

1 **Rationing and triage of scarce, lifesaving therapy in the context of**
2 **the COVID-19 pandemic - a cross-sectional, social media-driven,**
3 **scenario-based online query of societal attitudes**

4 Oliver J. Muensterer, MD^{1,2}, Emilio A. Gianicolo, PhD^{3,4}, Norbert W. Paul, MD²

5 Surnames underlined

6 ¹ Department of Pediatric Surgery,

7 ² Institute for History, Theory and Ethics of Medicine,

8 ³ Institute of Medical Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics (IMBEI),

9 University Medical Center of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Mainz, Germany

10 ⁴ Institute of Clinical Physiology. National Research Council, Lecce, Italy

11

12 Correspondence to:

13 Oliver J. Muensterer, MD, PhD

14 Department of Pediatric Surgery

15 University Medical Center of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz

16 Langenbeckstrasse 1, 55131 Mainz, Germany

17 Telephone: +49 6131 17 3865 Fax: +49 6131 17 6523

18 Email: oliver.muensterer@unimedizin-mainz.de

19

20 This work is part of the masterthesis of OM in medical ethics at the Institute for History,
21 Theory and Ethics of Medicine at the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz (under
22 supervision of Norbert W. Paul)

23 Word count: manuscript 3494 words, abstract 247 words; 3 tables, 2 illustrations

24

25 **Rationing and triage of scarce, lifesaving therapies in the context of**
26 **the COVID-19 pandemic - a cross-sectional, scenario-based online**
27 **query of societal attitudes**

28

29 **ABSTRACT**

30 **Background** The recent COVID-19 pandemic made us aware that medical resources are
31 limited. When demand for essential resources surpasses availability, difficult triaging
32 decisions are necessary. While algorithms exist, almost nothing is known on societal attitudes
33 regarding triage criteria.

34 **Methods** A cross-sectional survey was conducted via social media channels to query a broad
35 sample of society. Participants were asked to make triage decisions in case-based vignettes,
36 exploring a variety of factors. They also were asked to assess how sure they were about their
37 decisions, and how such decisions should be reached.

38 **Results** The survey was completed in full by 1626 participants in April 2020. Median age was
39 39 years (range 12-80 years), 984 (61%) were female. Patient prognosis, responsibility
40 towards others, the absence of behavior-induced co-morbidities, and younger age were
41 rated the most important triage criteria, while participants found that insurance status, social
42 status, and nationality should not play a substantial role. Ethics-committees and point
43 systems were regarded potentially helpful for triage decision-making, while decisions based
44 on order of presentation (first-come first-serve) or on a legal basis were viewed critically.
45 Participants were least sure about their decision when dealing with age or behavior-induced
46 co-morbidities. Overall, women were surer about their decisions than men, participants of
47 Christian faith were also more secure about their decision than atheists-agnostics.

48 **Conclusions** This study uses social media to generate insight into public opinion and
49 attitudes regarding triage criteria and modalities. These findings may be helpful for the
50 development of future medical triage algorithms.

51

52 **KEYWORDS**

53 COVID-19, intensive care, survey, triage, medical ethics

54

55 INTRODUCTION

56 Even in highly developed nations, the COVID-19 pandemic has shown how medical resources
57 can become limited when an overwhelming need arises. The discrepancy between supply and
58 demand in southern European medical centers, and later on in some metropolitan areas of
59 the United States, reached dimensions previously unimaginable.[1] Some of the most
60 strikingly extreme circumstances were the sudden need to ration lifesaving medical therapies,
61 in particular intensive care beds and ventilators, including advanced technology such as
62 extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO).[2]

63 Italy was the first country in which, due to the vast number of affected patients with
64 respiratory distress, medical personnel was required to make ad-hoc decisions regarding
65 which patient would receive a ventilator or not.[3] This gut-wrenching task mostly fell on
66 physicians working in the forefront, who were already overwhelmed and at their limits. The
67 precarious, highly dynamic situation left them practically no opportunity to prepare
68 emotionally, morally, or functionally for the resulting challenges.

69 Hence, the discourse focused on triage algorithms to be applied for the distribution of scarce
70 therapeutic resources, mostly in an operational mode. Such practical guidelines have long
71 been established in military and disaster.[4] Military algorithms, however, focus mainly on
72 maintaining an effective army of soldiers. They do not lend themselves for simple translation
73 into the civilian environment. After the September 11th attacks in 2001, algorithms with an
74 emphasis on patient prognosis as the lead criterion were developed.[5] In accordance, with
75 the principle of beneficence (acting with the best interest of the other), and with the
76 utilitarian principle of conferring the most benefit to the greatest number of individuals,
77 civilian triage systems correspondingly tend to favor patients with a better prognosis.

78 At times, triaging purely by prognosis seems inappropriate. Particularly the immanent conflict
79 between urgency and the prospect of successful outcome, along with the need for a timely
80 decision, poses an inextricable dilemma for medical practitioners in the trenches. Moral
81 intuitions that overshadow rational decisions can complicate matters even further. For
82 example, should a 30-year-old mother of 4 with a chronic medical condition receive priority
83 in receiving a scarce, life-saving therapy over an otherwise healthy, single 65 year old? In
84 reality, decisions are based on a multidimensional array of factors. These may include
85 responsibility for others (as in this example), age, expected quality of life after convalescence,
86 or sacrifice for others (for example, in the case of medical personnel). The weighting of these
87 different factors is strongly dependent upon the moral norms that result from the discourse
88 within a particular society. While experts and opinion leaders[6] have heavily driven the
89 narrative, for example labelling triage according to age as "radical-utilitarian discrimination of
90 the elderly", [7] there is very little known about the opinions and attitudes of the general
91 public. Cross sectional studies in this regard are lacking, but would be useful to guide the
92 implementation of acceptable future triage algorithms.

93 These deficits have been addressed in several recent publications,[8] particularly in the
94 context of the COVID-19 pandemic.[9] We were interested in surveying the opinions on
95 concrete criteria that should play a role in the rationing of life-saving measures in a cross-
96 sectional sample of the general public. Since contemporary public opinion has been shaped
97 increasingly by social media, we decided to launch this empiric study of the societal attitudes
98 through social media channels. After the COVID-19-pandemic had hit some European
99 countries so heavily, conducting this study during the ongoing crisis was embedded in the
100 ethically founded overall concept of preparedness, which might have contributed to the
101 relatively controlled course of the pandemic in Germany with relatively low mortality rates. To
102 our knowledge, a similarly-designed study has so far not been performed or published.

103

104 **METHODS**

105 In April, 2020, an online survey (LimeSurvey GmbH, Hamburg) was generated in German
106 language and propagated broadly via different social media channels (Internet webpages of
107 our institution, medical ethics listserver, pediatric surgery forum, institutional Facebook
108 account, Instagram account, SurveyCircle website, private contacts). In order to snowball the
109 distributive effects, participants were expressively asked to resend the link to their friends and
110 contacts.

111 Regarding content, the online survey (appendix A) included 10 imaginary scenarios, in which
112 two critically-ill patients required mechanical ventilation, but only one ventilator was
113 available. The fictitious patient pairs differed in one principal characteristic [1. age, 2.
114 insurance status, 3. fateful, non-behavior-associated co-morbidities (such as other preexisting
115 conditions), 4. behavior-associated co-morbidities (resulting from behavior, such as smoking
116 or drinking alcohol), 5. working in a healthcare profession, 6. asylum status/nationality, 7.
117 social status, 8. prognosis/chance of therapeutic success, 9. explicit consent for the intensive
118 therapy, 10. responsibility for others]. The participants were asked who they would provide
119 the ventilator to (patient A or patient B). Another option was to draw lots for an equal chance
120 to receive the therapy. Subsequently, participants were asked to mark how sure they were of
121 their decision on a scale from 0 to 100. They were also asked to mark how important in their
122 opinion the particular criterion should be for the distribution of lifesaving therapies on a scale
123 from 0 to 100.

124 After the imaginary case-vignettes, the participants were asked about their opinion on the
125 modalities that should be employed to make triage decisions (a. drawing lots
126 [randomization], b. chronologic distribution ["first come, first serve"], c. legal criteria [laws
127 that specify how a physician should decide in a particular circumstance], d. ethics committees
128 [on-site counselling of the physicians by an interdisciplinary team], e. decision committees
129 [the decision is made by an independent team remote from the treatment location], f. a
130 point-system similar to what is used for organ transplantation. Finally, the participants were
131 queried on their age, sex, religious beliefs, and whether they were working in a medical
132 profession.

133 Data were stored anonymously. The characteristics of our sample such as mean age, gender,
134 religion and proportion of health care professional were compared to those of the general
135 population (Statistisches Bundesamt[10]). Results of the scale values from 0 to 100 were
136 presented as mean and 95% confidence interval (CI). In order to compare characteristics of
137 the groups of participants according to the decisions met (Patient A, Patient B, or draw lot)
138 we employed an analysis of variance (ANOVA) for comparing the mean age of participants
139 and a binomial test for categorical variables such as gender, religion and health care
140 profession.

141

142 **RESULTS**

143 **Recall and demographic data**

144 The social media campaign was launched on March 30, 2020. From April 1 to 12, 2020, the
 145 online survey was clicked a total of 3438 times. Overall, 1626 participants completed the
 146 entire survey (47%). Only complete surveys were included in this analysis.

147 Mean age of the participants was 40 years (standard deviation 14 years, median 39 years,
 148 range 12 to 80 years (table 1). Most participants were female (n=984, 61%), 623 were male
 149 and 4 considered themselves diverse, while 15 elected not to reveal their gender. A total of
 150 645 (40%) worked in a medical or health profession.

151

152

153 **Table 1:** Demographics of the respondents compared to the German general population
 154 (Reference [10] except where noted). Respondents tended to be more females and slightly
 155 younger than the general population. Also, healthcare professionals were overrepresented in
 156 our collective.

Collective (n)	Gender (n [%])	Age (years)	Religion			Healthcare profession (%)
			Protestant (n, [%])	Catholic (n, [%])	Atheist (n, [%])	
Respondents study (1626)	Female 984 [61%] Male 623 [38%] Diverse 4 [<1%]	Mean 40 Median 39 Range 12 to 80	446 [29%]	432 [28%]	318 [21%]	645 [40%]
General population (83.2m)	Female 42.1m [51%] Male 41.0m [49%] Diverse 150 [<1%] [18]	Mean 44 Median 47 Range 0 - 113	21.1m [25%]	23.0m [28%]	34m - 40m [41-49%] [19]	5.7m [13%] (of 44.8m employed)

157 Abbreviations: m - million

158

159

160 The distribution of religious beliefs is also depicted in table 1. Most commonly participants
 161 were of protestant Christian faith (n=446 [29.2%]), and catholic Christian faith (n=432
 162 [28.3%]), followed by atheists-agnostics (n=318 [20.8%]), and those that elected not to give
 163 any specifics regarding their religious denomination (n=247 [16.2%]). Less commonly
 164 represented were other Christian faith (n=67 [4.4%]), Islam (n=13 [0.9%]), Judaism (n=4
 165 [0.3%]) and one Hindu person.

166

167 **Rationing decisions according to patient characteristics**

168 Figure 1 illustrates the triage decisions. A majority of participants decided to provide the
 169 ventilator to the younger patient, the patient without co-morbidities, the patient with explicit
 170 consent, and the mother taking care of 4 children. The majority of participants elected to

171 draw lots when *insurance status, asylum status/nationality, and social status* was in question.
172 Nearly equal distribution for patient A, patient B and drawing lots was found for the criteria
173 *chance of treatment success/prognosis*.

174

175 **Opinions on triage criteria**

176 The relative weighting of the respective concrete triage criteria are found in figure 2. The
177 participants scored *chance of treatment success/prognosis* as the most important criterion for
178 rationing life-saving resources (mean score 77.8 [95%CI 76.7-78.8]). According to the
179 participants' opinions, *behavior-associated co-morbidities* (62.1 [95%CI 60.7-63.5]) should be
180 as much of a criterion against receiving a scarce lifesaving therapy as *responsibility for others*
181 should be a criterion in favor of receiving the therapy (62.1 [95%CI 60.8-63.6]). Also,
182 participants generally favored younger over older patients (59.8 [95%CI 58.7-60.9]). On the
183 other hand, according to the participants, *insurance status* (5.9 [95%CI 5.2-6.7]), *asylum*
184 *status/nationality* (19.1 [95%CI 17.8-20.4]), as well as *social status* (24.8 [95%CI 23.4-26.2])
185 should not play a major role. *Fateful co-morbidities* (49.1 [95%CI 47.7-50.6]), *healthcare*
186 *profession* (43.6 [95%CI 42.1-45.1]) and *explicit consent for intensive care* (52.6 [95%CI 51.1-
187 54.1]) scored somewhat in the middle.

188

189 **Opinions on decision modalities**

190 The participants viewed *ethics committees* that provide on-site interdisciplinary guidance to
191 practicing physicians as the most helpful modality to make triage decisions (75.5 [95%CI
192 74.3-76.7]), followed by *point systems* similar to what is established for the distribution
193 process in organ transplantation (68.5 [95%CI 67.3-69.7]). Triaging according to *temporal*
194 *sequence* of presentation (27.3 [95%CI 26.1-28.5]) and *laws* (34.4 [95%CI 33.1-35.7]) were
195 viewed as less helpful (figure 2). The scores regarding *drawing lots* (41.4 [95%CI 40.2-42.6])
196 and *decision committees* (50.5 [95%CI 49.0-52.0]) were scored in the neutral middle.

197

198 **Demographics**

199 Table 2 shows the associations of demographic factors with the responses. Older participants
200 preferred drawing lots when the triage was based on *age*. Women preferred drawing lots for
201 *fateful co-morbidities, healthcare profession*, as well as for *asylum status/nationality* and *social*
202 *status*. Atheists-agnostics less often chose treating the patient with an *unfavorable prognosis*
203 than participants of religious faiths. Working in healthcare almost always influenced the
204 decision, except for the criteria *social status* and *healthcare profession*.

205

206

207 **Table 2:** Overview of the responses according to age, gender, religious denomination, and
 208 working in a healthcare profession. Discrepancies to 100 are due to rounding. Significant
 209 differences are marked in red (regarding healthcare profession, red marks difference to those
 210 not working versus working in healthcare).

age	decision	n, [%]	mean age (years, [95%CI])	female gender (n, [%])	Religion			Healthcare profession: No (n, [%])
					protestant (n, [%])	catholic (n, [%])	atheist (n, [%])	
1.	Patient A	1500 [92%]	40 [39-40]	911 [56%]	416 [35%]	402 [33%]	299 [25%]	872 [54%]
	Patient B	37 [2%]	38 [34-43]	23 [1%]	9 [1%]	7 [1%]	8 [1%]	27 [2%]
	Draw lots	88 [5%]	46 [44-49]	50 [3%]	21 [2%]	23 [2%]	18 [2%]	67 [4%]
2.	Patient A	259 [16%]	40 [38-41]	153 [9%]	58 [5%]	71 [6%]	49 [4%]	161 [10%]
	Patient B	135 [8%]	37 [35-39]	65 [4%]	37 [3%]	31 [3%]	34 [3%]	93 [6%]
	Draw lots	1231 [76%]	40 [40-41]	767 [47%]	351 [29%]	330 [27%]	242 [20%]	712 [44%]
3.	Patient A	183 [11%]	40 [38-42]	106 [7%]	51 [4%]	39 [3%]	35 [3%]	127 [8%]
	Patient B	1044 [64%]	40 [39-41]	622 [38%]	280 [23%]	282 [23%]	217 [18%]	554 [34%]
	Draw lots	398 [24%]	40 [39-42]	256 [16%]	115 [10%]	111 [9%]	73 [6%]	285 [18%]
4.	Patient A	1427 [88%]	40 [39-41]	860 [53%]	394 [33%]	375 [31%]	290 [24%]	820 [51%]
	Patient B	31 [2%]	42 [37-48]	13 [1%]	9 [1%]	8 [1%]	4 [0%]	19 [1%]
	Draw lots	167 [10%]	39 [37-41]	111 [7%]	43 [4%]	49 [4%]	31 [3%]	127 [8%]
5.	Patient A	54 [3%]	41 [37-45]	21 [1%]	13 [1%]	14 [1%]	13 [1%]	33 [2%]
	Patient B	754 [46%]	39 [38-40]	425 [26%]	193 [16%]	206 [17%]	166 [14%]	454 [28%]
	Draw lots	817 [50%]	41 [40-42]	538 [33%]	240 [20%]	212 [18%]	146 [12%]	279 [30%]
6.	Patient A	514 [32%]	41 [39-42]	296 [18%]	135 [11%]	132 [11%]	87 [7%]	340 [21%]
	Patient B	108 [7%]	37 [34-40]	55 [3%]	26 [2%]	26 [2%]	32 [3%]	55 [3%]
	Draw lots	1003 [62%]	40 [39-41]	633 [39%]	285 [24%]	274 [23%]	206 [17%]	571 [35%]
7.	Patient A	501 [31%]	40 [39-42]	265 [16%]	138 [11%]	132 [11%]	104 [9%]	279 [17%]
	Patient B	131 [8%]	42 [39-44]	77 [5%]	30 [2%]	29 [2%]	21 [2%]	88 [5%]
	Draw lots	993 [61%]	39 [39-40]	642 [40%]	278 [23%]	271 [23%]	200 [17%]	599 [37%]
8.	Patient A	476 [29%]	39 [38-41]	279 [17%]	126 [10%]	150 [12%]	76 [6%]	277 [17%]
	Patient B	606 [37%]	39 [38-40]	361 [22%]	167 [14%]	154 [13%]	143 [12%]	343 [21%]
	Draw lots	543 [33%]	41 [40-43]	344 [21%]	153 [13%]	128 [11%]	106 [9%]	346 [21%]
9.	Patient A	24 [1%]	39 [33-45]	12 [1%]	6 [1%]	8 [1%]	9 [1%]	17 [1%]
	Patient B	989 [61%]	41 [40-42]	568 [35%]	277 [23%]	254 [21%]	189 [16%]	619 [38%]
	Draw lots	612 [38%]	39 [38-40]	404 [25%]	163 [14%]	170 [14%]	127 [11%]	330 [20%]
10.	Patient A	26 [2%]	41 [34-47]	9 [1%]	4 [0%]	8 [1%]	8 [1%]	16 [1%]
	Patient B	1202 [74%]	40 [40-41]	706 [43%]	344 [29%]	326 [27%]	225 [19%]	743 [46%]
	Draw lots	397 [24%]	39 [38-40]	269 [17%]	98 [8%]	98 [8%]	92 [8%]	207 [13%]

211

212

213 **Decision certainty**

214 All participants together were more insecure about their decisions regarding age and
 215 *behavior-associated co-morbidities* in comparison to other factors (table 3). Female
 216 participants were generally more secure about their decisions than males. Atheists/agnostics
 217 were generally less secure about their decisions than protestant or catholic Christians.

218

219

220

221

222

223 **Table 3:** Feeling of security about the decision according to participant characteristics (scale
224 from 0 to 100). Statistical significant values marked in red.

case	mean	95% CI
1. age	38	36-39
2. insurance status	46	44-48
3. fateful co-morbidities	45	44-46
4. behavior-associated co-morbidities	37	35-38
5. healthcare profession	48	46-49
6. asylum status - nationality	45	43-46
7. social status	45	44-47
8. chance of treatment success - prognosis	42	41-44
9. consent	46	45-48
10. responsibility for others	41	40-43
male	41	40-43
female	45	44-46
diverse	54	12-97
healthcare profession: yes	44	42-45
healthcare profession: no	43	42-44
protestant Christian	45	43-47
catholic Christian	45	44-47
atheist-agnostic	40	38-42
other	41	39-43

225

226

227

228 **DISCUSSION**

229 To our knowledge, this is the first empirical survey study on triage attitudes of a cross-
230 sectional population sample using social media distribution. This study shows that using this
231 methodology, a relatively large sample of participants can be recruited in a short amount of
232 time, thus promoting participatory processes so essential in democratic societies, particularly
233 in the context of an ongoing crisis. This study gives insight into opinions and attitudes of a
234 select sample of the German population on rationing life-saving therapies during the
235 European peak of the corona-pandemic. It seems noteworthy, that during this peak, the
236 rationing of scarce resources and triage was highly present in German (mass-) media,
237 particularly with reference to the devastating situation in Northern Italy, parts of France,
238 Spain, and most currently, hot-spots in the United States, where physicians were suddenly
239 put in charge of what figuratively could be described as *a Titanic with not enough life-boats*.
240 This led to a situation in which most Germans were at least confronted with – if not interested
241 in – the concept of triage which they may have never heard of before. This was also one of
242 the reasons for addressing the issue at the first European peak of the pandemic and sending
243 out the questionnaire in a timely manner, using the window of opportunity to generate
244 knowledge about values and beliefs in the general population to avoid the implementation
245 of morally counterintuitive or socially unacceptable procedures in the process of preparing for
246 the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

247 The word triage etymologically stems from the French verb *trier*, which means to sort or
248 select. The principle of categorizing injured soldiers on the battleground according to their
249 treatability was developed by the Napoleonic military physician Baron Dominique-Jean Larrey
250 (1766-1842).[11] Larrey also invented the so-called *ambulances volantes*, with which injured
251 soldiers could be transported rapidly to the field lazaret. Once there, they were triaged
252 according to acuity and prognosis, and received tailored treatment. The COVID-19 crisis has
253 brought the concept of triaging scarce healthcare resources into the public discourse.[12]

254 Triage decisions are usually made according to utilitarian principles, so according to how the
255 scarce resources must be distributed to afford most beneficence for the greatest number of
256 patients. Superficially, this translates into the goal of simply saving the highest number of
257 lives. However, upon closer examination, it becomes more complex. Should a young person
258 be treated the same as a 93 year old? From a utilitarian perspective, one could argue that by
259 favoring the younger patient, more life-years are saved. Should a patient in a vegetative state
260 without a prospect of improvement receive the same chance of survival as a healthy
261 individual who is mentally normal? With other words, in a difficult triage situation, should
262 really every human life be valued and treated equally? The German ethics council demands
263 that egalitarian principles should be followed, based on the dignity of every human
264 person.[13] What appears obvious on first glance becomes challenging and counterintuitive
265 in reality. Consequently, one can hardly blame physicians working in SARS-CoV-2 hotspots
266 for including expected life-years and quality of life in their ad-hoc decisions of distributing
267 lifesaving resources. Some authorities actually explicitly demand taking these factors into

268 account.[14] From a socioeconomic standpoint, it may also be desirable for a society to
269 prefer younger, more active and fertile individuals in the triage of lifesaving measures. In this
270 sense, the call for "women and children first" may as well be regarded as a - possibly cynical -
271 neoliberal attempt of pushing an otherwise unacceptable construct of human economic
272 value.

273 On engaging deeper with this subject, one inevitably encounters John Rawls' contractual
274 approach,[15] in which the members of a society agree upon fair, universal rules behind an
275 imaginary veil of ignorance. In our case, these rules pertain to the criteria which should be
276 applied for triage in the event of a disaster such as the COVID-19 pandemic. The model is
277 based on the premise that nobody knows which position one would occupy in such a
278 situation. One could be anybody, the infant or the elderly individual, the rich or the poor, the
279 smoker or the health fanatic. This study tries to emulate such a paradigm by presenting the
280 different scenarios and allowing the participant to decide from an outside, noninvolved
281 standpoint.

282 Nonetheless, it needs to be stressed that triage criteria should not be considered universal in
283 the way it is usually understood in ethics, but varying according to the moral principles and
284 priorities of a given society. While they must be adapted to a certain situation, this should not
285 lead to complete moral relativism that is a fully fledged particularism, which may also be
286 found as an argumentative position in ethical debates, particularly in very diverse societies.
287 To facilitate a more pragmatic decision-making in the realm of clinical ethics, the results of
288 this study must be viewed in light of basic, universal, and associative norms embedded in a
289 larger framework of ethical principles, human dignity, and human rights in the sense of
290 integrative particularisms.

291 Another aspect is how the triage should be conducted, what modality should be used. In the
292 acute phase of a disaster, patients are often treated by chronologic sequence. Patients who
293 arrive to the hospital earlier are treated first. As long as resources are available for all, this
294 approach is fair. Once the available capacity is surpassed, however, this distribution becomes
295 arbitrary and inherently unfair. Drawing lots provides every patient with the same chance of
296 receiving therapy, however, this approach is only legitimate in patients presenting under the
297 same circumstances and with the same prognosis, a prerequisite that is hardly imaginable in
298 clinical practice. Acting upon set laws predetermined by the legislative alone would provide
299 legal security, but strongly encroach on individual and situational treatment decisions. Expert
300 panels that decide upon treatment allocation remotely have been criticized polemically as
301 "death panels" in the context of the implementation of the Affordable Care Act in the United
302 States.[16] In most western countries, ethics committees in the form of interdisciplinary
303 advisory teams are available to consult on and solve complex triage dilemmas, while
304 preserving autonomy of the patient and treating physicians.

305 The participants of this study most vehemently based their triage decisions on prognosis, age
306 and responsibility for others. They also regarded behavior-associated co-morbidities as a

307 negative criterion for receiving therapy. On the other hand, an overwhelming majority
308 rejected insurance, social, and asylum status as factors in the triage process.

309 Concerning the triage modality, most were in favor of ethics committees and a point system.
310 These are already commonplace in modern healthcare culture, as well as organ transplant
311 systems. Since healthcare professionals were relatively overrepresented in the study sample,
312 the responses can be interpreted as an affirmation of the existing triage mechanisms.

313 An additional interesting finding of our study is the influence of demographics. Older
314 participants did not universally favor the older imaginary patients, but were more likely to
315 draw lots. Women tended to employ randomization in questions of status more frequently,
316 and overall seemed surer about their decision than men. Christians also expressed more
317 certainty about their decisions than atheists/agnostics. This may be the result of an
318 internalized religious moral framework that could help making triage decisions. The sample
319 size of the other religions was too small to draw conclusions.

320 Since the beginning of the COVID-19 spread, several associations have published guidelines
321 on triage. One of these was the German Interdisciplinary Association for Intensive Care and
322 Emergency Medicine (Deutschen Interdisziplinären Vereinigung für Intensiv- und
323 Notfallmedizin, DIVI).[17] In these guidelines, the authors focus on the role of prognosis and
324 consent of the patient and postulate that triage decisions should be made in consensus by
325 the individuals involved in care. Aborting treatment of one patient in the interest of another
326 is not admissible because of the German constitution, which highlights the dignity of every
327 individual as equal. Also, prioritizing solely by age is also unacceptable. Other concrete
328 criteria are not mentioned in this publication.

329 Our study provides an initial impulse to substantiate triage criteria in the context of the
330 COVID-19 pandemic. By using case-based scenarios, we tried to include an emotional
331 component in the decision process, beyond the participants' abstract views on triage criteria.

332 However, it also has several limitations. The most obvious one is the fact that an online
333 survey based on recruitment through social media does not necessarily confer a
334 representative sample of society in general. In addition, those working in healthcare seemed
335 overrepresented. We cannot make any statements regarding recall, since the denominator of
336 how many people actually were reached is lacking. What we have shown, however, is that a
337 large group of people can be recruited through an online survey in a very short time, and
338 that the interest was high enough so that almost half of those that clicked the link also
339 completed the survey in whole. We interpret this finding as a general interest in the subject
340 of triage, and a willingness to participate in the public discourse around the factors that
341 should play a role. In the future, more precise and representative measurements may be
342 obtained by using more elaborate distribution channels, focus groups, and more detailed
343 demographic information.

344 Also, one may question whether the general public should be included in the discussion
345 about triage criteria or not. While some may argue that categorical principles interpreted by
346 experts in the relevant fields should receive priority, we strongly believe that it is appropriate
347 and necessary in a democratic society to develop such criteria in a societal discourse and to
348 facilitate participatory processes. In this regard, this study is also a small pilot test case for the
349 implementation of such participation. Since a large part of this public exchange currently
350 takes place on social media, we found it reasonable to evaluate whether these new
351 technologies can be harnessed to foster a culture of participation and inclusion, even when
352 the subject matter are complex ethical decisions. This study also shows that something as
353 abstract as moral attitudes involved in medical triage can be quantified in an empirical study.

354 We suggest that the findings of this study are used as a backdrop for a broader public
355 debriefing on triage criteria after the COVID-19 pandemic subsides. This should include a
356 push to establish morally acceptable triage criteria and algorithms for future disasters and
357 pandemics.

358

359 **CONCLUSION**

360 This study generated a snapshot of the attitudes of a sample of German-speaking
361 participants regarding criteria and modalities for the allocation of life-saving, limited
362 resources during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic. According to the participants,
363 prognosis, responsibility towards others, the absence of behavior-associated co-morbidities,
364 along with younger age should be criteria for allocation of scarce ventilators. Insurance
365 status, social status, as well as nationality and asylum status should not play a relevant role.
366 Ethics-committees and a point system similar to what is used for organ transplantation were
367 deemed potentially helpful in triage decision making. The findings and results of this study
368 may be useful in creating future surveys addressed at a broader public. Similar but refined
369 methods may be useful to expand future triage-algorithms by a dimension of societal
370 consensus.


371

372

373 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

374

375 **Figure 1:** Participants' decisions on the case scenarios. The paired characteristics of the
376 imaginary patients A versus B comprise 1. young/old, 2. public/private insurance, 3. with or
377 without fateful co-morbidities, 4. with or without behavior-associated co-morbidities, 5.
378 working or not working/working in healthcare, 6. local nationality/asylum seeker, 7. high/low
379 social status, 8. unfavorable/favorable prognosis, 9. consent given/lacking, 10. single
380 household/mother of 4 children.




381

382

383

384 **Figure 2:** Opinions of the participants regarding the weighting of the respective triage
385 criteria (a) and triage modalities (b). Participants regarded triage by prognosis as the most
386 appropriate criterion, followed by behavior-associated co-morbidities and responsibility for
387 others, as well as age (a). Most participants determined ethics committees and a point-
388 system similar to that used in organ transplantation to be the most appropriate triage
389 modalities (b). (ns: non-significant, *: $p < 0.05$).



390

391

392

393 **Contributors**

394 Oliver J. Muensterer: Conception of the study; study design; creation of the online survey;
395 data collection and processing; creating figures and tables; drafting and editing of the
396 manuscript.

397 Emilio A. Gianicolo: Data processing; statistical analysis; editing tables; review and editing of
398 manuscript.

399 Norbert W. Paul: Mentoring and overseeing the master thesis; conception of the study; study
400 design; co-drafting, review and editing of the manuscript.

401

402 **Funding**

403 The work of NWP regarding concepts of rationing was partly funded through the DFG-grant
404 "Graduierertenkolleg 2015/2", Research Training Group "Life Sciences – Life Writing". Other
405 work is based on intramural funding.

406

407 **Competing interests**

408 None declared.

409

410 **Patient consent for publication**

411 Not required. According to state law, institutional review board approval was waived because
412 no patient data was included in the study. Participation in the online study was voluntary and
413 anonymous. No identifiable information was collected or stored.

414

415 **Acknowledgements**

416 Thanks to Grigorios Pilidis and Diana Walz for helping with the online survey on Lime. Thanks
417 to the many participants in the survey that made this study possible.

418

419 **Data sharing Statement**

420 All data relevant to the study is available upon reasonable request from the corresponding
421 author.

422 REFERENCES

- 423 1 Rosenbaum L. Facing Covid-19 in Italy - Ethics, Logistics, and Therapeutics on the
424 Epidemic's Front Line. *N Engl J Med* 2020. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp2005492. PMID: 32187459
- 425 2 Truog RD, Mitchell C, Daley GQ. The Toughest Triage - Allocating Ventilators in a Pandemic.
426 *N Engl J Med* 2020. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp2005689. PMID: 32202721
- 427 3 Remuzzi A, Remuzzi G: Covid-19 and Italy: what next? *Lancet* 2020:S0140-6736(20)30627-9
- 428 4 Nakao H, Ukai I, Kotani J. A review of the history of the origin of triage from a disaster
429 medicine perspective. *Acute Med Surg* 2017;4:379–84
- 430 5 Simon R, Teperman S. The World Trade Center Attack: Lessons for disaster management.
431 *Crit Care* 2001;5:318–20
- 432 6 Lübbe, Weyma: Corona Triage: A Commentary on the Triage Recommendations by Italian
433 SIAARTI Medicals Regarding the Corona Crisis, VerfBlog, 2020/3/16,
434 <https://verfassungsblog.de/corona-triage-2/>, DOI: [https://doi.org/10.17176/20200317-](https://doi.org/10.17176/20200317-002812-0)
435 002812-0 (accessed 27 July 2020)
- 436 7 Zimmermann T. Ärzte in Zeiten von Corona. Wer stirbt zuerst? Legal Tribune Online.
437 [https://www.lto.de/recht/hintergruende/h/corona-triage-tod-strafrecht-sterben-](https://www.lto.de/recht/hintergruende/h/corona-triage-tod-strafrecht-sterben-krankenhaus-entscheidung-auswahl/)
438 [krankenhaus-entscheidung-auswahl/](https://www.lto.de/recht/hintergruende/h/corona-triage-tod-strafrecht-sterben-krankenhaus-entscheidung-auswahl/) (accessed 27 July 2020)
- 439 8 Hübner J, Schewe DM, Katalinic A, et al. Rechtsfragen der Ressourcenzuteilung in der
440 COVID-19-Pandemie – Zwischen Utilitarismus und Lebenswertindifferenz [Legal Issues of
441 Resource Allocation in the COVID-19 Pandemic - Between Utilitarianism and Life Value
442 Indifference] *Dtsch Med Wochenschr* 2020;145:687–92
- 443 9 Mannelli C. Whose life to save? Scarce resources allocation in the COVID-19 outbreak. *J*
444 *Med Ethics* 2020;46:364-6
- 445 10 Statistisches Bundesamt https://www.destatis.de/DE/Home/_inhalt.html (accessed 27 July
446 2020)
- 447 11 Brewer LA 3rd. Baron Dominique Jean Larrey (1766-1842). Father of modern military
448 surgery, innovater, humanist. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1986;92:1096-8
- 449 12 Schwartz K. Triage in Deutschland - Wer wird beatmet? Wer nicht?
450 www.tagesschau.de/inland/corona-triage-intensivmedizin-101.html (accessed 21 July 2020)
- 451 13 German Ethics Council. Deutscher Ethikrat. Solidarity and Responsibility during the
452 Coronavirus Crisis. [https://www.ethikrat.org/fileadmin/Publikationen/Ad-hoc-](https://www.ethikrat.org/fileadmin/Publikationen/Ad-hoc-Empfehlungen/englisch/recommendation-coronavirus-crisis.pdf)
453 [Empfehlungen/englisch/recommendation-coronavirus-crisis.pdf](https://www.ethikrat.org/fileadmin/Publikationen/Ad-hoc-Empfehlungen/englisch/recommendation-coronavirus-crisis.pdf) (accessed 27 July 2020)
- 454 14 Persad G, Wertheimer A, Emanuel EJ. Principles for allocation of scarce medical
455 interventions. *Lancet* 2009;373:423–31

- 456 15 Rawls J. A Theory of Justice. Belknap Press, 1971; ISBN 978-0-674-00078-0
- 457 16 Nyhan B. Why the "Death Panel" Myth Wouldn't Die: Misinformation in the Health Care
458 Reform Debate. The Forum, Volume 8, Issue 1;2010 Article 5 The politics of health care
459 reform. Berkeley Electronic Press. [www.dartmouth.edu/~nyhan/health-care-](http://www.dartmouth.edu/~nyhan/health-care-misinformation.pdf)
460 [misinformation.pdf](http://www.dartmouth.edu/~nyhan/health-care-misinformation.pdf) (accessed 27 July 2020)
- 461 17 DIVI (Deutsche Interdisziplinäre Vereinigung für Intensiv- und Notfallmedizin).
462 Entscheidungen über die Zuteilung von Ressourcen in der Notfall- und der Intensivmedizin
463 im Kontext der COVID-19-Pandemie. Klinisch-ethische Empfehlungen.
464 [https://www.divi.de/aktuelle-meldungen-intensivmedizin/covid-19-klinisch-ethische-](https://www.divi.de/aktuelle-meldungen-intensivmedizin/covid-19-klinisch-ethische-empfehlungen-zur-entscheidung-ueber-die-zuteilung-von-ressourcen-veroeffentlicht)
465 [empfehlungen-zur-entscheidung-ueber-die-zuteilung-von-ressourcen-veroeffentlicht](https://www.divi.de/aktuelle-meldungen-intensivmedizin/covid-19-klinisch-ethische-empfehlungen-zur-entscheidung-ueber-die-zuteilung-von-ressourcen-veroeffentlicht)
466 (accessed 27 July 2020)
- 467 18 Deutsches Ärzteblatt: Zahl der Menschen mit drittem Geschlecht geringer als
468 angenommen. [https://www.aerzteblatt.de/nachrichten/102938/Zahl-der-Menschen-mit-](https://www.aerzteblatt.de/nachrichten/102938/Zahl-der-Menschen-mit-drittem-Geschlecht-geringer-als-angenommen)
469 [drittem-Geschlecht-geringer-als-angenommen](https://www.aerzteblatt.de/nachrichten/102938/Zahl-der-Menschen-mit-drittem-Geschlecht-geringer-als-angenommen) (accessed 27 July 2020)
- 470 19 Zuckerman P. „Atheism, contemporary numbers and patterns“, in: "The Cambridge
471 Companion to Atheism", edited by Michael Martin, New York: Cambridge University Press,
472 2007,47–65
- 473

474 **Appendix A: Online-survey**

475 **(translated from German, the original survey in German available upon request)**

476 **Survey** **Entry requested by participant marked in yellow**

477 **Introduction**

478 Imagine you are working as a physician in an intensive care unit of a hospital. In the following
479 imaginary scenarios, a situation is described in which you will have to take a difficult decision.

480 You have two very ill COVID-19 patients who only have a chance of survival if they receive
481 mechanical ventilation (a respirator). You only have one ventilator machine available. You must
482 therefore make a decision on who receives the ventilator. You can also draw lots, allowing chance to
483 decide who receives the ventilator. In that case, both patients have equal chances.

484 How would you decide? How sure are you about your decision? How appropriate do you think the
485 particular characteristic is to determine who receives the ventilator?

486 This survey includes 10 of these scenarios. At the end of the survey, you will be asked a few
487 questions regarding your age, gender, religious beliefs, and whether you work in healthcare. In total,
488 the survey will take around 20 to 30 minutes.

489 By clicking *Continue* below you consent to participating in this study.

490 **Continue**

491

492

1. Case number 1

Patient A	Patient B
A 22 year old, otherwise healthy student was infected with the new coronavirus in Austria during a skiing trip. He developed a severe pneumonia and requires mechanical ventilation to survive.	An 87 year old was admitted from an old-age-home where a corona-positive nurse was working. He started coughing severely and developed increasing shortness of breath. He will die if he is not ventilated mechanically.

493

494 a) Who would you make the ventilator available to?

495 Patient A

496 Patient B

497 I would draw lots

498

499 b) How sure are you about your decision? Please mark the scale accordingly

500 0 _____ 100

501 very unsure neither sure nor unsure very sure

502

503 In your opinion, how much should **age** play a role in determining who receives the ventilator
504 (lifesaving therapy)?

505 0 _____ 100

506 not at all somewhat completely

507

508 d) Commentary to this scenario (voluntary):

509 _____ (free text)

510

511

512 **2. Case number 2**

Patient A	Patient B
A 54 year old woman who is insured in the public system tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 without a history of sick contact. Her clinical condition markedly deteriorated over the last 24 hours, so that she requires mechanical ventilation in order to have a chance of survival.	A 52 year old, female patient with private health insurance most likely was infected at work by a colleague who also has COVID-19. She developed pneumonia, is in a life-threatening condition and therefore requires mechanical ventilation.

513

514 a) Who would you make the ventilator available to?

515 Patient A

516 Patient B

517 I would draw lots

518

519 b) How sure are you about your decision? Please mark the scale accordingly

520 0 _____ 100

521 very unsure

neither sure nor unsure

very sure

522

523 In your opinion, how much should **insurance status** play a role in determining who receives the
524 ventilator (lifesaving therapy)?

525 0 _____ 100

526 not at all

somewhat

completely

527

528 d) Commentary to this scenario (voluntary):

529 _____ (free text)

530

531

532 **3. Case number 3**

Patient A	Patient B
A 62 year old who has been in early retirement for the last 15 years receives regular dialysis because of a congenital kidney condition. He was infected with the new coronavirus 10 days ago and is deadly ill due to pneumonia. He would most likely die soon without mechanical ventilation.	An otherwise healthy 65 year old without significant other health issues caught COVID-19 at a tennis club meeting. He became so ill over the last 7 days that the only way to save him would be mechanical ventilation.

533

534 a) Who would you make the ventilator available to?

535 Patient A

536 Patient B

537 I would draw lots

538

539 b) How sure are you about your decision? Please mark the scale accordingly

540 0 _____ 100

541 very unsure neither sure nor unsure very sure

542

543 In your opinion, how much should **fateful co-morbidities** play a role in determining who receives the
544 ventilator (lifesaving therapy)?

545 0 _____ 100

546 not at all somewhat completely

547

548 d) Commentary to this scenario (voluntary):

549 _____ (free text)

550

651

652 **9. Case number 9**

Patient A	Patient B
<p>a 28 year old music student from another country is spending a semester in Germany through an exchange program. His history includes a suicide attempt 1 month ago. He recently contracted COVID-19 and has rapidly deteriorated, so that there was no chance of obtaining consent for intensive care. His family cannot be reached, but now requires urgent mechanical ventilation to survive.</p>	<p>A 32 year old engineer became deadly ill from an infection with SARS-CoV-2. He has signed the consent for intensive care. His family is present and asks that "everything possible be done for him". He has progressive respiratory failure and will not survive if he is not intubated and ventilated soon.</p>

653

654 a) Who would you make the ventilator available to?

655 Patient A

656 Patient B

657 I would draw lots

658

659 b) How sure are you about your decision? Please mark the scale accordingly

660 0 100

661 very unsure neither sure nor unsure very sure

662

663 In your opinion, how much should explicitly having given **consent** for the intensive care play a role in
 664 determining who receives the ventilator (lifesaving therapy)?

665 0 100

666 not at all somewhat completely

667

668 d) Commentary to this scenario (voluntary):

669 (free text)

670

735 12. Please give us some information about yourself (all entries are **voluntary**).

736 a) Age in years ___ years

737 b) Gender male/female/diverse

738 c) Religious denomination

739 catholic/protestant/other Christian/Muslim/Jew/Hindu/Budhist/Atheist-agnostic/ other _____

740 d) Healthcare profession (for example physician, therapist, nurse)? yes/no

741

742