Effects of trauma quality improvement program implementation on mortality: A nonrandomized controlled trial

Johanna Berg

Date: 25 September, 2024

Cover page

Corresponding author

Johanna Berg, MD Department of Global Public Health, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden Department of Emergency and Internal Medicine, Skåne University Hospital, Malmö, Sweden
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7553-7337
Email: johanna.berg@ki.se
Telephone: +46730659092 Address: Department of Global Public Health, Karolinska Institutet, SE-171 77, Stockholm, Sweden

Author list

Johanna Berg, MD Department of Global Public Health, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden Department of Emergency and Internal Medicine, Skåne University Hospital, Malmö, Sweden. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7553-7337

Siddarth David, PhD Doctors For You, India Department of Global Public Health, Karolinska Institutet, Sweden. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4848-2358

Girish D. Bakhshi, MS, MRCSEd.Uk, FACS, Grant Government Medical College & Sir J.J. Group of Hospitals, Mumbai-400008, Maharashtra, India. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9542-4428

Debojit Basak, SSKM Hospital/IPGME&R

Shamita Chatterjee, MS, FMAS, FAIS, Department of Surgery, IPGME&R-SSKM Hospital, Kolkata, India. ORCID https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9460-108X

Kapil Dev Soni, MD, Department of Critical and Intensive Care, JPN Apex Trauma Centre, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1214-4119

Ulf Ekelund, MD, PhD, Emergency Medicine, Department of Clinical Sciences Lund, Lund University, Lund, Sweden. Department of Emergency Medicine, Skåne University Hospital, Lund, Sweden. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0951-1582

Li Felländer-Tsai, MD, PhD Division of Orthopaedics and Biotechnology, Department of Clinical Science, Intervention and Technology, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden. Reconstructive Orthopaedics, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0693-6080

Manjul Joshipura, MD Academy of Traumatology (India), Ahmedabad, India. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5891-8234

Tamal Khan, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Patna- 801507, India

Monty Khajanchi, DNB, Department of General Surgery, Seth G. S Medical College & K.E. M Hospital, Mumbai, India ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0898-6391

Mohan L N, MBBS, MS, FRCS, Vydehi Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Centre, Bangalore. India ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3503-832X

Anurag Mishra, MBBS, MS, DNB, MNAMS, FACS, FAIS Department of Surgery, Maulana Azad Medical College, New Delhi, India

Max Petzold, PhD ORCID: 0000-0003-4908-2169 School of Public Health and Community Medicine, Institute of Medicine, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

Sendhil Rajan, MBBS MS MCh FEBS FRCS Department of Surgery, Norfolk & Norwich University Hospital, Colney Ln, Colney, Norwich NR4 7UY, United Kingdom. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3161-5553

Nobhojit Roy, MS, PhD, MPH The George Institute for Global Health, India Department of Global Public Health, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

Rajdeep Singh, MS, DNB, FACS, FRCS Department of Surgery, Maulana Azad Medical College, Delhi, India. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6593-2624

Martin Gerdin Wärnberg, MD, PhD Department of Global Public Health, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden Function Perioperative Medicine and Intensive Care, Karolinska University Hospital, Solna, Sweden. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6069-4794

Abstract

Importance: Trauma causes over four million deaths annually, predominantly in low- and middle-income countries. Implementing trauma quality improvement programs may improve outcomes, and though extensively used, high-quality evidence of their effectiveness is scarce.

Aim: To assess if implementing a trauma quality improvement program using on audit filters improves trauma patients' outcomes.

Design: A controlled interrupted time-series study.

Setting: Prospective, multicenter study across four tertiary care hospitals in urban India between 2017-2022.

Participants: Adult patients admitted to participating hospitals with history a of trauma, defined as having any of the external causes listed in block V01-Y36, chapter XX of the ICD-10 as reason for admission.

Intervention: In the intervention arm (two hospitals), a trauma quality improvement program using audit filters was implemented after a one-year observation period. The control arm (two hospitals) continued baseline data collection without intervention throughout the study period.

Main outcomes: All-cause mortality (in-hospital and at 30 days). For time series analysis, segmented regression with a generalized additive model (GAM) assessed the effect on in-hospital mortality. Secondary analysis using difference-in-differences and linear regression assessed in-hospital and 30-day mortality. The study was not powered for time series analysis on 30-day mortality.

Results: We included 10143 patients, median age 35 (IQR 26 – 50), 83% men and found a crude 8% reduction *(95% CI -11% to -5.3%, p<0.001)* in in-hospital mortality and 14% reduction *(95% CI -18% to -9.6%, p<0.001)* in 30-day mortality in the intervention arm. Using time series analysis, we observed a significant reduction in in-hospital mortality *(32% vs 24%; OR 0.56, 95% CI 0.4-0.77, p<0.001)* in the intervention arm, with no significant change in the control arm. Difference-in-differences analysis found a significant reduction in 30-day mortality *(39% vs 26%; DiD estimate -0.15 95% CI -0.19 to -0.11, p<0.001)* and in-hospital mortality *(32% vs 24%; DiD estimate -0.12 95% CI -0.16 to -0.09, p<0.001)*. However, external factors such as the opening of a dedicated trauma center at one intervention hospital and the COVID-19 pandemic may have influenced these results.

Conclusion: Implementing a trauma quality improvement program using audit filters may reduce mortality. More research is needed to confirm these findings across different settings and to understand by which mechanisms these programs mediate the effect and ensure sustainability in terms of improving outcomes.

Trial registration: Trauma Audit Filter Trial, ClinicalTrials.gov ID NCT03235388, https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT03235388

Introduction

Trauma causes more than four million deaths per year and is the most common cause of death in individuals aged 10-29 years[1]. Over two million lives could be saved each year if mortality rates in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) were the same as those in high-income countries (HICs).[2] The establishment of trauma systems, encompassing prevention, pre- and intrahospital care, and rehabilitation, is associated with reduced mortality in HICs.[3–6] Trauma quality improvement programs, a core part of trauma systems, involve an ongoing process that includes identifying deviations from care standards, analyzing these findings, evaluating factors for improvement, and implementing corrective action plans to improve patient care.[7–9]

Audit filters, in some areas referred to as process quality indicators, are predefined statements that represent ideal care standards.[8,10] An example of an audit filter is "Patients with a Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) score of less than 8 should receive a definitive airway." These filters are used to flag individual patient cases so that the care can be reviewed, potential opportunities for improvement can be identified, and corrective strategies can be implemented. This process is resource intensive because it requires continuous data collection and filter violation tracking.[8,11]

The American College of Surgeons released the first 22 trauma audit filters as a part of the guidelines on trauma care in 1987[12]. Since then, the use of audit filters has been widely applied in HIC and recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO) as a way to meet the global demand for improved care of individuals with injures, despite the lack of evidence that doing so improves patient outcomes. A 2009 systematic Cochrane review on trauma audit filters revealed no studies of sufficient quality for inclusion.[11] Our aim was therefore to assess whether implementing a trauma quality improvement program using audit filters improves trauma patient outcomes.

Methods

Study design and setting

We conducted a controlled interrupted time series study across four hospitals in urban India (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier NCT03235388[13]). All tertiary care hospitals have approximately 1500 beds and in-house clinical specialties to care for trauma patients. None of the hospitals used any structured trauma quality improvement process. The study had three phases: an observation phase lasting 14 months in all four hospitals to establish baseline outcomes, an implementation phase lasting six months, during which two hospitals were randomized to implement a trauma quality improvement program with audit filters, and an intervention phase lasting 41 months. The intervention phase was extended by 18 months due to the COVID-19 pandemic. We performed an interim analysis 15 months after the initiation of the intervention to asses the quality of the data and identify unexpected changes in outcomes. We followed the TREND checklist for reporting of non-radomized clinical trials.[14]

Participants

Inclusion criteria and enrollment

We included adults aged 18 years and older admitted for in-hospital care with a history of trauma, defined by International Classification of Diseases, tenth revision (ICD-10) codes V01-Y36 for external causes of morbidity and mortality, as the reason for admission. Project officers were trained to record vital signs with standard equipment for patients across rotating shifts (day, evening, and night). Each shift comprised six hours for enrolling new patients in the emergency department and two hours for follow-up of previously included patients. We also included patients retrospectively due to unexpectedly low prospective inclusion rates, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic. Using hospital records, we identified all trauma patients admitted monthly to each hospital and collected data retrospectively from a random sample of these patients.

Data collection and management

Initial data collection was performed using paper forms, and the data were then periodically entered into a digital data collection tool and uploaded to secure servers. Patient identifiers were not uploaded, and identification was only possible through the original paper records, which were stored at each hospital in compliance with local regulations. Basic data validation was performed at the time of entry, and double entry of all variables was performed after all the data had been collected to minimize the risk of transfer errors. Quality control visits were conducted each quarter with project officers from different hospitals evaluating the data collection processes based on predefined criteria.

Outcomes

Our primary outcome was all-cause mortality at 30 days after admission to the hospital. This information was collected from medical records if the patient died during the hospital stay; otherwise, it was obtained via telephone follow-up. We collected data on secondary outcomes, including in-hospital mortality, length of stay and intensive care unit (ICU) admissions. Data on several covariates, such as vital parameters, injury type and examinations, were collected to allow us to describe and compare cohorts and adjust for case-mix differences and differences between hospitals over time. For the retrospectively included patients, data on the date of admission, age, sex, mechanism of injury, and in-hospital mortality were collected.

Study execution

One principal investigator and one coprincipal investigator were recruited for each participating hospital. These were all experienced trauma clinicians with extensive local knowledge and research interest.

Observation phase (Month 1-14)

The participating hospitals started data collection at the same time to establish baseline outcomes. Weekly meetings were held with all project officers and the core research team to identify and address any issues related to data collection.

Implementation phase (Month 15-20)

The participating hospitals were paired so that the two hospitals with the highest and lowest volumes formed one pair, and the two remaining hospitals formed the second pair. One pair of hospitals was then randomly selected to implement trauma audit filters, becoming intervention hospitals, while the other two were control hospitals. The process of data collection remained the same at all sites. At the intervention hospitals, a two-day session on the background and rationale of trauma audit filters was held by representatives from the core research team. This session was attended by a multidisciplinary team of surgeons/physicians, anesthetists, administrators and nurses involved in trauma care. A local trauma audit review board was established at each intervention hospital.

We conducted an anonymous Delphi survey at each intervention site to select audit filters[15]. A list of implemented audit filters is included as supplementary material. A second project officer, who prospectively included patients and noted any violations to the defined audit filters by direct observation and chart reviews, was employed at each intervention center. A report based on these data, flagging and presenting cases of violations, was prepared by the core research team for each review meeting. Participants from the core research team attended audit filter review meetings to facilitate the discussion and formulate corrective strategies accordingly.

Intervention phase (Months 21-42)

The intervention hospitals continued the data collection, both for base data and for audit filter deviations. The trauma audit review board continued to analyze deviations, implementing corrective strategies. The meetings were held without participation from the core research team. Three months after the intervention phase started, the largest intervention hospital opened a dedicated trauma center. The control hospitals continued with base data collection.

Statistical analysis

For our primary analysis, we applied a segmented generalized additive model (GAM) to assess the impact of the intervention on outcomes.[16] This approach was chosen to allow us to accommodate for nonlinearity in the intervention effect while adjusting for potential autocorrelation, seasonality, and case-mix differences. We adjusted for month using a cubic spline with 12 knots to allow for seasonality. The data were pooled from the intervention and control centers by month, with each observation representing averaged data for all patients during that month. We investigated the occurrence of autocorrelation by the Ljung-Box test. We developed a counterfactual model to compare predictions with or without the intervention.

We performed a secondary analysis with patient-level data for formal comparisons between the control and intervention arms using a linear regression difference-in-differences analysis while adjusting for confounders. We used R for the statistical analyses[17], adopting a 95% confidence level and 5% significance level. A GAM was applied using the mgcv R package. The Holm procedure was applied to adjust for multiple tests.[18] Unadjusted pre/post analyses were performed using two-sample Z tests for proportions.

Subgroup and sensitivity analyses

We conducted two prespecified subgroup analyses for *major trauma* and potentially *salvageable trauma* patients. We defined a major trauma patient as any patient who was in the hospital for more than three days with an injury severity score (ISS) >15 or who died within three days of arrival and a potentially salvageable trauma patient as any patient with 15<ISS<24. We conducted three sensitivity analyses: an analysis excluding the implementation phase, an analysis excluding the period after a trauma center opened at one intervention hospital and an analysis excluding the COVID-19 phase from the time-series model.

Sample size considerations

The sample size requirements for interrupted time series analyses depend on several factors, including model complexity, data variance and the temporal spread of observations. For our primary analysis, we chose to adhere to published guidelines stating that at least twelve observations are needed during the observation phase and twelve observations are needed during the intervention phase and that each observation should be an aggregate of at least 100 patients.[19] Our use of a large GAM introduced extra complexity, and we estimated that 100 patients/arm/month and an extended intervention

phase were needed to detect the potential impact of the intervention. This sample size allowed us to detect a reduction in mortality from 20% to 15% (power 0.8, alpha 0.05) using a pre-post design.

Missing data and data processing

We analyzed the associations between missing data for the included covariates and outcomes using ANOVA-F test for continuous variables and the chi-squared test for categorical variables. If a significant correlation was found, we conducted further investigation to determine the type of missingness. Only patients with complete data were included in the statistical analysis. Analysis for missing data was performed using the R package finalfit.[20] We calculated the Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) and the subsequent ISS based on ICD-10 codes using the R package icdpicr.[21]

Ethical considerations

The need for informed consent to participate in the intervention was not deemed applicable, and we were granted waivers of informed consent for recording vital signs, demographic parameters and in-hospital outcomes. The project officers obtained written consent for telephone follow-up. Ethical approval was granted by the Swedish Ethical Review Authority (approved 2017-06-07 2017/930-31/2), as well as by all local ethical review boards at each participating hospital (Maulana Azad Medical College (MAMC) - approved 2017-07-19 F.1/IEC/MAMC/(57/02/2017/No 113. SSKM/IPGME&R, Kolkata – approved 2017-08-21, IPGME&R/IEC/2017/396. JJ Hospital, Mumbai – approved 2017-08-22, No. IEC/Pharm/CT/111/A/2017. St. Johns, Bangalore – approved 2017-08-24, 160/2017).

Results

We included 10143 patients between October 2017 and October 2022. Of these patients, 4126 were prospectively included (Figure 1). We included an average of 166 standard deviation (SD) (61) patients per month, 45 out of 61 months did not reach the target number of inclusions, due to low inclusion rates and lower number of patients during COVID-19. The included patients, key characteristics and number of missing data are listed in Table1 for all patients and Table2 for prospectively included patients. We found no significant association between missing data and the predictors used, except for one month in the control arm, which is unlikely to influence the results of the time series analysis. In the intervention arm, we prospectively screened 1454 patients for audit filter violations. A complete list of audit filters, filters with the most violations and additional details on missing data is available in the supplementary material.

In the intervention arm, the intervention phase was associated with an absolute 14% reduction *(95% CI -18% to -9.6%, p<0.001)* in the 30-day mortality rate in the prospectively included cohort, and an 8% reduction *(95% CI -11% to -5.3%, p<0.001)* in the in-hospital mortality rate in the total cohort. For patients with major trauma, we found a 31% reduction *(95% CI -36% to -26%, p<0.001)* in 30-day mortality, and a 26% reduction *(95%*

CI -31% to 20%, p<0.001) in in-hospital mortality. In the control arm there was no significant change in the 30-day mortality, but a 3% increase in the in-hospital mortality rate *(95% CI 0.38% to 5.0%, p=0.032)*. For patients with major trauma, there was a 15% increase *(95% CI 3.2% to 28%, p=0.016)* in in-hospital mortality, and a 15% increase in 30-day mortality *(95% CI 2.3% to 27%, p=0.023)*

Time series analysis for in-hospital mortality

The time series analysis of all 10143 included patients revealed that the intervention phase was associated with a significant reduction in the odds of in-hospital mortality in the intervention arm *(odds ratio (OR): 0.56, 95% CI 0.4-0.77, p<0.001* while no significant change was detected in the control arm, *(OR: 0.94, 95% CI 0.5-1.75, p=0.83)* (Figure 2).The parameter month was not significant *(p=0.48)*, indicating no significant seasonality. The Ljung-Box test of residuals did not return any significant results, indicating no significant autocorrelation.

Difference in differences analysis

Formally comparing the control and intervention arms in the difference-in-differences analysis, including 3317 prospectively included patients, we found that the intervention was associated with a 15% reduction in the 30-day mortality rate *(-0.15, 95% CI -0.19 to -0.11, p<0.001)* and an 12% reduction in the in-hospital mortality rate *(-0.12, 95% CI -0.16 to -0.09, p<0.001)* in the intervention arm compared to the control arm after adjusting for sex, age, GCS score, Injury Severity Score (ISS) and shock. For major trauma and potentially salvageable trauma patients the reduction in the mortality was more pronounced (Table 3).

Sensitivity analysis

We performed three sensitivity analyses for the time-series analysis: excluding the implementation phase, excluding the time after the trauma center opened and excluding the main COVID-19 period. We defined the exclusion period for COVID-19 as the time when we were not able to include prospective patients, April 2020 and December 2020. All analyses showed a significant reduction in the in-hospital mortality rate in the intervention arm. One analysis, excluding the implementation phase, revealed in a significant increase in the in-hospital mortality rate in the control arm, with the remaining analysis showing no significant change in the control arm. Results are available in the supplementary material.

Discussion

Our results indicate that implementing a trauma quality improvement program using audit filters was associated with a substantial, significant reduction in both 30-day and in-hospital mortality rates. For severely injured patients, the effect is more pronounced. We also observed increased use of ultrasound, intubations and admissions to the ICU, reflecting changes in care processes in alignment with the audit filters. However, the largest hospital in the intervention arm opened a trauma center equipped with in-house CT scanner, multiple operating rooms, improved resuscitation capabilities and an increased

number of ICU beds nine months after the beginning of the implementation phase. Although our sensitivity analysis revealed a decrease in mortality before the trauma center opened, it remains challenging to separate the impacts of the trauma center and the quality improvement program or determine whether their effects were synergistic.

Several studies have reported improved mortality after trauma quality improvement implementation[22–26]. However, definitions of trauma quality improvement vary, with heterogeneous interventions reported. Two studies conducted over 20 years ago in Germany and Thailand used trauma audit filters and reported reduced mortality and improved care processes[27,28]. In more recent years, two studies from Ghana and Cameroon developed local trauma audit filters for implementation[29,30]. These filters differ substantially from those initially developed by ASCOT and later suggested in the WHO guidelines. In our previous study, the usefulness of the filters developed in Ghana and Cameroon was deemed high in India, compared filters developed in HICs.[15]

In HIC trauma quality improvement programs and audit filters have been criticized for being inefficient in detecting opportunities for improvement and being costly.[31] In obstetric care, audit processes have shown to improve outcomes while also emphasizing the importance of adaption[32], highlighting that standards of care need to be developed considering local priorities and knowledge to ensure that improvement efforts are directed to areas in greatest need. This is especially important in settings with less developed trauma systems.

The maturity level of a trauma system is linked to reduced mortality and preventable deaths.[5,33] Therefore, the effectiveness of these programs in reducing mortality likely varies with system maturity. In a similar urban Indian setting, over 50% of trauma deaths where estimated to be preventable.[34] Our results can likely be generalized to settings with similarly mature trauma systems, tough local adaptations and contextual factors greatly influence their success. The core process of data collection, case revision and multidisciplinary review can be utilized to empower providers to identify areas for improvement, learning, education to develop of the care provided. This can be conducted for trauma systems at all levels, even though data quality is a known barrier to this in LMICs.[25,35,36]

Our study has several limitations. First, the introduction of a new trauma center likely influenced patient outcomes, posing a significant confounder. Second, lower than expected inclusion rates required the collection of retrospective data, preventing the main time-series analysis of 30-day mortality. However, the study was well powered for the pre-post design, allowing us to estimate the effect of the program on this outcome. Third, an unexpected difference in mortality between the experimental arms required more power to detect changes in the control arms. Using a difference-in-differences approach, we relied on trends in the control centers rather than mortality levels. Fourth, the COVID-19 pandemic significantly impacted the participating centers. One intervention center was converted to a COVID-19 hospital, reducing trauma patient intake. Quarantine restrictions also decreased the overall number of trauma patients. Despite extending the study by 18 months and adjusting for the pandemic's effects in the sensitivity analysis, its long-term impacts were likely beyond our ability to fully account for. The pandemic led to the

suspension of review meetings, necessitating a restart postpandemic. Last, both intervention hospitals receive a high number of transferred patients at varying intervals after the time of injury, potentially introducing bias, as patients may have died before arriving at the study hospital.

Despite these limitations, this is the first quasi-experimental study attempting to assess the impact of quality improvement programs using audit filters on patient outcomes. We conducted a broad and comprehensive statistical analysis that supports our main findings, which are also in alignment with previous research. We believe that there is knowledge on how to select and adapt audit filters and implement a review process, but our understanding of how this translates into changes in care and outcomes is lacking. We also need better understanding of the implementation and sustainability of these programs in complex health care systems, including how to best tailor them to local needs and detect potential negative effects, especially for other patient populations also competing for care resources.

In conclusion, our results suggest that system-level changes and data-driven quality improvement programs using audit filters may reduce mortality in trauma patients. However, the challenge to understand what makes these programs effective, useful and sustainable in terms of improving outcomes remains.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Johan von Schreeb, professor at the department of Global Public Health at the Karolinska Institutet and Charles Mock, Professor Emeritus of Surgery and Epidemiology, University of Washington for their valuable input during this project. A warm thank you to Manjula Ranagatti and all project officers that have dedicated their time and expertise to this project and ensuring the quality of data collection.

JB and MGW had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Author contributions

MGW conceived the study and has been the PI. MGW, KS, MK, NR, SD, LFT, and MP contributed to the design of the study. SD was the project manager during study execution. MGW, KS, MK, NR, SD, JB, MJ, SR, MLN, RS, AM, SC, GB, DB, TK contributed to the execution of the study. JB prepared the data and conducted the statistical analysis. MGW and MP reviewed the results of the statistical analysis. JB drafted the first version of the article. All authors contributed to interpretation of data and critical revisions of the work for important intellectual content. MGW is the guarantor.

Funding

This work was supported by the Swedish Research Council (2016-02041).

Competing interests

Non declared.

Tables and figures

Figure 1: Flow chart

Figure 2: Interrupted time-series analysis

Table 1: All included patients, n = 10143

Characteristic	Control arm		Intervention arm	
	Observation phase, N = 832	**Intervention phase**, N = 3,565	**Observation phase**, N = 1,436	**Intervention phase**, N = 4,310
Age, Median (IQR)	32 (25, 46)	35 (25, 48)	36 (25, 50)	36 (26, 51)
Missing	1	19	0	6
Sex male, n (%)	667 (80)	2,939 (83)	1,148 (80)	3,612 (84)
Missing	2	10	1	10
Transfers, n (%)	466 (71)	1,196 (74)	1,250 (90)	2,448 (80)
Missing	175	1,957	42	1,255
Type of injury, n (%)				
Assault	70 (8.4)	299 (8.7)	100 (7.0)	215 (5.0)
Burns	27 (3.2)	149 (4.4)	51 (3.6)	88 (2.1)
Fall	197 (24)	753 (22)	339 (24)	840 (20)
Intentional self-harm	6 (0.7)	35 (1.0)	17 (1.2)	12 (0.3)
Other accident, not violence	109 (13)	306 (8.9)	79 (5.5)	111 (2.6)
Transport accident	405 (49)	1,815 (53)	840 (59)	3,019 (70)
Undetermined intent	17 (2.0)	65 (1.9)	7 (0.5)	6 (0.1)
Missing	1	143	3	19
Died in hospital, n (%)	74 (8.9)	409 (12)	455 (32)	1,016 (24)
Missing	4	41	2	10

Table 2: All prospectively included patients, n = 4126

Characteristic	Control arm		Intervention arm	
	Observation phase, N = 583	Intervention phase, N = 888	Observation phase, N = 938	Intervention phase, N = 1,717
Age, Median (IQR)	31 (24, 45)	34 (25, 46)	40 (25, 55)	37 (27, 52)
Missing	1	2		
Sex male, n (%)	470 (81)	720 (81)	729 (78)	1,438 (84)
Glasgow coma scale, Median (IQR)	15 (15, 15)	15 (15, 15)	15 (8, 15)	12 (9, 15)
Missing	17	38	5	6
Shock, n (%)	5 (0.9)	18 (2.1)	54 (5.9)	25 (1.5)
Missing	22	34	20	14
Injury Severity Score (ISS), Mean (SD)	6 (8)	7 (8)	12 (8)	13 (7)
Missing	50	134	164	166
Major trauma, n (%)	103 (19)	155 (21)	486 (65)	1,164 (75)
Missing	53	142	186	174
CT done, n (%)				
Before arrival	11 (2.4)	32 (4.6)	506 (54)	833 (51)
No	219 (48)	302 (43)	137 (15)	101 (6.2)
Yes	227 (50)	363 (52)	293 (31)	688 (42)
Missing	126	191	2	95
Ultrasound done, n (%)				
Before arrival	0 (0)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	31 (1.9)
No	258 (58)	341 (52)	908 (97)	1,455 (89)
Yes	187 (42)	312 (48)	22 (2.4)	147 (9.0)
Missing	138	234	6	84
Intubated, n (%)				
Before arrival	8 (2.0)	6 (1.1)	2 (0.2)	2 (0.1)
No	350 (89)	496 (90)	907 (97)	1,203 (76)
Yes	34 (8.7)	50 (9.1)	24 (2.6)	377 (24)
Missing	191	336	5	135
Admitted to ICU, n (%)	62 (16)	109 (20)	13 (1.4)	77 (4.9)
Missing	197	340	12	148
Dead at 24 hours after arrival, n (%)	14 (2.4)	17 (1.9)	99 (11)	109 (6.3)
Missing	4	7	1	0
Died in hospital, n (%)	42 (7.3)	79 (9.1)	300 (32)	405 (24)
Missing	4	18	1	0
Dead at 30 days after arrival, n (%)	46 (8.5)	85 (11)	328 (39)	435 (26)
Missing	43	94	102	20

Shock is defined as systolic blood pressure < 95 mmHg with heart rate > 100 beats per minute at arrival. Major trauma defined as ISS > 15 and admitted for more then three days, or, died within three days.

Table 3: Difference-in-differences analysis n=3317

Characteristic	**All patients**(n=3317)		**Major trauma patients**(n=1714)			**Potentially salvageable trauma patients**(n=1505)		
	Beta (95% CI)[1]	**p-value**	**Beta (95% CI)**[1]	**p-value**	**Adj. P-value**[2]	**Beta (95% CI)**[1]	**p-value**	**Adj. P-value**[2]
Outcome: 30 Day Mortality								
Intervention Effect	-0.15 (-0.19 to -0.11)	<0.001	-0.24 (-0.33 to -0.15)	<0.001	<0.001	-0.26 (-0.37 to -0.15)	<0.001	<0.001
Sex	0.00 (-0.02 to 0.02)	0.97	-0.01 (-0.05 to 0.02)	0.50	>0.9	0.00 (-0.04 to 0.04)	0.93	>0.9
Age	0.00 (0.00 to 0.00)	<0.001	0.00 (0.00 to 0.00)	<0.001	0.001	0.00 (0.00 to 0.00)	<0.001	0.003
Injury Severity Score (ISS)	0.00 (0.00 to 0.00)	0.13	-0.01 (-0.01 to 0.00)	<0.001	<0.001	0.01 (-0.01 to 0.02)	0.49	>0.9
Glasgow coma scale	-0.08 (-0.09 to -0.08)	<0.001	-0.09 (-0.10 to -0.09)	<0.001	<0.001	-0.09 (-0.10 to -0.09)	<0.001	<0.001
Shock	0.07 (0.01 to 0.14)	0.017	0.02 (-0.06 to 0.09)	0.67	>0.9	0.08 (0.00 to 0.17)	0.063	0.2
Outcome: In-Hospital Mortality								
Intervention Effect	-0.12 (-0.16 to -0.09)	<0.001	-0.24 (-0.33 to -0.15)	<0.001	<0.001	-0.25 (-0.36 to -0.14)	<0.001	<0.001
Sex	0.00 (-0.03 to 0.02)	0.81	-0.02 (-0.06 to 0.02)	0.31	0.6	0.00 (-0.04 to 0.04)	0.92	>0.9
Age	0.00 (0.00 to 0.00)	<0.001	0.00 (0.00 to 0.00)	<0.001	0.001	0.00 (0.00 to 0.00)	<0.001	0.003
Injury Severity Score (ISS)	0.00 (0.00 to 0.00)	0.21	-0.01 (-0.01 to 0.00)	<0.001	<0.001	0.01 (-0.01 to 0.02)	0.38	0.8
Glasgow coma scale	-0.08 (-0.09 to -0.08)	<0.001	-0.09 (-0.10 to -0.09)	<0.001	<0.001	-0.09 (-0.09 to -0.09)	<0.001	<0.001
Shock	0.07 (0.01 to 0.13)	0.018	0.02 (-0.05 to 0.10)	0.59	0.6	0.08 (0.00 to 0.17)	0.055	0.2

[1]CI = Confidence Interval

[2]Holm correction for multiple testing

References

1. Global Burden of Disease Collaborative Network. Global burden of disease study 2019 (GBD 2019) results. Published online 2020. https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-results/

2. Kotagal M, Agarwal-Harding KJ, Mock C, Quansah R, Arreola-Risa C, Meara JG. Health and Economic Benefits of Improved Injury Prevention and Trauma Care Worldwide. *PLoS ONE*. 2014;9(3):e91862. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0091862

3. SHACKFORD SR, HOLLINGWORTH-FRIDLUND P, EASTMAN AB. The Effect of Regionalization upon the Quality of Trauma Care as Assessed by Concurrent Audit before and after Institution of a Trauma System: A Preliminary Report. *J Trauma*. 26(9):812. doi:10.1097/00005373-198609000-00006

4. Davenport RA, Tai N, West A, et al. A major trauma centre is a specialty hospital not a hospital of specialties. *BRITISH JOURNAL OF SURGERY*. 2010;97(1):109-117. doi:10.1002/bjs.6806

5. Alharbi RJ, Shrestha S, Lewis V, Miller C. The effectiveness of trauma care systems at different stages of development in reducing mortality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *World journal of emergency surgery: WJES*. 2021;16(1):38. doi:10.1186/s13017-021-00381-0

6. Celso B, Tepas J, Langland-Orban B, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis comparing outcome of severely injured patients treated in trauma centers following the establishment of trauma systems. *The Journal of trauma*. 2006;60(2):371-8; discussion 378. doi:10.1097/01.ta.0000197916.99629.eb

7. Ronald Maier, Michael Rhodes. Trauma Performance Improvement. In: *Injury Control: A Guide to Research and Program Evaluation*. Cambridge University Press; :236-249. doi:DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511530234.017

8. World Health Organization. *Guidelines for trauma quality improvement programmes*.; 2009. https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/44061

9. Juillard CJ, Mock C, Goosen J, Joshipura M, Civil I. Establishing the Evidence Base for Trauma Quality Improvement: A Collaborative WHO-IATSIC Review. *World journal of surgery*. 2009;33(5):1075-1086. doi:10.1007/s00268-009-9959-8

10. Willis CD, Gabbe BJ, Cameron PA. Measuring quality in trauma care. *Injury*. 2007;38(5):527-537. doi:10.1016/j.injury.2006.06.018

11. Evans C, Howes D, Pickett W, Dagnone L. Audit filters for improving processes of care and clinical outcomes in trauma systems. Group CI, ed. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2009;84(4):782. doi:10.1002/14651858.cd007590.pub2

12. American College of Surgeons Committee on Trauma. *Hospital and prehospital resources for optimal care of the injured patient*. American College of Surgeons; 1987.

13. The Trauma Audit Filters Trial (TAFT). https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03235388

14. Des Jarlais DC, Lyles C, Crepaz N, TREND Group. Improving the reporting quality of nonrandomized evaluations of behavioral and public health interventions: The TREND statement. *American journal of public health*. 2004;94(3):361-366. doi:10.2105/ajph.94.3.361

15. Berg J, Alvesson HM, Roy N, et al. Perceived usefulness of trauma audit filters in urban india: A mixed-methods multicentre delphi study comparing filters from the WHO and low and middle-income countries. *BMJ open*. 2022;12(6):e059948. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-059948

16. Shadish WR, Zuur AF, Sullivan KJ. Using generalized additive (mixed) models to analyze single case designs. *Journal of School Psychology*. 2014;52(2):149-178. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2013.11.004

17. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Published online 2017. https://www.r-project.org/

18. Holm S. A Simple Sequentially Rejective Multiple Test Procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*. 1979;6(2):65-70. doi:10.2307/4615733

19. Wagner AK, Soumerai SB, Zhang F, Ross-degnan D. Segmented regression analysis of interrupted time series studies in medication use research. *Journal of Clinical Pharmacy and Therapeutics*. Published online 2002:299-309.

20. Harrison E, Drake T, Pius R. *Finalfit: Quickly Create Elegant Regression Results Tables and Plots When Modelling*.; 2023. https://github.com/ewenharrison/finalfit

21. Black A, Clark D. *Icdpicr: 'ICD' Programs for Injury Categorization in r*.; 2022.

22. Hashmi ZG, Haider AH, Zafar SN, et al. Hospital-based trauma quality improvement initiatives: first step toward improving trauma outcomes in the developing world. *The journal of trauma and acute care surgery*. 2013;75(1):60-8; discussion 68. doi:10.1097/TA.0b013e31829880a0

23. Hemmila MR, Cain-Nielsen AH, Jakubus JL, Mikhail JN, Dimick JB. Association of hospital participation in a regional trauma quality improvement collaborative with patient outcomes. *JAMA surgery*. 2018;153(8):747-756. doi:10.1001/jamasurg.2018.0985

24. Juillard CJ, Mock C, Goosen J, Joshipura M, Civil I. Establishing the evidence base for trauma quality improvement: A collaborative WHO-IATSIC review. *World Journal of Surgery*. 2009;33(5):1075-1086. doi:10.1007/s00268-009-9959-8

25. Reynolds TA, Stewart B, Drewett I, et al. The Impact of Trauma Care Systems in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *Annual review of public health*. 2017;38(1):507-532. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-032315-021412

26. Dinh MM, Bein KJ, Gabbe BJ, et al. A trauma quality improvement programme associated with improved patient outcomes: 21 years of experience at an Australian Major Trauma Centre. *Injury*. 2014;45(5):830-834. doi:10.1016/j.injury.2013.11.005

27. Ruchholtz S, Waydhas C, Lewan U, et al. A multidisciplinary quality management system for the early treatment of severely injured patients: Implementation and results in two trauma centers. *Intensive Care Med*. 2002;28(10):1395-1404.

28. Chadbunchachai W, Sriwiwat S, Kulleab S, Saranrittichai S, Chumsri J, Jaikwang P. The comparative study for quality of trauma treatment before and after the revision of trauma audit filter, Khon Kaen hospital 1998. *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand = Chotmaihet thangphaet*. 2001;84(6):782-790.

29. Stewart BT, Gyedu A, Quansah R, et al. District-level hospital trauma care audit filters: Delphi technique for defining context-appropriate indicators for quality improvement initiative evaluation in developing countries. *Injury*. 2016;47(1):211-219. doi:10.1016/j.injury.2015.09.007

30. Wu N, Carvalho M, Nwanna-Nzewunwa O, et al. Developing Trauma Audit Filters for Regional Referral Hospitals in Cameroon: Mixed-Methods Approach. *The Journal of surgical research*. 2018;232:578-586. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2018.07.048

31. Willis CD, Gabbe BJ, Cameron PA. Measuring quality in trauma care. *Injury*. 2007;38(5):527-537. doi:10.1016/j.injury.2006.06.018

32. Graham W, Wagaarachchi P, Penney G, McCaw-Binns A, Antwi KY, Hall MH. Criteria for clinical audit of the quality of hospital-based obstetric care in developing countries. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2000;78(5):614-620.

33. Teixeira PGR, Inaba K, Salim A, et al. Preventable morbidity at a mature trauma center. *Archives of surgery*. 2009;144(6):536-41; discussion 541-2. doi:10.1001/archsurg.2009.82

34. Roy N, Veetil DK, Khajanchi MU, et al. Learning from 2523 trauma deaths in India-opportunities to prevent in-hospital deaths. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2017;17(1):142. doi:10.1186/s12913-017-2085-7

35. McIver R, Erdogan M, Parker R, et al. Effect of trauma quality improvement initiatives on outcomes and costs at community hospitals: A scoping review. *Injury*. Published online March 2024:111492. doi:10.1016/j.injury.2024.111492

36. Kapanadze G, Berg J, Sun Y, Gerdin Wärnberg M. Facilitators and barriers impacting in-hospital trauma quality improvement program (TQIP) implementation across country income levels: A scoping review. *BMJ open*. 2023;13(2):e068219. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-068219


Controlled interrupted time-series
Observed and predicted in-hospital mortality over time
Control arm
Intervention arm
In-hospital mortality in percent
100
75
50
25
0
Observation
Intervention
Observation
Intervention
0
20
40
60
0
20
40
60
Time in months
Observed mortality
Counterfactual
Predicted mortality


Included
Study population (n=10143)
Randomization of hospitals
Control arm (n=4,397)
Intervention arm (n=5,746)
Excluded (n=45):
• Missing in-hospital mortality (n=45)
Excluded (n=11):
• Missing in-hospital mortality (n=11)
Time-series analysis
Included i time-series analysis (n=4,352)
Included i time-series analysis (n=5,735)
Excluded (n=3,236):
• Lost to follow-up (n=115)
• Missing covariates (n=218)
• Retrospective inclusion (n=2,903)
Excluded (n=3,534):
• Lost to follow-up (n=120)
• Missing covariates (n=333)
• Retrospective inclusion (n=3,081)
Difference-in-differences analysis
Included in Difference-in-differences analysis (n=1,116)
Included in Difference-in-differences analysis (n=2,201)