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Trends in demand for emergency ambulance services in Wiltshire over nine years: observational study

Hannah Wrigley, Steve George, Helen Smith, Helen Snooks, Alan Glasper, Eileen Thomas

Demand for emergency medical services in the United Kingdom is rising.1 Research into the type of patients transported by emergency ambulances and the severity of their illness has tended to focus on identifying people who use the service inappropriately rather than factors influencing demand, and our understanding of the increase in demand is poor.2,3

In Wiltshire, a largely rural county in the south west of England, the number of emergency transports of patients increased from 11 268 in 1988 to 16 814 in 1996, a crude increase of 49%.4 This increase is often attributed to general practitioners redirecting patients with urgent problems to the ambulance service, particularly out of surgery hours. Over the same period, however, urgent transports booked by general practitioners rather than in response to a 999 call rose from 9982 to 13 951 (40%). We examined the reasons for this rise.

Methods and results
We conducted a retrospective analysis of emergency ambulance despatches using a random sample of records held by Wiltshire Ambulance Service NHS Trust. From each year in nine years’ records (1988-96) we sampled 14 days, stratified by season, providing a dataset of 126 days of calls. Data were drawn from AS1 forms (completed by call takers) and from patient report forms (completed by paramedics). We used the system of call classification used by the trust to categorise data on the nature of incidents for analysis. We used indirect age standardisation based on the year with the most complete age data (1994) to account for demographic changes over the nine years (see methodological supplement on bmj.com). We calculated significance of trends with EpilInfo 6.03, using χ² for trend.

Our sample contained details of 6100 calls relating to 5821 incidents. For 1225 (21%) of these, patient report forms rather than AS1 forms had been filled in. The table shows the numbers of vehicles despatched, incidents, and patients transported in each year. A 72% increase in incidents attended over nine years reduced to 53% after standardisation for age. The proportion of incidents in response to a call from a general practitioner, or incidents where one was present, remained fairly constant over the study period, whereas the proportion of calls made by patients and relatives rose from 11.8% to 20.1% (see tables A and B on bmj.com). Calls from other emergency services peaked in 1990. The category showing an increase out of line with that seen overall was “sudden illness at

Extra tables and a methodological supplement appear on bmj.com
Use of ambulance services in Wiltshire. Values are numbers (percentages) unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident (n=5821)</th>
<th>1988 (n=474)</th>
<th>1989 (n=546)</th>
<th>1990 (n=590)</th>
<th>1991 (n=577)</th>
<th>1992 (n=580)</th>
<th>1993 (n=709)</th>
<th>1994 (n=773)</th>
<th>1995 (n=759)</th>
<th>1996 (n=813)</th>
<th>P value (χ² for trend over time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP made call</td>
<td>31 (6.5)</td>
<td>26 (4.8)</td>
<td>29 (4.9)</td>
<td>23 (4.0)</td>
<td>25 (4.3)</td>
<td>32 (4.5)</td>
<td>45 (5.3)</td>
<td>39 (5.1)</td>
<td>36 (4.4)</td>
<td>0.49 (0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP was present</td>
<td>46 (8.7)</td>
<td>49 (9.0)</td>
<td>43 (7.3)</td>
<td>43 (7.5)</td>
<td>52 (9.0)</td>
<td>52 (7.3)</td>
<td>87 (11.3)</td>
<td>72 (9.5)</td>
<td>83 (10.2)</td>
<td>0.12 (2.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of incident:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudden illness at home</td>
<td>106 (22.4)</td>
<td>101 (18.5)</td>
<td>123 (20.1)</td>
<td>126 (21.6)</td>
<td>146 (25.2)</td>
<td>180 (25.4)</td>
<td>219 (28.3)</td>
<td>184 (24.2)</td>
<td>228 (28.8)</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001 (20.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudden illness, public place</td>
<td>73 (15.4)</td>
<td>80 (14.7)</td>
<td>74 (12.5)</td>
<td>88 (15.3)</td>
<td>93 (16.0)</td>
<td>101 (14.3)</td>
<td>109 (14.1)</td>
<td>132 (17.4)</td>
<td>139 (17.1)</td>
<td>3.04 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstetric or gynaecological problem</td>
<td>20 (4.2)</td>
<td>22 (4.0)</td>
<td>14 (2.4)</td>
<td>28 (4.9)</td>
<td>22 (3.8)</td>
<td>22 (3.1)</td>
<td>20 (2.6)</td>
<td>27 (3.6)</td>
<td>21 (2.6)</td>
<td>0.09 (2.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdose or self harm</td>
<td>29 (6.1)</td>
<td>36 (6.6)</td>
<td>29 (4.9)</td>
<td>32 (5.6)</td>
<td>41 (7.1)</td>
<td>52 (7.3)</td>
<td>53 (8.9)</td>
<td>39 (5.1)</td>
<td>54 (8.6)</td>
<td>0.66 (0.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall (assistance required)</td>
<td>5 (1.1)</td>
<td>7 (1.3)</td>
<td>6 (1.0)</td>
<td>12 (2.1)</td>
<td>6 (1.0)</td>
<td>12 (1.7)</td>
<td>11 (1.4)</td>
<td>6 (0.8)</td>
<td>10 (1.2)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident at home</td>
<td>42 (8.9)</td>
<td>37 (6.8)</td>
<td>62 (10.5)</td>
<td>59 (10.2)</td>
<td>64 (11.0)</td>
<td>72 (10.2)</td>
<td>80 (10.4)</td>
<td>78 (10.0)</td>
<td>73 (9.9)</td>
<td>0.41 (0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident in public place</td>
<td>41 (8.7)</td>
<td>51 (9.3)</td>
<td>41 (7.0)</td>
<td>28 (4.9)</td>
<td>47 (8.1)</td>
<td>57 (8.0)</td>
<td>51 (8.8)</td>
<td>56 (7.4)</td>
<td>72 (9.8)</td>
<td>0.97 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road traffic accident</td>
<td>86 (18.1)</td>
<td>108 (19.8)</td>
<td>110 (18.7)</td>
<td>96 (16.6)</td>
<td>64 (11.0)</td>
<td>112 (15.8)</td>
<td>76 (9.8)</td>
<td>115 (15.2)</td>
<td>112 (13.8)</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001 (18.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports accident</td>
<td>12 (2.5)</td>
<td>7 (1.3)</td>
<td>9 (1.5)</td>
<td>11 (1.9)</td>
<td>12 (2.1)</td>
<td>14 (2.0)</td>
<td>11 (1.4)</td>
<td>10 (1.3)</td>
<td>9 (1.1)</td>
<td>0.14 (2.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial accident</td>
<td>9 (1.9)</td>
<td>9 (1.7)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>8 (1.4)</td>
<td>8 (1.4)</td>
<td>11 (1.6)</td>
<td>11 (1.4)</td>
<td>13 (1.7)</td>
<td>10 (1.2)</td>
<td>0.83 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>14 (3.0)</td>
<td>20 (3.7)</td>
<td>22 (3.7)</td>
<td>22 (3.8)</td>
<td>13 (2.2)</td>
<td>17 (2.4)</td>
<td>32 (4.1)</td>
<td>23 (3.0)</td>
<td>21 (2.6)</td>
<td>0.43 (0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
<td>4 (0.7)</td>
<td>11 (1.9)</td>
<td>11 (1.9)</td>
<td>9 (1.6)</td>
<td>5 (0.7)</td>
<td>21 (2.7)</td>
<td>16 (2.1)</td>
<td>11 (1.4)</td>
<td>0.11 (2.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire call</td>
<td>6 (1.3)</td>
<td>25 (4.6)</td>
<td>31 (5.3)</td>
<td>36 (6.2)</td>
<td>28 (4.8)</td>
<td>29 (4.1)</td>
<td>28 (3.6)</td>
<td>37 (4.9)</td>
<td>15 (1.9)</td>
<td>0.28 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoax call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.1)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total valid cases</td>
<td>447 (90.7)</td>
<td>507 (92.7)</td>
<td>557 (95.5)</td>
<td>553 (94.7)</td>
<td>684 (92.2)</td>
<td>722 (94.3)</td>
<td>734 (76.7)</td>
<td>776 (94.5)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or unclassifiable</td>
<td>27 (5.3)</td>
<td>39 (7.2)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correction and clarifications**

*Filler*

A missing letter escaped our notice in the endpiece “Choosing a doctor” by W H Auden (5 January, p 38). The first line should read: “Give me a doctor partridge-plump not [partridge-pump].”

**Minerva**

Having corresponded with author David Bourne about the details relating to the Minerva picture (2 February, p 308), we then forgot to include the name of his coauthor, P Bannister, consultant physician and geriatrician at Manchester Royal Infirmary, Manchester M13 9WL. We apologise for this omission.

**Biological warfare and bioterrorism**

In this article by Nicholas J Beeching and colleagues (9 February, pp 536-9) we wrongly attributed the street depicted on p 337 to North Korea. The street is in fact in Seoul, South Korea.
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