Impact of a geriatric emergency management nurse on thirty-day emergency department revisits: a retrospective propensity score matched case-control study

Nathalie Germain[1,2,3], Rawane Samb[1], Émilie Côté[1], Annie Toulouse-Fournier[1,3], Joanie Robitaille[1], Stéphane Turcotte[1], Michèle Morin[1,2], Martyne Audet[1], Laetitia Bert[1,2,3], Josée Rivard[1], Audrey-Anne Brousseau[4], Lucas B. Chartier[5], Nadia Sourial[6], France Légaré[2,3,7,8], Holly O. Witteman[2,3], Clémence Dallaire[1,2,3], Chantal Kroon[1], & Patrick Archambault[1,2,3,7] on behalf of the LEARNING WISDOM investigators[1] for the Network of Canadian Emergency Researchers[9]

Word count: 4526

Abstract

Background and Objectives: Geriatric Emergency Management (GEM) nurses aim to reduce adverse outcomes by addressing unique needs of older adults seen in emergency departments (EDs), but evidence to demonstrate their impact on ED care transitions is mixed. We evaluated the impact of implementing a GEM nurse model in a local ED on thirty-day revisits using propensity score matching to control for relevant patient characteristics.

Research Design and Methods: A retrospective case-control design was used to analyze older adult patients who were triaged to a stretcher at an ED in Lévis, Québec, from October 2018 to September 2019. We used propensity score matching to compare patients who received the GEM nurse intervention with control patients who did not receive the intervention. This intervention involved a targeted geriatric ED assessment including history, physical exam, chart review, communication with caregivers and home care services, and the creation of an intervention and care transition plan to support safe discharge from the ED.

Results: Out of 21,024 patients visiting the ED over a one-year period, 7,952 were eligible for analysis, with pre-matching differences showing GEM patients were older and more frequent ED users. Propensity score matching resulted in 724 patients with no significant differences in baseline characteristics between groups. Using a Cox regression analysis, we found a non-significant 6% decrease in the risk of ED revisit within 30 days for the GEM group (HR = 0.94, p = .692).

Discussion and Implications: The GEM nursing intervention targeting better care transition plans personalized to the needs of each patient did not significantly impact thirty-day revisits to

[1] Centre de recherche intégrée pour un système apprenant en santé et services sociaux, Centre intégré de santé et services sociaux de Chaudière-Appalaches, Lévis, Québec, Canada
[2] Faculty of Medicine, Université Laval, Québec, Québec, Canada
[3] VITAM - Centre de recherche en santé durable, Québec, Québec, Canada
[4] Département de médecine familiale et médecine d'urgence, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Canada
[5] Department of Emergency Medicine, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
[6] Département de gestion, d'évaluation et de politique de santé, École de Santé Publique, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada
[7] Department of Family Medicine and Emergency Medicine, Université Laval, Québec, Québec, Canada
[8] Centre de recherche du CHU de Québec - Université Laval, Axe santé des populations et pratiques optimales en santé, Université Laval, Québec, Québec, Canada
[9] Canadian Association of Emergency Physicians, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

the ED. Further work is needed to determine the most effective specific components of such interventions to maximize future positive impact on the care transitions of older patients.

Introduction

The emergency department (ED) often lacks the specialized multidisciplinary care needed for older adults, who often experience complex comorbidities and frailty, making them the highest users of health-care services.[1] Older adults also have the highest ED use, high rates of ED revisits, and the longest length of ED stays, despite the ED being an unfriendly environment for geriatric patients.[2] Once treated and discharged, they may be more at risk to revisit the ED because they may require ongoing and frequent medical attention.

Hospital-based geriatric interventions generally have little overall effect on ED utilization, whereas outpatient, primary care or home care assessment (including geriatric assessment and management and case management) do reduce ED utilization.[3] Geriatric Emergency Management (GEM) nurses identify, assess, and liaise with older adults to identify appropriate services and practices to reduce adverse outcomes.[4] This approach may meet both the unique health and functional needs of older adults who present to the ED.

However, their impact still lacks certainty. In a systematic review,[4] GEM nurses heterogeneously contributed to reducing ED revisits, with some studies indicating a reduction,[5] others no effect,[6] and one found an increase in return ED visits.[7] Where GEM nurse positive effects have been demonstrated, they are small. At Mount Sinai Hospital in Toronto, their GEM nursing team, through proactive screening and engagement with appropriate community support, reduced avoidable admissions by 17, avoidable hospital days by 195, and saved the hospital nearly CAD$200,000 over 12 months.[8] Another program in Australia found an increased likelihood of discharge and reduced ED length of stay, without increasing the risk of mortality or revisits to the ED.[9] An ED GEM program implemented in Canada yielded mixed results: improvements occurred in cost-effectiveness, referrals to community and primary care, and in the risk of functional decline, but ED revisits increased.[7,10,11]

Models of care employed in ED service delivery and enhancement for older adults are trending toward a multidisciplinary approach (e.g., SWAT[12], TREAT[13], ASET[14] and GEDI WISE[15]). These models show heterogeneous benefits, and some are weakened by the absence of convincing rigorous evaluative research outcomes. Our objective was to conduct a quasi-experimental design to document the impact of implementing a GEM nurse model in our local ED.

Method

Design and Setting

We developed a retrospective propensity score matched case-control study of older adult patients who were triaged to a stretcher at the ED at the Hôtel-Dieu de Lévis (Lévis, Québec, Canada) between 2018-10-01 and 2019-09-30. Early revisits were defined as revisits within 30 days of discharge from the index visit. We compared and matched the characteristics of patients seen by the GEM nurse with those of patients not seen by the GEM nurse. The GEM nurse was a nurse clinician with ten years of experience. This project was authorized by the Research ethics board of the Centre de recherche du Centre intégré de santé et de services sociaux (CISSS) de

Chaudière-Appalaches (#2018-462) with a waiver of informed consent. We followed the brief guidelines for reporting a propensity score analysis and the STROBE guideline.[16,17]

Intervention and comparison

As part of a context-adapted Acute Care for Elders (ACE) intervention developed for the LEARNING WISDOM project[18] and the International ACE Collaborative[19], the GEM nurse intervention was the main intervention implemented during the study.

Patients were not randomized to the GEM nurse intervention. Instead, the intervention was focused on a pragmatic approach of targeting a specific phenotype in older adult patients that would benefit most from a GEM nurse consultation and evaluation (See Appendix A for evaluation form) and would improve ED flow.[20] Target patients were complex cases with physical and social limitations, but whose medical condition seemed stable enough to consider being discharged back to the community after their visit to the ED. Priority was given to patients with common ED complaints in this population, such as cardiac insufficiency and chronic pain, along with geriatric syndromes (e.g., loss of autonomy, confusion, falls, polypharmacy, behavioral and psychological symptoms of dementia). Additionally, the GEM nurse prioritized frequent ED users operationally defined as patients who had ED consultations in the last 7 days or a hospitalization in the last month.[21]

These patients were identified by the GEM nurse each morning by attending the daily team brief led by the ED charge nurse, and by screening the list of patients cared for in the ED observation unit. ED physicians could also refer patients to the GEM nurse. The GEM nurse also targeted patients experiencing agitation, delirium, or who had been physically restrained. For these patients, the GEM nurse provided bedside teaching to the clinical team managing the patient (i.e., bedside nurses, orderlies, and ED physicians) about senior-friendly approaches to manage agitation and delirium. The GEM nurse was available during standard weekday working hours, excluding holidays.

The intervention provided by a single GEM nurse was a targeted geriatric assessment (Appendix A) including a revision of current and past patient files, and a collection of information from the patient and validation of that information with ED staff, staff at the patient's care home or community services center, and with family. This consultation also consisted of: 1) a physical exam with particular attention paid to mobility, autonomy at home, activities of daily living, and mental state; 2) identification of risk factors for certain geriatric syndromes and patient needs; 3) the construction of an intervention plan designed to prevent falls and/or alleviate geriatric syndromes; and 4) to develop a care transition plan by organizing home care services or convalescent care, and to educate both the patient and their caregivers on the results of the consultation and on the community resources at their disposal. Controls were time-concurrent patients who did not receive the GEM nurse intervention. Because patients seen by the GEM nurse had distinct characteristics, our control group was sampled on relevant characteristics with propensity-score matching to isolate for the effect of the intervention.

Participants

We defined a patient's index visit as the first visit to the ED made by the patient during the yearlong study period (October 1st, 2018, to September 30th, 2019). Inclusion criteria included: (1) aged ≥ 65 years at the time of the index visit; (2) received care while on a stretcher in the ED

observation unit during the index visit; and (3) were discharged home or admitted to the hospital after this first visit. Patients were excluded if they died while in hospital, or if they were transferred to long-term care from hospital.

Data collection

Data were collected using a clinical administrative database (*Med-GPS*, MediaMed Technologies, Mont-Saint-Hilaire, Quebec). From this database, we selected all patients who were at least 65 years of age at the time of their index visit between 2018-10-01 and 2019-09-30. For matching, we collected covariates that were likely to be associated with an early ED revisit and that were not influenced by the GEM nurse intervention, to reduce bias. We collected the patient's age, biological sex, and whether or not they had a family doctor. Then, for the ED visit, we recorded the patient's provenance (home, care home, referred from a clinic, transferred from hospital), mode of arrival (ambulance or walk-in), major diagnostic category using the International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision, with Canadian Enhancements [ICD-10-CA], autonomy after triage (stretcher, or waiting room), time of visit (during or not during typical working hours, which were weekdays from 8AM to 6PM), orientation after the visit (admitted to the ward, or discharged home), and whether or not the patient was a frequent user of the ED. We defined frequent users as patients who consulted the ED at least 5 times in the 12 months before the index visit.[22] We also documented diagnoses or presentations associated with geriatric syndromes that would be prioritized by the GEM nurse in her practice (e.g., delirium or confusion, trauma or falls, genitourinary problems).

Statistical analysis

Data were analyzed with R (Version 4.3.1). Quantitative variables were summarized using their mean and standard deviation if normally distributed, and with the median and interquartile range if otherwise. Qualitative variables were summarized by their frequency distributions. We compared patient characteristics according to whether they were seen or not seen by the GEM nurse. We also assessed the balance of baseline covariates between matched groups with an independent samples *t*-test (if normally distributed; with the Wilcoxon rank-sum test if otherwise) and Fisher's exact test for continuous and categorical variables, respectively. To analyze the effect of the GEM nurse on the overall risk of an early ED revisit, we also report the proportion of patients who returned to the ED within 30 days based on these two groups in the matched sample.[23]

Propensity score matching

We used the *MatchIt* package in R (version 4.5.5)[24] to perform propensity score matching (PSM) using logistic regression with the optimal matching method[25] without replacement and matching in a 1:1 ratio. Our chosen model used the average treatment effect as its target estimand (ATT).[26]

Variable selection was based on clinical importance and available information in the database. Using propensity score analyses necessitate two methodological assumptions: 1) assignment to the experimental arm or the control arm is independent of the potential outcomes conditional on the observed baseline covariates, and 2) every subject had a nonzero probability to receive either the experimental condition or control. We believe that we adequately met this first assumption and that all patients included in propensity score matching could have been selected

as candidates to receive the GEM nurse intervention.[27] We used the independent samples *t*-test, Fisher's exact test, the standardized mean difference (SMD), and the risk difference (RD) to demonstrate the comparability of baseline characteristics in the GEM nurse group and the control group. There were no missing values for any of the variables included in the propensity score matching model.

Survival analysis

A Kaplan-Meier model with right-censoring was used to compare the survival curves of patients in the GEM nurse group versus the control group. Each patient had an observation period of thirty days. For each patient, the observation period started at the moment of discharge from the ED to the community. If a patient was admitted to hospital during their index visit, the observation period started at the moment of discharge from hospital to the community. In this model, if patients did not experience a revisit within 30 days of the index visit, they were right censored at day thirty-one. Any ED revisit within 30 days of the index visit was considered an event. We defined survival time as the patient's number of days within their community since discharge on the initial ED index visit. Any patients that died in community were censored from the analysis on the day of their death. We hypothesized that the GEM nurse intervention would be successful if patients experienced more days in their communities. We then conducted a univariate Cox proportional hazards model to obtain an unbiased estimate of the relative change in the hazard of an early revisit to the emergency department attributable to the GEM nurse intervention.[28]

Results

Participant characteristics

Eligible patients retrieved from the database numbered 7,952, representing approximately 35% of the 22,570 patients above age 50 who visited the Hôtel-Dieu de Lévis ED between October 1, 2018, and September 30, 2019 (See Figure 1). Important pre-matching differences in characteristics were observed for patients seen by the GEM nurse: frequent ED users were more likely to have been seen by the GEM nurse (24% in the intervention group versus 5% in the control group) and patients seen by the GEM nurse were 8 years older on average. Nearly all patients had a family doctor on file, and most were women. Thirteen patients died in their communities within thirty days of ED discharge, one of which was seen by the GEM nurse.

Matching and survival analysis

The propensity score matching yielded two groups each with 362 patients for a total of 724 patients (See Table 1). Matching variables were patient age, patient sex, arrival method, their level of autonomy after triage, triage priority (CTAS), provenance, the date of the index visit (week or weekend), the major diagnostic category, and whether the patient was a frequent user of the emergency department. Major diagnostic category and primary complaint or diagnosis could not both be used as matching variables due to multicollinearity. Adequate balance of baseline covariates was achieved as no differences in means or proportions were statistically significant. In total over thirty days, 179 patients revisited the ED, 87 in the GEM nurse group and 92 in the matched control group.

Figure 1. Recruitment flowchart of patient selection and outcomes at the Hôtel-Dieu de Lévis ED between 2018-10-01 and 2019-09-30



Table 1. Demographic characteristics of all patients before and after propensity score matching

	Before matching		After matching			
Characteristic	**Control**, N = 7590 (95.4%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (4.55%)[1]	**Control**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**p-value**[2]	**SMD or RD**
Age[3]	78.1 (8.6)	86.4 (6.4)	86.6 (7.7)	86.4 (6.4)	0.7	0.03
Sex					0.5	-0.03
Male	3,509 (46%)	123 (34%)	133 (37%)	123 (34%)		
Female	4,081 (54%)	239 (66%)	229 (63%)	239 (66%)		
Family physician					0.11	0.02
Has family physician	7,309 (96%)	356 (98%)	348 (96%)	356 (98%)		
No family physician	281 (4%)	6 (2%)	14 (4%)	6 (2%)		
Frequent ED user					0.7	-0.02
No	7,230 (95%)	275 (76%)	281 (78%)	275 (76%)		

	Before matching		After matching			
Characteristic	**Control**, N = 7590 (95.4%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (4.55%)[1]	**Control**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**p-value**[2]	**SMD or RD**
Yes	360 (5%)	87 (24%)	81 (22%)	87 (24%)		
Autonomy after triage					0.2	-0.10
Stretcher	6,332 (83%)	332 (92%)	342 (94%)	332 (92%)		
Waiting room	1,258 (17%)	30 (8%)	20 (6%)	30 (8%)		
Arrival method					0.9	-0.01
Ambulance	4,939 (65%)	333 (92%)	335 (93%)	333 (92%)		
Walk-in	2,626 (35%)	29 (8%)	27 (7%)	29 (8%)		
Adapted transport	13 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		
Police	9 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		

	Before matching		After matching			
Characteristic	**Control**, N = 7590 (95.4%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (4.55%)[1]	**Control**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**p-value**[2]	**SMD or RD**
Correctional services	3 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		
Orientation					0.084	0.07
Admitted to hospital	2,466 (32%)	134 (37%)	111 (31%)	134 (37%)		
Discharged home	5,124 (68%)	228 (63%)	251 (69%)	228 (63%)		
Triage priority					>0.9	
Priority 1	51 (1%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)		0
Priority 2	1,269 (17%)	16 (4%)	13 (4%)	16 (4%)		0.1
Priority 3	3,225 (42%)	108 (30%)	117 (32%)	108 (30%)		-0.04
Priority 4	2,897 (38%)	228 (63%)	222 (61%)	228 (63%)		0.01

	Before matching		After matching			
Characteristic	**Control**, N = 7590 (95.4%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (4.55%)[1]	**Control**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**p-value**[2]	**SMD or RD**
Priority 5	148 (2%)	9 (2%)	9 (2%)	9 (2%)		0
Provenance					>0.9	
Home	5,544 (73%)	125 (35%)	122 (34%)	125 (35%)		0.01
Retirement home	1,651 (22%)	235 (65%)	237 (65%)	235 (65%)		0
Hospital transfer	110 (1%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)		0
Medical clinic	155 (2%)	1 (0%)	2 (1%)	1 (0%)		-0.3
Other	130 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		0
Weekday or weekend					>0.9	0
Weekday	5,612 (74%)	327 (90%)	327 (90%)	327 (90%)		

	Before matching		After matching			
Characteristic	**Control**, N = 7590 (95.4%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (4.55%)[1]	**Control**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**p-value**[2]	**SMD or RD**
Weekend	1,978 (26%)	35 (10%)	35 (10%)	35 (10%)		
Discharge time at index visit					0.071	0.07
After 6PM up to 8AM	2,927 (39%)	111 (31%)	135 (37%)	111 (31%)		
Between 8AM and 6PM	4,663 (61%)	251 (69%)	227 (63%)	251 (69%)		
Major diagnostic category					>0.9	
Circulatory system diseases	659 (9%)	14 (4%)	18 (5%)	14 (4%)		-0.13
Digestive system diseases	439 (6%)	7 (2%)	10 (3%)	7 (2%)		-0.18
Endocrine, nutritional and metabolic diseases	101 (1%)	4 (1%)	4 (1%)	4 (1%)		0
Genitourinary system diseases	197 (3%)	6 (2%)	2 (1%)	6 (2%)		0.5

	Before matching		After matching			
Characteristic	**Control**, N = 7590 (95.4%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (4.55%)[1]	**Control**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**p-value**[2]	**SMD or RD**
Infectious and parasitic diseases	171 (2%)	7 (2%)	5 (1%)	7 (2%)		0.16
Mental disorders	258 (3%)	49 (14%)	51 (14%)	49 (14%)		-0.02
Musculoskeletal system and connective tissue diseases	331 (4%)	20 (6%)	23 (6%)	20 (6%)		-0.07
Nervous system diseases	161 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		0
Respiratory system diseases	469 (6%)	25 (7%)	25 (7%)	25 (7%)		0
Traumatic injuries	1,081 (14%)	145 (40%)	141 (39%)	145 (40%)		0.01
Other	3,723 (49%)	85 (23%)	83 (23%)	85 (23%)		0.01
Primary complaint or diagnosis					0.2	
Cardiovascular and cerebrovascular complaints and	1,431 (19%)	20 (6%)	25 (7%)	20 (6%)		-0.11

Characteristic	Before matching		After matching			
	Control, N = 7590 (95.4%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (4.55%)[1]	**Control**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**p-value**[2]	**SMD or RD**
diagnoses						
Confusion or delirium	260 (3%)	53 (15%)	46 (13%)	53 (15%)		0.07
Edema, trouble walking, or joint pain	333 (4%)	20 (6%)	24 (7%)	20 (6%)		-0.09
Falls, syncope, vertigo, or weakness	511 (7%)	23 (6%)	9 (2%)	23 (6%)		0.43
Fever or hypothermia	215 (3%)	5 (1%)	7 (2%)	5 (1%)		-0.16
Gastrointestinal problems	621 (8%)	12 (3%)	16 (4%)	12 (3%)		-0.14
Respiratory problems	798 (11%)	33 (9%)	37 (10%)	33 (9%)		-0.06
Trauma, fractures, or lesions	1,090 (14%)	147 (41%)	136 (38%)	147 (41%)		0.04
Urinary tract infections or urinary retention	104 (1%)	5 (1%)	2 (1%)	5 (1%)		0.43

	Before matching		After matching			
Characteristic	**Control**, N = 7590 (95.4%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (4.55%)[1]	**Control**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**GEM**, N = 362 (50.0%)[1]	**p-value**[2]	**SMD or RD**
Other	2,227 (29%)	44 (12%)	60 (17%)	44 (12%)		-0.15

[1] Mean (SD); n (%)
[2] Two Sample t-test; Fisher's exact test; Fisher's Exact Test for Count Data with simulated p-value (based on 2000 replicates)
[3] Matched variables are italicized
Abbreviations: GEM: Geriatric Emergency Management; SMD: standardized mean difference (continuous variables); RD: risk difference (absolute; categorical values)

We conducted a Cox proportional-hazards regression analysis with the effect of the GEM nurse as the sole predictor variable, having already controlled for covariates with matching. The assumption of proportional hazards was met ($\chi^2 = 0.14$, $p = .71$). The GEM nurse intervention was associated with a 6% reduction in the risk of returning to the ED within 30 days, but this association was not statistically significant (Hazard Ratio (HR) = 0.94, 95% CI = [0.70, 1.26], $p = .692$). Figure 2 presents survival curves and a risk table with ten-day intervals. The unadjusted estimate without matched cohorts demonstrated that patients seen by the GEM nurse were at a higher risk of ED revisit than all older adult patients visiting the ED (HR = 1.36, 95% CI = [1.1, 1.7], $p = .005$).



Figure 2. Survival curves and risk table for early revisits to the ED among the propensity-matched sample. The *y*-axis is the probability of success (not returning to the ED), and the *x*-axis is the number of days spent in community after ED discharge. The red solid line denotes the survival curve of the control group, and the blue dotted line the curve of the GEM nurse group. Plus marks (+) indicate censors. Shaded areas denote the 95% confidence intervals.

Discussion

We used a propensity-score matched design to assess the impact of implementing a GEM nurse model in our local ED, controlling for baseline factors related to both being an ideal candidate

for the intervention, and the risk of an early ED revisit. We found that—contrary to our hypothesis—the GEM nurse intervention was not associated with a significant decrease in the risk of thirty-day revisits to the ED. The wide confidence intervals around our estimate of a 6% lesser risk of revisit indicate that the risk of revisiting within thirty days associated with the GEM nurse intervention may be reduced by 29.3% but also increased by up to 26.3% relative to the control group.

Our results align with the conflicting literature on geriatric-focused nurse assessments and interventions in the ED.[4,29] The impact of such assessments and interventions may not impact hospitalizations, re-admissions, or ED revisits at thirty days—and in some cases—an increase in ED revisits after thirty days was observed.[30] Although several studies also reported improvements in revisits and admissions.[31] In a recent umbrella review, the evidence for ED interventions in improving patient experience and quality of life was considered to be low quality, but the effect on reducing ED revisits had considerable variability, ranging from very low to moderate.[32] In a 2024 study on transitional care teams, the thirty-day revisit rate was stable at 14% and was not affected by the transitional care team, and 71% of revisits were due to care needs unrelated to the index visit.[33] Our revisit rate of 24.7% mirrors rates from other sites, but we suspect that thirty-day revisits may not be an adequate outcome measure for assessing the impact of a GEM nurse intervention.[34]

Our GEM nurse intervention was extensive and multidisciplinary, and our patient population heterogeneous, which may make it difficult to determine which aspects of the intervention were most helpful. According to the extant literature, for discharge interventions, the most effective interventions extend beyond referral and use a clinical risk prediction tool to identify those who would most benefit from the intervention.[35] Clinical risk assessments using tools such as InterRAI ED Screener[36] or the Identification of Seniors at Risk (ISAR)[37] were not performed systematically in this study, but the GEM nurse did use a personalized structured assessment form that included screening for delirium using the Confusion Assessment Method,[38–40] functional decline, immobilization, falls, wound screening, dehydration, and incontinence (see Appendix A). Individual investigations reported had efficacy reducing ED revisits and nursing home admissions, which are attributed to telephone follow-up.[41] Follow-up has been identified by both patients and their caregivers as an element needing immediate improvement to ameliorate the quality of care transitions from the ED.[42,43] For nursing interventions, there is conflicting moderate but inconsistent agreement across the studies for the effectiveness of nurse led interventions.[30] Generally, the main weakness of these interventions arise from the fact that they do not extend past the ED to the community. Even so, GEM nurses are considered the cornerstone of geriatric emergency care and are thought to improve the quality of care, accessibility, and quality of life within our province.[44] In 2021, the Quebec ministry of health and social services recommended the implementation of a GEM nurse in every ED in the province.[45]

A single GEM nurse alone does not make an interdisciplinary geriatric emergency care team, and may not have had enough of an impact on the population level.[46] On the other hand, some studies also report changes in admission rates for control groups, indicating that comprehensive geriatric assessments and similar interventions may alter culture and practices around the risks of admission versus discharge in geriatric emergency care, as discharge may not be appropriate, even if it is considered a positive metric.[47] Because interventions can be so heterogeneous, some reviews of interventions have been undertaken to look for shared efficacious strategies.

Commonalities across three reviews indicate that appropriate assessment within the ED, bridge interventions that include planning both before and after discharge, and follow-up are the most effective components of interventions to improve outcomes for older adults attending the ED, and therefore merit implementation in the ED.[46] The GEM nurse was a critical liaison with social teams at the ED as she prioritized patients for which a discharge home was likely compromised. We also know from her accounts that some patients would revisit repeatedly, be seen by the GEM nurse, and would consequently have their file advanced in the waitlist for long-term care.

A challenge to contend with in future work is the over-reliance on using service-level measures (e.g., revisits, admissions, length of stay) to assess the efficacy of interventions at the ED.[48] Current protocols and investigations appear to be shifting towards evaluating quality of life and symptom burden as primary outcome variables while keeping service-level measures as secondary outcomes.[49] In recent and ongoing trials, both service-level measures and qualitative interviews of patients, caregivers, and treating physicians were triangulated in the assessment of the intervention.[33] The caregiver perspective merits attention from ED trialists because greater caregiver burden is linked to a greater odds of ED revisit in older adult patients.[50] A GEM nurse intervention (especially the development of the care transition plan, organization of homecare services, and educational debrief with both patients and their caregivers) may both reduce caregiver burden, and equip caregivers with strategies to keep patients living in their communities. An additional element that could be explored within GEM nurse interventions in future studies is the initiation of a discussion of goals of care, as our GEM nurse reported frequently identifying the need to discuss levels of care and catalyzed the discussion in consequence. These discussions are of critical importance to ED physicians, but are still not normalized in ED settings.[51] Broadly, caregivers are critical collaborators and informants in evaluating outcomes relevant to older adults at the ED as they can identify relevant outcomes that are not commonly captured in trials, and advocate for patients who may not be able to advocate for themselves.[52,53]

Strengths and limitations

Strengths include the rigorous use of propensity matching to enhance a quasi-experimental design with adherence to reporting guidelines, as part of a pragmatic approach within a learning health system[54], and is timely given the recognized importance of GEM nurses, evidenced by their permanent implementation in several sites within our catchment area.

The study has several limitations, including its monocentric design, reliance on a single GEM nurse, and the inability to perform propensity matching on both geriatric syndrome presentations and major diagnostic criteria. The latter of which was a challenge arising from working with clinical administrative databases. For instance, some patients presented with issues touching upon multiple systems but could only be assigned one major diagnostic category within the database at the ED. The final diagnosis within this database was frequently a primary complaint without a clear diagnosis (e.g., vertigo) and as such, these complaints required extensive cleaning and grouping. These challenges with major diagnostic criteria and primary complaints result from known limitations of administrative data. Most critically, we were unable to account for the added complexity of multiple comorbidities, terminal conditions and frailty, which are characteristics probably immutable by the GEM nurse intervention but are likely drivers of an ED revisit. In future studies, using a measure of frailty, a potential source of residual

confounding in our cohort, will be important to include to measure the impact of a GEM nurse intervention.[55]

Conclusion

The GEM nurse intervention did not significantly reduce thirty-day revisits to the ED among older adult patients matched on baseline characteristics, although we were unable to match for other relevant psycho-social and clinical characteristics, such as frailty, terminal conditions, or caregiver burden. While GEM nurses are an established and important role in ED settings, our results suggest that the precise components of a GEM nurse intervention merit further investigation due to the highly complex and personalized nature of the intervention.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the invaluable support of participating patients and their caregivers. We also thank Denis Roy, Lise Lavoie, Maryse Turcotte, Josée Chouinard, Don Melady, Samir Sinha, Marie-Soleil Hardy, Richard Fleet, Annie LeBlanc, Marcel Émond, Jean-Louis Denis, Éric Mercier, Valérie Roy, Rosalie Beaudoin, Julie Émond, Marie-Josée Sirois, Isabelle Pelletier, Marie-Hélène Savard, Vanessa Couture, Raphaëlle Giguère, Sam Chandavong, Lyna Abrougui, El Kebir Ghandour, Daniel Paré, Tom van de Belt and David Buckeridge for their support and expertise in planning and contributing to the LEARNING WISDOM project.

Funding

The LEARNING WISDOM clinical trial was funded by an Embedded Clinician Salary Award (ECRA) awarded to PMA from the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR) (#201603), a Fonds de recherche du Québec - Santé (FRQS) Senior Clinical Scholar Award (#283211), and a CIHR Project Grant (#378616). Work on this article was supported by a Master's Award: Canada Graduate Scholarships Award (CIHR) awarded to NG (#202112). The funding bodies had no role in the design of the study, collection, or analysis of the data, interpretation of the results, or writing of the manuscript. The authors do not have any conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethics approval

The protocol for this study was approved by the Centre intégré de santé et de services sociaux - Chaudière Appalaches (CISSS-CA, Québec, Canada) Ethics Review Committee (project #2018-462, 2018-007).

References

1. Stolee P, Elliott J, Giguere AM, et al. Transforming primary care for older Canadians living with frailty: mixed methods study protocol for a complex primary care intervention. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(5):e042911. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042911
2. Gruneir A, Silver MJ, Rochon PA. Emergency department use by older adults: a literature review on trends, appropriateness, and consequences of unmet health care needs. *Med Care Res Rev MCRR*. 2011;68(2):131-155. doi:10.1177/1077558710379422
3. McCusker J, Verdon J. Do geriatric interventions reduce emergency department visits? A systematic review. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2006;61(1):53-62. doi:10.1093/gerona/61.1.53
4. Leaker H, Fox L, Holroyd-Leduc J. The Impact of Geriatric Emergency Management Nurses on the Care of Frail Older Patients in the Emergency Department: a Systematic Review. *Can Geriatr J*. 2020;23(3):250-256. doi:10.5770/cgj.23.408
5. Miller DK, Lewis LM, Nork MJ, Morley JE. Controlled trial of a geriatric case-finding and liaison service in an emergency department. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 1996;44(5):513-520. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.1996.tb01435.x
6. Mion LC, Palmer RM, Meldon SW, et al. Case finding and referral model for emergency department elders: a randomized clinical trial. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2003;41(1):57-68. doi:10.1067/mem.2003.3
7. McCusker J, Dendukuri N, Tousignant P, Verdon J, Poulin de Courval L, Belzile E. Rapid Two-stage Emergency Department Intervention for Seniors: Impact on Continuity of Care. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2003;10(3):233-243. doi:10.1197/aemj.10.3.233
8. Sinha S, Asomaning N. Measuring the impact of the gem nursing role in the emergency department setting. *Innov Aging*. 2017;1(suppl_1):1347. doi:10.1093/geroni/igx004.4945
9. Wallis M, Marsden E, Taylor A, et al. The Geriatric Emergency Department Intervention model of care: a pragmatic trial. *BMC Geriatr*. 2018;18(1):297. doi:10.1186/s12877-018-0992-z
10. McCusker J, Verdon J, Tousignant P, de Courval LP, Dendukuri N, Belzile E. Rapid emergency department intervention for older people reduces risk of functional decline: results of a multicenter randomized trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2001;49(10):1272-1281. doi:10.1046/j.1532-5415.2001.49254.x
11. McCusker J, Jacobs P, Dendukuri N, Latimer E, Tousignant P, Verdon J. Cost-effectiveness of a brief two-stage emergency department intervention for high-risk elders: results of a quasi-randomized controlled trial. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2003;41(1):45-56. doi:10.1067/mem.2003.4
12. Davis RA, Dinh MM, Bein KJ, Veillard AS, Green TC. Senior work-up assessment and treatment team in an emergency department: a randomised control trial. *Emerg Med Australas EMA*. 2014;26(4):343-349. doi:10.1111/1742-6723.12256
13. Wright PN, Tan G, Iliffe S, Lee D. The impact of a new emergency admission avoidance system for older people on length of stay and same-day discharges. *Age Ageing*. 2014;43(1):116-121. doi:10.1093/ageing/aft086
14. Shanley C, Sutherland S, Tumeth R, Stott K, Whitmore E. Caring for the Older Person in the Emergency Department: The ASET Program and the Role of the ASET Clinical Nurse Consultant in South Western Sydney, Australia. *J Emerg Nurs*. 2009;35(2):129-133. doi:10.1016/j.jen.2008.05.005

15. Hwang U, Dresden SM, Rosenberg MS, et al. Geriatric Emergency Department Innovations: Transitional Care Nurses and Hospital Use. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2018;66(3):459-466.
16. Yao XI, Wang X, Speicher PJ, et al. Reporting and Guidelines in Propensity Score Analysis: A Systematic Review of Cancer and Cancer Surgical Studies. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2017;109(8):djw323. doi:10.1093/jnci/djw323
17. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2008;61(4):344-349. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008
18. Archambault PM, Rivard J, Smith PY, et al. Learning Integrated Health System to Mobilize Context-Adapted Knowledge With a Wiki Platform to Improve the Transitions of Frail Seniors From Hospitals and Emergency Departments to the Community (LEARNING WISDOM): Protocol for a Mixed-Methods Implementation Study. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2020;9(8):e17363. doi:10.2196/17363
19. El Kebir Ghandour, Sara Leblond, Sebastien Binette, et al. Implementation of the Acute Care for Elders Strategy to Improve the Quality of Care Transitions in Quebec and Ontario: a Retrospective Multiple Case Study. *Can Geriatr J CGJ*. 2023;26(4). doi:10.5770/cgj.26.679
20. Dresden SM, Hwang U, Garrido MM, et al. Geriatric Emergency Department Innovations: The Impact of Transitional Care Nurses on 30-day Readmissions for Older Adults. *Acad Emerg Med Off J Soc Acad Emerg Med*. 2020;27(1):43-53. doi:10.1111/acem.13880
21. Kahan D, Leszcz M, O'Campo P, et al. Integrating care for frequent users of emergency departments: implementation evaluation of a brief multi-organizational intensive case management intervention. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2016;16:156. doi:10.1186/s12913-016-1407-5
22. Shukla DM, Faber EB, Sick B. Defining and Characterizing Frequent Attenders: Systematic Literature Review and Recommendations. *J Patient-Centered Res Rev*. 2020;7(3):255-264. doi:10.17294/2330-0698.1747
23. Irwig L, Irwig J, Trevena L, Sweet M. Relative risk, relative and absolute risk reduction, number needed to treat and confidence intervals. In: *Smart Health Choices: Making Sense of Health Advice*. Hammersmith Press; 2008. Accessed September 11, 2024. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK63647/
24. Ho D, Imai K, King G, Stuart EA. MatchIt: Nonparametric Preprocessing for Parametric Causal Inference. *J Stat Softw*. 2011;42:1-28. doi:10.18637/jss.v042.i08
25. Gu XS, Rosenbaum PR. Comparison of Multivariate Matching Methods: Structures, Distances, and Algorithms. *J Comput Graph Stat*. 1993;2(4):405-420. doi:10.1080/10618600.1993.10474623
26. Simoneau G, Mitroiu M, Debray TP, et al. Visualizing the target estimand in comparative effectiveness studies with multiple treatments. *J Comp Eff Res*. 2024;13(2):e230089. doi:10.57264/cer-2023-0089
27. Austin PC. An Introduction to Propensity Score Methods for Reducing the Effects of Confounding in Observational Studies. *Multivar Behav Res*. 2011;46(3):399-424. doi:10.1080/00273171.2011.568786
28. Austin PC. The use of propensity score methods with survival or time-to-event outcomes: reporting measures of effect similar to those used in randomized experiments. *Stat Med*. 2014;33(7):1242-1258. doi:10.1002/sim.5984
29. Memedovich A, Asante B, Khan M, et al. Strategies for improving ED-related outcomes of older adults who seek care in emergency departments: a systematic review. *Int J Emerg Med*.

2024;17(1):16. doi:10.1186/s12245-024-00584-7
30. Malik M, Moore Z, Patton D, O'Connor T, Nugent LE. The impact of geriatric focused nurse assessment and intervention in the emergency department: A systematic review. *Int Emerg Nurs*. 2018;37:52-60. doi:10.1016/j.ienj.2018.01.008
31. Aldeen AZ, Courtney DM, Lindquist LA, Dresden SM, Gravenor SJ. Geriatric emergency department innovations: preliminary data for the geriatric nurse liaison model. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2014;62(9):1781-1785. doi:10.1111/jgs.12979
32. Conneely M, Leahy S, Dore L, et al. The effectiveness of interventions to reduce adverse outcomes among older adults following Emergency Department discharge: umbrella review. *BMC Geriatr*. 2022;22(1):462. doi:10.1186/s12877-022-03007-5
33. Pepping RMC, Vos RC, Numans ME, et al. An emergency department transitional care team prevents unnecessary hospitalization of older adults: a mixed methods study. *BMC Geriatr*. 2024;24(1):668. doi:10.1186/s12877-024-05260-2
34. Schouten B, Driesen BEJM, Merten H, et al. Experiences and perspectives of older patients with a return visit to the emergency department within 30 days: patient journey mapping. *Eur Geriatr Med*. 2022;13(2):339-350. doi:10.1007/s41999-021-00581-6
35. Karam G, Radden Z, Berall LE, Cheng C, Gruneir A. Efficacy of emergency department-based interventions designed to reduce repeat visits and other adverse outcomes for older patients after discharge: A systematic review. *Geriatr Gerontol Int*. 2015;15(9):1107-1117. doi:10.1111/ggi.12538
36. Mowbray FI, Heckman G, Hirdes JP, et al. Examining the utility and accuracy of the interRAI Emergency Department Screener in identifying high-risk older emergency department patients: A Canadian multiprovince prospective cohort study. *J Am Coll Emerg Physicians Open*. 2023;4(1):e12876. doi:10.1002/emp2.12876
37. McCusker J, Warburton RN, Lambert SD, Belzile E, de Raad M. The Revised Identification of Seniors At Risk screening tool predicts readmission in older hospitalized patients: a cohort study. *BMC Geriatr*. 2022;22(1):888. doi:10.1186/s12877-022-03458-w
38. Émond M, Boucher V, Carmichael PH, et al. Incidence of delirium in the Canadian emergency department and its consequences on hospital length of stay: a prospective observational multicentre cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8(3):e018190. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018190
39. Émond M, Grenier D, Morin J, et al. Emergency Department Stay Associated Delirium in Older Patients. *Can Geriatr J CGJ*. 2017;20(1):10-14. doi:10.5770/cgj.20.246
40. Wei LA, Fearing MA, Sternberg EJ, Inouye SK. The Confusion Assessment Method (CAM): A Systematic Review of Current Usage. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2008;56(5):823. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2008.01674.x
41. Lowthian JA, McGinnes RA, Brand CA, Barker AL, Cameron PA. Discharging older patients from the emergency department effectively: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Age Ageing*. 2015;44(5):761-770. doi:10.1093/ageing/afv102
42. Couture V, Germain N, Côté É, et al. Transitions of care for older adults discharged home from the emergency department: an inductive thematic content analysis of patient comments. *BMC Geriatr*. 2024;24(1):8. doi:10.1186/s12877-023-04482-0
43. Germain N, Jémus-Gonzalez E, Couture V, et al. Caregivers' burden of care during emergency department care transitions among older adults: a mixed methods cohort study. *BMC Geriatr*. 2024;24(1):788. doi:10.1186/s12877-024-05388-1
44. Poulin V, Mailhot-Bisson D, Turcotte-Brousseau AA. Le déploiement du rôle d'une

infirmière en pratique avancée en gériatrie à l'urgence□: une innovation en Estrie. *Soins D'urgence Rev L'Association Infirm Infirm D'urgence Qué*. 2021;2(2):35-44. doi:10.7202/1101813ar
45. Brousseau AA, Grégoire M. *Vers Un Service d'urgence Adapté Pour La Personne Âgée - Cadre de Référence*. (Ministère de la Santé et des Services sociaux, ed.).; 2021. Accessed October 3, 2024. https://numerique.banq.qc.ca/patrimoine/details/52327/4501881
46. Sinha SK, Bessman ES, Flomenbaum N, Leff B. A systematic review and qualitative analysis to inform the development of a new emergency department-based geriatric case management model. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2011;57(6):672-682. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2011.01.021
47. Jay S, Whittaker P, Mcintosh J, Hadden N. Can consultant geriatrician led comprehensive geriatric assessment in the emergency department reduce hospital admission rates? A systematic review. *Age Ageing*. 2017;46(3):366-372. doi:10.1093/ageing/afw231
48. Preston L, Oppen JD van, Conroy SP, Ablard S, Woods HB, Mason SM. Improving outcomes for older people in the emergency department: a review of reviews. *Emerg Med J*. 2021;38(12):882-888. doi:10.1136/emermed-2020-209514
49. Koirala B, Badawi S, Frost S, et al. Study protocol for Care cOORDInatioN And sympTom managEment (COORDINATE) programme: a feasibility study. *BMJ Open*. 2023;13(12):e072846. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2023-072846
50. Germain N, Toulouse-Fournier A, Samb R, et al. Emergency department revisits at thirty days are modestly explained by caregiver burden: a prospective cohort study. Published online September 26, 2024:2024.09.25.24314385. doi:10.1101/2024.09.25.24314385
51. Péloquin F, Marmen E, Gélinas V, et al. Discussions about Goals of Care in the Emergency Department: a Qualitative Study of Emergency Physicians' Opinions Using the Normalization Process Theory. Published online July 27, 2024:2024.07.26.24310500. doi:10.1101/2024.07.26.24310500
52. Tochel C, Smith M, Baldwin H, et al. What outcomes are important to patients with mild cognitive impairment or Alzheimer's disease, their caregivers, and health-care professionals? A systematic review. *Alzheimers Dement Diagn Assess Dis Monit*. 2019;11:231-247. doi:10.1016/j.dadm.2018.12.003
53. Chary AN, Hernandez N, Rivera AP, et al. Emergency department communication with diverse caregivers and persons living with dementia: A qualitative study. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2024;72(6):1687-1696. doi:10.1111/jgs.18897
54. Menear M, Blanchette MA, Demers-Payette O, Roy D. A framework for value-creating learning health systems. *Health Res Policy Syst*. 2019;17(1):79. doi:10.1186/s12961-019-0477-3
55. Muscedere J, Bagshaw SM, Kho M, et al. Frailty, Outcomes, Recovery and Care Steps of Critically Ill Patients (FORECAST): a prospective, multi-centre, cohort study. *Intensive Care Med*. 2024;50(7):1064-1074. doi:10.1007/s00134-024-07404-9