

Survey on emergency care utilization in tertiary care hospitals in Indonesia

Authors: Mineto Fujisawa^{1,2}; Kiyomitsu Fukaguchi, MD, MCR³; Akio Tokita^{2,4}; Yuta Iwamoto, MD², Takanori Takeda, MSc², Lukito Condro⁵, Monalisa Tobing⁶, Bobi Prabowo, MD⁵; Rarasanti Rania Qodri, S.Tr. Battra⁷, Tadahiro Goto, MD, MPH, PhD^{2,8}

Affiliations:

1. Faculty of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan
2. TXP Medical Co. Ltd., Tokyo, Japan
3. Department of Emergency Medicine, Shonan Kamakura General Hospital, Kanagawa, Japan
4. School of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Gunma University, Gunma, Japan
5. RSUD Kanjuruhan Kabupaten Malang, Kabupaten Malang, Indonesia
6. Emergency Department, Hermina Depok Hospital, Jakarta Barat, Indonesia
7. Airlangga University, Indonesia
8. Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Health Economics, School of Public Health, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

Correspondence author:

Tadahiro Goto, MD, MPH, PhD

TXP Medical Co. Ltd., Tokyo, Japan; Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Health Economics, School of Public Health, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

Address: 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, 113-0033

Email: tag695@mail.harvard.edu

Phone: +81-3-5615-8433

ABSTRACT (248 words)

Objective: Indonesia's emergency care system remains suboptimal despite rising demand due to socio-economic changes and increased life expectancy. This study aims to examine patient and family perceptions of the current emergency care system, identify potential needs, and provide a foundation for its development and improvement.

Methods: This cross-sectional study used an online survey at two Indonesian hospitals in 2022 to target adult emergency department patients or their families. Each participant's demographic data, patient journey details, and potential additional medical services were analyzed using descriptive statistics.

Results: The study included 446 participants, primarily family members of patients (93.7%), with a median age of 37 (IQR: 28 to 43 years). The majority of patients visited the hospital using private cars (36.9%) and taxis (17.2%), with marked variation between the two hospitals. Only 9.4% of participants were aware of Public Safety Center (PSC) services, and the majority (58.9%) did not use them because they did not know how to contact PSC. The most common waiting time was up to 20 minutes at two tertiary care hospitals. Additional services desired by participants included doctor reservation systems, medical interview applications, and home visitation services. Reported problems included long waiting times and crowded emergency rooms.

Conclusions: The study highlights transportation disparities and the demand for supplemental services to better emergency department experiences. For optimizing PSC utilization and future resource distribution, it is vital to further investigate patient behaviors and needs during emergency department visits.

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia has the fourth largest population in the world. While recent socio-economic changes and increased life expectancy have led to a growing demand for emergency medical services (EMS),¹ the emergency care system in Indonesia, encompassing EMS and emergency departments (ED), remains suboptimal.² For example, the mortality rate from road traffic accidents per 100,000 population in Indonesia (12.2) was three or four times compared to those in nearby countries such as Singapore (2.8), Australia (5.6) or Japan (4.1).² Moreover, Indonesia's emergency care system has much room for improvement, as illustrated by the high proportion (62.8%) of patients with myocardial infarction in Indonesia reportedly did not receive timely reperfusion therapy.^{3,4}

In an effort to address the rising demand for EMS, the Ministry of Health (MoH) has recently taken the lead in establishing the Public Safety Center (PSC) and an 119 call system in pre-hospital services in Indonesia⁵, and the effectiveness of these measures is expected to increase. A cross-sectional study from a tertiary hospital in Indonesia revealed that ambulance usage accounted for 10% of emergency transportation, while approximately 60% of patients arrived at the ED via private cars and ride-sharing services.⁶ This was largely due to patients and their families being unaware of how to contact an ambulance and the existence of EMS.⁵ However, it remains uncertain whether such findings can be generalized to EDs in other tertiary care hospitals and whether patients and their families are satisfied with the current state of emergency visits and transportation.

Given this context, enhancing Indonesia's emergency care system is of utmost importance to reduce preventable fatalities and improve public health. The objective of this study is to investigate the perceptions of patients and their families regarding the existing emergency care system, to gain insights into the current state and potential needs in emergency care, and to provide a foundation for the development and improvement of emergency care.

METHODS

Study design and setting

This study is a cross-sectional, online survey conducted from January 12th to 24th, 2023 using Google Forms (Alphabet Inc., California, USA). Two hospitals from Indonesia participated in the study: RS Umum Daerah Kabupaten Malang (RSUDKM) and RS Hermina Depok (RSHD). RSUDKM is a governmental tertiary care hospital with 778 employees with 27 ED beds, and RSHD is a private tertiary care hospital with 667 employees with 34 ED beds.

Study participants

The survey was performed for adult ED patients or their family members who attended the hospital EDs from January 12th to 24th 2023. Surveys were conducted from 10:00 am to 6:00 pm each day of the 13-day study period.

Contents of the online survey and measurements

This survey consisted of three main sections: 1) respondents' demographic characteristics, 2) information on the patient's journey to the hospital, including the patient's or their family's prior knowledge, sources of information, means of transportation to the hospital, and satisfaction with emergency medical services, and 3) possibility of additional medical applications to meet potential patient needs. The questions were initially developed in English with a native English speaker, then translated into the local common language, Bahasa Indonesia. The details of questionnaires are shown in **Supplemental Table**. The questionnaire was estimated to take approximately 15 minutes to complete, and the questions were based on a previous study.⁶

Statistical analysis

The characteristics of the participating hospitals and responders were reported as medians with interquartile ranges (IQRs) for continuous variables and as numbers and percentages (%) for

categorical variables. All data analyses were performed using Microsoft Excel version 16.74 (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA, USA).

RESULTS

Basic demographic characteristics

The total number of patients who participated in the survey was 446, of which 190 (42.6%) were male (**Table 1**). The median age for all participants was 37□ years old (IQR: 28 to 43□ years). Among the 446 people who participated in the survey, 418 (93.7%) were family members of patients, 13 (2.9%) were patients themselves and 15 (3.4%) were others. The patients' homes were most frequently 1-5km away from the hospital (47.0%), followed by 6-10 km (23.0%).

Transportation modes

Figure 1A shows the proportions of transportation modes used for ED visits. Private cars accounted for 36.9% of transportation modes, followed by taxi, including the Indonesian ride-hailing services, Grab and Gojek (17.2%). Ambulans Sehat, a local ambulance service, is responsible for 11.9% of transportations, followed by hospital ambulance at 7.0%. In RSUDKM, compared to RSHD, more patients used Ambulans Sehat (20.2% vs. 2.3%) and Hospital Ambulance (12.3% vs. 0.9%), and fewer used the taxi (4.0% vs. 32.6%).

The median score of participants' satisfaction with the visit was 8 (IQR: 7-9) in both RSUDKM and RSHD. The distributions of satisfaction scores were similar between hospitals. Overall, 9.4% of the participants were aware of PSC services. Furthermore, none of the RSUDKM participants knew about the PSC's services. **Figure 1B** summarizes the reasons for not using PSC services. The most common reason was that they did not know how to contact the PSC service (58.9%), followed by it being not necessary (12.0%). In the RSHD, only 27.5% of the participants answered that they did not know how to contact the PSC service, while in the

RSUDKM, 92.3% of the participants did.

Patient waiting time

Figure 2 shows the waiting time from arrival at the ED to the first consultation or treatment. The most common waiting time was less than 10 minutes with RSUDKM and 10-20 minutes with RSHD. Furthermore, 96.0% of all RSUDKM participants had a waiting time of 0 minutes (direct). The median satisfaction level in RSHD was 8 (IQR: 8-9).

Participants' needs and problems

Figure 3 shows how much participants were willing to pay for additional medical services in the current emergency system. We focused on the following services: reservation systems to see a doctor, medical interview applications (e.g., smartphone app), and home visitation services. We asked participants if they would like to use each of these services, and 83%, 79%, and 65% of them said they would like to, respectively. For each of the three services, the highest number of respondents wanted to use them free of charge. Apart from "free," however, the most common price the participants were willing to pay for the three services was Rp 5,000 (0.33 USD) for reservation systems, Rp 10,000 (0.67 USD) for medical interview applications, and Rp 50,000 (3.35 USD) for home visitation services.

According to an open-ended question on the problems that patients or their families felt in the ER, of the 35 responses received, most participants felt that long waiting times (n=17) and crowded ERs (n=15) were the problems.

DISCUSSION

In this cross-sectional survey, we found that there was 1) variation in the mode of transportation between hospitals, 2) a shorter ED waiting time than we expected, and 3) a potential need for several additional services, such as reservation systems, medical interview applications, and

home visitation services.

In this survey, we found that the most used mode of transportation was private cars, accounting for 36.9%. These findings are consistent with a previous study conducted in Jakarta, Indonesia, which indicated that 30.3% of patients arrived at the hospital by private car.⁶ When Ambulans Sehat and hospital ambulance were combined, ambulances accounted for 18.9%, followed by taxi at 17.2%, with substantial variation (ambulance: 32.5% in RSUDKM vs. 3.2% in RSHD; taxi: 4.0% in RSUDKM vs. 32.6% in RSHD). Such variation in the use of taxi or ambulance has also been reported in earlier studies.^{6,7} For example, in Jakarta, taxi (including ride-sharing services) was the most common method of ED visits (33.5%) while ambulances were used infrequently (9.3%),⁶ whereas 36.7% of ED patients used ambulances in Yogyakarta.⁷

This regional variation in transportation mode can be attributed to several geographic differences.⁸⁻¹⁰ Ride-sharing services are more prevalent in urban areas.⁶ Depok, which is near Jakarta, may have higher usage of such services, which could lead to an increase in taxi usage. In contrast, rural areas tend to have stronger bonds within communities. As a result, patients are more likely to first consult with their local health clinic and then use an ambulance, which is a well-established practice in these communities.

Surprisingly, only 9.4% of participants were aware of PSC, which is the national emergency medical care system. Moreover, approximately 60% of the participants answered that they did not know how to contact PSC as the reason for not using PSC. Of note, none of the participants at RSUDKM knew about PSC, while 18% of the participants at RSHD knew. One possible reason for the low awareness of PSC is that PSC is a relatively new service and has not yet been installed in some areas, and awareness is not fully spread among citizens.⁶ Patients often lack knowledge about the appropriate means of transportation to the hospital, leading to the assumption that private cars or ride-sharing services are commonly utilized. However, in the event of a clearly emergent accident, raising awareness about the availability of Prehospital

Emergency Medical Services (PSC) may promote the appropriate utilization of this service.¹¹

Another possible reason for the lack of widespread use of ambulances, including PSC, in Indonesia is that ambulances are not given priority on public roads.⁶ It has been pointed out that the ambulance is one of the slowest modes of transportation to the hospital because ambulances cannot run faster than general transportation.

Regarding ED care, the majority of patients (65.1%) experienced a waiting time of 10 minutes or less from their arrival at the ED until the initiation of their first treatment or consultation. Notably, at RSUDKM, 96% of patients had a waiting time of 10 minutes or less. However, it should be noted that in nearly all of these cases, the wait time was actually zero, with patients receiving immediate treatment and consultation upon arrival at the hospital. A study conducted in Jakarta also showed that the waiting time was 5 minutes (IQR 0-10), which aligns with our findings.⁶ These results suggest relatively short waiting times in Indonesian EDs compared to other countries.^{12,13} Nevertheless, some participants expressed concerns about lengthy waiting periods and overcrowded emergency rooms in this study. Therefore, further investigation is warranted to examine whether long waiting times are a problem in Indonesian EDs.^{14,15} To achieve this, quantitative evaluations through digital modes are preferable.^{16,17}

The demand for additional services, namely reservation systems to see a doctor, medical interview applications (e.g., smartphone app), and home visitation services, are high. To address the identified challenges, digitization for these services could be a potential solution, but it remains unclear whether these solutions will actually improve patient convenience, optimization of resources, and finally patient outcomes. Therefore, further research is warranted to ascertain the potential improvements in patient convenience and the optimization of healthcare resources.

LIMITATIONS

Our study has several limitations. First, not all patients who came to the ED participated in the study. It is possible that a self-selection bias exists in which relatively healthy or health-conscious individuals were more likely to have participated in the survey. However, this bias was more or less mitigated by a dedicated team conducting the survey at fixed times during the study period. Second, this study only collected data from two hospitals in two regions. Since different populations in different regions of Indonesia may have different characteristics, our results may not be representative of the results for Indonesia as a whole.

CONCLUSIONS


We reported the perceptions of patients and their families regarding the existing emergency care system and potential needs in emergency care, highlighting stark differences in transportation methods and the need for additional services to support emergency department visits. Further investigation is warranted to promote the utilization of PSC and design targeted investigations to improve ED visits and healthcare resource allocation.

REFERENCE


1. Yusvirazi, L., Sulistio, S., Wijaya Ramlan, A. A. & Camargo Jr, C. A. Snapshot of emergency departments in Jakarta, Indonesia. *Emergency Medicine Australasia*. 2020; 32(5): 830-839.
2. WHO. Global status report on road safety 2018. Geneva, Switzerland, 2018
<https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/276462/9789241565684-eng.pdf?ua=1>
(accessed June 10, 2023).
3. Surya Dharma, Hananto Andriantoro, Ismi Purnawan, Characteristics, treatment and in-hospital outcomes of patients with STEMI in a metropolitan area of a developing country: an initial report of the extended Jakarta Acute Coronary Syndrome registry. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(8): e012193.
4. Dharma S, Andriantoro H, Dakota I, et al. Organisation of reperfusion therapy for STEMI in a developing country. *Open Heart*. 2015; 2(1): e000240.
5. Yusvirazi, L., Ramlan, A. A. W. & Hou, P. C. State of emergency medicine in Indonesia. *Emergency Medicine Australasia*. 2018; 30(6): 820-826.
6. Brice, S.N., Bouthillier, J.J., Gartner, D. et al. Emergency services utilization in Jakarta (Indonesia): a cross-sectional study of patients attending hospital emergency departments. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2022; 22(1): 639.
7. Kusumawati, Happy I., Judy Magarey, and Philippa Rasmussen. Analysis of factors influencing length of stay in the Emergency Department in public hospital, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Australasian emergency care* 2019; 22(3):174-179.
8. Rain E Freeman, Krislyn M Boggs, Ashley F Sullivan, et al. Distance From Freestanding Emergency Departments to Nearby Emergency Care. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2021; 77(1): 48-56.
9. Katherine M Joyce, Ryan C Burke, Thomas J Veldman, et al. Use of Fine-scale Geospatial Units and Population Data to Evaluate Access to Emergency Care. *West J Emerg Med*.

- 2018; 19(6): 1043-1048.
10. Lucas C Carlson, Olesya N Baker, Jeremiah D Schuur. A Geospatial Analysis of Freestanding and Hospital Emergency Department Accessibility via Public Transit. *West J Emerg Med.* 2019; 20(3): 472-476.
 11. Nariman Sepehrvand, Wendimagegn Alemayehu, Padma Kaul, et al. Ambulance use, distance and outcomes in patients with suspected cardiovascular disease: a registry-based geographic information system study. *Eur Heart J Acute Cardiovasc Care.* 2020; 9(1_suppl): 45-58.
 12. Steven L Bernstein, Dominik Aronsky, Reena Duseja, et al. The effect of emergency department crowding on clinically oriented outcomes. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2009; 16(1): 1-10.
 13. Philip L Henneman 1, Brian H Nathanson, Haiping Li, Howard A Smithline, et al. Emergency department patients who stay more than 6 hours contribute to crowding. *J Emerg Med.* 2010; 39(1): 105-12.
 14. Amir Elalouf, Guy Wachtel. Queueing Problems in Emergency Departments: A Review of Practical Approaches and Research Methodologies. *Oper Res Forum.* 2022; 3(1): 2.
 15. Hervé Spechbach, Jessica Rochat, Jean-Michel Gaspoz, et al. Patients' time perception in the waiting room of an ambulatory emergency unit: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Emerg Med.* 2019 Aug 1;19(1):41.
 16. Jenna M Geers, Kalyan S Pasupathy, Kimberly K Lovik, et al. Characterization of emergency department abandonment using a real-time location system. *Am J Emerg Med.* 2020; 38(4): 759-762.
 17. Kiyomitsu Fukaguchi, Tadahiro Goto, Tadatsugu Yamamoto, et al. Experimental Implementation of NSER Mobile App for Efficient Real-Time Sharing of Prehospital Patient Information With Emergency Departments: Interrupted Time-Series Analysis. *JMIR Form Res.* 2022; 6(7): e37301.


Transport mode



Reasons for not using PSC services



Waiting time from arrival at the ED to first consultation/treatment



How much are you willing to pay for each service?




Table 1. Participants' characteristics and their responses.

Variables	Overall	RSUDKM	RSHD
Age, year, median (IQR)	37 (28, 43)	36 (28.8, 43.3)	37 (27, 43)
Sex			
Female	255 (57.2)	128 (50.6)	127 (65.8)
Male	190 (42.6)	125 (49.4)	65 (33.7)
Others	1 (0.2)	0 (0)	1 (0.5)
Participants' identity			
Patient	13 (2.9)	1 (0.4)	12 (6.2)
Family member of patient	418 (93.7)	251 (99.2)	167 (86.5)
Others	15 (3.4)	1 (0.4)	14 (7.3)
Distance from home to the hospital (km)			
<1	3 (1)	2 (1.7)	1 (0.6)
1-5	139 (47)	16 (13.3)	123 (69.9)
6-10	68 (23)	27 (22.5)	41 (23.3)
11-20	39 (13.2)	29 (24.2)	10 (5.7)
21-30	27 (9.1)	26 (21.7)	1 (0.6)
31-40	11 (3.7)	11 (9.2)	0 (0)
>40	9 (3)	9 (7.5)	0 (0)
Mode of transportation			
Private car	174 (36.9)	104 (41.1)	70 (32.1)

Ambulans Sehat	56 (11.9)	51 (20.2)	5 (2.3)
Hospital ambulance	33 (7)	31 (12.3)	2 (0.9)
Taxi (Grab, Gojek)	81 (17.2)	10 (4)	71 (32.6)
Others	127 (27)	57 (22.5)	70 (32.1)
Do the participants know about the transportation services of the Public Safety Center (PSC)?			
Yes	34 (9.4)	0 (0)	34 (17.6)
No	328 (90.6)	169 (100)	159 (82.4)
Reasons for not using PSC services			
Too expensive	10 (2.7)	8 (4.4)	2 (1)
Takes too long	7 (1.9)	5 (2.7)	2 (1)
Not necessary	45 (12)	0 (0)	45 (23.3)
Not knowing how to contact PSC	221 (58.9)	168 (92.3)	53 (27.5)
Others	92 (24.5)	1 (0.5)	91 (47.2)
Do the participants know about the Emergency Button application? †			
Yes	58 (13)	5 (2)	53 (27.5)
No	388 (87)	248 (98)	140 (72.5)
Method for obtaining information in emergencies			
Search engines like Google	116 (22.3)	4 (1.6)	112 (41.8)

Instagram	71 (13.6)	1 (0.4)	70 (26.1)
Twitter	1 (0.2)	0 (0)	1 (0.4)
Facebook	4 (0.8)	0 (0)	4 (1.5)
TikTok	11 (2.1)	0 (0)	11 (4.1)
Others (already knew, recommendation from medical settings, [#] etc.)	318 (61)	248 (98)	70 (26.1)
Waiting time from arrival at the ED to first consultation/treatment (min)			
<10	276 (65.1)	244 (96)	32 (18.6)
10-20	92 (21.7)	6 (2)	87 (50.6)
21-30	32 (7.5)	2 (1)	30 (17.4)
31-40	5 (1.2)	0 (0)	5 (2.9)
41-50	4 (0.9)	0 (0)	4 (2.3)
51-60	6 (1.4)	0 (0)	6 (3.5)
>60	9 (2.1)	1 (0)	8 (4.7)

Footnotes: The characteristics of the participating hospitals and responders were reported as medians with interquartile ranges (IQRs) for continuous variables and as numbers and percentages (%) for categorical variables. [†] “Emergency Button application” is an alert button within the application that notifies the PSC service of an emergency in the event of a sudden illness. [#] “Recommendation from medical settings” refers to information provided during previous visits to medical facilities or information obtained from posters displayed at medical facilities.