Effects of trauma quality improvement program implementation on mortality: A multi-center controlled interrupted time-series study

Johanna Berg

Date: 27 May, 2024

Pre-print

Cover page

Word count: 2988

Corresponding author

Johanna Berg, MD

Department of Global Public Health, Karolinska Institute, 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: VO Akutsjukvård och Internmedicin, Ruth Lundskogsgata 5, vån 5, 205 02, Malmö, Sweden

Author list

Johanna Berg, MD, Department of Global Public Health, Karolinska Institute, 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 Institute, 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, M.PHARM, 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, Dr Med Sc, 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, M.PHARM, 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, FCRS, 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, School of Public Health and Community Medicine, Institute of Medicine, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden
ORCID: 0000-0003-4908-2169

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 Institute, Stockholm, Sweden Function Perioperative Medicine and Intensive Care, Karolinska University Hospital, Solna, Sweden ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6069-4794

Pre-print

Key points

Question: Does implementation of a trauma quality improvement program using audit filters improve mortality in adult trauma patients?

Findings: In this prospective, multi-center, controlled interrupted time series including 10143 patients across four tertiary care hospitals in urban India we found a significant reduction of all-cause 30 day and in-hospital mortality after implementation of a trauma quality improvement program using audit filters.

Meaning: Implementation of trauma quality improvement programs, using audit filters, may reduce mortality. However, these programs require local adaptation, and their effectiveness is dependent on setting, context and the maturity of the health care system.

Abstract

Importance: Trauma causes over four million deaths annually, the majority of these 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.

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

Design: A controlled interrupted time-series study, the Trauma Audit Filter Trial (TAFT).

Setting: A prospective, multi-center study across four tertiary care hospitals in urban India.

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

Intervention: In the intervention arm, comprised of two hospitals, we implemented a trauma quality improvement program using audit filters after an observation period of one year. The remaining two hospitals, the control arm, continued baseline data collection during the entire study period, 2017 - 2022, with no intervention made.

Main Outcomes: All-cause mortality (in-hospital and at 30 days). For time series analysis, we applied segmented regression with a generalized additive model (GAM) to assess the effect on in-hospital mortality. We performed secondary analysis applying difference-in-differences analysis with linear regression to assess the effect on in-hospital and 30-day mortality. The study was not adequately powered to do time series analysis on 30-day mortality.

Results: We included 10143 patients, median age 35 (IQR 26 – 50), 83% men. Using time series analysis, we observed a significant reduction in in-hospital mortality *(32% vs 24%; OR 0.57, 95% CI 0.41-0.79, p<0.001)* in the intervention arm, with no significant change in the control arm. Using difference-in-differences analysis we found a significant reduction in

Pre-print

30-day mortality *(39% vs 26%; -0.15 95% CI -0.19 to -0.11, p<0.001)* and in-hospital mortality *(32% vs 24%; -0.11 95% CI -0.15 to -0.07, 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 what makes these programs efficient, useful and sustainable in terms of improving outcomes.

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

Introduction

Trauma causes over four million deaths per year and is the most common cause of death in the age group 10-29 years.[1] Over two million lives could be saved each year if mortality rates in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) were the same as in high-income countries (HIC).[2] The establishment of trauma systems, encompassing prevention, pre- and intra-hospital care, and rehabilitation, is associated with reduced mortality in HIC.[3–6] Trauma quality improvement programs, a core part of trauma systems, involves 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] For example, "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 identified, and corrective strategies implemented. This process is resource intensive because it requires continuous data collection and tracking of filter violations.[8,11]

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

Pre-print

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 with approximately 1500 beds and in-house clinical specialties to care for trauma patients. None of the hospitals used any structured trauma quality improvement process at time of enrollment. The study had three phases: an observation phase for 13 months in all four hospitals to establish baseline outcomes, an implementation phase for six months during which two hospitals were randomized to implement a trauma quality improvement program with audit filters, followed by an intervention phase for 42 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 review data quality and identify unexpected changes in outcomes.

Participants

Inclusion criteria and enrollment

We included adults aged 18 years and older admitted to in-hospital care with a current history of trauma, defined by ICD-10 codes V01-Y36 for external causes of morbidity and mortality, as their reason for admission. Project officers, trained in recording vital signs with standard equipment, included patients across rotating shifts (day, evening, and night). Each shift entailed six hours for enrolling new patients in the emergency department and two hours to follow-up 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 done on paper forms and then periodically entered into a digital data collection tool and uploaded to secure servers. A codebook documented all variables. Patient identifiers were not uploaded, and identification was only possible through the original paper records, which were stored locally at each hospital in compliance with local regulations. Basic data validation was done at the time of entry, and double entry of all variables was done when all data had been collected to minimize risk of transfer errors. Quality control visits were conducted each quarter with project officers from different hospitals evaluating data collection processes based on predefined criteria.

Outcomes

Our primary outcome was all-cause mortality at 30 days from arrival to hospital. This was collected from medical records if the patient died during the hospital stay; otherwise, it was obtained via telephone follow-up. We collected several secondary outcomes, including in-

Pre-print

hospital mortality, length of stay and ICU admission. Several covariates such as vital parameters, injuries and investigations were collected to allow us to describe and compare cohorts and adjust for differences in case-mix and between hospitals over time. For the retrospectively included patients, the date of admission, age, sex, mechanism of injury, and outcome (mortality or discharge from hospital) were collected.

Study execution

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

Observation phase (Month 1-13)

Participating hospitals started data collection at the same time to establish outcome baselines. Weekly meetings were held with all project officers and the core research team to identify and address any issues related to data collection or inconsistencies in uploaded data.

Implementation phase (Month 14-19)

Participating hospitals were paired so that the two hospitals with highest and lowest volumes respectively formed one pair and the two remaining hospitals formed the second pair. One pair of hospitals were then randomly selected to implement trauma audit filters, becoming intervention hospitals, while the other two remained as controls. 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[14]. A list of all implemented audit filters is included as supplementary material. A second project officer was employed at each intervention center who prospectively included patients and noted any violations to the defined audit filters by direct observation and chart reviews. A report based on this data, flagging and presenting cases with violations, was prepared for each review meeting by the core research team. Participants from the core research group attended audit filter review meetings to help facilitate the discussion and formulate corrective strategies accordingly.

Intervention phase (Months 20-42)

Intervention hospitals continued data collection, both for base data and audit filter deviations. The trauma audit review board continued to analyze deviations and identify opportunities for improvement and implement corrective strategies. The meetings were held without participation from the core research team. Three months after the

Pre-print

intervention phase started, the largest intervention hospital opened a dedicated trauma center. 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 institutional implementation of audit filters on outcomes.[15] This approach was chosen to allow us to accommodate for non-linearity 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. Data were pooled from intervention and control centers, by month, each observation representing averaged data for all patients enrolled during that month. We investigated the occurrence of autocorrelation by the Ljung-box test of residuals. We modeled a counterfactual to compare predictions with or without the intervention.

We performed secondary analysis with patient-level data for formal comparison between control and intervention arms using a linear regression difference in differences analysis while adjusting for confounders. We used R for statistical analyses,[16] adopting a 95% confidence level and 5% significance level. Application of the GAM was done using the mgcv R-package. The Holm procedure was applied to adjust for multiple tests.[17] Unadjusted pre/post analysis was done using two sample Z-test for proportions.

Subgroup and sensitivity analyses

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

Sample size considerations

The sample size requirements for interrupted time series analyses depends on several factors including model complexity, data variance and 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 during the intervention phase, and that each observation should be an aggregate of at least 100 patients.[18] Our use of a large GAM model introduces extra complexity and we estimated the need for 100 patients/arm/month with an extended intervention phase to detect whether the potential impact of the intervention. This sample size allows 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 included covariates and outcomes using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) F-test for continuous variables and the chi-squared

Pre-print

test for categorical variables. If a significant correlation was found, we conducted further investigation to determine the type of missingness. Only complete cases were included in the statistical analysis. Analysis for missing was done using the R package finalfit.[19] We calculated the Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) and the subsequent ISS based on ICD-10 codes using the R package `icdpicr`.[20]

Ethical considerations

Informed consent to take part of 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 telephonic follow-up .Ethical approvals were granted by the Swedish Ethical Review Authority, approved 2017-06-07 2017/930-31/2, as well as at all local ethical review boards for each participating hospital: Maulana Azad Medical College, MAMC - approved 2017-07-19 F.1/IEC/MAMC/(57/02/2017/No113. 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 4126 were prospectively included. We included an average of 166 (61 SD) 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. Included patients, key characteristics and number of missing are listed in Table1 for all patients, and Table2 for prospective 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 -9.5%, p<0.001)* for 30 day mortality in the prospective cohort, and 8% reduction *(95% CI -11% to -5.3%, p<0.001)* for in-hospital mortality in the total cohort. In the control arm there was no significant change for 30 day mortality, but a 3% increase in in-hospital mortality *(95% CI 0.44% to 5.0%, p=0.029)*, see Table 3.

Time series analysis for in-hospital mortality

Using time series analysis, including all 10143 prospectively and retrospectively included patients, the intervention phase was associated with a significant reduction in the odds of in-hospital mortality in the intervention arm *(OR 0.57, 95% CI 0.41-0.79, p<0.001* with no significant change in the control arm, *(OR 0.94, 95% CI 0.5-1.76, p=0.84)*. The model parameter month was not significant *(p=0.45)*, indicating no significant seasonality. The Ljung-Box test of residuals did not return any significant result, indicating no significant autocorrelation. See Figure 1.

Pre-print

Difference in differences analysis

Formally comparing the control and intervention arms in the Difference-in-Differences, including 3320 prospectively included patients, we found that the intervention was associated with a 15% reduction of 30 day mortality *(-0.15, 95% CI -0.19 to -0.11, p<0.001)* and 11% reduction of in-hospital mortality *(-0.11, 95% CI -0.15 to -0.07, p<0.001)* in the intervention arm compared to the control arm, while adjusting for sex, age, Glasgow Coma Scale score, Injury Severity Score (ISS) and shock. For patients with major trauma and potentially salvageable trauma the reduction of mortality is even more pronounced. See Table 4.

Sensitivity analysis

We performed three sensitivity analyses for the time-series analysis: excluding the implementation phase, excluding 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, which was between April 2020 and December 2020. All three show significant reduction in the odds of in-hospital mortality in the intervention arm and one, excluding the implementation phase, resulted in significant increase of in-hospital mortality in the control arm with the remaining showing no significant change in the control arm. Full results are available in the supplementary material.

Discussion

Our results indicate that the implementation of a trauma quality improvement program, using audit filters, was associated with substantial, significant reduction of both 30-day and in-hospital mortality. For severely injured patients, the effect is even more pronounced. We also identified increased use of ultrasound, intubations and admissions to the intensive care unit, 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, multiple operating rooms, improved resuscitation capabilities and increased number of ICU beds nine months after the beginning of the implementation phase. While our sensitivity analysis shows mortality reduction before the trauma center opened, it remains challenging to separate the impacts of the trauma center and the quality improvement program or determine if their effects are synergistic.

Several studies report improved mortality after trauma quality improvement implementation.[21–25] However, definitions of trauma quality improvement vary, with heterogeneous interventions reported. Most studies are retrospective, or smaller single-center studies with a pre/post design. Two studies over 20 years ago in Germany and Thailand used trauma audit filters, showing reduced mortality and improved care processes.[26,27] In more recent years, two studies from Ghana and Cameroon developed local trauma audit filters for implementation.[28,29] These filters differ substantially from those initially developed by ASCOT and later suggested in the WHO guidelines. In our

Pre-print

previous study, the usefulness of the filters derived in Ghana and Cameroon were deemed high in India, compared to filters derived from high-income countries.[14]

In HIC trauma quality improvement programs, using audit filters, have been extensively utilized and audit filters have been criticized for not being efficient in detecting opportunities for improvement and being costly[30]. In obstetric care, audit filters and audit processes have shown association with improvement in outcomes while also emphasizing the importance of local adaptation of filters to the local context[31]. This highlights that standards of care need to be developed to local priorities to ensure that improvement efforts are directed to areas that are in most need, based on local knowledge. This is especially important implemented in settings with less developed trauma systems.

The maturity level of a trauma system is linked to reduced mortality and preventable deaths.[5,32] Therefore, the effectiveness of these programs in reducing mortality likely varies with the system's maturity. In a similar urban India setting, over 50% of trauma deaths were estimated to be preventable.[33] 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, revision of cases and multidisciplinary review can be utilized to empower providers to identify areas for improvement, learn, educate and develop the care given. This can be conducted at all levels of trauma systems, even though data quality is a known barrier to this in LMICs.[24,34,35]

Our study has several limitations. Firstly, the introduction of a new trauma center likely influenced patient outcomes, posing a significant confounder. Secondly, lower than expected inclusion rates required collecting retrospective data, preventing the main time-series analysis on 30-day mortality. However, the study was well powered for the pre-post design, allowing us to estimate the effect on this outcome. Thirdly, an unexpected difference in mortality between study 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. Fourthly, the COVID-19 pandemic significantly impacted the participating centers. One intervention center was converted into a COVID-19 hospital, reducing trauma patient intake. Quarantine restrictions also decreased trauma cases overall. Despite extending the study by 18 months and adjusting for the pandemic's effects, its long-term impacts were likely beyond our ability to fully account for. The pandemic also led to the suspension of review meetings, necessitating a restart post-pandemic. Lastly, both intervention hospitals are tertiary hospitals that receive a high number of transferred patients at varying intervals after trauma, 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 have 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 a growing knowledge base on how to select and adapt audit filters and implement the review process, but there is a paucity in our understanding of how this then translates into changes in the process of care and ultimately outcomes. There is also a need for better understanding of the implementation and sustainability of these programs in complex health care systems,

Pre-print

how to best tailor implementation to local needs and detect potential negative effects, especially on other patient populations also competing for resources for care.

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 remains to understand what makes these programs efficient, useful and sustainable in terms of improving outcomes.

Pre-print

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Johan von Schreeb, professor at the department of Global Public Health at the Karolinska Institute and Charles Mock, Professor Emeritus of Surgery and Epidemiology, University of Washington for their valuable input during this entire 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.

Pre-print

Tables and figures

Figure 1: Time series analysis



Pre

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)	411 (12)	457 (32)	1,025 (24)
Missing	4	41	2	9

Pre-print

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)	487 (65)	1,165 (75)
Missing	53	142	185	173
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 (%)	17 (3.0)	24 (2.8)	133 (14)	171 (10.0)
Missing	8	22		
Died in hospital, n (%)	42 (7.3)	79 (9.1)	301 (32)	406 (24)
Missing	4	18	1	0
Dead at 30 days after arrival, n (%)	46 (8.5)	86 (11)	328 (39)	436 (26)
Missing	42	88	101	19

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.

Pre-print

Table 3: Absolute difference in mortality, comparing observation and intervention phases

All included patients n = 10143								
	Control arm				Intervention arm			
Characteristic	**Intervention phase**, N = 3,565	**Observation phase**, N = 832	**Difference (95% CI)**[1,2]	**p-value**[1]	**Intervention phase**, N = 4,310	**Observation phase**, N = 1,436	**Difference (95% CI)**[1,2]	**p-value**[1]
Died in hospital, n (%)	411 (12)	74 (8.9)	2.7% (0.44% to 5.0%)	0.029	1,025 (24)	457 (32)	-8.0% (-11% to -5.3%)	<0.001
Missing	41	4			9	2		

Prospectively included patients n = 4126								
	Control arm				Intervention arm			
Characteristic	**Intervention phase**, N = 888	**Observation phase**, N = 583	**Difference (95% CI)**[1,2]	**p-value**[1]	**Intervention phase**, N = 1,717	**Observation phase**, N = 938	**Difference (95% CI)**[1,2]	**p-value**[1]
Dead at 30 days after arrival, n (%)	86 (11)	46 (8.5)	2.2% (-1.1% to 5.6%)	0.21	436 (26)	328 (39)	-14% (-18% to -9.5%)	<0.001
Missing	88	42			19	101		

[1]Two sample test for equality of proportions

[2]CI = Confidence Interval

Pre-print

Table 4: Difference-in-differences analysis n=3320

Characteristic	**All patients**(n=3320)		**Major trauma**(n=1715)			**Potentially salvageable trauma**(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	0.08 (0.01 to 0.14)	0.017	0.02 (-0.06 to 0.09)	0.66	>0.9	0.08 (0.00 to 0.17)	0.063	0.2
Outcome: In-Hospital Mortality								
Intervention Effect	-0.11 (-0.15 to -0.07)	<0.001	-0.21 (-0.30 to -0.12)	<0.001	<0.001	-0.22 (-0.33 to -0.12)	<0.001	<0.001
Sex	0.00 (-0.02 to 0.02)	0.91	-0.02 (-0.05 to 0.02)	0.33	0.7	0.00 (-0.04 to 0.04)	0.96	>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	0.002
Injury Severity Score (ISS)	0.00 (0.00 to 0.00)	0.053	-0.01 (-0.01 to 0.00)	<0.001	< 0.001	0.01 (-0.01 to 0.02)	0.42	0.8
Glasgow coma scale	-0.08 (-0.08 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	0.10 (0.04 to 0.15)	0.002	0.03 (-0.04 to 0.11)	0.40	0.7	0.10 (0.01 to 0.19)	0.022	0.066

[1]CI = Confidence Interval

[2]Holm correction for multiple testing

Pre-print

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. 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

Pre-print

15. 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

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

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

18. 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.

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

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

21. 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

22. 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

23. 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

24. 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

25. 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

26. 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.

27. 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.

Pre-print

28. 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

29. 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

30. 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

31. 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.

32. 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

33. 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

34. 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

35. 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

Pre-print