



Predictors of fracture from falls reported in hospital and residential care facilities: A cross-sectional study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-002948
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Mar-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Chari, Satyan; Monash University, Physiotherapy; Queensland Health, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital McRae, Prue; Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Safety and Quality Varghese, Paul; Queensland Health, Geriatric Medicine, Princess Alexandra Hospital Ferrar, Kaye; Queensland Health, Patient Safety Centre Haines, Terry; Monash University, Physiotherapy
Primary Subject Heading:	Geriatric medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research, Nursing
Keywords:	Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, GERIATRIC MEDICINE, Risk management < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Predictors of fracture from falls reported in hospital and residential care facilities: A cross-sectional study

Satyan Chari^{1,2,3,4}, Prue McRae^{4,5}, Paul Varghese^{4,6,7}, Kaye Ferrar⁸, Terry P Haines^{9,10,11*}

1 – Program Coordinator Falls Prevention, Safety and Quality Unit, Royal Brisbane and Women’s Hospital, Queensland Health, Australia

2 – Research Fellow, Queensland Health Office of Health and Medical Research (OHMR)

3 – Ph D Candidate, Physiotherapy Department, Monash University, Frankston, Australia

4 – Queensland Falls Injury Prevention Collaborative

5 – Falls Prevention, Safety and Quality Unit, Royal Brisbane and Women’s Hospital, Queensland Health, Australia

6 – Director of Geriatric Medicine, Geriatric Assessment and Rehabilitation Unit, Princess Alexandra Hospital, Queensland Health, Australia

7 – School of Medicine, University of Queensland, St Lucia, Australia

8 – Data Analysis Team, Patient Safety Centre, Queensland Health, Australia

9 – Director of Research, Southern Physiotherapy Clinical School, Physiotherapy Department, Monash University, Frankston, Australia.

10 – Director of Allied Health Research Unit, Southern Health, Cheltenham, Australia

11 – School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Queensland, St Lucia, Australia

Corresponding Author

Satyan Chari

1 Email: srcha5@student.monash.edu.au

2 Telephone: +61 7 3636 5375

3 Fax: +61 7 3636 1406

4 Postal: Safety and Quality Unit, Level 7, Block 7, Royal Brisbane and Women's
5 Hospital, Herston 4029, Queensland, Australia

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 *Senior Author

16
17
18
19 **Contributorship:**

20
21
22 SC designed the study, wrote the study plan, acquired data, prepared data, conducted
23 data analysis, interpreted results, drafted and revised the paper. PMc contributed to
24 data analysis, interpretation of results, initial draft and subsequent revisions. PV
25 contributed to the development of study design, data analysis, interpretation of results,
26 development of initial draft and subsequent revisions. KF contributed to writing the
27 study plan, acquiring data, data preparation, conducting data analysis, interpreting
28 results, initial draft and final revisions. TH provided overall supervision to the study,
29 designed the study, co-wrote the study plan, contributed to data preparation, data
30 analysis, interpretation of results, initial draft and subsequent revisions.

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 **Data sharing:**

40 There is no additional data.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Background: Fall-related fractures are associated with substantial human and economic costs. An improved understanding of the predictors of fall-related fracture in healthcare settings would be useful in developing future interventions.

Methods: We employed a retrospective cross-sectional design to identify predictors for fracture from adult falls reported over three years across 197 public healthcare facilities in Queensland, Australia. Associations between fall-related factors and fracture outcomes were analysed using logistic regression analysis.

Results: We analysed 24 218 falls (with 229 fractures) among adult hospital patients and 8 980 falls (with 74 fractures) among aged care residents. In the adjusted hospital model, advanced age (eighty years and over), female gender, falls from standing, and falls that were not witnessed, were all associated with increased fracture odds. In the adjusted residential care model, falls during reaching activities in standing, and falls due to tripping were associated with increased odds of fracture. Hospital patients who had been screened for their risk of falling at admission suffered fewer fractures than those who had not.

Conclusion: Our findings suggest that screening of hospital patients for their risk of falling may protect patients from injurious falls. Falls from upright postures appear to be more likely to result in fractures than other falls in healthcare settings.

Key Words: Falls, Fracture, Patient, Hospital, Residential Care, Risk Factors

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Article focus

- To explore and identify predictive relationships between factors related to falls in institutional settings and fractures outcomes through the analysis of routinely reported clinical incident data.

Key Points

- Certain types of falls sustained in hospital and residential care settings are more likely to be associated with fracture than others.
- These include falls from more upright positions, and falls due to tripping.
- Hospital patients who have been screened for their risk of falling are less likely to experience fracture producing falls than those who are not.

Strengths and Limitations

- This research highlights new associations between falls screening and fracture outcomes.
- An important limitation of this study is that voluntary clinical incident reporting systems are likely to be affected by reporting inconsistencies and error, due to which results of our study should only be applied to practice with caution.

INTRODUCTION

Falls among older people in institutional settings are an issue of growing concern. (1) While not all falls are injurious, the ones that cause serious injuries, such as hip fractures, are responsible for the major portion of the economic (2) and human cost (2,3) described in the literature. As a result, preventing such injurious falls is an important public health priority.

Typically, fall prevention trials have implemented interventions targeting modifiable risk factors for falls among older people identified as being at risk of falling, and some have been successful in reducing fall rates. (4-6) Nevertheless, due to the large numbers of older people who would be considered to be at risk of falling in hospital and residential care settings, such broad approaches can be expensive to implement and sustain. A more cost-effective approach would be to focus directly on the prevention of injurious falls among older people at risk of sustaining fall-related injury. However, our understanding of the predictors of fall-related injury in health care settings is currently inadequate to develop such targeted interventions. The aim of this study was to advance an understanding of fall-related fracture predictors in hospital and residential care settings, by examining incident reports completed after falls in these environments.

METHODS

Design

This retrospective cross-sectional study utilised clinical incident reports completed after adult falls in healthcare settings (hospital and residential care) and explored

1
2 predictive relationships between fall-related factors and fracture outcomes using
3
4 logistic regression analysis.
5
6
7

8 **Participants**

9
10 All adult fall-related incidents reported on the Queensland Health (QH) clinical
11 incident reporting system (also known as 'PRIME') between 1 January 2007 and 30
12
13 November 2009 were included in our dataset.
14
15
16

17 **Setting**

18
19 QH operates 167 hospital facilities with 8 859 beds, 27 residential care facilities with
20
21 1 798 beds and four specialised psychiatric residential facilities with 458 beds
22
23 respectively. QH hospital facilities are geographically scattered with fifteen facilities
24
25 in metropolitan areas, 78 in regional areas and 74 in remote areas across the State.
26
27

28
29 All but one facility (a 538 bed tertiary metropolitan hospital in southeast
30
31 Queensland) utilise the PRIME reporting system.
32
33

34
35 The PRIME reporting system is accessible online by QH staff. Once basic
36
37 information about the individual is entered, the reporter inputs incident details
38
39 through a series of drop-down fields pertaining to the specific incident type (for
40
41 example, a fall or pressure ulcer). The system generates additional fields on
42
43 subsequent pages based on the incident type chosen by the reporter. Some fields are
44
45 mandatory and required to be completed before progressing to subsequent sections.
46
47 Reporters are able to save incomplete reports and exit at any point, with the option to
48
49 return and finalise the report at a later stage. The reporting interface is designed to
50
51 be usable by reporters without prior experience with the system, however regular
52
53 training sessions are available for staff in addition to comprehensive online resources
54
55 and local support from expert users. To ensure report accuracy, ward managers are
56
57
58
59
60

1 responsible for reviewing incidents periodically. The QH Patient Safety Centre
2
3 (PSC) monitors overall system functionality and coordinates system improvements
4
5 as necessary.
6
7
8
9

10 **Procedure**

11 The institutional human research ethics review committee of the Royal Brisbane and
12 Women's Hospital (RBWH) approved this study. We included all mandatory and
13 non-mandatory fields collected in relation to individual fall incidents across QH
14 facilities for the observation period. Retrieved fields included date of incident, time
15 of incident, the incident severity level, health district, facility, service area, ward/unit,
16 date of birth, gender, universal reference number (patient ID), place of incident (such
17 as bedroom, bathroom, or toilet), injuries sustained, function when the fall occurred
18 (such as standing, walking, or sitting), activity when fall occurred (such showering,
19 grooming, or resting), fall mechanism (such as slip, trip, or overbalance), whether a
20 fall risk screen or assessment was completed upon admission, and whether the fall
21 was witnessed. The QH clinical incident (CI) data dictionary provides definitions for
22 a selection of fall-related field types. These are listed in Table 1.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 (Table 1 here)

40
41
42
43 We examined raw data and eliminated duplicate records, along with records that
44 pertained to community clients and falls that occurred while hospital patients or aged
45 care residents were outside the healthcare facility. We also excluded falls that related
46 to hospital patients under the age of eighteen. In total, we removed 3 812 records
47 through this process, resulting in a final dataset of 33 198 incidents. The dataset was
48 interrogated for inconsistencies through the creation of frequency tables, data ranges
49 and histograms at various stages of the data preparation process.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 For fields with multiple response options, we coded for the presence or absence of
5
6 each response variable separately to enable logistic regression analysis. Similarly, for
7
8 'Age at time of fall', a continuous variable, we created age-ranges and then coded
9
10 within these categories dichotomously. Prior to analysis, we separated records into
11
12 hospital and residential care datasets. This decision was based on a review of the
13
14 literature, which suggested that hospital and residential care populations were
15
16 sufficiently different in terms of demographic characteristics, health status, risk
17
18 factor profile, level of frailty, and systems of care delivery to require separate
19
20 analysis. (7-12)
21
22
23
24
25

26 Microsoft® Excel 2002 and Access 2002 were used for data preparation and coding.
27
28 We used Microsoft® Excel 2007 to create tables and StatCorp® Stata SE version 10
29
30 to perform all statistical analysis.
31
32
33
34

35 **Data Analysis**

36
37 We examined relationships between individual predictor variables and fractures
38
39 using univariate and multiple logistic regression analysis. We clustered fall incidents
40
41 by universal identification number employing robust variance estimates to account
42
43 for the dependency between multiple fall records contributed by the same individual.
44
45 We additionally subjected predictor variables to factor analysis (principal
46
47 components) to explore between-variable colinearity prior to building a multiple
48
49 logistic regression model as described by Hosmer and Lemeshow. (13) We started
50
51 by including all univariate predictor variables with p-values equal to or less than 0.25
52
53 in the initial model. We then adopted a stepwise backward elimination approach to
54
55 progressively remove variables with the highest p-values until all remaining
56
57
58
59
60

1 variables in the model had p-values of equal to or less than 0.05. Excluded variables
2
3
4 were subsequently re-entered into the model in order of statistical significance, and
5
6 retained if they achieved p-values of 0.05 or less in the final model.
7
8
9

11 RESULTS

12 The final dataset consisted of 24 218 hospital fall incidents and 8 980 residential care
13
14 fall incidents. Table 2 presents a comparison of demographic, fall and fall-related
15
16 fracture characteristics for hospital and residential care subsets.
17
18

19 (Table 2 here)
20
21
22
23
24

25 Table 3 provides unadjusted odds-ratios for the likelihood of fracture when
26
27 individual fall-related variables are present. Table 4 and 5 present the models
28
29 developed for hospital and residential care datasets respectively, adjusted for the
30
31 effects of other variables entered into the model. Results showed that male hospital
32
33 patients were considerably less likely to fracture upon falling than female patients
34
35 [OR: 0.42, $p < 0.001$]. Further, patients of advanced age (80 years and over) were the
36
37 age group most likely to fracture upon falling in hospital [OR: 1.44, $p < 0.001$].
38

39 We found a number of fall-related characteristics to be predictive of fracture. 'Falls
40
41 while walking' were associated with higher odds of fracture in both hospital [OR:
42
43 1.96, $p < 0.001$] and residential care settings [OR: 2.04, $p < 0.001$] than falls during
44
45 other functions. 'Falls due to trips' were strongly predictive of fracture outcomes
46
47 across both settings as an unadjusted variable but only in residential care [OR: 2.89,
48
49 $p = 0.006$] once adjusted for the effects of other variables. Falls in certain physical
50
51 locations were associated with an increased probability of fracture outcomes.
52
53

54 Considered individually, falls in corridors or hallways [OR: 2.10, $p = 0.006$] were
55
56 strongly associated with fractures in hospital, while falls in resident rooms (but not
57
58
59
60

1 the immediate bedside environment) were similarly associated with an elevated risk
2 of fractures [OR: 1.88, p=0.011] in the adjusted residential care model.
3
4
5
6
7

8 In the adjusted hospital model, we found that falls reported as having been
9 ‘witnessed’ were half as likely to be associated with fracture outcomes [OR: 0.51,
10 p=0.003] than falls reported as being unwitnessed. Among hospital patients who had
11 been reported as having been screened for their fall risk at admission, falls were less
12 likely to be associated with fractures [OR: 0.60, p=0.012] than among patients for
13 whom a risk screen was not completed. Temporal factors were also associated with
14 the likelihood of fall-related fracture outcomes across both hospital and residential
15 care models.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 (Table 3 here)

26 (Table 4 here)

27 (Table 5 here)

28 **DISCUSSION**

29 Cost-effectiveness is increasingly being seen as important in the evaluation of
30 programs aimed at preventing falls in hospitals. (14) Previous cost-of-falls studies
31 have recognised that the economic burden of falls is heavily skewed towards falls
32 that result in fracture. (12, 15) The present study identified specific characteristics of
33 falls (and fallers) which increased the likelihood of fractures. Such data is necessary
34 for the development of future interventions to prevent these high cost falls.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Our results revealed that female hospital patients were almost twice as likely to
52 sustain fractures upon falling as male patients. These results are directionally
53 consistent with previous findings on gender-specific fall injury rates (5, 12). The lack
54 of a comparable trend in the residential care dataset could be attributed to the smaller
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 size of our residential care sample. However, previous studies have documented a
2 reduction in the female gender bias for fracture in people of advanced age or the
3 'oldest' old group, (16) hypothesising an acceleration of physiological bone changes
4 in men of advanced age. As our residential care group was considerably older than
5 the hospital group with a mean age difference of ten years, such an explanation could
6 be plausible.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14
15
16
17 In line with current biomechanical models for fall-related fractures (17-19), our
18 results support the premise that the likelihood of fracture is elevated for falls from
19 more upright postures compared to falls from lower heights. In our hospital dataset
20 for example, falls while walking, falls while standing and falls in corridor areas were
21 predictive of fractures. Conversely, falls reported to have happened when patients
22 were resting had a lower association with fractures in hospital. A similar trend was
23 observable in the residential care model in terms of both activity and spatial factors.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 On adjusting for other variables in the hospital multiple regression model, falls that
36 were reported as having been witnessed by staff were found to be half as likely to be
37 associated with fractures than unwitnessed falls. It would be reasonable to assume
38 that a number of these witnessed falls happened when patients were under the
39 supervision of a staff member. Therefore, intervention by staff may have contributed
40 to the reduced odds of fracture. At the same time, supervised patients might be less
41 likely to engage in 'risky' activities than unsupervised patients would due to input
42 from the staff member. For example, patients would be less likely to mobilise
43 without their prescribed mobility aid if a staff member were present to encourage its
44 use. While we recognise that a fall being 'witnessed' does not equate to the fall being
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 supervised in all instances, our results do highlight appropriate supervision as an
2 important part of a holistic approach to keeping older patients safe.
3
4

5
6
7
8 Falls that were reported as having occurred between the periods from two and three
9 in the afternoon and nine and ten at night were associated with increased fracture
10 odds in hospital after adjusting for other variables in the multiple logistic regression
11 model. These periods potentially intersect nursing shift changeover times. As
12 previously posited in this paper, the reduced availability of supervision could be a
13 factor influencing the risk of fall-related fracture outcomes during such periods. We
14 also identified relationships between falls in certain time periods and fractures in the
15 residential care settings. These were falls between seven and eight in the morning,
16 four and five in the afternoon and between seven and eight at night. Although
17 convergence was not readily identifiable between all of these periods and any single
18 daily activity routine or known physiological phenomena, a composite influence of
19 underlying factors may be an explanation. Due to the relatively high odds of fracture
20 from falls during these periods in residential care settings, further investigation is
21 warranted.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Our results suggest that patients who suffered serious falls were less likely to have
42 been screened for their risk of falling upon admission. While such an association has
43 not been previously discussed in the literature, there are possible mechanisms
44 through which falls risk screening could preferentially prevent injurious falls.
45
46
47
48

49 Theoretically, patients identified to be at risk of falling may receive interventions
50 more frequently than those patients whose risk has not yet been established. If some
51 of these interventions have a greater effect in preventing falls associated with
52 fracture, it would explain our results. An example of this would be the completion of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 mobility assessments for patients identified to be at risk of falling. Patients who
2 receive mobility assessments would be safer while mobilising thereby reducing the
3 risk of falls while walking, which is a type of fall associated with fractures in our
4 data. It should be noted that there is considerable heterogeneity in falls risk screening
5 processes across Queensland Health facilities with a mixture of validated falls risk
6 screening tools, formal and informal clinical judgment based approaches being
7 employed.
8
9

10 A parsimonious adjusted model proved elusive for both hospital and residential care
11 data sets, with a number of variables retaining p-values equal to or less than 0.05.
12

13 Despite this, the final model explained only a modest proportion of the overall
14 variance in the outcome variable. While this could be indicative of Type I error or a
15 high degree of random chance governing fracture phenomena, it is at least partly due
16 to the recognised multifactorial nature of fall-related fractures. A comprehensive
17 explanatory model would require the inclusion of other independently predictive
18 intrinsic variables such as diagnosis, frailty, cognitive and mobility status in addition
19 to the variables we considered here.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Falls due to tripping were strongly predictive of fractures in both hospital and
42 residential care settings when considered individually. Although falls due to tripping
43 did not retain statistical significance after being adjusted for other factors in the
44 hospital model, these results signify the need for greater emphasis on managing low-
45 level trip hazards for older people and improving their ability to safely negotiate
46 hospital environments.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Limitations

58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

There are a number of important limitations to our study, several of which are known shortcomings of cross-sectional research with routinely collected incident data (20, 21). As our sample was extracted from a voluntary incident reporting system, it is recognised that many unreported incidents would be missing from analysis.

Admittedly, a reporting bias towards injurious falls might also introduce an unknown degree of skew. Variations in incident reporting culture are unavoidable in large heterogeneous organisations such as Queensland Health, which consists of numerous facilities spread across large geographical areas and servicing diverse populations. These variations in reporting can be a substantial confounder for cross-sectional studies such as this where data is aggregated across multiple sites.

We recognise that by using ‘fracture’ as the outcome variable, we are aggregating fracture types with potentially dissimilar fracture mechanisms and therefore risk factors. Clearly, there is some suggestive evidence that activities preceding fracture producing falls vary depending on the resultant fracture type (22).

Another potential confounder is that most falls in health facilities are unwitnessed by staff. In our sample, fewer than twenty-five per cent of hospital falls and sixteen per cent of residential care falls were reported as having been witnessed. It is likely that details relating to these unwitnessed incidents are based on information collected from patients or residents themselves, other observers, and the reporter’s investigation of the circumstances surrounding the fall. It is possible that any extrapolation on the part of reporters could introduce error and negatively influence veracity of the data.

Within the limitations listed here, our results would be useful in the development of future intervention strategies to address the problem of injurious falls in hospital and residential care settings.

FUNDING DISCLOSURE

This investigator-initiated study was seed-funded by an \$8,000 internal research grant from the Queensland Health Patient Safety Centre, which contributed towards off-line research time for the principal investigator. The principal investigator commenced a five-year Queensland Health research fellowship during the latter stages of this study, which supported part of the time spent in manuscript preparation and finalisation.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None declared.

Table 1 Fall-related field definitions^λ

Type of fall	
Slip	Fall or loss of balance occurring from loss of traction on surface
Trip	Loss of balance usually while walking resulting from portion of foot or lower limb contacting an obstacle.
Legs gave way	Involuntary loss of mechanical support in the leg or legs
Dizziness	Loss of equilibrium, for example, a spinning sensation, or light-headedness, or a feeling you are about to fall
Faint	Loss of consciousness
Overbalance	Movement of the body beyond its base of support
Activity at time of fall	
Walking	<i>(No definition provided)</i>
Standing	Standing without other overt activity
Sitting to Standing	Moving from a sitting position to a standing position, eg rising from bed or chair or toilet
Standing to sitting	Moving from a standing to sitting position, eg lowering to a bed, chair or toilet
Standing from lying position	Moving from a lying to standing position, eg getting out of bed
Standing to lying position	Moving from lying to standing, eg getting in to bed
Rolling out of bed	Rolling out of bed on to the floor
Sitting	Sitting without other activity
Seating to seating	Transferring from one seated position to another, eg chair or toilet to wheelchair
Reaching for object while seated	<i>(No definition provided)</i>
Reaching for object while standing	<i>(No definition provided)</i>
Function attempted by patient at time of fall	
Toileting	All activities involved in getting to and using the toilet
Bathing or showering	All activities involved in bathing or showering, including getting to the shower
Resting	Includes movement to the location of rest
Exercising	Activity undertaken for therapeutic or recreational purposes, eg. going for a walk, or a part of treatment program
Grooming or dressing	Includes activities such as brushing hair or teeth, dressing, etc
Use entertainment	Includes activities such as picking up a book or turning on the TV

^λ Source: Queensland Health PRIME Clinical Incident Data Dictionary v 4.1 2008

Table 2 Characteristics of study sample: Falls and fall-related fracture

	Hospital	Residential Care Facilities
Reported falls	24,218	8,980
Mean age (SD)	70.14 (17.28)	80.48 (10.65)
Median age	74.35	82.37
Gender (Male %)	57	54
Reported fractures (% reported falls)	229 (0.94)	74 (0.82)
Mean age (SD)	75.83 (15.21)	82.63 (9.99)
Median Age	78.98	85.33
Gender (Male %)	33	44

Table 3 Univariate analysis of fall-related predictors of fracture outcomes in hospital and residential care settings

Variable	Hospital		Residential care	
	O/R ^a (95% CI)	p-value ^b	O/R ^a (95% CI)	p-value ^b
Activity Factors				
Reaching in standing	0.67 (0.34-1.31)	0.251	2.64 (1.13-6.16)	0.024*
Rolling out of bed	0.29 (0.10-0.78)	0.015*	0.86 (0.26-2.76)	0.802
Sitting	0.23 (0.08-0.62)	0.004*	0.40 (0.09-1.67)	0.214
Walking	1.96 (1.50-2.56)	<0.001*	2.04 (1.27-3.27)	0.003*
Type of Fall				
Trip	2.06 (1.32-3.22)	0.001*	3.88 (1.90-7.94)	<0.001*
Slip	0.70 (0.49-0.98)	0.043*	0.57 (0.27-1.20)	0.143
Function Factors				
Resting	0.40 (0.22-0.73)	0.003*	0.33 (0.10-1.05)	0.062
Person Factors				
Age between 40 and 60	0.46 (0.27-0.78)	0.004*	0.29 (0.04-2.21)	0.238
Age over 80	1.51 (1.16-1.96)	0.002*	1.27 (0.74-2.16)	0.377
Male Gender	0.37 (0.28-0.50)	0.000*	0.67 (0.40-1.12)	0.132
Spatial/Environmental Factors				
Bedside	0.63 (0.46-0.84)	0.002*	0.45 (0.14-1.44)	0.179
Bedroom areas other than bedside	1.36 (1.00-1.85)	0.048*	1.50 (0.93-2.42)	0.091
Corridor/Hallway	2.39 (1.58-3.62)	0.000*	0.88 (0.38-2.02)	0.770
Other areas – Not classified	1.24 (0.45-3.35)	0.671	3.08 (1.11-8.55)	0.031*
Temporal Factors				
1600-1700	0.92 (0.43-1.97)	0.844	2.12 (1.03-4.35)	0.040*
1900-2000	0.92 (0.41-2.07)	0.848	2.86 (1.35-6.05)	0.006*
Other factors				
Risk screened/assessed at admission	0.66 (0.48-0.92)	0.015*	0.41 (0.16-1.04)	0.061

^aOdds ratio (95% Confidence interval)^bSignificance level

*Significant variable (p equal to or less than 0.05)

Table 4 Adjusted Odds Ratios- Hospital fractures

Logistic regression	Number of obs =	17016
	Wald $\chi^2(10)$ =	101.60
	Prob > χ^2 =	0.0000
Log pseudo-likelihood = -911.42064	Pseudo R ² =	0.0554
Variable	O/R (95% CI)	p-value
Witnessed by staff	0.51 (0.33-0.79)	0.003
Risk screened/assessed at admission	0.60 (0.41-0.89)	0.012
Standing	2.08 (1.22-3.55)	0.007
Walking	1.86 (1.32-2.62)	<0.001
Resting	0.52 (0.27-0.97)	0.043
Male gender	0.42 (0.30-0.58)	<0.001
Corridor/hallway	2.10 (1.23-3.58)	0.006
Age between 40 and 60	0.52 (0.27-0.98)	0.046
Age 80 and over	1.44 (1.05-1.99)	<0.001
1400-1500 hours	1.97 (1.09-3.54)	0.023
2100-2200 hours	1.73 (1.01-2.97)	0.044

Table 5 Adjusted Odds Ratios - Residential care fractures

Logistic regression	Number of obs =	8973
	Wald $\chi^2(10)$ =	62.61
	Prob > χ^2 =	0.0000
Log pseudo-likelihood = -406.85361	Pseudo R ² =	0.0510
Variable	O/R (95% CI)	p-value
Reaching in standing	3.51 (1.44-8.56)	0.006
Walking	2.11 (1.24-3.58)	0.006
Trip	2.89 (1.35-6.17)	0.006
Bedroom areas other than bedside	1.88 (1.15-3.07)	0.011
Other areas - Not classified	3.19 (1.15-8.85)	0.025
0700-0800	2.56 (1.08-6.07)	0.033
1600-1700	2.59 (1.24-5.39)	0.011
1900-2000	3.33 (1.55-7.14)	0.002

REFERENCES

1. Järvinen TLN, Sievänen H, Khan KM, Heinonen A, Kannus P. Shifting the focus in fracture prevention from osteoporosis to falls. *Br Med J* 2008; **336**:124-6.
2. Braithwaite RS, Col NF, Wong JB. Estimating hip fracture morbidity, mortality and costs. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003; **51**:364-70.
3. Jacobsen SJ, Goldberg J, Miles TP, Brody JA, Stiers W, Rimm AA. Race and sex differences in mortality following fracture of the hip. *Am J Public Health* 1992; **82**:1147-50.
4. Stenvall M, Olofsson B, Lundström M, Englund U, Borsen B, Svensson O, Nyberg L, Gustafson Y. A multidisciplinary, multifactorial intervention program reduces postoperative falls and injuries after femoral neck fracture. *Osteoporos Int* 2007; **18**:167-175.
5. Haines TP, Bennell KL, Osborne RH, Hill KD Effectiveness of targeted falls prevention programme in subacute hospital setting: randomised controlled trial. *Br Med J* 2004; **328**:676-82.
6. Healey F, Monro A, Cockram A, Adams V, Heseltine D. Using targeted risk factor reduction to prevent falls in older in-patients: a randomised controlled trial. *Age Ageing* 2004; **33**:390-395.
7. Stone KL, Seeley DG, Lui L-Y, Cauley JA, Ensrud K, Browner WS, Nevitt MC, Cummings SR. BMD at multiple sites and risk of fracture of multiple types: Long-term results from the study of osteoporotic fractures. *J Bone Miner Res* 2003; **18**:1947-54.
8. Cali CM, Kiel DP. An epidemiologic study of fall-related fractures among institutionalized older people. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1995; **43**:1336-40.
9. Lichtenstein MJ, Griffin MR, Cornell JE, Malcolm E, Ray WA. Risk factors for hip fractures occurring in the hospital. *Am J Epidemiol* 1994; **140**:830-8.
10. Cummings SR, Melton LJ. Epidemiology and outcomes of osteoporotic fractures. *Lancet* 2002; **359**:1761-7.
11. Wagner AK, Zhang F, Soumerai SB, Walker AM, Gurwitz JH, Glynn RJ, Ross-Degnan D. Benzodiazepine use and hip fractures in the elderly: who is at greatest risk? *Arch Intern Med* 2004; **164**:1567-72.
12. Nurmi I, Lüthje P. Incidence and costs of falls and fall injuries among elderly in institutional care. *Scand J Prim Health Care* 2002; **20**:118-22.
13. Hosmer DW, Lemeshow S. Applied logistic regression. Wiley-Interscience: 2000.
14. Haines T, Kuys SS, Morrison G, Clarke J, Bew P. Cost-effectiveness analysis of screening for risk of in-hospital falls using physiotherapist clinical judgement. *Med Care* 2009; **47**:448-56.
15. Bates DW, Pruess K, Souney P, Platt R. Serious falls in hospitalized patients: correlates and resource utilization. *Am J Med* 1995; **99**:137-43.
16. Sanders KM, Seeman E, Ugoni AM, Pasco JA, Martin TJ, Skoric B, Nicholson GC, Kotowicz MA. Age- and gender-specific rate of fractures in Australia: A population-based study. *Osteoporos Int* 1999; **10**:240-47.
17. Testi D, Viceconti M, Baruffaldi F, Cappello A. Risk of fracture in elderly patients: a new predictive index based on bone mineral density and finite element analysis. *Comput Meth Programs Biomed* 1999; **60**:23-33.
18. Aharonoff GB, Dennis MG, Elshinawy A, Zuckerman JD, Koval KJ. Circumstances of falls causing hip fractures in the elderly. *J Orthop Trauma* 2003; **17**: S22-26.
19. Hemenway D, Feskanich D, Colditz GA. Body height and hip fracture: a cohort study of 90 000 women. *Int J Epidemiol* 1995; **24**:783-6.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
20. Hill A-M, Hoffmann T, Hill K, Oliver D, Beer C, McPhail S, Brauer S, Haines TP. Measuring falls events in acute hospitals—A comparison of three reporting methods to identify missing data in the hospital reporting system. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2010; **58**:1347-52
21. Haines TP, Massey B, Varghese P, Fleming J, Gray L. Inconsistency in classification and reporting of in-hospital falls. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2009; **57**:517-523.
22. Keegan THM, Kelsey JL, King AC, Quesenberry CP, Sidney S. Characteristics of fallers who fracture at the foot, distal forearm, proximal humerus, pelvis, and shaft of the tibia/fibula compared with fallers who do not fracture. *Am J Epidemiol* 2004; **159**:192-203.

For peer review only

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract ✓ (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found ✓
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported ✓
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses ✓
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper ✓
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection ✓
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants ✓
Variables	7	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 ✓
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias ✓
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at ✓
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why ✓
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding ✓ (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions ✓ (c) Explain how missing data were addressed ✓ (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy ✓ (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses ✓
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 N/A (c) Consider use of a flow diagram N/A
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders ✓ (where available) (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest Not possible for size of dataset
Outcome data	15*	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 ✓ (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 N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses ✓

Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives ✓
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 ✓
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence ✓
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 ✓

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

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.



21 JAN 2013



Predictors of fracture from falls reported in hospital and residential care facilities: A cross-sectional study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-002948.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-Jun-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Chari, Satyan; Monash University, Physiotherapy; Queensland Health, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital McRae, Prue; Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Safety and Quality Varghese, Paul; Queensland Health, Geriatric Medicine, Princess Alexandra Hospital Ferrar, Kaye; Queensland Health, Patient Safety Centre Haines, Terry; Monash University, Physiotherapy
Primary Subject Heading:	Geriatric medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research, Nursing
Keywords:	Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, GERIATRIC MEDICINE, Risk management < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5 **Predictors of fracture from falls reported in hospital and residential care facilities: A cross-**
6 **sectional study**
7
8

9
10 Satyan Chari^{1,2,3,4}, Prue McRae^{4,5}, Paul Varghese^{4,6,7}, Kaye Ferrar⁸, Terry P Haines^{9,10,11*}
11

12
13 1 – Program Coordinator Falls Prevention, Safety and Quality Unit, Royal Brisbane and
14 Women’s Hospital, Queensland Health, Australia
15

16
17 2 –Research Fellow, Queensland Health Office of Health and Medical Research (OHMR)
18

19
20 3 – Ph D Candidate, Physiotherapy Department, Monash University, Frankston, Australia
21

22
23 4 – Queensland Falls Injury Prevention Collaborative
24

25
26 5 – Falls Prevention, Safety and Quality Unit, Royal Brisbane and Women’s Hospital,
27 Queensland Health, Australia
28

29
30 6 – Director of Geriatric Medicine, Geriatric Assessment and Rehabilitation Unit, Princess
31 Alexandra Hospital, Queensland Health, Australia
32

33
34 7 – School of Medicine, University of Queensland, St Lucia, Australia
35

36
37 8 – Data Analysis Team, Patient Safety Centre, Queensland Health, Australia
38

39
40 9 – Director of Research, Southern Physiotherapy Clinical School, Physiotherapy Department,
41 Monash University, Frankston, Australia.
42

43
44 10 – Director of Allied Health Research Unit, Southern Health, Cheltenham, Australia
45

46
47 11 – School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Queensland, St Lucia, Australia
48

49
50 **Corresponding Author**
51

52
53 Satyan Chari
54

55
56 Email: srcha5@student.monash.edu.au
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Telephone: +61 7 3636 5375
4

5 Fax: +61 7 3636 1406
6
7

8 Postal: Safety and Quality Unit, Level 7, Block 7, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital,
9

10 Herston 4029, Queensland, Australia
11
12

13
14
15 *Senior Author
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

ABSTRACT

Background: Fall-related fractures are associated with substantial human and economic costs.

An improved understanding of the predictors of fall-related fracture in healthcare settings would be useful in developing future interventions.

Methods: We employed a retrospective cross-sectional design to identify predictors for fracture from adult falls reported over three years across 197 public healthcare facilities in Queensland, Australia. Associations between fall-related factors and fracture outcomes were analysed using logistic regression analysis.

Results: We analysed 24 218 falls (with 229 fractures) among adult hospital patients and 8 980 falls (with 74 fractures) among aged care residents. In the adjusted hospital model, advanced age (eighty years and over), female gender, falls from standing, and falls that were not witnessed, were all associated with increased fracture odds. In the adjusted residential care model, falls during reaching activities in standing, and falls due to tripping were associated with increased odds of fracture. Hospital patients who had been screened for their risk of falling at admission suffered fewer fractures than those who had not.

Conclusion: Our findings suggest that screening of hospital patients for their risk of falling may protect patients from injurious falls. Falls from upright postures appear to be more likely to result in fractures than other falls in healthcare settings.

Key Words: Falls, Fracture, Patient, Hospital, Residential Care, Risk Factors

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Article focus

- To explore and identify predictive relationships between factors related to falls in institutional settings and fractures outcomes through the analysis of routinely reported clinical incident data.

Key Points

- Certain types of falls sustained in hospital and residential care settings are more likely to be associated with fracture than other types.
- These include falls from more upright positions, and falls due to tripping.
- Hospital patients who have been screened for their risk of falling may be less likely to experience fracture producing falls than those who are not.

Strengths and Limitations

- This research highlights new associations between falls screening and fracture outcomes.
- An important limitation of this study is that voluntary clinical incident reporting systems are likely to be affected by reporting inconsistencies and error, due to which results of our study should only be applied to practice with caution.

INTRODUCTION

Falls among older people in institutional settings are an issue of growing concern. (1) While not all falls are injurious, the ones that cause serious injuries, such as hip fractures, are responsible for the major portion of the economic (2) and human cost (2,3) described in the literature. As a result, preventing fall-related fracture is an important public health priority (4).

Typically, fall prevention trials have implemented interventions targeting modifiable risk factors for falls among older people identified as being at risk of falling, and some have been successful in reducing fall rates. (5-7) Nevertheless, due to the large numbers of older people who would be considered to be at risk of falling in hospital and residential care settings, such broad approaches can be expensive to implement and sustain. A more cost-effective approach would be to focus directly on the prevention of injurious falls among older people at risk of sustaining fall-related injury. However, our understanding of the predictors of fall-related injury in health care settings is currently inadequate to develop such targeted interventions. The aim of this study was to advance an understanding of fall-related fracture predictors in hospital and residential care settings, by examining incident reports completed after falls in these environments.

METHODS

Design

1
2
3 This retrospective cross-sectional study utilised clinical incident reports completed after adult
4 falls in healthcare settings (hospital and residential care) and explored predictive relationships
5
6 between fall-related factors and fracture outcomes using logistic regression analysis.
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 **Participants**

14 All adult fall-related incidents reported on the Queensland Health (QH) clinical incident
15 reporting system (also known as 'PRIME') between 1 January 2007 and 30 November 2009
16 were included in our dataset.
17
18
19
20
21

22 23 24 25 **Setting**

26 QH operates 167 hospital facilities with 8 859 beds, 27 residential care facilities with 1 798
27 beds and four specialised psychiatric residential facilities with 458 beds respectively. QH
28 hospital facilities are geographically scattered with fifteen facilities in metropolitan areas, 78 in
29 regional areas and 74 in remote areas across the State. All but one facility (a 538 bed tertiary
30 metropolitan hospital in southeast Queensland) utilise the PRIME reporting system.
31
32
33

34 The PRIME reporting system is accessible online by QH staff. Once basic information about
35 the individual is entered, the reporter inputs incident details through a series of drop-down
36 fields pertaining to the specific incident type (for example, a fall or pressure ulcer). The system
37 generates additional fields on subsequent pages based on the incident type chosen by the
38 reporter. Some fields are mandatory and required to be completed before progressing to
39 subsequent sections. Reporters are able to save incomplete reports and exit at any point, with
40 the option to return and finalise the report at a later stage. The reporting interface is designed to
41 be usable by reporters without prior experience with the system, however regular training
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sessions are available for staff in addition to comprehensive online resources and local support
4
5 from expert users. To ensure report accuracy, ward managers are responsible for reviewing
6
7 incidents periodically. The QH Patient Safety Centre (PSC) monitors overall system
8
9 functionality and coordinates system improvements as necessary.
10
11
12
13

14 Procedure

15
16 The institutional human research ethics review committee of the Royal Brisbane and Women's
17
18 Hospital (RBWH) approved this study. We included all mandatory and non-mandatory fields
19
20 collected in relation to individual fall incidents across QH facilities for the observation period.
21
22 Retrieved fields included date of incident, time of incident, the incident severity level, health
23
24 district, facility, service area, ward/unit, date of birth, gender, universal reference number
25
26 (patient ID), place of incident (such as bedroom, bathroom, or toilet), injuries sustained,
27
28 function when the fall occurred (such as standing, walking, or sitting), activity when fall
29
30 occurred (such as showering, grooming, or resting), fall mechanism (such as slip, trip, or
31
32 overbalance), whether a fall risk screen or assessment was completed upon admission, and
33
34 whether the fall was witnessed. The QH clinical incident (CI) data dictionary provides
35
36 definitions for a selection of fall-related field types. These are listed in Table 1.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 (Table 1 here)
44
45
46
47

48 We examined raw data and eliminated duplicate records, along with records that pertained to
49
50 community clients and falls that occurred while hospital patients or aged care residents were
51
52 outside the healthcare facility. We also excluded falls that related to hospital patients under the
53
54 age of eighteen. In total, we removed 3 812 records through this process, resulting in a final
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 dataset of 33 198 incidents. The dataset was interrogated for inconsistencies through the
4
5 creation of frequency tables, data ranges and histograms at various stages of the data
6
7 preparation process.
8
9

10
11
12 For fields with multiple response options, we coded for the presence or absence of each
13
14 response variable separately to enable logistic regression analysis. Similarly, for 'Age at time of
15
16 fall', a continuous variable, we created age-ranges and then coded within these categories
17
18 dichotomously. Prior to analysis, we separated records into hospital and residential care
19
20 datasets. This decision was based on a review of the literature, which suggested that hospital
21
22 and residential care populations were sufficiently different in terms of demographic
23
24 characteristics, health status, risk factors, level of frailty, levels of activity and systems of care
25
26 delivery to require separate analysis. (8-13)
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Microsoft[®] Excel 2002 and Access 2002 were used for data preparation and coding. We used
35
36 Microsoft[®] Excel 2007 to create tables and StatCorp[®] Stata SE version 10 to perform all
37
38 statistical analysis.
39
40
41
42

43 **Data Analysis**

44
45 We examined relationships between individual predictor variables and fractures using
46
47 univariate and multiple logistic regression analysis. We clustered fall incidents by universal
48
49 identification number employing robust variance estimates to account for the dependency
50
51 between multiple fall records contributed by the same individual. We additionally subjected
52
53 predictor variables to factor analysis (principal components) to explore between-variable
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 colinearity prior to building a multiple logistic regression model as described by Hosmer and
4 Lemeshow. (14) We started by including all univariate predictor variables with p-values equal
5
6 to or less than 0.25 in the initial model. We then adopted a stepwise backward elimination
7
8 approach to progressively remove variables with the highest p-values until all remaining
9
10 variables in the model had p-values of equal to or less than 0.05. Excluded variables were
11
12 subsequently re-entered into the model in order of statistical significance, and retained if they
13
14 achieved p-values of 0.05 or less in the final model.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 RESULTS

24
25 The final dataset consisted of 24 218 hospital fall incidents and 8 980 residential care fall
26
27 incidents. Table 2 presents a comparison of demographic, fall and fall-related fracture
28
29 characteristics for hospital and residential care subsets.
30
31

32
33 (Table 2 here)
34
35
36

37
38 Table 3 provides unadjusted odds-ratios for the likelihood of fracture when individual fall-
39
40 related variables are present. Table 4 and 5 present the models developed for hospital and
41
42 residential care datasets respectively, adjusted for the effects of other variables entered into the
43
44 model. Results showed that male hospital patients were considerably less likely to fracture
45
46 upon falling than female patients [OR: 0.42, $p < 0.001$]. Further, patients of advanced age (80
47
48 years and over) were the age group most likely to fracture upon falling in hospital [OR: 1.44,
49
50 $p < 0.001$].
51
52

53
54 We found a number of fall-related characteristics to be predictive of fracture. 'Falls while
55
56 walking' were associated with higher odds of fracture in both hospital [OR: 1.96, $p < 0.001$] and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 residential care settings [OR: 2.04, $p < 0.001$] than falls during other functions. 'Falls due to
4 trips' were strongly predictive of fracture outcomes across both settings as an unadjusted
5 variable but only in residential care [OR: 2.89, $p = 0.006$] once adjusted for the effects of other
6 variables. Falls in certain physical locations were associated with an increased probability of
7 fracture outcomes. Considered individually, falls in corridors or hallways [OR: 2.10, $p = 0.006$]
8 were strongly associated with fractures in hospital, while falls in resident rooms (but not the
9 immediate bedside environment) were similarly associated with an elevated risk of fractures
10 [OR: 1.88, $p = 0.011$] in the adjusted residential care model.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 In the adjusted hospital model, we found that falls reported as having been 'witnessed' were
25 half as likely to be associated with fracture outcomes [OR: 0.51, $p = 0.003$] than falls reported as
26 being unwitnessed. Among hospital patients who had been reported as having been screened
27 for their fall risk at admission, falls were less likely to be associated with fractures [OR: 0.60,
28 $p = 0.012$] than among patients for whom a risk screen was not completed. Temporal factors
29 were also associated with the likelihood of fall-related fracture outcomes across both hospital
30 and residential care models.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 (Table 3 here)

42 (Table 4 here)

43 (Table 5 here)

44 45 46 47 48 **DISCUSSION**

49 Cost-effectiveness is increasingly being seen as important in the evaluation of programs aimed
50 at preventing falls in hospitals. (15) Previous cost-of-falls studies have recognised that the
51 economic burden of falls is heavily skewed towards falls that result in fracture. (13, 16) The
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 present study identified specific characteristics of falls (and fallers) which increased the
4 likelihood of fractures. Such data is necessary for the development of future interventions to
5 prevent these high cost falls.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Our results revealed that female hospital patients were almost twice as likely to sustain
13 fractures upon falling as male patients. These results are directionally consistent with previous
14 findings on gender-specific fall injury rates (6, 13). The lack of a comparable trend in the
15 residential care dataset could be attributed to the smaller size of our residential care sample.
16
17 However, previous studies have documented a reduction in the female gender bias for fracture
18 in people of advanced age or the 'oldest' old group, (17) hypothesising an acceleration of
19 physiological bone changes in men of advanced age. As our residential care group was
20 considerably older than the hospital group with a mean age difference of ten years, such an
21 explanation could be plausible.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 In line with current biomechanical models for fall-related fractures (18-20), our results support
37 the premise that the likelihood of fracture is elevated for falls from more upright postures
38 compared to falls from lower heights. In our hospital dataset for example, falls while walking,
39 falls while standing and falls in corridor areas were predictive of fractures. Conversely, falls
40 reported to have happened when patients were resting had a lower association with fractures in
41 hospital. A similar trend was observable in the residential care model in terms of both activity
42 and spatial factors. Falls while walking were strongly predictive of fracture in both adjusted
43 models. Compared with falls from static positions, this could relate to higher impact forces
44 from an additive effect of an individual's existing motion and the fall-related acceleration.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 On adjusting for other variables in the hospital multiple regression model, falls that were
7
8 reported as having been witnessed by staff were found to be half as likely to be associated with
9
10 fractures than unwitnessed falls. It would be reasonable to assume that a number of these
11
12 witnessed falls happened when patients were under the supervision of a staff member.
13
14 Therefore, intervention by staff may have contributed to the reduced odds of fracture. At the
15
16 same time, supervised patients might be less likely to engage in 'risky' activities than
17
18 unsupervised patients would due to input from the staff member. For example, patients would
19
20 be less likely to mobilise without their prescribed mobility aid if a staff member were present to
21
22 encourage its use. While we recognise that a fall being 'witnessed' does not equate to the fall
23
24 being supervised in all instances, our results do highlight appropriate supervision as an
25
26 important part of a holistic approach to keeping older patients safe.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Falls that were reported as having occurred between the periods from two and three in the
35
36 afternoon and nine and ten at night were associated with increased fracture odds in hospital
37
38 after adjusting for other variables in the multiple logistic regression model. These periods
39
40 potentially intersect nursing shift changeover times. As previously posited in this paper, the
41
42 reduced availability of supervision could be a factor influencing the risk of fall-related fracture
43
44 outcomes during such periods. We also identified relationships between falls in certain time
45
46 periods and fractures in the residential care settings. These were falls between seven and eight
47
48 in the morning, four and five in the afternoon and between seven and eight at night. Although
49
50 convergence was not readily identifiable between all of these periods and any single daily
51
52 activity routine or known physiological phenomena, a composite influence of underlying
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 factors may be an explanation. Due to the relatively high odds of fracture from falls during
4
5 these periods in residential care settings, further investigation is warranted.
6
7
8
9

10 Our results suggest that patients who suffered serious falls were less likely to have been
11 screened for their risk of falling upon admission. While such an association has not been
12 previously discussed in the literature, there are possible mechanisms through which falls risk
13 screening could preferentially prevent injurious falls. Theoretically, patients identified to be at
14 risk of falling may receive interventions more frequently than those patients whose risk has not
15 yet been established. If some of these interventions have a greater effect in preventing falls
16 associated with fracture, it would explain our results. An example of this would be the
17 completion of mobility assessments for patients identified to be at risk of falling. Patients who
18 receive mobility assessments would be safer while mobilising thereby reducing the risk of falls
19 while walking, which is a type of fall associated with fractures in our data. It should be noted
20 that there is considerable heterogeneity in falls risk screening processes across Queensland
21 Health facilities with a mixture of validated falls risk screening tools, formal and informal
22 clinical judgment based approaches being employed.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 A parsimonious adjusted model proved elusive for both hospital and residential care data sets,
44 with a number of variables retaining p-values equal to or less than 0.05. Despite this, the final
45 model explained only a modest proportion of the overall variance in the outcome variable.
46
47
48

49 While this could be indicative of Type I error or a high degree of random chance governing
50 fracture phenomena, it is at least partly due to the recognised multifactorial nature of fall-
51 related fractures. A comprehensive explanatory model would require the inclusion of other
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 independently predictive intrinsic variables such as diagnosis, frailty, cognitive and mobility
4
5 status in addition to the variables we considered here.
6
7
8
9

10 A recent landmark study examining causative mechanisms for falls in older people highlighted
11 tripping as a frequent cause of falls in institutional settings (21). In our study falls due to
12 tripping were also independently predictive of fractures in both hospital and residential care
13 settings. Consequently, there is a need for greater emphasis on managing low-level trip hazards
14 for older people and improving their ability to safely negotiate institutional environments.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Limitations**

25
26 There are a number of important limitations to our study, several of which are known
27 shortcomings of cross-sectional research with routinely collected incident data (22, 23). As our
28 sample was extracted from a voluntary incident reporting system, it is recognised that many
29 unreported incidents would be missing from analysis. Admittedly, a reporting bias towards
30 injurious falls might also introduce an unknown degree of skew. Variations in incident
31 reporting culture are unavoidable in large heterogeneous organisations such as Queensland
32 Health, which consists of numerous facilities spread across large geographical areas and
33 servicing diverse populations. These variations in reporting can be a substantial confounder for
34 cross-sectional studies such as this where data is aggregated across multiple sites.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 We recognise that by using 'fracture' as the outcome variable, we are aggregating fracture
52 types with known differences in injury mechanisms (24). This approach could therefore conceal
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 underlying divergences in risk factors. Additionally, there is some suggestive evidence that
4
5 activities preceding fracture producing falls vary depending on the resultant fracture type (25).
6
7
8

9
10 Another potential confounder is that most falls in health facilities are unwitnessed by staff. In
11
12 our sample, fewer than twenty-five per cent of hospital falls and sixteen per cent of residential
13
14 care falls were reported as having been witnessed. It is likely that details relating to these
15
16 unwitnessed incidents are based on information collected from patients or residents themselves,
17
18 other observers, and the reporter's investigation of the circumstances surrounding the fall. It is
19
20 possible that any extrapolation on the part of reporters could introduce error and negatively
21
22 influence veracity of the data.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 An important weakness of our study is the inability to account for the effect of exposure rates
30
31 with this approach. In this study, we identified fall-related predictors of fracture outcomes by
32
33 comparing falls resulting in fracture with falls that did not. While this approach is useful in
34
35 identifying fall types that are associated with high injury risk, it is not possible to estimate the
36
37 overall risk of fall-related fracture associated with particular activities or situational factors.
38
39 For example, while our data allows us to compare the odds of a fracture outcome from falls
40
41 during mobilization with the odds of fracture from other fall types, we cannot comment on the
42
43 overall risk of fall-related fracture during mobilisation without the addition of information on
44
45 exposure rates and activity-related fall rates. Nevertheless, such cumulative estimates of risk
46
47 were outside the scope of the present study and could be the focus of future work.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Within the limitations listed here, our results would be useful in the development of future
4
5 intervention strategies to address the problem of injurious falls in hospital and residential care
6
7 settings.
8
9

10 11 **FUNDING DISCLOSURE**

12 This investigator-initiated study was seed-funded by an \$8,000 internal research grant from the
13
14 Queensland Health Patient Safety Centre, which contributed towards off-line research time for
15
16 the principal investigator. The principal investigator commenced a five-year Queensland Health
17
18 research fellowship during the latter stages of this study, which supported part of the time spent
19
20 in manuscript preparation and finalisation.
21
22
23
24

25 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

26
27
28 None declared.
29

30 **Contributorship:**

31
32
33
34 SC co-designed the study, wrote the study plan, acquired data, prepared data, conducted data
35
36 analysis, interpreted results, drafted and revised the paper. PMc contributed to data analysis,
37
38 interpretation of results, initial draft and subsequent revisions. PV contributed to the
39
40 development of study design, data analysis, interpretation of results, development of initial draft
41
42 and subsequent revisions. KF contributed to writing the study plan, acquiring data, data
43
44 preparation, conducting data analysis, interpreting results, initial draft and final revisions. TH
45
46 provided overall supervision to the study, co-designed the study, co-wrote the study plan,
47
48 contributed to data preparation, data analysis, interpretation of results, development of initial
49
50 draft and subsequent revisions.
51

52 **Data sharing:**

53
54 No additional data.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Fall-related field definitions^λ

Type of fall		
	Slip	Fall or loss of balance occurring from loss of traction on surface
	Trip	Loss of balance usually while walking resulting from portion of foot or lower limb contacting an obstacle.
	Legs gave way	Involuntary loss of mechanical support in the leg or legs
	Dizziness	Loss of equilibrium, for example, a spinning sensation, or light-headedness, or a feeling you are about to fall
	Faint	Loss of consciousness
	Overbalance	Movement of the body beyond its base of support
Activity at time of fall		
	Walking	<i>(No definition provided)</i>
	Standing	Standing without other overt activity
	Sitting to Standing	Moving from a sitting position to a standing position, eg rising from bed or chair or toilet
	Standing to sitting	Moving from a standing to sitting position, eg lowering to a bed, chair or toilet
	Standing from lying position	Moving from a lying to standing position, eg getting out of bed
	Standing to lying position	Moving from lying to standing, eg getting in to bed
	Rolling out of bed	Rolling out of bed on to the floor
	Sitting	Sitting without other activity
	Seating to seating	Transferring from one seated position to another, eg chair or toilet to wheelchair
	Reaching for object while seated	<i>(No definition provided)</i>
	Reaching for object while standing	<i>(No definition provided)</i>
Function attempted by patient at time of fall		
	Toileting	All activities involved in getting to and using the toilet
	Bathing or showering	All activities involved in bathing or showering, including getting to the shower
	Resting	Includes movement to the location of rest
	Exercising	Activity undertaken for therapeutic or recreational purposes, eg. going for a walk, or a part of treatment program
	Grooming or dressing	Includes activities such as brushing hair or teeth, dressing, etc
	Use entertainment	Includes activities such as picking up a book or turning on the TV

^λ Source: Queensland Health PRIME Clinical Incident Data Dictionary v 4.1 2008

Table 2 Characteristics of study sample: Falls and fall-related fracture

	Hospital	Residential Care Facilities
Reported falls	24,218	8,980
Mean age (SD)	70.14 (17.28)	80.48 (10.65)
Median age	74.35	82.37
Gender (Male %)	57	54
Reported fractures (% reported falls)	229 (0.94)	74 (0.82)
Mean age (SD)	75.83 (15.21)	82.63 (9.99)
Median Age	78.98	85.33
Gender (Male %)	33	44

Table 3 Univariate analysis of fall-related predictors of fracture outcomes in hospital and residential care settings

Variable	Hospital		Residential care	
	O/R ^{a,c} (95% CI)	p-value ^b	O/R ^a (95% CI)	p-value ^b
Activity Factors				
Reaching in standing	0.67 (0.34-1.31)	0.251	2.64 (1.13-6.16)	0.024*
Rolling out of bed	0.29 (0.10-0.78)	0.015*	0.86 (0.26-2.76)	0.802
Sitting	0.23 (0.08-0.62)	0.004*	0.40 (0.09-1.67)	0.214
Walking	1.96 (1.50-2.56)	<0.001*	2.04 (1.27-3.27)	0.003*
Type of Fall				
Trip	2.06 (1.32-3.22)	0.001*	3.88 (1.90-7.94)	<0.001*
Slip	0.70 (0.49-0.98)	0.043*	0.57 (0.27-1.20)	0.143
Function Factors				
Resting	0.40 (0.22-0.73)	0.003*	0.33 (0.10-1.05)	0.062
Person Factors				
Age between 40 and 60	0.46 (0.27-0.78)	0.004*	0.29 (0.04-2.21)	0.238
Age over 80	1.51 (1.16-1.96)	0.002*	1.27 (0.74-2.16)	0.377
Male Gender	0.37 (0.28-0.50)	0.000*	0.67 (0.40-1.12)	0.132
Spatial/Environmental Factors				
Bedside	0.63 (0.46-0.84)	0.002*	0.45 (0.14-1.44)	0.179
Bedroom areas other than bedside	1.36 (1.00-1.85)	0.048*	1.50 (0.93-2.42)	0.091
Corridor/Hallway	2.39 (1.58-3.62)	0.000*	0.88 (0.38-2.02)	0.770
Other areas – Not classified	1.24 (0.45-3.35)	0.671	3.08 (1.11-8.55)	0.031*
Temporal Factors				
1600-1700	0.92 (0.43-1.97)	0.844	2.12 (1.03-4.35)	0.040*
1900-2000	0.92 (0.41-2.07)	0.848	2.86 (1.35-6.05)	0.006*
Other factors				
Risk screened/assessed at admission	0.66 (0.48-0.92)	0.015*	0.41 (0.16-1.04)	0.061

^a Odds ratio (95% Confidence interval)

^b Significance level

^c Reference value for all comparisons using odds ratios are 1.00; Each variable is compared against all other remaining variables within category. For example, within 'Activity Factors', odds for fracture during falls while 'reaching in standing'

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

are expressed as a ratio against odds for fracture after falls related to all other activity variables. Hospital and residential care results are presented in parallel but have been analyzed separately.
*Significant variable (p equal to or less than 0.05)

For peer review only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-002948 on 1 August 2013. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on April 18, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Table 4 Adjusted Odds Ratios- Hospital fractures

Logistic regression	Number of obs =	17016
	Wald $\chi^2(10)$ =	101.60
	Prob > χ^2 =	0.0000
Log pseudo-likelihood = -911.42064	Pseudo R ² =	0.0554
Variable	O/R (95% CI)	p-value
Witnessed by staff	0.51 (0.33-0.79)	0.003
Risk screened/assessed at admission	0.60 (0.41-0.89)	0.012
Standing	2.08 (1.22-3.55)	0.007
Walking	1.86 (1.32-2.62)	<0.001
Resting	0.52 (0.27-0.97)	0.043
Male gender	0.42 (0.30-0.58)	<0.001
Corridor/hallway	2.10 (1.23-3.58)	0.006
Age between 40 and 60	0.52 (0.27-0.98)	0.046
Age 80 and over	1.44 (1.05-1.99)	<0.001
1400-1500 hours	1.97 (1.09-3.54)	0.023
2100-2200 hours	1.73 (1.01-2.97)	0.044

Table 5 Adjusted Odds Ratios - Residential care fractures

Logistic regression	Number of obs =	8973
	Wald $\chi^2(10)$ =	62.61
	Prob > χ^2 =	0.0000
Log pseudo-likelihood = -406.85361	Pseudo R ² =	0.0510
Variable	O/R (95% CI)	p-value
Reaching in standing	3.51 (1.44-8.56)	0.006
Walking	2.11 (1.24-3.58)	0.006
Trip	2.89 (1.35-6.17)	0.006
Bedroom areas other than bedside	1.88 (1.15-3.07)	0.011
Other areas - Not classified	3.19 (1.15-8.85)	0.025
0700-0800	2.56 (1.08-6.07)	0.033
1600-1700	2.59 (1.24-5.39)	0.011
1900-2000	3.33 (1.55-7.14)	0.002

REFERENCES

1. Järvinen TLN, Sievänen H, Khan KM, et al. Shifting the focus in fracture prevention from osteoporosis to falls. *Br Med J* 2008; **336**:124-6.
2. Braithwaite RS, Col NF, Wong JB. Estimating hip fracture morbidity, mortality and costs. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003; **51**:364-70.
3. Jacobsen SJ, Goldberg J, Miles TP, Brody JA, Stiers W, Rimm AA. Race and sex differences in mortality following fracture of the hip. *Am J Public Health* 1992; **82**:1147-50.
4. Parkkari J, Kannus P, Niemi S, et al. Secular trends in osteoporotic pelvic fractures in Finland: number and incidence of fractures in 1970–1991 and prediction for the future. *Calcif Tiss Int* 1996; **59**: 79-83.
5. Stenvall M, Olofsson B, Lundström M, et al. A multidisciplinary, multifactorial intervention program reduces postoperative falls and injuries after femoral neck fracture. *Osteoporos Int* 2007; **18**:167-175.
6. Haines TP, Bennell KL, Osborne RH, et al. Effectiveness of targeted falls prevention programme in subacute hospital setting: randomised controlled trial. *Br Med J* 2004; **328**:676-82.
7. Healey F, Monro A, Cockram A, et al. Using targeted risk factor reduction to prevent falls in older in-patients: a randomised controlled trial. *Age Ageing* 2004; **33**:390-395.
8. Stone KL, Seeley DG, Lui L-Y, et al. BMD at multiple sites and risk of fracture of multiple types: Long-term results from the study of osteoporotic fractures. *J Bone Miner Res* 2003; **18**:1947-54.
9. Cali CM, Kiel DP. An epidemiologic study of fall-related fractures among institutionalized older people. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1995; **43**:1336-40.
10. Lichtenstein MJ, Griffin MR, Cornell JE, et al. Risk factors for hip fractures occurring in the hospital. *Am J Epidemiol* 1994; **140**:830-8.
11. Cummings SR, Melton LJ. Epidemiology and outcomes of osteoporotic fractures. *Lancet* 2002; **359**:1761-7.
12. Wagner AK, Zhang F, Soumerai SB, et al. Benzodiazepine use and hip fractures in the elderly: who is at greatest risk? *Arch Intern Med* 2004; **164**:1567-72.
13. Nurmi I, Lüthje P. Incidence and costs of falls and fall injuries among elderly in institutional care. *Scand J Prim Health Care* 2002; **20**:118-22.
14. Hosmer DW, Lemeshow S. Applied logistic regression. Wiley-Interscience: 2000.
15. Haines T, Kuys SS, Morrison G, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of screening for risk of in-hospital falls using physiotherapist clinical judgement. *Med Care* 2009; **47**:448-56.
16. Bates DW, Pruess K, Souney P, et al. Serious falls in hospitalized patients: correlates and resource utilization. *Am J Med* 1995; **99**:137-43.
17. Sanders KM, Seeman E, Ugoni AM, et al. Age- and gender-specific rate of fractures in Australia: A population-based study. *Osteoporos Int* 1999; **10**:240-47.
18. Testi D, Viceconti M, Baruffaldi F, et al. Risk of fracture in elderly patients: a new predictive index based on bone mineral density and finite element analysis. *Comput Meth Programs Biomed* 1999; **60**:23-33.
19. Aharonoff GB, Dennis MG, Elshinawy A, et al. Circumstances of falls causing hip fractures in the elderly. *J Orthop Trauma* 2003; **17**: S22-26.
20. Hemenway D, Feskanich D, Colditz GA. Body height and hip fracture: a cohort study of 90 000 women. *Int J Epidemiol* 1995; **24**:783-6.
21. Robinovitch SN, Feldman F, Yang Y, et al. Video capture of the circumstances of falls in elderly people residing in long-term care: an observational study. *Lancet* 2013; **381**:47-54.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
22. Hill A-M, Hoffmann T, Hill K, et al. Measuring falls events in acute hospitals—A comparison of three reporting methods to identify missing data in the hospital reporting system. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2010; **58**:1347-52
23. Haines TP, Massey B, Varghese P, et al. Inconsistency in classification and reporting of in-hospital falls. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2009; **57**:517-523.
24. Palvanen M, Kannus P, Parkkari J, et al. The injury mechanisms of osteoporotic upper extremity fractures among older adults: a controlled study of 287 consecutive patients and their 108 controls. *Osteoporos Int* 2000; **10**: 822-831.
25. Keegan THM, Kelsey JL, King AC, et al. Characteristics of fallers who fracture at the foot, distal forearm, proximal humerus, pelvis, and shaft of the tibia/fibula compared with fallers who do not fracture. *Am J Epidemiol* 2004; **159**:192-203.

Formatted: Left: 1", Right: 1", Top: 1", Bottom: 1", Width: 8.5", Height: 11", Header distance from edge: 0.49", Footer distance from edge: 0.49"

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
Predictors of fracture from falls reported in hospital and residential care facilities: A cross-sectional study

14 Satyan Chari^{1,2,3,4}, Prue McRae^{4,5}, Paul Varghese^{4,6,7}, Kaye Ferrar⁸, Terry P Haines^{9,10,11*}

16 1 – Program Coordinator Falls Prevention, Safety and Quality Unit, Royal Brisbane and
17 Women’s Hospital, Queensland Health, Australia

20 2 – Research Fellow, Queensland Health Office of Health and Medical Research (OHMR)

22 3 – Ph D Candidate, Physiotherapy Department, Monash University, Frankston, Australia

24 4 – Queensland Falls Injury Prevention Collaborative

26 5 – Falls Prevention, Safety and Quality Unit, Royal Brisbane and Women’s Hospital,
27 Queensland Health, Australia

30 6 – Director of Geriatric Medicine, Geriatric Assessment and Rehabilitation Unit, Princess
31 Alexandra Hospital, Queensland Health, Australia

33 7 – School of Medicine, University of Queensland, St Lucia, Australia

35 8 – Data Analysis Team, Patient Safety Centre, Queensland Health, Australia

37 9 – Director of Research, Southern Physiotherapy Clinical School, Physiotherapy Department,
38 Monash University, Frankston, Australia.

40 10 – Director of Allied Health Research Unit, Southern Health, Cheltenham, Australia

42 11 – School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Queensland, St Lucia, Australia

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Corresponding Author

Satyan Chari

Email: srcha5@student.monash.edu.au

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Telephone: +61 7 3636 5375

10 Fax: +61 7 3636 1406

11
12 Postal: Safety and Quality Unit, Level 7, Block 7, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital,
13
14 Herston 4029, Queensland, Australia
15

16
17
18 *Senior Author
19

20 21 **Contributorship:**

22
23
24 SC co-designed the study, wrote the study plan, acquired data, prepared data, conducted data
25 analysis, interpreted results, drafted and revised the paper. PMc contributed to data analysis,
26 interpretation of results, initial draft and subsequent revisions. PV contributed to the
27 development of study design, data analysis, interpretation of results, development of initial draft
28 and subsequent revisions. KF contributed to writing the study plan, acquiring data, data
29 preparation, conducting data analysis, interpreting results, initial draft and final revisions. TH
30 provided overall supervision to the study, co-designed the study, co-wrote the study plan,
31 contributed to data preparation, data analysis, interpretation of results, development of initial
32 draft and subsequent revisions.
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Data sharing:**

39 There is no additional data.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Background: Fall-related fractures are associated with substantial human and economic costs.

An improved understanding of the predictors of fall-related fracture in healthcare settings would be useful in developing future interventions.

Methods: We employed a retrospective cross-sectional design to identify predictors for fracture from adult falls reported over three years across 197 public healthcare facilities in Queensland, Australia. Associations between fall-related factors and fracture outcomes were analysed using logistic regression analysis.

Results: We analysed 24 218 falls (with 229 fractures) among adult hospital patients and 8 980 falls (with 74 fractures) among aged care residents. In the adjusted hospital model, advanced age (eighty years and over), female gender, falls from standing, and falls that were not witnessed, were all associated with increased fracture odds. In the adjusted residential care model, falls during reaching activities in standing, and falls due to tripping were associated with increased odds of fracture. Hospital patients who had been screened for their risk of falling at admission suffered fewer fractures than those who had not.

Conclusion: Our findings suggest that screening of hospital patients for their risk of falling may protect patients from injurious falls. Falls from upright postures appear to be more likely to result in fractures than other falls in healthcare settings.

Key Words: Falls, Fracture, Patient, Hospital, Residential Care, Risk Factors

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Article focus

- To explore and identify predictive relationships between factors related to falls in institutional settings and fractures outcomes through the analysis of routinely reported clinical incident data.

Key Points

- Certain types of falls sustained in hospital and residential care settings are more likely to be associated with fracture than other types.
- These include falls from more upright positions, and falls due to tripping.
- Hospital patients who have been screened for their risk of falling are may be less likely to experience fracture producing falls than those who are not.

Strengths and Limitations

- This research highlights new associations between falls screening and fracture outcomes.
- An important limitation of this study is that voluntary clinical incident reporting systems are likely to be affected by reporting inconsistencies and error, due to which results of our study should only be applied to practice with caution.

Formatted: Line spacing: 1.5 lines

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

Falls among older people in institutional settings are an issue of growing concern. (1) While not all falls are injurious, the ones that cause serious injuries, such as hip fractures, are responsible for the major portion of the economic (2) and human cost (2,3) described in the literature. As a result, preventing ~~fall-related such injurious falls is~~fracture is an important public health priority (4).

Typically, fall prevention trials have implemented interventions targeting modifiable risk factors for falls among older people identified as being at risk of falling, and some have been successful in reducing fall rates. (54-76) Nevertheless, due to the large numbers of older people who would be considered to be at risk of falling in hospital and residential care settings, such broad approaches can be expensive to implement and sustain. A more cost-effective approach would be to focus directly on the prevention of injurious falls among older people at risk of sustaining fall-related injury. However, our understanding of the predictors of fall-related injury in health care settings is currently inadequate to develop such targeted interventions. The aim of this study was to advance an understanding of fall-related fracture predictors in hospital and residential care settings, by examining incident reports completed after falls in these environments.

METHODS

Design

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 This retrospective cross-sectional study utilised clinical incident reports completed after adult
10 falls in healthcare settings (hospital and residential care) and explored predictive relationships
11 between fall-related factors and fracture outcomes using logistic regression analysis.
12
13

14 15 16 **Participants**

17 All adult fall-related incidents reported on the Queensland Health (QH) clinical incident
18 reporting system (also known as 'PRIME') between 1 January 2007 and 30 November 2009
19 were included in our dataset.
20
21
22
23

24 25 26 **Setting**

27 QH operates 167 hospital facilities with 8 859 beds, 27 residential care facilities with 1 798
28 beds and four specialised psychiatric residential facilities with 458 beds respectively. QH
29 hospital facilities are geographically scattered with fifteen facilities in metropolitan areas, 78 in
30 regional areas and 74 in remote areas across the State. All but one facility (a 538 bed tertiary
31 metropolitan hospital in southeast Queensland) utilise the PRIME reporting system.
32
33
34

35 The PRIME reporting system is accessible online by QH staff. Once basic information about
36 the individual is entered, the reporter inputs incident details through a series of drop-down
37 fields pertaining to the specific incident type (for example, a fall or pressure ulcer). The system
38 generates additional fields on subsequent pages based on the incident type chosen by the
39 reporter. Some fields are mandatory and required to be completed before progressing to
40 subsequent sections. Reporters are able to save incomplete reports and exit at any point, with
41 the option to return and finalise the report at a later stage. The reporting interface is designed to
42 be usable by reporters without prior experience with the system, however regular training
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

sessions are available for staff in addition to comprehensive online resources and local support from expert users. To ensure report accuracy, ward managers are responsible for reviewing incidents periodically. The QH Patient Safety Centre (PSC) monitors overall system functionality and coordinates system improvements as necessary.

Procedure

The institutional human research ethics review committee of the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital (RBWH) approved this study. We included all mandatory and non-mandatory fields collected in relation to individual fall incidents across QH facilities for the observation period. Retrieved fields included date of incident, time of incident, the incident severity level, health district, facility, service area, ward/unit, date of birth, gender, universal reference number (patient ID), place of incident (such as bedroom, bathroom, or toilet), injuries sustained, function when the fall occurred (such as standing, walking, or sitting), activity when fall occurred (such as showering, grooming, or resting), fall mechanism (such as slip, trip, or overbalance), whether a fall risk screen or assessment was completed upon admission, and whether the fall was witnessed. The QH clinical incident (CI) data dictionary provides definitions for a selection of fall-related field types. These are listed in Table 1.

(Table 1 here)

We examined raw data and eliminated duplicate records, along with records that pertained to community clients and falls that occurred while hospital patients or aged care residents were outside the healthcare facility. We also excluded falls that related to hospital patients under the age of eighteen. In total, we removed 3 812 records through this process, resulting in a final

7

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 dataset of 33 198 incidents. The dataset was interrogated for inconsistencies through the
10 creation of frequency tables, data ranges and histograms at various stages of the data
11 preparation process.
12
13

14
15
16 For fields with multiple response options, we coded for the presence or absence of each
17 response variable separately to enable logistic regression analysis. Similarly, for 'Age at time of
18 fall', a continuous variable, we created age-ranges and then coded within these categories
19 dichotomously. Prior to analysis, we separated records into hospital and residential care
20 datasets. This decision was based on a review of the literature, which suggested that hospital
21 and residential care populations were sufficiently different in terms of demographic
22 characteristics, health status, risk factors, profile, level of frailty, levels of activity and systems
23 of care delivery to require separate analysis. (~~87-132~~)
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Microsoft® Excel 2002 and Access 2002 were used for data preparation and coding. We used
34 Microsoft® Excel 2007 to create tables and StatCorp® Stata SE version 10 to perform all
35 statistical analysis.
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Data Analysis**

42 We examined relationships between individual predictor variables and fractures using
43 univariate and multiple logistic regression analysis. We clustered fall incidents by universal
44 identification number employing robust variance estimates to account for the dependency
45 between multiple fall records contributed by the same individual. We additionally subjected
46 predictor variables to factor analysis (principal components) to explore between-variable
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

colinearity prior to building a multiple logistic regression model as described by Hosmer and Lemeshow. (143) We started by including all univariate predictor variables with p-values equal to or less than 0.25 in the initial model. We then adopted a stepwise backward elimination approach to progressively remove variables with the highest p-values until all remaining variables in the model had p-values of equal to or less than 0.05. Excluded variables were subsequently re-entered into the model in order of statistical significance, and retained if they achieved p-values of 0.05 or less in the final model.

RESULTS

The final dataset consisted of 24 218 hospital fall incidents and 8 980 residential care fall incidents. Table 2 presents a comparison of demographic, fall and fall-related fracture characteristics for hospital and residential care subsets.

(Table 2 here)

Table 3 provides unadjusted odds-ratios for the likelihood of fracture when individual fall-related variables are present. Table 4 and 5 present the models developed for hospital and residential care datasets respectively, adjusted for the effects of other variables entered into the model. Results showed that male hospital patients were considerably less likely to fracture upon falling than female patients [OR: 0.42, $p < 0.001$]. Further, patients of advanced age (80 years and over) were the age group most likely to fracture upon falling in hospital [OR: 1.44, $p < 0.001$].

We found a number of fall-related characteristics to be predictive of fracture. 'Falls while walking' were associated with higher odds of fracture in both hospital [OR: 1.96, $p < 0.001$] and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 residential care settings [OR: 2.04, $p < 0.001$] than falls during other functions. 'Falls due to
10 trips' were strongly predictive of fracture outcomes across both settings as an unadjusted
11 variable but only in residential care [OR: 2.89, $p = 0.006$] once adjusted for the effects of other
12 variables. Falls in certain physical locations were associated with an increased probability of
13 fracture outcomes. Considered individually, falls in corridors or hallways [OR: 2.10, $p = 0.006$]
14 were strongly associated with fractures in hospital, while falls in resident rooms (but not the
15 immediate bedside environment) were similarly associated with an elevated risk of fractures
16 [OR: 1.88, $p = 0.011$] in the adjusted residential care model.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 In the adjusted hospital model, we found that falls reported as having been 'witnessed' were
27 half as likely to be associated with fracture outcomes [OR: 0.51, $p = 0.003$] than falls reported as
28 being unwitnessed. Among hospital patients who had been reported as having been screened
29 for their fall risk at admission, falls were less likely to be associated with fractures [OR: 0.60,
30 $p = 0.012$] than among patients for whom a risk screen was not completed. Temporal factors
31 were also associated with the likelihood of fall-related fracture outcomes across both hospital
32 and residential care models.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 (Table 3 here)

40 (Table 4 here)

41 (Table 5 here)

42 43 44 45 **DISCUSSION**

46 Cost-effectiveness is increasingly being seen as important in the evaluation of programs aimed
47 at preventing falls in hospitals. (154) Previous cost-of-falls studies have recognised that the
48 economic burden of falls is heavily skewed towards falls that result in fracture. (132, 165) The
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 present study identified specific characteristics of falls (and fallers) which increased the
10 likelihood of fractures. Such data is necessary for the development of future interventions to
11 prevent these high cost falls.
12
13

14
15
16 Our results revealed that female hospital patients were almost twice as likely to sustain
17 fractures upon falling as male patients. These results are directionally consistent with previous
18 findings on gender-specific fall injury rates (65, 132). The lack of a comparable trend in the
19 residential care dataset could be attributed to the smaller size of our residential care sample.
20
21 However, previous studies have documented a reduction in the female gender bias for fracture
22 in people of advanced age or the 'oldest' old group, (176) hypothesising an acceleration of
23 physiological bone changes in men of advanced age. As our residential care group was
24 considerably older than the hospital group with a mean age difference of ten years, such an
25 explanation could be plausible.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 In line with current biomechanical models for fall-related fractures (187-2019), our results
37 support the premise that the likelihood of fracture is elevated for falls from more upright
38 postures compared to falls from lower heights. In our hospital dataset for example, falls while
39 walking, falls while standing and falls in corridor areas were predictive of fractures.
40
41 Conversely, falls reported to have happened when patients were resting had a lower association
42 with fractures in hospital. A similar trend was observable in the residential care model in terms
43 of both activity and spatial factors. Falls while walking were strongly predictive of fracture in
44 both adjusted models. Compared with falls from static positions, this could relate to higher
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 impact forces from an additive effect of an individual's existing motion and the fall-related
10 acceleration.
11
12
13

14 On adjusting for other variables in the hospital multiple regression model, falls that were
15 reported as having been witnessed by staff were found to be half as likely to be associated with
16 fractures than unwitnessed falls. It would be reasonable to assume that a number of these
17 witnessed falls happened when patients were under the supervision of a staff member.
18 Therefore, intervention by staff may have contributed to the reduced odds of fracture. At the
19 same time, supervised patients might be less likely to engage in 'risky' activities than
20 unsupervised patients would due to input from the staff member. For example, patients would
21 be less likely to mobilise without their prescribed mobility aid if a staff member were present to
22 encourage its use. While we recognise that a fall being 'witnessed' does not equate to the fall
23 being supervised in all instances, our results do highlight appropriate supervision as an
24 important part of a holistic approach to keeping older patients safe.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Falls that were reported as having occurred between the periods from two and three in the
38 afternoon and nine and ten at night were associated with increased fracture odds in hospital
39 after adjusting for other variables in the multiple logistic regression model. These periods
40 potentially intersect nursing shift changeover times. As previously posited in this paper, the
41 reduced availability of supervision could be a factor influencing the risk of fall-related fracture
42 outcomes during such periods. We also identified relationships between falls in certain time
43 periods and fractures in the residential care settings. These were falls between seven and eight
44 in the morning, four and five in the afternoon and between seven and eight at night. Although
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

convergence was not readily identifiable between all of these periods and any single daily activity routine or known physiological phenomena, a composite influence of underlying factors may be an explanation. Due to the relatively high odds of fracture from falls during these periods in residential care settings, further investigation is warranted.

Our results suggest that patients who suffered serious falls were less likely to have been screened for their risk of falling upon admission. While such an association has not been previously discussed in the literature, there are possible mechanisms through which falls risk screening could preferentially prevent injurious falls. Theoretically, patients identified to be at risk of falling may receive interventions more frequently than those patients whose risk has not yet been established. If some of these interventions have a greater effect in preventing falls associated with fracture, it would explain our results. An example of this would be the completion of mobility assessments for patients identified to be at risk of falling. Patients who receive mobility assessments would be safer while mobilising thereby reducing the risk of falls while walking, which is a type of fall associated with fractures in our data. It should be noted that there is considerable heterogeneity in falls risk screening processes across Queensland Health facilities with a mixture of validated falls risk screening tools, formal and informal clinical judgment based approaches being employed.

A parsimonious adjusted model proved elusive for both hospital and residential care data sets, with a number of variables retaining p-values equal to or less than 0.05. Despite this, the final model explained only a modest proportion of the overall variance in the outcome variable.

While this could be indicative of Type I error or a high degree of random chance governing

fracture phenomena, it is at least partly due to the recognised multifactorial nature of fall-related fractures. A comprehensive explanatory model would require the inclusion of other independently predictive intrinsic variables such as diagnosis, frailty, cognitive and mobility status in addition to the variables we considered here.

A recent landmark study examining causative mechanisms for falls in older people highlighted tripping as a frequent cause of falls in institutional settings (21). In our study Falls due to tripping were also strongly independently predictive of fractures in both hospital and residential care settings, ~~when considered individually. A~~ Consequently, though falls due to tripping did not retain statistical significance after being adjusted for other factors in the hospital model, there is a se results signify the need for greater emphasis on managing low-level trip hazards for older people and improving their ability to safely negotiate institutional hospital environments.

Limitations

There are a number of important limitations to our study, several of which are known shortcomings of cross-sectional research with routinely collected incident data (22, 23). As our sample was extracted from a voluntary incident reporting system, it is recognised that many unreported incidents would be missing from analysis. Admittedly, a reporting bias towards injurious falls might also introduce an unknown degree of skew. Variations in incident reporting culture are unavoidable in large heterogeneous organisations such as Queensland Health, which consists of numerous facilities spread across large geographical areas and

servicing diverse populations. These variations in reporting can be a substantial confounder for cross-sectional studies such as this where data is aggregated across multiple sites.

We recognise that by using 'fracture' as the outcome variable, we are aggregating fracture types with potentially dissimilar known differences in fracture-injury mechanisms (24). This approach could and therefore conceal underlying divergences in risk factors. Clearly Additionally, there is some suggestive evidence that activities preceding fracture producing falls vary depending on the resultant fracture type (253).

Another potential confounder is that most falls in health facilities are unwitnessed by staff. In our sample, fewer than twenty-five per cent of hospital falls and sixteen per cent of residential care falls were reported as having been witnessed. It is likely that details relating to these unwitnessed incidents are based on information collected from patients or residents themselves, other observers, and the reporter's investigation of the circumstances surrounding the fall. It is possible that any extrapolation on the part of reporters could introduce error and negatively influence veracity of the data.

An important weakness of our study is the inability to account for the effect of exposure rates with this approach. In this study, we identified fall-related predictors of fracture outcomes by comparing falls resulting in fracture with falls that did not. While this approach is useful in identifying fall types that are associated with high injury risk, it is not possible to estimate the overall risk of fall-related fracture associated with particular activities or situational factors. For example, while our data allows us to compare the odds of a fracture outcome from falls

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 during mobilization with the odds of fracture from other fall types, we cannot comment on the
10 overall risk of fall-related fracture during mobilisation without the addition of information on
11 exposure rates and activity-related fall rates. Nevertheless, such cumulative estimates of risk
12 were outside the scope of the present study and could be the focus of future work.
13
14
15

16 Within the limitations listed here, our results would be useful in the development of future
17 intervention strategies to address the problem of injurious falls in hospital and residential care
18 settings.
19
20
21
22

23 **FUNDING DISCLOSURE**

24 This investigator-initiated study was seed-funded by an \$8,000 internal research grant from the
25 Queensland Health Patient Safety Centre, which contributed towards off-line research time for
26 the principal investigator. The principal investigator commenced a five-year Queensland Health
27 research fellowship during the latter stages of this study, which supported part of the time spent
28 in manuscript preparation and finalisation.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

36 None declared.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60**Table 1** Fall-related field definitions^λ

Type of fall	
Slip	Fall or loss of balance occurring from loss of traction on surface
Trip	Loss of balance usually while walking resulting from portion of foot or lower limb contacting an obstacle.
Legs gave way	Involuntary loss of mechanical support in the leg or legs
Dizziness	Loss of equilibrium, for example, a spinning sensation, or light-headedness, or a feeling you are about to fall
Faint	Loss of consciousness
Overbalance	Movement of the body beyond its base of support
Activity at time of fall	
Walking	<i>(No definition provided)</i>
Standing	Standing without other overt activity
Sitting to Standing	Moving from a sitting position to a standing position, eg rising from bed or chair or toilet
Standing to sitting	Moving from a standing to sitting position, eg lowering to a bed, chair or toilet
Standing from lying position	Moving from a lying to standing position, eg getting out of bed
Standing to lying position	Moving from lying to standing, eg getting in to bed
Rolling out of bed	Rolling out of bed on to the floor
Sitting	Sitting without other activity
Seating to seating	Transferring from one seated position to another, eg chair or toilet to wheelchair
Reaching for object while seated	<i>(No definition provided)</i>
Reaching for object while standing	<i>(No definition provided)</i>
Function attempted by patient at time of fall	
Toileting	All activities involved in getting to and using the toilet
Bathing or showering	All activities involved in bathing or showering, including getting to the shower
Resting	Includes movement to the location of rest
Exercising	Activity undertaken for therapeutic or recreational purposes, eg. going for a walk, or a part of treatment program
Grooming or dressing	Includes activities such as brushing hair or teeth, dressing, etc
Use entertainment	Includes activities such as picking up a book or turning on the TV

^λ Source: Queensland Health PRIME Clinical Incident Data Dictionary v 4.1 2008

Table 2 Characteristics of study sample: Falls and fall-related fracture

	Hospital	Residential Care Facilities
Reported falls	24,218	8,980
Mean age (SD)	70.14 (17.28)	80.48 (10.65)
Median age	74.35	82.37
Gender (Male %)	57	54
Reported fractures (% reported falls)	229 (0.94)	74 (0.82)
Mean age (SD)	75.83 (15.21)	82.63 (9.99)
Median Age	78.98	85.33
Gender (Male %)	33	44

Table 3 Univariate analysis of fall-related predictors of fracture outcomes in hospital and residential care settings

Variable	Hospital		Residential care	
	O/R ^{a,c} (95% CI)	p-value ^b	O/R ^a (95% CI)	p-value ^b
Activity Factors				
Reaching in standing	0.67 (0.34-1.31)	0.251	2.64 (1.13-6.16)	0.024*
Rolling out of bed	0.29 (0.10-0.78)	0.015*	0.86 (0.26-2.76)	0.802
Sitting	0.23 (0.08-0.62)	0.004*	0.40 (0.09-1.67)	0.214
Walking	1.96 (1.50-2.56)	<0.001*	2.04 (1.27-3.27)	0.003*
Type of Fall				
Trip	2.06 (1.32-3.22)	0.001*	3.88 (1.90-7.94)	<0.001*
Slip	0.70 (0.49-0.98)	0.043*	0.57 (0.27-1.20)	0.143
Function Factors				
Resting	0.40 (0.22-0.73)	0.003*	0.33 (0.10-1.05)	0.062
Person Factors				
Age between 40 and 60	0.46 (0.27-0.78)	0.004*	0.29 (0.04-2.21)	0.238
Age over 80	1.51 (1.16-1.96)	0.002*	1.27 (0.74-2.16)	0.377
Male Gender	0.37 (0.28-0.50)	0.000*	0.67 (0.40-1.12)	0.132
Spatial/Environmental Factors				
Bedside	0.63 (0.46-0.84)	0.002*	0.45 (0.14-1.44)	0.179
Bedroom areas other than bedside	1.36 (1.00-1.85)	0.048*	1.50 (0.93-2.42)	0.091
Corridor/Hallway	2.39 (1.58-3.62)	0.000*	0.88 (0.38-2.02)	0.770
Other areas - Not classified	1.24 (0.45-3.35)	0.671	3.08 (1.11-8.55)	0.031*
Temporal Factors				
1600-1700	0.92 (0.43-1.97)	0.844	2.12 (1.03-4.35)	0.040*
1900-2000	0.92 (0.41-2.07)	0.848	2.86 (1.35-6.05)	0.006*
Other factors				
Risk screened/assessed at admission	0.66 (0.48-0.92)	0.015*	0.41 (0.16-1.04)	0.061

^a Odds ratio (95% Confidence interval)

^b Significance level

^c Reference value for all comparisons using odds ratios are 1.00; Each variable is compared against all other remaining variables within category. For example, within 'Activity Factors', odds for fracture during falls while 'reaching in standing'

Formatted Table

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Font: (Default) Tahoma

Formatted: Font: (Default) Tahoma

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

are expressed as a ratio against odds for fracture after falls related to all other activity variables. Hospital and residential care results are presented in parallel but have been analyzed separately.

*Significant variable (p equal to or less than 0.05)

Formatted: Font: (Default) Tahoma

For peer review only

Table 4 Adjusted Odds Ratios– Hospital fractures

Variable	O/R (95% CI)	p-value
Witnessed by staff	0.51 (0.33-0.79)	0.003
Risk screened/assessed at admission	0.60 (0.41-0.89)	0.012
Standing	2.08 (1.22-3.55)	0.007
Walking	1.86 (1.32-2.62)	<0.001
Resting	0.52 (0.27-0.97)	0.043
Male gender	0.42 (0.30-0.58)	<0.001
Corridor/hallway	2.10 (1.23-3.58)	0.006
Age between 40 and 60	0.52 (0.27-0.98)	0.046
Age 80 and over	1.44 (1.05-1.99)	<0.001
1400-1500 hours	1.97 (1.09-3.54)	0.023
2100-2200 hours	1.73 (1.01-2.97)	0.044

Table 5 Adjusted Odds Ratios - Residential care fractures

Variable	O/R (95% CI)	p-value
Reaching in standing	3.51 (1.44-8.56)	0.006
Walking	2.11 (1.24-3.58)	0.006
Trip	2.89 (1.35-6.17)	0.006
Bedroom areas other than bedside	1.88 (1.15-3.07)	0.011
Other areas – Not classified	3.19 (1.15-8.85)	0.025
0700-0800	2.56 (1.08-6.07)	0.033
1600-1700	2.59 (1.24-5.39)	0.011
1900-2000	3.33 (1.55-7.14)	0.002

REFERENCES

1. Järvinen TLN, Sievänen H, Khan KM, Heinonen A, Kannus P. Shifting the focus in fracture prevention from osteoporosis to falls. *Br Med J* 2008; **336**:124-6.
2. Braithwaite RS, Col NF, Wong JB. Estimating hip fracture morbidity, mortality and costs. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003; **51**:364-70.
3. Jacobsen SJ, Goldberg J, Miles TP, Brody JA, Stiers W, Rimm AA. Race and sex differences in mortality following fracture of the hip. *Am J Public Health* 1992; **82**:1147-50.
4. [Parkkari J, Kannus P, Niemi S, Pasanen M, Järvinen M, Lühje P, Vuori I. Secular trends in osteoporotic pelvic fractures in Finland: number and incidence of fractures in 1970–1991 and prediction for the future. *Calcif Tiss Int* 1996; **59**: 79-83.](#)
5. Stenvall M, Olofsson B, Lundström M, Englund U, Borssen B, Svensson O, Nyberg L, Gustafson Y. A multidisciplinary, multifactorial intervention program reduces postoperative falls and injuries after femoral neck fracture. *Osteoporos Int* 2007; **18**:167-175.
65. Haines TP, Bennell KL, Osborne RH, Hill KD Effectiveness of targeted falls prevention programme in subacute hospital setting: randomised controlled trial. *Br Med J* 2004; **328**:676-82.
76. Healey F, Monro A, Cockram A, Adams V, Heseltine D. Using targeted risk factor reduction to prevent falls in older in-patients: a randomised controlled trial. *Age Ageing* 2004; **33**:390-395.
87. Stone KL, Seeley DG, Lui L-Y, Cauley JA, Ensrud K, Browner WS, Nevitt MC, Cummings SR. BMD at multiple sites and risk of fracture of multiple types: Long-term results from the study of osteoporotic fractures. *J Bone Miner Res* 2003; **18**:1947-54.
98. Cali CM, Kiel DP. An epidemiologic study of fall-related fractures among institutionalized older people. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1995; **43**:1336-40.
109. Lichtenstein MJ, Griffin MR, Cornell JE, Malcolm E, Ray WA. Risk factors for hip fractures occurring in the hospital. *Am J Epidemiol* 1994; **140**:830-8.
110. Cummings SR, Melton LJ. Epidemiology and outcomes of osteoporotic fractures. *Lancet* 2002; **359**:1761-7.
124. Wagner AK, Zhang F, Soumerai SB, Walker AM, Gurwitz JH, Glynn RJ, Ross-Degnan D. Benzodiazepine use and hip fractures in the elderly: who is at greatest risk? *Arch Intern Med* 2004; **164**:1567-72.
132. Nurmi I, Lühje P. Incidence and costs of falls and fall injuries among elderly in institutional care. *Scand J Prim Health Care* 2002; **20**:118-22.
143. Hosmer DW, Lemeshow S. Applied logistic regression. Wiley-Interscience: 2000.
154. Haines T, Kuys SS, Morrison G, Clarke J, Bew P. Cost-effectiveness analysis of screening for risk of in-hospital falls using physiotherapist clinical judgement. *Med Care* 2009; **47**:448-56.
165. Bates DW, Pruess K, Souney P, Platt R. Serious falls in hospitalized patients: correlates and resource utilization. *Am J Med* 1995; **99**:137-43.
176. Sanders KM, Seeman E, Ugoni AM, Pasco JA, Martin TJ, Skoric B, Nicholson GC, Kotowicz MA. Age- and gender-specific rate of fractures in Australia: A population-based study. *Osteoporos Int* 1999; **10**:240-47.
187. Testi D, Viceconti M, Baruffaldi F, Cappello A. Risk of fracture in elderly patients: a new predictive index based on bone mineral density and finite element analysis. *Comput Meth Programs Biomed* 1999; **60**:23-33.
198. Aharonoff GB, Dennis MG, Elshinawy A, Zuckerman JD, Koval KJ. Circumstances of falls causing hip fractures in the elderly. *J Orthop Trauma* 2003; **17**: S22-26.

Formatted: Font: Bold

2019. Hemenway D, Feskanich D, Colditz GA. Body height and hip fracture: a cohort study of 90 000 women. *Int J Epidemiol* 1995; **24**:783-6.
210. Robinovitch SN, Feldman F, Yang Y, Schonnop R, Lueng PM, Sarraf T, Sims-Gould J, Loughin M. Video capture of the circumstances of falls in elderly people residing in long-term care: an observational study. *Lancet* 2013; **381**:47-54.
22. Hill A-M, Hoffmann T, Hill K, Oliver D, Beer C, McPhail S, Brauer S, Haines TP. Measuring falls events in acute hospitals—A comparison of three reporting methods to identify missing data in the hospital reporting system. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2010; **58**:1347-52
- 23+. Haines TP, Massey B, Varghese P, Fleming J, Gray L. Inconsistency in classification and reporting of in-hospital falls. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2009; **57**:517-523.
242. Palvanen M, Kannus P, Parkkari J, Pitkälä T, Pasanen M, Vuori I, Järvinen M. The injury mechanisms of osteoporotic upper extremity fractures among older adults: a controlled study of 287 consecutive patients and their 108 controls. *Osteoporos Int* 2000; **10**: 822-831.
25. Keegan THM, Kelsey JL, King AC, Quesenberry CP, Sidney S. Characteristics of fallers who fracture at the foot, distal forearm, proximal humerus, pelvis, and shaft of the tibia/fibula compared with fallers who do not fracture. *Am J Epidemiol* 2004; **159**:192-203.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: English (Australia)

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, English (Australia)

Formatted: Font: Bold, Not Italic, English (Australia)

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, English (Australia)

Formatted: English (Australia)

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract ✓ (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found ✓
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported ✓
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses ✓
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper ✓
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection ✓
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants ✓
Variables	7	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 ✓
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias ✓
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at ✓
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why ✓
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding ✓ (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions ✓ (c) Explain how missing data were addressed ✓ (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy ✓ (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses ✓
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 N/A (c) Consider use of a flow diagram N/A
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders ✓ (where available) (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest Not possible for size of dataset
Outcome data	15*	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 ✓ (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 N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses ✓

Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives ✓
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 ✓
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence ✓
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 ✓

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

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.



21 JAN 2013