



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
Main Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2017

Acute exacerbated COPD: room for improvement in key elements of care

Markun, Stefan; Franzen, Daniel P; Dalla Lana, Kaba; Beyer, Swantje; Wieser, Stephan; Hess, Thomas;
Kohler, Malcolm; Rosemann, Thomas; Senn, Oliver; Steurer-Stey, Claudia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2147/COPD.S145496>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich
ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-140959>



Originally published at:

Markun, Stefan; Franzen, Daniel P; Dalla Lana, Kaba; Beyer, Swantje; Wieser, Stephan; Hess, Thomas;
Kohler, Malcolm; Rosemann, Thomas; Senn, Oliver; Steurer-Stey, Claudia (2017). Acute exacerbated
COPD: room for improvement in key elements of care. *International Journal of COPD*, 1:2969-2975.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2147/COPD.S145496>

Acute exacerbated COPD: room for improvement in key elements of care

Short title: Swiss AECOPD treatment audit

Stefan Markun, MD^{1,*}; Daniel P. Franzen, MD^{2,*}; Kaba Dalla Lana, MSc¹; Swantje Beyer, MD³; Stephan Wieser, MD⁴; Thomas Hess, MD³; Malcolm Kohler, MD²; Thomas Rosemann, MD¹; Oliver Senn, MD¹; Claudia Steurer-Stey, MD^{1,5}

* The first two authors contributed equally to this article

¹ Institute of Primary Care, University Hospital Zurich, University of Zurich, Pestalozzistr. 24, 8091 Zürich

² Department of Pneumology, University Hospital Zurich, University of Zurich, Rämistrasse 100, 8091 Zürich

³ Department of Pneumology, Cantonal Hospital of Winterthur, Brauerstrasse 15, 8401 Winterthur

⁴ Department of Pneumology, City Hospital Waid, Töschstrasse 99, 8037 Zürich

⁵ mediX group, Rotbuchstrasse 46, 8037 Zürich

Financial support: There was no financial source of this study.

Conflict of interest: None of the authors has any conflict of interest to declare.

Corresponding author:

Daniel Franzen, MD

Department of Pneumology, University Hospital Zurich, 8091 Zurich, Switzerland

Tel: +41 44 255 11 11; Fax: +41 44 255 44 51; Email: daniel.franzen@usz.ch

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Hospitalizations because of acute exacerbated COPD (AECOPD) are a major burden to patients and the healthcare system. Interventions during acute and post-acute hospital care exist to improve short-term outcomes but also to prevent future exacerbations and disease progression. We aimed at measuring the implementation rates of acute and post-acute hospital care interventions for AECOPD.

Methods: Twenty-four months (1.1.2012-31.12.2013) retrospective medical chart review of consecutive cases hospitalized to one of three public hospitals in the Canton of Zurich due to AECOPD. Implementation rates of five acute care and seven post-acute care interventions were assessed.

Results: Data from 263 hospitalizations (61% male, mean age 68.5 years, 47% active smokers) were analyzed. The median length of stay was 9 days (IQR 6-12). 32% of hospitalizations were caused by individuals with previous hospitalizations because of AECOPD. Implementation rates of four acute care interventions were above 75% (lowest was appropriate antibiotic therapy with 56%). Compared to this, implementation rates of five post-acute care interventions were below 25% (lowest was patient education and self-management advice with 2%).

Conclusions: The results of this audit revealed room for improvement mainly in post-acute care interventions for AECOPD.

KEY WORDS: Audit, COPD, exacerbation, guideline recommendations, hospital medicine, performance of care

INTRODUCTION

Acute exacerbated chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (AECOPD) is a leading cause of hospital admissions and readmissions in patients with COPD.¹ Patients with AECOPD show high morbidity and mortality, resulting in substantial resource utilization and socioeconomic burden.²⁻⁴ International and national clinical practice guidelines for the assessment and management of stable disease and AECOPD exist to aid health professionals improving patients' outcomes with evidence based interventions during the entire care chain.^{5,6}

In-hospital management of AECOPD is focused on the acute stage with demand-responsive measures, i.e. pharmacotherapy, oxygen therapy and if necessary non-invasive ventilation or invasive mechanical ventilation. However, it must be acknowledged that exacerbations leading to hospitalizations are an acute and severe worsening of a pre-existing chronic disease and harbor a high risk of recurrence. Therefore, in-hospital care for AECOPD should not only aim to avert the critical condition but also planning forward and consider aspects of chronic care and coordination of care to reduce the risk of readmission and improve prognosis.⁷⁻¹⁵ Thus, particular "post-acute" interventions should already be considered or preferably started during the hospital stay. At least, these interventions should be communicated in the discharge letter for the physicians and health care professionals responsible for follow-up care.–Key issues with robust evidence base are influenza vaccination,⁷ smoking cessation assistance,¹⁰ referral to pulmonary rehabilitation,⁸ patient education and self-management support,^{6,9,11} addressing two or more components of the chronic care model,¹²⁻¹⁴ and care coordination.¹⁵

Several international audits and one large European audit of in-hospital care of patients admitted for AECOPD exist. However, the majority of these audits focused on acute measures of

care and played little attention to implementation of post-acute measures.¹⁶⁻²² Recently, two single-center audits investigated on in-hospital post-acute care measures for AECOPD and reported low implementation of evidence-based recommendations.^{23,24} In Switzerland, data on quality of care regarding acute management of AECOPD are scarce, and no data exist regarding post-acute in-hospital care. Nevertheless, these data are essential to mirror possible gaps between recommendations and real-life management in order to establish targeted quality improvement programs. Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate the implementation of evidence-based acute and post-acute management recommendations for AECOPD in three public hospitals in Switzerland.

METHODS

Patients

We performed a retrospective chart review of all patients who were hospitalized in the medical or respiratory ward of one of three public teaching hospitals in the Canton of Zurich, Switzerland between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2013 due to AECOPD.

Hospital 1 was the Waid City Hospital of Zurich. In the Department of Internal Medicine approximately 4200 inpatients are treated per year. In this hospital, there was no specialized respiratory unit, thus patients with AECOPD are treated on the ward of General Internal Medicine by the regular staff. There are, however, board-certified pulmonologists working in this hospital performing consultations for patients with AECOPD if required. During 2012 and 2013, no pulmonary rehabilitation program for COPD patients existed in this hospital.

Hospital 2 was the Cantonal Hospital of Winterthur, a referral center in a mixed urban and rural area. In the Department of Internal Medicine, approximately 6800 inpatients are treated per year. In this hospital, there was no specialized respiratory unit, thus patients with AECOPD are treated on the ward of General Internal Medicine by the regular staff. Board-certified pulmonologists conduct weekly visits and perform consultations as needed. An ambulatory pulmonary rehabilitation program was available during the evaluated time period.

Hospital 3 was the University Hospital Zurich. It is a tertiary academic referral center featuring all medical specializations including General Internal Medicine and Pulmonology. Inpatient treatment of AECOPD is provided by the Department of Internal Medicine and the Department of Respiratory Medicine. Approximately 1900 inpatients per year are treated in the General Internal Medicine unit, compared to approximately 800 patients in the Pulmonology unit.

Patient allocation to these units was triggered by bed availabilities. The current audit was performed in both units, but outcome data were merged as one institution. During 2012 and 2013, no rehabilitation program for COPD patients existed in this hospital.

Hospitalization due to AECOPD were identified by applying an electronic full-text search in physicians' documentations for keywords containing common German medical nomenclature for COPD and exacerbation or/and by searching in the hospital administrative database for established diagnostic codes linked to COPD (ICD: J42 – 45 or DRG E65). Keywords and diagnostic codes were selected to maximize the sensitivity of the search. After identification of the cases by electronic full-text search exclusion criteria were checked for each eligible case by manual search, limiting the population to cases hospitalized and treated primarily because of AECOPD. Exclusion criteria included a) main reason for hospitalization was not AECOPD (e.g. pneumonia, asthma, lung transplantation); b) death during hospitalization (chronic care no longer relevant); c) transfer to another hospital before hospital discharge, and d) other reasons like treatment in emergency department only (with stay over midnight and consecutive appearance as inpatient in administrative data).

The local ethics committee reviewed and waived the need for a formal consent according to cantonal and Swiss federal law (Kantonale Ethik-Kommission Zürich; KEK-StV-Nr. 35/13, September 13, 2013).

Data collection

We collected data using an anonymized case report form. The form was developed collaboratively based on templates of previous comparable COPD audits,^{23,25} and was piloted to allow for necessary adjustments before start of the study. The complete medical records generated by the treating physicians during the whole hospitalization were reviewed on site by one of the authors (SM, DF and KDL). In addition, discharge letters were reviewed for statements or recommendations with respect to the investigated measures. Besides the primarily investigated interventions in acute and post-acute care, demographic data, disease-specific data, information about pharmacological treatment and data about health service utilization were collected.

Outcomes

The implementation rates of twelve acute and post-acute care interventions were outcomes of this audit. Acute care interventions were: (1) complete assessment of COPD cardinal symptoms at admission, (2) arterial blood gas analysis, (3) radiologic imaging within first 24 hours, (4) treatment with systemic steroids for at least five days and (5) appropriate antibiotic treatment (defined as administering antibiotics in cases with all three COPD cardinal symptoms or two cardinal symptoms including more sputum purulence):²⁶ post-acute care interventions were: (6) smoking cessation intervention or counselling (only in currently smoking cases), (7) reassessment of inhaler technique, (8) influenza vaccination administration or recommendation in discharge letter, (9) physical activity or capacity assessment or counselling, (10) referral to rehabilitation (directly or recommendation for rehabilitation in discharge letter), (11) patient education and self-management support and (12) post-discharge follow-up.

Data analysis

Categorical variables are presented as counts and proportions (n, %), continuous variables are presented as medians and interquartile range (IQR) or means and standard deviation (SD) as appropriate. Implementation of care interventions are presented as rates, i.e. numbers of cases with documented implementation divided by the total number of applicable cases (e.g. smoking cessation interventions only assessed in currently smoking cases). We assessed the individual implementation rates as well as a composite score of implemented interventions for between-hospital variability with logistic regression models and ANOVA controlling for age, gender, smoking status and illness severity. A p-value < 0.01 was chosen to define statistical significance. Statistical analysis was performed using R, version 3.2.0 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

RESULTS

Audited hospitalizations

During the years 2012 and 2013, totally 263 hospitalizations due to AECOPD were identified in the three audited hospitals (Figure 1). The median length of stay was 9 (IQR 6-12) days and 32% of these hospitalizations were caused by individuals with repeated AECOPD hospitalizations during the audited time period. Hospitalized cases were 61% male, median age 69 (IQR 61-78) years and 47% were active smokers (Table 1).

Implementation of management recommendations

The average composite score of the twelve implemented interventions was 5.9 (SD 1.6) across all audited hospitalizations. Among acute care interventions, the three hospitals most consistently implemented early radiologic imaging (96%) and treatment with systemic steroids for at least five days (79%). Appropriate administration of antibiotics was the acute care measure with the lowest implementation rate (56%), owing to over-prescription in 38% of the cases and under-prescription in 6% of the cases.

Among post-acute care interventions, post-discharge follow-up was most thoroughly implemented: in 94% of the cases at least a formal discharge letter was sent to a physician in outpatient care. Interventions for smoking cessation were found in 47% of the currently smoking patients. Referral to rehabilitation or at least an according recommendation was made in 24% of the cases. Remaining post-acute care interventions were implemented at rates below 20%. Detailed results of average implementation rates are displayed in Figure 2.

Variability of medical care

Between-hospital differences in the composite score of implemented interventions were small and ranged from an average of 5.4 (SD 1.4) in the hospital with lowest implementation rates to 6.5 (SD 1.7) in the hospital with highest implementation rates. After adjusting for age, gender, smoking status and illness severity, the differences in the composite score did not reach the predefined level for statistical significance ($p=0.015$). We found significant variability between hospitals in several interventions (see Figure 2 for lowest, average and highest implementation rates of hospitals), such as assessment of AECOPD symptoms on admission ($p<0.01$), arterial blood gas analysis on admission ($p<0.01$), treatment with systemic steroids for at least five days ($p<0.001$), smoking cessation intervention or counselling ($p<0.001$), reassessment of inhaler technique ($p<0.001$), realization or recommendation of influenza vaccination ($p<0.01$), physical activity assessment or counselling ($p<0.001$) and post-discharge follow-up ($p<0.001$).

DISCUSSION

In this study performed in three public hospitals in Switzerland, we assessed implementation rates of guideline recommended interventions for AECOPD care. In acute care, these were fair to very high. In post-acute care, implementation rates were considerably lower. Moreover, we found significant between-hospital differences in implementation rates of several post-acute care measures without a particular hospital clearly performing better than the others when considering implementation summary scores.

Results from our study are in line with various similar audits of in-hospital care for AECOPD from countries other than Switzerland.^{16,17,21-23,25} Most previous audits measured implementation rates of acute care interventions, revealing a generally fair performance. Of particular notice, considering the acute care measures is the potential antibiotic overuse found in one out of three hospitalizations for AECOPD. Antibiotics for COPD exacerbations showed large and consistent beneficial effects across outcomes of patients admitted to an ICU. However, for outpatients and inpatients the results were inconsistent.²⁷ Growing antibiotic multi-resistance, possible side effects and costs are compelling reasons to avoid antibiotics in patients for whom the benefits are unproven.

Similar to other audits, we found little evidence for implementation of post-acute care interventions.^{16,21,23} The largest gaps seemed to appear in patient education and self-management advice. Self-management interventions improve not only health-related quality of life but also re-admission risk and are a grade A recommendation in the NICE COPD guidelines for patients at risk for AECOPD.^{6,28-30} We also detected little implementation rates of inhaler technique assessment, influenza vaccination/recommendation and referral for pulmonary rehabilitation

though there is robust evidence available in favor of these interventions.³¹ These findings of potential shortcomings in hospital care, however, require careful interpretation: The majority of the post-acute care interventions are not linked to a clearly defined and traceable technical processes as acute care measures are (e.g. radiologic imaging). In some cases self-management interventions or also smoking cessation interventions for example, might have been delivered to patients without according documentation in the medical chart or in the discharge letter. Consecutively, the gaps we found in this audit may only partially reflect real defaults in implementation of recommended treatment measures but also just omissions in documentation. A recent study by the British Lung Foundation and British Thoracic Society, however found that only a third of the patients discharged from hospital felt adequately informed about COPD and confident about spotting early signs of a recurrent AECOPD episode. In addition, only a third of the hospitals made use of a formal discharge check list, and that post-acute support was given only to a minority of patients.³²

The significant between-hospital differences in implementation rates of several post-acute care measures indicate that substantial improvements may not only be possible but also realistic. Checklists (also called “care bundles”) are disease management aids supporting clinicians to implement pre-defined elements of care in individual patients and improve important outcomes such as re-hospitalization rates.³³⁻³⁵ For clinical practice, the implementation of such structured disease management aids seems advisable. Notably, however, post-acute care interventions must not necessarily be delivered in the in-hospital setting but can also be committed to outpatient care providers. For the chain of care, however, hospitals would ideally inform outpatient care providers about the already implemented interventions and those still recommended to be delivered. An automatized linkage between an electronic in-hospital AECOPD care bundle and the discharge

letter generation might efficiently contribute to communication and comprehensiveness along the chain of care.

In this study, we present a retrospective approach to assess in-hospital implementation of key elements of care in AECOPD. Especially in post-acute care we contribute to the so far scarcely available data, and our approach and results may inform future audits or quality improvement initiatives in the field. There are, however, several limitations of this study: Owing to its retrospective design, information about implementation of specific interventions might have been lost. Some interventions may have been performed, but without proper documentation or notice in the discharge letter, therefore leading to under-estimation of the true implementation rate. In subsequent audits, researchers might want to introduce measurements of documentation reliability for outcomes with unclear documentation practice. On the other hand the gaps we describe appear at least in communication to outpatient providers and are therefore still elements that could certainly be improved. We assessed post-discharge follow-up with a minimal requirement of a discharge letter to an outpatient physician. This very generous view on coordination of post-discharge follow-up must be regarded as potential over-estimation because successful follow-up cannot be assumed to have occurred just because a letter was sent to an outpatient physician. Ultimately, between-hospital differences in implementation rates might have been biased by differing documentation practices within hospitals and by the persons collecting the data for this audit. However, the audit form we developed based on forms from previous audits with similar questions and methods, and the utilized form we developed collaboratively by the auditors including a collaborative run-in period to improve uniformity of documentation.

CONCLUSION

The results of this audit reveal room for improvement mainly in implementation and communication of post-acute care interventions for AECOPD.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Literature search: SM, CSS

Data collection: SM, DPF, KDL, SB, SW, TH

Study design: SM, DPF, MK, TR, OS, CSS

Analysis of data: SM, DPF, TH, MK, TR, OS, CSS

Manuscript preparation: SM, DPF, CSS

Review of manuscript: all authors

REFERENCES

1. Sharma G, Kuo YF, Freeman JL, Zhang DD, Goodwin JS. Outpatient follow-up visit and 30-day emergency department visit and readmission in patients hospitalized for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Arch Intern Med.* 2010;170(18):1664-1670.
2. Halbert RJ, Natoli JL, Gano A, Badamgarav E, Buist AS, Mannino DM. Global burden of COPD: systematic review and meta-analysis. *The European respiratory journal.* 2006;28(3):523-532.
3. Chapman KR, Mannino DM, Soriano JB, et al. Epidemiology and costs of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *The European respiratory journal.* 2006;27(1):188-207.
4. Blasi F, Cesana G, Conti S, et al. The clinical and economic impact of exacerbations of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a cohort of hospitalized patients. *PloS one.* 2014;9(6):e101228.
5. Russi EW, Karrer W, Brutsche M, et al. Diagnosis and management of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: the Swiss guidelines. Official guidelines of the Swiss Respiratory Society. *Respiration; international review of thoracic diseases.* 2013;85(2):160-174.
6. NICE TNiHaCE. Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in over 16s: diagnosis and management. 2010; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg101/resources/chronic-obstructive-pulmonary-disease-in-over-16s-diagnosis-and-management-35109323931589>.
7. Poole PJ, Chacko E, Wood-Baker RW, Cates CJ. Influenza vaccine for patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews.* 2006(1):Cd002733.
8. McCarthy B, Casey D, Devane D, Murphy K, Murphy E, Lacasse Y. Pulmonary rehabilitation for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews.* 2015;2:Cd003793.
9. Bourbeau J, Julien M, Maltais F, et al. Reduction of hospital utilization in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a disease-specific self-management intervention. *Arch Intern Med.* 2003;163(5):585-591.
10. Pelkonen M, Notkola IL, Tukiainen H, Tervahauta M, Tuomilehto J, Nissinen A. Smoking cessation, decline in pulmonary function and total mortality: a 30 year follow up study among the Finnish cohorts of the Seven Countries Study. *Thorax.* 2001;56(9):703-707.
11. Harrison SL, Janaudis-Ferreira T, Brooks D, Desveaux L, Goldstein RS. Self-Management Following an Acute Exacerbation of Copd: A Systematic Review. *Chest.* 2014.
12. Wagner EH, Austin BT, Von Korff M. Organizing care for patients with chronic illness. *The Milbank quarterly.* 1996;74(4):511-544.
13. Adams SG, Smith PK, Allan PF, Anzueto A, Pugh JA, Cornell JE. Systematic review of the chronic care model in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease prevention and management. *Arch Intern Med.* 2007;167(6):551-561.
14. Fromer L. Implementing chronic care for COPD: planned visits, care coordination, and patient empowerment for improved outcomes. *International journal of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.* 2011;6:605-614.
15. Casas A, Troosters T, Garcia-Aymerich J, et al. Integrated care prevents hospitalisations for exacerbations in COPD patients. *The European respiratory journal.* 2006;28(1):123-130.
16. Roberts CM, Ryland I, Lowe D, Kelly Y, Bucknall CE, Pearson MG. Audit of acute admissions of COPD: standards of care and management in the hospital setting. *The European respiratory journal.* 2001;17(3):343-349.
17. Lindenauer PK, Pekow P, Gao S, Crawford AS, Gutierrez B, Benjamin EM. Quality of care for patients hospitalized for acute exacerbations of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Annals of internal medicine.* 2006;144(12):894-903.
18. Chang CL, Sullivan GD, Karalus NC, Hancox RJ, McLachlan JD, Mills GD. Audit of acute admissions of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: inpatient management and outcome. *Internal medicine journal.* 2007;37(4):236-241.
19. Liaaen ED, Henriksen AH, Stenfors N. A Scandinavian audit of hospitalizations for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Respiratory medicine.* 2010;104(9):1304-1309.
20. Pozo-Rodriguez F, Lopez-Campos JL, Alvarez-Martinez CJ, et al. Clinical audit of COPD patients requiring hospital admissions in Spain: AUDIPOC study. *PloS one.* 2012;7(7):e42156.

21. Pretto JJ, McDonald VM, Wark PA, Hensley MJ. Multicentre audit of inpatient management of acute exacerbations of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: comparison with clinical guidelines. *Internal medicine journal*. 2012;42(4):380-387.
22. Roberts CM, Lopez-Campos JL, Pozo-Rodriguez F, Hartl S, European CA. European hospital adherence to GOLD recommendations for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) exacerbation admissions. *Thorax*. 2013;68(12):1169-1171.
23. Tang CY, Taylor NF, McDonald CF, Blackstock FC. Level of adherence to the GOLD strategy document for management of patients admitted to hospital with an acute exacerbation of COPD. *Respirology (Carlton, Vic.)*. 2014;19(8):1191-1197.
24. Migone C, O'Connor M, Kelly E, McDonnell TJ. Patients Hospitalised with an Acute Exacerbation of COPD: Is There a Need for a Discharge Bundle of Care? *Irish medical journal*. 2015;108(9):273-275.
25. Lopez-Campos JL, Hartl S, Pozo-Rodriguez F, Roberts CM. European COPD Audit: design, organisation of work and methodology. *The European respiratory journal*. 2013;41(2):270-276.
26. 2015 GfCOLDG. From the Global Strategy for the Diagnosis, Management and Prevention of COPD. 2015.
27. Vollenweider DJ, Jarrett H, Steurer-Stey CA, Garcia-Aymerich J, Puhan MA. Antibiotics for exacerbations of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 2012;12:Cd010257.
28. Benzo R, Vickers K, Novotny PJ, et al. Health Coaching and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Rehospitalization. A Randomized Study. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine*. 2016;194(6):672-680.
29. Zwerink M, Brusse-Keizer M, van der Valk PD, et al. Self management for patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 2014;3:CD002990.
30. Lenferink A, Brusse-Keizer M, van der Valk PD, et al. Self-management interventions including action plans for exacerbations versus usual care in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 2017;8:CD011682.
31. Puhan MA, Gimeno-Santos E, Scharplatz M, Troosters T, Walters EH, Steurer J. Pulmonary rehabilitation following exacerbations of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 2011(10):Cd005305.
32. Society BLFBT. Ready for Home? Improving hospital discharge care for people living with COPD. A report by the British Lung Foundation and the British Thoracic Society. 2010; <https://www.brit-thoracic.org.uk/document-library/clinical-information/copd/ready-for-home-improving-hospital-discharge-care-for-people-living-with-copd/>. Accessed 08, 22, 2018.
33. Hopkinson NS, Englebretsen C, Cooley N, et al. Designing and implementing a COPD discharge care bundle. *Thorax*. 2012;67(1):90-92.
34. Laverty AA, Elkin SL, Watt HC, et al. Impact of a COPD discharge care bundle on readmissions following admission with acute exacerbation: interrupted time series analysis. *PloS one*. 2015;10(2):e0116187.
35. Ospina MB, Mrklas K, Deuchar L, et al. A systematic review of the effectiveness of discharge care bundles for patients with COPD. *Thorax*. 2017;72(1):31-39.

TABLES

Table 1. Characteristics of audited cases

Category	Variable	n or median	% or IQR
	Total n (n and %)	263	100%
	Age (years, median and IQR)	69	61-78
	Sex (male, n and %)	160	60.8%
	BMI (m/kg ² , median and IQR)	24	20 -29
	Dependent in daily living activities (n and %)	47	17.9%
	>80 (n and %)	4	1.5%
	50-79 (n and %)	47	17.9%
	30-49 (n and %)	76	28.9%
	<30 (n and %)	79	30.0%
	missing (n and %)	57	21.7%
	Pack-Years (median and IQR)	50	30-61
	Currently active smoker (n and %)	123	46.8%
	Ex-smoker (n and %)	114	43.3%
	Never-smoker (n and %)	18	6.8%
	Current smoking status missing (n and %)	8	3.0%
Oxygen therapy	Having prescribed long-term oxygen (n and %)	57	21.7%
	Diabetes mellitus (n and %)	40	15.2%
	Hypertension (n and %)	137	52.1%
	Coronary heart disease (n and %)	43	16.3%
	Congestive heart failure (n and %)	32	12.2%
	Depression (n and %)	36	13.7%
	Required invasive ventilation (n and %)	11	4.2%
	Required non-invasive ventilation (n and %)	8	3.0%

FIGURES

Figure 1: Flowchart of the study

Figure 2: Interventions and implementation rates

Figure legend: Bars are overall average implementation rates (in %) of interventions in AECOPD hospital care from all 263 audited cases. Orange bars are acute care interventions, blue bars are post-acute care interventions. Whiskers extend from the average rates of the hospital with lowest to the hospital with highest implementation.