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Abstract

Objective: The aim of this study was to determine the incidence of adverse events and patients’ outcomes in inter-facility critical care transfers by paramedics.

Methods: We conducted a retrospective cohort study of adults undergoing inter-facility transfer to a tertiary medical facility by paramedics. We included all patients transferred between 1st June, 2011 and 31st December, 2014. The primary outcome is in-transit adverse event and the secondary outcome is in-hospital mortality. Multiple logistic regression models were fitted to assess predictor variables for adverse events and in-hospital mortality.

Results: The incidence of adverse events was 13.7% (31/227 patients had in-transit adverse event); the most common adverse events reported were desaturation and hypotension. A unit increase in risk score for transported patients (RSTP) significantly increased the occurrence of adverse events (adjusted odds ratio [OR]: 1.36, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.07–1.72 and adjusted P = 0.01). Compared to medical patients, cardiac patients were less likely to develop adverse events (adjusted OR: 0.117, 95% CI: 0.02–0.52 and adjusted P < 0.01). The in-hospital mortality was 30.4% and 30-day survival was 68.1%. For two patients whose age differed by 1 year, the older patient was more likely to die (adjusted OR: 1.03, 95% CI: 1.01–1.05 and P < 0.01) and a unit increase in RSTP significantly increased occurrence of in-hospital mortality (adjusted OR: 1.30, 95% CI: 1.0–1.60 and P = 0.01).

Conclusion: The incidence of adverse events was 13.7%. The most common observed adverse events were desaturation and hypotension. In-hospital mortality was 30.4% and 30-day survival was 68.1%.

Keywords: Allied health personnel, ambulances, critical care, patient transfer, transportation of patients

INTRODUCTION

Critically ill patients are at higher risk of developing adverse events, including mortality, following inter-hospital transfers.[1] An inter-facility transfer is defined as the transportation of patients between healthcare facilities using a licensed ambulance.[2] Inter-facility transfer is usually done by ground or air ambulance. This kind of transportation carries potential risks to a patient, especially when the patient’s safety is dependent on the skills of ambulance staff as well the functionality of devices necessary for the transport.

There has been considerable debate on the ideal team composition and core skills of personnel conducting inter-facility critical transfer.[3] In particular, there is uncertainty as to whether paramedics, nurses, or doctors are the most staff
staff suitable for this task; the efficacy of utilising a specialised
transporting team remains unclear. There is little data in the
literature that have evaluated the efficacy of critical care
transfers by paramedics and a recent systematic review done by
our research team found that there is a gap in the literature on
the safety and adverse events during inter-facility critical care
transfers by paramedics. We seek to investigate the incidence of adverse events in adult critical patients transported to a tertiary
medical facility in Saudi Arabia by paramedics, and instances
of in-hospital mortality and 30-day survival experienced by
these particular patients.

**Methods**

**Study design and setting**

A retrospective cohort study of all adult patients transferred by
paramedics to a tertiary medical facility was conducted. Ethical
approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board.

Emergency medical services (EMS) is a division under the
Department of Emergency Medicine. In 2014, the EMS
division responded to 5997 calls, of which 2143 required an
advanced life support unit. Medical oversight and consultation
facilities are available 24 hours, 365 days a year under an
on-duty board certified emergency medicine consultant.

Minimum skill competency is granted through the paramedic
license requirements. All paramedics involved in inter-facility
transfer of critical patients have received advanced training in
operating ventilators and syringe pumps; also, they are
advanced cardiac life support, basic life support, pre-hospital
trauma life support and paediatric advance life support
providers. However, despite the minimum skills competency
which is granted through the Saudi Commission for Health
Specialities which licences paramedics, there is a marked
diversity in training, and there is a marked heterogeneity in
the skills that individual paramedics possess.

Inter-facility transfer is usually operated with two paramedics.

In the rare cases where two paramedics are not available, a
registered nurse from the receiving hospital unit may support
the transfer, but the paramedic is the designated primary
provider of clinical care.

Paramedic protocols utilise a wide range of medications
including advanced life-support medications and rapid
sequence intubation medications.

Inter-facility transfer is operated with type-3 ambulance
vehicles. Inter-facility transfer vehicles are equipped with
portable transport ventilator, a defibrillator and monitor, at
least two syringe pumps and a refrigerator to maintain opioids
and intravenous fluids.

**Sample size calculation**

Sample size was calculated based on the incidence of adverse
events. Assuming an observed incidence of 18%, the reported
incidence by Domeier et al., 2011 through December 31
2011 were defined as critically ill
adult patients, who met the inclusion criteria specified below
and who were transported by paramedics, were included.

The inclusion criteria were:

- Adult patients (14 years or older are classified as adults
  according to the facility policies; however, for this study
  we define adults as 16 years or older)
- Inter-facility transferred to the facility by paramedics
  through land ambulance
- Risk score for transported patient (RSTP) >6.

**Data collection**

Patients’ data were collected anonymously on-site using paper
forms. The data were then transferred to a computer where
they were encrypted and saved on an Excel Spreadsheet.

Data were collected from referring hospitals’ reports, EMS
patient-care records and receiving hospital’s records. Data
extracted included patient demographics: the patient’s age,
sex, reason for transfer, length of transfer, mode of transfer
and patient group (patients were divided into medical, trauma
or cardiac-based on their clinical diagnosis). The following
physiological parameters were collected: pulse, respiratory
rate, temperature, blood pressure, oxygen saturation, Glasgow
coma scale, lung sounds, skin condition, electrocardiogram
results, glucose level, haemoglobin, airway devices,
mechanical ventilation, ventilator setting, medication infusion,
central intravenous line, chest drainage system, intracranial
pressure monitoring, invasive blood pressure monitoring,
intravenous line, chest drainage system, intracranial
pressure monitoring, invasive blood pressure monitoring,
blood transfusion, cardiac pacing, comorbidity, RSTP,
mortality and 30-day survival.

The RSTP is a scoring system developed to identify patients
at higher risk of developing complications during inter-facility
transfer. Patients with RSTP >6 were defined as critically ill
patients. The complete RSTP list can be found in Appendix 1.

**Method of measurements**

A modified list of adverse events was adapted from the
Royal College of Anaesthetists’ list of critical incidents.

The Royal College list itself was adopted from Dewhurst
et al.,[5] [Figure 1]. The criteria list was modified to match the
Saudi ground inter-facility transfer system. Modification of
the criteria included changing all air transport terms to meet
ground transport processes.

The in-hospital mortality and 30-day survival were measured
by accessing the hospital electronic charts for each patient.

When 30-day survival was unknown, the data were considered
missing.

Adverse events were identified by reviewing patient records
before, during and post-transfer. Any intervention that was
not initiated by the referring facility was considered a new
intervention. Receiving facility records, including receiving
hospital unit records, were screened to identify undocumented
Cardiovascular:  
- Cardiac arrest  
- Cardiac arrhythmia  
- Cardiac failure  
- Cardiac ischaemia/infarction  
- Haemorrhage  
- Hypertension (MAP > 120mmHg or systolic > 160)  
- Hypotension (MAP < 60mmHg or systolic < 80)  
- Other – describe

Respiratory:  
- Airway obstruction  
- Aspiration  
- Bronchospasm/asthma  
- Tracheal tube blocked or kinked  
- Exubation (inadvertent)  
- Peak airway pressures > 45cmH2O  
- Hypercapnia Paco2 > 7kPa  
- Hypoxia SpO2 <90%  
- Intubation problem  
- Pneumothorax  
- Pulmonary oedema  
- Respiratory arrest  
- Ventilation difficulty/failure  
- Other – describe

Neurological:  
- Convulsion  
- Reduction in Glasgow coma scale by 3 points  
- Other – describe

Logistics:  
- Vehicle problem  
- Communication/information problem  
- Handover of care problem  
- Patient-handling problem  
- Other – describe

Equipment failure:  
- Drug/Fluid delivery system problem  
- Equipment disconnection  
- Equipment failure  
- Equipment not available  
- Monitoring problem  
- Supply failure (gas or power)  
- Ventilator problem  
- Other – describe

Drug Related:  
- Wrong drug given  
- Wrong dose/route

Equipment failure:  
- Other – describe

Equipment failure:  
- Drug/fluid delivery system problem  
- Equipment disconnection  
- Equipment failure  
- Equipment not available  
- Monitoring problem  
- Supply failure (gas or power)  
- Ventilator problem  
- Other – describe

Drug Related:  
- Wrong drug given  
- Wrong dose/route

Equipment failure:  
- Other – describe

Figure 1: List of critical incidents

RESULTS

Incidence of adverse events

We identified the first 227 adult critically ill patients meeting the inclusion criteria and who were transferred by EMS paramedics. Characteristics of patients transported by paramedics are provided in Table 1.

The rate of in-transit adverse events was 13.7% (31 patients had in-transit adverse event). The most common adverse event seen in adult critical-care transport in Saudi Arabia was desaturation, and a full list of adverse events is provided in Table 2. Multiple logistic regression analysis revealed that RSTP was significantly higher in patients who developed adverse events (adjusted OR: 1.36, 95% CI: 1.07–1.72 and adjusted P = 0.01). A full summary of multiple logistic regression is provided in Table 3.

In-hospital mortality and 30-day survival

The in-hospital mortality was 30.4% of patients transferred by paramedic. The 30-day survival was 68.1% (3 patients died within 30 days post-discharge). Missing data pertained to 1 patient (this patient had been discharged to a long-term care facility). Multiple logistic regression analyses showed that patients with in-hospital mortality had a higher age (adjusted OR: 1.03, 95% CI 1.01–1.05 and adjusted P < 0.01) and a higher RSTP (adjusted OR: 1.30, 95% CI: 1.06–1.60 and adjusted P < 0.01). A full summary of the multiple regression analysis is provided in Table 4.

Limitations

One important limitation of this study is the retrospective design. The risk of unmeasured confounding variables is
Table 3: Summary of results assessing which variables predict adverse events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unadjusted analysis</th>
<th>Adjusted analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (year increment)</td>
<td>1.01 (0.99-1.03)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.97-1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (female)</td>
<td>1.27 (0.58-2.74)</td>
<td>1.11 (0.46-2.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>0.82 (0.33-2.02)</td>
<td>0.53 (0.17-1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac</td>
<td>0.36 (0.11-1.13)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.02-0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>1.32 (1.17-1.49)</td>
<td>1.36 (1.07-1.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of transfer</td>
<td>1.01 (0.99-1.02)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.98-1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical ventilation</td>
<td>0.16 (0.07-0.37)</td>
<td>0.40 (0.08-1.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central IV</td>
<td>0.42 (0.15-1.16)</td>
<td>2.54 (0.65-9.86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RSTP: Risk score for transported patient; CI: Confidence interval; OR: Odds ratio

Table 4: Summary of results assessing which variables predict in hospital mortality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unadjusted analysis</th>
<th>Adjusted analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (year increment)</td>
<td>1.02 (1.01-1.03)</td>
<td>1.03 (1.01-1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (female)</td>
<td>1.24 (0.69-2.22)</td>
<td>0.98 (0.46-2.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>1.24 (0.62-2.47)</td>
<td>0.86 (0.35-2.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac</td>
<td>1.01 (0.50-2.01)</td>
<td>0.75 (0.25-2.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>1.48 (1.12-1.65)</td>
<td>1.30 (1.06-1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of transfer</td>
<td>1.02 (1.01-1.03)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.98-1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical ventilation</td>
<td>0.08 (0.04-0.17)</td>
<td>0.32 (0.08-1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central IV</td>
<td>0.14 (0.06-0.36)</td>
<td>0.78 (0.22-2.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-transit adverse event</td>
<td>6.47 (2.85-14.70)</td>
<td>2.84 (0.97-8.30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RSTP: Risk score for transported patient; CI: Confidence interval; OR: Odds ratio; IV: Intravenous line

possible. Despite our effort to obtain data from several resources (sending hospital reports, paramedics patient care reports and receiving hospital records), the risk of recall bias and the question of accuracy in providers' documentation still exists in our study. Another limitation is the narrow outcomes measured in our study; this study reports only in-transit adverse events and hospital outcomes, while other outcomes such as morbidity and length of stay were not measured. The hospital-based EMS where the study was conducted is a diverse system with different levels of training received; also, the population represented were mainly Saudi citizens which might directly impact the external validity of our study.

**Discussion**

In this retrospective chart review of critically ill adult patients transferred to a tertiary hospital by paramedics, we found that adverse events occurred in 13.7% of patients. The most common adverse events reported were desaturation 4.4% (ten patients) and hypotension 3.1% (seven patients).

Four patients (1.8%) had an in-transit cardiac arrest. Adverse events were more common in patients with a higher RSTP and less common in cardiac patients. The adverse event rate is consistent with a similar study done in the United States of America[4] but higher than the adverse events rate reported in Ontario, Canada (6.5%).[8]

The association of increased risk of developing an adverse event in patients with higher RSTP is consistent with previous studies on RSTP.[5,6] The small percentage of traumatic patients transferred by paramedics prevents the possibility of drawing a firm conclusion regarding the development of an adverse event in this group of patients. Cardiac patients were the majority of the transported patients in our study and they were less likely to have in-transit adverse events. The low rate of adverse events (6.5%) reported from Canada by Singh et al.[8] could be attributed to the different population in the Canadian study, also our study included more adverse events compared to the Singh et al., study, which only included new in-transit haemodynamic instability, new in-transit respiratory instability, in-transit death or in-transit major resuscitative procedure.

Four of our patients (<2%) developed in-transit cardiac arrests. The rate of cardiac arrest and death is comparable to rates in other studies.[9-11] These four patients were initially transported to our tertiary care facility because they had a cardiac arrest (in the previous 60 min of transfer) and they were revived successfully, but these patients were transferred urgently in critical conditions (low blood pressure, low heart rate, decreased level of consciousness and respiratory rate). Paramedics transferring critically-ill patients in Saudi Arabia had a noticeably high frequency of switching mechanically ventilated patients to ventilation by bag valve mask (BVM), when desaturation occurred, which required further analysis to investigate these actions. It is hard to conclude that such acts affected the patients’ outcomes. In many cases, paramedics intervened in the patient’s clinical status before it reached the threshold at which it could be considered an adverse event. For example, a paramedic in one of the cases switched to BVM when the patient’s SpO₂ dropped to 93% and rapidly restored the level to 99%. Furthermore, it is important to notice that the existence of mechanical ventilation (in our multiple logistic regression) did not correlate with increased patient’s risk of developing an adverse event (P = 0.26).

Patients transferred by paramedics had an in-hospital mortality of 30.4% and 30-day survival was 68.1%. The rate of in-hospital mortality is consistent with both local and internationally published data.[9,12,13]

It is planned to conduct an international expert survey to examine consensuses on the safety of paramedic intervention to adverse events. Adverse events are not always preventable. The question that remains is whether the adverse events in this study were preventable or not. The usual way to determine preventability is by means of chart (case note) review.[14,16] We planned a study of expert, implicit, review of the case note where each case would be reviewed by four
independent reviewers. The use of these many reviewers would mitigate the human low reliability of implicit case note review.[14,17]

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the rate of adverse events in adult critical patients transferred by paramedics to a tertiary care facility in Saudi Arabia is 13.7%. The most common adverse events reported were hypoxia and hypotension. The in-hospital mortality was 30.4% and 30-day survival was 68.1%. Further analysis to interventions and the root cause of adverse events are recommended. The ability of paramedics in intervening safely with patients’ adverse events should be investigated to ensure that paramedics mode of transferring inter-facility adult critical patients is safe.
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Appendix 1: Risk Score for Transported Patients (RSTP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk score for transport patients*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hemodynamics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately stable (requires volume &lt;15 ml/min in adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable (requires volume &gt;15 ml/min or inotropics or blood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrhythmias (existing or probable)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, not serious (and AMI after 48 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious (and AMI in the first 48 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECG monitoring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (desirable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (essential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intravenous line</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulmonary artery catheter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisional pacemaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (not invasive). AMI in the first 48 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (endocavity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respiration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory rate between 10 and 14 breaths/min in adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory rate between 15-35 breaths/min in adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apnoea &lt;10 or &gt;36 or irregular breathing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airway</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Guedel tube)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (intubation or tracheostomy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respiratory support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (oxygen therapy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (mechanical ventilation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS 8-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS &lt;8 and/or neurological disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prematurity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborn ≥ 2000 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborn between 1200 and 2000 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborn ≤ 1200 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technopharmacological support (see medication group table)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adopted from Markakis C et al.

Medication group table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medication group table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inotropics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasodilators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiarrhythmics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicarbonate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analgesics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiepileptics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steroids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitol 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trombolytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naloxone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoracic tube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inotropics + vasodilators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant incubator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General anaesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uterine relaxants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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