

A NEED FOR PREHOSPITAL TRIAGE STANDARDIZING TOOL IN MASS CASUALTY INCIDENTS

POTRZEBA STANDARYZACJI SEGREGACJI MEDYCZNEJ W ZDARZENIACH MASOWYCH

Amir Khorram-Manesh^{1,2(A,B,C,D,E,F)}, Johan Nordling^{1(A,B,D,E)}, Eric Carlström^{3,4(E)},
Krzysztof Goniewicz^{5(E)}, Roberto Faccincani^{6(E)}, Frederick M. Burkle^{7(E)}

¹Department of Surgery, Institute of Clinical Sciences, Sahlgrenska Academy, Gothenburg University, Sweden

²Department of Development and Research, Armed Forces Center for Defense Medicine, Gothenburg, Sweden

³Institute of Health and Care Sciences, Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

⁴USN School of Business, University of South-Eastern Norway, Kongsberg, Norway

⁵Department of Security Studies, Military University of Aviation, Dęblin, Poland

⁶Emergency Department, Humanitas Mater Domini, Castellanza, Italy

⁷Harvard Humanitarian Initiative, T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, Boston, United States

Authors' contribution
Wkład autorów:
A. Study design/planning
zaplanowanie badań
B. Data collection/entry
zebranie danych
C. Data analysis/statistics
dane – analiza i statystyki
D. Data interpretation
interpretacja danych
E. Preparation of manuscript
przygotowanie artykułu
F. Literature analysis/search
wyszukiwanie i analiza literatury
G. Funds collection
zebranie funduszy

Dear Editor,

There is no global consensus on the use of prehospital triage systems in mass casualty incidents [1,2]. However, most of the triage systems aim to cover four essential factors: speed, precision, fairness, and compatibility [3], of which the element of speed of decision-making is of importance, due to the large number of casualties that should be managed. Prehospital triage systems range from fast, crude algorithms and flowcharts to complex scoring systems requiring exact information on vital parameters, mechanisms of injury and available resources [1,2]. This heterogeneity constitutes a particular threat in the event of a Mass Casualty Incident (MCI) which often involves rescue personnel from different organizations or nationalities. There have been several attempts to achieve a global or national consensus in a number of cases without fruition due to a lack of actual research behind the origin or refinements of the various systems. When proposing a modern system for universal consideration there often has not been much more than anecdotal evidence to its efficacy, making it hard to choose one over the other [1-4].

It is logical to believe that these controversies will continue in the future prompting additional systems to emerge. Having acknowledged this fact, the only way to achieve a consensus seems to be a combined criteria system which offers a way to display the results without proposing yet another triage system. Such a system should consider a comparison of the following areas: *Ambulation, Breathing/open airway, Respiratory rate, Radial/peripheral pulse, Following commands*, and the need for *Lifesaving interventions* to accommodate a combined system that also includes Chemical, Biological, Radiation and Nuclear (CBRN) events [4,5]. The importance of these areas lies on the fact that they are all presented in every triage system. As such, they may also create difficulties in decision-making. For instance, counting respiratory rate and measuring/estimating systolic blood pressure not only can be difficult in an emergency but may also delay the immediate management of patients.

Keywords: prehospital care, triage, mass casualty incidents

Słowa kluczowe: opieka przedszpitalna, segregacja, zdarzenia masowe

Tables: 0
Figures: 0
References: 5
Submitted: 2021 Jul 9
Accepted: 2021 Jul 9

Khorram-Manesh A, Nordling J, Carlström E, Goniewicz K, Faccincani R, Burkle FM. A need for prehospital triage standardizing tool in mass casualty incidents. *Health Prob Civil.* 2021; 15(4): 249-250. <https://doi.org/10.5114/hpc.2021.107782>

Address for correspondence / Adres korespondencyjny: Amir Khorram-Manesh, Department of Development and Research, Armed Forces Center for Defense Medicine, 426 76 Västra Frölunda, Gothenburg, Sweden, e-mail: amir.khorram-manesh@surgery.gu.se, phone: +46 031 69 20 20
ORCID: Amir Khorram-Manesh <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2734-5733>, Eric Carlström <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9463-7341>, Krzysztof Goniewicz <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4368-6850>, Roberto Faccincani <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4498-3833>, Frederick M. Burkle <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5110-7284>

Copyright: © Pope John Paul II State School of Higher Education in Biała Podlaska, Amir Khorram-Manesh, Johan Nordling, Eric Carlström, Krzysztof Goniewicz, Roberto Faccincani, Frederick M. Burkle. This is an Open Access journal, all articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>), allowing third parties to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format and to remix, transform, and build upon the material, provided the original work is properly cited and states its license.

These quantity-based measurements can be substituted by qualitative measurements and an estimation based on the presence of a condition, i.e., confirming whether patient respiration is distressed or not? Or do the patients exhibit external hemorrhages or not? These qualitative measures can easily be answered in the chaotic situation of an MCI by YES/NO, and thus, can enhance the process of medical evaluation on the field and create a constant denominator of all triage systems.

The key to a successful management in MCI is the simplicity of its measures and approaches. As over-treatment of victims may expose them to more harm, using complicated systems, which depend on new technologies, is also risky. An uncomplicated tool that simplifies prehospital triage is needed. Such a tool may convert various prehospital triage systems into one by using translational triage measures, in a multistep research program by which all decision-making steps can be evaluated and confirmed based on present medical evidence. However, it is also important that medical professionals realize the need for change and both study and embrace new ideas.

References:

1. McKee CH, Heffernan RW, Willenbring BD, Schwartz RB, Liu JM, Colella R. Comparing the accuracy of mass casualty triage systems when used in an adult population. *Prehosp Emerg Care*. 2020 Jul-Aug; 24(4): 515-524. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10903127.2019.1641579>
2. Bazyar J, Farrokhi M, Khankeh H. Triage systems in mass casualty incidents and disasters: a review study with a worldwide approach. *Open Access Maced J Med Sci*. 2019; 7: 482-494. <https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2019.119>
3. Khorram-Manesh A. Facilitators and constrainers of civilian-military collaboration: the Swedish perspectives. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg*. 2020; 46: 649-656. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00068-018-1058-9>
4. Burkle MF. Triage and the lost art of decoding vital signs: restoring physiologically based triage skills in complex humanitarian emergencies. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*. 2017; 12(1): 76-85. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2017.40>
5. Jenkins JL, McCarthy ML, Sauer LM, Green GB, Stuart S, Thomas TL, et al. Mass-casualty triage: time for an evidence-based approach. *Prehosp Disaster Med*. 2008; 23(1): 3-8. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049023X00005471>