieving the eight-minute or ten-minute benchmark 90% of the time may require a data-driven approach to spatially optimize routes and coverage areas of current EMS stations, and identify the need and best location for additional EMS stations.<sup>32-34</sup> Concerted efforts by government, community stakeholders, and EMS administrators to fund the EMS infrastructure, train workers, and educate the population in communities with the greatest risk of fatal fall injuries may be needed for success.

This study is subject to a number of important limitations. As a cross-sectional study, causal inferences are not possible. While the NTDB is the largest trauma data pool across the US, it is not a census of all US trauma cases and is not necessarily broadly representative of the entire US trauma population. We did not control for rurality/urbanicity since this measure was not provided in the NTDB data released for this study. However, earlier studies had reported longer median EMS response times in rural areas, with 33% and 46% of crash victims experiencing less than nine minutes of EMS response time.<sup>9, 11</sup> It is, therefore, likely that a similar pattern would be present among older adults with fall injuries in rural areas. Furthermore, we controlled for trauma center designation, a variable that is strongly associated with rurality/urbanicity.<sup>35</sup> Level I and II trauma centers are often inaccessible in rural and underserved areas where levels III to IV predominate.<sup>36</sup> Also, the absence of county identifiers limits the generalization of the results for policy recommendations and community interventions. We used data that captured the pre-COVID (2015 to 2018) and intra-COVID (2019 - 2020) periods. Earlier studies had reported reduced hospital utilization, less EMS dispatch, and more out-of-hospital deaths for non-COVID cases.<sup>37-39</sup> Our computed fall case fatality rates may be conservative estimates and the fatality rates may be much higher in the general population during the COVID period. Also, with data entry, errors may result in a misclassification bias. Our results would be conservative if such bias is present. Misclassification of outcomes, however, is unlikely since death is a terminal diagnosis.

## **Conclusion**

This is, to our knowledge, the first study of the relationship between EMS response time and fatal fall injury mortality among older adults in the US. Delay in EMS response time is associated with fatal fall injuries. Improving the EMS infrastructure, especially in communities that are logistically impossible to meet the national benchmark, may reduce the odds of fatal fall injuries among older adults.

## References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Deaths from Older Adult Falls. Accessed 01/13/2023, <https://www.cdc.gov/falls/data/fall-deaths.html>
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Facts About Falls. Accessed 04/27/2022, <https://www.cdc.gov/falls/facts.html>
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Keep on Your Feet—Preventing Older Adult Falls. Accessed 05/26/2022, <https://www.cdc.gov/injury/features/older-adult-falls/index.html>
4. Burns E, Kakara R. Deaths from Falls Among Persons Aged  $\geq 65$  Years - United States, 2007-2016. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. May 11 2018;67(18):509-514. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6718a1
5. Appeadu MK, Bordonni B. Falls and Fall Prevention In The Elderly. StatPearls [Internet]; 2022. Accessed 01/13/2022. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK560761/>
6. EMS.Gov. What is EMS? National Highway Traffic Safety Agency. Accessed 11/19/2020, <https://www.ems.gov/whatisems.html>
7. Faul M, Stevens JA, Sasser SM, et al. Older Adult Falls Seen by Emergency Medical Service Providers: A Prevention Opportunity. *Am J Prev Med*. Jun 2016;50(6):719-726. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2015.12.011
8. Jeruzal JN, Boland LL, Jin D, et al. Trends in fall-related encounters and predictors of non-transport at a US Emergency Medical Services Agency. *Health & Social Care in the Community*. 2022;30(5):e1835-e1843. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.13613>
9. Adeyemi OJ, Paul R, DiMaggio C, et al. The association of crash response times and deaths at the crash scene: A cross-sectional analysis using the 2019 National Emergency Medical Service Information System. *The Journal of Rural Health*. 2022/04/22 2022;doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/jrh.12666>
10. Emergency Medical Services. NEMSIS Data Dictionary. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; 2020;version 3.4.0. Accessed 03/22/2021. [https://nemsis.org/media/nemsis\\_v3/release-3.4.0/DataDictionary/PDFHTML/DEMEMS/index.html](https://nemsis.org/media/nemsis_v3/release-3.4.0/DataDictionary/PDFHTML/DEMEMS/index.html)
11. Adeyemi OJ, Paul R, Arif A. An assessment of the rural-urban differences in the crash response time and county-level crash fatalities in the United States. *The Journal of Rural Health*. 2021/10/19 2021;doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/jrh.12627>
12. Byrne JP, Mann NC, Dai M, et al. Association Between Emergency Medical Service Response Time and Motor Vehicle Crash Mortality in the United States. *JAMA surgery*. 2019;154(4):286-293. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamasurg.2018.5097>
13. Alumran A, Albinali H, Saadah A, et al. The Effects of Ambulance Response Time on Survival Following Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest. *Open Access Emerg Med*. 2020;12:421-426. doi:10.2147/oaem.S270837
14. Dyson K, Morgans A, Bray J, et al. Drowning related out-of-hospital cardiac arrests: Characteristics and outcomes. *Resuscitation*. 2013/08/01/ 2013;84(8):1114-1118. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2013.01.020>
15. Fuller GF. Falls in the elderly. *Am Fam Physician*. 2000;61(7):2159-68, 2173-4. Accessed 06/12/2022. <https://www.aafp.org/pubs/afp/issues/2000/0401/p2159.html>
16. AARP. The Aging Readiness & Competitiveness Report: UNITED STATES. 2020. Accessed 01/13/2023. <https://www.aarpinternational.org/file%20library/arc/countries/full%20reports/arc-report---united-states.pdf>
17. American College of Surgeons. National Trauma Data Bank. Accessed 01/15/2023, <https://www.facs.org/quality-programs/trauma/quality/national-trauma-data-bank/>
18. National Weather Service. Tornadoes of March 3, 2019: Event Summary for Central Alabama. Accessed 11/08/2021, [https://www.weather.gov/bmx/event\\_03032019](https://www.weather.gov/bmx/event_03032019)



19. Fire and EMS Department. EMS Response Time. Accessed 11/08/2021, <https://fems.dc.gov/page/ems-response-time>
20. National Fire Protection Agency. Standard for the Organization and Deployment of Fire Suppression Operations, Emergency Medical Operations, and Special Operations to the Public by Career Fire Departments *NFPA 1710*. 2020. <https://www.nfpa.org/codes-and-standards/all-codes-and-standards/list-of-codes-and-standards/detail?code=1710>
21. Southern AP, Celik DH. *EMS, Trauma Center Designation*. StatPearls Publishing, Treasure Island (FL); 2022.
22. American Trauma Society. Trauma Center Levels Explained. Accessed 01/16/2023, <https://www.amtrauma.org/page/traumalevels>
23. *RStudio: Integrated Development for R*. RStudio, Inc.; 2019. <http://www.rstudio.com/>
24. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2019. <http://www.R-project.org/>
25. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 17*. StataCorp LLC; 2020.
26. Berry SD, Miller RR. Falls: epidemiology, pathophysiology, and relationship to fracture. *Current osteoporosis reports*. 2008;6(4):149-154. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11914-008-0026-4>
27. Labib N, Nouh T, Winocour S, et al. Severely injured geriatric population: morbidity, mortality, and risk factors. *J Trauma*. Dec 2011;71(6):1908-14. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1097/TA.0b013e31820989ed>
28. Llompart-Pou JA, Pérez-Bárcena J, Chico-Fernández M, et al. Severe trauma in the geriatric population. *World journal of critical care medicine*. 2017;6(2):99-106. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5492/wjccm.v6.i2.99>
29. Pulver A, Wei R, Mann C. Locating AED Enabled Medical Drones to Enhance Cardiac Arrest Response Times. *Prehosp Emerg Care*. May-Jun 2016;20(3):378-89. doi:10.3109/10903127.2015.1115932
30. Johnson AM, Cunningham CJ, Arnold E, et al. Impact of Using Drones in Emergency Medicine: What Does the Future Hold? *Open Access Emerg Med*. 2021;13:487-498. doi:10.2147/oaem.S247020
31. National Fire Protection Agency. NFPA Standard 1710. 2016. Accessed 01/16/2023. [https://www.iaff.org/wp-content/uploads/Departments/Fire\\_EMS\\_Department/30541\\_Summary\\_Sheet\\_NFPA\\_1710\\_standard.pdf](https://www.iaff.org/wp-content/uploads/Departments/Fire_EMS_Department/30541_Summary_Sheet_NFPA_1710_standard.pdf)
32. Deng Y, Zhang Y, Pan J. Optimization for Locating Emergency Medical Service Facilities: A Case Study for Health Planning from China. *Risk Manag Healthc Policy*. 2021/12/31 2021;14:1791-1802. doi:10.2147/RMHP.S304475
33. Fritze R, Graser A, Sinnl M. Combining spatial information and optimization for locating emergency medical service stations: A case study for Lower Austria. *Int J Med Inform*. Mar 2018;111:24-36. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2017.12.008
34. Zhou L, Wang S, Xu Z. A Multi-factor Spatial Optimization Approach for Emergency Medical Facilities in Beijing. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*. 2020;9(6). doi:10.3390/ijgi9060361
35. Newgard CD, Fu R, Bulger E, et al. Evaluation of Rural vs Urban Trauma Patients Served by 9-1-1 Emergency Medical Services. *JAMA Surgery*. 2017;152(1):11-18. doi:10.1001/jamasurg.2016.3329
36. Dave U, Gosine B, Palaniappan A. An Overview of Trauma Center Levels and Disparities in Rural Trauma Care. *Reconstructive Review*. 2020;10doi:<https://doi.org/10.15438/rr.10.1.234>
37. Al Amiry A, Maguire BJ. Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Calls During COVID-19: Early Lessons Learned for Systems Planning (A Narrative Review). *Open Access Emerg Med*. 2021;13:407-414. doi:10.2147/oaem.S324568
38. Siegler JE, Heslin ME, Thau L, et al. Falling stroke rates during COVID-19 pandemic at a comprehensive stroke center. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis*. Aug 2020;29(8):104953. doi:10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2020.104953

39. Zavadsky M. Complete April data shows alarming 911 trends for EMS calls during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JEMS*. 2020;

Table 1: Demographic, health, and injury characteristics of older adults with fall injuries (N=705,491).

Variables	All population (%) N = 705,491	Fatal Fall n= 31,117 (4.4%)	Non-fatal Fall n=674,374 (95.6%)	p-value
Age (Mean (SD)) <sup>a</sup>	78.1 (7.1)	79.2 (6.8)	78.1 (7.1)	<0.001
Sex				
Female	423,633 (60.0)	13,071 (42.0)	410,562 (60.9)	<0.001
Male	281,858 (40.0)	18,046 (58.0)	263,812 (39.1)	
Race/Ethnicity				
Non-Hispanic Whites	575,788 (81.6)	24,736 (79.5)	551,052 (81.7)	<0.001
Non-Hispanic Blacks	33,464 (4.7)	1,438 (4.6)	32,026 (4.8)	
Hispanics	34,738 (4.9)	1,643 (5.3)	33,095 (4.9)	
Other Races	26,039 (3.7)	1,548 (5.0)	24,491 (3.6)	
Unknown	35,462 (5.1)	1,752 (5.6)	33,710 (5.0)	
Hypertension				
No	226,557 (32.1)	10,402 (33.4)	216,155 (32.0)	<0.001
Yes	478,934 (67.9)	20,715 (66.6)	458,219 (68.0)	
Diabetes Mellitus				
No	519,782 (73.7)	21,992 (70.7)	497,790 (73.8)	<0.001
Yes	185,709 (26.3)	9,125 (29.3)	176,584 (26.2)	
COPD				
No	602,643 (85.4)	25,600 (82.3)	577,043 (85.6)	<0.001
Yes	102,848 (14.6)	5,517 (17.7)	97,331 (14.4)	
Trauma Center Designation				
Level I	310,322 (44.0)	16,486 (53.0)	293,836 (43.6)	<0.001
Level II	295,169 (41.8)	12,081 (38.8)	283,088 (42.0)	
Level III	97,154 (13.8)	2,486 (8.0)	94,668 (14.0)	
Level IV	2,846 (0.4)	64 (0.2)	2,782 (0.4)	
EMS Response time (mins)				
Median (Q1, Q3) <sup>b</sup>	8.0 (5.0 – 13.0)	8.0 (5.0 – 15.0)	8.0 (5.0 – 13.0)	<0.001
EMS Response Categories				
Less than 9minutes	424,266 (60.1)	17,573 (56.5)	406,693 (60.3)	<0.001
9 to 17.59 minutes	186,100 (26.4)	7,874 (25.3)	178,226 (26.4)	
18 to 26.59 minutes	52,630 (7.5)	3,017 (9.7)	49,613 (7.4)	
27 minutes or higher	42,495 (6.0)	2,653 (8.5)	39,842 (5.9)	

Test of association was the chi-square test except otherwise specified; a: One-sample t-test performed; b: Mann-Whitney U test performed

Table 2: Unadjusted and adjusted odds of fatal fall injuries among older adults (N=705,491)

	Variables	Univariate Model Unadjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Model 1 Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Model 2 Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Interaction Model Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)
Predictor Variables	EMS Response Time				
	Response in minutes	<b>1.01 (1.01 – 1.01)</b>	<b>1.01 (1.01 – 1.01)</b>		
	EMS Response Categories				
	Less than 9 minutes	Ref		Ref	Ref
	9 to 17.59 minutes	<b>1.02 (1.00 – 1.05)</b>		1.02 (0.99 – 1.05)	<b>1.06 (1.01 – 1.10)</b>
	18 to 26.59 minutes	<b>1.41 (1.35 – 1.46)</b>		<b>1.33 (1.28 – 1.39)</b>	<b>1.37 (1.29 – 1.46)</b>
	27 minutes or higher	<b>1.54 (1.48 – 1.61)</b>		<b>1.41 (1.35 – 1.47)</b>	<b>1.52 (1.42 – 1.62)</b>
Control Variables	Age	<b>1.02 (1.02 – 1.02)</b>	<b>1.03 (1.03 – 1.03)</b>	<b>1.03 (1.03 – 1.03)</b>	<b>1.03 (1.03 -1.03)</b>
	Sex				
	Female	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
	Male	<b>2.15 (2.10 – 2.20)</b>	<b>2.18 (2.05 – 2.32)</b>	<b>2.17 (2.12 – 2.22)</b>	<b>2.24 (2.18 – 2.31)</b>
	Race/Ethnicity				
	Non-Hispanic Whites	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
	Non-Hispanic Blacks	1.00 (0.95 – 1.06)	0.98 (0.90 – 1.08)	0.99 (0.93 – 1.04)	0.99 (0.93 – 1.04)
	Hispanics	<b>1.11 (1.05 – 1.16)</b>	<b>1.11 (1.07 – 1.15)</b>	<b>1.11 (1.06 – 1.17)</b>	<b>1.11 (1.06 – 1.17)</b>
	Other Races	<b>1.41 (1.34 – 1.48)</b>	<b>1.38 (1.10 – 1.72)</b>	<b>1.38 (1.31 – 1.45)</b>	<b>1.38 (1.31 – 1.45)</b>
	Hypertension				
	No	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
	Yes	<b>0.94 (0.92 – 0.96)</b>	<b>0.88 (0.85 – 0.90)</b>	<b>0.88 (0.85 – 0.90)</b>	<b>0.88 (0.85 – 0.90)</b>
	Diabetes Mellitus				
No	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	
Yes	<b>1.17 (1.14 – 1.20)</b>	<b>1.16 (1.15 – 1.17)</b>	<b>1.16 (1.13 – 1.19)</b>	<b>1.16 (1.13 – 1.19)</b>	
COPD					
No	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	
Yes	<b>1.28 (1.24 – 1.32)</b>	<b>1.34 (1.27 – 1.42)</b>	<b>1.34 (1.30 – 1.38)</b>	<b>1.34 (1.30 – 1.38)</b>	
R.E	Trauma level				
	Level	<b>1.13 (1.07 – 1.27)</b>	<b>1.12 (1.06 – 1.25)</b>	<b>1.11 (1.03 – 1.60)</b>	<b>1.12 (1.03 – 1.60)</b>
Interaction	EMS Response X Male				
	Less than 9 **Male				<b>Ref</b>
	9 to 17.59 **Male				<b>0.94 (0.89 – 0.99)</b>
	18 to 26.59 **Male				0.95 (0.87 – 1.03)
	27 or higher **Male				<b>0.88 (0.80 – 0.96)</b>

Model 1: EMS response time (continuous measure) as the predictor; Model 2: EMS response time categories as the predictor; EMS: Emergency Medical Service; R.E.: Random Effect variable




Figure 1: Data selection steps




Figure 2: Yearly case fatality rates of fall injuries stratified by male and female older adults.




Figure 3: Predicted probabilities of fatal fall injuries among older adults across EMS response categories