

MONitoring Knockbacks in EmergencyY (MONKEY) - An Audit of Outcomes in Emergency Patients with Rejected Admission Requests

Wendell Zhang

University of Melbourne

Lee Yung Wong (✉ leeyung.wong@austin.org.au)

Austin Hospital

Jasmine Liu

Austin Hospital

Soham Sarkar

Austin Hospital

Research Article

Keywords: Emergency Department, Knockback, Admission, Referral, Disposition

Posted Date: April 25th, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1555694/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Open Access Emergency Medicine on September 2nd, 2022. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.2147/OAEM.S376419>.

Abstract

Background

Emergency department (ED) clinicians commonly experience difficulties in referring patients to inpatient teams for hospital admission. There is limited literature reporting on patient outcomes following these complicated referrals, where ED requests for inpatient admission are rejected – termed a ‘knockback’.

Study Objective:

To identify disposition outcomes in ED patients whose admission referral was initially rejected, i.e., encountered a ‘knockback.’ Secondary objectives were to identify additional factors associated with knockbacks.

Methods

A prospective audit of patients identified as having knockbacks over two time periods (Jan-Feb 2020 and Aug 2020 to Jan 2021) at a tertiary Australian ED. Data was analysed with a mixed-methods approach and subsequent descriptive and thematic analyses were performed.

Results

A total of 109 patients were identified as knockbacks. Despite the knockback, 89.0% of cases (n = 97) ultimately required a hospital admission. Moreover, in 60.6% (n = 66) of the admissions, patients were admitted under the inpatient team initially referred to by the ED. There was a statistically significant link between the number of in-hospital units involved in the admission process and the ED length of stay (Pearson correlation 0.404, $p < 0.001$). Patient factors associated with knockbacks include pre-existing chronic medical conditions and presenting acutely unwell. In line with previous studies, analysis of clinicians’ perspectives yielded recurring themes of disagreements over admission destination and diagnostic uncertainty.

Conclusion

The admission process of patients from the ED to inpatient teams is often an arduous process complicated by numerous factors and is associated with an increased ED length of stay. However, ED clinicians accurately referred to the correct inpatient unit in almost two thirds of this patient sample, and most patients required an inpatient admission. Knockbacks may adversely affect patient care and warrant further focused discussion and clearer referral guidelines between ED clinicians and their inpatient colleagues.

Introduction

Emergency Department (ED) doctors are routinely required to work alongside their inpatient counterparts when referring patients for hospital admission, a process known as referrals or handoffs. Despite these interactions being commonplace, it is often reported to be a frustrating process with difficulties being reported as frequently as 56% of the time.¹ Ineffective and incongruent communication between physicians has been identified repeatedly as a primary contributor to adverse patient events.² Studies conducted both in Australian and overseas institutions, such as in the US and UK, identified various factors such as poor communication skills, competing priorities and clinical uncertainty around the patient contributed significantly towards these disagreements.³⁻⁶ In particular, several studies have highlighted a lack of trust on the part of in-hospital teams regarding the clinical decisions of ED physicians, and would not accept the patient until they had either reviewed the patient personally or received further investigation results.^{1,5-7}

Problems in the consultation and referral process may carry significant implications not only for clinical outcomes such as length of stay, but also overcrowding in the ED while decisions are made surrounding patients' ultimate in-hospital destination.⁸ There has been an increasing emphasis on referral practices and communication skills as part of ED physician training to improve this process.^{1,4,9} However, there remains a lack of understanding in the current Australian healthcare context on disposition outcomes and contributing factors regarding patients whose referral process was complicated by a rejected admission request – which the study investigators termed a 'knockback'.

The aim of this exploratory study was to describe knockbacks in a tertiary Australian ED, its impact on patient outcomes, and other patient, clinician and systemic contributing factors. The primary outcome examined was whether the referrals for admission were warranted. Secondary outcomes included whether the initial referral from ED was directed at the correct inpatient team. The study was titled "MONitoring Knockbacks in Emergency" (The "MONKEY" Audit).

Methods

Aim:

The MONKEY audit was undertaken to identify patients who were initially knocked back for admission, and yet subsequently required inpatient care within one week, such as an inpatient admission, or hospital-based procedure or intervention. The study also sought to determine how frequently patients were ultimately admitted under the team first contacted by ED. Furthermore, patterns and practices around patient knockbacks as well as contributing factors such as patient factors, clinician factors and systems issues were additionally uncovered and thematically detailed.

Setting:

The MONKEY audit was undertaken in the Austin Hospital ED which is a tertiary level teaching institution located in North-Eastern suburban Melbourne, Australia. The Austin ED receives more than 90,000 presentations annually. The Austin ED is staffed by clinicians comprising of nurse practitioners, hospital medical officers (HMOs), ED registrars (doctors in speciality training) and ED consultants (Emergency Physicians). Referrals for admission are made to specialty registrars or consultants of inpatient teams, with approximately 40% of ED patients being admitted daily.

Recruitment:

Patients were prospectively recruited by ED clinicians who identified their patient as having a knockback. This process was conducted over two separate periods which were denoted as MONKEY1 and MONKEY2. MONKEY1 was conducted over 4 weeks from January 2020 until February 2020 while MONKEY2 was conducted over six months from August 2020 until January 2021.

Figure 1 shows patient inclusion, where a total of 109 cases were included (MONKEY1, n = 67; MONKEY2, n = 42). 3 patients were initially excluded from MONKEY1 because they were duplicates or ineligible. 1 patient was initially excluded from MONKEY2 because of insufficient data obtained.

Study Design:

ED clinicians were asked to anonymously nominate their patients who were knocked back by submitting the patient's Unit Record (UR) number to a secure collection box located in the Austin ED. In cases where the same patient represented to the Emergency Department within one week for the same complaint, these were classified as one admission. At the end of each study period, investigators (the second, third and fourth authors) collected the patient UR numbers, and conducted a retrospective chart review of electronic patient records. Details of each knockback were recorded in an Excel database, including:

1. The seniority of the referring ED staff member
2. In-hospital teams contacted, and in what order
3. Final admission unit and length of ED and hospital stay, if known
4. Basic patient demographics and clinical outcome of the patient within the first week of admission
5. Free-text section to detail reasons for disposition disagreement, if identifiable

Thematic and Statistical Analysis:

A mixed-methods approach was undertaken to analyse the data, primarily by the first and second authors. Detailed qualitative analysis was performed with the constant comparative method used in the grounded theory approach to identify themes based on demographical data and the free-text section providing context for the disposition disagreement. Codes were generated and refined over multiple iterations of the data to develop key themes, until saturation of themes was reached. Basic quantitative analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26 comparing correlations between variables, with a p value of 0.01 taken as significant.

Results

Descriptive analysis:

Patient demographics are shown in Table 1. The distribution of patient age was negatively skewed with a median age of 64 years old, and a range from 16 to 97 years old. Patient comorbidities were defined as existing medical issues detailed on hospital records. The distribution was positively skewed with a median of 5 and a range from 0 to 17.

Demographics of referring clinicians whose patients encountered knockbacks are shown in Table 2. Of the 109 cases, 32.1% (n = 35) of cases were submitted by junior hospital medical officers (HMOs), 53.2% (n = 58) by ED registrars, 11.0% (n = 12) by ED consultants and 3.7% (n = 4) by nurse practitioners.

Table 1: Patient Demographics

<u>Age</u>	
Median	64
25th Quartile	43
75th Quartile	80
Minimum	16
Maximum	97
 <u>Comorbidities</u>	
Median	5

The median number of teams involved in the admission process was 2, ranging from 1 to 4 (Fig. 2). The teams most frequently contacted were general medicine, general surgery and the short stay unit (SSU). Regarding knockback patterns, the most common inter-unit knockbacks occurred between general medicine – general surgery, and general surgery – gastroenterology (Table 3).

Table 2: Referring Clinician Demographics

<u>Seniority of ED Clinician</u>	<u>Number of cases (%)</u>	<u>Accurate referrals, n (%)</u>
HMO	35 (32.1%)	22 (62.9%)
Registrar	58 (53.2%)	35 (60.3%)
Consultant	12 (11.0%)	6 (50.0%)
<u>Nurse Practitioner</u>	<u>4 (3.7%)</u>	<u>3 (75.0%)</u>
Total	109 (100%)	66 (60.6%)

Table 3: Description of Inpatient Teams

<u>Top 5 Teams contacted</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
General medicine	48
General surgery	30
SSU	26
Cardiology	13
Orthopaedics	12
<u>Top 3 Knockback patterns</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Gen. Med. v Gen. Surg.	6
Gen. Surg. v Gastro.	6
Gen. Med. v Cardio.	5

Patient disposition outcomes:

89.0% of cases (n=97) required a hospital admission with 24.7% (n=24) of these admissions lasting over 7 days, and 12.7% (n=12) of admissions requiring an inpatient procedure (such as surgery or procedures requiring anaesthetics involvement), and 3.7% (n=4) requiring outpatient care (such as imaging, outpatient consultations or follow-up procedure). 4.6% (n=5) of patients represented after an initial discharge from the hospital (Table 4).

The ED length of stay was positively skewed with a median of 9 hours and a range from 0 to 37 hours^[1] (Table 4). Notably, there was a statistically significant link between the number of in-hospital units involved in the admission process and the ED length of stay (Pearson Correlation 0.404, p<0.001) (Table 5).

“Accuracy” of initial referral:

Regarding the second study question examining referral accuracy, in 60.6% of cases (n=66), the patient was eventually admitted under the team who was initially contacted, with study investigators defining this as an “accurate referral”. 68.7% of cases (n=46) in MONKEY1 and 47.6% of cases (n=20) in MONKEY2 were deemed accurate (Table 4).

Table 4: Patient disposition outcomes

<u>Overall Accuracy of Referrals</u>	<u>Accurate Referrals (Total)</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
MONKEY1	46 (67)	68.7%
MONKEY2	20 (42)	47.6%
Total	66 (109)	60.6%

<u>Patient Outcomes</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Hospital Admission	97
Extended Admission (>7 days)	24
Inpatient Procedure	12
Representation after ED discharge	5
No admission	12
Outpatient Procedure	4

<u>ED Length of Stay (hours)</u>	
Median	9
Minimum	0
Maximum	37

Table 5: Correlations between patient variables, number of inpatient units involved and ED Length of Stay

<u>Patient Factors:</u>	Units Involved
Age	
Pearson Correlation	-0.063
Sig. (2-tailed)	p = 0.517
Comorbidities	
Pearson Correlation	-0.062
Sig. (2 tailed)	p = 0.520
<u>Outcomes:</u>	ED Length of Stay
Units Involved	
Pearson Correlation	0.404
Sig. (2-tailed)	p < 0.001

Factors contributing to knockbacks:

Patient factors:

Regarding patient factors that may have contributed to the knockback, as shown in table 5, there was no clear association between patient age and the number of units involved in admission (Pearson Correlation - 0.063, p = 0.517), or between the number of patient comorbidities and the number of units involved in admission (Pearson Correlation - 0.062, p = 0.520).

Qualitative analysis revealed several recurring themes revolving around patient presentations. 91 patients in the audit had 1 key presenting complaint, 17 patients had 2 active issues and there was one patient whose presenting complaint was unclear. Of these difficult admissions, the most common presenting complaints were fever or suspected infection, abdominal pain in females and central neurological issues such as delirium and headache (Table 6).

Individual patient contributing themes, defined as factors not directly related to their presenting complaint but likely complicating the diagnostic process, were also identified and thematically analysed. Patients had between 0 to 3 contributing factors, with the most frequent themes being the presence of co-morbid conditions requiring ongoing care/medication (not including cancer), an acutely unwell state in the ED (e.g. in significant pain or clinically unstable) and a medical history of cancer. Representation to the ED and patients who were suspected COVID-19 patients rounded out the top 5 contributing factors to patient knockbacks (Table 6).

Table 6: Patient-related knockback themes

<u>Patient Presentation Distribution</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
1 Presenting Complaint	91
2 Presenting Complaints	17
Unclear Presenting Complaint	1
<u>Top 5 Presenting Complaints</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Fever	14
Abdominal Pain (female)	13
Central Neurology	13
Shortness of Breath	12
Falls	12
<u>Top 5 Patient Contributing Factors</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Chronic Medical Condition	22
Acutely Unwell	14
History of Malignancy	11
Representation to ED	11
Suspected COVID-19	10

Clinician and System Factors:

Referrals made by HMO doctors involved the greatest number of teams with a mean of 2.43 (SD 0.94). This was followed by Registrars (2.21 – SD 1.20), Consultants (2.08 – SD 1.16) and NPs (1.25 – SD 1.00) (Table 7).

Systems-related factors, which were derived from free-text written submissions, were also examined with thematic analysis. Individual cases featured between 1 to 6 clinician-related themes. The most frequently occurring was in-hospital teams directing the admission to another team. Other prominently recurring themes included requests to review the patient in person first, disagreement regarding clinical decisions, requesting further investigation results, interpersonal/communication issues (such as lack of professionalism or difficulties in establishing contact) and administration issues (such as unclear guidelines for referral or being outside contact hours for specific services) (Table 7).

Table 7: Clinician and System-related Knockback Themes

<u>Seniority</u>	<u>Mean Teams Contacted</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
HMO (n=35)	2.43	0.94
Registrar (n=58)	2.21	1.20
Consultant (n=12)	2.08	1.16
Nurse Practitioner (n=4)	1.25	1.00

<u>Top 5 Themes in Knockback</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Refer Elsewhere	77
Review In-person First	36
Clinician Disagreement	35
Request Investigations	31
Communication Issues	15

Two case vignettes are provided here to illustrate the process and decision complexity surrounding referrals and knockbacks.

Case Vignettes:

1) Young female with abdominal pain

A female in her 30s presented to ED complaining of severe abdominal pain, on the background of previously diagnosed ovarian cancer. She required ketamine for analgesia and was noted to be both febrile and tachycardic. The ED registrar considered differentials ranging from appendicitis, Pelvic Inflammatory Disease and pyelonephritis, and contacted the general surgery team for admission. She was reviewed by general surgery, who advised she was more likely to have Pelvic inflammatory disease and requested that ED refer the patient onto gynaecology. Gynaecology reviewed the patient and requested that ED refer to general medicine instead. In addition, ED referred to Acute Pain Service to help manage the patient's pain. After 4 referrals, the patient spent 23 hours in the Emergency department before being admitted to the general medicine ward for 4 days.

2) Elderly patient with altered mental state

A male in his 80s presented to the ED with altered behaviour, reduced conscious state and a Systolic Blood Pressure of 200mmHg. The registrar considered differentials of basilar artery stroke, intracranial bleeding and delirium before contacting radiology to arrange a CT brain. Since there was no bleeding, a stroke code was called, and a CT perfusion was ordered which was refused by radiology as they requested a stroke score be performed first. The stroke team advised a CT perfusion scan was needed but the CT was cancelled with the patient on the table following a discussion between the stroke and radiology team. The ED registrar noted poor professionalism demonstrated by the radiologist and radiographer, citing derogatory attitudes. The patient spent 9 hours in the ED before being admitted for 9 days on the general medicine ward.

[1] Patients whose ED length of stay exceeded 24 hours were those admitted to the Short Stay Unit and therefore total time included ED and SSU length of stay

Discussion

The MONKEY audit evaluated disposition outcomes in a cohort of 109 ED patients where referral for hospital inpatient admission was initially rejected (a knockback) and investigated common themes which would have contributed to this outcome.

Predicting patients who required admission:

The findings of the MONKEY audit bear much clinical significance, with 9 out of 10 patients subsequently requiring an admission, some of them lengthy inpatient stays. As almost two-thirds of patients were eventually admitted to the team where the referral was first made, this suggests that the majority of requests for referrals to multiple other teams were not warranted. Therefore, most of these knockbacks

may be regarded as an unnecessary delay to the patient care journey once the need for admission has been identified by ED clinicians. This outcome appears to partially support the hypothesis that ED decision making regarding patient disposition is mostly accurate and that knockbacks may be associated with poorer patient outcomes, including increased length of stay in ED. This is noted by the correlation between the number of inpatient units involved and the prolonged stay in ED, demonstrating the previously identified complex ED-inpatient team interface.¹⁰ Prior studies regarding ED admissions have focused primarily on predicting the need for admission and accuracy of diagnosis.^{11,12} A retrospective study by Chiu et al conducted in a Hong Kong hospital found that ED diagnoses matched final discharge diagnoses 71.4% of the time. A prospective cohort study of experienced physicians conducted by Vlodaver et al in the United States found that ED physicians predicted the correct admission 88.6% of the time.¹³ While these studies were conducted in overseas institutions with likely different admission protocols, scopes of practice and patient demographics, results from the MONKEY audit nonetheless seem to reinforce the notion that ED clinicians are capable at predicting both clinical diagnoses and the appropriate admitting team. The comparatively lower accuracy reported in the MONKEY audit could be attributed to the study only investigating cases where there was a disposition dilemma while including clinicians of varying levels of seniority.

Referral Accuracy:

There was a disparity in accuracies of referrals between the two study periods (MONKEY1 and MONKEY2). MONKEY1 also involved an overlap between acquainted inpatient registrars with incoming new registrars including ones from other hospital networks and states. Study investigators initially proposed comparisons between the two study periods, however this was not performed, as the two samples were not comparable in time period, size and situation (N.B. MONKEY2 was limited by the Victorian COVID-19 “second wave”, impacting on patient recruitment). It is possible that referral accuracy rates were lower due to COVID-19 necessitating additional testing requirements and inhibiting patient flow processes. With hospital emergency departments being the frontline in providing care for undifferentiated patients, there is a need for efficient ED flow to prevent overcrowding. Furthermore, as disposition disagreements in the ED are common, it is important to identify areas for improvement in the admission process. It must be considered, however, that due to both the complex nature of the admission process as well as the limited sample size of this audit, concrete conclusions on the correlations and interactions between the investigated variables cannot be drawn with the current data and the nature of this study.

In analysing the teams involved, most knockbacks encountered in the study involved teams such as general medicine, general surgery and the short stay unit (SSU). This reflects that these are often the busiest units within the hospital and does not necessarily reflect any predisposition on their behalf to knock back referrals. Another potential explanation for these findings is the increasing emphasis on sub-specialisation units, increased workload, and patient acuity, all of which may further complicate the referral-admission process.

Factors involved in knockback:

Exploring patient factors linked to knockbacks, there was no significant association between patient age or number of comorbidities and knockbacks. This may suggest that knockbacks are universal and not simply related to older and more complex patients. It was also demonstrated that certain presentations (such as fever or abdominal pain in females) and patient factors (such as complex medical history) were associated with disposition dilemmas. Of particular concern, multi-morbid, acutely unwell patients were often the subject of knockbacks, with patient safety connotations. Specifically, these factors can make it difficult for ED clinicians to arrive confidently at a clinical diagnosis that is agreed upon by receiving inpatient units.

Examining clinician-related factors, there was a weak negative association between the seniority of the doctor making the admission with its accuracy, as well as a weak negative association between seniority and teams involved prior to admission. HMOs and Registrars submitted a total of 85.3% of cases in the study. This likely reflects that these clinicians comprise most of the ED workforce. The results also raise the possibility that junior clinicians may be more likely to face knockbacks from in-hospital teams due to their relative inexperience, as claimed by Reid et al.¹ Of note, the two cases where the admitting team asked for the referral to come from a more senior role both involved junior doctors placing the referral. One factor that may confound these results is that more complex patients are usually assigned to more senior doctors in the emergency department. The most frequent clinician-sided themes, apart from deferment of responsibility to another unit, were the need for external teams to review first and clinician disagreements, both suggesting lack of reciprocal trust.³ Another recurring theme identified among clinicians was interpersonal issues. Communication-related issues during referrals have been well documented previously, and the MONKEY audit highlights that referring ED clinicians also experience interpersonal conflict which may impact on their patient care.^{4,6} Likewise, Staib et al discussed various barriers in ED to hospital admissions including both avoidable and unavoidable delays, competing priorities, as well as confusion over clinical territories.¹⁰ The findings from the MONKEY audit support these as key systemic issues that require addressing.

Future research could aim to investigate all admissions to the ED within a smaller time frame to be able to compare outcomes with those patients whose admission processes were more streamlined. Furthermore, while there were several identified factors linked to state-wide health policy such as the subspecialisation of hospital teams, it is difficult to generalise the findings of the MONKEY audit to other healthcare settings. Thus, it would be of benefit to conduct future similar audits across multiple sites to compare and confirm these findings.

Limitations:

The main limitation to the MONKEY audit was its limited size and scope. The original purpose of the study was not to perform a wide-ranging analysis of ED admission outcomes but instead was exploratory in nature, identifying outcomes and contributors to difficult admission processes, and hence was not designed or powered for detailed quantitative analysis. Any attempt at correlation analysis may be impacted by low power, especially when other potential confounding variables were not controlled for

(such as patient characteristics, state of busy-ness of the ED, or clinician characteristics). In addition, it is difficult to determine causality such as whether patient outcomes were impacted by factors such as knockbacks or delayed reviews, or vice versa. To this end, future studies may explore the importance of these factors relative to one another.

There were also significant limitations to recruitment for the two studies. As mentioned previously, the two study periods were not homogenous and not comparable in either scope, length or study environment due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. These differences also led to possible reporting bias. In both cases, clinicians were simply asked to submit patients who met the study criteria at their own discretion, and in addition, not all knockbacks would have been captured suggesting likely selection and performance biases. Furthermore, patients in the MONKEY audit were not matched to control groups, so it is difficult to generalise these findings to the broader ED environment.

Conclusion

Despite its limited scope, the strength of this audit includes analysis by mixed methods of an important process in the patient journey. It identifies several key patterns and recurring themes around referral-admission complications; it is not unreasonable to propose that this is a reoccurring phenomenon in similar tertiary Emergency Department contexts. The salient findings are that ED clinicians generally initially refer to the correct team, and that requests for admission are valid in most cases. The themes around knockbacks identified both patient and systems-centred issues such as patient complexity and clinician disagreement, which match the existing literature. This does not, however, invalidate the fact that sometimes knockbacks are an inevitable outcome with complicated patient presentations. There is a need for focused discussion and clearer referral guidelines between in-hospital physicians as well as ED doctors.

Abbreviations

ED – Emergency Department

HMO – Hospital Medical Officer

MONKEY – Monitoring Knockbacks in Emergency

SD – Standard Deviation

SSU – Short Stay Unit

UR – Unit Record

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate:

The study was reviewed by the Austin Health Office for Research and was approved as a clinical audit project with the reference number Audit/20/Austin/19. As per the Austin Health Office for Research committee, informed consent was not required from individual participants as this was a clinical audit involving the collection, use and disclosure of data in a de-identified format. All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations. No experiments were conducted on humans.

Consent for publication:

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials:

The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are not publicly available due to patient confidentiality but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request

Competing interests:

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

Funding:

Not applicable

Authors' contributions:

WZ analysed and parsed the data and was a major contributor in writing the manuscript. LW designed the audit, obtained ethics approval, collected data, and edited the manuscript. SS and JL contributed to the collection and sorting of data. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements:

Professor Leonid Churilov – Statistician

Dr Simon Judkins for his insight and assistance in reviewing the paper.

References

1. Reid C, Moorthy C, Forshaw K. Referral patterns: an audit into referral practice among doctors in emergency medicine. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2005 May 1;22(5):355-8.
2. Horwitz LI, Meredith T, Schuur JD, Shah NR, Kulkarni RG, Jenq GY. Dropping the baton: a qualitative analysis of failures during the transition from emergency department to inpatient care. *Annals of emergency medicine*. 2009 Jun 1;53(6):701 – 10.
3. Chan T, Bakewell F, Orlich D, Sherbino J. Conflict prevention, conflict mitigation, and manifestations of conflict during emergency department consultations. *Academic Emergency Medicine*. 2014

Mar;21(3):308–13.

4. Lawrence S, Spencer LM, Sinnott M, Eley R. It takes two to tango: improving patient referrals from the emergency department to inpatient clinicians. *Ochsner Journal*. 2015 Jun 20;15(2):149–53.
5. Lawrence S, Sullivan C, Patel N, Spencer L, Sinnott M, Eley R. Admission of medical patients from the emergency department: An assessment of the attitudes, perspectives and practices of internal medicine and emergency medicine trainees. *Emergency Medicine Australasia*. 2016 Aug;28(4):391–8.
6. Smith CJ, Britigan DH, Lyden E, Anderson N, Welniak TJ, Wadman MC. Interunit handoffs from emergency department to inpatient care: A cross-sectional survey of physicians at a university medical center. *Journal of hospital medicine*. 2015 Nov;10(11):711–7.
7. Dearden CH. Emergency delays. *BMJ: British Medical Journal*. 1995 May 6;310(6988):1199.
8. Lee RS, Woods R, Bullard M, Holroyd BR, Rowe BH. Consultations in the emergency department: a systematic review of the literature. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2008 Jan 1;25(1):4–9.
9. Kessler C, Scott NL, Siedsma M, Jordan J, Beach C, Coletti CM. Interunit handoffs of patients and transfers of information: a survey of current practices. *Annals of emergency medicine*. 2014 Oct 1;64(4):343-9.
10. Staib A, Sullivan C, Jones M, Griffin B, Bell A, Scott I. The ED-inpatient dashboard: Uniting emergency and inpatient clinicians to improve the efficiency and quality of care for patients requiring emergency admission to hospital. *Emergency Medicine Australasia*. 2017 Jun;29(3):363–6.
11. Kim SW, Li JY, Hakendorf P, Teubner DJ, Ben-Tovim DI, Thompson CH. Predicting admission of patients by their presentation to the emergency department. *Emergency Medicine Australasia*. 2014 Aug;26(4):361–7.
12. Chiu HS, Chan KF, Chung CH, Ma K, Au KW. A comparison of emergency department admission diagnoses and discharge diagnoses: retrospective study. *Hong Kong Journal of emergency medicine*. 2003 Apr;10(2):70–5.
13. Vlodayer ZK, Anderson JP, Brown BE, Zwank MD. Emergency medicine physicians' ability to predict hospital admission at the time of triage. *The American journal of emergency medicine*. 2019 Mar 1;37(3):478 – 81.

Figures




Figure 1

Patient inclusion flowchart




Figure 2

Number of Teams Involved in Admission

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Appendix.docx](#)