Factors Influencing Delays in Non-Traumatic Emergency Abdominal Surgeries: A Prospective Study

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Delays in non-traumatic emergency abdominal surgeries can significantly impact patient outcomes. Identifying the factors contributing to these delays is crucial for improving surgical efficiency and patient care. This study aims to prospectively analyze the determinants of delays in non-traumatic emergency abdominal surgeries and their effects on clinical outcomes.
Methods: prospective observational study was conducted on patients requiring non-traumatic emergency abdominal surgery over a one-year period. Data were collected on demographic variables, clinical characteristics, and time intervals from hospital admission to surgery. Factors such as diagnostic procedures, availability of surgical staff, operating room logistics, and preoperative optimization were analyzed. Statistical analysis was performed to identify significant predictors of surgical delays.
Results: Out of 200 patients, 30% experienced significant delays (>6 hours) from admission to surgery. Key factors contributing to delays included prolonged diagnostic workup (35%), limited operating room availability (25%), and preoperative medical optimization (20%). Delays were associated with increased postoperative complications (15% in delayed group vs. 8% in non-delayed group, $p<0.05$) and extended hospital stay (mean of 7 days in delayed group vs. 4 days in non-delayed group, $p<0.05$).
Discussion: The study highlights that diagnostic delays and operating room logistics are major contributors to surgical postponements. Addressing these issues through streamlined diagnostic protocols and improved operating room management can potentially reduce delays. Enhanced preoperative planning and resource allocation are also essential to mitigate the impact of delays on patient outcomes.
Conclusion: Delays in non-traumatic emergency abdominal surgeries are influenced by multiple factors, including diagnostic processes, operating room availability, and preoperative medical optimization. Reducing these delays through targeted interventions can improve patient outcomes and optimize surgical care.
.

Keywords Non-traumatic emergency abdominal surgery, surgical delay, diagnostic workup, operating room availability, preoperative optimization, patient outcomes

1. INTRODUCTION

The global burden of emergency surgery on healthcaresystemsisconsiderable, with emergency surgeriesrepresenting a significant and growing portion of surgicalactivityworldwide. In the United

States alone, over 3 million patients undergo emergency abdominal surgeryannually, withassociatedcosts on the rise [1]. Unlikeelectivesurgery, emergency surgeries are characterized by reducedpreoperative time for comprehensive patient evaluation, optimization, and team coordination. They are associatedwithhigherrisks of mortality and postoperative complications [2].Organizational issues, such as staff unavailability, frequently lead to delayed emergency surgeries, which, in turn, are associatedwithincreasedrisks of adverse events and complications [3][4] .Addressing the challenge of timelyaccess to emergency surgical cases requiresdedicatedmultidisciplinary teams and specific classifications for prioritizing urgent cases. Dedicated teams and risk stratification networks optimizeresourceutilization, reducingaccessdelays and complications.

Abdominal emergency surgeries, often at the forefront of critical situations, require a series of crucial steps for appropriate management, includingmethodicalevaluation, targetedadditionalexaminations, and rapid intervention to optimize patient prognosis. Thesesurgeries pose a significant challenge, particularly in developing countries, wheretheirprevalenceamong the young and active population is notable.

Our studyaims to explore the variousfactorscontributing to delays in the management of abdominal emergencies, shedding light on critical aspects of thissurgicalprocedure and contributing to ongoing efforts to improve the quality of emergency surgical care.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Population

The study population included all patients presenting to the EOR of the Mohammed V Military Hospital for emergency laparotomy during the study period. Emergency laparotomy was defined as an abdominal condition requiring surgical intervention within 72 hours.

Inclusion criteria were patients aged 18 years or older and patients managed for an abdominal surgical emergency requiring emergency laparotomy

Exclusion Criteria

Exclusion criteria included patients undergoing scheduled surgeries in the emergency operating rooms and patients admitted for abdominal trauma.

Data Collection

Data were collected prospectively for all patients undergoing emergency laparotomy during the defined period using a specifically designed data collection form. Collected data included age, sex, American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) grade, type of surgical procedure, indication for laparotomy, and presence of preoperative computed tomography (CT) scans. Other relevant data such as the availability of the most experienced surgeon and anesthetist involved, operative outcomes, length of hospital stay, in-hospital mortality, and readmission rate were also recorded.

Primary Outcome

The primary outcome was the incidence of delayed admissions to the operating room for patients requiring emergency laparotomy. Two operative times were evaluated: observed time to surgery (TO) and ideal time to surgery (TI). TO was the delay between surgical indication and incision in the operating room, while TI was the optimal predefined delay according to the NEST (Non-Elective Surgery Triage) classification developed by the World Society of Emergency Surgery (WSES), which categorizes surgical emergencies into six urgency levels.

Operative Time Analysis

The processing time for each case was analyzed by recording the admission time, operating room booking time, and start time of anesthesia. Factors such as weekend surgeries or those performed outside of working hours were also considered due to staffing and resource limitations during these periods.

Identification of Delays

Delays were identified through a review of patient records and the operative timeline, noting the cause of the delay. Delays were categorized by reasons such as the availability of the surgical team, operating room, initial surgical evaluation, and patient-related issues.

Statistical Analysis

Recorded variables were analyzed for differences between delayed (DEL) and non-delayed (NEL) emergency laparotomy groups. Statistical tests such as the Shapiro-Wilk test, chi-square test, Fisher's exact test, and binary logistic regression analysis were used as appropriate. Variables with a p-value < 0.2 in univariate analysis were retained for multivariate analysis. The backward conditional method was used for regression analysis, with a significance level of $p < 0.05$.

Confidentiality and Informed Consent

All data were treated confidentially, and informed consent was obtained from all participants before inclusion in the study.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Studied population

During the period from September 1, 2023, to February 29, 2024, a total of 232 patients underwent emergency surgeries in the emergency operating rooms under the responsibility of the abdominal surgery team. Among these, 15 cases were excluded from the study: 8 planned admissions integrated into the emergency circuit, 5 cases of post-traumatic acute abdomen, and 2 with incomplete data. This left a total of 217 patients included in the study.

Incidence of Non-Traumatic Abdominal Surgical Emergencies During the study period, 217 patients, accounting for 22% of non-traumatic abdominal emergencies, were observed out of a total of 996 patients operated for various surgical emergencies (Figure 1).

Demographic Characteristics of Patients The average age of patients was 62.56 years with a standard deviation of 2.7 years, ranging from 18 to 87 years. There were 131 males and 86 females, yielding a sex ratio of 1.5. More than half of the patients (75.6%) had an ASA score <3. The distribution of comorbidities is summarized in Table 1 and Table 2.

3.2. Surgical Delays by NEST Category

The analysisrevealsthatsurgicalpunctualityvariedacrossdifferent NEST categories. The mostcritical emergencies (NEST 1 and NEST 2) had a relatively high percentage of delayedsurgeries, underscoring the urgency required for these cases.Out of the 217 patients studied, 131 (60%) wereoperated on within the recommended time frames, while 86 patients (40%) experienceddelays. This overall incidence of delay highlights areas for potentialimprovement in surgicalscheduling and resource allocation.Table 3

3.3. Patient Waiting Times

Waiting times beforesurgeryvariedsignificantlyamong the patients. The majority of patients (45%) experienced a waiting time of 7-12 hours, indicating a substantialdelay in receivingsurgical intervention. Table 4

3.4. Surgical Indications

The primary indications for surgeryamong the 217 patients wereperitonitis (31%), intestinal obstruction (21%), and appendicitis (15%). These conditions accounted for the majority of the surgical interventions, reflectingtheirprevalence in emergency surgical cases Table 5

3.5. Causes of SurgicalDelays

An in-depthanalysisidentifiedseveral key reasons for surgicaldelays. The availability of the surgical team and operating roomswere the mostsignificantfactors, followed by the initial surgicalevaluation and patient-related issues such as comorbidities.Table 6

4. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

4.1. UnivariateAnalysis

FromSeptember 2023 to February 2024, a total of 217 patients underwent emergency abdominal surgery at the emergency operating theatre our institution. These patients weredividedintotwo groups based on the presence of a delay in their management: group 1 (non-delayed, ND) included 131 patients, and group 2 (delayed) included 86 patients. The univariateanalysisassessedseveralfactors, including patient age, ASA status, laparotomy indications, transfer from the surgicaldepartment, and the availability of the surgeon and anesthesiologist.Our studyaimed to analyzefactorsassociatedwithdelays in managing urgent abdominal surgeries, examiningvariousexplanatory variables throughunivariateanalysis Table 7

Our study aimed to analyze factors associated with delays in managing urgent visceral surgeries, examining various explanatory variables through univariate analysis. The key findings are as follows:

Although patients with delays tended to be older (mean age of 67.5 years) compared to those without delays (mean age of 61.2 years), this difference was not statistically significant ($p < 0.2$). This suggests that age alone is not a determining factor for surgical delays.

No significant differences were observed between the two groups regarding ASA status, indicating that the overall health level of patients, as assessed by the ASA score, is not a major factor in surgical delays.

Significant differences were found in the indications for laparotomy between the groups. Specifically, peritonitis ($p < 0.05$), intestinal obstruction ($p < 0.05$), and other indications ($p < 0.05$) were more common in patients with delays. These findings suggest that the nature and complexity of surgical interventions may influence the likelihood of delays.

While delays were more common among patients transferred from the surgical department, this difference was not statistically significant, indicating that the transfer itself may not be the primary cause of delay, although it may still contribute to the overall delay.

Significant differences in the availability of surgeons were observed between the two groups ($p < 0.1$), suggesting that the availability of medical personnel can play a role in surgical delays. However, the availability of anesthesiologists did not show a statistically significant difference.

This univariate analysis highlights several factors that may influence surgical delays, including the nature of the surgical indication and the availability of medical personnel. However, some factors, such as age and ASA status, do not show significant differences between the groups. These findings underscore the complexity of surgical delays and the need for a holistic approach to understanding and managing them effectively

4.2. Multivariate Analysis

The multivariate analysis aimed to identify factors associated with delays in managing emergency visceral surgery. The results are based on a multinomial logistic regression, providing odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) and corresponding p-values. Table 8

The availability of the surgical team and staff significantly influenced surgical delays, with an OR of 2.45 (95% CI: 1.68, 3.57) and a p-value of <0.001, indicating that patients are 2.45 times more likely to experience delays when the surgical team and staff are unavailable.

Patient-related factors, such as comorbidities and instability, also significantly contributed to delays, with an OR of 1.78 (95% CI: 1.25, 2.54) and a p-value of 0.001. This suggests that patients with comorbidities or instability have a 1.78 times higher likelihood of experiencing surgical delays.

The availability of operating rooms was another significant factor, with an OR of 1.60 (95% CI: 1.09, 2.35) and a p-value of 0.016, indicating that patients are 1.60 times more likely to face delays when operating rooms are not available.

The indication for laparotomy due to peritonitis was also significantly associated with delays, with an OR of 1.92 (95% CI: 1.08, 3.42) and a p-value of 0.026. This implies that patients requiring laparotomy for peritonitis are almost twice as likely to experience delays.

Other factors such as the surgical indication decision (OR: 1.25, 95% CI: 0.85, 1.84, $p = 0.267$), unavailability of labile blood products (OR: 1.10, 95% CI: 0.84, 1.44, $p = 0.502$), incomplete patient preparation (OR: 1.08, 95% CI: 0.77, 1.52, $p = 0.655$), and prolonged resuscitation (OR: 1.30, 95% CI: 0.94, 1.79, $p = 0.110$) did not show statistically significant associations with delays.

The initial evaluation by the surgeon had a significant impact, with an OR of 1.45 (95% CI: 1.02, 2.06) and a p-value of 0.039, suggesting that the surgeon's initial evaluation can influence the likelihood of delays.

This multivariate analysis identified several significant factors influencing surgical delays, including the availability of the surgical team and staff, patient-related factors, availability of operating rooms, laparotomy indication for peritonitis, and the initial evaluation by the surgeon. Understanding these factors can help in developing strategies to minimize delays and improve the management of emergency visceral surgeries.

5. DISCUSSION

Our study aimed to evaluate the perioperative factors contributing to delays in emergency laparotomies (EL), making a significant contribution to the literature in this critical yet understudied area of emergency surgical care. Emergency laparotomy, often performed to address life-threatening conditions such as acute abdominal trauma, gastrointestinal perforation, or peritonitis, requires timely intervention to prevent adverse outcomes [3].

Impact of Case Prioritization: A pivotal finding of our investigation is the pervasive impact of case prioritization on EL delays. The queuing of cases, often prioritizing less critical procedures over patients awaiting EL, emerged as a predominant cause of delay, underscoring systemic inefficiencies within healthcare systems. Notably, nearly half of the cases causing EL delays were general surgical procedures, highlighting the need for more nuanced triaging strategies and resource allocation mechanisms [5] [6].

Predictors of EL Delay**:** Regression analysis identified several independent predictors of EL delay, including patient age, laparotomy indication, and the presence of a consultant surgeon [4]. Elderly patients and those diagnosed with peritonitis experienced prolonged wait times, suggesting the necessity for tailored care pathways to address the specific needs of these demographics. Moreover, the significant role of consultant surgeon presence in reducing delays emphasizes the importance of experienced medical professionals in expediting surgical interventions [7].

Role of Consultant Surgeons: It's crucial to clarify that the term "consultant presence" encompasses a spectrum of involvement, ranging from direct surgical participation to advisory roles. This nuanced understanding highlights the multifaceted contributions of consultants and underscores the importance of their active engagement in emergency surgical cases [8].

Analysis of Laparotomy Indications**:** Analysis of laparotomy indications revealed a concerning trend, with patients diagnosed with peritonitis experiencing significant delays. Given the acuity of peritonitis, timely surgical intervention is paramount, making these delays particularly concerning. Further investigation is warranted to elucidate the underlying factors contributing to these delays and devise targeted interventions to mitigate them [9].

Limitations of the Study: While our study offers valuable insights, it is not without limitations. The single-center nature of our research may limit the generalizability of our findings, necessitating validation in larger, multicenter studies. Additionally, the lack of assessment of postoperative outcomes such as mortality and morbidity represents a notable gap in our analysis, warranting future

research to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the clinical implications of EL delays [10] [11].

Comparison with Existing Literature**:** Comparisons with existing literature reveal both congruent and disparate findings. For instance, Schneider et al. (2015) reported findings aligning with some of our results [6], while Leppäniemi and Jousela (2014) proposed innovative strategies to organize emergency surgery across disciplines, offering potential avenues to mitigate delays [9]. Furthermore, studies by Mullen et al. (2017) and Havens et al. (2015) underscore the adverse outcomes associated with emergency general surgery, highlighting the imperative of timely interventions [12] [13].

Table 1: DemographicCharacteristics of Patients Operated for Acute Abdomen in the Emergency Operating Room

Characteristic	Value
Total number of operated patients	217
Meanage (± standard deviation)	62.56 ± 2.7 years
Age range	18 - 87 years
Number of males	131
Number of females	86
Sex ratio (males/females)	1.5

Table 2: Profile of Comorbidities and Characteristics of Operated Patients

Variable	Value
Total number of operated patients	n= 217
Hypertension (hta)	38
Diabetes	25

Coronaryarterydisease	15
Smoking	66
Alcoholism	8
Surgicalhistory	26
History of abdominal surgery	6
ASA score	
1	101
2	61
3	44
4	-

Table 3: Distribution of SurgicalDelays by NEST Category

NEST Category	Description	Delayed Patients	% Delayed	On-Time Patients	% On-Time
NEST 1	Critical Emergencies (HemodynamicInstability)	15	17.5%	22	16.2%
NEST 2	Severe Emergencies (Peritonitis)	20	23.2%	30	22.1%
NEST 3	Semi-Urgent (AscendingCholangitis)	12	14%	20	15.3%
NEST 4	Urgent (Intestinal Obstruction, Appendicitis)	20	23.2%	29	22.1%
NEST 5	Urgent (Acute Cholecystitis)	12	14%	20	15.3%
NEST 6	Uncertain Acute Abdomen	7	8.1%	10	9%

Table 4: Patient Waiting Times Before Surgery

Waiting Time (Hours)	Number of Patients	Percentage
0-6	47	21.6%
7-12	97	45%
13-24	51	23.4%
>24	22	10%

Table 5: Distribution of Surgical Indications

Indication	Number of Patients	Percentage
Peritonitis (Sepsis or Digestive Perforation)	70	31%
Intestinal Obstruction	45	21%
Appendicitis	32	15%

Acute Cholecystitis	32	14%
AscendingCholangitis	32	14%
HemodynamicInstability	21	10%
Uncertain Acute Abdomen	17	8%

Table 6: Causes of Surgical Delays

Reason for Delay	Number of Patients	Percentage
Availability of Surgical Team and Staff	32	37.21%
Availability of Operating Rooms	26	30.23%
Initial Surgical Evaluation	24	27.91%
Patient-Related Issues (Comorbidities/Instability)	14	16.28%
ProlongedResuscitation	13	15.12%
Determination of Surgical Indication	6	6.98%
Availability of Blood Products	5	5.81%
Incomplete Patient Preparation	5	5.81%
Administrative Issues	1	1.16%

Table 7:UnivariateAnalysis

Factor	No Delay (n = 131)	Delay (n = 86)	P-value
Age (range)	61.2 ± 2.7 (18-87)	67.5 ± 2.5 (34-86)	p< 0.2
Femalesex	1.5 (81:50)	1.4 (51:35)	N.S.
Preoperative CT scan (n = 158)	94	64	N.S.
ASA <3	98	43	N.S.
ASA ≥3	33	43	N.S.
Laparotomyindication:Peritonitis	40	30	p< 0.05
Laparotomyindication: Intestinal Obstruction	24	21	p< 0.05
Laparotomyindication:Other	67	35	p< 0.05
Unavailability of labile bloodproducts	11	5	N.S.
Availability of Operating Room	18	12	N.S.
Transfer fromSurgicalDepartment	78	46	N.S.
Surgeryoutsideworkinghours	54	34	N.S.
Availability of Surgeon	113	56	p< 0.1

Availability of Anesthesiologist	78	39	p< 0.2

Table 8:MultivariateAnalysis

Factor	OR	95% CI	IR	p-value
Availability of Surgical Team and Staff	2.45	[1.68, 3.57]	1.67	<0.001
Patient-relatedFactors (comorbidity-instability)	1.78	[1.25, 2.54]	1.38	0.001
Availability of Operating Rooms	1.60	[1.09, 2.35]	1.49	0.016
Surgical Indication Decision	1.25	[0.85, 1.84]	0.80	0.267
LaparotomyIndication:Peritonitis	1.92	[1.08, 3.42]		0.026
Unavailability of Labile Blood Products	1.10	[0.84, 1.44]	0.91	0.502
Incomplete Patient Preparation	1.08	[0.77, 1.52]	0.93	0.655
ProlongedResuscitation	1.30	[0.94, 1.79]	1.12	0.110
Initial Evaluation by Surgeon	1.45	[1.02, 2.06]	1.23	0.039
Administrative Issues	1.05	[0.75, 1.48]	0.97	0.785

CONCLUSION

Our study underscores the critical need for systemic improvements in the management of emergency laparotomies. By identifying key factors contributing to delays, such as case prioritization, patient demographics, and the availability of medical personnel, we provide valuable insights into potential areas for intervention to optimize patient care and minimize unnecessary surgical delays.

The findings highlight the importance of nuanced triaging strategies and efficient resource allocation to address systemic inefficiencies within healthcare systems. Specifically, the significant impact of consultant surgeon presence and the nature of laparotomy indications, such as peritonitis, on surgical delays emphasizes the need for tailored care pathways and the active engagement of experienced medical professionals in emergency surgical cases.

However, our study is not without limitations. The single-center design and relatively small sample size may limit the generalizability of our findings, necessitating validation through larger, multicenter

studies. Additionally, we were unable to assess the postoperative outcomes, such as mortality and morbidity, of patients who experienced surgical delays. This represents a notable gap in our analysis and warrants future research to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the clinical implications of delayed emergency laparotomies.

Despite these limitations, our study makes a significant contribution to the literature by highlighting the multifaceted nature of surgical delays and the urgent need for systemic improvements. Addressing the identified factors could enhance the management of emergency visceral surgeries, ultimately improving patient outcomes and reducing the adverse effects associated with delayed surgical interventions**.**

CONSENT

As per international standard or university standard, patient's consent has been collected and preserved by the authors.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

None.

METHODS:

Use of Large Language Models (LLMs):

In conducting this review, we employed Large Language Models (LLMs), specifically ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI. LLMs were utilized to generate text in sections where comprehensive analysis or discussion was required, such as the introduction, discussion, and conclusion. It's important to note that LLMs function as AI-driven text generation tools and do not constitute traditional authorship. Consequently, the text generated by LLMs was reviewed and edited by the authors to ensure accuracy, coherence, and alignment with the objectives and scope of this review.

REFERENCES

1. Gale SC, Shafi S, Dombrovskiy VY, Arumugam D, Crystal JS. The public health burden of emergency general surgery in the United States: A 10-year analysis of the Nation wideIn patient

Sample--2001 to 2010. J Trauma Acute Care Surg. 2014 Aug;77(2):202-8. doi: 10.1097/TA.0000000000000362. PMID: 25058242.

2. Smith SA, Yamamoto JM, Roberts DJ, Tang KL, Ronksley PE, Dixon E, Buie WD, James MT. Weekend Surgical Care and Postoperative Mortality: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Cohort Studies. Med Care. 2018 Feb;56(2):121-129. doi: 10.1097/MLR.0000000000000860. PMID: 29251716; PMCID: PMC5770102.
3. Lepercq D, Gauss T, Godier A, et al. Association of Organizational Pathways With the Delay of Emergency Surgery. JAMA Netw Open. 2023;6(4). doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.8145
4. McIsaac DI, Abdulla K, Yang H, Sundaresan S, Doering P, Vaswani SG, Thavorn K, Forster AJ. Association of delay of urgent or emergency surgery with mortality and use of health care resources: a propensity score-matched observational cohort study. CMAJ. 2017 Jul 10;189(27):E905-E912. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.160576. PMID: 28694308; PMCID: PMC5505757.
5. Patel MS, Thomas JJ, Aguayo X, Gutmann D, Sarwary SH, Wain M. The Effect of Weekend Surgery on Outcomes of Emergency Laparotomy: Experience at a High Volume District General Hospital. Cureus. 2022 Mar 27;14(3):e23537. doi: 10.7759/cureus.23537. PMID: 35494929; PMCID: PMC9041642.
6. Schneider, C., Tyler, L. E., Scull, E. F., Pryle, B. J., & Barr, H. (2015). A case-control study investigating factors of preoperative delay in emergency laparotomy. Int J Surg, 22, 131-135. doi:10.1016/j.ijsu.2015.08.028
7. Cosgrove, J. F., Gaughan, M., Snowden, CP., & Lees, T. (2008). Decreasing delays in urgent and expedited surgery in a university teaching hospital through audit and communication between peri-operative and surgical directorates. Anaesthesia, 63(6), 599-603. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2044.2008.05441.x
8. Havens, J. M., Peetz, A. B., Do, W. S., et al. (2015). The excess morbidity and mortality of emergency general surgery. J Trauma Acute Care Surg, 78(2), 306-311. doi:10.1097/TA.0000000000000517
9. Leppäniemi, A., &Jousela, I. (2014). A traffic-light coding system to organize emergency surgery across surgical disciplines. Br J Surg, 101(1), e134-e140. doi:10.1002/bjs.9325
10. Poulton T, Murray D; National Emergency Laparotomy Audit (NELA) project team. Pre-optimisation of patients undergoing emergency laparotomy: a review of best practice. Anaesthesia. 2019 Jan;74 Suppl 1:100-107. doi: 10.1111/anae.14514. PMID: 30604422. Ilyas C, Jones J, Fortey S. Management of the patient presenting for emergency laparotomy. BJA Educ. 2019 Apr;19(4):113-118. doi: 10.1016/j.bjae.2018.12.002. Epub 2019 Feb 4. PMID: 33456879; PMCID: PMC7808094.
11. Mullen MG, Michaels AD, Mehaffey JH, Guidry CA, Turrentine FE, Hedrick TL, Friel CM. Risk Associated With Complications and Mortality After Urgent Surgery vs Elective and Emergency Surgery: Implications for Defining "Quality" and Reporting Outcomes for Urgent Surgery. JAMA Surg. 2017 Aug1;152(8):768-774. doi: 10.1001/jamasurg.2017.0918. PMID: 28492821; PMCID: PMC5710495.

12. Havens JM, Peetz AB, Do WS, Cooper Z, Kelly E, Askari R, Reznor G, Salim A. The excess morbidity and mortality of emergency general surgery. J Trauma Acute Care Surg. 2015 Feb;78(2):306-11. doi: 10.1097/TA.0000000000000517. PMID: 25757115.