COVID-19 Triage Systems and Case Fatality Rates: A Comparative Simulation Study Between Singapore, Japan, Norway, the USA and the UK.

*Mansab F[1], Bhatti S[1,2] and *Goyal D[1,3].

1. *COVID-19 Team, Public Health Gibraltar*
2. *Post-Graduate Medical School, University of Gibraltar*
3. *Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine, St Bernard's Hospital, Gibraltar*

**Lead Authors with equal contribution*

Fatma Mansab, *BSc, MSc Immunology, Senior Researcher, COVID-19 Team, Public Health Gibraltar, Gibraltar*

Sohail Bhatti, *MBChB, MSc, FFPH, FRSPH, Director of Public Health, Gibraltar & Head of School of Postgraduate Medicine, University of Gibraltar*

Daniel K Goyal, *MBChB, DTM&H, MRCP, PhD, Acute Internal Medicine, St Bernard's Hospital, Gibraltar & COVID 19 Team, Public Health Gibraltar*

Authors declare no conflict of interest.

There was no external funding for this publication.

Abstract
Introduction: The case fatality rate from COVID-19 differs markedly around the world. There are likely a number of factors one can attribute to such disparity, not least of which is differing healthcare models and approaches. Here, we examine the COVID-19 related health advice issued by six different countries, specifically examining the patient-led triage pathways in each country.

Methods: A simulation study was conducted on current, nationwide, patient-led triage systems from three countries with low case fatality rates (Singapore, Norway and Japan) and two countries with high case fatality rates (the USA and the UK). Cases were simulated by clinicians to approximate typical COVID-19 presentations (mild, severe and critical), and COVID-19 mimickers (sepsis, bacterial pneumonia). The same simulations were applied to each of the five country's patient-led triage systems, and the recommendations to refer on for medical care or to advise to stay at home were recorded and compared. Statistical analysis examined the potential correlation between triage outcomes and case fatality rates.

Results: Patient-led triage systems from Singapore, Japan and Norway maintained a low threshold for advising clinical contact for patients with possible COVID-19 (88 to 100% of cases were referred). Patient-led triage systems from the USA and the UK maintained high thresholds for advising healthcare contact (28 and 33% of cases were referred, respectively). There was a strong inverse correlation between percentage of cases referred and the nation's case fatality rate (Pearson's Correlation = -0.642, $p = 0.01$).

Conclusion: In this simulation study, the triage algorithms of Singapore, Norway and Japan successfully identified severe COVID-19 and triaged such cases to medical care. The USA triage system and the UK's triage system performed poorly, failing to identify severe COVID-19 infection and sepsis. The performance of national COVID-19 triage systems correlate with case fatality rates, in this cohort of countries.

Introduction

COVID-19 is a new infection in humans. The symptom profile, disease progression and complication rates are still unknown[1]. Whilst the true mortality rate may be lower when accounting for milder cases, over a period of four months COVID-19 has led to more than 200,000 confirmed deaths[2].

The Case Fatality Rate (CFR) between countries varies greatly[2]. Initially this was thought related to the method of recording deaths or the total number of tests conducted (i.e the detection of the milder cases)[3]. As the pandemic spreads across the globe it is becoming increasingly clear that how society responds to the infection impacts the number of deaths their locality will experience[4,5].

Patient-led triaging has become popular. Early on the crisis China implemented 'symptom-checkers' as part of their disease surveillance and control efforts. Similar applications have been adapted by a number of countries to attempt triaging of patients with minimal expenditure of resources.

Triaging of patients during a pandemic is arguably the most central activity of any response. Evidence must feed into it as it arrises, particularly when it is an infectious disease never before encountered. Changing resource availability will determine the limits and boundaries of such triage systems. Public information will centre around the key symptoms feeding into the triage system. The criteria for triaging is a critical factor in mortality[6].

The World Health Organisation (WHO) have provided guidelines for both primary care triaging[7], and triaging in low resource settings[8].

Different countries have taken different approaches to the triage process. Singapore, Norway and Japan appear to have implemented a triage system along the lines recommended by the WHO.

Singapore

Singapore appears to have streamlined their response to the outbreak[9]. All patients with suspicion of COVID-19 were initially seen and assessed. All positive cases or cases where suspicion was high were admitted to an isolation ward. Best supportive care was implemented[10]. At this time, the case numbers were well contained and case fatality rate was less than 1%[11].

As numbers have increased, Singapore's Ministry of Health have initiated a symptom checker application to keep uncomplicated, low-risk cases at home or sign-posted to the nearest Public Health Preparedness Clinic (PHPC). The app effectively gives three outcomes: advise to self-isolate for 2-3 days and if no better or if they get worse then to contact their nearest PHPC; make an appointment with their PHPC; or go straight to the emergency department[12].

The Singapore COVID-19 patient-led triage application has a low threshold for referral. For example, anyone of any age or medical history who self-reports difficulty breathing is advised to go straight to the emergency department.

Norway
Norway has maintained a low CFR[2]. Patients with mild illness are advised to self-isolate and contact their GP if symptoms worsen or are unresolved by day 7. All patients with shortness of breath are advised to contact their GP or go to the emergency department.

Norway have recently implemented a symptom-checker app. It is accessible only to Norwegian residents.

Japan
Japan follows a similar approach to Singapore, with a default position of clinical assessment of patients and clinician led triaging. Any patient with symptoms suggestive of COVID-19 are directed through an on-line interactive pathway finder to a specialist clinic for further assessment. CFR in Japan has remained low (<3%)[2]. Out of 12,240 confirmed cases, 10,469 cases have been admitted to hospital[13].

Methodology
Five countries were selected for analysis. Three (Singapore, Japan and Norway) had maintained low case fatality rates despite a demonstrable surge of cases in the preceding three months. Two countries (UK and USA) were selected due to concern regarding high case fatality rates.

Public Health guidelines from each country were reviewed. Access was obtained to any available government sponsored online patient-led triage systems (Singapore, Japan, USA (CDC) and UK (NHS '111')). Case Scenario's were designed to test the public health advice and where available patient-led triage systems in relation to COVID-19.

Case scenarios were designed around three specific presentations:

1. Cough
2. Co-morbidity
3. Shortness of Breath

Specific presentations were then varied in relation to one or more of the following:

1. Duration of symptoms
2. Age of Patient
3. Severity of symptoms

All scenarios included fever as a symptom.

Each scenario was applied to either the country's national health advice for COVID-19 or to the government sponsored online patient-led triaging tool. Where there was conflict between the two, the online tool results were used.

The data was collated into table format and compared. The percentage of referrals per specific presentation was then calculated and analysed for correlation with nationally reported case fatality rates. Statistical analysis with Pearson's Correlation was preferred as the comparison was between two continuous variables.

Results

The key population and testing data are presented in Table 1. Notably, the highest rate of testing was by Norway with the lowest being Japan. CFR's were similar for both. Norway had the highest reported physicians per capita. From the available statistics the UK had the highest CFR currently. All data was extracted from WHO as of 26.04.2020.

	Singapore	Norway	Japan	USA	UK
Total Tests (per million)	20,815	28,141	1,166	16,507	9,867
Total Tests	122,000	155,000	147,000	5,500,000	669,000
Population (millions)	5·8	5·4	126·5	331	67·9
Confirmed COVID-19 Positive	12,693	7,467	13,182	899,281	148,381
Case Fatality Rate (%)	0·1	2·7	2·7	5·6	13·6
Physicians per 10,000 head of capita	24	46	24	25	28

Table 1 - Population and Testing Data for the Six Countries Studied.

In total 216 scenarios were tested, 36 per country. Norway triaged 29 out of 36 pseudo-patients to either doctor or hospital, Singapore triaged 33 out of 36 to specialist clinics or hospital, and Japan triaged all pseudo-patients to specialist medical centres. The UK triaged 10 pseudo-patients to a national call centre and 4 pseudo-patients to hospital, recommending the other 22 to stay at home without any further healthcare contact. The USA system triaged 6 patients to a 'medical provider within 24 hours' and 4 patients to hospital, recommending the other 26 patients to remain at home with no further healthcare contact. The results for each scenario are presented in tabulated format (Table 2 to Table 7).

	Singapore	Norway	Japan	USA	UK
	Scenario 1A - Cough + Fever for 4 days				
12 yr old with cough and fever for 4 days	Stay Home	Stay Home	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
32 yr old with cough and fever for 4 days	Stay Home	Stay Home	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
52 yr old with cough and fever for 4 days	Stay Home	Stay Home	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
72 yr old with cough and fever for 4 days	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
	Scenario 1B - Cough and Fever for 7 days				
12 yr old with cough and fever for 7 days	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
32 yr old with cough and fever for 7 days	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
52 yr old with cough and fever for 7 days	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
72 yr old with cough and fever for 7 days	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
	Scenario 1C - Cough and Fever for 10 days				
12 yr old with cough and fever for 10 days	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
32 yr old with cough and fever for 10 days	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
52 yr old with cough and fever for 10 days	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
72 yr old with cough and fever for 10 days	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home

Table 2 - Scenario 1. Cough and Fever in various age groups with varying durations.

	Singapore	Norway	Japan	USA	UK
	Scenario 2A - Cough, Fever and Co-Morbidity (4 days)				
12 yr old with cough and fever	PHCC or GP	Stay Home	Medical Centre	Call medical provider within 24 hours	Call 111
32 yr old with cough and fever	PHCC or GP	Stay Home	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
52 yr old with cough and fever	PHCC or GP	Stay Home	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
72 yr old with cough and fever	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
	Scenario 2B - Cough, Fever and Comorbidity (7 days)				
12 yr old with cough and fever	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Call Medical Provider within 24 hours	Call 111
32 yr old with cough and fever	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
52 yr old with cough and fever	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
72 yr old with cough and fever	PHCC or GP	GP	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home

Table 3- Scenario 2 - Co-morbidity with Possible COVID-19. Co-morbidity was applied to mean a congenital heart condition in relation to the 12 year old, and hypertension in relation to the adults.

	Singapore	Norway	Japan	USA	UK
	Scenario 3 - Cough + Fever + Immunosuppression				
12 yr old with cough and fever for 4 days	PHCC or GP	GP or Emergency Dept.	Medical Centre	Call medical provider within 24 hours	Call 111 & Speak to a Nurse
32 yr old with cough and fever for 4 days	PHCC or GP	GP or Emergency Dept.	Medical Centre	Call medical provider within 24 hours	Call 111 & Speak to a Nurse
52 yr old with cough and fever for 4 days	PHCC or GP	GP or Emergency Dept.	Medical Centre	Call medical provider within 24 hours	Call 111 & Speak to a Nurse
72 yr old with cough and fever for 4 days	PHCC or GP	GP or Emergency Dept.	Medical Centre	Call medical provider within 24 hours	Call 111 & Speak to a Nurse

Table 4 - Scenario 3. Cough and Fever in varying ages of patients with significant immunosuppression e.g. recent chemotherapy or a transplant patient.

	Singapore	Norway	Japan	USA	UK
	Scenario 4 - Mild Shortness of Breath + Fever for 5 days				
12 yr old with shortness of breath and fever	Emergency Department	GP or Emergency Department	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
32 yr old with shortness of breath and fever	Emergency Department	GP or Emergency Department	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
52 yr old with shortness of breath and fever	Emergency Department	GP or Emergency Department	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home
72 yr old with shortness of breath and fever	Emergency Department	GP or Emergency Department	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Stay Home

Table 5 - Scenario 4. Shortness of Breath and Fever for five days duration in varying age groups.

	Singapore	Norway	Japan	USA	UK
	Scenario 5 - Moderate Shortness Of Breath + Fever for 5 days				
12 yr old with shortness of breath and fever	Emergency Department	GP or Emergency Department	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Call 111 & speak to a Nurse
32 yr old with shortness of breath and fever	Emergency Department	GP or Emergency Department	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Call 111 & speak to a Nurse
52 yr old with shortness of breath and fever	Emergency Department	GP or Emergency Department	Medical Centre	Stay Home	Call 111 & speak to a Nurse
72 yr old with shortness of breath and fever	Emergency Department	GP or Emergency Department	Medical Centre	Emergency Department	Call 111 & speak to a Nurse

Table 6 - Scenario 5. Moderate Shortness of Breath and Fever for five days in various age ranges.

	Singapore	Norway	Japan	USA	UK
	Scenario 6 - Severe Shortness Of Breath + Fever for 8 days				
12 yr old with shortness of breath and fever	Emergency Department	Emergency Department	Medical Centre	Emergency Department	Call 999 (Emergency)
32 yr old with shortness of breath and fever	Emergency Department	Emergency Department	Medical Centre	Emergency Department	Call 999 (Emergency)
52 yr old with shortness of breath and fever	Emergency Department	Emergency Department	Medical Centre	Emergency Department	Call 999 (Emergency)
72 yr old with shortness of breath and fever	Emergency Department	Emergency Department	Medical Centre	Emergency Department	Call 999 (Emergency)

Table 7 - Scenario 6. Severe Shortness of Breath and Fever for 8 days in varying ages.

Of the three distinct presentations - 1) cough + fever, 2) Cough + fever + co-morbidity, or 3) Fever + shortness of breath -, the UK and US systems failed to triage any of the cough + fever cases to any form of healthcare, regardless of duration of symptoms. Of the cough + fever + co-morbidity simulations, the US and UK triaged 25% to further healthcare. For those with shortness of breath + fever, the UK and US triage systems referred on 75% and 63% respectively (Figure 1). Percentage of distinct presentations triaged to further care (versus no care) was strongly inversely correlated with national case fatality rates (Pearson's Correlation = -0.642, p = 0.01).



Figure 1. Percentage referred versus distinct presentations.

Interpretation
The UK and USA national, patient-led triage systems failed to triage cases with signs of severe COVID-19 infection or cases with signs of sepsis to appropriate medical care.

In Scenario 1, a 72 year old patient with a fever and cough lasting 7 or even 10 days would, if using either NHS '111' COVID app or CDC 'Coronavirus Self-Checker', be advised to stay at home, and would not be directed towards any medical care.

In Scenario 2, a 72 year old with a five day history of fever and cough with a history of hypertension would also have been advised to stay at home and not seek medical care. In the UK '111' COVID app, even if the 72 year old with possible COVID-19 infection had diabetes, moderate asthma, ischaemic heart disease, congestive cardiac failure and a history of stroke, the patient would not have spoken to a nurse or been directed to a clinician.

In Scenario 3, a patient with possible neutropenic sepsis would have been advised by the USA triage system to contact medical care within 24 hours. The UK system would have advised the patient to call 111 and ask for a nurse.

In Scenario 4, a patient with suspected COVID-19 gives symptoms of shortness of breath. In Singapore, Japan and Norway, all patients in all age groups complaining of any difficult breathing or shortness of breath would be advised to contact a doctor or attend an Emergency Department (ED) immediately. In the UK and USA, the advice is to self-isolate and no contact with healthcare is needed.

In Scenario 5, - moderate shortness of breath with possible COVID-19, the US model advised all patients except the 72 year old to stay at home. The UK discriminated better with a question relating to feeling short of breath at rest, although this would likely have missed the mild to moderate shortness of breath in an otherwise healthy person.

In Scenario 6, patients presented with respiratory failure due to COVID-19, and all countries successfully triaged to the ED.

Discussion

There were a number of specific areas the NHS '111' COVID-19 patient-led triage system (UK), and CDC 'Coronavirus Self-Checker' (USA) failed in the simulation cases.

From the case simulation data, the main differences in health advice relating to COVID-19 between the low CFR countries and the high CFR countries are:

1. Duration of symptoms - in low-risk cases, the low CFR countries advise early assessment (Japan) or clinical assessment after 2-3 days (Singapore) or 7 days (Norway) if symptoms persist. Duration of symptoms did not seem to affect the advice given in the USA or UK systems.
2. Age - Older patients are more likely to be referred for clinical assessment in low CFR countries.
3. Co-morbidity - Singapore's online triage system will advise a clinical assessment for any person presenting with possible COVID-19 who has any comorbidity, in any age group.
4. Shortness of breath - Norway, Singapore and Japan do not differentiate the severity of the shortness of breath - all patients with shortness of breath are told to seek medical attention immediately.
5. Safety-net advice - the low CFRs provide clear guidance on what to do if symptoms worsen or fail to improve.

The main utility in a patient-led triage system is to detect potential cases. Workload may be offset to some degree by advising 'stay at home' to clear low-risk patient groups, provided clear instructions and safety-net advice are given.

The WHO advises that a small proportion of potential COVID-19 cases can be triaged to 'home'. The advice is to screen the majority of patients with potential COVID-19 - an unknown and potentially fatal disease -, in a clinic or hospital specific for that purpose. Neither the UK nor the US national triage systems appear to be following the international guidelines or consensus. Indeed, neither the US nor the UK would meet the recommended triaging efforts required for low resource settings[8].

Conclusion

Following review of the public health policies and patient-led triage systems of five countries, it seems quite likely patient-led triage systems have an impact on case fatality rates during the COVID-19 pandemic.

In the present study, when tested, the UK system discriminated too early and failed to pick up clear signs of severe COVID-19 infection or other serious, life-threatening conditions. The US system failed in a similar regard, although may have been slightly protected by the different provisions and guidelines issued on a state by state basis. For example, New York City issued their own guidelines encouraging people with symptoms to contact medical professionals earlier, after data revealed a high number of patients dying from COVID-19 at home[16].

The most critical aspect of the societal response to COVID-19 is the correct triaging of patients. Few issues are as important during the outbreak of a new pathogen than identifying those who need medical attention. In most critical incidents the highest level of expertise is deployed for triaging. It is the place where the most experienced and astute direct the fate of individuals[6,14].

The importance of getting the triage system correct becomes more urgent as many nations move towards the uncertainty of relaxing restrictions and increasing population exposure. To do so without a clear and working triage system would be taking a substantial risk in an already high-risk situation.

In this simulation study, the UK and USA patient-led triage systems performed poorly. Even if such triage systems were considered within a context of severe shortages of staff and hospital beds, the systems would still have performed poorly. Particular concerns were advising no medical contact for elderly patients with COVID-19 related symptoms or patients who had developed shortness of breath or any patient with persistent fever. There was a strong inverse correlation between triage performance and national case fatality rates (Pearson's Correlation = -0.642, $p = 0.01$). The quality of a locality's triage system is likely to significantly affect the total number of deaths it will experience from COVID-19.

Conflict of Interests

Authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Ethics Statement

No ethical approval was required for this simulation study. NHS Improvements and NHS Digital were informed of the results of this simulation study on 28/04/20.

REFERENCES

1. Rothan HA, Byrareddy SN. The epidemiology and pathogenesis of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak. J Autoimmun. 2020;109:102433. doi:10.1016/j.jaut.2020.102433
2. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report – 97. Data as received by WHO from national authorities by 10:00 CEST, 26 April 2020.
3. Rajgor DD, Lee MH, Archuleta S, Bagdasarian N, Quek SC. The many estimates of the COVID-19 case fatality rate [published online ahead of print, 2020 Mar 27]. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;S1473-3099(20)30244-9. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30244-9
4. Sun Q, Qiu H, Huang M, Yang Y. Lower mortality of COVID-19 by early recognition and intervention: experience from Jiangsu Province. *Ann Intensive Care*. 2020;10(1):33. Published 2020 Mar 18. doi:10.1186/s13613-020-00650-2
5. Li X, Xu S, Yu M, et al. Risk factors for severity and mortality in adult COVID-19 inpatients in Wuhan [published online ahead of print, 2020 Apr 12]. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2020;S0091-6749(20)30495-4. doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2020.04.006
6. Schuetz P, Hausfater P, Amin D, et al. Optimizing triage and hospitalization in adult general medical emergency patients: the triage project. BMC Emerg Med. 2013;13:12. Published 2013 Jul 4. doi:10.1186/1471-227X-13-12
7. WHO Technical Guidance. Role of primary care in the COVID-19 response http://iris.wpro.who.int/handle/10665.1/14510
8. WHO Technical Guidance. Algorithm for COVID-19 triage and referral : patient triage and referral for resource-limited settings during community transmission. http://iris.wpro.who.int/handle/10665.1/14502,
9. Ministry of Health, Singapore. COMPREHENSIVE MEDICAL STRATEGY FOR COVID-19. Updated 28th April 2020 https://www.moh.gov.sg/news-highlights/details/comprehensive-medical-strategy-for-covid-19
10. National Centre for Infectious Diseases, Singapore. Interim Treatment Guidelines for COVID-19. 4th April 2020. https://www.ncid.sg/Health-Professionals/Diseases-and-Conditions.
11. Wong JEL, Leo YS, Tan CC. COVID-19 in Singapore—Current Experience: Critical Global Issues That Require Attention and Action. JAMA. Published online February 20, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2467
12. Singapore COVID-19 Symptom Checker. https://sgcovidcheck.gov.sg.
13. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. About Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19), https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/newpage_00032.html
14. Christian MD, Sprung CL, King MA, et al. Triage: care of the critically ill and injured during pandemics and disasters: CHEST consensus statement. Chest. 2014;146(4 Suppl):e61S–74S. doi:10.1378/chest.14-0736
15. Li LQ, Huang T, Wang YQ, et al. COVID-19 patients' clinical characteristics, discharge rate, and fatality rate of meta-analysis [published online ahead of print, 2020 Mar 12]. J Med Virol. 2020;10.1002/jmv.25757. doi:10.1002/jmv.25757
16. New York City Government. Severely Ill People Should Seek Medical Care. https://www1.nyc.gov/site/doh/covid/covid-19-providers.page