

# Difference of Emergency Department Frequent Users' Clinical Characteristics between Two Tertiary Teaching Hospitals in South Korea

Doyeop Kim, BE<sup>1</sup>, Jaeyong Yu, MS<sup>3</sup>, Seng Chan You, MD, MS<sup>1</sup>,  
Won Chul Cha, MD<sup>3,4</sup>, Rae Woong Park, MD, PhD<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biomedical Informatics, Ajou University School of Medicine, Suwon, South Korea;

<sup>2</sup>Department of Biomedical Sciences, Ajou University Graduate School of Medicine, Suwon, South Korea; <sup>3</sup>Sungkyunkwan University (SAIHST), Seoul, South Korea; <sup>4</sup>Department of Emergency Medicine, Samsung Medical Center, Sungkyunkwan University School of Medicine, Seoul, South Korea

Is this the first time you have submitted your work to be displayed at any OHDSI Symposium? No

## Abstract

*Frequent Emergency Department (ED) user and ED crowding has been observed as both a concern for patient safety and a worldwide public health problem. Unnecessary frequent ED visits can cause misuse of medical resources. We compared the difference of clinical properties such as gender, severity, admission status (admitted from), discharge status (discharge to) and diagnosis of frequent ED users in two tertiary teaching hospitals by using OMOP-CDM research ecosystem.*

## Introduction

The Korean national medical insurance system is built in a way that around 97% of medical bills are covered by the government. Therefore, many patients frequently visit the ED as the low cost of the ED care. Furthermore, there are many ED visits for the purpose of inpatient admission, because usually it takes long time for admission via outpatient department. Frequent ED user and ED crowding has been observed as both a concern for patient safety and a worldwide public health problem<sup>1</sup>. Unnecessary frequent ED visits can cause misuse of medical resources. Understanding the characteristics of frequent ED users is critical to designing effective interventions to reduce their visits and the associated healthcare costs<sup>2</sup>. However, very few studies have examined the difference of clinical characteristics of the frequent ED users between different institutions.

The purpose of this study is to identify the difference of characteristics between frequent users of ED in two institutions with OMOP-CDM.

## Method

We developed a mapping system to transform the National Emergency Department Information System (NEDIS) into OMOP-CDM (<https://github.com/OHDSI/ETL---Korean-NEDIS>). Two tertiary teaching hospital's NEDIS data were converted into CDM which contains emergency information such as severity, chief complaint, injury intent and mechanism of injury. The study subject was defined ED visitors from January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2017.

The frequent ED users were defined as patient with more than four ED visits per years. We compared the difference of clinical properties such as age, gender, admission status (admitted from), severity, ED diagnosis, discharge status (discharge to) of the frequent users of ED in two tertiary teaching hospitals.

## Result

There is a significant difference among discharge status (discharge to), and ED diagnosis (Table 1). The proportion of admission in frequent user are 21.7% and 32.8% in institution A and S respectively.

**Table 1.** Characteristics of frequent user of emergency department between two institutions.

Variable	Hospital A		p-value*	Hospital B		p-value*
	Chance user (N=467,305)	Frequent user (N=48,082)		Chance user (N=338,281)	Frequent user (N=67,014)	
Gender			< 0.001			< 0.001
Male	246,754 (52.8%)	26,480 (55.1%)		165,962 (49.1%)	34,808 (51.9%)	
Female	220,551 (47.2%)	21,602 (44.9%)		172,319 (50.9%)	32,206 (48.1%)	
Age group			< 0.001			< 0.001
18 < Age	157,152 (33.6%)	18,790 (39.1%)		71,312 (21.1%)	16,354 (24.4%)	
18 ≤ Age < 65	243,762 (52.2%)	20,149 (41.9%)		186,778 (55.2%)	31,826 (47.5%)	
65 ≤ Age	66,391 (14.2%)	9,143 (19.0%)		80,191 (23.6%)	18,834 (28.1%)	
Admission Status (admitted from)			< 0.001			< 0.001
Direct	385,372 (82.5%)	44,265 (92.1%)		269,533 (80.4%)	56,657 (85.0%)	
Transferred from other hospital	81,445 (17.4%)	3,776 (7.9%)		44,739 (13.3%)	4,411 (6.6%)	
Referred by outpatient department	191 (0.0%)	7 (0.0%)		19,921 (5.9%)	5,239 (7.9%)	
Others	76 (0.0%)	17 (0.0%)		1,182 (0.4%)	311 (0.5%)	
Unknown	221 (0.0%)	17 (0.0%)		2 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Discharge status (discharge to)			< 0.001			< 0.001
Home	350,457 (75.0%)	35,323 (73.5%)		242,262 (73.95%)	43,467 (66.0%)	
Inpatient admission	101,312 (21.7%)	11,755 (24.4%)		77,465 (23.6%)	21,645 (32.8%)	
Transfer to other hospital	2,298 (0.5%)	98 (0.2%)		5,432 (1.7%)	504 (0.8%)	
Death	2,063 (0.4%)	71 (0.1%)		2,397 (0.7%)	212 (0.3%)	
Others	832 (0.2%)	93 (0.2%)		312 (0.1%)	76 (0.1%)	
Unknown	10,343 (2.2%)	742 (1.5%)		2 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	

\*Chi-square test.

Especially in the diagnosis, the proportion of injuries at the chance and frequent user is 31.1%, 9.1% respectively which is highest in institution A. In contrast, the proportion of cancer at the chance and frequent user are 12.6%, 40.2% respectively which is highest in institution S (Appendix Table 2). We found the number of injury is highest in ED patients in institution A, and cancer is high in ED patients in institution S, as Institution A and S is specialized and famous for trauma center and cancer center, respectively.

## Conclusion

Based on this comparison, we can compare and understand the basic characteristics of frequent ED users in two different hospitals. In the future study, we will try to predict the frequent ED user for taking appropriate interventions to reduce the number of ED visits, thus improving ED crowding problem and quality of care.

## Acknowledgment

This work was supported by a grant of the Korea Health Technology R&D Project through the Korea Health Industry Development Institute (KHIDI), funded by the Ministry of Health & Welfare, Republic of Korea (grant number : HI16C0992) and the Bio Industrial Strategic Technology Development Program (20003883) funded By the Ministry of Trade, Industry & Energy (MOTIE, Korea).

## References

1. Morley C, Unwin M, Peterson GM, Stankovich J, Kinsman L (2018) Emergency department crowding:

A systematic review of causes, consequences and solutions. PLOS ONE 13(8): e0203316. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0203316>

2. Woo JH, Grinspan Z, Shapiro J, Rhee SY (2016) Frequent Users of Hospital Emergency Departments in Korea Characterized by Claims Data from the National Health Insurance: A Cross Sectional Study. PLoS ONE 11(1): e0147450. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0147450

**Table 2.** Top ten occurrence in classification of reason for ED visit.

Hospital A				Hospital B			
Variable	Chance user (n=563,660)	Frequent user (n=60,666)	p-value*	Variable	Chance user (n=405,877)	Frequent user (n=81,847)	p-value*
			< 0.001				< 0.001
1	Injury, poisoning certain other consequences of external causes	175,429 (31.1%)	5512 (9.1%)	1	Symptoms, signs and abnormal clinical and laboratory findings, NEC	85096 (21.5%)	10663 (13.2%)
2	Diseases of the respiratory system	67,252 (11.9%)	12,163 (20.0%)	2	Neoplasms	49716 (12.6%)	32425 (40.2%)
3	Certain infectious and parasitic diseases	57,986 (10.3%)	6,765 (11.2%)	3	Injury, poisoning and certain other consequences of external causes	71121 (18.0%)	3466 (4.3%)
4	Symptoms, signs and abnormal clinical and laboratory findings, NEC	52,414 (9.3%)	5,485 (9.0%)	4	Diseases of the respiratory system	28301 (7.2%)	4946 (6.1%)
5	Diseases of the digestive system	50,624 (9.0%)	5,809 (9.6%)	5	Diseases of the digestive system	27220 (6.9%)	4512 (5.6%)
6	Diseases of the circulatory system	30,266 (5.4%)	3,039 (5.0%)	6	Certain infectious and parasitic diseases	21010 (5.3%)	2292 (2.8%)
7	Diseases of the genitourinary system	25,883 (4.6%)	3,247 (5.4%)	7	Diseases of the musculoskeletal system and connective tissue	18449 (4.7%)	4697 (5.8%)
8	Diseases of the ear and mastoid process	18,633 (3.3%)	1,225 (2.0%)	8	Diseases of the circulatory system	17653 (4.5%)	2522 (3.1%)
9	Neoplasms	14,013 (2.5%)	5,357 (8.8%)	9	Diseases of the genitourinary system	16224 (4.1%)	3235 (4.0%)
10	Diseases of the skin and subcutaneous tissue	15,428 (2.7%)	1,361 (2.2%)	10	Factors influencing health status and contact with health services	10632 (2.7%)	3723 (4.6%)

\*Chi-square test.