

The Effect of Removing the Four-Hour Access Standard in the ED:

A Retrospective Observational Study

Tomás Momesso¹, Bilal Gokpinar¹, Rouba Ibrahim¹, and Adrian Boyle²

¹UCL School of Management, University College London, London, UK

²Emergency Department, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, UK

ABSTRACT

Background: Time-based targets are used to improve patient flow and quality of care within Emergency Departments (EDs). While previous research often highlighted the benefits of these targets, some studies found negative consequences of their implementation. We study the consequences of removing the four-hour access standard.

Methods: We conducted a before and after, retrospective, observational study using anonymised, routinely collected, patient-level data from an English NHS Emergency Department between April 2018 and December 2019. The primary outcomes of interest were the proportion of admitted patients, i.e., the conversion rate, the length of stay in the ED, and ambulance handover times. We used segmented regression models to study and estimate the impact of removing the four-hour access standard.

Results: A total of 192,123 attendances were included in the analysis. The segmented regression models for the average daily conversion rate indicate a drop from an estimated 35.07% to an estimated 31.02% (95% CI (-6.3%, -1.8%)). This drop is only statistically significant for Majors (Ambulant) patients (from an estimated 38.42% to an estimated 31.36%) and, particularly, for short-stay admissions (from an estimated 18.29% to an estimated 12.42%). The models also show an increase in the average daily length of stay for admitted patients from an estimated 316 minutes to an estimated 387 minutes (95% CI (33.54, 108.93)), and an increase in the average daily length of stay for discharged patients from an estimated 222 minutes to an estimated 262 minutes (95% CI (6.96, 40.42)). Finally, the segmented regression models indicate a marginally significant change in the average daily handover times from an estimated 16.23 minutes to an estimated 16.50 minutes (95% CI (-0.8, 1.41)).

Conclusion: Lifting the four-hour access standard reporting was associated with a drop in short-stay admissions to the hospital. However, it was also associated with an increase in the average length of stay in the ED, and a marginal increase in ambulance handover times.

Key Messages

What is already known on this topic:

Previous research has shown that time-based targets lead to a reduction in patients' length of stay in emergency departments (EDs), and ED crowding. However, other studies found an increase in short-stay admissions as a result of introducing time-based targets in the ED. Also, studies found strong evidence of high stress and low morale after the introduction of time-based targets.

What this study adds:

This retrospective, observational before and after study show that removing the reporting of the four-hour access standard led to a reduction in the proportion of patients admitted to the hospital, in particular for short-stay admissions. It also shows an increase in the length of stay in the ED for both admitted and discharged patients, as well as a marginal increase in ambulance handover times.

How this study might affect research, practice or policy:

Removing time-based targets is associated with a reduction in short-stay admissions, while the average length of stay in the ED increased across all groups, particularly older and admitted patients.

INTRODUCTION

Delays are common in healthcare. They are the result of a temporary mismatch between the demand for the healthcare service and the capacity available to meet such demand. Long waiting times are associated with an increase in mortality [1] and with adverse patient outcomes [2]. Many countries, including the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand, introduced time-based targets to improve patient flow and the quality of care within Emergency Departments (EDs). In England, the National Health Service (NHS) Constitution for England specifies that at least 95% of patients attending an ED have to be admitted to the hospital, transferred to another hospital, or discharged within four hours of arriving [3].

Previous research highlighted the benefits of time-based targets. Several studies have shown a link between the introduction of the target and a reduction in patients' overall length of stay and time to assessment [4–9]. For example, Mason *et al.* [10] found that the introduction of the four-hour access standard in England reduced the proportion of patients spending more than four hours, and led to an increase in the proportion of patients departing within twenty minutes of the target. Ngo *et al.* [11] and Higginson *et al.* [12] found a negative relationship between ED crowding and performance against the four-hour access standard.

However, some studies found negative consequences of implementing time-based targets. Tenbencil *et al.* [13] and Forero *et al.* [14] found an increase in short-stay admissions after the introduction of time-based targets. Further, studies exploring the impact of time-based targets on ED staff found strong evidence of high stress and low morale after the implementation of such targets [15–16].

In this study, using patient-level data from the ED unit of a major hospital where the four-hour access standard reporting was stopped as part of an NHS England field study, we are the first to use patient-level data to investigate the effects of the removal of the four-hour access standard on patients' length of stay in the ED, hospital admissions, and ambulance handover times, three key performance and quality indicators used by NHS England [17, 18].

METHODS

Study Design

We conducted a before and after, retrospective, observational study of all adult patients attending an Emergency Department (ED) in England between April 2018 and December 2019. This particular ED was one of 14 hospital trusts that participated in a field test between May 2019 and December 2019 in which the trusts stopped reporting their performances against the four-hour access standard [19]. The study period did not include the COVID pandemic period because this period was marked with significant and exceptional changes to processes and short-stay wards in the ED.

The primary outcome of interest in our study was the daily proportion of patients admitted to the hospital from the ED, also known as the conversion rate. We also analysed the effects of removing the four-hour access standard on the total lengths of stay in the ED and in the hospital, and on ambulance handover times. Due to space constraints in the paper, the main focus of this study will be on adult patients attending the ED. This is also because Paediatric and Resuscitation patients follow different processes and utilise separate resources, making it hard to carry out a valid comparison across all groups. All patients were considered for the ambulance handover time analysis. There was no formal calculation of the number of patients needed in the study.

Adult patients attending the ED can be categorised into three main categories based on their need of urgent care: Minors, Majors (Ambulant), and Majors (Trolley) [20]. The difference between Majors (Ambulant) and Majors (Trolley) patients is the need for a trolley or bed in the ED. In categorising patients'

lengths of stay in the hospital, patients who are discharged on the same day (next day) from when they are admitted to the hospital are referred to as “zero-day” (“one-day”) admissions, respectively, whilst patients discharged two or more days after their admission to the hospital are categorised as “two-plus-day” admissions. We considered zero- and one-day admissions patients as one category, representing short-stay admissions.

Data Sources

This study used anonymised patient-level data from an English NHS Emergency department, as well as anonymised patient-level hospital-admissions (from the ED) data between April 2018 and December 2019. This hospital has a complete electronic health record (EPIC) which allows for detailed and complete data collection from ED attendances and hospital admissions. study also uses hourly occupancy data measured as the proportions of occupied beds in the hospital. Staffing levels remained the same during the pre-intervention and post-intervention periods. For details see Supplementary Data.

Statistical Analysis

To analyse the effect of the removal of the four-hour access standard on the daily proportion of patients admitted to the hospital — also known as the ‘conversion rate’ — we used a segmented regression model [21–24]. The model estimates the changes in levels and trends for the proportion of average daily admissions. Using the anonymised patient-level data, we calculated the effect of removing the four-hour access standard on the average daily conversion rate, as well as the average daily length of stay, and average daily ambulance handover time. We defined the period between April 2018 and April 2019 as preintervention, and May 2019 through December 2019 as postintervention. The model used was:

$$Y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * time_t + \beta_2 * intervention_t + \beta_3 * time_post_t + \beta_4 * M_{t4} + \dots + \beta_p * M_{tp} + \epsilon_t \quad (1)$$

In summary, β_0 is the baseline level in April 2018, β_1 is the slope during the preintervention period, β_2 is the change in the average daily proportion of admitted patients, β_3 is the difference in slopes between the post and preintervention periods, and $M_{t4} + \dots + M_{tp}$ are covariates, such as the average age of the patients attending the ED daily, the average daily number of procedures and investigations, and indicator variables for the time and day of admissions. We also used a segmented regression model to analyse the impact of removing the four-hour access standard on the average daily ambulance handover time, the average daily ED length of stay, and the daily proportion of patients spending twelve hours or more in the ED. We used time-related covariates, such as the month of attendance and hour of arrival, to control for seasonality. We used robust standard errors for all models.

We run the segmented regression model for different patient categories and age groups to compare the pilot’s impact across those categories and groups. Using β_3 , the coefficient that explains the intervention’s impact on the dependent variable, we compare how the pilot study impacted different age groups in terms of, for example, length of stay in the ED. The following z-test compares whether two regression coefficients are different:

$$Z = \frac{\beta_{3,1} - \beta_{3,2}}{\sqrt{SE(\beta_{3,1})^2 + SE(\beta_{3,2})^2}} \quad (2)$$

where $\beta_{3,1}$ is the coefficient for group 1 (e.g., Majors (Ambulant) patients), and $\beta_{3,2}$ is the coefficient for group 2 (e.g., Minors patients) [25].

Ethical approval was not required following the algorithm on the NHS HRA website. There was no patient or public involvement in the study design or results.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows a summary and demographic breakdown of attendances to the ED and hospital admissions.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of patients attending the ED

Patient Category	ED	
	Preintervention April 2018 – April 2019	Postintervention May 2019 – December 2019
Number of Adult Patients Attendances	102,227	67,689
Admitted Adult Patients	36,700 35.90%	22,350 33.02%
Number of Majors (Ambulant) Patients	41,669	28,750
Admitted Majors (Ambulant)	16,948 40.67%	10,185 35.43%
Number of Majors (Trolley) Patients	22,925	14,341
Admitted Majors (Trolley) Patients	17,020 74.24%	10,521 73.36%
Number of Minors Patients	37,633	24,598
Admitted Minors Patients	2,732 7.26%	1,644 6.68%
	ED - LoS (minutes)	
	Preintervention Median April 2018 – April 2019	Postintervention Median May 2019 – December 2019
Admitted Patients	237	314
Discharged Patients	168	184
	Hospital	
Patient Category	Preintervention April 2018 – April 2019	Postintervention May 2019 – December 2019
All Admitted Patients	50,708	24,822
Zero/One Day Patients	21,291	10,408
Two+ Days Patients	29,417	14,414
	Ambulance	
	Preintervention April 2018 – April 2019	Postintervention May 2019 – December 2019
Number of Arrivals	44,175	22,970
Percentage of Total Attendances	35.50%	33.90%
Mean Handover Time	15.7	16.4
Median Handover Time	14	14

By using the number of arrivals from the hour prior to the arrival of each patient, and the number of doctors and nurses working in the ED during that same hour, we estimated the ED’s patient volume [26], standardised by staffing levels. Based on the ED’s patient volume faced by individual patients, we calculate the hourly average ED’s patient volume, and then calculate the average daily ED’s patient volume to use as a control for crowding. Similarly, to control for a possible effect of the hospital’s occupancy level on ED-to-hospital admissions (e.g., exit-block) [27], using the hourly occupancy data, we calculated the average daily hospital occupancy level and used its one-day lagged average to avoid using data that is not available at the point of the estimation.

The ED and the hospital data sets do not have a common patient identifier. However, we were able to match 54,133 (80.9%) admitted patients from the ED dataset with the hospital admissions. The matched dataset was only used for regressions where the outcome variable were short-stay admissions. For details on the matching methodology, see Supplementary Data.

Observations with missing data points were removed since they represented only 0.62% of all the observations. All models were run for all adult patients, and for each category of patients separately. This allowed us to study the impact of removing the four-hour access standard on the ED as a whole and on each category of patients separately.

Table 2: Estimated Effects of the Policy Change by November 15th, 2019, in Minutes

Source	Post Intervention Estimate	Pre Intervention Estimate	Estimated Difference	Estimated Difference 95% CI	Estimated Proportional Change	Proportional Change 95% CI
Daily Average LoS	261.88 min	221.93 min	39.94 min	(18.45, 61.44)	18.00%	(9.78%, 26.22%)
Daily Average LoS - Admitted	387.23 min	315.99 min	71.24 min	(33.54, 108.93)	22.54%	(12.05%, 33.04%)
Daily Average LoS – Discharged	203.31 min	179.61 min	23.69 min	(6.96, 40.42)	13.19%	(5.60%, 20.79%)
Ambulance Handover	16.50 min	16.23 min	0.27 min	(-0.88, 1.41)	1.65%	(-3.52%, 6.82%)
Spending Twelve Hours in ED	3.58%	1.61%	1.97	(0.12, 3.83)	122.68%	(-65.70%, 311.06%)
Conversion Rate	31.02%	35.07%	-4.05	(-6.30, -1.80)	-11.55%	(-15.72%, -7.38%)
Daily Conversion Rate	31.36%	38.42%	-7.06	(-11.06, -3.05)	-18.37%	(-24.74%, -11.99%)
Zero-Day & One-Day Conversion Rate	12.42%	18.29%	-5.88	(-9.23, -2.53)	-32.13%	(-41.90%, -22.36%)
Self-Discharged Rate	4.41%	3.37%	1.04	(-0.03, 2.11)	30.64%	(0.46%, 60.82%)

The Estimated Difference is the difference between the Post Intervention Estimate and the Pre Intervention Estimate. For example, for Adult Patients Daily Average LoS, we see an estimated 261.88 - 221.93 = 39.94 minutes increase between the pre-intervention and post-intervention period. The

Estimated Proportional Change is the proportional change between the Post Intervention Estimate and the Pre Intervention Estimate. For example, for Adult Patients Daily Average LoS, we see an estimated 18% increase between the pre-intervention and post-intervention period.

Table 2 shows the estimated effect for the outcome variables 6 months post-intervention (i.e., using November 15th as the date for comparison). The estimations show an estimated 39.94 minute increase in the average daily length of stay in the ED for all adult patients (95% CI (18.45, 61.44)). They also show an estimated 71.24 minute increase for admitted patients (95% CI (33.54, 108.93)), and an estimated 23.69 minute increase for discharged patients (95% CI (6.96, 40.42)). Results are similar when using October and December as the months for comparison. November was chosen over October due to being later into the pilot test, while December has behavioural aspects related to the Christmas holidays that might make it harder to correctly identify the pilot’s impact. All estimation interpretations, in what follows, will be based on this table.

Conversion Rate

Interestingly, we observe an estimated 4.05 percentage points reduction in the daily proportion of patients admitted to the hospital (i.e., conversion rate) post-intervention (Table 2). When analysing the regression results for the daily conversion rate for all adult patients attending the ED (Table 3), we see that the difference between the preintervention and pilot test slope is -0.019 (Column 1 - Time Post Pilot 95% CI (-0.026 to -0.012)). This represents an estimated drop from 35.07% to 31.02% in the daily adult patients’ conversion rate (Table 2).

Table 3: Conversion Rate Regression Results for all Adult patients

Daily Conversion Rate			
(1)			
Predictors	Estimates	CI	p
(Intercept)	1.768	-9.499 – 13.035	0.758
Time	0.003	-0.002 – 0.007	0.224
Pilot	-0.279	-2.013 – 1.454	0.752
Time Post Pilot	-0.019	-0.026 – -0.012	<0.001
Procedures	0.326	-0.883 – 1.535	0.597
Investigations	2.758	2.082 – 3.433	<0.001
Ambulance	0.118	0.034 – 0.203	0.006
Patient Volume	-0.045	-0.092 – 0.002	0.06
Lag Occupancy	-0.115	-0.199 – -0.032	0.007
Age	0.479	0.320 – 0.638	<0.001
Observations		639	

R2 / R2 adjusted**0.532 / 0.512**

The estimated coefficient of Time (β_1 in Section 2.3) is 0.003. The estimated coefficient of Pilot (β_2 in Section 2.3) is -0.279. The main coefficient of interest, Time Post Pilot (β_3 in Section 2.3) shows the intervention's impact on the dependent variable. A negative coefficient represents a drop in the daily conversion rate associated with the pilot (intervention). Time-related controls, such as month of attendance and day of the week were also included.

We further investigated whether and to what extent different patient categories saw a decrease in their conversion rates. As we can see in Table 4, we observed that only Majors (Ambulant) patients saw a reduction in the daily conversion rate (Column 1 - Time Post Pilot - 95% CI (-0.044, -0.019)), and only for short-stay admissions (Column 2 - Time Post Pilot 95% CI (-0.038, -0.017)). The models for Minors and Majors (Trolley) patients did not show a statistically significant change in their conversion rate post-intervention (see Supplementary Data). From Table 2, we can see that these represent an estimated drop from 38.42% to 31.36% in the conversion rate for Majors (Ambulant) patients, and an estimated drop from 18.29% to 12.42% for short-stay admissions. In addition, while Resuscitation and Paediatric patients are outside the scope of our paper, we nevertheless checked their daily conversion rates post-intervention and found no statistically significant changes for them.

Older patients, i.e., patients over 70 years, attending the ED are more likely to get admitted to the hospital (60% conversion rate compared to 25%). However, during the pilot test, older and younger patients saw a statistically similar proportional drop in their conversion rate (p-value = 0.85).

Table 4: Conversion Rate Regression Results for Majors (Ambulant) Patients

Majors (Ambulant) Daily Conversion Rate			
(1)			
Predictors	Estimates	CI	p
(Intercept)	3.146	-13.387 – 19.680	0.709
Time	-0.001	-0.009 – 0.006	0.697
Pilot	-0.745	-3.853 – 2.364	0.638
Time Post Pilot	-0.032	-0.044 – -0.019	<0.001
Procedures	4.395	2.529 – 6.260	<0.001
Investigations	1.492	0.635 – 2.349	0.001
Ambulance	-0.006	-0.106 – 0.093	0.901
Patient Volume	-0.022	-0.100 – 0.056	0.582
Lag Occupancy	-0.14	-0.287 – 0.007	0.062
Age	0.547	0.360 – 0.733	<0.001
Observations	639		
R2 / R2 adjusted	0.394 / 0.369		
Zero-Day & One-Day Conversion Rate			
(2)			
Predictors	Estimates	CI	p
(Intercept)	9.57	-3.822 – 22.963	0.161
Time	0.003	-0.003 – 0.009	0.338

Pilot	-0.395	-2.990 – 2.199	0.765
Time Post Pilot	-0.028	-0.038 – -0.017	<0.001
Procedures	2.228	0.673 – 3.783	0.005
Investigations	1.017	0.324 – 1.710	0.004
Ambulance	-0.015	-0.097 – 0.067	0.715
Patient Volume	-0.046	-0.111 – 0.019	0.161
Lag Occupancy	-0.178	-0.301 – -0.055	0.005
Age	0.254	0.104 – 0.404	0.001
Observations		639	
R2 / R2 adjusted		0.256 / 0.224	

Time-related controls, such as month of attendance and day of the week were also included.

Length of Stay in the ED

Daily average length of stay in the ED increased by an estimated 39 minutes (Table 2). In particular, the daily average length of stay in the ED for admitted patients increased by an estimated 71 minutes, and by an estimated 23 minutes for discharged patients (Table 2). Table 5 shows the result for the segmented regression models for the daily average length of stay in the ED for all adult patients, and for admitted and discharged patients separately. The models show that the difference between the preintervention and pilot study slope is 0.184 (Column 1 - Time Post Pilot 95% CI (0.115, 0.253)). They also show an increase for admitted (Column 2 - Time Post Pilot) and for discharged patients (Column 2 Time Post Pilot).

Table 5: Segmented Regression Models for the Daily Average Length of Stay (LoS)

Daily Average LoS			
(1)			
Predictors	Estimates	CI	p
(Intercept)	-277.496	-385.327 – -169.666	<0.001
Time	0.033	-0.008 – 0.074	0.111
Pilot	3.293	-13.297 – 19.884	0.697
Time Post Pilot	0.184	0.115 – 0.253	<0.001
Procedures	-0.039	-11.610 – 11.532	0.995
Investigations	20.017	13.552 – 26.482	<0.001
Ambulance	0.879	0.068 – 1.689	0.034
Patient Volume	1.977	1.529 – 2.425	<0.001
Lag Occupancy	2.339	1.543 – 3.135	<0.001
Age	0.83	-0.689 – 2.349	0.284
Observations		639	
R2 / R2 adjusted		0.541 / 0.521	
Daily Average LoS - Admitted Patients			
(2)			
Predictors	Estimates	CI	p
(Intercept)	-284.478	-444.719 – -124.237	0.001
Time	0.052	-0.016 – 0.120	0.134
Pilot	3.744	-25.325 – 32.813	0.8

Time Post Pilot	0.339	0.218 – 0.460	<0.001
Procedures	12.526	-2.238 – 27.289	0.096
Investigations	2.505	-6.082 – 11.092	0.567
Ambulance	0.299	-0.463 – 1.060	0.441
Patient Volume	2.209	1.484 – 2.933	<0.001
Lag Occupancy	4.132	2.750 – 5.515	<0.001
Age	0.174	-1.566 – 1.914	0.844
R2 / R2 adjusted		0.556 / 0.537	

**Daily Average LoS - Discharged Patients
(3)**

Predictors	Estimates	CI	p
(Intercept)	-98.23	-170.105 – -26.354	0.007
Time	0.018	-0.013 – 0.050	0.253
Pilot	0.965	-11.980 – 13.910	0.884
Time Post Pilot	0.114	0.061 – 0.168	<0.001
Procedures	3.643	-4.746 – 12.032	0.394
Investigations	20.261	15.792 – 24.730	<0.001
Ambulance	0.541	-0.037 – 1.118	0.066
Patient Volume	1.466	1.134 – 1.797	<0.001
Lag Occupancy	1.251	0.636 – 1.865	<0.001
Age	-0.134	-1.098 – 0.830	0.785
Observations		639	
R2 / R2 adjusted		0.522 / 0.502	

Time-related controls, such as month of attendance and day of the week were also included.

Using Equation 2 and the *Time Post Pilot* regression coefficients for admitted and discharged patients (Table 5 Columns (2) & (3)), we see that the daily average length of stay in the ED increased in a higher proportion for admitted patients than for discharged patients (p-value < 0.001).

It is important to investigate whether the pilot had a larger impact on older patients. When comparing the daily average length of stay in the ED for admitted patients, older patients saw an estimated 84 minute increase, while younger patients saw an estimated 60 minute increase (see Supplementary Data). Similarly, when comparing between discharged patients, older patients saw an estimated 33 minute increase, whereas younger patients saw an estimated 21 minute increase. It is worth mentioning that for admitted and discharged patients, older and younger patients saw a statistically similar proportional increase in their average length of stay in the ED.

On the other hand, if we compare the pilot's impact across patient categories, we see that Majors (Ambulant) and Majors (Trolley) saw a proportionally higher increase in their length of stay in the ED than Minors (p-value = 0.04 and p-value = 0.002), while Majors (Ambulant) and Majors (Trolley) saw a similar proportional increase (p-value = 0.12) (see Supplementary Data for regression results). It is also important to note that, on average, Majors (Trolley) patients' length of stay in the ED is higher than Majors (Ambulant) patients (see Supplementary Data for estimated daily average length of stay for Majors (Ambulant) and Majors (Trolley))).

Other Implications

Besides conversion rate and overall length of stay in the ED, ambulance handover times provide useful insight into the extent of crowding in the ED [28]. Table 6 shows the results of the segmented regression models for the daily average ambulance handover time. The model controls for exit block using the average hospital's occupancy level from the day before. It also controls for crowding at the ambulance arrival area by using the number of ambulance patients being cared for at the ambulance arrival area before the handover begins, divided by the number of doctors and nurses allocated to the area. The results show a marginally significant change in the daily average handover time during the postintervention period (Time Post Pilot 95% CI (-0.001, 0.007)).

Table 6: Daily Average Ambulance Handover Linear Segmented Regression

Predictors	Daily Average Handover		
	Estimates	CI	p
(Intercept)	2.929	-0.281 – 6.140	0.074
Time	0	-0.002 – 0.002	0.941
Pilot	-0.366	-1.253 – 0.521	0.418
Time Post Pilot	0.003	-0.001 – 0.007	0.088
Ambulance Patient Volume	10.036	9.397 – 10.675	<0.001
Lag Occupancy	0.065	0.023 – 0.107	0.003
Observations		639	
R2 / R2 adjusted		0.675 / 0.663	

Time-related controls, such as month of attendance and day of the week were also included.

Finally, patient self-discharged rates increased during the pilot by an estimated 1.04 percentage points (Table 2). However, there were no changes to the 72-hour revisit rates. Additionally, we also investigated the effects of the intervention on other measures of quality of care such as reported incidents and mortality. We did not find statistically significant changes for reported incidents or for 30-day mortality rates for patients admitted to the hospital, although the mortality data is a limited sample. We did not find statistically significant changes to the daily average ED occupancy levels (defined as the ratio between number of patients in the ED and number of doctors and nurses) during the pilot.

DISCUSSION

This study investigated the effects of the removal of the four-hour access standard reporting in the ED by using data from a major NHS trust which was part of a field study by NHS England. During the post-intervention period when the ED stopped reporting the four-hour access standard, we observed a drop in the daily proportion of patients admitted to the hospital from the ED, in particular for short-stay admissions of Majors (Ambulant) patients. This suggests that the hospital might benefit from a reduction in short-stay admissions when the pressure to adhere to the four-hour access standard in the ED is lifted. However, our analysis also reveals an increase in the daily proportion of patients spending twelve hours or more in the ED, and an increase in the daily average length of stay in the ED, post-intervention. More importantly, admitted patients saw a proportionally higher increase in their length of stay in the ED compared to discharged patients, even when controlling for patients' age group and category. We found a marginally statistically

significant increase in the ambulance handover time during the pilot test. Self-discharged rates increased during the intervention, however there were no changes to patient 72-hour revisit rates.

Our study is the first systematic investigation that uses detailed patient-level data to analyse the effects of lifting the four-hour access standard reporting in the ED, and it presents a set of interesting results and potential trade-offs. Our findings suggest that the removal of time-based targets in the emergency department do not impact all patients equally. While certain patient groups such as those Majors (Ambulant) patients with less severe issues might have benefited from the removal of the four-hour access standard by avoiding short-stay hospital admissions, the average length of stay in the ED seemed to have increased across all groups, particularly for older and admitted patients.

Our study offers several important policy implications. First, although various performance measures and targets have been considered, implemented, and ceased in the NHS over the years, such as the four-hour access standard, these critical policy changes do not always have a rigorous evidence-driven basis. Moreover, there are often only limited investigations of their implications within hospitals. By deep diving into one ED with large-scale data, our study illuminates a previously unrecognised trade-off between short-stay hospital admissions and ED lengths of stay associated with the four-hour access standard reporting. Second, our findings point to a possible behavioural mechanism whereby ED staff might have responded to the original four-hour access standard by speeding up ED operations. While this helped patients by reducing the length of stay in the ED, it might have resulted in greater short-stay admissions in the hospital, which are costly. As such, in devising policy and performance targets, it is essential to consider behavioural implications for ED staff, which may be the main driver behind the policy outcomes. Finally, it appears that lifting the four-hour access standard might have had the unintended consequence of benefiting the well-off (in terms of health) the most and the disadvantaged (older, hospital admitted patients) the least. It would make sense for policymakers to recognise such heterogeneity, and to consider, more explicitly, how different patient groups may be affected differently by such interventions.

The study has several limitations. Firstly, it only used data from one NHS trust, so the results may not generalise. Also, the daily number of patients attending this particular ED has considerably increased, while the number of resources has remained the same. Secondly, the study did not use a control ED or hospital. Thus, causality cannot be established, even though the methodology used in this study attempted to adjust for that by using interrupted time-series models. Thirdly, since the data did not allow for differentiation between treatment time in the ED and waiting time, the study cannot conclude that the increase in the average observed length of stay and the reduction in short-stay admissions are due to patients receiving extra care in the ED.

Contributions: TM, RI and BG initiated and designed the study. AB reviewed and refined the content. TM wrote the paper.

Acknowledgements and unfunded

AB's time was supported by the NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre. This work was unfunded.

Competing interests: None declared

References

1. S. Jones, C. Moulton, S. Swift, *et al.*, *Emergency Medicine Journal* 39, 168–173, DOI 10.1136/emj.2021.211572 (Mar. 2022).
2. A. Guttman, M. J. Schull, M. J. Vermeulen, *et al.*, *BMJ* 342, d2983–d2983, DOI 10.1136/bmj.d2983 (jun01 1 June 1, 2011).
3. N. H. S. (NHS), *The NHS Constitution for England*.
4. P. Jones, S. Wells, A. Harper, *et al.*, *N Z Med J.* 130, 21 (May 12, 2017).
5. C. M. Sullivan, A. Staib, J. Flores, *et al.*, *Australian Health Review* 38, 564, DOI 10.1071/AH14083 (2014).
6. E. J. Weber, S. Mason, J. V. Freeman, *et al.*, *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 60, 699–706, DOI 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2012.08.009 (Dec. 2012).
7. A. Staib, C. Sullivan, B. Griffin, *et al.*, *Australian Health Review* 40, 319, DOI 10.1071/AH15071 (2016).
8. P. G. Jones, B. Kool, S. Dalziel, *et al.*, *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health* 53, 685–690, DOI 10.1111/jpc.13519 (July 2017).
9. J. Lowthian, A. Curtis, L. Straney, *et al.*, *Emergency Medicine Australasia* 27, 35–41, DOI 10.1111/17426723.12338 (Feb. 2015).
10. S. Mason, E. J. Weber, J. Coster, *et al.*, *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 59, 341–349, DOI 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2011.08.017 (May 2012).
11. H. Ngo, R. Forero, D. Mountain, *et al.*, *PLOS ONE* 13, ed. by I. Puebla, e0193902, DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0193902 (Mar. 14, 2018).
12. I. Higginson, A. Kehoe, J. Whyatt, *et al.*, *European Journal of Emergency Medicine* 24, 25–28, DOI 10.1097/MEJ.0000000000000417 (Feb. 2017).
13. T. Tenbenschel, L. Chalmers, P. Jones, *et al.*, *BMC Health Services Research* 17, 678, DOI 10.1186/s12913-0172617-1 (Dec. 2017).
14. R. Forero, N. Man, S. McCarthy, *et al.*, *Emergency Medicine Australasia* 31, 253–261, DOI 10.1111/17426723.13142 (Apr. 2019).
15. R. Forero, N. Man, S. Nahidi, *et al.*, *Emergency Medicine Australasia* 32, 228–239, DOI 10.1111/1742-6723.13395 (Apr. 2020).
16. A. Mortimore, S. Cooper, *Emergency Medicine Journal* 24, 402–404, DOI 10.1136/emj.2006.044933 (June 1, 2007).
17. “A&E Clinical Quality Indicators” (Department of Health and Social Care, 2010).
18. “NHS Standard Contract 2021/22 - Technical Guidance” (National Health Service (NHS), Oct. 2021).
19. “Clinically-led Review of NHS Access Standards: Interim Report from the NHS National Medical Director” (National Health Service (NHS), Mar. 11, 2019).
20. “Process and definitions for the daily situation report web form” (National Health Service (NHS), Dec. 2, 2020).
21. E. J. Mascha, D. I. Sessler, *Anesthesia & Analgesia* 129, 618–633, DOI 10.1213/ANE.00000000000004153 (Aug. 2019).
22. A. K. Wagner, S. B. Soumerai, F. Zhang, *et al.*, *Journal of Clinical Pharmacy and Therapeutics* 27, 299–309, DOI 10.1046/j.1365-2710.2002.00430.x (Aug. 2002).
23. C. R. Ramsay, L. Matowe, R. Grilli, *et al.*, *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care* 19, 613–623, DOI 10.1017/S0266462303000576 (Dec. 2003).

24. J. Lopez Bernal, S. Cummins, A. Gasparrini, *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 348–355, DOI 10.1093/ije/dyw098 (June 9, 2016).
25. R. Paternoster, R. Brame, P. Mazerolle, *et al.*, *Criminology* 36, 859–866, DOI 10.1111/j.1745-9125.1998.tb01268.x (Nov. 1998).
26. L. I. Solberg, B. R. Asplin, R. M. Weinick, *et al.*, *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 42, 824–834, DOI 10.1016/S0196-0644(03)00816-3 (Dec. 2003).
27. S. Mason, E. Knowles, A. Boyle, *Emergency Medicine Journal* 34, 46–51, DOI 10.1136/emered-2015-205201 (Jan. 2017).
28. A. Boyle, I. Higginson, K. Sarsfield, *et al.*, “RCEM Acute Insight Series: Crowding and its Consequences” (Royal College of Emergency Medicine, Nov. 2021)