Title: Changes in English NHS outpatient activity during the early Covid-19 period

*Jessica Morris, Researcher, Nuffield Trust, 59 New Cavendish Street, London, W1G 7LP, UK. Jessica.morris@nuffieldtrust.org.uk 0000-0002-5178-6600

Theo Georghiou, Senior Fellow, Nuffield Trust, 59 New Cavendish Street, London, W1G 7LP, UK. theo.georghiou@nuffieldtrust.org.uk 0000-0001-9532-876X

John Appleby, Director of Research and Chief Economist, Nuffield Trust, 59 New Cavendish Street, London, W1G 7LP, UK.
john.appleby@nuffieldtrust.org.uk 0000-0003-3839-9662

*Corresponding author

WORD COUNT: 2,795

ABSTRACT

Objective To describe changes in NHS outpatient activity connected to the Covid-19 pandemic

Design Nationwide population-based retrospective study

Setting England, UK, 31 December 2018 to 25 October 2020

Data source Outpatient Hospital Episode Statistics data

Results Between early March and late October 2020, there was a total reduction of 16.6 million outpatient attendances compared to the same period in 2019, equivalent to a 27% decline. The largest weekly drop of 48% relative to 2019 occurred the week beginning 30 March. Activity recovered more slowly than it fell, and by the end of the study period remained 16% lower than the equivalent week in 2019. Changes in patterns of attendances were broadly similar across most patient characteristic groups. There was a substantial increase in the proportion of attendances taking place remotely, peaking at more than one in three during April and May 2020. Differences were observed in trends of remote consultations between age and sex categories, ethnic groups, and proxy deprivation levels. There was also substantial variation in overall activity and use of remote consultations by clinical specialty.

Conclusions The large increase in remote outpatient consultations during the early Covid-19 period, variations in remote care use by specialty as well as proxy deprivation and ethnic groups all suggest a need to evaluate the impact of these changes particularly in light of national policy to encourage greater use of remote consultations.

SUMMARY BOX

What is already known on this topic

- Numbers of outpatient attendances in England have increased substantially over recent years.
- Historically, the vast majority of attendances have been face-to-face, with remote consultations accounting for ~4% of all attendances.
- The emergence of the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020 had a large impact on outpatient services in English hospitals, and on health services more generally in England and around the world.

What this study adds

- There were significant differences by clinical specialty in changes to patterns of attendances and remote consultations.
- Changes in the volume of outpatient attendances as a result of responses to the pandemic were broadly similar across patient groups.
- However, there were marked differences across patient groups in trends in remote consultations.

INTRODUCTION

In England, the total number of outpatient appointments has increased by two thirds since 2008/09 - to 125 million a year¹ – and outpatient services currently account for approximately seven per cent of the National Health Service (NHS) budget.² This is the largest increase in activity of any hospital service, and as a result, long wait times, delayed appointments, and rushed consultations have become more common.³ Traditional outpatient service models have relied on face-to-face consultations, which can require repeat hospital visits that often prolong uncertainty and waste patient and staff time.³ As part of its outpatient redesign programme, NHS England is looking to avoid one third of face-to-face outpatient attendances by 2024. It claims that this would save the NHS in England an estimated £1.1 billion a year (also saving patients 30 million visits to hospital) by streamlining service delivery through expanded technology at each stage of the pathway.⁴

In spring 2020, soon after the first full year of NHS England's ten-year programme, the Covid-19 pandemic brought huge disruption to people's lives, to the economy, and to the nation's health services. An early priority of the NHS was to ensure that there was available bed capacity to deal with Covid-19 patients. In mid-March 2020, NHS England recommended that hospital trusts should postpone all non-urgent elective operations from mid-April 2020, with local discretion to move quicker than this target.⁵ In wider society, a national lockdown followed on 23 March 2020.

The impact on English NHS outpatient services was significant (just as it was on health services in many other countries).⁶ Total outpatient attendances fell by 48%, from an average of around 8.1 million per month pre-pandemic to 4.2 million in April 2020. By September, attendances had recovered to around 90% of their level in September 2019. The impact of another wave of Covid-19 during winter was evident with attendances in January 2021 falling back to 73% compared to the number in January 2020.⁷ The disruption to outpatient and other NHS services has raised concerns about negative consequences for patient care, including increased waiting times, impact on patients' health and lost service productivity. However, there are also questions about whether the disruption has led to some positive changes in how the NHS delivers its services – such as greater use of remote consultations, reductions in attendances of perhaps marginal health value, and other innovations.

Aims

This study is one component of a larger project by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) funded Rapid Service Evaluation Team (RSET) which focuses on identifying promising innovations in outpatient services for evaluation.⁸ The aim of this analysis is to describe changes in NHS outpatient activity in England including the use of remote consultations over an initial Covid-19 period (up to late October 2020), in order to inform future work to identify and evaluate innovations in how outpatient services are delivered. We intend to update this analysis periodically.

METHODS

Data

We extracted data on all activity recorded in Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) Outpatient dataset between 30 December 2019 and 25 October 2020 inclusive, and for an equivalent period the prior year (31 December 2018 to 27 October 2019). These dates correspond to the start of week 1 and the end of week 43 in 2020 and 2019 respectively using a standard week numbering system (ISO 8601).⁹ Data prior to 1 April 2020 was taken from 'annual refresh' HES datasets, while data from 1 April 2020

was taken from a monthly extract to end October 2020. All datasets were supplied by NHS Digital under agreement DARS-NIC-194629-S4F9X.

We included activity data from all providers: English NHS hospitals, and English NHS commissioned activity in the independent sector.

Outcomes and comparisons

We counted the total number of attended appointments (referred to in this paper as attendances, and covering both face-to-face and remote consultations) during each week in 2020, and compared against the equivalent weeks in 2019.

For the period between 2 March and 25 October 2020 (weeks 10 to 43 inclusive), we recorded the total cumulative difference in activity, the maximum weekly percentage difference, and the weekly percentage difference at the end of the period.

To allow us to make more appropriate comparisons, we adjusted the weekly counts of attendances to take account of public holidays, multiplying by 5/4 for weeks containing public holidays (note that the overwhelming majority of outpatient attendances in England tend to take place during the working week).

For sub-national analyses – by region of provider, and by groupings of patient characteristics (age and sex bands, ethnic groups, and deciles of socioeconomic deprivation assigned via Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 linked at the lower super output area of residence) – we compared the 2020 adjusted weekly counts of attendances with week 9 values (24 February to 1 March 2020). Week 9 was selected to represent a period before any Covid-19-related impacts had become evident.

We documented adjusted weekly counts of attendances that took place remotely (by telephone or telemedicine) versus face-to-face, also calculating weekly ratios and comparing with weekly 2019 ratios. We additionally calculated weekly ratios of remote versus face-to-face attendances in 2020 for the aforementioned patient characteristic groupings.

We also carried out two analyses by clinical treatment specialty. Selecting the 30 largest clinical specialties as measured by activity at week 9 (accounting for over 80% of national outpatient activity that week), we firstly calculated adjusted weekly numbers of attendances by specialty, relative to week 9 values. Secondly, we calculated weekly ratios of face-to-face versus remote consultations by specialty.

The relative size of all analysis groups can be found in Appendix Table A1.

Patient and public involvement

Two patient representatives were involved in reviewing a draft of the wider project of which this study was one component, but they were not directly involved in the design or implementation of the study. No patient representatives were asked to advise on interpretation or writing of the manuscript.

RESULTS

Total attendances

The outbreak of Covid-19 was associated with a large drop in outpatient attendances in England (Figure 1). Attendances began to diverge from 2019 levels at the beginning of March 2020, and fell rapidly following the publication of NHS guidance recommending that trusts free up inpatient capacity and postpone planned operations.

Between weeks 10 (beginning 2 March) and 43 (beginning 19 October), there was a total reduction of 16.6 million attendances compared to the same period in 2019. This is equivalent to 27% of outpatient attendances in these weeks in 2019. The largest weekly drop relative to 2019 (adjusted figures) was 48% in week 14 (week beginning 30 March). Subsequently, numbers of attendances increased but at a much slower rate than they fell; by week 43 they were still 16% lower than the equivalent week in 2019.

Attendances by region

There was little difference in the timing of the fall in attendances for different NHS regions, with the bulk occurring in weeks 12 and 13 (16 to 29 March) (Figure 2). There were, however, some differences in the relative magnitude of reductions by region. For example, compared to week 9, the largest percentage drop in attendances occurred in the West Midlands (54%), while the smallest drop occurred in the South East (45%). By week 43, the number of attendances in all regions remained between 15% and 23% below the number in week 9.

Attendances by patient characteristics

Patterns of attendances were broadly similar across most patient characteristics: by age and sex, ethnic groups, and areas grouped by deciles of socioeconomic deprivation. The exceptions were in the case of females aged 18 to 39, and the relatively small mixed ethnic group, where the relative reductions in attendances after week 9 were less pronounced than for other groups (Figures 3, 4 and 5).

Outpatient attendances carried out remotely

There was a significant increase in the proportion of consultations taking place remotely associated with the pandemic in 2020. Remote consultations increased from 4% of all outpatient attendances in week 9 (also 4% in the weeks before, including throughout 2019) to a high of 36% in week 18 (beginning 27 April 2020) (Figure 6). Subsequently, the proportion of remote consultations fell, although by week 43 they still represented 25% of all outpatient attendances. The relative reduction in remote attendances after week 18 was largely the result of an increase in face-to-face attendances, rather than a decline in the absolute number of remote attendances.

Attendances carried out remotely by patient characteristics

Patterns of remote consultations were broadly similar for those in the 40-59 and 60 plus age groups, as well as for males aged 18-39. For males and females aged under 18, the proportion of remote attendances peaked at a higher level than for other age groups and then fell more rapidly. For women aged 18-39, remote attendances were markedly less common than for other groups (Figure 7).

There was an apparent gradient by decile of socioeconomic deprivation, with patients in the most deprived areas tending to have lower rates of remote consultations than those in the least deprived areas (Figure 8). There was a noticeable difference between ethnic groups, with higher rates of remote attendances among white patients and lower rates among black, south Asian and other ethnic groups (Figures 9).

Attendances by clinical specialty

Trends in numbers of attendances varied considerably by clinical specialty (Figure 10). For example, attendances for audiology fell by 78% in week 17 compared to week 9, while those for medical oncology – the specialty with the most modest fall – fell by 11% (in week 13). Obstetrics, midwifery and clinical oncology were other services that showed relatively little variation over time. Note that for these specialties, the adjusted figures likely over-adjust for weeks containing public holidays (hence the peaks).

The specialties also displayed differences in levels of recovery (in terms of numbers of attendances) by week 43. For example, general surgery (which saw a maximum drop of 62% in week 16) had recovered to a 4% drop (relative to week 9) by week 43. Whereas physiotherapy (which saw a maximum drop of 66% in week 18) was still 40% lower than week 9 values at week 43.

Three of the smaller specialties showed a rather erratic pattern of attendances.

Attendances carried out remotely by clinical specialty

The proportion of attendances that were carried out remotely by telephone or video increased across nearly all clinical specialties from the middle of March 2020, and there were marked differences in the extent to which different specialties switched to remote care (Figure 11). For example, more than 60% of weekly gastroenterology consultations took place remotely at peak (around week 22; up from 14% in week 9), while midwifery services increased to 7% remote consultations at peak (weeks 17 to 24; up from 1% in week 9). Diagnostic imaging consultations remained overwhelmingly face-to-face.

A further pattern of interest between specialties lay in the extent to which increases in remote attendances from March 2020 persisted across the rest of the year. A number of specialties (including diabetic medicine, medical and clinical oncology, and clinical haematology) broadly held steady over the period in their relative use of remote versus face-to-face consultations (Figure 11a); others (including ophthalmology, oral surgery and ear, nose and throat) had by week 43 fallen by up to 30 percentage points from their peak remote care proportion (Figure 11c).

DISCUSSION

We report on a substantial decline of more than one quarter of outpatient attendances in England following the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic. The trend was one of an initial large fall between March and April 2020, followed by a gradual, although far from complete, recovery in numbers to late October 2020. We found almost no difference in the timing of the initial decline across NHS regions, and relatively little difference in changes in attendances across sex, age, ethnicity and proxy deprivation groups. We also found a very large increase in attendances that took place remotely; more than one in three were remote at peak (during April and May 2020) falling to one in four by late October. We observed some variation in the use of remote care by demographic groups of patients; patients living in more deprived areas had lower rates of remote consultations, and the same was true for ethnic minority patients (specifically Black, South Asian and Other ethnic groups). Finally, clinical specialties showed differing patterns in how their activity levels changed and in the extent to which they switched to remote consultations.

A major strength of the study is its nationwide population-based approach, which included all recorded outpatient activity in England's NHS hospitals, in addition to NHS commissioned activity in

independent providers. A disadvantage is that the analysis is largely descriptive and does not allow us to draw conclusions about, for example, the impact on the quality of outpatient care, or on the health and experience of patients. While the data was up-to-date at the time of analysis, trends in outpatient activity have continued to change. No formal statistical tests of differences were carried out (however, the numbers of events were relatively large) and adjustments for public holidays were crude. Furthermore, some of the differences we observed between groups of patients (for example, ethnic groups) may be partly explained by differences in the demographic structure and relative prevalence of conditions in these groups; our analysis did not account for these factors. It is also possible that the accuracy of the data may have been affected by the pandemic in ways we do not understand. For example, clinical coding of remote versus face-to-face appointments may not have been consistent across services or over time.

Published data shows that the trends observed in outpatient attendances mirrored similar changes in activity across other hospital services in England, including elective and emergency admissions, and attendances at emergency departments.^{10,11} A similar trend in outpatients was also observed in the United States, where attendances fell by almost 60% in April 2020 but had largely recovered by October.¹² The lack of variation in the timing of the initial decline in attendances across NHS regions does not match the geographical differences in Covid-19 case numbers and death rates at the outset of the pandemic.¹³ This suggests that the initial reductions were related to hospitals across the country anticipating an impending wave of virus impacts and responding to instructions to free-up inpatient care, rather than being direct effects of local levels of illness.

An exception to the lack of variation in changes in attendances between demographic groups was for women aged 18 to 39 for whom falls in attendances were more modest than other groups. This is likely to be connected to the observation that activity levels for midwifery and obstetrics specialties continued throughout the period at broadly pre-pandemic levels. Attendances also remained largely stable for medical oncology, clinical oncology and clinical haematology – probably a reflection of the services' prioritisation or ringfencing of activity for more urgent and time-critical cases. In comparison, clinical specialties such as ophthalmology, physiotherapy and audiology exhibited very large declines of 60-80% at their minimum points. This may partly reflect the postponement of less urgent cases but also a lack of suitability of remote consultation for certain clinical specialties.

We note that the proportion of attendances that took place remotely in October is in line with NHS England's 2021/22 planning guidance, which recommends that where attendances are clinically necessary, at least 25% should be delivered remotely.¹⁴ It remains to be seen to what extent this is sustained. More detailed work is also needed to understand whether variations in remote care use between demographic groups of patients reflect significant differences in healthcare access.

Further work is needed to better understand the differing patterns in the extent to which clinical specialties switched to remote consultations, and the ability of some specialties to maintain high levels of remote care while others declined over time. Some variations may in part reflect the nature of the specialty – for example, the inability to carry out diagnostic imaging remotely. Also unknown is whether the switch to remote consultations has resulted in comparable levels of quality of care and patient outcomes; this remains an outstanding evaluative question.

Conclusions

The Covid-19 pandemic has led to large-scale change in outpatient service provision. The main aim of this analysis was to describe changes in outpatient activity in England over the initial months of

the pandemic in order to inform future work to identify and evaluate innovations in how outpatient services are delivered. The two major changes have been the overall drop in activity, and the rise in remote consultations. With respect to the latter there has been variation in patterns of remote consultation between patient groups. Along with impacts that remote care may be having on patient experiences and outcomes as well as on the efficiency with which the NHS delivers outpatient services, this highlights the need to evaluate the reasons for these differences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank NHS Digital staff for the provision of data for use by NIHR Rapid Service Evaluation Team (RSET). The Hospital Episode Statistics data are copyright NHS Digital. We would also like to thank our colleagues Sarah Reed and Jonathan Spencer for their advice.

CONTRIBUTORS

JM, TG and JA (guarantor) contributed to the design of the study. JM was responsible for the data analysis. JM, TG and JA were all involved in the interpretation of data, contributing to drafts of the manuscript and reviewing the final version. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

FUNDING

This work was funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) (Health Services and Delivery Research, 16/138/17 – Rapid Service Evaluation Team). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Competing interests: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: financial support from NIHR for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

Ethical approval was not needed for this study.

DATA SHARING

The authors do not have permission to share data with third parties, but the data may be accessed through NHS Digital via an appropriate agreement.

DISSEMINATION TO PARTICIPANTS AND RELATED PUBLIC COMMUNITIES

The size of the study population rules out direct dissemination to participants.

References

1. NHS Digital. Hospital Outpatient Activity 2019-20, 2020. Available from: <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/hospital-outpatient-activity/2019-20>
2. NHS England. National Cost Collection for the NHS, 2018/19. Available from: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/national-cost-collection/>
3. Royal College of Physicians. Outpatients: the future – adding value through sustainability, 2018. Available from: <https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/outpatients-future-adding-value-through-sustainability>
4. NHS Long Term Plan, 2019. Available from: <https://www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/>
5. NHS England and NHS Improvement. Next steps on NHS response to COVID-19: Letter from Sir Simon Stevens and Amanda Pritchard, 2020. Available from: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/wp-content/uploads/sites/52/2020/03/20200317-NHS-COVID-letter-FINAL.pdf>
6. Moynihan R, Sanders S, Michaleff ZA, et al. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on utilisation of healthcare services: a systematic review. BMJ Open, 2021. Available from: <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/11/3/e045343>
7. NHS Digital. Provisional Monthly Hospital Episode Statistics for Admitted Patient Care, Outpatient and Accident and Emergency data - April 2020 - January 2021. Available from: <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/hospital-episode-statistics-for-admitted-patient-care-outpatient-and-accident-and-emergency-data/april-2020--january-2021>
8. Nuffield Trust, Rapid Service Evaluation Team. Investigating innovations in outpatient services, 2021. Available from: <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/rset-the-rapid-service-evaluation-team#evaluations>
9. International Organisation for Standardisation. ISO 8601 Date and Time Format, 2019. Available from: <https://www.iso.org/iso-8601-date-and-time-format.html>
10. NHS Digital. Hospital Episode Statistics for Admitted Patient Care and Outpatient Data, 2020. Available from: <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/hospital-episode-statistics-for-admitted-patient-care-outpatient-and-accident-and-emergency-data>
11. NHS England. A&E Attendances and Emergency Admissions, 2020-21. Available from: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/ae-waiting-times-and-activity/ae-attendances-and-emergency-admissions-2020-21/>
12. The Commonwealth Fund. The Impact of COVID-19 on Outpatient Visits in 2020: Visits Remained Stable, Despite a Late Surge in Cases, 2021. Available from: <https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/2021/feb/impact-covid-19-outpatient-visits-2020-visits-stable-despite-late-surge>
13. Morris J. What has been the impact of Covid-19 on urgent and emergency care across England? A Q&A. Nuffield Trust comment, 2020. Available from: <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/news-item/what-has-been-the-impact-of-covid-19-on-urgent-and-emergency-care-across-england>
14. NHS England. 2021/22 priorities and operational planning guidance, 2021. Available from: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/2021-22-priorities-and-operational-planning-guidance/>

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Weekly counts of outpatient attendances in 2019 and 2020 (to week 43) a) unadjusted figures b) adjusted for public holidays. Dashed lines indicate weeks in 2020 corresponding to NHS England COVID-19 letter (left) and start of national lockdown (right).

Figure 2. Weekly outpatient attendances (adjusted) by NHS region in 2020, (percentage change relative to week 9)

Figure 3. Weekly outpatient attendances (adjusted) by age and sex in 2020, (percentage change relative to week 9) a) males and b) females

Figure 4. Weekly outpatient attendances (adjusted) by ethnicity group in 2020 (percentage change relative to week 9)

Figure 5. Weekly outpatient attendances (adjusted) by decile of socioeconomic deprivation in 2020 (percentage change relative to week 9), IMD decile 1 = most deprived and IMD decile 10 = least deprived

Figure 6. Mode of outpatient attendance: remote and face-to-face. A) Weekly adjusted counts of attendances in 2020, b) Weekly ratios of counts in 2020, and 2019 (line)

Figure 7. Weekly attendances held via remote means, 2020, by sex and age band. A) Males, B) Females

Figure 8. Weekly attendances held via remote means, 2020, by decile of deprivation. IMD decile 1 = most deprived and IMD decile 10 = least deprived.

Figure 9. Weekly attendances held via remote means, 2020, by ethnic group.

Figure 10. Weekly outpatient attendances (adjusted) by clinical specialty (percentage change relative to week 9). For convenience, displayed separately by groups of maximum weekly fall (between weeks 10 and 20) of a) <20% b) 20 to 50% c) 50 to 60% d) > 60%

Figure 11. Percentage of weekly outpatient attendances (adjusted) carried out remotely by clinical specialty. For convenience, displayed separately by groups of maximum percentage point (ppt) difference from peak to week 43 a) <5 ppt b) 5 to 15 ppt c) >15 ppt

Appendix Table A1. Size of groups (number of attendances in Week 9, 2020 – pre-COVID)

Grouping	Description	Attendances in week 9	% of attendances
(None)	All attendances	1,943,023	100%
Region	London	345,197	18%
	South East	310,418	16%
	North West	279,842	14%
	West Midlands	234,392	12%
	East of England	189,823	10%
	Yorkshire and The Humber	180,529	9%
	South West	178,319	9%
	East Midlands	127,070	7%
	North East	97,433	5%
Age and sex bands	0 - 17 Male	109,258	6%
	18 - 39 Male	108,850	6%
	40 - 59 Male	192,173	10%
	60+ Male	414,494	21%
	0 - 17 Female	95,890	5%
	18 - 39 Female	300,599	15%
	40 - 59 Female	278,342	14%
	60+ Female	443,417	23%
IMD deprivation decile	1 (most deprived)	190,715	10%
	2	191,834	10%
	3	191,726	10%
	4	190,193	10%
	5	191,544	10%
	6	192,932	10%
	7	190,533	10%
	8	191,341	10%
	9	189,480	10%
	10 (least deprived)	187,420	10%
Ethnic group	White	1,353,005	70%
	Black	58,094	3%
	Mixed	25,880	1%
	South Asian	87,641	5%
	Any other ethnic group	70,805	4%
	Not stated	228,019	12%
	Not known	119,579	6%
Clinical specialty	Ophthalmology	168,046	9%
	Trauma and Orthopaedics	148,462	8%
	Physiotherapy	103,018	5%
	Diagnostic Imaging	86,997	4%
	Cardiology	77,494	4%
	Dermatology	72,566	4%
	Obstetrics	70,809	4%
	Gynaecology	67,795	3%
	Urology	59,611	3%
	Ear, Nose and Throat (ENT)	59,008	3%
	Clinical Oncology	53,259	3%
	Midwifery Service	49,135	3%
	Rheumatology	44,348	2%
	Respiratory Medicine	43,564	2%
	General Surgery	43,300	2%
	Gastroenterology	40,829	2%
	Clinical Haematology	37,965	2%
	Paediatrics	36,415	2%
	Medical Oncology	34,924	2%
	Audiology	29,843	2%
	Neurology	29,701	2%
	Breast Surgery	28,767	1%
	Diabetic Medicine	24,535	1%
	General Medicine	23,663	1%
	Nephrology	22,847	1%
	Plastic Surgery	21,003	1%
	Adult Mental Illness	20,519	1%
	Colorectal Surgery	19,704	1%
	Intermediate Care	19,701	1%

	Oral Surgery	18,759	1%
--	--------------	--------	----

STROBE Statement

Checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

Section/Topic	Item No	Recommendation	Reported on Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	3
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	3-4
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	3-4
Participants	6	(a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	3-4
		Case-control study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls	
		Cross-sectional study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	-
		(b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables	7	Case-control study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	4
		Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	3-4
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	-
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	3-4
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	4
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	4
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	4
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	-
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	-
		Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	
		Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	-
	(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	-	

Section/Topic	Item No	Recommendation	Reported on Page No
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	-
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	-
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	-
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	12
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	-
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	-
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	5
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	-
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	-
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	5
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	-
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	-
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	5-6
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	6
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	7
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	7
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	-
Other Information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	9

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

Figure 1

a)

b)

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

a)

b)

Figure 7

a)

b)

Figure 8

Figure 9

Figure 10

Figure 11