VALUE IN HEALTH 17 (2014) 555–560

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jval

Time Is Money, But How Much? The Monetary Value of Response Time for Thai Ambulance Emergency Services

Henrik Jaldell, PhD[1,*], *Prachaksvich Lebnak, MD*[2], *Anurak Amornpetchsathaporn, MD*[2]

[1]*Department of Economics, Karlstad University, Karlstad, Sweden;* [2]*Emergency Medical Institute Thailand, Bangkok, Thailand*

ABSTRACT

Objective: To calculate the monetary value of the time factor per minute and per year for emergency services. **Methods:** The monetary values for ambulance emergency services were calculated for two different time factors, response time, which is the time from when a call is received by the emergency medical service call-taking center until the response team arrives at the emergency scene, and operational time, which includes the time to the hospital. The study was performed in two steps. First, marginal effects of reduced fatalities and injuries for a 1-minute change in the time factors were calculated. Second, the marginal effects and the monetary values were put together to find a value per minute. **Results:** The values were found to be 5.5 million Thai bath/min for fatality and 326,000 baht/min for severe injury. The total monetary value for a 1-minute improvement for each dispatch, summarized over 1 year, was 1.6 billion Thai baht using response time. **Conclusions:** The calculated values could be used in a cost-benefit analysis of an investment reducing the response time. The results from similar studies could for example be compared to the cost of moving an ambulance station or investing in a new alarm system.

Keywords: cost-benefit, emergency medical service, medicine, response time.

Introduction

It is reasonable to say that all efforts should be made to decrease the time factor in the emergency alarm chain from calling to taking the call, to dispatching, to getting ready to leave, to driving to the injured people or people involved in the accident, to taking care of the injured or suppressing the fire, and to getting the injured to the hospital. However, should all efforts be made solely to decrease the time factor? Such efforts are costly, and there are other health matters that investments could be done in: better ambulances with more technical equipment, more training of the staff, better hospitals, provision of self-help equipment, and so forth. An economical way of dealing with this problem of the public sector is to perform cost-benefit analyses. The cost side of such an analysis is quite unproblematic. It consists of costs for new equipment, staff education, and so forth. The benefit side, however, is more problematic. For example, if the emergency sector intends to invest in a new alarm technology that could save 1 minute in response time for all responses, how much will such an investment lead to in benefits measured in economic welfare terms? Not only must the effect of a changed response time, measured in fewer fatalities, injuries, and illness, be found, but this change should also be measured in monetary units.

The purpose of this study was to find a monetary value for the time factor of emergency responses in Thailand. It is not a cost-benefit analysis because it considers only the benefit side of the time factor. Notwithstanding, the results of the study could be used in a cost-benefit analysis. Furthermore, the methodology could be used for ambulance services elsewhere.

As noted by Blanchard et al. [1], there are not so many studies on the relationship between the response time of emergency medical service and the saving of lives. The results have been mixed. When it comes to cardiac arrest, reducing ambulance response time has been shown to increase the survival rate [2–4]. Gonzales et al. [5] found increased emergency medical service prehospital time to be associated with higher mortality rates, as did Wilde [6] and McCoy et al. [7] recently. Fire and rescue services have been found to increase the survival rate when having shorter response times than traditional ambulances for health care responses [8–10]. Newgard et al. [11], however, recently concluded that there is no relationship between the response time and outcome of the patient, as other studies have also done before [12–14].

There are five motivations behind this article. The first is that, as noted above, there is not much research done on the effect of the response time. The second is that most of the studies mentioned have taken up one health problem (cardiac arrest), while from a planning perspective there are, of course, many more reasons for having ambulance services. Furthermore, most of the analyses have evaluated the 8-minute response time goal for American advanced life support units responding to life-threatening events. This study focuses instead on a continuous

* *Address correspondence to:* Henrik Jaldell, Department of Economics, Karlstad University, S-651 88, Karlstad, Sweden.
E-mail: henrik.jaldell@kau.se.

1098-3015$36.00 – see front matter

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2014.05.006

measure of the response time. The third is that this analysis examines not only the relationship between response time and mortality but also the effect of the illness condition for non-mortality cases. The fourth is that the number of observations in this study is more than a million compared with hundreds or thousands in the articles mentioned above. The fifth is that this analysis does not stop at the outcome of the patient, but instead takes on an economic perspective, in which the purpose is to find a monetary value for the total benefits of reducing the response time. No similar cost-benefit study has been found, and there have been very few economic studies of out-of-hospital emergency care [15].

To find the monetary value of the time factor for emergency responses in Thailand, the analysis was done using an estimation procedure involving two major steps. The first step was to analyze the emergency response data in Thailand using logistic regressions. The dependent variables are fatality, severe injury, and slight injury. The independent variable is the response time or the operational time, where response time is the time from when a call is received until the response team arrives at the emergency scene and operational time is the time from when a call is received until the patient is admitted to a hospital. Holding other independent variables and risk factors constant, the marginal effect describes the increase or decrease in the time factor for a 1-minute change and how this will affect the risk of fatality, severe injury, and slight injury. In the second step, the perceived marginal effects from the first step are multiplied with monetary values of fatality, severe injury, and slight injury. Extrapolated to a loss value for the whole of Thailand, the value would be 2.2 billion Thai baht for response time and 1.1 billion Thai baht for operational time. These figures represent the positive welfare effect, for 1 year, of reducing the emergency response time in Thailand by 1 minute on average.

The second section describes the Thai emergency system and the data used. The model and the results are presented in the third section and the fourth section, respectively. The last section concludes the study with a discussion.

Data

The emergency call number "1669" is being introduced as the emergency medical contact number in Thailand. Up to now it has been common to call directly to a hospital. A dispatcher controls the resources by using different types of ambulances including the first response unit, the basic life support unit, and the advanced life support unit. The monitoring and implementation reports are created by extracting relevant data and information from the online-dispatch system called the "Narenthorn Emergency Medical Database" administrated by the Emergency Medical Institute of Thailand. The reports in the system include not only basic information on the dispatch center, location, and notification, but also time information and information about the injury, such as the time the information is received, the command time, the vehicle dispatch time, the scene arrival time, the scene departure time, the hospital arrival time, the base returning time, the total response time, the distance (in kilometers), and the type of ambulance.

The information on accident or emergency injury is categorized into 12 items (for disaster into 6 items). Information of the injury is also categorized on the basis of seriousness levels and type of ambulance. The reports include information on the preliminary operation results on scene categorized by the type of treatment and identified by the referral, for example, death and no treatment, heart attack, and onsite treatment. The hospital treatment consists of admission time, treatment duration, treatment result, referrals, continuous treatment, death, and so forth.

In this study, response time and operational time are used and defined as follows: The *response time* is the time from when the call taker receives the phone call until the operational unit arrives at the scene site. The *operational time* is the time from when the call taker receives the phone call to the operational unit transfer of the patient to the hospital.

The Narenthorn database has been used nationwide and covers the regions with about three fourths of the population of Thailand (eight provinces not included). For the period studied here, 2009 to 2010, there are 1,489,800 reports. There are qualitative problems, however, with the reports from October 1, 2009, to March 31, 2010, because some obviously contain wrong time data. In total, only 1,186,067 reports are used in the analysis (see the next section).

Treatment results are categorized into four levels: no injury, slight injury, severe injury, and fatality. *Slight injury* means patients who receive medical care on scene and are not transported to hospital, or are transported to the hospital, but are not admitted to a hospital. *Severe injury* means patients who receive medical care, are admitted to a hospital, and when there is no death before or after the rescue services arrive on the scene, or after the patients receive emergency care. *Fatality* means patients who die before or after the rescue services arrive at the scene, or after the patients receive emergency care, and includes death at the hospital. No injury is used when no other criteria is met.

The cause of the incident is divided into four groups: physical trauma, medical emergency, traffic accident, and others. Physical trauma includes falling and collapsing, fall from a height, building collapse, physical assault, other traumas, fire, electrocution, burns, bombing, natural hazards, and hazardous materials. Medical emergency includes drowning, suicide, and medical emergency, while traffic accident includes motor vehicle collision.

In Figure 1, we can see the relationship between the response time variable and the percentage of death and severe injury for all cases and for each emergency type. The risk of fatality increases up to a response time of 20 to 25 minutes, but after 25 to 30 minutes the curves seem to be quite horizontal and thus the risk of dying is no longer increasing. For severe injuries, the relationships have about the same shapes (not shown here).

The purpose of an economic cost-benefit analysis is to measure the welfare effects of public investments. If the benefits of the investment are larger than the costs, measured in monetary units, welfare can be increased by investing in the project. Therefore, we need figures in Thai baht for saving lives and reducing injuries.

There are two main methods of finding such monetary values: the cost-of-illness method and the willingness-to-pay approach. Willingness to pay is based on the idea that people can assess the risk of having an accident and that they will pay for reducing or minimizing that risk (see e.g., [16–18]).

When it comes to estimating the value of a statistical life, there have been only a few studies that cover Thailand [19–22], with values ranging from US $0.25 million to US $3.0 million. Another question is whether the same value should be used for different injuries; some studies have found different values depending on the context [23–26]. This fact, however, has not been taken into account in this study.

The above studies only calculate values of a statistical life. We are also interested here, however, in the monetary value of severe injury and slight injury. We therefore instead use results from a study that used a cost-of-illness method (see e.g., [27,28]) to calculate the cost of traffic accidents in Thailand in 2004. The Thai study [29] focused on five regional hospitals that had a department for providing service data on injuries caused by traffic accidents. The loss value for 2004 was also recalculated