

Developing a Simulation Tool for Analyzing Emergency Department Performance

Yariv Marmor

Developing a Simulation Tool for Analyzing Emergency Department Performance

Project Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of
master of science in Industrial Engineering

Yariv Marmor

Submitted to the Senate of the Technion - Israel Institute of Technology

Iyar 5763

Haifa

May 2003

The research thesis was done under the supervision of Dr. David Sinreich in the faculty Industrial Engineering

The Generous financial help of the Technion is gratefully acknowledged.

Table of Content

1.	Abstract	1
2.	Introduction.....	5
	2.1 Background	5
	2.2 Choosing a model	5
	2.3 Previous works.....	6
	2.4 Research goals	8
3	Literature review	9
4.	Data collection.....	21
	4.1 Operating model.....	21
	4.2 Observation	23
	4.3 Observation theme	24
	4.4 Process chart.....	25
	4.5 History data	25
5.	Model's assumption	29
	5.1 Structure of the model's process	29
	5.2 Times of model activities	41
6.	Simulation structure	46
	6.1 Computerized simulation model	46
	6.2 Definition of simulation models - ED	48
	6.3 User interface.....	50
	6.4 Database	52
	6.5 Mathematical models.....	53

Table of Content (Continue)

7.	Mathematical models	55
7.1	EDs patient arrival model	55
7.2	Model for other hospital's patient arrival to the Imaging	73
7.3	Walking ED staff model.....	80
8.	Tool description (User interface)	88
8.1	Screens – presenting data	88
8.2	Dynamic animation	104
8.3	Graphical output.....	105
9.	Results and tool validation	108
9.1	Examine the simulation result	108
9.2	Tool validation with additional hospital.....	121
10.	Discussion.....	127
10.1	Result discussion.....	127
10.2	Validation degree	127
10.3	Future development	128
11.	Appendices	130
11.1	Appendix 1 – Typical patient process chart	131
11.2	Appendix 2 – ED physical structure	150
11.3	Appendix 3 – Data collecting forms.....	155
11.4	Appendix 4 – Data collecting codes.....	160
11.5	Appendix 5 – Calculating the accuracy.....	163
11.6	Appendix 6 – Data mining query.....	169
11.7	Appendix 7 – X-ray data concentration	171
11.8	Appendix 8 – Parameter for X-ray arrival	172
11.9	Appendix 9 – Scale above the chosen answer	176
11.10	Appendix 10 – Normal QQ-plot	179
12.	References	180

List of Table

Table 1	Research environment	7
Table 2	Hospital partition by operating model	21
Table 3	Patient type in the EDs	22
Table 4	Summary of observation partition by shifts	23
Table 5	Summary of time spent on direct observation by observation issue	28
Table 6	Matrix f for analysis similarity between charts (percent)	33
Table 7	Normal matrix ($\tilde{f}$) for analysis a similarity between charts (percent)	34
Table 8	Normal matrix ($\tilde{f}$) for analysis a similarity between Internal patient charts (percent)	35
Table 9	Normal matrix ($\tilde{f}$) for analysis a similarity between Surgical patient charts (percent)	35
Table 10	Normal matrix ($\tilde{f}$) for analysis a similarity between Orthopedic patient charts (percent) ..	35
Table 11	Normal matrix ($\tilde{f}$) for analysis a similarity between Internal patient and other (percent) ..	36
Table 12	Accuracy for every patient type and for overall average	44
Table 13	Accuracy for orthopedic patient type in every ED and for average orthopedic patient	45
Table 14	Possible room names	48
Table 15	Possible stuff types by operating process	49
Table 16	Patient type factors for of the hospitals in the survey	58
Table 17	Parameters of stuff walking model by patient type	87
Table 18	Average daily patient amount by patient type (database)	113
Table 19	Chart key ("1" to "4")	114
Table 20	Comparing simulation result to the database	123
Table 21	Average daily patient amount by patient type (database "6")	123
Table 22	Chart key ("6")	123
Table 23	Accuracy for main patient type	163
Table 24	Average for main patient type	164
Table 25	Standard deviation for main patient type	165
Table 26	Calculating the "Net cycle time" for main patient type	166
Table 27	Weight of every operation from "net cycle time" for main patient type (percent)	167
Table 28	Amount of time where operation have been seen for main patient type	168
Table 29	Summary time observed in the X-Ray by patient type and hospital	171
Table 30	Parameters of Rentgen arrival model (1)	172
Table 31	Parameters of Rentgen arrival model (2)	173
Table 32	Parameters of Rentgen arrival model (3)	174
Table 33	Parameters of Rentgen arrival model (4)	175
Table 34	Scale of 3 groups	175
Table 35	Scale of 4 groups	175

List of Figures

Figure1	Summary of observation distribution by day of week.....	23
Figure2	Principal example of process chart	30
Figure3	Random distribution for 4 equal groups	40
Figure4	Chosen distribution for 4 groups.....	40
Figure5	The simulation structure.....	46
Figure6	Main Screen in the simulation	51
Figure7	Example for the simulation output	52
Figure8	Example for list of database tables	53
Figure9	Average and standard deviation of residual for Internal patient by day of week.....	57
Figure10	Residual distribution for Internal patient.....	58
Figure11	Internal patient arrival rate to the ED by day of week.....	60
Figure12	Orthopedic patient arrival rate to the ED by day of week	63
Figure13	Surgical patient arrival rate to the ED by day of week	65
Figure14	Internal patient arrival rate to the ED by day of week (6 Hospitals).....	68
Figure15	Orthopedic patient arrival rate to the ED by day of week (6 Hospitals).....	70
Figure16	Surgical patient arrival rate to the ED by day of week (6 Hospitals).....	72
Figure17	Residual distribution for Internal patient (6 Hospitals)	73
Figure18	Residual distribution for sample group.....	75
Figure19	Not ED patient arrival rate to the X-Rat by day of week	78
Figure20	Comparing the model group to the validation group	79
Figure21	Standard deviation distribution of the residual from inquiry group	79
Figure22	Analysis of explained variance of physician walking model	82
Figure23	Analysis of residual of physician walking model	82
Figure24	Analysis of explained variance of nurse walking model	83
Figure25	Analysis of residual of nurse walking model.....	83
Figure26	Analysis the difference from observation an physician model	84
Figure27	Analysis the difference from observation an nurse model	85
Figure28	ED “4” walking distances chart.....	86
Figure29	Opening screen.....	88
Figure30	Choosing patient for display	89
Figure31	Main screen	90
Figure32	Toolbar	91
Figure33	Stuff walking model	93
Figure34	Additional time.....	93
Figure35	Scheduling shift exchanges	94
Figure36	Duration for shift exchange.....	94

List of Figures (Continue)

Figure37 Beginning of the first shift	95
Figure38 Resource availability screen	96
Figure39 Calculating patient arrival stream to the ED screen	97
Figure40 Extracting factor from database screen	98
Figure41 Verifying data stream screen	98
Figure42 External ED Patient arrival to the X-ray screen	99
Figure43 External ED Patient arrival Parameters to the external X-ray screen	100
Figure44 External ED Patient arrival Parameters to the attached X-ray screen.....	100
Figure45 Changing patient type stream.....	101
Figure46 Imaging department screen	102
Figure47 Consulting screen.....	103
Figure48 Patient delay screen	103
Figure49 Example for dynamic animation screen	105
Figure50 Opening screen for output displaying	106
Figure51 Example for output graphical screen	107
Figure52 Internal patient length of stay distribution in ED “1”	109
Figure53 Surgical patient length of stay distribution in ED “1”	109
Figure54 Orthopedic patient length of stay distribution in ED “1”	110
Figure55 Internal patient length of stay distribution in ED “2”	110
Figure56 Surgical patient length of stay distribution in ED “2”	110
Figure57 Orthopedic patient length of stay distribution in ED “2”	111
Figure58 Internal patient length of stay distribution in ED “3”	111
Figure59 Surgical patient length of stay distribution in ED “3”	111
Figure60 Orthopedic patient length of stay distribution in ED “3”	112
Figure61 Internal patient length of stay distribution in ED “4”	112
Figure62 Surgical patient length of stay distribution in ED “4”	112
Figure63 Orthopedic patient length of stay distribution in ED “4”	113
Figure64 Amount of Internal patient in ED “1”	115
Figure65 Amount of Surgical patient in ED “1”	115
Figure66 Amount of Orthopedic patient in ED “1”	116
Figure67 Amount of Internal patient in ED “2”	116
Figure68 Amount of Surgical patient in ED “2”	117
Figure69 Amount of Orthopedic patient in ED “2”	117
Figure70 Amount of Internal patient in ED “3”	118
Figure71 Amount of Surgical patient in ED “3”	118

List of Figures (Continue)

Figure72 Amount of Orthopedic patient in ED “3”	119
Figure73 Amount of Internal patient in ED “4”	119
Figure74 Amount of Surgical patient in ED “4”	120
Figure75 Amount of Orthopedic patient in ED “4”	120
Figure76 Internal patient length of stay distribution in ED “6”	121
Figure77 Surgical patient length of stay distribution in ED “6”	122
Figure78 Orthopedic patient length of stay distribution in ED “6”	122
Figure79 Amount of Internal patient in ED “6”	124
Figure80 Amount of Surgical patient in ED “6”	124
Figure81 Amount of Orthopedic patient in ED “6”	125
Figure82 Comparison of amount of Surgical patient with control chart (95%).....	126
Figure83 “Int” Patient process chart in hospital “2”	131
Figure84 “S” Patient process chart in hospital “2”	132
Figure85 “O” Patient process chart in hospital “2”	133
Figure86 “Triage/FT” Patient process chart in hospital “1”	134
Figure87 “Int” Patient process chart in hospital “1”	135
Figure88 “S” Patient process chart in hospital “1”	136
Figure89 “O” Patient process chart in hospital “1”	137
Figure90 “Int_W” Patient process chart in hospital “3”	138
Figure91 “Int_A” Patient process chart in hospital “3”	139
Figure92 “S_W” Patient process chart in hospital “3”	140
Figure93 “O_W” Patient process chart in hospital “3”	141
Figure94 “T” Patient process chart in hospital “3”	142
Figure95 “Int_A” Patient process chart in hospital “4”	143
Figure96 “Int_S” Patient process chart in hospital “4”	144
Figure97 “O” Patient process chart in hospital “4”	145
Figure98 “Int” Patient process chart in hospital “5”	146
Figure99 “Tri/FT” Patient process chart in hospital “5”	147
Figure100 “S” Patient process chart in hospital “5”	148
Figure101 “O” Patient process chart in hospital “5”	149
Figure102 Physical chart of ED in hospital “2”	150
Figure103 Physical chart of ED in hospital “1”	151
Figure104 Physical chart of ED in hospital “3”	152
Figure105 Physical chart of ED in hospital “4”	153
Figure106 Physical chart of ED in hospital “5”	154
Figure107 Collecting observation data on patients (form)	155

List of Figures (Continue)

Figure108 Bed supervision while observing patients (form)	156
Figure109 Collecting observation data on medical stuff (form)	157
Figure110 Collecting observation data on patients in the X-Ray (form)	158
Figure111 Collecting observation data on patients waiting for consulting (form)	159
Figure112 Coding for observation on physician	160
Figure113 Coding for observation on nurse	161
Figure114 Coding for observation on patient	162
Figure115 Normal QQ-Plot.....	179

Abstract

The health care industry is going through major changes in recent years. Hospitals are vigorously searching for ways to reduce cost and improve productivity due to dwindling resources. In the face of an increase in the number of patients who arrive to Emergency Departments (ED) seeking medical care. As a result ED overcrowding coupled with shortages in the nursing staff and limited resident hours have become an acute problem in many large urban hospitals in recent years. As a result, it has been recognized by hospital managers and other health care policy makers that new types of information techniques and tools are needed to improve hospital operations in general and ED productivity and efficiency in particular. At the same time, it is widely accepted that simulation can assist management in evaluating different operational alternatives in order to improve existing Emergency Departments (EDs) or assist in planning and designing new EDs.

Although research surveys list hundreds of simulation studies, simulation is still not widely accepted, mainly due to the reluctance of hospital management to accept results, which come from a “Black-Box” type of tool. In order to improve the widespread proliferation of simulation in health-care systems in general and EDs in particular, it is suggested that the hospital management should be directly involved in the development of the simulation projects in order to build up the models’ credibility. In addition, it is important to simplify the simulation processes and use visual aids or animation in order to gain more confidence in the model’s ability. In light of this, it is apparent that a different approach to health-care simulation in general and ED simulation in particular has to be taken. This approach has to address the following principals:

- i. The simulation tool has to be general and flexible enough to model every possible ED setting.
- ii. The tool has to be intuitive and simple to use. This way managers, hospital engineers and other nonprofessional simulation modelers, can build and run simulation models with very little effort.
- iii. The tool has to include base-values for all (or most) of the system parameters. This will reduce the need for comprehensive costly and time

consuming time studies which are usually one of the first steps in building any simulation model.

5 hospitals were chosen for this study. A meeting was set with the senior physician and head nurses of each ED to learn about the specific procedures routinely performed by the ED staff. In the next step, teams of supervised students, equipped with standardized code lists for different process elements, conducted time studies and observations. An element was defined as a unique operation a patient goes through, or one which a member of the EDs staff performs. A total sample size of 16,250 elements were gathered. Based on the interviews and observations, 8 patient types were identified: Fast-Track, Internal, Surgical, Orthopedic, Trauma, Walk-In Surgical, Walk-In Orthopedic and Internal/Surgical.

In addition to the data gathered through the time study and observations, the hospitals (except hospital 5) provided us with 24 month of historical patient data from their computerized information system. The data covered three main sites which treat and handle patients at each hospital: the ED, the Imaging centers and the Labs.

Based on this data, 19 individual process charts, one for each patient's type at each of the 5 EDs observed, were developed. These charts include the duration of each of the elements in the process and the frequencies of each of the connections between the different elements. These processes were classified into 4 different groups based on some similarity measure. The groups were formed based on patient type, group 1 - Fast-Track and walk in patients, group 2 - Internal patients, group 3 - Surgical patients and group 4 - Orthopedic patients. This shows that the processes patients go through when visiting the ED are mostly effected by the patient type rather than the hospital in which those are performed. This leads to the conclusion that a general simulation tool which based on a unified process with base value can be developed.

In order for the simulation tool to be general, flexible and easy to use, several mathematical models were developed:

Patient arrival model to the ED – The data from the hospitals revealed that the square root of the patient's arrival rate in every hour of the weekdays, is normally distributed and it differs from one hospital to the other by a constant factor.

Patient arrival model to the Imaging center – Imaging centers (X-ray, CT and Ultrasound) may serve the entire hospital patient population. So in order to estimate

accurately the service time including the waiting time, ED patients experience when sent to the imaging center. A linear regression model was used revealing again that the square root of the patients arrival rate is normally distributed

Physician's and nurse's walking model – The observations revealed that 5% - 11% of the medical staff's time in the ED is spent moving between different service points. A linear regression model was developed to estimate this time and add it to the staff's operation whenever a move is made.

All these models and other unified processes base values gathered through the observations were imbedded in a friendly user interface. From the user point of view the simulation does not demand any programming. Users are only required to fill in values or choose from predetermined ones.

Once the data is in place, the simulation runs AREANA 5.0, and the user can control the presenting animation. The Animation gives the user on-line information on the process and the interrelations between the three main sites which treat and handle the ED patients. Once the simulation is complete, the user can use the interactive graphical interface to present the main parameters and to compare them to elective historical data.

The tool validation process was conducted using a 6th hospital which did not participate in building the simulation tool. The data from the hospital's computerized information systems and observations were compared to results obtained from a running a simulation model using average base values gathered from the other hospitals (excluding hospital 6). The comparison revealed similar performance which validates the simulation tool as initially argued.