



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients: a comparison between patients younger or older than 70 years

Lucke, J.A.; Gelder, J. de; Clarijs, F.; Heringhaus, C.; Craen, A.J.M. de; Fogteloo, A.J.; ... ; Mooijaart, S.P.

Citation

Lucke, J. A., Gelder, J. de, Clarijs, F., Heringhaus, C., Craen, A. J. M. de, Fogteloo, A. J., ... Mooijaart, S. P. (2018). Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients: a comparison between patients younger or older than 70 years. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 35(1), 18-27. doi:10.1136/emered-2016-205846

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/76376>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Emergency Medicine Journal

Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years.

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>Emergency Medicine Journal</i> |
| Manuscript ID | emermed-2016-205846.R6 |
| Article Type: | Original article |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | n/a |
| Complete List of Authors: | <p>Lucke, Jacinta; Leiden University Medical Center, Emergency Medicine; Leiden University Medical Center, Gerontology and Geriatrics de Gelder, Jelle; Leiden University Medical Center, Gerontology and Geriatrics</p> <p>Clarijs, Fleur; Leiden University Medical Center, Emergency Medicine</p> <p>Heringhaus, Christian; Leiden University Medical Center, Emergency Medicine</p> <p>de Craen, Anton; Leiden University Medical Center, Gerontology and Geriatrics</p> <p>Fogteloo, Anne; Leiden University Medical Center, Internal Medicine</p> <p>Blauw, Gerard Jan; Leiden University Medical Center, Gerontology and Geriatrics; Medical Center Haaglanden - Bronovo, Internal Medicine and Geriatrics</p> <p>de Groot, Bas; Leiden University Medical Center, Emergency Medicine</p> <p>Mooijaart, Simon; Institute for Evidence-based Medicine in Old Age IEMO, ; Leiden University Medical Center, Gerontology and Geriatrics</p> |
| Keywords: | geriatrics, hospitalisations, emergency department, aged, research, epidemiology |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1 Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years.
3
4
5

6 **TITLEPAGE**

7
8
9 **Title**

10 Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients
11 younger or older than 70-years.
12
13

14
15
16 **Authors**

17 Jacinta A. Lucke, MD^{1,2}; Jelle de Gelder, MD²; Fleur Clarijs, MD¹; Christian Heringhaus, MD¹; Anton J.M. De
18 Craen, PhD^{2,5}; Anne J. Fogteloo, MD, PhD³; Gerard J. Blauw, MD, PhD^{2,6}; Bas de Groot, MD, PhD¹; Simon P.
19 Mooijaart, MD, PhD^{2,4}
20
21
22

23
24 **Affiliations**

- 25 1. Department of Emergency Medicine, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands
- 26 2. Department of Gerontology and Geriatrics, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands
- 27 3. Department of Internal Medicine, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands
- 28 4. Institute for Evidence-based Medicine in Old Age | IEMO, Leiden, the Netherlands
- 29 5. Department of Internal Medicine and Geriatrics, Medical Center Haaglanden-Bronovo, The Hague,
30 The Netherlands
31

32
33
34
35
36
37 **Corresponding author**

38 Drs. Jacinta A. Lucke, MD

39 Department of Emergency Medicine K-02-174/
40

41 Department of Gerontology and Geriatrics C-07-44
42

43 Leiden University Medical Center
44

45 Albinusdreef 2, 2333 ZA, Leiden, The Netherlands
46

47 Tel: +31715262025/ Fax: +31715248216/ Email: j.a.lucke@lumc.nl
48

49
50
51 **Word count**

52 3965
53

54
55 **Keywords**

56 Geriatrics, hospitalizations, emergency department, aged, research, epidemiology.
57
58
59
60

1 Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years

3 **ABSTRACT**

4 **Objective:** The aim of this study was to develop models that predict hospital admission of emergency
5 department patients in patients younger and older than 70 and compare their performance.
6

7 **Method:** Prediction models were derived in a retrospective observational study of all patients ≥ 18 years-old
8 visiting the emergency department (ED) of a university hospital during the first 6 months of 2012. Patients
9 were stratified into two age groups (<70 years-old, ≥ 70 years-old). Multivariable logistic regression analysis
10 was used to identify predictors of hospital admission among factors available immediately after patient arrival
11 to the ED. Validation of the prediction models was performed on patients presenting to the ED during the
12 second-half of the year 2012.
13

14 **Results:** 10,807 patients were included in the derivation and 10,480 in the validation cohorts. Strongest
15 independent predictors of hospital admission among the 8,728 patients <70 years-old were age, sex, triage
16 category, mode of arrival, performance of blood tests, chief complaint, ED revisit, type of specialist,
17 phlebotomised blood sample, and all vital signs. Area-under-the-curve (AUC) of the validation cohort for those
18 <70 years-old was 0.86 (95%CI 0.85-0.87). Among the 2,079 patients ≥ 70 years the same factors were
19 predictive except for gender, type of specialist and heart rate; the AUC was 0.77 (95%CI 0.75-0.79). The
20 prediction models could identify a group of 10% patients with the highest risk in whom hospital admission was
21 predicted at ED triage with a positive predictive value (PPV) of 71% (95%CI 68-74%) in younger and PPV 87%
22 (95%CI 81-92%) in older patients.
23

24 **Conclusion:**

25 Demographic and clinical factors readily available early in the ED visit can be useful in identifying patients who
26 are likely to be admitted to hospital. While the model for the younger patients had a higher AUC, the model
27 for older patients had a higher PPV in identifying the patients at highest risk for admission. Of note, heart rate
28 was not a useful predictor in the older patients.
29

30 **Word count abstract: 316**
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years

| What this paper adds | |
|---|--|
| What is already known on this subject | What this study adds |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patients presenting to the emergency department (ED) are at risk for hospital admission, functional decline and mortality, with older patients having even higher risks. • Clinical decision making tools for older patients in the ED have not been found to be effective. • It is unknown whether independent predictors may vary between age groups, which may influence the design of future tools. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The models created in this study indicate that predictors of hospital admission from the ED are similar for younger and older patients, but differ in their prognostic capabilities. The overall prognostic ability of the models was greater for the patients under 70, but the model for older patients is better at identifying the a group of patients very likely to be admitted. • These results constitute preparatory work towards creating a screening instrument that could adequately predict hospital admission, particularly for older adults. |

1 Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years

3 INTRODUCTION

4 Older adults presenting to emergency departments (EDs) for medical care frequently are admitted to the
5 hospital[1-4]. Despite a high probability of admission, they are at risk of having prolonged length of stay in
6 the ED, which increases the chance of in-hospital adverse events[5]. If ED physicians had an accurate
7 decision-making tool they could use early during the ED visit to predict which older patients have the
8 highest probability of being admitted using routinely available demographic and clinical factors available at
9 triage, ED length of stay might be reduced. Interventions to expedite the admission of older patients might
10 also improve health-related and ED flow and function outcomes. Such a tool however, is not yet
11 available[6]. It also is not yet known if demographic and clinical factors predictive of hospital admission are
12 the same for both older and younger ED patients, and if decision-making tools comprised of these factors
13 perform equally well for both age groups.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25
26
27 Independent predictors of hospital admission of ED patients have been identified[7] previously, yet mainly
28 reflect disease severity. The Modified Early Warning Score (MEWS)[8] is frequently used to quantify disease
29 severity and can predict probability of hospital admission,[9] disposition[10] and mortality[11] of ED patients.
30 However, physiology, polypharmacy and multiple comorbidities of older patients affect measured vital signs
31 and delay recognition of serious disease; when relying solely on vital signs a proportion of severely ill older
32 patients requiring admission will not be identified[12]. Given the discrepancy in the utility of hospital
33 admission prediction models using vital signs and disease severity when they are applied to different age
34 groups, tools helping to predict need for admission based on other clinical characteristics also might not be
35 equally useful for older and younger ED adult patients. If this is the case, different prediction rules should be
36 derived and used based on patient age.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The goal of this study was therefore to derive prediction models separately for older and younger adults which
48 identify need for hospital admission, using routinely demographic and clinical data available at ED triage. We
49 further aimed to assess how well these prediction models performed for these two age groups. The ultimate
50 aim for this prediction model was for its eventual application in identifying early which patients would be
51 admitted from the ED, potentially improving efficiency of care pathways and reducing ED length of stay.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Lucke et al.** Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years

3 **METHOD**

4
5 **Study design and setting**

6
7 This investigation involved deriving and validating a hospital admission prediction rule for adult ED patients.
8
9 Data were obtained retrospectively from the ED of the Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC), which is a
10 tertiary care hospital with an annual census of approximately 30.000 ED visits. LUMC has an Acute Medical
11 Unit (13 beds) designed to accept admissions from the ED. The Medical Ethics Committee waived the need for
12 informed consent because data were collected as part of past clinical care and de-identified after extraction
13 from the patient files.
14
15
16
17
18

19
20 **Selection of participants**

21 Inclusion criteria

22 We included all ED visits by adults ≥ 18 years-old to LUMC between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012.
23
24 ED patients who presented between January 1 – June 30 were included in the derivation cohort, while those
25 presenting July 1 – December 31 were included in the validation cohort.
26
27
28

29 Exclusion criteria

30
31 Patients who arrived to the ED undergoing cardiopulmonary resuscitation or classified as Manchester Triage
32 System[13] (MTS) category 'red' (needing immediate care) were excluded because their likelihood of hospital
33 admission was so great that a prediction tool would not be needed for this population. Patients who died in
34 the ED and those who left without being evaluated also were excluded. In addition, patients with ED visits due
35 to logistical reasons were excluded, such as those attending for a planned re-evaluation because they could
36 not wait until the next available out-patient clinic appointment, visits to the ED because of lack of availability
37 of time in the out-patient clinic, laboratory checks for logistical reasons and patients who were sent away from
38 the ED to visit their GP (Figure 1). For this, a pre-defined list of objective criteria, based on expert opinion, was
39 used. Patient files were checked by a single researcher (JAL) to assess exclusion criteria.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Study protocol and measurements**

51 Data were automatically harvested from the electronic patient files (Chipsoft-EZIS®, version 5.2, 2006-2014,
52 Amsterdam, The Netherlands) using an application designed by the LUMC department of Information
53 Technology. One investigator (JAL) checked the data for validity and corrected typing errors. This was
54 performed by reference to medical records in case of outliers. Furthermore using sampling JAL checked patient
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Lucke et al.** Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years

3 records to assess if study data was adequately withdrawn from the patients files. The data were not extracted
4 manually and not subject to interpretation. Therefore, a measure of inter-rater variability is not applicable.

5
6 Because the aim of this investigation was to develop a tool, using data readily available at triage, the following
7 data were collected: age, sex, Manchester Triage System (MTS) triage category, chief complaint, mode of
8 arrival to ED, type of specialist, ED visits within prior 30 days, indication for phlebotomised blood sample
9 testing and vital signs. These variables were chosen by the study authors based on clinical judgement,
10 frequently used variables in similar research[14 15] [16], their availability upon patient arrival to the ED and
11 inclusion in the ED electronic medical records. A detailed description of the collection of all variables can be
12 found in Supplemental Material.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 **Outcomes**

22
23 The primary endpoint of this study was hospital admission, defined as either admission to the LUMC or
24 transfer to another hospital for admission. This outcome was downloaded directly from the patient files.
25
26
27

28 29 **Data Analysis**

30
31 Patients were divided into two age groups for analysis, <70 years and ≥ 70 years-old, in line with the age cut-off
32 used in government initiated interventions in The Netherlands[17]. Data were summarized as number and
33 percentages or means and standard deviation for normally distributed variables, or as medians with
34 interquartile ranges for non-normally distributed variables, as appropriate. Missing measurements of vital
35 signs were handled as a separate category and analysed alongside categories of measured values, for example
36 oxygen saturation has 4 categories: <90%, 91-94%, $\geq 95\%$ and missing, where the reference category is $\geq 95\%$.
37 Student's t-tests assuming independence were used to compare groups for normally distributed variables and
38 Mann-Whitney-U tests for non-normally distributed variables. Chi-square tests were used for categorical
39 variables. Univariable binary logistic regression was used to assess possible predictors of hospital admission
40 using demographic and clinical characteristics extracted from the medical records. Age (< 70 years-old or ≥ 70 -
41 years-old) as an effect modifier of the relationship between variables in the model and the outcome of
42 hospital admission was tested in the univariable analyses. Multivariable binary logistic regression was used to
43 create an optimal model. Odds Ratios (ORs) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were estimated.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56 Risks associated with age were expressed per 10 year age groups. The general rule of thumb that at least 10
57
58
59
60

1 **Lucke et al.** Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years

3 events per predictor variable are needed to prevent over-fitting of the model was used. Because the database
4 contained more than 3000 hospital admissions all potential predictor variables could be incorporated in the
5 model[18].
6

7
8 An optimal model was created for each age group, using backward elimination with Akaike's Information
9 Criterion to eliminate predictors from the model, with a cut-off point of $p < 0.05$. This made the model as small
10 as possible whilst still containing all clinically relevant parameters. Goodness of fit was tested using the
11 Hosmer-Lemeshow test, this was performed ten times in a random subsample of 1000 patients.
12

13
14 This method standardized the power of the Hosmer-Lemeshow test to prevent overpowering caused by the
15 large number of study subjects[19].
16

17
18 Receiver operator characteristics curves were drafted and area under the curve (AUC) estimated to measure
19 the discriminative performance of the models. Temporal validation of the models were performed using data
20 collected from the second-half of 2016. Calibration of the models in the validation cohort was assessed using
21 calibration plots.
22

23
24 The distribution of risk of admission per age group was calculated for the validation cohort using the following
25 equation: $\frac{1}{1 + e^{(\text{intercept} + \text{linear predictor})}}$. The individual risk of each patient was calculated and ranked. The 10% of
26 the ED patient population, per age group, with the highest chance of hospital was designated 'high risk'. This
27 was deemed a clinically relevant and feasible cut-off point for risk of admission, for which sensitivity,
28 specificity, positive predictive value, negative predictive value were calculated.
29

30
31 As a sensitivity analysis, the alternative clinically relevant vital sign cut-off values were assessed as predictors
32 in the models and their discriminative performance and calibration were re-assessed. In a second sensitivity
33 analysis, we created a multivariable model using the whole year 2012 (without dividing the year into
34 successive six-month blocks of time) and randomly selected a training and test cohort to assess for
35 introduction of bias due to the temporal validation.
36

37
38 Statistical significance was set at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level for all analyses. All statistical analyses were performed
39 using IBM SPSS Statistics package (version 23, New York, USA).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years

RESULTS

Characteristics of study subjects

In 2012, there were 27,862 visits to the LUMC ED, of which 21,287 were included in this analysis (Figure 1).

The 6575 excluded patients were due to ED use for logistical reasons or arrival during CPR (n=1486), patients aged ≤ 18 years (n=4802) or patients with red triage or who deceased (n=287).

Baseline characteristics of the study population stratified by age group are shown in Table 1. The distribution of demographics and clinical characteristics by age group were similar within the derivation and validation cohorts.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of study population.

| Baseline features | Derivation | | P value | Validation | | P value |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| | <70 years n=8728 | ≥ 70 years n=2079 | | <70 years n=8411 | ≥ 70 years n=2069 | |
| Age, median IQR | 44.8 (28.8-57.4) | 78.1 (73.9-83.6) | | 44.8 (28.4-58.0) | 77.9 (73.9-83.0) | |
| Male, n (%) | 4762 (54.6) | 995 (47.9) | <0.001 | 4597 (54.7) | 1044 (50.5) | 0.001 |
| Triage category, n (%) | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| <10 minutes | 1921 (22.0) | 657 (31.6) | | 1893 (22.5) | 683 (33.0) | |
| <1 hour | 3567 (40.9) | 943 (45.4) | | 3557 (42.3) | 966 (46.7) | |
| <2 hour | 3205 (36.7) | 472 (22.7) | | 2921 (34.7) | 410 (19.8) | |
| <4 hours | 35 (0.4) | 7 (0.3) | | 40 (0.5) | 10 (0.5) | |
| Arrival mode, n (%) | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| Self-referral | 4258 (48.8) | 467 (22.5) | | 3794 (45.1) | 404 (19.5) | |
| Ambulance/other institution | 1316 (15.1) | 596 (28.7) | | 1659 (19.7) | 833 (40.3) | |
| Referred by GP/specialist | 3154 (36.1) | 1016 (48.9) | | 2958 (35.2) | 832 (40.2) | |
| Type of specialist | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| Medicine | 3809 (43.6) | 1251 (60.2) | | 3732 (44.4) | 1245 (60.2) | |
| Surgery | 4919 (56.4) | 828 (39.8) | | 4679 (55.6) | 824 (39.8) | |
| Revisit to the ED, n (%) | | | 0.082 | | | 0.071 |
| Visit <30 days | 922 (10.6) | 247 (11.9) | | 873 (10.4) | 243 (11.7) | |
| Chief complaint¹ | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| Minor trauma | 3656 (42.2) | 621 (30.1) | | 3301 (39.6) | 641 (31.2) | |
| Major trauma | 183 (2.1) | 32 (1.5) | | 208 (2.5) | 28 (1.4) | |
| Chest pain | 980 (11.3) | 302 (14.6) | | 992 (11.9) | 329 (16.0) | |
| Dyspnea | 426 (4.9) | 221 (10.7) | | 394 (4.7) | 179 (8.7) | |
| Syncope | 219 (2.5) | 118 (5.7) | | 241 (2.9) | 100 (4.9) | |
| Psychiatric complaints | 219 (2.5) | 34 (1.6) | | 230 (2.8) | 26 (1.3) | |
| Malaise | 1032 (11.9) | 377 (18.3) | | 1034 (12.4) | 403 (19.6) | |
| Abdominal pain | 935 (10.7) | 183 (8.9) | | 922 (11.1) | 183 (8.9) | |
| Other | 1018 (11.7) | 177 (8.6) | | 1019 (12.2) | 164 (8.0) | |
| Vital signs | | | | | | |
| Systolic BP, mmHg ² | 136 (21.4) | 145 (27.3) | <0.001 | 135 (21.5) | 145 (28.1) | <0.001 |
| O ₂ saturation, % ³ median, IQR | 98 (98-100) | 98 (96-100) | <0.001 | 99 (97-100) | 98 (96-99) | <0.001 |
| Temperature, °C ⁴ | 37.0 (0.8) | 36.9 (1.0) | <0.001 | 37.0 (0.8) | 36.9 (0.9) | <0.001 |

Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|-------------|------------|--------|
| Respiratory rate, /min ⁵ | 17.6 (4.6) | 18.7 (5.5) | 0.007 | 17.6 (4.8) | 18.6 (5.4) | <0.001 |
| Heart rate, /min ⁶ | 86 (20) | 84 (20) | <0.001 | 86 (21) | 84 (21) | <0.001 |
| Testing, n (%) | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| Phlebotomised blood sample | 4714 (54.0) | 1606 (77.2) | | 4583 (54.5) | 1599(77.3) | |

a) Values are mean, standard deviation unless noted otherwise.

b) Abbreviations: SD: standard deviation. n: number, IQR: interquartile range, GP: general practitioner, min: minute

c) Vital parameters measured are: O₂: oxygen saturation, measured in percentage oxygenated haemoglobin. Systolic BP: Systolic blood pressure, measured in millimetres of mercury. Temperature measured in degrees Celsius. Heart rate and respiratory rate are measured as times per minute.

d) Number of measured values per age group.

<70 years: 1:n=17009, 2:n=9924, 3:n=10018, 4:n=9953, 5:n=5807, 6:n=10371

≥70 years: 1:n=4118, 2:n=3232, 3:n=3208, 4:n=2890, 5:n=2302, 6:n=3292

e) P values are measured by t-test for scale values and chi-square for categorical values. Mann-Whitney U test for non-parametric variables.

In the derivation cohort, 2,014 (23.1%) younger patients and 898 (43.2%) older patients were admitted to the hospital. In the validation cohort, 2,030 (24.1%) younger patients and 919 (44.4%) older patients were admitted. Baseline characteristics between patients in the derivation cohort admitted to hospital and those discharged are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Baseline characteristics of study population, the derivation cohort stratified around hospital admission.

| Baseline features | <70 years | | P value | ≥70 years | | P value |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------|----------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | Discharged n=6714 | Admitted n=2014 | | Discharged n=1181 | Admitted n=898 | |
| Age, median IQR | 41.9 (26.8-55.6) | 52.4 (40.0-62.0) | <0.001 | 78.1 (73.7-83.4) | 78.1 (74.2-83.7) | 0.280 |
| Male, n (%) | 3625 (54.0) | 1137 (56.5) | 0.052 | 529 (44.8) | 466 (51.9) | 0.001 |
| Triage category, n (%) | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| <10 minutes | 1066 (15.9) | 855 (42.5) | | 270 (22.9) | 387 (43.1) | |
| <1 hour | 2609 (38.9) | 958 (47.6) | | 530 (44.9) | 413 (46.0) | |
| <2 hour | 3007 (44.8) | 198 (9.8) | | 374 (31.7) | 98 (10.9) | |
| <4 hours | 32 (0.5) | 3 (0.1) | | 7 (0.6) | 0 (0) | |
| Arrival mode, n (%) | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| Self-referral | 3648 (54.3) | 610 (30.3) | | 303 (25.7) | 164 (18.3) | |
| Ambulance/other institution | 782 (11.6) | 534 (26.5) | | 287 (24.3) | 309 (34.4) | |
| Referred by GP/specialist | 2284 (34.0) | 870 (43.2) | | 591 (50.0) | 425 (47.3) | |
| Type of specialist | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| Medicine | 2430 (36.2) | 1379 (68.5) | | 605 (51.2) | 646 (71.9) | |
| Surgery | 4284 (63.8) | 635 (31.5) | | 576 (48.8) | 252 (28.1) | |
| Revisit to the ED, n (%) | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| Visit <30 days | 595 (8.9) | 327 (16.2) | | 118 (10.0) | 129 (14.4) | 0.002 |
| Chief complaint¹ | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| Minor trauma | 3370 (50.6) | 286 (14.3) | | 456 (39.0) | 165 (18.4) | |
| Major trauma | 103 (1.5) | 80 (4.0) | | 11 (0.9) | 21 (2.3) | |
| Chest pain | 764 (11.5) | 216 (10.8) | | 215 (18.4) | 87 (9.7) | |
| Dyspnea | 238 (3.6) | 188 (9.4) | | 93 (7.9) | 128 (14.3) | |
| Syncope | 141 (2.1) | 78 (3.9) | | 64 (5.5) | 54 (6.0) | |
| Psychiatric complaints | 127 (1.9) | 92 (4.6) | | 13 (1.1) | 21 (2.3) | |
| Malaise | 526 (7.9) | 506 (25.3) | | 136 (11.6) | 241 (26.9) | |
| Abdominal pain | 592 (8.9) | 343 (17.1) | | 81 (6.9) | 102 (11.4) | |
| Other | 804 (12.1) | 214 (10.7) | | 101 (8.6) | 76 (8.5) | |
| Vital signs | | | | | | |

Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|--------|-------------|------------|--------|
| Systolic BP, mmHg ² | 138 (20) | 135 (23) | <0.001 | 148 (27) | 142 (27) | <0.001 |
| O ₂ saturation, % ³ median, IQR | 99 (98-100) | 99 (97-100) | <0.001 | 98 (96-100) | 98 (95-99) | <0.001 |
| Temperature, °C ⁴ | 36.9 (0.7) | 37.2 (1.1) | <0.001 | 36.8 (0.6) | 37.1 (1.2) | <0.001 |
| Respiratory rate, /min ⁵ | 16.9 (3.9) | 18.6 (5.4) | <0.001 | 17.5 (4.3) | 19.7 (6.1) | <0.001 |
| Heart rate, /min ⁶ | 83 (19) | 91 (22) | <0.001 | 82 (21) | 86 (20.7) | 0.002 |
| Performed test, n (%) | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| Phlebotomised blood sample | 2868 (42.7) | 1846 (91.7) | | 747 (63.3) | 859 (95.7) | |

a) Values are mean, standard deviation unless noted otherwise.

b) Abbreviations: SD: standard deviation, n: number, IQR: interquartile range, GP: general practitioner, min: minute

c) Vital parameters measured are: O₂: oxygen saturation, measured in percentage oxygenated haemoglobin. Systolic BP: Systolic blood pressure, measured in millimetres of mercury.

Temperature measured in degrees Celsius. Heart rate and respiratory rate are measured as times per minute.

d) Number of measured values per age group.

<70 years: 1:n=8668, 2:n=5006, 3:n=5000, 4:n=4795, 5:n=2895, 6:n=5178,

≥70 years: 1:n=2065, 2:n=1589, 3:n=1582, 4:n=1434, 5:n=1154, 6:n=1614

e) P values are measured by t-test for scale values and chi-square for categorical values. Mann-Whitney U test for non-parametric variables.

Differences in baseline characteristics between the derivation and validation cohorts, stratified by age, can be found in Supplemental Table 1.

Relationship of patient demographic and clinical factors to hospital admission

The univariable analyses examining the relationship between patient demographic and clinical characteristics and hospital admission stratified by the two age groups are provided in Supplemental Table 2. The factors associated with hospital admission were the same for both age groups (for example; urgent triage category, phlebotomised blood sample, fever) although the strength of the relationships differed for some factors between age groups. The variables in the final model for the younger patients are age, sex, triage category, arrival mode, chief complaint, ED revisit, type of specialist, phlebotomised blood sample, oxygen saturation, systolic BP, temperature, heart rate and respiratory rate. The variables in the final model for the older patients are triage category, arrival mode, chief complaint, type of specialist, phlebotomised blood sample, oxygen saturation, systolic BP, temperature and respiratory rate.

As shown in the results for the multivariable models by age groups (Table 3), urgent triage category, hospital arrival by ambulance, indication for taking a phlebotomised blood sample, presenting complaint of "malaise", or a non-surgical problem, a systolic blood pressure below 100mmHg, oxygen saturation below 95%, fever or tachypnea >30 breaths/min were associated with greater odds of hospital admission for both age groups. Chest pain, loss of consciousness and dyspnea as a presenting complaint, as well as no measured blood pressure were associated with a significantly decreased odds of being admitted among older patients while in younger patients chest pain decreased the probability of hospital admission. In the sensitivity analyses, similar results were found for the relationship between patient demographic and clinical factors and hospital

Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years

admission when a single model instead of separate models for the two age groups were used (Supplemental

Table 3) and when a randomly selected training and test cohort were used for these comparisons

(Supplemental Table 4).

Table 3: Final multivariable models of hospitalization of patients at the Emergency Department.

| Predictor | < 70 years | | | ≥70 years | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|--------|------|-----------|--------|-------|
| | OR | 95% CI | | OR | 95% CI | |
| Age/10 | 1.25 | 1.19 | 1.30 | | | |
| Sex | | | | | | |
| Male | 1.25 | 1.11 | 1.42 | | | |
| Female | ref | ref | ref | | | |
| Triage category | | | | | | |
| >1 hour | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| < 1 hour | 2.22 | 1.85 | 2.67 | 1.72 | 1.27 | 2.33 |
| < 10 min | 3.64 | 2.93 | 4.52 | 3.15 | 2.19 | 4.53 |
| Arrival mode | | | | | | |
| Self-referral | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Referred | 1.21 | 1.05 | 1.40 | 1.09 | 0.82 | 1.44 |
| Ambulance | 1.94 | 1.63 | 2.32 | 1.40 | 1.03 | 1.90 |
| Chief Complaint | | | | | | |
| Minor trauma | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Major trauma | 1.31 | 0.89 | 1.94 | 0.90 | 0.39 | 2.08 |
| Chest pain | 0.28 | 0.21 | 0.36 | 0.19 | 0.13 | 0.29 |
| Dyspnea | 0.79 | 0.58 | 1.07 | 0.44 | 0.28 | 0.68 |
| Syncope | 0.74 | 0.51 | 1.06 | 0.52 | 0.32 | 0.83 |
| Psychiatric | 1.48 | 1.03 | 2.13 | 1.29 | 0.59 | 2.84 |
| Malaise | 1.31 | 1.03 | 1.66 | 1.27 | 0.90 | 1.78 |
| Abdominal pain | 1.34 | 1.07 | 1.68 | 1.11 | 0.74 | 1.66 |
| Other | 1.13 | 0.89 | 1.43 | 1.23 | 0.80 | 1.88 |
| Type of specialist | | | | | | |
| Medicine | 1.17 | 0.99 | 1.37 | | | |
| Surgery | ref | ref | ref | | | |
| Revisit to the ED | 1.57 | 1.32 | 1.88 | 1.94 | 1.41 | 2.67 |
| Phlebomotised blood sample | 4.79 | 3.83 | 5.99 | 7.46 | 4.94 | 11.28 |
| Oxygen saturation | | | | | | |
| ≤ 90% | 1.80 | 0.93 | 3.48 | 4.26 | 1.77 | 10.25 |
| 91-94% | 1.78 | 1.26 | 2.51 | 1.62 | 1.04 | 2.52 |
| ≥ 95% | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Missing | 1.11 | 0.81 | 1.52 | 1.14 | 0.67 | 1.92 |
| Systolic BP | | | | | | |
| ≤100 | 1.96 | 1.33 | 2.88 | 1.67 | 0.91 | 3.06 |
| 101-199 | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| >200 | 1.32 | 0.70 | 2.47 | 0.74 | 0.41 | 1.32 |
| Missing | 0.57 | 0.40 | 0.82 | 0.52 | 0.30 | 0.89 |
| Temperature | | | | | | |
| ≤35.0 | 1.86 | 0.89 | 3.87 | 0.96 | 0.36 | 2.56 |
| 35.1-38.4 | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| ≥38.5 | 3.34 | 2.41 | 4.61 | 3.43 | 1.82 | 6.47 |
| Missing | 0.85 | 0.70 | 1.02 | 0.93 | 0.69 | 1.25 |

Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years

| Heart rate | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|------|------|------------------|------|-------|
| ≤50 | 0.67 | 0.36 | 1.26 | | | |
| 51 - 100 | ref | ref | ref | | | |
| 101 -110 | 1.62 | 1.29 | 2.03 | | | |
| 111-129 | 1.57 | 1.22 | 2.02 | | | |
| ≥130 | 2.57 | 1.76 | 3.74 | | | |
| Missing | 1.07 | 0.69 | 1.68 | | | |
| Respiratory rate | | | | | | |
| ≤8 | 0.75 | 0.15 | 3.74 | 2.37 | 0.15 | 36.95 |
| 9-14 | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| 15-20 | 0.94 | 0.76 | 1.15 | 1.04 | 0.74 | 1.45 |
| 21-29 | 1.29 | 0.99 | 1.69 | 1.74 | 1.16 | 2.62 |
| ≥30 | 3.98 | 1.99 | 7.95 | 4.41 | 1.86 | 10.43 |
| Missing | 1.05 | 0.85 | 1.29 | 0.99 | 0.69 | 1.42 |
| Intercept | -4.572 | | | -2.623 | | |
| AUC (95% CI) | 0.85 (0.84-0.86) | | | 0.81 (0.79-0.82) | | |
| GoF-value | 0.289 | | | 0.559 | | |
| Temporal validation AUC (95%CI) | 0.86 (0.85-0.87) | | | 0.77 (0.75-0.79) | | |

a) Abbreviations: n: number, OR: odds ratio, 95%CI: 95% confidence interval. GoF= Hosmer-Lemeshow Goodness of Fit χ^2 test. AUC: Area Under The Curve

b) Age in years divided by ten.

c) Vital parameters measured are oxygen saturation, measured in percentage oxygenated haemoglobin. Systolic BP: Systolic blood pressure, measured in millimetres of mercury. Temperature measured in degrees Celsius. Heart rate and respiratory rate are measured as times per minute.

d) P-value values are derived from multiple logistic regression analysis.

e) Individual chance of hospital admission <70 years = $1/(1 + \exp(-(-4.572 + (0.220 \cdot \frac{\text{age}}{10}) + 0.225 \cdot \text{male} + 0.798 \cdot \text{triage} < 1 \text{ hour} + 1.292 \cdot \text{triage} < 10 \text{ min} + 0.194 \cdot \text{self-referral} + 0.664 \cdot \text{ambulance} + 0.273 \cdot \text{major trauma} + -1.282 \cdot \text{chestpain} + -0.238 \cdot \text{breathlessness} + -0.305 \cdot \text{syncope} + 0.391 \cdot \text{psychiatric} + 0.269 \cdot \text{malaise} + 0.294 \cdot \text{abdominal pain} + 0.122 \cdot \text{other complaint} + 0.155 \cdot \text{medicine} + 0.453 \cdot \text{revisit} + 1.567 \cdot \text{blood drawn} + 0.585 \cdot \text{sat} \leq 90\% + 0.576 \cdot \text{sat} 91 - 94\% + 0.103 \cdot \text{missing sat} + 0.674 \cdot \text{BP} \leq 100 + 0.277 \cdot \text{BP} \geq 200 + -0.558 \cdot \text{BP missing} + 0.619 \cdot \text{temp} \leq 35 + 1.205 \cdot \text{temp} \geq 38.5 + -0.165 \cdot \text{temp missing} + -0.395 \cdot \text{heartrate} \leq 50 + 0.481 \cdot \text{heartrate} 101 - 110 + 0.450 \cdot \text{heartrate} 111 - 129 + 0.943 \cdot \text{heartrate} \geq 130 + 0.071 \cdot \text{heartrate missing} + -0.290 \cdot \text{resp rate} \leq 8 + -0.064 \cdot \text{resp rate} 15 - 20 + 0.256 \cdot \text{resp rate} 21 - 29 + 1.380 \cdot \text{resp rate} \geq 30 + 0.047 \cdot \text{resp rate missing}))$

f) Individual chance of hospital admission ≥70 years = $1/(1 + \exp(-(-2.623 + 0.541 \cdot \text{triage} < 1 \text{ hour} + 1.148 \cdot \text{triage} < 10 \text{ min} + 0.086 \cdot \text{self-referral} + 0.337 \cdot \text{ambulance} + -0.103 \cdot \text{major trauma} + -1.640 \cdot \text{chestpain} + -0.829 \cdot \text{breathlessness} + -0.659 \cdot \text{syncope} + 0.258 \cdot \text{psychiatric} + 0.236 \cdot \text{malaise} + 0.102 \cdot \text{abdominal pain} + 0.208 \cdot \text{other complaint} + 0.663 \cdot \text{revisit} + 2.010 \cdot \text{blood drawn} + 1.449 \cdot \text{sat} \leq 90\% + 0.483 \cdot \text{sat} 91 - 94\% + 0.128 \cdot \text{missing sat} + 0.511 \cdot \text{BP} \leq 100 + -0.300 \cdot \text{BP} \geq 200 + -0.655 \cdot \text{BP missing} + -0.037 \cdot \text{temp} \leq 35 + 1.232 \cdot \text{temp} \geq 38.5 + -0.071 \cdot \text{temp missing} + 0.861 \cdot \text{resp rate} \leq 8 + 0.037 \cdot \text{resp rate} 15 - 20 + 0.555 \cdot \text{resp rate} 21 - 29 + 1.483 \cdot \text{resp rate} \geq 30 + -0.014 \cdot \text{resp rate missing}))$

The AUC of the prediction model for the derivation cohort for hospital admission among patients <70 years-old was 0.85 (95%CI 0.84-0.86), which was higher than the AUC of the prediction model for ≥70 years-old (0.81 (95% CI 0.79-0.82). In the temporal validation cohort, the AUC for younger patients was 0.86 (95%CI 0.85-0.87), which also was higher than the model for older patients, which was 0.77 (95%CI 0.75-0.79).

The calibration plots in Figure 2 show the observed hospital admission rate in relation to the predicted chance of hospital admission in the validation group. The Hosmer-Lemeshow Goodness of Fit-test in both groups was $p > 0.05$, suggesting that predicted probabilities are in line with the observed and that the model fit the data well. In a sensitivity analysis using different cut-off points for vital signs in younger and older patients, there were no differences in the performance of either model.

As shown in Figure 3, there were more younger adult patients with a lower predicted chance of hospital admission in the validation cohort than for the older adult group. The predicted chance of hospital admission was also more equally distributed among the older patients. Table 4 depicts the test performance parameters

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years of the models in predicting hospital admission by age group. Specificity, PPV and LR+ were higher in older patients. The prediction model shows superior predictive applicability than for example triage category alone.

Confidential: For Review Only

Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years.

Table 4: Predictive applicability of prediction model in validation cohort

| | Sens (95%CI) | Spec (95% CI) | PPV(95% CI) | NPV(95% CI) | LR+(95% CI) | LR-(95% CI) |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 10% of population with highest risk of hospital admission | | | | | | |
| <70 years | 0.30 (0.28-0.32) | 0.96 (0.96-0.97) | 0.71 (0.68-0.74) | 0.81 (0.80-0.82) | 7.85 (6.81-9.04) | 0.73 (0.71-0.75) |
| ≥70 years | 0.19 (0.17-0.22) | 0.98 (0.96-0.98) | 0.87 (0.81-0.91) | 0.60 (0.58-0.62) | 8.23 (5.54-12.2) | 0.82 (0.80-0.85) |
| Triage category - <10 min | | | | | | |
| <70 years | 0.42 (0.40-0.44) | 0.84 (0.83-0.85) | 0.45 (0.43-0.47) | 0.82 (0.81-0.83) | 2.58 (2.39-2.78) | 0.69 (0.68-0.72) |
| ≥70 years | 0.46 (0.42-0.49) | 0.77 (0.75-0.80) | 0.61 (0.58-0.65) | 0.64 (0.61-0.67) | 1.99 (1.76-2.27) | 0.70 (0.66-0.75) |

a) Abbreviations: 95%CI: 95% confidence interval, sens: sensitivity, spec: specificity, PPV: positive predictive value, NPV: negative predictive value, LR+: positive likelihood ratio, LR-: negative likelihood ratio, AUC: area under the curve

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years.

DISCUSSION

In this investigation, we found that routinely collected demographic and clinical patient data at ED triage can be used to predict hospital admission among ED patients. However, although the predictors of hospital admission are the same regardless of age groups, the strength of the relationships between patient demographic and clinical factors and hospital admission as well as the performance of the predictive models differ by age groups (<70 year-old vs. ≥70 years-old). Overall predictive performance of the model was better for younger patients, although positive predictive value was higher among older patients.

Our findings are in concordance with prior studies[7 9 14 20] [10]. Most of these variables, like triage category[13], chief complaint and abnormal vital signs[9], reflect illness severity at ED presentation. Sun *et al.*[14] derived a prediction model for hospital admission in over 300.00 ED patients in Singapore. It was validated using split-validation and the model used age, race, arrival mode, triage category, preceding hospital admission or ED visit and chronic conditions as predictors. The AUC of this model was 0.85, which is comparable to our findings. Cameron *et al.* created a similar prediction model in over 300.000 adult ED patients in Scotland. This prediction model used age, early warning score, triage category, referral and arrival mode and preceding hospital admission within one year and found an AUC of 0.88. A model by Meisel *et al.* in the United States to predict hospital admission in the pre-hospital phase used age and chief complaint as predictors and found an AUC of 0.80[20]. For all these studies, the investigators observed that age was an important factor in predicting hospital admission, however they did not compare the predictive properties of disease severity between the younger and older patients. A prediction model for hospitalization for ED patients in 4,873 patients ≥75 years-old by LaMantia *et al.*[21] , included injury severity, heart rate, diastolic blood pressure and patient chief complaint as predictors had an AUC of 0.73 (95%CI 0.69-0.76), with a sensitivity of 33%, specificity 88% and LR of 2.75. Our model performed better, possibly due to inclusion of more demographic and clinical characteristics. Also sample size, differences in care system and selection of patients could have influenced the performance of the models. Physiology, polypharmacy and multi-morbidity affects the measured vital signs of older patients, and some studies indicate that when relying solely on vital signs a proportion of severely ill older patients will be missed [12]. To address this concern, we assessed

1 **Lucke et al.** Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years

3 whether the predictors of hospital admission are different for older as compared to younger adult ED patients.

4 In our model for older patients, age was not a predictor. One explanation for this observation may be that by
5

6 limiting the age range to those 70 years-old and older to assess the predictive value of age there was limited
7

8 contrast in this population and hence a lack of power to detect differences by age. As an alternative
9

10 explanation, among older patients disease severity and geriatric factors (eg. pre-existing functional or cognitive
11

12 impairment) are more important than calendar age. As shown in Table 2 there is no difference between
13

14 median age for patients hospitalized or discharged in the older age group. For these reasons models that
15

16 combine predictors of disease severity and geriatric factors may perform even better than ours, but such
17

18 models do not exist yet.
19

20 In contrast to the prediction rule derived by Meisel et al. 'chest pain' as chief complaint was associated with a
21

22 lower probability of hospital admission in our models for both older and younger patients. This observation
23

24 could be explained by the care system in the region where the study was performed that patients with ST-
25

26 elevation myocardial infarction bypass this ED and go to the heart-catheterisation laboratory immediately[22].
27

28 Older patients with dyspnea and syncope also had a decreased chance of hospital admission, which we explain
29

30 by the fact that those patients with severe dyspnea or who have not regained consciousness after syncope are
31

32 triaged 'red' and were excluded from the study.
33

34 Although it was one of the important predictors of hospital admission in our models, there were missing values
35

36 for vital signs in our study database. We believe that these values are missing because the triage nurse
37

38 probably deemed vital signs registration unnecessary if the patient was not perceived ill. Using missing
39

40 measurements of vital signs, such as the absence of measured blood pressure, as valuable information in this
41

42 study, seemed to be a marker of being less ill (Table 3). Using the combination of predictors in this study into a
43

44 prediction model successfully identified the 10% of the ED patient population with the highest risk of hospital
45

46 admission, for both younger and older patients.
47

48 The prediction model for older patients had a lower AUC but higher PPV for this population. When predicting
49

50 chance of hospital admission, one would want a high positive predictive value. When designing an intervention
51

52 based on such a prediction model, the patients with the highest risk should be targeted to prevent
53

54 unnecessary and costly admissions. A low number of false-positives is therefore desirable.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Lucke et al.** Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years

3 Using the prediction model created in this study identifies the 10% of the ED patient population with the
4 highest probability of hospital admission with a PPV of 71% in the young and 81% in the old.

5
6 The PPV for hospital admission was higher in older than in younger patients, likely due to the higher a priori
7 chance of hospital admission for older patients (derivation cohort: 23.1% admission rate in younger patients
8 vs. 43.2% for older patients, validation cohort 24.1% admission rate in younger patients, 44.4% in older
9 patients). In addition, the LR+ was slightly better for older patients, which increases its clinical utility. Thus,
10 this tool could trigger early awareness of the high chance of hospital admission, which could affect the clinical
11 decision-making, preparation for admission, enhancement of ED work flow and shortened length of ED stay.

12
13 The overall discriminative performance of the model and odds ratios of the individual predictors were
14 significantly higher for younger patients. This observation could be explained by three different mechanisms.

15
16 First, the relationship between vital signs and disease severity is likely to be different between younger and
17 older patients. It is well known that with aging the physiology of the body changes, with less homeostatic,
18 respiratory and cardiovascular reserve. In combination with polypharmacy (eg. beta-blockers), severely ill
19 older patients show less prominent vital sign abnormalities. For example, in this study heart rate was an
20 independent predictor for younger but not older patients. This finding was also shown in two recent studies in
21 which normal vital signs proved to be less specific for the absence of severe illness for older adults[23] [24].

22
23 This phenomenon is not captured using standard MEWS-cut off points and could explain a part of the
24 difference in discriminative power between models observed in this study.

25
26 Second, older patients with multiple comorbidities are often in a delicate equilibrium in which they can still
27 function with relative independence and health. However, relative minor trauma or disease can disturb this
28 equilibrium and result in severe illness and need for hospitalization[25]. The absence of comorbidities in our
29 model and other or currently existing models, could also explain the difference in the discriminative
30 performance between the models for younger and older patients [10 11].

31
32 Finally, older patients are sometimes hospitalized for their increased vulnerability rather than disease severity.
33 For example, a patient with a small social network and low functional capabilities with the same minor trauma
34 as a younger person, would more easily be hospitalized. It has recently been shown that tools that exclusively
35 use frailty to predict adverse outcomes in older patients, lack specificity and predictive capability[6]. The fact
36 that overall discriminative performance of our model for the older group was lower could be explained by the
37 lack of information about conditions more prevalent among older patients such as impaired cognitive function
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Lucke et al.** Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years

3 and functional status.

4 We therefore hypothesize that the combination of two dimensions: 'disease severity' and 'geriatric
5 phenotypes' such as multi-morbidity and social, cognitive and physical function of the acutely presenting older
6 patient, will result in an optimal model for prediction of adverse events and hospitalization.
7

8
9
10
11
12 Strengths of this study are the large number of patients and events. These features enable better estimates of
13 test performance parameters of the models. The clear and clinically relevant endpoint also is one of the
14 strengths, as it is without bias whether a patient was admitted or not. The present study had several
15 limitations. First, this was a retrospective study which limits the ability to examine possible predictors which
16 might have been obtained prospectively. There is also risk for information bias, although this was minimized by
17 automatically harvesting data from the electronic patient files. Possible variables were selected based upon
18 earlier research, clinical judgement and availability in the ED records. The second threat was missing
19 measurements of vital signs, for which we conceived a solution. The fact that a parameter was not measured
20 in a specific patient was considered to contain information with respect to the indication to perform such a
21 measurement and as such analysed alongside measured values rather than imputed. Third, there were no data
22 available on geriatric phenotypes such as multi-morbidity and social, cognitive and physical function, also the
23 comorbidities in young patients are lacking. Whilst these factors could have an important impact on
24 hospitalization, it was possible to create a robust model with high specificity. Fourth, we used temporal
25 validation to validate the model. Temporal factors could affect who was admitted, for example time of year
26 and changes in admission over time. However, as a sensitivity analysis we performed the same study with a
27 randomly selected split-cohort and found similar results.
28

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Finally, the admission rate in the current single centre study may be different in other care systems which
influences its clinical applicability and PPVs of prediction models. While the prediction models has been
created according to the recommendations by Stiell. et al[26] and has been internally validated using temporal
data, it was not prospectively validated, evaluated in another patient population, implemented and
disseminated or analysed for cost-effectiveness because it is still in the early stages of development.

In summary, the composition of prediction models for hospital admission are similar for ED patients younger

1 **Lucke et al.** Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years
3 and older than 70 years-old, although the AUC is higher in the model for younger patients and the model for
4 older patients showed a higher PPV and LR+. This retrospective study could help identify determinants of
5 admission in older ED patients. Further research should investigate the combination of disease severity with
6 frailty to improve prediction of hospital admission. We are currently performing a multicentre, prospective
7 follow up study (www.apop.eu)[27] in which we will derive, validate and implement a prediction model
8 according to internationally acknowledged recommendations[26] to optimize care for this vulnerable patient
9 group.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Confidential: For Review Only

1 **Lucke et al.** Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years

3 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

4 The authors would like to thank Mary Ann Ety (Department of Information Technology, Leiden University
5 Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands) for her help in extracting the data from the medical records. Anton
6 J.M. De Craen deceased on January 17th 2016.
7
8
9

10
11
12 **FUNDING**

13 The Institute for Evidence-Based Medicine in Old Age (IEMO) is funded by the Dutch Ministry of Health and
14 Welfare and supported by ZonMW (project number 62700.3002). The funding organization had no role in the
15 design or conducts of the study, neither in the data collection and analyses or the interpretation of the data.
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 **DISCLOSURES**

23 The authors declare no conflict of interest.
24
25
26
27

28 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT**

29 SPM, GJB, CH, AJF and BG designed the study. SPM and GJB obtained funding. JAL and JDG collected the data
30 from the electronic patient files and JAL checked them for validity. AJMC provided statistical advice. JAL and FC
31 performed the statistical analysis and drafted the paper. BG and SPM advised during the drafting process. All
32 authors contributed to its revision and gave approval of the final version of the article.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS**

41 The Medical Ethics Committee waived the need for informed consent as data were collected as part of past
42 clinical care and handled anonymously.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years

REFERENCES

1. Aminzadeh F, Dalziel WB. Older adults in the emergency department: a systematic review of patterns of use, adverse outcomes, and effectiveness of interventions. *Annals of emergency medicine* 2002;**39**(3):238-47
2. Gruneir A, Silver MJ, Rochon PA. Emergency department use by older adults: a literature review on trends, appropriateness, and consequences of unmet health care needs. *Medical care research and review* : MCRR 2011;**68**(2):131-55 doi: 10.1177/1077558710379422[published Online First: Epub Date]].
3. Latham LP, Ackroyd-Stolarz S. Emergency department utilization by older adults: a descriptive study. *Canadian geriatrics journal* : CGJ 2014;**17**(4):118-25 doi: 10.5770/cgj.17.108[published Online First: Epub Date]].
4. Kennelly SP, Drumm B, Coughlan T, et al. Characteristics and outcomes of older persons attending the emergency department: a retrospective cohort study. *QJM : monthly journal of the Association of Physicians* 2014;**107**(12):977-87 doi: 10.1093/qjmed/hcu111[published Online First: Epub Date]].
5. Ackroyd-Stolarz S, Read Guernsey J, Mackinnon NJ, et al. The association between a prolonged stay in the emergency department and adverse events in older patients admitted to hospital: a retrospective cohort study. *BMJ quality & safety* 2011;**20**(7):564-9 doi: 10.1136/bmjqs.2009.034926[published Online First: Epub Date]].
6. Carpenter CR, Shelton E, Fowler S, et al. Risk Factors and Screening Instruments to Predict Adverse Outcomes for Undifferentiated Older Emergency Department Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Academic emergency medicine* : official journal of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine 2015;**22**(1):1-21 doi: 10.1111/acem.12569[published Online First: Epub Date]].
7. Cameron A, Rodgers K, Ireland A, et al. A simple tool to predict admission at the time of triage. *Emergency medicine journal* : EMJ 2015;**32**(3):174-9 doi: 10.1136/emj-2013-203200[published Online First: Epub Date]].
8. Subbe CP, Kruger M, Rutherford P, et al. Validation of a modified Early Warning Score in medical admissions. *QJM : monthly journal of the Association of Physicians* 2001;**94**(10):521-6
9. Burch VC, Tarr G, Morroni C. Modified early warning score predicts the need for hospital admission and in-hospital mortality. *Emergency medicine journal* : EMJ 2008;**25**(10):674-8 doi: 10.1136/emj.2007.057661[published Online First: Epub Date]].
10. Dundar ZD, Ergin M, Karamercan MA, et al. Modified Early Warning Score and VitalPac Early Warning Score in geriatric patients admitted to emergency department. *European journal of emergency medicine* : official journal of the European Society for Emergency Medicine 2015 doi: 10.1097/MEJ.0000000000000274[published Online First: Epub Date]].
11. Cei M, Bartolomei C, Mumoli N. In-hospital mortality and morbidity of elderly medical patients can be predicted at admission by the Modified Early Warning Score: a prospective study. *International journal of clinical practice* 2009;**63**(4):591-5 doi: 10.1111/j.1742-1241.2008.01986.x[published Online First: Epub Date]].
12. Lamantia MA, Stewart PW, Platts-Mills TF, et al. Predictive value of initial triage vital signs for critically ill older adults. *The western journal of emergency medicine* 2013;**14**(5):453-60 doi: 10.5811/westjem.2013.5.13411[published Online First: Epub Date]].
13. van der Wulp I, van Baar ME, Schrijvers AJ. Reliability and validity of the Manchester Triage System in a general emergency department patient population in the Netherlands: results of a simulation study. *Emergency medicine journal* : EMJ 2008;**25**(7):431-4 doi: 10.1136/emj.2007.055228[published Online First: Epub Date]].
14. Sun Y, Heng BH, Tay SY, et al. Predicting hospital admissions at emergency department triage using routine administrative data. *Academic emergency medicine* : official journal of the

1 Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years

- 3 Society for Academic Emergency Medicine 2011;**18**(8):844-50 doi: 10.1111/j.1553-
4 2712.2011.01125.x[published Online First: Epub Date] | .
- 5 15. Dexheimer JW, Leegon J, Aronsky D. Predicting hospital admission at triage in an emergency
6 department. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings / AMIA Symposium AMIA Symposium
7 2007:937
- 8 16. Barfod C, Lauritzen MM, Danker JK, et al. Abnormal vital signs are strong predictors for intensive
9 care unit admission and in-hospital mortality in adults triaged in the emergency department
10 - a prospective cohort study. Scandinavian journal of trauma, resuscitation and emergency
11 medicine 2012;**20**:28 doi: 10.1186/1757-7241-20-28[published Online First: Epub Date] | .
- 12 17. De Rooij SE, Emmelot-Vonk MH, A. E. *Praktijkgids 'Kwetsbare Ouderen'*. Den Haag, 2009.
- 13 18. Harrell FE, Jr., Lee KL, Mark DB. Multivariable prognostic models: issues in developing models,
14 evaluating assumptions and adequacy, and measuring and reducing errors. Statistics in
15 medicine 1996;**15**(4):361-87 doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0258(19960229)15:4<361::AID-
16 SIM168>3.0.CO;2-4[published Online First: Epub Date] | .
- 17 19. Paul P, Pennell ML, Lemeshow S. Standardizing the power of the Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness of
18 fit test in large data sets. Statistics in medicine 2013;**32**(1):67-80 doi:
19 10.1002/sim.5525[published Online First: Epub Date] | .
- 20 20. Meisel ZF, Pollack CV, Mechem CC, et al. Derivation and internal validation of a rule to predict
21 hospital admission in prehospital patients. Prehospital emergency care : official journal of
22 the National Association of EMS Physicians and the National Association of State EMS
23 Directors 2008;**12**(3):314-9 doi: 10.1080/10903120802096647[published Online First: Epub
24 Date] | .
- 25 21. LaMantia MA, Platts-Mills TF, Biese K, et al. Predicting hospital admission and returns to the
26 emergency department for elderly patients. Academic emergency medicine : official journal
27 of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine 2010;**17**(3):252-9 doi: 10.1111/j.1553-
28 2712.2009.00675.x[published Online First: Epub Date] | .
- 29 22. Liem SS, van der Hoeven BL, Oemrawsingh PV, et al. MISSION!: optimization of acute and chronic
30 care for patients with acute myocardial infarction. Am Heart J 2007;**153**(1):14 e1-11 doi:
31 10.1016/j.ahj.2006.10.002[published Online First: Epub Date] | .
- 32 23. Brown JB, Gestring ML, Forsythe RM, et al. Systolic blood pressure criteria in the National
33 Trauma Triage Protocol for geriatric trauma: 110 is the new 90. The journal of trauma and
34 acute care surgery 2015;**78**(2):352-9 doi: 10.1097/TA.0000000000000523[published Online
35 First: Epub Date] | .
- 36 24. Heffernan DS, Thakkar RK, Monaghan SF, et al. Normal presenting vital signs are unreliable in
37 geriatric blunt trauma victims. The Journal of trauma 2010;**69**(4):813-20 doi:
38 10.1097/TA.0b013e3181f41af8[published Online First: Epub Date] | .
- 39 25. Olde Rikkert M.G.M RJFM, Jurgen A.H.R. Claassen. Waarschuwingssignalen voor acute
40 verergering van chronische ziekten. Ned Tijdschr Geneeskd 2015;**159**:A8150
- 41 26. Stiell IG, Wells GA. Methodologic standards for the development of clinical decision rules in
42 emergency medicine. Annals of emergency medicine 1999;**33**(4):437-47
- 43 27. De Gelder J, Lucke J, De Groot B, et al. Predicting adverse health outcomes in older emergency
44 department patients: the APOP study. Netherlands Journal of Medicine 2016;**74**(8):342-52
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between
2 patients younger or older than 70-years.
3
4
5

6 **LEGENDS OF FIGURES**
7

8
9
10 **Figure 1: Flowchart of participant selection.**

11 ED: Emergency department. CPR: cardiopulmonary resuscitation. Red triage: most urgent triage category,
12 needing immediate care, often in trauma room. ED use for logistical reasons means a pre-planned re-
13 evaluation, laboratory check or patient who had left without being seen. Individual visits were included, there
14 can be multiple visits of one patient in this study.
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Figure 2: Calibration plot of expected and observed chance of admission for patients aged <70 and ≥ 70**
21 **years – validation cohort.**
22

23 Patients are divided into ten equal groups to compare expected and observed chance of admission per group.
24 Ideally the dots would be aligned across the grey striped line. ● Indicates decile of patient group.
25
26
27
28


29 **Figure 3: Distribution of chance of admission predicted by our model for patients aged <70 and ≥70 years –**
30 **validation cohort.**
31

32 The x-axis is a scale of individually predicted chance of hospital admission, ranging from 0-100%. On the y-axis
33 is the percentage of patients in the study with that individual risk.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Lucke et al. Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years.

Confidential: For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



ED: Emergency department. CPR: cardiopulmonary resuscitation. Red triage: most urgent triage category, needing immediate care, often in trauma room. ED use for logistical reasons means a pre-planned re-evaluation, laboratory check or patient who had left without being seen. Individual visits were included, there can be multiple visits of one patient in this study.

388x179mm (96 x 96 DPI)




Figure 2: Calibration plot of expected and observed chance of admission for patients aged <70 and ≥ 70 years – validation cohort.

Patients are divided into ten equal groups to compare expected and observed chance of admission per group. Ideally the dots would be aligned across the grey striped line. • Indicates decile of patient group.

84x39mm (600 x 600 DPI)

For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3: Distribution of chance of admission predicted by our model for patients aged <70 and ≥70 years – validation cohort.

The x-axis is a scale of individually predicted chance of hospital admission, ranging from 0-100%. On the y-axis is the percentage of patients in the study with that individual risk.

99x41mm (300 x 300 DPI)

For Review Only

1
2
3 **Appendix 1:** Description of collection and categorizing of variables.
4
5

6 **DATA COLLECTION**
7

8
9 **Age and sex**

10 Age and sex of the patient are checked with the identity card of the patient.
11
12

13 **Triage category and chief complaint**

14 All patients are triaged upon ED arrival by an ED-nurse according to the Manchester Triage System (MTS)[1].
15
16

17 The MTS consists of 52 presenting complaints to determine the patients acuity. Per presenting complaint, key
18 questions further specify the patients acuity. Finally, questions and measurements using the ABCDE
19 assessment are used to determine the definitive triage category. The most urgent category (red), needing
20 immediate care, were excluded. In order of urgency the next categories are: orange (care <10 minutes), yellow
21 (care <1 hour), green (care <2 hours), blue (care < 4 hours). For example, the presenting complaint fever would
22 become yellow, but if the patient has an oxygen saturation less than 90% it would become orange or even red.
23
24

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

30 The chief complaint was assessed using one of 52 categories available in the MTS and grouped into nine
31 categories for analysis (appendix 2).
32
33

34 **Mode of arrival**

35 Patients were divided into three groups of arrival: self-referral, referred by a physician (general practitioner or
36 medical specialist), or ambulance. When a patient was referred by a doctor, but travelled to the ED by
37 ambulance this was categorized as 'Ambulance'. Transfers to our ED from other hospitals were also in this
38 category.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Type of specialist**

46 Type of specialist that the patient was assigned to was categorized into surgical (for example: surgery,
47 orthopedics, urology) or medical (for example: internal medicine, neurology, cardiology, pulmonology).
48
49
50

51 **Revisit within 30 days**

52 From the electronic patient files data was derived as to whether the patient visited our ED within 30 days prior
53 to the included visit. The variable 'revisit within 30 days' indicates that the index visit is their second visit
54 within 30 days prior to the index visit.
55
56
57
58

59 **Drawing of blood**

60 The nurse caring for the patient draws blood according to protocol and the chief complaint, in consultation

1
2
3 with the responsible physician. The decision to draw blood is made as soon as possible after the arrival of the
4 patient, often within minutes. If no laboratory results were noted in the electronic patient file from the day of
5 the ED visit, this was categorized as 'no phlebotomised blood sample'.
6
7

8 9 **Vital signs**

10 The nurse caring for the patient measures vital signs according to protocol and chief complaint, in consultation
11 with the responsible physician. Oxygen saturation, blood pressure, respiratory rate and heart rate were
12 measured using a medical monitor (IntelliVue MP50®, Amsterdam, The Netherlands) and manually registered
13 into the patient file. Temperature was measured using a tympanic thermometer (Genius 2®, Mansfield, U.S.)
14 and manually registered. The categories for vital parameters were selected according to the Modified Early
15 Warning Score (MEWS)[2], with categories containing less than 1% of patients being merged. Missing vital
16 signs were not imputed, but analyzed alongside registered data because a valid measurement also indicates
17 necessity. Besides the indication for a measurement, we assessed whether the vital sign was considered too
18 high or too low according to MEWS.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **References:**

- 32
33
34 1. Azeredo TR, Guedes HM, Rebelo de Almeida RA, et al. Efficacy of the Manchester Triage System: a
35 systematic review. *International emergency nursing* 2015;**23**(2):47-52 doi:
36 10.1016/j.ienj.2014.06.001[published Online First: Epub Date]].
37
38
39 2. Subbe CP, Kruger M, Rutherford P, et al. Validation of a modified Early Warning Score in medical admissions.
40
41 *QJM : monthly journal of the Association of Physicians* 2001;**94**(10):521-6
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix 2: Categories of presenting complaints

CATEGORIES OF PRESENTING COMPLAINTS

9 groups of presenting complaints.

1. Minor trauma injuries
2. Major trauma injuries
3. Chest pain
4. Dyspnea
5. Syncope
6. Mental Health Problems
7. Malaise
8. Abdominal Pain
9. Others

52 possible flowcharts of Manchester Triage System re-categorized in 9 groups of presenting complaints:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Abdominal pain in adults | Abdominal pain (8) |
| 2. Abdominal pain in children | Irrelevant |
| 3. Abscesses and local infections | Minor trauma injuries (1) |
| 4. Allergy | Others (9) |
| 5. Apparently drunk | Others (9) |
| 6. Assault | Minor Trauma Injuries (1) |
| 7. Asthma | Dyspnea (4) |
| 8. Back pain | Others (9) |
| 9. Behaving strangely | Mental Health Problems (6) |
| 10. Bites and stings | Minor trauma injuries (1) |
| 11. Burns and scalds | Minor trauma injuries (1) |
| 12. Chest pain | Chest Pain (3) |
| 13. Collapsed adult | Loss of consciousness (5) |
| 14. Crying baby | Irrelevant |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 15. Dental problems | Minor Trauma Injuries (1) |
| 16. Diabetes | Others (9) |
| 17. Diarrhea and vomiting | Abdominal pain (8) |
| 18. Ear problems | Others (9) |
| 19. Exposure to chemicals | Minor Trauma Injuries (1) |
| 20. Facial problems | Minor Trauma Injuries (1) |
| 21. Falls | Minor Trauma Injuries (1) |
| 22. Fits | Loss of consciousness (5) |
| 23. Foreign body | Minor Trauma Injuries (1) |
| 24. GI bleeding | Abdominal pain (8) |
| 25. Headache | Others (9) |
| 26. Head injury | Minor trauma Injuries (1) |
| 27. Irritable child | Irrelevant |
| 28. Limb problems | Minor Trauma Injuries (1) |
| 29. Limping child | Irrelevant |
| 30. Major trauma | Major Trauma Injuries (2) |
| 31. Mental illness | Mental Health Problems (6) |
| 32. Neck pain | Others (9) |
| 33. Overdose and poisoning | Mental Health Problems (6) |
| 34. Palpitations | Chest pain (3) |
| 35. Pregnancy | Others (9) |
| 36. Psychiatric Illness | Mental Health Problems (6) |
| 37. PV bleeding | Others (9) |
| 38. Rashes | Others (9) |
| 39. Self-harm | Mental Health Problems (6) |
| 40. Sexually acquired infection | Others (9) |
| 41. Shortness of breath in adults | Dyspnea (4) |
| 42. Shortness of breath in children | Irrelevant |
| 43. Sore throat | Others (9) |

| | | |
|----|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | 44. Testicular pain | Others (9) |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | 45. Torso injury | Minor Trauma Injuries (1) |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | 46. Unwell adult | Malaise (7) |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | 47. Unwell child | Irrelevant |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | 48. Urinary problems | Others (9) |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | 49. Worried parent | Others (9) |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | 50. Wounds | Minor Trauma Injuries (1) |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | 51. Major incidents-primary | Major Trauma injuries (2) |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | 52. Major incidents secondary | Major Trauma injuries (2) |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| 29 | | |
| 30 | | |
| 31 | | |
| 32 | | |
| 33 | | |
| 34 | | |
| 35 | | |
| 36 | | |
| 37 | | |
| 38 | | |
| 39 | | |
| 40 | | |
| 41 | | |
| 42 | | |
| 43 | | |
| 44 | | |
| 45 | | |
| 46 | | |
| 47 | | |
| 48 | | |
| 49 | | |
| 50 | | |
| 51 | | |
| 52 | | |
| 53 | | |
| 54 | | |
| 55 | | |
| 56 | | |
| 57 | | |
| 58 | | |
| 59 | | |
| 60 | | |

Supplemental table 1. Comparing baseline characteristics for age groups between derivation and validation cohorts

| | <u>Derivation</u> | <u>Validation</u> | | <u>Derivation</u> | <u>Validation</u> | |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| | <u><70 years</u> | <u><70 years</u> | | <u>≥70 years</u> | <u>≥70 years</u> | |
| Baseline features | n=8728 | n=8411 | P value | n=2079 | n=2069 | P value |
| Age, median IQR | 44.8 (28.8-57.4) | 44.8 (28.4-58.0) | 0.870 | 78.1 (73.9-83.6) | 78.9 (73.9-83.0) | 0.178 |
| Male, <i>n</i> (%) | 4762 (54.6) | 4597 (54.7) | 0.901 | 995 (47.9) | 1044 (50.5) | 0.094 |
| Triage category, <i>n</i> (%) | | | 0.049 | | | 0.130 |
| <10 minutes | 1921 (22.0) | 1893 (22.5) | | 657 (31.6) | 683 (33.0) | |
| <1 hour | 3567 (40.9) | 3557 (42.3) | | 943 (45.4) | 966 (46.7) | |
| <2 hour | 3205 (36.7) | 2921 (34.7) | | 472 (22.7) | 410 (19.8) | |
| <4 hours | 35 (0.4) | 40 (0.5) | | 7 (0.3) | 10 (0.5) | |
| Arrival mode, <i>n</i> (%) | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| Self-referral | 4258 (48.8) | 3794 (45.1) | | 467 (22.5) | 404 (19.5) | |
| Ambulance/other institution | 1316 (15.1) | 1659 (19.7) | | 596 (28.7) | 833 (40.3) | |
| Referred by GP/specialist | 3154 (36.1) | 2958 (35.2) | | 1016 (48.9) | 832 (40.2) | |
| Type of specialist | | | 0.336 | | | 1.0 |
| Medicine | 3809 (43.6) | 3732 (44.4) | | 1251 (60.2) | 1245 (60.2) | |
| Surgery | 4919 (56.4) | 4679 (55.6) | | 828 (39.8) | 824 (39.8) | |
| Revisit to the ED, <i>n</i> (%) | | | | | | |
| Visit <30 days | 922 (10.6) | 873 (10.4) | 0.693 | 247 (11.9) | 243 (11.7) | 0.892 |
| Chief complaint¹ | | | 0.040 | | | 0.263 |
| Minor trauma | 3656 (42.2) | 3301 (39.6) | | 621 (30.1) | 641 (31.2) | |
| Major trauma | 183 (2.1) | 208 (2.5) | | 32 (1.5) | 28 (1.4) | |
| Chest pain | 980 (11.3) | 992 (11.9) | | 302 (14.6) | 329 (16.0) | |
| Dyspnea | 426 (4.9) | 394 (4.7) | | 221 (10.7) | 179 (8.7) | |
| Syncope | 219 (2.5) | 241 (2.9) | | 118 (5.7) | 100 (4.9) | |
| Psychiatric complaints | 219 (2.5) | 230 (2.8) | | 34 (1.6) | 26 (1.3) | |
| Malaise | 1032 (11.9) | 1034 (12.4) | | 377 (18.3) | 403 (19.6) | |
| Abdominal pain | 935 (10.7) | 922 (11.1) | | 183 (8.9) | 183 (8.9) | |
| Other | 1018 (11.7) | 1019 (12.2) | | 177 (8.6) | 164 (8.0) | |
| Vital signs | | | | | | |
| Systolic BP, mmHg ² | 136 (21.4) | 135 (21.5) | 0.021 | 145 (27) | 145 (28) | 0.566 |
| O ₂ saturation, % ³ median, IQR | 98 (98-100) | 99 (97-100) | <0.001 | 98 (96-100) | 98 (96-99) | 0.100 |
| Temperature, °C ⁴ | 37.0 (0.8) | 37.0 (0.8) | 0.065 | 36.9 (1.0) | 36.9 (0.9) | 0.913 |
| Respiratory rate, /min ⁵ | 17.6 (4.6) | 17.6 (4.8) | 0.875 | 18.7 (5.5) | 18.6 (5.4) | 0.666 |
| Heart rate, /min ⁶ | 86 (20) | 86 (21) | 0.783 | 84 (20) | 84 (21) | 0.982 |
| Performed test, <i>n</i> (%) | | | | | | |
| Phlebotomised blood sample | 4714 (54.0) | 4583 (54.5) | 0.530 | 1606 (77.2) | 1599 (77.3) | 0.979 |

a) Values are mean, standard deviation unless noted otherwise.

b) Abbreviations: SD: standard deviation. n: number, IQR: interquartile range, GP: general practitioner, min: minute

c) Vital parameters measured are: O₂: oxygen saturation, measured in percentage oxygenated haemoglobin. Systolic BP: Systolic blood pressure, measured in millimetres of mercury. Temperature measured in degrees Celsius. Heart rate and respiratory rate are measured as times per minute.

d) Number of measured values per age group.

<70 years: 1:n=17009, 2:n=9924, 3:n=10018, 4:n=9953, 5:n=5807, 6:n=10371

≥70 years: 1:n=4118, 2:n=3232, 3:n=3208, 4:n=2890, 5:n=2302, 6:n=3292

e) P values are measured by t-test for scale values and chi-square for categorical values. Mann-Whitney U test for non-parametric variables.

Supplemental table 2: Univariable association of predictors of hospitalization of patients aged younger and older than 70 years at the emergency department – derivation cohort

| Predictor | < 70 years n=8728 | | | ≥ 70 years n=2079 | | | P for interaction | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------|-------|----------------------|-------------|--------|----------------------|-------|--------|
| | n (%) | OR | 95%CI | n (%) | OR | 95% CI | | | |
| Age/10 | | 1.42 | 1.37 | 1.47 | | 1.06 | 0.93 | 1.22 | |
| Sex | | | | | | | | | 0.071 |
| Male | 4762 (54.6) | 1.11 | 1.00 | 1.22 | 995 (47.9) | 1.33 | 1.12 | 1.58 | |
| Female | 3966 (45.4) | ref | ref | ref | 1084 (52.1) | ref | ref | ref | |
| Triage category | | | | | | | | | <0.001 |
| >1 hour | 3240 (37.1) | ref | ref | ref | 479 (23.0) | ref | ref | ref | |
| < 1 hour | 3567 (40.9) | 5.55 | 4.73 | 6.52 | 943 (45.4) | 3.03 | 2.34 | 3.92 | |
| < 10 min | 1921 (22.0) | 12.13 | 10.24 | 14.36 | 657 (31.6) | 5.57 | 4.25 | 7.31 | |
| Arrival mode | | | | | | | | | <0.001 |
| Self- referral | 4258 (48.8) | ref | ref | ref | 467 (22.4) | ref | ref | ref | |
| Referred | 3154 (36.1) | 2.28 | 2.03 | 2.56 | 1016 (48.9) | 1.33 | 1.06 | 1.67 | |
| Ambulance | 1316 (15.1) | 4.08 | 3.55 | 4.70 | 596 (28.7) | 1.99 | 1.55 | 2.55 | |
| Chief Complaint | | | | | | | | | <0.001 |
| Minor trauma | 3656 (42.2) | ref | ref | ref | 321 (30.1) | ref | ref | ref | |
| Major trauma | 183 (2.1) | 9.15 | 6.67 | 12.55 | 32 (1.5) | 5.28 | 2.49 | 11.18 | |
| Chest pain | 980 (11.3) | 3.33 | 2.75 | 4.04 | 302 (14.6) | 1.12 | 0.82 | 1.52 | |
| Dyspnea | 426 (4.9) | 9.31 | 7.42 | 11.67 | 221 (10.7) | 3.80 | 2.76 | 5.24 | |
| Syncope | 219 (2.5) | 6.52 | 4.82 | 8.81 | 119 (5.7) | 2.33 | 1.56 | 3.49 | |
| Psychiatric | 219 (2.5) | 8.54 | 6.36 | 11.46 | 34 (1.6) | 4.46 | 2.19 | 9.12 | |
| Malaise | 1032 (11.9) | 11.34 | 9.55 | 13.46 | 377 (18.3) | 4.90 | 3.72 | 6.45 | |
| Abdominal pain | 935 (10.8) | 6.83 | 5.70 | 8.17 | 183 (8.9) | 3.48 | 2.47 | 4.90 | |
| Other | 1018 (11.7) | 3.14 | 2.59 | 3.80 | 177 (8.6) | 2.08 | 1.47 | 2.94 | |
| Type of specialist | | | | | | | | | <0.001 |
| Medicine | 3809 (43.6) | 3.83 | 3.44 | 4.26 | 1251 (60.2) | 2.44 | 2.03 | 2.94 | |
| Surgery | 4919 (56.4) | ref | ref | ref | 828 (39.8) | ref | ref | ref | |
| Revisit to the ED | 922 (10.6) | 1.99 | 1.72 | 2.31 | 247 (11.9) | 1.51 | 1.16 | 1.97 | 0.074 |
| Phlebotomised blood sample | 4714 (54.0) | 14.74 | 12.49 | 17.38 | 1606 (77.2) | 12.80 | 9.09 | 18.02 | 0.467 |
| Oxygen saturation | | | | | | | | | 0.005 |
| ≤ 90% | 57 (0.7) | 4.19 | 2.39 | 7.35 | 53 (2.5) | 6.93 | 3.11 | 15.45 | |
| 91-94% | 188 (2.2) | 2.91 | 2.16 | 3.92 | 126 (6.1) | 2.19 | 1.48 | 3.22 | |
| ≥95% | 4755 (54.5) | ref | ref | ref | 1403 (67.5) | ref | ref | ref | |
| Missing | 3728 (42.7) | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.15 | 497 (23.9) | 0.21 | 0.17 | 0.28 | |
| Systolic BP | | | | | | | | | 0.007 |
| ≤100 | 146 (1.7) | 2.96 | 2.11 | 4.15 | 61 (2.9) | 2.27 | 1.30 | 3.97 | |
| 101-199 | 4813 (55.1) | ref | ref | ref | 1468 (70.6) | ref | ref | ref | |
| >200 | 47 (0.5) | 1.76 | 0.99 | 3.13 | 60 (2.9) | 0.89 | 0.53 | 1.49 | |
| Missing | 3722 (42.6) | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.13 | 490 (23.6) | 0.17 | 0.13 | 0.22 | |
| Temperature | | | | | | | | | 0.004 |
| ≤35.0 | 36 (0.4) | 2.68 | 1.39 | 5.19 | 22 (1.1) | 1.83 | 0.76 | 4.39 | |
| 35.1-38.4 | 4471 (51.2) | ref | ref | ref | 1307 (62.9) | ref | ref | ref | |
| ≥38.5 | 288 (3.3) | 7.51 | 5.65 | 9.99 | 105 (5.1) | 7.40 | 4.10 | 13.36 | |
| Missing | 3933 (45.1) | 0.21 | 0.18 | 0.24 | 645 (31.0) | 0.33 | 0.26 | 0.40 | |
| Heart rate | | | | | | | | | |
| ≤50 | 63 (0.7) | 0.80 | 0.46 | 1.40 | 31 (1.5) | 1.87 | 0.89 | 3.93 | |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|------|------|-------|-------------|------|------|-------|-------|
| 51 - 100 | 4098 (47.0) | ref | ref | ref | 1308 (62.9) | ref | ref | ref | |
| 101 -110 | 456 (5.2) | 1.85 | 1.52 | 2.25 | 115 (5.5) | 1.72 | 1.16 | 2.55 | |
| 111-129 | 395 (4.5) | 2.51 | 2.04 | 3.09 | 95 (4.6) | 1.76 | 1.15 | 2.71 | |
| ≥130 | 166 (1.9) | 3.05 | 2.22 | 4.18 | 65 (3.1) | 1.06 | 0.64 | 1.74 | |
| Missing | 3550 (40.7) | 0.12 | 0.10 | 0.14 | 465 (22.4) | 0.18 | 0.13 | 0.23 | |
| Respiratory rate | | | | | | | | | 0.048 |
| ≤8 | 8 (0.1) | 1.12 | 0.26 | 4.70 | 3 (0.1) | 2.16 | 0.19 | 24.12 | |
| 9-14 | 726 (8.3) | ref | ref | ref | 237 (11.4) | ref | ref | ref | |
| 15-20 | 1566 (17.9) | 1.09 | 0.91 | 1.31 | 584 (28.1) | 1.04 | 0.77 | 1.40 | |
| 21-29 | 517 (5.9) | 1.78 | 1.42 | 2.24 | 273 (13.1) | 1.96 | 1.37 | 2.79 | |
| ≥30 | 78 (0.9) | 8.50 | 4.67 | 15.45 | 57 (2.7) | 6.61 | 3.00 | 14.56 | |
| Missing | 5833 (66.8) | 0.32 | 0.27 | 0.38 | 925 (44.5) | 0.45 | 0.33 | 0.60 | |

-
- a) Abbreviations: n: number, OR: odds ratio, 95%CI: 95% confidence interval. AUC: Area Under The Curve
b) Age in years divided by ten.
c) Vital parameters measured are: oxygen saturation, measured in percentage oxygenated hemoglobin. Systolic BP: Systolic blood pressure, measured in millimeters of mercury. Temperature measured in degrees Celsius. Heart rate and respiratory rate are measured as times per minute.
d) P-for interaction

ntial: For Review Only

Supplemental table 3: Complete multivariable model of hospitalization of patients at the Emergency Department – derivation cohort.

| Predictor | < 70 years | | | | ≥ 70 years | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|--------|---------|--------|------------|---------|-------|--------|
| | OR | 95% CI | P-value | OR | 95% CI | P value | | |
| Age/10 | 1.25 | 1.19 | 1.30 | <0.001 | 1.11 | 0.94 | 1.31 | 0.226 |
| Sex | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 1.25 | 1.11 | 1.42 | <0.001 | 1.01 | 0.82 | 1.25 | 0.918 |
| Female | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Triage category | | | | | | | | |
| >1 hour | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| < 1 hour | 2.22 | 1.85 | 2.67 | <0.001 | 1.70 | 1.26 | 2.31 | 0.001 |
| < 10 min | 3.64 | 2.93 | 4.52 | <0.001 | 3.09 | 2.14 | 4.45 | <0.001 |
| Arrival mode | | | | | | | | |
| Self-referral | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Referred | 1.21 | 1.05 | 1.40 | 0.007 | 1.09 | 0.82 | 1.45 | 0.541 |
| Ambulance | 1.94 | 1.63 | 2.32 | <0.001 | 1.40 | 1.03 | 1.91 | 0.030 |
| Chief Complaint | | | | | | | | |
| Minor trauma | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Major trauma | 1.31 | 0.89 | 1.94 | 0.171 | 0.94 | 0.40 | 2.18 | 0.881 |
| Chest pain | 0.28 | 0.21 | 0.36 | <0.001 | 0.19 | 0.12 | 0.30 | <0.001 |
| Dyspnea | 0.79 | 0.58 | 1.07 | 0.128 | 0.41 | 0.25 | 0.67 | <0.001 |
| Syncope | 0.74 | 0.51 | 1.06 | 0.099 | 0.48 | 0.29 | 0.79 | 0.004 |
| Psychiatric | 1.48 | 1.03 | 2.13 | 0.036 | 1.19 | 0.53 | 2.69 | 0.668 |
| Malaise | 1.31 | 1.03 | 1.66 | 0.026 | 1.22 | 0.83 | 1.79 | 0.316 |
| Abdominal pain | 1.34 | 1.07 | 1.68 | 0.012 | 1.12 | 0.74 | 1.69 | 0.600 |
| Other | 1.13 | 0.89 | 1.43 | 0.317 | 1.24 | 0.80 | 1.94 | 0.342 |
| Type of specialist | | | | | | | | |
| Medicine | 1.17 | 0.99 | 1.37 | 0.062 | 1.10 | 0.81 | 1.49 | 0.526 |
| Surgery | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Revisit to the ED | 1.57 | 1.32 | 1.88 | <0.001 | 1.95 | 1.41 | 2.69 | <0.001 |
| Phlebotomised blood sample | 4.79 | 3.83 | 5.99 | <0.001 | 7.25 | 4.76 | 11.05 | <0.001 |
| Oxygen saturation | | | | | | | | |
| ≤ 90% | 1.80 | 0.93 | 3.48 | 0.083 | 4.42 | 1.83 | 10.68 | 0.001 |
| 91-94% | 1.78 | 1.26 | 2.51 | 0.001 | 1.58 | 1.02 | 2.47 | 0.042 |
| ≥ 95% | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Missing | 1.11 | 0.81 | 1.52 | 0.522 | 1.25 | 0.68 | 2.29 | 0.475 |
| Systolic BP | | | | | | | | |
| ≤100 | 1.96 | 1.33 | 2.88 | 0.001 | 1.70 | 0.92 | 3.13 | 0.091 |
| 101-199 | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| >200 | 1.32 | 0.70 | 2.47 | 0.386 | 0.71 | 0.39 | 1.28 | 0.259 |
| Missing | 0.57 | 0.40 | 0.82 | 0.002 | 0.59 | 0.31 | 1.11 | 0.103 |
| Temperature | | | | | | | | |
| ≤35.0 | 1.86 | 0.89 | 3.87 | 0.099 | 0.91 | 0.34 | 2.41 | 0.844 |
| 35.1-38.4 | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| ≥38.5 | 3.34 | 2.41 | 4.61 | <0.001 | 3.36 | 1.78 | 6.36 | <0.001 |
| Missing | 0.85 | 0.70 | 1.02 | 0.083 | 0.94 | 0.70 | 1.27 | 0.691 |
| Heart rate | | | | | | | | |
| ≤50 | 0.67 | 0.36 | 1.26 | 0.214 | 2.07 | 0.90 | 4.76 | 0.086 |
| 51 - 100 | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| 101 -110 | 1.62 | 1.29 | 2.03 | <0.001 | 1.35 | 0.86 | 2.11 | 0.196 |
| 111-129 | 1.57 | 1.22 | 2.02 | <0.001 | 1.20 | 0.73 | 1.98 | 0.471 |
| ≥130 | 2.57 | 1.76 | 3.74 | <0.001 | 0.76 | 0.41 | 1.39 | 0.369 |
| Missing | 1.07 | 0.69 | 1.68 | 0.753 | 0.81 | 0.39 | 1.70 | 0.577 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|---------------------|------|------|--------|---------------------|------|-------|-------|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Respiratory rate | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | ≤8 | 0.75 | 0.15 | 3.74 | 0.724 | 2.62 | 0.17 | 39.95 | 0.488 |
| 5 | 9-14 | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| 6 | 15-20 | 0.94 | 0.76 | 1.15 | 0.546 | 1.06 | 0.75 | 1.49 | 0.745 |
| 7 | 21-29 | 1.29 | 0.99 | 1.69 | 0.060 | 1.79 | 1.18 | 2.71 | 0.006 |
| 8 | ≥30 | 3.98 | 1.99 | 7.95 | <0.001 | 4.48 | 1.87 | 10.73 | 0.001 |
| 9 | Missing | 1.05 | 0.85 | 1.29 | 0.659 | 1.02 | 0.70 | 1.47 | 0.930 |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Intercept | -4.572 | | | | -3.521 | | | |
| 13 | AUC (95% CI) | 0.853 (0.844-0.861) | | | | 0.808 (0.790-0.826) | | | |
| 14 | GoF-value | 0.289 | | | | 0.455 | | | |

- 15 e) Abbreviations: n: number, OR: odds ratio, 95%CI: 95% confidence interval. GoF= Hosmer-Lemeshow Goodness of Fit χ^2 test. AUC: Area Under The Curve
- 16 f) Age in years divided by ten.
- 17 g) Vital parameters measured are: oxygen saturation, measured in percentage oxygenated hemoglobin. Systolic BP: Systolic blood pressure, measured in millimeters of mercury. Temperature measured in degrees Celsius. Heart rate and respiratory rate are measured as times per minute.
- 18 h) P-value values are derived from multiple logistic regression analysis.
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

Supplemental table 4: Multivariable model of hospitalization of patients at the Emergency Department - training and test cohort

| Predictor | < 70 years | | | | | ≥ 70 years | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------|--------|------|---------|------------|------|--------|-------|---------|
| | beta | OR | 95% CI | | P-value | beta | OR | 95% CI | | P-value |
| Age/10 | 0.228 | 1.26 | 1.20 | 1.31 | <0.001 | 0.259 | 1.30 | 1.10 | 1.53 | 0.002 |
| Sex | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 0.280 | 1.32 | 1.17 | 1.50 | <0.001 | | | | | |
| Female | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | | | | | |
| Triage category | | | | | | | | | | |
| >1 hour | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| < 1 hour | 0.772 | 2.16 | 1.79 | 2.62 | <0.001 | 0.752 | 3.77 | 2.60 | 5.46 | <0.001 |
| < 10 min | 1.302 | 3.68 | 2.95 | 4.59 | <0.001 | 1.327 | 2.12 | 1.54 | 2.92 | <0.001 |
| Arrival mode | | | | | | | | | | |
| Self-referral | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Referred | 0.207 | 1.93 | 1.62 | 2.29 | <0.001 | 0.250 | 1.28 | 0.96 | 1.72 | 0.095 |
| Ambulance | 0.656 | 1.23 | 1.06 | 1.43 | 0.006 | 0.543 | 1.72 | 1.27 | 2.33 | <0.001 |
| Main Complaint | | | | | | | | | | |
| Minor trauma | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Major trauma | 0.137 | 1.15 | 0.78 | 1.69 | 0.486 | -0.115 | 0.89 | 0.39 | 2.03 | 0.785 |
| Chest pain | -1.534 | 0.22 | 0.16 | 0.28 | <0.001 | -1.220 | 0.30 | 0.20 | 0.44 | <0.001 |
| Dyspnea | -0.576 | 0.56 | 0.41 | 0.77 | <0.001 | -0.210 | 0.81 | 0.53 | 1.25 | 0.343 |
| Collaps | -0.332 | 0.72 | 0.51 | 1.02 | 0.065 | -0.755 | 0.47 | 0.29 | 0.77 | 0.003 |
| Psychiatric | 0.284 | 1.33 | 0.93 | 1.91 | 0.123 | 0.083 | 1.09 | 0.50 | 2.35 | 0.833 |
| Malaise | 0.134 | 1.14 | 0.90 | 1.46 | 0.276 | 0.308 | 1.36 | 0.96 | 1.93 | 0.081 |
| Abdominal pain | 0.111 | 1.12 | 0.89 | 1.41 | 0.351 | -0.141 | 0.87 | 0.58 | 1.31 | 0.503 |
| Other | -0.046 | 0.96 | 0.75 | 1.23 | 0.717 | 0.033 | 1.03 | 0.66 | 1.61 | 0.884 |
| Type of specialist | | | | | | | | | | |
| Medicine | 0.344 | 1.41 | 1.20 | 1.67 | <0.001 | | | | | |
| Surgery | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | | | | | |
| Revisit to the ED | 0.561 | 1.75 | 1.46 | 2.10 | <0.001 | 0.498 | 1.65 | 1.18 | 2.29 | 0.003 |
| Phlebotomised blood sample | 1.642 | 5.17 | 4.10 | 6.51 | <0.001 | 1.893 | 6.64 | 4.33 | 10.19 | <0.001 |
| Oxygen sturation | | | | | | | | | | |
| ≤ 90% | 0.655 | 1.93 | 1.00 | 3.72 | 0.051 | 1.482 | 4.40 | 1.55 | 12.48 | 0.005 |
| 91-94% | 0.387 | 1.47 | 1.05 | 2.07 | 0.025 | 0.216 | 1.24 | 0.83 | 1.86 | 0.294 |
| ≥ 95% | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Missing | 0.090 | 1.09 | 0.78 | 1.53 | 0.600 | 0.032 | 1.03 | 0.58 | 1.85 | 0.914 |
| Systolic BP | | | | | | | | | | |
| ≤100 | 0.802 | 2.23 | 1.52 | 3.27 | <0.001 | | | | | |
| 101-199 | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | | | | | |
| >200 | 0.243 | 1.28 | 0.67 | 2.43 | 0.462 | | | | | |
| Missing | -0.453 | 0.64 | 0.46 | 0.89 | 0.008 | | | | | |
| Temperature | | | | | | | | | | |
| ≤35.0 | 0.225 | 1.25 | 0.58 | 2.72 | 0.571 | -0.017 | 0.98 | 0.38 | 2.52 | 0.971 |
| 35.1-38.4 | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| ≥38.5 | 1.356 | 3.88 | 2.79 | 5.40 | <0.001 | 1.688 | 5.41 | 2.61 | 11.23 | <0.001 |
| Missing | -0.041 | 0.96 | 0.80 | 1.16 | 0.668 | -0.228 | 0.80 | 0.59 | 1.08 | 0.137 |
| Heart rate | | | | | | | | | | |
| ≤50 | 0.095 | 1.10 | 0.64 | 1.89 | 0.729 | 0.713 | 2.04 | 0.90 | 4.63 | 0.088 |
| 51 - 100 | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| 101 -110 | 0.458 | 1.58 | 1.26 | 1.99 | <0.001 | -0.030 | 0.97 | 0.64 | 1.47 | 0.888 |
| 111-129 | 0.417 | 1.52 | 1.17 | 1.97 | 0.002 | 0.105 | 1.11 | 0.69 | 1.79 | 0.667 |
| ≥130 | 0.620 | 1.86 | 1.27 | 2.72 | 0.001 | -0.740 | 0.48 | 0.26 | 0.89 | 0.02 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|------------------|------|------|------|--------|------------------|------|------|------|-------|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Missing | -0.106 | 0.90 | 0.58 | 1.40 | 0.638 | -0.324 | 0.72 | 0.38 | 1.39 | 0.328 |
| 4 | Respiratory rate | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | ≤8 | -0.840 | 0.43 | 0.09 | 1.98 | 0.280 | 21.663 | ∞ | 0 | ∞ | 0.999 |
| 6 | 9-14 | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| 7 | 15-20 | -0.026 | 0.97 | 0.80 | 1.20 | 0.802 | 0.189 | 1.21 | 0.87 | 1.68 | 0.261 |
| 8 | 21-29 | 0.352 | 1.42 | 1.09 | 1.86 | 0.010 | 0.630 | 1.88 | 1.26 | 2.79 | 0.002 |
| 9 | ≥30 | 1.220 | 3.39 | 1.79 | 6.41 | <0.001 | 1.073 | 2.93 | 1.38 | 6.20 | 0.005 |
| 10 | Missing | -0.007 | 0.99 | 0.81 | 1.22 | 0.949 | -0.054 | 0.95 | 0.67 | 1.34 | 0.761 |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Intercept | -4.687 | | | | | -5.021 | | | | |
| 14 | Training cohort | 0.86 (0.85-0.87) | | | | | 0.80 (0.78-0.82) | | | | |
| 15 | AUC (95% CI) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | GoF-value | 0.387 | | | | | 0.373 | | | | |
| 17 | Test cohort AUC | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | (95%CI) | 0.85 (0.84-0.86) | | | | | 0.78 (0.76-0.80) | | | | |

- 19 a) Abbreviations: n: number, OR: odds ratio, 95%CI: 95% confidence interval. GoF= Hosmer-Lemeshow Goodness of Fit χ^2 test. AUC: Area Under The Curve
- 20 b) Age in years divided by ten.
- 21 c) Vital parameters measured are: oxygen saturation, measured in percentage oxygenated hemoglobin. Systolic BP: Systolic blood pressure, measured in millimeters of mercury. Temperature measured in degrees Celsius. Heart rate and respiratory rate are measured as times per minute.
- 22 d) P-value values are derived from multiple logistic regression analysis.
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REBUTTAL

MS ID#: emermed-2016-205846.R6

MS TITLE: Early prediction of hospital admission for emergency department patients, a comparison between patients younger or older than 70-years.

Authors: Lucke, Jacinta; de Gelder, Jelle; Clarijs, Fleur; Heringhaus, Christian; de Craen, Anton; Fogteloo, Anne; Blauw, Gerard Jan; de Groot, Bas; Mooijaart, Simon

May 2017

Confidential: For Review Only

Editor:

Comments to the Author:

Thank you for your recent revision. Our remaining concern is about the exclusion for "unjustified ED visits."

Question 1:

First, we are very concerned that readers might not find the term "unjustified ED visits" acceptable and in conflict with permitting laypeople to decide their healthcare needs and priorities. This term needs to be removed from the paper. It is not necessary to label these visits but rather fully describe them, which leads to our second point.

Answer 1:

We will adjust this term, and change it to 'ED visits due to logistical reasons'

Adjustment:

'unjustified ED visits' changes into 'ED visits due to logistical reasons' throughout the manuscript.

Question 2: In your most recent reply to reviewers you state that the list included patients with: planned re-evaluation (e.g patients with a wound or abdominal pain that could not wait for the next available appointment in the out-patient clinic), visits to the ED because of lack of availability of time in the out-patient clinic, laboratory checks for logistical reasons, patients who were sent away from the ED to visit their GP etc (because a visit to the GP is approximately 350 euro's less expensive in the current Dutch health care system).

This list should be included in your Methods. Most of these seem reasonable exclusions in that the patients were either scheduled to be seen, the ED was presumably the only site to get labs, or they were not seen because they were sent to GP clinics. *However, there is one group of patients who were seen by the ED but came because of lack of availability of time in the outpatient clinic. Why would these patients be excluded?* In some cases, patients will present to an outpatient clinic and be sick enough to require admission. Please explain why you chose to exclude these patients and also how you were able to retrospectively identify them in your cohort. You should also tell us how many such patients there were - if only a few, this would not affect your results much, but if its the majority, this could have had an impact on your results.

Answer 2:

These patients were excluded because the ED is sometimes used as an alternative pathway to get patients into the outpatient clinic. For example, a patient calls from home to his/her medical specialist because of a non-urgent problem but there are no places on their scheduled consultation hour. The specialist sends the patient to the ED, and because the patient is in the ED, the scheduling of the consultation hour is re-arranged and a place in the outpatient clinic is created. These patients do not require ED care, but rather use a backdoor into the outpatient clinic. This is registered in the file of the patient in the free text of the 'reason for ED visit' section, therefore we were able to identify this retrospectively. As you can imagine, this can be undesirable course of action as a patient is registered in the ED but does not receive care there, however it was a common practice during the inclusion period.

In the same group we categorized patients with eye or ENT problems that were registered in the ED but were not treated in the ED. Because the eye and ENT specialists prefer to see the patients in the outpatient clinic (where they have additional material and personnel), these patients are not treated in the ED but go to the outpatient clinic immediately. However they are registered in the computer system as ED visitors, therefore for the this retrospective study we had to exclude them. A total of 415 patients were excluded for this reason, 1.5% of all registered ED visits in that year.

Adjustment:

We will provide additional explanation about this exclusion in the method section. We feel that the exclusion of these patients is justified as they do not require ED care and are not a true part of the ED patient population. If they would be included this would only introduce bias as they contain many missing data (because they were not treated in the ED, their charts are empty and only contain the referral to the outpatient clinic) and do not have similar chances of hospital admission compared to patient who visit the ED due to an acute situation.

We hope this explanation is satisfactory and we can proceed to swift publication of this manuscript.

Kind regards on behalf of the authors,

Jacinta Lucke