

German Trauma Society (DGU)

Committee on Emergency Medicine, Intensive Care and Trauma Management (Sektion NIS)

and AUC - Academy for Trauma Surgery



Annual Report 2016

with patients admitted until end of 2015

TraumaRegister DGU[®] TR-DGU

This report does not contain real hospital results (where indicated as 'Your hospital') but provides summary data from the whole registry or artificial values in order to generate an impression of how a real hospital report looks like

Preface

Dear participant of TraumaRegister DGU[®],

we are happy to present the Annual Report 2016 of the TraumaRegister DGU[®] for your hospital. This report contains all trauma patients admitted until end of 2015, and completely documented until end of March 2016.

The number of patients documented per year has stabilized on a high level. Last year, 39,346 trauma patients have been documented in the registry, this were about 500 more than in 2014. We welcome new participants from Finland, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Switzerland. The number of hospitals from Germany was again about 600.

Unfortunately, the number of patients with less severe injuries is still high. Therefore, the total number patients documented in the registry should not be titled as 'severe trauma' or 'polytrauma'. Last year, a **basic patient group** was defined. This group excludes patients with minor injuries and thus improved the comparability of the results. This decision received a lot of positive feedback so that we continued to limit the annual report to this patient group. In 2015, about 7000 cases (18%) not belonging to the basic patient group were excluded.

A **new dataset definition** of the registry has been approved last year, and the online documentation as been adapted accordingly. The revised online platform has been relaunched early this year. However, a large portion of patients from 2015 (77%) have still been documented with the previous platform. Thus results from the new dataset version will be available in the report only from next year on.

What is new in this report

Compared to the changes introduced last year (new page 1: patient groups; pages 2 & 8 extended with a second page) there were only minor changes in the present report.

The graph presenting the number of **documented patients** (basic group) on page 6.1 has been replaced by a box-plot-like figure. It was also split up for the three different levels of care so that you could compare like with like.

The focus on **data quality** was further increased by adding a new page (9.2). We developed a combined measure for data completeness based on 10 different variables. This combined measure of data quality, the average compoleteness rate, is then compared among all hospitals. Again, a figure similar to a box plot has been added where each hospital could identify the individual value amongst all other hospitals.

Kindest regards

U. Waythm

11 Nionaber

Rolf Lefering Christian Waydhas Sektion NIS of DGU - Arbeitskreis TraumaRegister and AUC - Akademie der Unfallchirurgie GmbH

Stefan Huber-Wagner Ulrike Nienaber

Content

		Page
1.	Sample Overview of patients and injury severity; Definition of the basic patient group	1
2.	Observed mortality and prognosis Hospital outcome (mortality) and RISC II prognosis, compated over time and to the overall result in the registry; data quality of prognosis	. 2.1 – 2. 2
3.	Basic data from the last 3 years Change of patient characteristics, treatment, and outcome over time (3 years) and compared to the last 10 years of TraumaRegister DGU [®]	3
4.	Quality indicators	4
5.	Individual cases Listing of individual cases in whom prognosis and actual outcome differ considerably; to be used as a basis for internal M&M conferences	5
6.	Graphical comparisons Number of patients and selected variables are presented graphically for all hospitals; the results of your hospital are highlighted among the sorted results	6.1 - 6.3
7.	Basic data On three pages basic data of the patients, the accident, the pre-hospital care, the early in-hospital treatment, intensive care and outcome are reported. Data are compared to the actual year and the last 10 years of TraumaRegister DGU [®]	7.1 - 7.3
8.	Subgroup analyses Outcome, RISC II prognosis and patient characteristics in specific subgroups of your own hospital (8.1) as well as comparison with hospitals of the same level (8.2)	8.1 - 8. 2
9.	Data quality and completeness. The completeness of important variables, especially those needed for outcome prediction, are presented and classified; average data completeness rate	9.1 - 9. 2
10.	Pattern of injuries The pattern of injuries are presented for different body regions; results are compared with the TraumaRegister DGU [®]	10
11.	General results	1.1 - 11.2
Imp	print	12
Ap	pendix	13
-	List of publications from the TraumaRegister DGU [®] , published in the last three year	S
•	List of abbreviations used	

1. Sample

Admission via the shock room and need for intensive care is the official **inclusion criterion** for documenting a patient in the TraumaRegister DGU[®] (TR-DGU). Patients who died before ICU admission should also be included. This pragmatic criterion was chosen to avoid complicated score calculations in the emergency room, and to limit the documentation to patients with relevant injuries.

However, in recent years, the number of patients with only minor injuries continuously increased. On the one hand, this means a higher workload, but more important it limits also the comparability of findings both between hospitals and over time. Therefore, a **'basic patient group**' was defined last year, and nearly all analyses presented in this report refer to this patient group only (and not to all documented patients).

The severity of an injury is determined by the *Abbreviated Injury Scale* (**AIS**) which assigns a severity grade from 1 (minor) to 6 (maximal) points to each injury. Using these severity grades, more sophisticated measures like the *maximum AIS severity* (**MAIS**), the *Injury Severity Score* (**ISS**) or the *New ISS* (**NISS**) could be derived.

The following table gives an overview about the different patient groups in 2015.

	Your hospital 2015	primary admitted	transfer in	early transfer out	TR-DGU 2015
Total number of documented patients	39346	33645	3095	2606	39346
MAIS 1 The most severe injury of these patients were of AIS grade 1 (MAIS = 1). Thus they were not severely injured. Furthermore, the RISC II prognostic score has not been validated for these cases. These cases were excluded from further analysis (except page5, chapter 3)	4211 (11%)	4036	38	137	4211 (11%)
MAIS 2 The worst injury was of AIS grade 2	8997 (23%)	8148	327	522	8997 (23%)
MAIS 3+ The worst injury was of AIS grade 3 or more (MAIS 3+) which recently was defined as a "serious injury" by the EU when looking for an internationally agreed definition for road traffic research.	26138 (66%)	21461	2730	1947	26138 (66%)
Intensive care Patients who required intensive care due to their injuries (admission to ICU)	30557 (78%)	26484	2771	1302	30557 (78%)
Deceased These patients died in the acute care hospital	3444 (9%)	3095	349		3444 (9%)
Basic patient group This definition includes all MAIS 3+ patients. MAIS 2 patients were included only if they died or were treated on the intensive care unit. Patients also had to have valid age data.	32338 (82%)	27142	2996	2200	32338 (82%)
ISS 16+ The definition ISS \geq 16 (or > 15) is used in many scientific papers on trauma patients.	17630 (45%)	14120	2115	1395	17630 (45%)
Severely injured Injury severity (ISS \geq 16) is combined with physiological consequences as done with the new 'polytrauma' definition (see p. 11, and Paffrath et al. 2014).	10043 (26%)	8309	1020	714	10043 (26%)
Polytrauma According to the new der "Berlin Definition" two body regions need to be severely affected (MAIS 3+ in each), and one or more physiological problems are present (see p. 11, and Pape et al. 2014)	4800 (12%)	4165	356	279	4800 (12%)



2. Observed Mortality and Prognosis

Comparing the **observed mortality** of severely injured trauma patients with their **prognosis** is a central element of quality assessment in the TraumaRegister DGU[®]. Here the prognosis is derived from the newly developed **RISC II** prognostic score (Revised Injury Severity Classification, see Lefering et al. 2014). This score could be calculated for all primary admitted patients. The analysis on this page is limited to the **basic patient group** as defined on page 1.

Number of patients (basic patient group) documented in the last 10 years (2006-15):	n = 180870
- among them, documented last year (2015):	n = 32338
- among them, primary admitted cases (no tranfer in: no early transfer out):	n = 27142

Comparisons of outcome and prognosis will be performed in **primary admitted patients** only. For patients **transferred in** from another hospital (n=2996 in 2015) initial status from primary admission was missing; patients **transferred out** early (within 48 hours after admission; n=2200 in 2015) have no final outcome documented.

The mean age of the 27142 patients was 51.0 years, and 69% ware males. The mean ISS was 18.1 points. Of these patients 3074 died in hospital, which was **11.3%** (95% confidence interval: 10.9 - 11.7). The risk of death prognosis based on RISC II **10.8%**. You find these values in the figure below, where also your hospital results from previous years are presented together with the overall result in the registry.

Details and definition of data quality are given on the following page 2.2 (see also page 8).



Legend to the figure:

The bars represent the observed mortality rate; percentages are given at the bottom of each bar. The predicted mortality rate based on RISC II is given as a **grey** vertical bar. This bar turns to **green** or **red** in case that the observed mortality is significantly lower (= better) or higher (= worse) than expected, respectively.

The interpretation of the results has to consider that these findings depend on statistical uncertainty. Therefore, the <u>95% confidence interval</u> for the observed mortality rate is given as well (*vertical line*). The confidence interval describes a range of values which cover the true value with a high probability (95%). The more patients a value is based on, the narrower is the confidence interval. In case that the expected prognosis lies outside the confidence interval, it could be interpreted as a significant deviation (p<0.05).

If the observed mortality rate is based on *less than 5 cases*, the large confidence interval will not be presented.

Data Quality of Prognosis

The validity of a prognosis depends on the quality and the completeness of variables required for its calculation. The **RISC II** score requires 13 different pieces of information; these data are wighted and combined into a final estimator of outcome. The only compulsory components were age and injury severity, however, every additional information about the patient makes the outcome prediction more precise.

Therefore, we added supplementary information about the data quality of the prediction. If all data required for calculating the RISC II score were present, or if only a single value was missing, then this patient was considered as a '**well documented**' case. The percentage of well documented patients (per hospital) is then used to quantify the data quality of outcome prediction. We defined three colour-coded categories:

means: **95-100%** of cases were 'well documented',

means: **80-94%** of cases were 'well documented',

means: less than 80% of cases were 'well documented'.

Yo	our hospital 10 years	Your hospital 2014	Your hospital 2015	TR-DGU 2015	TR-DGU 10 years
All cases in the basic group (n)	150969	26559	27142	27 142	150 969
'well documented' cases (n)	111435	21229	21287	21 287	109 726
(%)	73.8	79.9	78.4	78.4	72.7
Data quality, colour code					
Average number of missing					
components per patient	1.1	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.1

Mortality versus prognosis

Your hospital 2015: Patients in the basic group:

Deviation from prognosis:

27142 primary admitted cases +0.5% (TR-DGU: +0.5%)

The following figure compares each hospital's **observed mortality rate** with the respective **RISC II prognosis in 2015,** like on page 2.1. The deviation of observed mortality rate from the expected prognosis is plotted against the number of patients on the horizontal axis. Negative values correspond to mortality rates which are lower than expected. The dotted lines represent the 95% confidence interval. Hospitals with **less than five patients** were **not included** in this figure, due to the large statistical uncertainty.





3. Basic data from the last 3 years

The results in this table refer to the **basic patient group** only excluding patients with minor injuries (see page 1). <u>Attention:</u> Results have to be interpreted with caution when the number of patients is low!

		Your h	nospital		TraumaReg	gister DGU [®]
	10 years	2013	2014	2015	2015	10 years
Total no. of patients [n]	180,870	29,018	31,538	32,338	32,338	180,870
Primary adm. & treated [n]	151,290	24,450	26,604	27,142	27,142	151,290
Early transferred out [n]	10,930	1,810	2,060	2,200	2,200	10,930
All primary admissions [n]	162,220	26,260	28,664	2,9342	29,342	162,220
From other hospital [n]	18,650	2,758	2,874	2,996	2,996	18,650
Patients						
Mean age [years]	49.2	50.4	50.9	51.2	51.2	49.2
70 years or older [%]	23%	25%	26%	26%	26%	23%
Male patients [%]	71%	70%	70%	69%	69%	71%
Trauma						
Blunt trauma [%]	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
Mean ISS [points]	19.7	18.4	18.4	18.4	18.4	19.7
ISS ≥ 16 [%]	59%	54%	54%	55%	55%	59%
Head injury (AIS head \geq 3) [%]	39%	37%	37%	37%	37%	39%
Pre-hospital Care (only primary	admissions)					
Intubation [%]	29%	24%	23%	22%	22%	29%
Unconscious (GCS ≤ 8) [%]	20%	18%	17%	17%	17%	20%
Shock (BP \leq 90 mmHg) [%]	12%	10%	9%	9%	9%	12%
Avg. amount of volume [ml]	779	672	655	653	653	779
Shock Room / ER (only primary	admissions)					
Whole body CT [%]	74%	75%	76%	78%	78%	74%
X-ray of thorax [%]	44%	41%	38%	36%	36%	44%
Blood transfusion [%]	11%	9%	8%	8%	8%	11%
Treatment in the Hospital						
Operated patients ^{1) 4)} [%]	70%	67%	66%	65%	65%	70%
No. of op. if operated ^{1) 4)} [n]	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.6
Treatment on ICU [%]	88%	86%	87%	88%	88%	88%
LOS on ICU ²⁾ [days]	7.4	6.7	6.6	6.4	6.4	7.4
Intubated/ventilated ²⁾ [%]	48%	42%	41%	39%	39%	48%
Days intubated ²⁾ [days]	3.7	3.1	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.7
Outcome						
LOS in hospital ³⁾ [days]	18.3	17.1	16.8	15.9	15.9	18.3
Hospital mortality ³⁾ [%]	11.8%	11.1%	10.8%	11.4%	11.4%	11.8%
Multiple organ failure ¹⁾³⁾ [%]	23%	20%	20%	20%	20%	23%
Discharge to other hosp. [%]	17%	17%	16%	18%	18%	17%

¹⁾ not available in the reduced QM dataset ²⁾ only ICU patients ³⁾ without patients transferred out early ⁴⁾ years with incomplete documentation excluded

4. Quality Indicators

Measurements of process of care are compared with the TR-DGU average and with previous years. The results on this page refer to primary admitted cases from the **basic patient group** (see page 1), or subgroups thereof. This includes also patients transferred out early. For calculating the time from hospital admission until various diagnostic procedures, only patients with valid time data were considered (see also remarks below). A standard deviation (SD) is presented only if more than one value was available.

		Your h	TR-DGU			
Indicator	10 years	2012	2013	2014	2014	10 years
Primary admitted cases (basic patient group only)	n=162,220	n=26,260	n=28,664	n=29,342	n=29,342	n=162,220
 Pre-hospital time from the accident until hospital admis- sion; in patients with ISS ≥ 16 [Ø min ± SD, n] 	72 ± 54 n=77232	71 ± 56 n=11281	71 ± 56 n=12295	73 ± 58 n=12632	73 ± 58 n=12,632	72 ± 54 n=77,232
2. Intubation rate in unconscious patients (GCS 3-8) [%, n / total]	85% 25322/29634	83% 3606 / 4333	83% 3622 / 4361	81% 3822 / 4698	81% 3,822/4,698	85% 25,322/29,634
3. Time from hospital admission until first x-ray of the thorax [Ø min ± SD, n]	16 ± 20 n=62101	17 ± 21 n=9671	17 ± 21 n=10061	16 ± 21 n=9973	16 ± 21 n=9,973	16 ± 20 n=62,101
 4. Time from hospital admission until first x-ray of the pelvis [Ø min ± SD, n] 	16 ± 18 n=43026	17 ± 20 n=6663	17 ± 19 n=6791	16 ± 18 n=7002	16 ± 18 n=7,002	16 ± 18 n=43,026
 5. Time from hospital admission until abdominal sonography (FAST) [Ø min ± SD, n] 	6 ± 10 n=117935	7 ± 10 n=19063	6 ±10 n=21468	6 ±10 n=23174	6 ± 10 n=23,174	6 ± 10 n=117,935
 6. Time from hospital admission until cranial CT (cCT), in patients with pre-hospital GCS < 15 [Ø min ± SD, n] 	23 ± 17 n=63950	22 ± 17 n=9992	22 ± 16 n=10687	22 ± 17 n=11286	22 ± 17 n=11,286	23 ± 17 n=63,950
 7. Time from hospital admission until whole-body CT (WBCT) [∅ min ± SD, n] 	24 ± 18 n=109513	23 ± 18 n=18170	23 ± 17 n=20299	23 ± 17 n=22035	23 ± 17 n=22,035	24 ± 18 n=109,513
 8. Time from hospital admission until first emergency surgery; (for list of interventions: see remark below) [Ø min ± SD, n] 	86 ± 39 n=23934	89 ± 38 n=4123	91 ± 38 n=4522	90 ± 37 n=4764	90 ± 37 n=4,764	86 ± 39 n=23,934

<u>Remarks:</u> \emptyset = average

Indicator 1: Times exceeding 8 hours were disregarded.

Indicator 3-8: Times exceeding 3 hours were disregarded.

Indicator 6: If a whole-body CT was performed, it was counted as cCT well.

Indicator 8 is based on the following seven interventions: craniotomy, thoracotomy, laparotomy, revascularization, embolization, and external stabilization of the pelvis or of extremities.

5. Individual Cases

5.1 Non-survivor with a low risk of death (< 15% acc. to RISC II)

Patients from the **basic patient subgroup** who died in hospital although their initial prognosis (based on the RISC II score) seemed to be rather low are listed here. In total, 560 such cases were observed in the whole registry in 2015.

A low risk of death does not mean that none of these patients would die, however, this does not happen very often. Therefore, a detailed analysis of such cases may lead to **relevant problems** during the acute care of these patients. But this could only be judged in a more detailed individual analysis of these cases.

<u>Your hospital</u>: Among the 27142 primary admitted cases, **22253** patients had a risk of death < 15%. From these cases **560 patients died.** They are listed in the following table (LOS = length of stay).

ID in the registry*	RISC II	ISS	Age	Sex	Date of admission	LOS
D-xxxxx-A@2015-00123.n	9.8	17	89	F	01-Mai-2015	5

5.2 Survivor with a high risk of death (> 75% acc. to RISC II)

Patients who survived although their risk of death was rather high (>75%) could be indicative for a very well functioning **interdisciplinary approach** in acute care. Overall, 210 such cases were observed in the registry last year. Again, details could only be found after individual analysis of each case. Patients transferred into another hospital within the first two days were disregarded here, of course. Nevertheless, patients could have been transferred later and survival might not have been secured.

<u>Your hospital:</u> Among the 27142 primary admitted cases, **1399 patients** had a risk of death > 75%. The survivors among these patients (n = 210) are listed below.

ID in the registry*	RISC II	ISS	Age	Sex	Date of admission	LOS
D-xxxxx-A@2015-003.n	81.2	45	25	М	24-Jul-2015	45

5.3 Non-survivor with minor injuries

The RISC II score is calculated for patients with $ISS \ge 4$ points only. However, in 2015 there were 4211 cases with an ISS less than 4, i.e. the most severe injury had an AIS severity grade of one (max. AIS = 1). Although such patients usually survive, we observed 28 deaths is this subgroup (0.5%). These cases should be subject of a detailed internal revision, including the correctness and completeness of injury coding.

Your hospital: **4211 patients** had a max. AIS = 1; **20 of them died**:

ID in the registry*	ISS	Age	Sex	Date of admission	LOS

* The ID in the registry is composed of the hospital code, the year of trauma, and an individual patient code

6. Graphical Comparisons

6.1 Patients documented in the last 10 years

The following figure presents the number of documented trauma patients in the last ten years. Only cases from the basic patient subgroup were considered here. (see page 1 for definition). From your hospital **180870 patients** were documented in the last 10 years, among them **32338 patients from 2015**.

In order to better interpret your annual sample size the **median number of cases** per year and hospital is also given in the figure, for three levels of care: blue line for supra-regional trauma centers (n=132), and orange and green lines for regional (n=39) and local (n=9) trauma centers. Your hospital has been classified as **supra-regional trauma center**. Hospitals without a certified level of care were classified at the best knowledge.





In 2015, your hospital documented **32338 patients** in the basic patient group. This value is marked with a **red diamond** (\blacklozenge) below. The values in the graph represent the median (vertilal line), the inter-quartile range (grey box) and minimum / maximum of all hospitals in 2015.



6.3 Graphical Comparisons with other Hospitals 2015

The following figures compare data of your hospital (from **2015**) with respective data from all other hospitals in the TraumaRegister DGU^{\otimes} . Only cases from the **basic patient subgroup** will be considered (see page 1). Your hospital's value is indicated as a **red dot** (\bullet) if data from **at least 3 patients** were available. The horizontal line is the median value of all hospitals, and the broken lines are the 10% and 90% percentiles.

Age (mean)

Your hospital: **49.4 years** (3,2338 patients)





Hospital Mortality (%)

Your hospital: 11.4% (3,422 of 30,138 patients)

Only primary admitted patients and those transferred in were considered here. Early transfers out (within 48 h) were excluded. The median mortality rate of all 563 hospitals in 2015 (with at least 3 cases) was 8.0%.



Prehospital Time (mean time in min.)

Your hospital: **61.9 min.** (23,104 cases)

Your hospital value is based on 23104 of 29342 **primary admitted patients** from the basic group with valid time points for both accident <u>and</u> hospital admission. The median value of all 576 hospitals (with at least 3 valid cases) in 2015 was 58 minutes. If there were less than 3 cases with valid values your hospital was <u>not</u> included in this figure.



5.4 Length of Stay and Injury Severity

This figure describes the association of length of stay (LOS) in hospital and injury severity (ISS). The mean value was calculated for survivors from the basic patient group. Patients transferred to another hospital (n=172) were excluded here.

Hospitals with less than three valid cases were not included in this figure.



7. Basic Data

The following three pages present basic data from five different areas: Demographics / Accident (S); Pre-hospital Phase (A); Emergency Room (B); Intensive Care (C), and Final Assessment / Discharge (D). Your hospital data refer to patients from the basic patient group (see page 1) documented in 2015. Comparative registry data are provided from the same year (**TR-DGU 2015**) and from the last 10 years 2006-2015 (**TR-DGU 10 years**).

	Your hospit	al 2015	TR-DGU	2015	TR-DGU 1	0 years
Total no. of patients (basic patient group)	32338	}	32,338	3	180,87	0
(S) Demographics / Accident						
Primary Admissions / Transfers	%	n	%	n	%	n
primary admitted	90.7	29,342	90.7	29,342	89.3	162,220
among these transferred out within 48h	6.8	2,200	6.8	2,200	6.0	10,930
transferred in within 24h after trauma	8.4	2,702	8.4	2,702	9.2	16,644
transferred in later	0.9	294	0.9	294	1.1	2,006
Patient Characteristics						
Age in years $(M \pm SD, n)$	51.2 ± 22.6	32,338	51.2 ± 22.6	32,338	49.2 ± 22.2	180,870
Children / adolescents (<16y.) (%, n)	4.0	1,301	4.0	1,301	4.1	7,400
Elderly patients (age 70+) $(\%, n)$	26.2	8,461	26.7	8,461	22.9	41,448
Males (%, n)	69.3	22,408	69.3	22,408	70.4	127,264
ASA 3-4 prior to trauma (since 2009) (%, n)	17.0	4,827	17.0	4,872	15.5	21,538
Mechanism of Injury	%	n	%	n	%	n
blunt	96.1	29,740	96.1	29,740	95.7	164,474
penetrating	3.9	1,202	3.9	1,202	4.3	7,399
Type and Cause of Accident	%	n	%	n	%	n
Traffic – car	21.5	6,555	21.5	6,555	23.4	39,280
Traffic – motor bike	12.8	3,899	12.8	3,899	13.3	22,343
Traffic – bicycle	9.4	2,857	9.4	2,857	9.1	15,232
Traffic – pedestrian	6.9	2,106	6.9	2,106	7.1	11,983
High fall (>3m)	16.3	4,952	16.3	4,952	17.0	28,540
Low fall	26.0	7,929	26.0	7,929	22.5	37,766
Suicide (suspected)	4.4	1,372	4.4	1,372	4.6	8,080
Assault (suspected)	2.6	805	2.6	805	2.4	4,182

(A) Pre-hospital Phase

Results only for primary admitted cases	29,342	2	29,342	2	162,220	
Vital Signs	M ± SD	n	$M \pm SD$	n	$M \pm SD$	n
Systolic Blood Pressure sBP [mm Hg]	133 ± 33	25,727	133 ± 33	25,727	129 ± 34	141,919
Respiratory rate RR [/min]	15.7 ± 5.6	17,765	15.7 ± 5.6	17,765	15.6 ± 6.0	97,552
Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS)	$\textbf{12.5} \pm 4.0$	27,412	$\textbf{12.5} \pm 4.0$	27,412	12.2 ± 4.2	151,046
Findings	%	n	%	n	%	n
Shock (sBP \leq 90 mmHg)	9.0	2,314	9.0	2,314	11.7	16,561
Unconsciousness (GCS ≤ 8)	17.2	4,723	17.2	4,723	19.7	29,805
Therapy	%	n	%	n	%	n
Cardio-pulmonary resuscitation (CPR)	2.9	830	2.9	830	3.0	4,777
Intubation	22.3	6,368	22.3	6,368	28.5	45,204
Volume administration	82.1	22,775	82.1	22,775	84.9	129,879
Analgo-sedation *	58.2	8,143	58.2	8,143	65.5	56,820
Chest drain *	2.4	331	2.4	331	3.4	2,978
Catecholamines *	7.6	1,064	7.6	1,064	7.9	6,850
Volume Administration	$\mathbf{M} \pm \mathbf{SD}$	n	$\mathbf{M} \pm \mathbf{SD}$	n	$\mathbf{M} \pm \mathbf{SD}$	n
Average amount in all patients (ml)	$\textbf{653} \pm 552$	27,744	$\textbf{653} \pm 552$	27,545	779 ± 669	152,913
Crystalloids given (%)	82%	22,600	82%	22,600	84%	127,790
average amount, if given (ml)	769 ± 467	,	769 ± 467	,	797 ± 482	,
Colloids given (%)	4%	1,145	4%	1,145	16%	24,064
average amount if given (ml)	605 ± 308		$\textbf{605} \pm 308$		642 ± 347	

* not available in the reduced QM dataset

	Your hospi	tal 2015	TR-DGU 2015		TR-DGU 1	0 years
No. of patients	32338		32,338		180,870	
(B) Emergency Room						
Results for primary admitted cases only	n = 29,	342	n = 29,	324	n = 162	,220
Transportation to hospital	%	n	%	n	%	n
with helicopter	19.2%	5,625	19.2%	5,625	21.9%	35,579
Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS)	$M \pm SD$	n	$\mathbf{M} \pm \mathrm{SD}$	n	$\mathbf{M} \pm \mathrm{SD}$	n
if intubated on admission	3.2 ± 1.2	2,567	3.2 ± 1.2	2,567	3.2 ± 1.3	26,503
if not intubated	12.7 ± 4.0	10,537	$\textbf{12.7} \pm 4.0$	10,537	$\textbf{13.5} \pm 2.9$	53,729
Initial diagnostics	%	n	%	n	%	n
Sonography (FAST)	81.7%	23,985	81.7%	23,985	79.8%	129,463
X-ray of the thorax	35.9%	10,538	35.9%	10,538	42.9%	69,532
cranial CT (isolated or WBCT)	89.8%	26,354	89.8%	26,354	88.0%	142,820
whole-body CT	76.9%	22,564	76.9%	22,564	72.4%	117,498
ER diagnostic not completed *	2.3%	328	2.3%	328	3.0%	2,673
Time in the ER *	$M \pm SD$	n	$\mathbf{M} \pm \mathbf{SD}$	n	$\mathbf{M} \pm \mathbf{SD}$	n
if diagnostics not completed [min] *	56 ± 47	283	56 ± 47	283	46 ± 40	2,612
if send to the operation room [min] *	68 ± 45	2,513	68 ± 45	2,513	69 ± 45	22,462
if transferred to the ICU [min] *	73 ± 53	5,232	73 ± 53	5,232	70 ± 48	35,554
Bleeding and Transfusion	%	n	%	n	%	n
systol. blood pressure ≤ 90 mmHg	7.9%	2,149	7.9%	2,149	9.3%	13,736
hemostasis treatment *	15.9%	2,084	15.9%	2,084	13.8%	9,421
blood transfusion	7.6%	2,222	7.6%	2,222	10.7%	17,342
pRBC, if transfused (mean units)	5.1	,	5.1	<i>,</i>	6.2	,
FFP, if transfused (mean units)	3.1		3.1		4.0	
Treatment in the ER	%	n	%	n	%	n
cardio-pulmonary resuscitation (CPR) *	2.5%	363	2.5%	363	3.0%	2,703
chest drain *	9.3%	1,345	9.3%	1,345	12.8%	10,815
external fracture stabilisation *	7.0%	1,019	7.0%	1,019	7.8%	6,879
Initial Laboratory Values	$M \pm SD$	n	$\mathbf{M} \pm \mathrm{SD}$	n	$\mathbf{M} \pm \mathrm{SD}$	n
base excess [mmol/l]	- 1.7 ± 4.6	22,532	- 1.7 ± 4.6	22,532	- 2.1 ± 4.7	106,398
hemoglobine [g/dl]	13.2 ± 2.2	28,056	13.2 ± 2.2	28,056	$\textbf{12.9} \pm 2.4$	152,259
Quick's value [%]	87 ± 22	26,478	87 ± 22	26,478	85 ± 22	142,709
Int. Normalized Ratio, INR **	$\textbf{1.19} \pm 0.58$	27,026	$\textbf{1.19} \pm 0.58$	27,026	$\textbf{1.21} \pm 0.60$	145,078
temperature [°C] *	36.2 ± 1.1	7,396	$\textbf{36.2} \pm 1.1$	7,396	$\textbf{36.1} \pm 1.2$	40,593

(C) Intensive Care Unit

Patients with intensive care therapy	n = 28,418 (87.9%)		n = 28,418	(87.9%)	158,427 (87.6%)		
Severity	$M \pm SD$	n	$\mathbf{M} \pm SD$	n	$\mathbf{M} \pm SD$	n	
SAPS II score on ICU admission *	25.4 ± 17.3	6,236	$\textbf{25.4} \pm 17.3$	6.236	26.4 ± 16.7	51.948	
Treatment*	%	n	%	n	%	n	
hemostatic drugs *	15.6%	2,141	15.6%	2,141	17.1%	12,233	
dialysis / hemofiltration *	2.2%	294	2.2%	294	2.5%	2,053	
blood transfusion * within the first 48 h after admission	19.1%	2,895	19.1%	2,895	20.1%	18,558	
mechan. ventilation / intubated	39.4%	11,190	39.4%	11,190	47.6%	75,345	
Complications on ICU*	%	n	%	n	%	n	
organ failure (OF) *	34.1%	4783/14045	34.1%	4,783	37.9%	32,428	
multiple organ failure (MOF) *	20.4%	2867/14045	20.4%	2,867	22.8%	19,510	
sepsis *	5.0%	681/13632	5.0%	681	6.3%	5,235	
Length of stay and ventilation	$M \pm SD$	n	$M \pm SD$	n	$M \pm SD$	n	
length of intubation [days]	2.9 ± 7.3	28,297	2.9 ± 7.3	28,297	3.7 ± 8.5	157,226	
LOS on ICU [days]	6.4 ± 9.9	28,418	$\textbf{6.4} \pm 9.9$	28,418	$\textbf{7.4} \pm 11.0$	158,407	

* not available in the reduced QM dataset (PT) if not documented if not documented

	Your hospital 2015		TR-DGU	J 2015	TR-DGU 10 years		
No. of patiets (basic group)	32,33	38	32,33	38	180,8	70	
(D) Discharge / Outcome	,						
Diagnoses	М	n	М	n	М	n	
number of injuries per patient	4.5	32,338	4.5	32,338	4.6	180 870	
patients with only <u>one</u> injury (%, n)	9.5%	3,064	9.5	3,064	9.5%	17.170	
Operations*	%	n	%	n	%	n	
patients with surgery *	65.5%	10,944	65.5%	10,944	70.2%	68.494	
no. of procedures if operated * [Mean]	3.3		3.3		3.6		
Thrombo-ombolic Events							
(MI: pulmonary embolism: DVT: stroke: etc.)	%	n	%	n	%	n	
patients with at least one event *	3.4%	523	3.4	523	2.9	2.571	
1							
Outcome (without early transfers out)	%	n	%	n	%	n	
survivor	88.6%	26,716	88.6%	26,716	88.2%	149.817	
hospital mortality	11.4%	3,422	11.4%	3,422	11.8%	20.123	
died within 30 days	11.0%	3,322	11.0%	3,322	11.4%	19.360	
died within 24 hours	5.2%	1,553	5.2%	1,553	5.7%	9.704	
aled in the ER/OP (no ICU)	1.0%	493	1.0%	493	2.0%	3.398	
Transfor / Discharge (all patients)	9/	n	0/	n	0/	n	
Survivor who were discharged and	100%	28.916	100%	28.916	100%	160 648	
transferred into another hospital	17.6%	5 096	17.6%	5 096	17.2%	27 693	
among them early discharges (<48h)	7.6%	2,200	7.6%	2,200	6.8%	10.930	
transferred into a rehabilitation center	17.7%	5,122	17.7%	5,122	22.8%	36.579	
other discharges	3.4%	989	3.4%	989	3.3%	5.381	
sent home	61.2%	17,709	61.2%	17,709	56.6%	90.995	
Condition at the time of discharge							
(Glasgow Outcome Scale: GOS)							
(without early transfers out)	%	n	%	n	%	n	
Patients with valid GOS		28,995		28,995		162.010	
Surviving patients	100%	25,573	100%	25,573	100%	141.887	
 good recovery 	67.3%	17,214	67.3%	17,214	64.8%	91.963	
- moderate disability	23.1%	5,903	23.1%	5,903	24.8%	35.146	
- severe disability	8.2% 1.49/	2,090	8.2%	2,090	8./% 1.70/	12.409	
- persistant vegetative state	1.4 70	500	1.4 70	500	1.770	2.309	
Length of stay in hospital (all patients)	M + SD	n	M + SD	n	M + SD	n	
All patients, mean	14.9 ± 16.3	32,337	14.9 ± 16.3	32,337	17.3 ± 19.4	180.833	
median	11		11		12		
Only non-survivors	$\textbf{15.9} \pm 16.6$	28,915	$\textbf{15.9} \pm 16.6$	28,915	$\textbf{18.5} \pm 19.8$	160.713	
Only survivors,	$\textbf{7.0} \pm 10.8$	3,422	$\textbf{7.0} \pm 10.8$	3,422	7.1 ± 12.4	20.120	
median survivors / non-survivors	11/3		11/3		13/3		
Survivors transferred into a rehab. center	28.8 ± 21.0	5,122	28.8 ± 21.0	5,122	30.8 ± 22.8	36.574	
Survivors transferred into another hospital	10.0 ± 14.2	5,096	10.0 ± 14.2 13.6 ± 12.6	5,096 17 709	11.3 ± 15.9 15.6 + 16.0	27.689	
Survivors sent nome	13.0 ± 13.0	17,708	13.0 ± 13.0	17,708	13.0 ± 10.9	90.977	
Costs of treatment	MO		MO				
(without early transfers out; see footnote)	M€	n	M€	n	M€	n	
all natients	14 503	30.049	14 503	30.049	16 005	168 977	
only non-survivor	14,505	3 399	10 495	3 399	11 349	19 920	
only survivor	15.014	26.650	15.014	26.650	17.647	149.057	
only patients with ISS ≥ 16	19,167	16,154	19.167	16,154	23.156	98.160	
Sum of all costs	435 804	114€	435 504	114€	2 856 501	103€	
Sum of all days in hospital	479 469	davs	479 469	davs	3,107 62	9 davs	
Average costs per day	908.9	3€	908.9	3€	919.1	9€	

* not available in the reduced QM dataset M = mean

Treatment costs: The estimated treatment costs are based on data of 1002 German TR-DGU patients treated in 2007 and 2008. For these patients a detailed cost analysis was available. Assuming a cost increase of 2% per year would result in 17% higher costs today.

8. Subgroup Analyses

Summary results might not be helpful when looking for potential causes. Therfore, subgroup results of your hospital are presented on this page. Besides descriptive data about the patients and the process of care also hospital outcome and prognosis are presented here for each subgroup.

In order to reduce the statistical uncertainty involved in subgroup analyses, patients from the **last three years** (2013-2015) were pooled together. Again, only patients from the **basic patient group** (see page 1) were considered here.

8.1 Subgroups within your hospital

All results in the following table refer to primary admitted cases from the basic patient group. Patients transferred in as well as those transferred out early (within 48h) are <u>not</u> considered here.

There were a total of **78196 patients** from your hospital in the last three years.

	All			Subg	rupps		
	patients 3 years	No TBI	Combined trauma	Isolated TBI	Shock	Severe injury	Elderly
Defionition of subgroup	Basic group	AIS head ≤ 1	head and body AIS ≥ 2	AIS head \geq 3 and AIS elsew. \leq 1	syst. BP ≤ 90 on admission	$\begin{array}{l} ISS \geq 16 \ \& \\ at \ least \ one \\ problem * \end{array}$	age 70 years or more
No. of patients (basic group) n %	78,196	39,055	29,222	9,919	5,855	23,508	19,338
	100%	50%	37%	13%	7%	30%	25%
PatientsAge[years]Males%ASA 3-4%	50.5	48.2	50.7	58.7	50.4	58.4	79.7
	69%	71%	69%	64%	69%	80%	54%
	14%	11%	14%	24%	16%	28%	38%
Injuries [points] ISS [points] Head injury (AIS≥3) % Thoracic injury (AIS≥3) % Abdominal injury (AIS≥3) %	18.0 34% 38% 9%	14.5 43% 13%	22.7 56% 43% 8%	18.2 100% 	30.2 47% 56% 22%	28.8 64% 52% 22%	18.7 45% 34% 5%
Pre-hospital carePre-hospital timemin.Intubation%Volume given[ml]	62	61	63	63	67	66	63
	23%	13%	33%	32%	65%	50%	21%
	665	664	718	509	1042	818	540
Emergency roomBlood transfusion%Whole-body CT%CPR%	8%	8%	10%	3%	36%	19%	7%
	76%	77%	81%	54%	77%	78%	65%
	1%	1%	2%	1%	9%	4%	1%
$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	25%	19%	26%	42%	25%	46%	100%
	7%	6%	10%	6%	100%	20%	8%
	9%	7%	12%	9%	36%	24%	9%
	11%	8%	14%	14%	32%	27%	20%
	16%	4%	26%	35%	45%	45%	18%
Length of stayTreated on ICUn- Intubation (ICU)[days]- Days on ICU[days]Days in hospital[days]	69,538	33,487	27,187	8,864	5,019	21,371	16,722
	3.0	1.6	4.3	3.9	7.3	6.7	3.3
	6.6	5.0	8.3	7.3	12.2	11.5	7.1
	16.2	16.5	16.8	13.5	20.3	20.1	16.0
Outcome and prognosisNon-survivornHospital mortality%RISC II prognosis%	8,587	1,830	4,188	2,569	2,168	7,188	4,649
	11.0%	4.7%	14.3%	25.9%	37.0%	30.6%	24.0%
	10.6%	4.6%	14.2%	23.5%	38.0%	29.2%	22.5%

* according to the definition of severely injured patients from Paffrath et al. (Injury 2014) and Pape et al. (J Trauma 2014)

8.2 Hospital level of care

The following table allows a comparison of your hospital with hospitals of the same level of care. There are three levels of care (local, regional, and supra-regional trauma centers); non-certified hospitals were grouped according to patient volume and ressources. The results of the whole registry (TR-DGU) are presented as well.

Again only cases from the **basic patient group** were considered here. In order to reduce the statistical uncertainty, all patients from the **last three years** were pooled together (available from your hospital: 3 years).

	Your	Trauma Center			
	Hospital	local	regional	supra-regional	TR-DGU
Level of care / trauma center	local	▼			
Number of hospitals		279	233	124	636
Percentage of patients in TR-DGU		10.2%	32.0%	57.9%	100%
Patients per year n	51 /year	13 /year	43 /year	147 /year	51 /year
All patients (3 years)	n=92 571	n=9 412	n=29 588	n=53 571	n=92 571
primary admitted and treated n,%	77947 84%	75%	84%	86%	84%
primary admitted; early transferred out n,%	6070 7%	23%	11%	1%	7%
transferred in from other hospital n,%	8554 9%	270	5%	13%	9%
Patients					
average age [years]	50.9	54,0	51,9	49,7	50,9
elderly patients aged 70+ years %	26%	30%	27%	24%	26%
males %	70%	67%	69%	10%	1.40/
ASA 3-4 %	14%0	1/%	10%	12%0	14%
Injuries					
Injury Severity Score, ISS [points]	18.4	14,7	17,3	19,7	18,4
$1SS \ge 16$ %	54%	39%	50%	59%	54%
polytrauma 70 pat with head injury (AIS>3) 96	37%	070 23%	31%	1/%	13%
pat. with floracic injury (AIS \geq 3) %	37%	34%	37%	37%	37%
pat. with abdominal injury (AIS \geq 3) %	9%	8%	9%	10%	9%
Pre-hospital Care (only primary admissions)	n=84 017	n=9 232	n=28 211	n=46 574	n=84 017
time (from accident to hospital) [min]	61	55	59	64	61
volume administration [ml]	660	530	633	703	660
intubation %	23%	7%	15%	31%	23%
unconsciousness (GCS 3-8) %	16%	7%	11%	21%	16%
Emergency Room (all patients)					
blood transfusionen %	8%	5%	6%	10%	8%
whole-body CT scan %	71%	54%	73%	73%	71%
CPR %	1%0 70/	0%	0%	2%	1%
coagulopathy %	11%	3% 9%	10%	8% 13%	11%
Length of stay (withot early transfers out)	1170	570	1070	1570	1170
length of intubation on ICU [days]	3.1	0.9	2.2	3.9	3.1
LOS on ICU [days]	6.8	3.8	5.5	7.9	6.8
LOS in hospital [days]	16.6	12.5	14.8	18.0	16.6
Outcome and Prognosis (without transfers in and early transfers out)					
Patients n	77 947	7 105	24 993	45 849	77 947
Non-survivor n	8 587	493	2 324	5 770	8 587
Hospital mortality %	11.0%	6.9%	9.3%	12.6%	11.0%
RISC II prognosis %	10.6%	6.8%	8.9%	12.1%	10.6%

ICU = Intensive Care Unit GCS = Glasgow Coma Scale AIS = Abbreviated Injury Scale ISS = Injury Severity Score, LOS = Length of Stay CPR = cardio-pulmonary resuscitation CT = computed tomography

* Polytrauma: see Berlin definition of Pape et al. (2014)

9. Data Quality and Completeness

9.1 Completeness of selected variables

Registries and audit reports could only be as good as the data they are based on. If a lot of patients have missing data in important variables then these patients have to be excluded from analysis, and results might be biased or even wrong. The following table describes the completeness rates (%) of several important variables, together with the number of patients with missing data (\emptyset) . The list of variables specifically contains the prognostic variables needed for the RISC II. As on the previous pages only cases from the basic patient group were considered here.

Good completeness rates are indicated in green color (96% or better), variables with moderate completeness are marked in yellow (90-95%), and insufficient completeness (below 90%) is indicated in red . The categories for completeness are thresholds defined by experts; they were not derived from the data.

The completeness rates of your hospital in 2015 are compared with your hospital's data from the previous years (since 2006) and with actual overall data from the whole registry (TR-DGU 2015). Besides the rates also the number of patients with missing data is given, marked with the \emptyset sign, including also cases with implausible data.

Variable Importance 2015 2006-2014		Category (%)	Your hospital	Your hospital	TR-DGU
	Variable Importance		2015	2006-2014	2015

Pre-hospital data (A)

only primary admitted cases						n=29,342	n=132,878	ſ	n=29,
GCS	RISC II requires the motor component; two quality indicators use GCS for the definition of cases	96+	90-95	<90		93% Ø 1,930	93% Ø 9244		93% ∅1,930
Blood pressure	initial blood pressure is important for validating the volume therapy and for the definition of shock	96+	90-95	<90		88% Ø 3,615	87% Ø 16,686		88% Ø 3,615
Pupils*	Pupil size and reactivity are relevant for prognosis (RISC II); will be required for all patients in future	96+	90-95	<90		85% ∅ 2,621	92% Ø 5,699		85% ∅2,621
CPR	Cardio-pulmonary resuscitation is seldom (3-4%) but highly predictive for outcome; required for RISC II	96+	90-95	<90		92% ∅ 2,288	93% ∅ 9,330		92% ∅ 2,288

Emergency room (B)

only primary admitted case								
Time of admission	Required to calculate the time until diagnostics were performed	96+	90-95	<90				
Blood pressure	BP on admission is used by RISC II as a prognostic variable; also needed for definition of shock	96+	90-95	<90				
Base excess	Base excess is part of the RISC II and an independent prognostic factor	96+	90-95	<90				
Coagulation	The INR (or Quick's value) is needed for the RISC II as coagulation marker	96+	90-95	<90				
Hemoglobin	Is part of the RISC II score as an indirect sign of relevant bleeding	96+	90-95	<90				



n=29,3	42
99%	
Ø 222	
880/	
ØØ 70 Ø 3 615	
5 ,015	
73%	
Ø 7,658	
91%	
Ø 2,622	
96%	
Ø 1,286	

n=29,342 93%

Patients and Outcome

			all p	patients
ASA	Prior diseases are relevant for outcome prediction (RISC II); doc. since 2009	96+	90-95	<90
Surgical treatment	Surgical treatmentA low rate of surgical patients could be based on incomplete documentation (only standard dataset; not QM)		50-69	<50
GOS	The Glasgow Outcome Scale (GOS) describes the patient's condition at discharge or transfer	96+	90-95	<90





Documentation

all patients										
Time point	A timely documentation of cases is able to improve data quality	month start	ns from ac t of docum	cident to nentation						
	Months from discharge until completion of documentation	<3	3-4	5+						

n=32,338 n=148,532 3.5 mon 6.1 mon. 4.6 5.6

n=148.532

80%

66%

93%

95% ∅1,631	
n=32,	338
3.5	mon.

4.6

* the actual dataset revision includes pupil size and reactivity for all cases

9.2 Comparison of data quality among hospitals

Detailed completeness rates for different variables were presented on the previous page 9.1. In order to compare data quality among hospitals, a combined **quality score** has to be considered.

This score was calculated from the following 10 variables: from the pre-hospital phase GCS, blood pressure, and CPR; from the emergency room phase the time of admission, blood pressure, base excess, hemoglobine, and coagulation (Quick's value or INR); finally the patient's prior health status (pre-injury ASA) and the GOS (Glasgow Outcome Scale) as outcome measure.

All these variables were part of both the standard and the reduced QM dataset.

The number of missing data points from all **primary admitted trauma patients in the basic patient group** were then added and compared to the theoretical maximum. This leads to an average completeness rate based on 10 different variables.

Data Completeness	Your hospital 2015	Your hospital 2006-2014	TR-DGU 2015
Primary admitted patienten in the basic patient group	n=29 342	132 878	29 342
Theoretical sum of all values	293 420	1 328 780	293 420
Sum of missing values	Ø 27 197	Ø 162 690	Ø 27 197
Average data completeness rate (%) based on 10 different measurements	90.7%	87.8%	90.7%

Graphical comparison with other hospitals

The following figure summarizes the completeness data from all 634 hospitals who submitted cases in 2015. The value of your hospital is presented as a **red diamond**.

The figure follows the idea of a box plot where the grey box ranging from 86.7 to 95.9 covers half of all hospital values. The vertical line within the box is the median hospital value (91.9%).



Development over time

The following figure shows the development of data completeness in the last 7 years since 2009. The completeness rates were pooled separately for hospitals using the standard dataset and the reduced QM dataset.



10. Pattern of Injury

The figure below shows the average injury pattern of your patients compared with the TraumaRegister DGU[®]. For these data all cases from the **basic patient group** were considered. In order to reduce the statistical uncertainty, all patients from the last three years (**2012-2014**) were pooled. In these three years, a total of **92894 patients** from your hospital have been documented in the registry (TR-DGU: 92 894).

Data are presented for each of the nine body regions according to the **Abbreviated Injury Scale** (**AIS**). The rates refer to injuries with an injury severity of **at least two points** (including, for example, radius fractures, spine fractures, lung contusions, etc.). The colour-coded figure refers to injury distribution from the whole registry.

Your hospital	48.0%	(n = 44 597)		_	_	
TR-DGU	48.0%	(n = 44 597)				
Your hospital	11.2%	(n = 10 379)			\$	
TR-DGU	11.2%	(n = 10 379)			<mark>-</mark>	
Your hospital	1.2%	(n = 1 157)				
TR-DGU	1.2%	(n = 1 157)				
Your hospital	44.7%	(n = 41 517)				
TR-DGU	44.7%	(n = 41 517)			7	
Your hospital	14.4%	(n = 13 346)		\mathbf{V}		
TR-DGU	14.4%	(n = 13 346)				
Your hospital	28.2%	(n = 26 241)		י ראי		
TR-DGU	28.2%	(n = 26 241)				
Your hospital	28.2%	(n = 26 221)				Logondi
TR-DGU	28.2%	(n = 26 221)				40% +
Your hospital	13.3%	$(n = 12\ 400)$				30-39%
TR-DGU	13.3%	(n = 12 400)				20-29%
Vour hospital	27 1%	(n - 25, 200)				< 10%
TR-DGU	27.1%	$(n = 25\ 200)$ $(n = 25\ 200)$	•			
	Your hospital TR-DGUYour hospital TR-DGUYour hospital TR-DGUYour hospital 	Your hospital TR-DGU 48.0% Your hospital TR-DGU 11.2% Your hospital TR-DGU 1.2% Your hospital TR-DGU 44.7% Your hospital TR-DGU 44.7% Your hospital TR-DGU 14.4% Your hospital TR-DGU 28.2% Your hospital TR-DGU 28.2% Your hospital TR-DGU 28.2% Your hospital TR-DGU 28.2% Your hospital TR-DGU 13.3% Your hospital TR-DGU 13.3% Your hospital TR-DGU 13.3% Your hospital TR-DGU 27.1%	Your hospital TR-DGU48.0% 48.0% $(n = 44597)$ $(n = 44597)$ Your hospital TR-DGU11.2% 11.2% $(n = 10379)$ $(n = 10379)$ Your hospital TR-DGU1.2% 1.2% $(n = 1157)$ $(n = 1157)$ $(n = 1157)$ Your hospital TR-DGU44.7% 44.7% $(n = 41517)$ $(n = 41517)$ Your hospital TR-DGU14.4% 14.4% $(n = 13346)$ $(n = 13346)$ Your hospital TR-DGU28.2% 28.2% $(n = 26241)$ $(n = 26241)$ $(n = 26221)$ Your hospital TR-DGU28.2% 28.2% $(n = 12400)$ $(n = 12400)$ $(n = 12400)$ Your hospital TR-DGU13.3% 27.1% $(n = 25200)$ $(n = 25200)$	$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	$\begin{array}{c c} \underline{Your\ hospital} \\ \overline{TR}\text{-}DGU \\ \hline TR\text{-}DGU \\ \hline TR\text{-}DGV \\ TR\text{-}DGV \\ \hline TR\text{-}DGV \\ TR - TR\text{-}DGV \\ \hline TR\text{-}DGV \\$	$\begin{array}{c cccc} \underline{Your\ hospital} \\ \overline{TR}-DGU \\ \hline TR-DGU \\ \hline TR-TTR-TTR-TTR-TTR-TTR-TTR-TTR-TTR-TTR-$

Serious Injuries (AIS 3+)

Injuries with a severity of 3 points or more (AIS) are considered as 'serious'. The prevalence of serious injuries in four different body regions (head; thorax; abdomen; extremities) is given below. The body regions considered here refer to the respective regions of the *Injury Severity Score*.

In contrast to the figure above only patients with **at least one relevant injury** (MAIS 3+; see page 1) are considered here. In the last three years there were **75570** such **patients** from your hospital. They constitute **81%** within the **basic patient group** (TR-DGU: 81.4%).

	Your hospital	TR-DGU
Serious injury (AIS \geq 3)	n = 75 570	n = 75 570
of the head	45.5% (n=34 420)	45.5% (n=34 420)
of the thorax	45.1% (n=34 081)	45.1% (n=34 081)
of the abdomen	11.6% (n=8 743)	11.6% (n= 8743)
of the extremities	29.5% (n=22 294)	29.5% (n=22 294)
Patients with more than one seriously injured body region	30.0% (n=22 696)	30.0% (n=22 696)

11. General Results

Some results from the actual analysis of 2015 data from the TraumaRegister DGU[®] are of general interest. They will be presented here without reference to individual hospitals' results.

11.1 Hospitals and Patients

Hospitals

In 2015 data of **39.355** patients from **636** actively participating hospitals were documented in the TraumaRegister DGU[®]. The total number of cases documented since 1993 thus increased to **238,247** patients. However, not all of these cases were severely injured. Details are given on the next page 11.2.

Among the total number of 636 hospitals there were 40 hospitals from outside Germany (6,3%): Austria 18, Switzerland 5, The Netherlands 4, Belgium 4, Luxembourg 4, Finland 3 Slovenia 1 and United Arab Emirates 1. The number of German hospitals was 596 last year.

The figure on the right shows the distribution of hospitals regarding their location (German vs. non-German) and the use of the standard dataset or the reduced QM dataset, respectively. The reduced version of the dataset is mainly used in Germany by local (87%) and regional (76%) trauma centers. The majority of level one trauma centers are using the standard documentation sheet (68%).





Patients

The figure below demonstrates the continuous increase of registered patients over time. The percentage of non-German patients actually is 11.9%. Only 4.6% of patients have been documented before 2002 when the online documentation was introduced. Last year, about half of all patients (48%) were documented with the standard dataset



11.2 Severity of Injuries

The TraumaRegister $DGU^{\text{®}}$ is designed to document and analyse **severely injured patients**. These patients are specifically suitable for the evaluation of interdisciplinary cooperation in trauma care within a hospital. It also reduces the workload for documentation considerably if not all but only severely injured patients are registered.

However, there are different approaches to define a 'severely injured' patient. The TR-DGU uses the need for intensive care as a pragmatic and easy to determine inclusion criterion. But in 2015, only 77.7% of all documented patients were treated on ICU. And this is not due to early deaths in the emergency room (only 499 patients; 1.3%) who did not reach the ICU.

In the scientific literature the **Injury Severity Score** (**ISS**) is frequently used to define severe trauma, for example, ISS ≥ 16 (in 2015 this refers to 45% of all documented patients). The concept of '**polytrauma**' has recently been reconsidered, and a new definition known as Berlin Definition has been published: at least two body regions have to be seriously injured (AIS \geq 3) and, in addition, there have to be one or more physiological problems (see Pape et al., *J. Trauma* 2014). In the TR-DGU this refers to 12% of patients last year).

Over the last years, there is an obvious trend to document more and more **patients with minor injuries** only. The figure below shows that the ISS has decreased to 15,8 points in 2015. In the 1990s the mean ISS was about 25 points. One reason for this is that the number of documented patients with marginal injuries (MAIS 1 = the worst injury is of AIS grade 1). In 2015 there were 4211 such patients, or 11% of the total number. Especially small hospitals (local trauma centers) tend to document patients with only minor injuries (23% of all patients in 2015 had MAIS 1).



The **basic patient group** defined last year excludes all patients with MAIS 1. Patients with a worst injury of grade 2 (MAIS 2) were included only if they died or were treated on the intensive care unit. If the worst injury grading was 3 or more (MAIS 3+) all cases were included. Furthermore, a valid entry for age is required in order to calculate the RISC II prognostic score. This basic patient group actually (2015) consists of 82% of all documented patients. Nearly all results presented in this report refer to this patient group in order to increase the comparability of the results.

Copyright

© 2016 Committee on Emergency Medicine, Intensive Care and Trauma Management of the German Trauma Society (Sektion NIS) of the German Trauma Society (DGU, Deutschen Gesellschaft für Unfallchirurgie); Working Group on TraumaRegister (Chairmen: S. Huber-Wagner, Ch. Waydhas, R. Lefering, U. Schmucker) and AUC - Academy of Trauma Surgery (Akademie der Unfallchirurgie GmbH)

Each publication or other public use of data from the TraumaRegister DGU[®] requires a prior approval by the Sektion NIS / AUC. Applications have to be sent to AUC (email: traumaregister@auc-online.de).

Publications with data from the own hospital only do not fall under this publication guideline. Also data presented in the annual reports could be used for own publications, under the condition that the reference is mentioned.

Scientific analyses and publications with data from the TraumaRegister $DGU^{(B)}$ have to follow the actual publication guideline of the TraumaRegister $DGU^{(B)}$. You will find this guideline on www.traumaregister-dgu.de. The term **TraumaRegister DGU**^(B) is a reserved name.



Imprint

Statistical analyses and preparation of the annual audit reports:

Rolf Lefering (IFOM) in cooperation with Ulrike Nienaber (AUC)

Address for correspondence:

Ulrike Nienaber Register and Research Coordination Academy of Trauma Surgery (AUC GmbH) Cologne Merheim Medical Center Ostmerheimer Str. 200, 51109 Cologne, Germany Phone: +49 221 88 82 39 - 0 E-Mail: traumaregister@auc-online.de

Prof. Dr. Rolf Lefering Institute for Research in Operative Medicine (IFOM) Faculty of Health, University Witten/Herdecke Ostmerheimer Str. 200 51109 Cologne, Germany

Phone: +49 221 98957-16 E-Mail: rolf.lefering@uni-wh.de





Financial Disclosure:

The **TraumaRegister DGU**[®] receives fees from the participating hospitals collected by the **AUC GmbH**. The AUC GmbH, a 100% affiliate of the DGU (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Unfallchirurgie), also hosts the registry and is owner of the database. Hospitals certified as members of a German trauma network (TraumaNetzwerk DGU[®]) are obliged to participate in the TraumaRegister DGU[®], all other hospitals participate voluntary.

In the past 10 years the registry received financial or other support from the following organizations and companies:

- Private University Witten/Herdecke gGmbH and Cologne-Merheim Medical Centre (2005-2016)
- Novo Nordisk A/S, Bagsværd, Denmark (2003-2009)
- Sanofi Aventis Deutschland GmbH (2008)

Publications from the TraumaRegister DGU[®]

Publications from the last three years (2014-2016), no abstracts; last update: August 2016

An extended list of publications from the TraumaRegister DGU[®] including also papers published previously is available on **www.traumaregister-dgu.de**.

[PDF] / [PDFprov] = this paper is available in PDF format / provisional PDF format.

The articles indicated with **[PDF]** could be provided to interested users on request if there is no direct access to the respective journal. In this case, please send an email to: traumaregister@auc-online.de.

The following figure presents the **number** of publications from the TraumaRegister DGU[®] since 1997 as well as the sum of **impact points** reached with these papers.



TraumaRegister DGU® - Scientific Publications

1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016

2016:

- Andruszkow H, Schweigkofler U, Lefering R, Frey M, Horst K, Pfeifer R, Beckers SK, Pape HC, Hildebrand F. Impact of Helicopter Emergency Medical Service in Traumatized Patients: Which Patient Benefits Most?. *PLoS One* 2016; 11: e0146897. [PDF]
- Böhmer A, Poels M, Kleinbrahm K, Lefering R, Paffrath T, Bouillon B, Defosse JM, Gerbergshagen MU, Wappler F, Joppich R. Change of initial and ICU treatment over time in trauma patients. An analysis from the TraumaRegister DGU®. *Langenbeck's Arch. Surg.* 2016 [Epub ahead of print] [PDF prov.]
- Bouillon B, Lefering R, Paffrath T, Sturm J, Hoffmann R. Versorgung Schwerverletzter in Deutschland Einfluss des TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Unfallchirurg* 2016; 119:469-474 [PDF]
- Brinck T, Handolin L, Lefering R. The effect of evolving fluid resuscitation on the outcome of severely injured patients: an 8-year experience at a tertiary trauma center. *Scand J Surg* 2016; 105: 109-116. [PDF]
- Brinck T, Raj R, Skrifvars MB, Kivisaari R, Siironen J, Lefering R, Handolin L. Unconscious trauma patients: outcome differences between southern Finland and Germany lesson learned from trauma-registry comparisons. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg* 2016; 42: 445-451. [PDF]
- Driessen A, Fröhlich M, Schäfer N, Mutschler M, Defosse JM, Brockamp T, Bouillon B, Stürmer EK, Lefering R, Maegele M and the TraumaRegister DGU. Prehospital volume resuscitation Did evidence defeat the crystalloid dogma? An analysis of the TraumaRegister DGU® 2002–2012. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med.* 2016; 24: 42. [PDF]
- Emami P, Czorlich P, Fritzsche FS, Westphal M, Rueger JM, Lefering R, Hoffmann M. Impact of Glasgow Coma Scale score and pupil parameters on mortality rate and outcome in pediatric and adult severe traumatic brain injury: a retrospective, multicenter cohort study. *J Neurosurg* 2016; 1: 1-8. [Epub ahead of print] [PDF]
- Esmer E, Delank KS, Siekmann H, Schulz M, Derst P und das TraumaRegister DGU. Gesichtsverletzungen bei Polytrauma: Mit welchen Verletzungen ist zu rechnen? Eine retrospektive Auswertung aus dem TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Notfall Rettungsmed* 2016; 19: 92-98. [PDF]

- Esmer E, Derst P, Lefering R, Schulz M, Siekmann H, Delank KS; das TraumaRegister DGU[®]. Präklinische Einschätzung der Verletzungsart und –schwere beim Schwerverletzten durch den Notarzt: Eine Analyse aus dem TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Unfallchirurg* 2016 [Epub ahead of print]. [PDF]
- Hegele A, Lefering R, Hack J, Ruchholtz S, Hofmann R, Kühne CA. Operative interventions of urologic traumata in severe injured patients in the acute phase. *Urologe A*. 2016; 55: 506-513. [PDF]
- Heuer M, Hussmann B, Lefering R, Kaiser GM, Lendemans S, TraumaRegister DGU. Abdominal upper GI injury in 416 polytraumatized patients. *J Clin Gastroenterol.* 2016 [accepted]
- Hilbert-Carius P, Hofmann GO, Lefering R, Stuttmann R, Struck MF; TraumaRegister DGU[®]. Clinical presentation and blood gas analysis of multiple trauma patients for prediction of standard coagulation parameters at emergency department arrival. *Anaesthesist* 2016; 65: 274-280. **[PDF]**
- Huber S, Crönlein M, von Matthey F, Hanschen M, Seidl F, Kirchhoff C, Biberthaler P, Lefering R, Huber-Wagner S and TraumaRegister DGU[®]. Effect of private versus emergency medical systems transportation in trauma patients in a mostly physician based system - a retrospective multicenter study based on the TraumaRegister DGU. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med* 2016; 24: 60. [PDF]
- Lech L, Jerkku T, Kanz KG, Wierer M, Mutschler W, Koeppel TA, Lefering R, Banafsche R. Bedeutung des Gefäßtraumas für die Schwerverletztenversorgung. Einfluss auf Verlauf und Mortalität. *Zentralbl. Chir.* 2016 [Epub ahead of print]
- Lefering R. Using data from registries like the TraumaRegister DGU[®] for effectiveness evaluations. *Z Evid Fortbild Qual Gesundhwes*. 2016; 112 Suppl 1: 11-15. [PDF]
- Lustenberger T, Walcher F, Lefering R, Schweigkofler U, Wyen H, Marzi I, Wutzler S and TraumaRegister DGU[®]. The Reliability of the Pre-hospital Physical Examination of the Pelvis: A retrospective, multi-center Study. *World J Surg.* 2016 [accepted].
- Wafaisade A, Lefering R, Bouillon B, Böhmer AB, Gäßler M, Ruppert M. Prehospital administration of tranexamic acid in trauma patiens. *Crit Care* 2016; 20: 143. [PDF]
- Zwingmann J, Lefering R, Feucht M, Südkamp NP, Strohm PC, Hammer T. Outcome and predictors for successful resuscitation in the Emergency Room of adult patients in traumatic cardiorespiratory arrest. *Crit Care* 2016 [accepted].

2015:

- Brinck T, Handolin L, Paffrath T, Lefering R. Trauma registry comparison: six-year results in trauma care in Southern Finland and Germany. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg* 2015; 41: 509-516. [PDF]
- Burkhardt M, Nienaber U, Krause J, Pizanis A, Moersdorf P, Culemann U, Aghayev E, Paffrath T, Pohlemann T, Holstein JH, Beckenregister DGU, TraumaRegister DGU. Das komplexe Beckentrauma. Matching des Beckenregisters DGU mit dem TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Unfallchirurg* 2015; 118: 957-962. [PDF]
- Debus F, Lefering R, Frink M, Kühne C, Mand C, Ruchholtz R. Das Polytrauma von Kindern und Jugendlichen. *Unfallchirurg* 2015; 118: 432-38. [PDF]
- Debus F, Lefering R, Frink M, Kühne CA, Mand C, Bücking B, Ruchholtz S, and the TraumaRegister DGU. Anzahl der Schwerverletzten in Deutschland — eine retrospektive Analyse aus dem TraumaRegister der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Unfallchirurgie (DGU). *Dtsch Arztebl* 2015; 112: 823–829. **[PDF]** – siehe auch Erratum
- Debus F, Lefering R, Frink M, Kühne CA, Mand C, Bücking B, Ruchholtz S. Numbers of Severely Injured Patients in Germany. *Dtsch Arztebl Int.* 2015; 112: 823-829. **[PDF]** siehe auch Erratum
- Delhey P, Huber S, Hanschen M, Häberle S, Trentzsch H, Deiler S, van Griensven M, Biberthaler P, Lefering R, Huber-Wagner S, TraumaRegister DGU. Significance of traumatic macroamputation in severely injured patients an analysis of the TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Shock* 2015; 43: 233-237. [PDF]
- Esmer E, Esmer EM, Derst P, Schulz M, Siekmann H, Delank KS und das TraumaRegister DGU. Einfluss der externen Beckenstabilisierung bei hämodynamisch instabilen Beckenfrakturen. *Unfallchirurg* 2015 [Epub ahead of print]. [PDF]
- Hanschen M, Kanz KG, Kirchhoff C, Khalil PN, Wierer M, van Griensven M, Laugwitz KL, Biberthaler P, Lefering R, Huber-Wagner S and the TraumaRegister DGU. Blunt cardiac injury in the severely injured A retrospective multicentre study. *PLOS One* 2015; 10: e0131362. **[PDF]**
- Heuer M, Hussmann B, Lefering R, Kaiser GM, Eicker C, Guckelberger O, Lendemanns S, TraumaRegister DGU. Prehospital fluid management of abdominal organ trauma patients: a matched pair analysis. *Langenbecks Arch Surg.* 2015; 400: 371-379. **[PDF]**
- Hilbert P, Hoffmann GO, Lefering R, Struck MF. Schockraumhämoglobin Prädiktor für eine Gerinnungsstörung beim Traumapatienten. *Unfallchirurg* 2015; 118: 601-606. [PDF]
- Hilbert-Carius P, Hofmann GO, Lefering R, Stuttmann R, Bucher M, Goebel P, Gronwald GH. Whole-body-CT in severely injured children. Results of a retrospective, multicenter study with patients from the TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Klin Padiatr.* 2015; 227: 206-212. **[PDF prov.]**

- Hoffmann M, Lehmann W, Schroeder M, Rueger JM and Lefering R on behalf of TraumaRegister DGU® of the German Trauma Society. Prospective evaluation of the Eppendorf-Cologne-Scale (ECS). *Eur J Emerg Med* 2015 [epub ahead of print].
- Horst K, Hildebrand F, Kobbe P, Pfeifer R, Lichte P, Andruszkow H, Lefering R, Pape HC. Detecting severe injuries of the upper body in multiple trauma patients. *J Surg Research* 2015; 199: 629-634. [PDF]
- Hussmann B, Heuer M, Lefering R, Touma A, Schoeneberg C, Keitel J, Lendemans S. Prehospital Volume Therapy as an Independent Risk Factor after Trauma. *BioMed Research International* 2015: 354367. [PDF]
- Kulla M, Maier J, Bieler D, Lefering R, Hentsch S, Lampl L, Helm M. Zivile Explosionstraumata ein unterschätztes Problem? Ergebnisse einer retrospektiven Analyse aus dem TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Unfallchirurg* 2015 [Epub ahead of print] [PDF]
- Lichte P, Kobbe P, Almahmoud K, Pfeifer R, Andruszkow H, Hildebrand F, Lefering R, Pape HC, Trauma Register DGU. Post-traumatic thrombo-embolic complications in polytrauma patients. *Int Orthop* 2015; 39: 947-954. [PDF prov.]
- Lichte P, Andruszkow H, Kappe M, Horst K, Pishnamaz M, Hildebrand F, Lefering R, Pape HC, Kobbe P; TraumaRegister DGU. Increased in-hospital mortality following severe head injury in young children: results from a nationwide trauma registry. *Eur J Med Res.* 2015; 20: 65. [PDF]
- Raj R, Brinck T, Skrifvars MB, Kivisaari R, Siironen J, Lefering R, Handolin L. Validation of the revised injury severity classification score in patients with moderate-to-severe traumatic brain injury. *Injury* 2015; 46: 86-93. [PDF]
- Reith G, Lefering R, Wafaisade A, Hensel KO, Paffrath T, Bouillon B, Probst C; TraumaRegister DGU. Injury pattern, outcome and characteristics of severely injured pedestrian. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med* 2015; 23: 56. [PDF]
- Schulz-Drost S, Oppel P, Grupp S, Krinner S, Langenbach A, Lefering R, Mauerer A. Knöcherne Verletzung der Brustwand beim Polytrauma: Inzidenz, Begleitverletzungen, Verlauf und Outcome. *Unfallchirurg* 2015 [Epub ahead of print] [PDF]
- Schweigkofler U, Reimertz C, Lefering R, Hoffmann R, TraumaRegister DGU. Bedeutung der Luftrettung für die Schwerverletztenversorgung. *Unfallchirurg* 2015; 118: 240-244. [PDF]
- Stephan K, Huber S, Häberle S, Kanz KG, Bühren V, van Griensven M, Meyer B, Biberthaler P, Lefering R, Huber-Wagner S; TraumaRegister DGU. Spinal cord injury incidence, prognosis, and outcome: an analysis of the TraumaRegister DGU. *Spine J.* 2015; 15: 1994-2001. [PDF prov.]
- Topp T, Lefering R, Lopez CL, Ruchholtz S, Ertel W, Kühne CA. Radiologic diagnostic procedures in severely injured patients - is only whole-body multislice computed tomography the answer? *Int J Emerg Med* 2015; 8: 3. [PDF]
- Trentzsch H, Lefering R, Nienaber U, Kraft R, Faist E, Piltz S, TraumaRegister DGU. The role of biological sex in severely traumatized patients on outcomes: A Matched-pair analysis. *Ann Surg* 2015; 261: 774-780. [PDF]
- Wafaisade A, Paffrath A, Lefering R, Ludwig C, Fröhlich M, Mutschler M, Banerjee M, Bouillon B, Probst C and the Section NIS. Patterns of early resuscitation associated with mortality after penetrating injuries. *Br J Surg* 2015: 102: 1220-1228. [PDF]
- Weber CD, Horst K, Lefering R, Hofman M, Dienstknecht T, Pape HC, FACS, TraumaRegister DGU. Major trauma in winter sports: an international trauma database analysis. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg* 2015 [Epub ahead of print]
- Wutzler S, Lefering R, Wafaisade A, Maegele M, Walcher F, Wyen H, Marzi I, Laurer H, TraumaRegister DGU. Aggressive operative treatment of isolated blunt traumatic brain injury in the elderly is associated with favourable outcome Injury. *Injury* 2015; 46: 1706-1711. [PDF]
- Zacher M, Kanz KG, Hanschen M, Häberle S, van Griensven M, Lefering R, Bühren V, Biberthaler P, Huber-Wagner S, TraumaRegister DGU. Effect of patient volume on mortality for German trauma centres - An analysis of the TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Br J Surg* 2015: 102: 1213-1219. [PDF]
- Zwingmann J, Lefering R, TraumaRegister DGU, Bayer J, Reising K, Südkamp NP, Strohm PC. Outcome and risk factors in children after traumatic cardiac arrest and successful resuscitation. *Resuscitation* 2015; 96: 59-65. [PDF]

2014:

- Andruszkow H, Hildebrand F, Lefering R, Pape HC, Hoffmann R, Schweigkofler U. 10 years of helicopter emergency medical services in Germany: Do we still need the helicopter rescue in multiple traumatized patients? *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S53-S58. [PDF]
- Bieler D, Franke AF, Hentsch S, Paffrath T, Willms A, Lefering R, Kollig EW, TraumaRegister DGU. Gunshot and stab wounds in Germany - Epidemiology and outcome: Analysis from the TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Unfallchirurg* 2014; 117: 995-1004. [PDF]

- Bliemel C, Lefering R, Buecking B, Frink M, Struewer J, Krueger A, Ruchholtz S, Frangen TM. Early or delayed stabilization in severely injured patients with spinal fractures? Current surgical objectivity according to the Trauma Registry of DGU: Treatment of spine injuries in polytrauma patients. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg* 2014; 76(2):366-73. [PDF]
- Böhmer AB, Just KS, Lefering R, Paffrath T, Bouillon B, Joppich R, Wappler F, Gerbershagen MU. Factors influencing lengths of stay in the intensive care unit for surviving trauma patients: a retrospective analysis of 30,157 cases. *Crit Care* 2014; 18: R143. [PDF]
- Burkhardt M, Holstein JH, Mörsdorf P, Kristen A, Lefering R, Pohlemann T, Pizanis A and the TraumaRegister DGU. Proper coding of the Abbreviated Injury Scale: Can clinical parameters help as surrogates in estimating the blood loss? *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg* 2014; 40: 473-479.
- Burkhardt M, Kristen A, Culemann U, Koehler D, Histing T, Holstein JH, Pizanis A, Pohlemann T, TraumaRegister DGU, German Pelvic Injury Register. Pelvic fracture in multiple trauma: Are we still up-to-date with massive fluid resuscitation? *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S70-S75. [PDF]
- Fröhlich M, Lefering R, Probst C, Paffrath T, Schneider MM, Maegele M, Sakka SG, Bouillon B, Wafaisade A and the TraumaRegister DGU[®]. Epidemiology and risk factors of multiple organ failure (MOF) after multiple trauma: An analysis of 31,154 patients from the TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg* 2014; 76:921-928. [PDF]
- Heuer M, Hussmann B, Kaiser G, Nast-Kolb D, Ruchholtz S, Lefering R, Paul A, Taeger, G, Lendemans S. Inzidenz von Hohlorganverletzungen nach Trauma: Behandlung, Verlauf und Outcome - eine organspezifische Auswertung von 1127 Patienten des Traumaregisters der DGU. *Zentralbl Chir* 2014; 139: 445-451 [PDFprov.]
- Huber S, Biberthaler P, Delhey P, Trentzsch H, Winter H, van Griensven M, Lefering R, Huber-Wagner S. Predictors of poor outcomes after significant chest trauma in multiply injured patients: a retrospective analysis from the TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Scand J Trauma Resusc* 2014; 22: 52. [PDF]
- Huber-Wagner S, Mand C, Ruchholtz S, Kühne C, Holzapfel K, Kanz KG, van Griensven M, Biberthaler A, Lefering R, TraumaRegister DGU. Effect of the localisation of the CT scanner during trauma resuscitation on survival A retrospective, multicentre study. *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S76-S82. [PDF]
- Hussmann B, Lendemans S. Pre-hospital and early in-hospital management of severe injuries: Changes and trends. *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S39-S42 [PDF]
- Kaske, S, Lefering R, Trentzsch H, Driessen A, Bouillon B, Maegele M, Probst C. Quality of life two years after severe trauma: A single centre evaluation. *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S100-S105 [PDF]
- Leenen M, Scholz A, Lefering R, Flohé S, TraumaRegister DGU. Limited volume resuscitation in hypotensive elderly multiple trauma is safe and prevents early clinical dilutive coagulopathy – a matched pair analysis from TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S59-S63 [PDF]
- Lefering R. Strategies for comparative analyses in registry data. Injury 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S83-S88 [PDF]
- Lefering R, Huber-Wagner S, Nienaber U, Maegele M, Bouillon B. Update of the trauma risk adjustment model of the TraumaRegister DGU: the revised injury severity classification, version II. *Crit care* 2014; 14:476 [PDF]
- Lefering R, Paffrath T, Nienaber U. Das TraumaRegister DGU[®] als Datenquelle für das Monitoring schwerer Unfallverletzungen. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt* 2014; 57: 660-665. **[PDF]**
- Leopold E, Trentzsch H, Nienaber U, Huber-Wagner S, Lefering R, Matthes G, Wölfl C, Paffrath T, Flohé S. Gemeinsam Gutes bewegen: 20 Jahre TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Orthopädie und Unfallchirurgie Mitteilungen und Nachrichten* 2014; Februar: 95-97. [PDF]
- Lichte P, Weber C, Sellei RM, Hildebrand F, Lefering R, Pape HC, Kobbe P, TraumaRegister DGU. Are bilateral tibial shaft fractures associated with an increased risk for adverse outcome? *Injury* 2014; 45(12):1985-1989 [PDF prov]
- Mutschler M, Nienaber U, Münzberg M, Fabian T, Paffrath T, Wölfl C, Bouillon B, Maegele M. Assessment of hypovolaemic shock at scene: is the PHTLS classification of hypovolaemic shock really valid? *Emerg Med J.* 2014; 31:35-40. [PDF]
- Mutschler M, Nienaber U, Wafaisade A, Brockamp T, Probst C, Paffrath T, Bouillon B, Maegele M and the TraumaRegister DGU. The impact of severe traumatic brain injury on a novel base deficit-based classification of hypovolemic shock. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med.* 2014; 22. [PDF]
- Mutschler M, Paffrath T, Wölfl C, Probst C, Nienaber U, Schnipper IB, Bouillon B, Maegele M. The ATLS[®] classification of hypovolemic shock: A well established teaching tool on the edge? *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S35-S38. [PDF]
- Paffrath T, Lefering R, Flohé S, TraumaRegister DGU. How to define severely injured patients? An Injury Severity Score (ISS) based approach alone is not sufficient. *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S64-S69. [PDF]
- Pape HC, Lefering R, Butcher N, Peitzman A, Leenen L, Marzi I, Lichte P, Josten C, Bouillon B, Schmucker U, Stahel PF, Giannoudis P, Balogh ZJ. The definition of polytrauma revisited: An international consensus process and proposal of the new 'Berlin definition'. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg* 2014; 77: 780-786 [PDF]

- Pape-Köhler CIA, Simanski C, Nienaber U, Lefering R. External factors and the incidence of severe trauma: time, date, season and moon. *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S93-S99. [PDF]
- Ruchholtz S, Lewan U, Debus F, Mand C, Siebert H, Kühne C. The TraumaNetwork DGU[®]: Optimizing patient flow and management. *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S89-S92 [PDF]
- Ruchholtz S, Lefering R, Lewan U, Debus F, Mand C, Siebert H, Kühne CA. Implementation of a nationwide trauma network for the care of severely injured patients. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg* 2014; 76: 1456-1461. [PDF prov]
- Steinhausen E, Lefering R, Tjardes T, Neugebauer EA, Bouillon B, Rixen D, Committee on Emergency Medicine, Intensive and Trauma Care (Sektion NIS) of the German Society for Trauma Surgery (DGU). A risk-adapted approach is beneficial in the management of bilateral femoral shaft fractures in multiple trauma patients: an analysis based on the trauma registry of the German Trauma Society. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg.* 2014; 76: 1288-93. [PDF]
- Timm A, Maegele M, Lefering R, Wendt K, Wyen H, TraumaRegister DGU. Prehospital rescue times and actions in severe trauma: A comparison between two trauma systems: Germany and the Netherlands. *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S43-S52. [PDF]
- TraumaRegister DGU. 20 years of trauma documentation in Germany Actual trends and developments. *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S14-S19. [PDF]
- TraumaRegister DGU. 20 years TraumaRegister DGU[®]: Development, aims and structure. *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S6-S13. [PDF]
- Trentzsch H, Nienaber U, Behnke M, Lefering R, Plitz S. Female sex protects from organ failure and sepsis in the squeal of major traumatic haemorrhage. *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S20-S28. [PDF]
- Wafaisade A, Lefering R, Bouillon B. 20 Jahre TraumaRegister DGU[®] was können wir für die Präklinik daraus lernen? *Der Notfallsanitäter* 2014; 2: 18-19. [PDF]
- Wutzler S, Maegele M, Wafaisade A, Wyen H, Marzi I. Lefering R, TraumaRegister DGU. Risk stratification in trauma and hemorrhagic shock: Scoring systems derived from the TraumaRegister DGU[®]. *Injury* 2014; 45 Suppl 3: S29-S34. [PDF]

List of abbreviations used in the report

Abbreviations

AIS	Abbreviated Injury Scale
ASA	American Society of Anaesthesiologists
AUC	AUC – Academy of Trauma Surgery (Akademie der Unfallchirurgie GmbH)
BE	Base Excess
СТ	Computed tomography
CCT	Cranial computed tomography
DGU	German Trauma Society (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Unfallchirurgie)
pRBC	Packed red blood cells
FFP	Fresh Frozen Plasma
GCS	Glasgow Coma Scale
GOS	Glasgow Outcome Scale
h	Hour
Hb	Hemoglobine (or Haemoglobine)
INR	International Normalized Ratio
ISS	Injury Severity Score
М	Mean value
MAIS	Maximum AIS severity score
min	Minute
ml	Milliliter
MOF	Multiple Organ Failure
NACA	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics
NIS	Committee on Emergency Medicine, Intensive Care and Trauma
	Management of the German Trauma Society (Sektion NIS of DGU)
NISS	New Injury Severity Score
OP	Operation
OF	Organ Failure
PDF	Portable Document Format
PTT	Partial thromboplastin time (in sec)
QM	Quality management
RISC	Revised Injury Severity Score (prognostic score)
RISC II	Revised Injury Severity Score, version II
RTS	Revised Trauma Score
SAPS	Simplified Acute Physiology Score
sBP	Systolic blood pressure
sec	Seconds
SD	Standard deviation
SMR	Standardized Mortality Ratio
SOFA	Sequential Organ Failure Assessment
ТВІ	Traumatic brain injury
TPZ	Thromboplastin timet; Quick's value
TR-DGU	TraumaRegister DGU [®]
TRISS	Trauma and Injury Severity Score (prognostic score)