

Scoping Review

Supporting decision-making on allocation of ICU beds and ventilators in pandemics

Magnolia Cardona, PhD, MBBS,^{1,2} Claudia C. Dobler MD, PhD,^{1,3,6} Eyzza Koreshe MPH, BSc,⁴ Daren K Heyland, MD, FRCPC,⁵ Rebecca Nguyen,⁶ Joan P.Y. Sim,⁶ Justin Clark, BA,¹ Alex Psirides MBBS, FCICM.⁷*

Affiliations

¹ Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare, Bond University Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia

² Gold Coast University Hospital, Southport, Queensland, Australia

³ Evidence-Based Practice Center, Robert D. and Patricia E. Kern Center for the Science of Health Care Delivery, Mayo Clinic, Minnesota, USA

⁴ Boden Institute, University of Sydney, NSW, Australia

⁵ Department of Critical Care Medicine, Queens University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada

⁶ The University of New South Wales, South Western Sydney Clinical School, NSW Australia

⁷ Intensive Care Unit, Wellington Regional Hospital, Wellington, New Zealand

Abstract

As the world struggles with the COVID-19 pandemic, health service demands have increased to a point where healthcare resources may prove inadequate to meet demand. Guidelines and tools on how to best allocate intensive care beds and ventilators developed during previous epidemics can assist clinicians and policy-makers to make consistent, objective and ethically sound decisions about resource allocation when healthcare rationing is inevitable. This scoping review of 62 published guidelines, triage protocols, consensus statements and prognostic tools from crisis and non-crisis situations sought to identify a multiplicity of objective factors to inform healthcare rationing of critical care and ventilator care. It also took ethical considerations into account. Prognostic indicators and other decision tools presented here can be combined to create locally-relevant triage algorithms for clinical services and policy makers deciding about allocation of ICU beds and ventilators during a pandemic. Community awareness of the triage protocol is recommended to build trust and alleviate anxiety among the public. This review provides a unique resource and is intended as a discussion starter for clinical services and policy makers to consider formalising an objective triage consensus document that fits the local context.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Keywords: intensive care; ventilator; COVID-19 pandemic; decision-making; healthcare rationing; triage; review.

Take-home message: An evidence-based catalogue of objective variables from 62 published resources tested in crisis and non-crisis situations can help clinicians make locally relevant triage decisions on ICU and ventilator allocation in inevitable COVID-19 health rationing.

Supporting decision-making on allocation of ICU beds and ventilators in pandemics

Background

The COVID-19 pandemic stretched hospital resources to their limits and beyond in Italy, Spain, England, France, Brazil and the United States [1]. Countries and cities that were not affected too badly initially may experience ongoing epidemic waves, and some countries are likely to reach maximum hospital capacity in the near future. A number of countries have faced a shortage of ventilators for COVID-19 patients due to pre-pandemic deficiency. There has been demand for additional care sites and health care to handle a surge in COVID-19 patients. Reported hospitalisation rates are age related, ranging from 0-1% (in people aged 29 years or younger) to 80% (in people aged 80+ years) [2]. Of hospitalised patients, 4.6 to 45.9% have required treatment in the ICU [2-4]. Of all those requiring critical care, 75%, 76% and 88% ended up receiving treatment on a ventilator in the UK, the USA and Italy respectively [5-7]. The length of stay in ICU for COVID-19 patients on ventilators has been longer than in non-crisis periods (median 10 days IQR between 8-14 days in Italy)[7] and median 18 days IQR 9-28 in USA) [8]. Over a quarter (26 to 38%) of those admitted to ICU have died [3,6,7], and overall, people older than 75 years have experienced the highest COVID-19 mortality rates (from 33.5% in UK, to 75.5% in France) [8,9].

ICUs have some capacity to respond to increased demand by surging ICU beds, repurposing hospital spaces, purchasing additional ventilators and hiring and/or training the health

workers needed to care for critically ill patients. However, with rapidly increasing and sustained demand such measures might be insufficient, and the need for resources may rapidly exceed capacity. In this situation, healthcare systems need to have evidence-based, equitable, and publicly defensible policies in place on how to ration potentially life-saving treatments [10,11]. Rules to guide allocation of life sustaining treatments will need to incorporate ethical considerations such as social justice, non-prejudice, prevention of preferential treatment of population subgroups, and be transparent to clinicians and the public to prevent moral distress and outrage.

While many health services have ICU admission policies in place for routine care, a recent survey of US services found vast heterogeneity in ventilator triage policies for COVID19. Policies were based (exclusively or in combination) on subjective perceptions of benefits to patients and medical need, ethical considerations, and objective clinical scoring systems [12]. A common gap in these recommendations is the lack of integration of patient values and treatment preferences [13].

We conducted a scoping review of publications that provide prognostic prediction tools or models, and/ or objective triage recommendations which can inform allocation of ICU beds and/or ventilators. The specific objectives were:

1. To identify criteria for ICU admission and ventilator allocation used in epidemic situations as well as during routine care
2. To identify prognostic tools used in patient care during and outside epidemic situations that can potentially enhance confidence in decision-making about resource allocation during the COVID-19 pandemic; and
3. To discuss applicability of these tools for ICU triage in future global emergencies

Methods

For this scoping review, we searched the databases Medline and Embase on 1st May 2020 for English language articles published since 1st January 2002 (the year in which a SARS outbreak emerged) [14]. Additionally, we manually searched institutional websites of professional intensive care societies, reference lists of systematic reviews, pandemic guidelines from World Health Organization and Centre for Disease Control, and consulted

with experts in the field (AP, CD, DH). Details of the full search strategy are shown in [Supplement 1, Table S1.1](#)

Inclusion criteria

We included studies that described patient characteristics and clinical or laboratory parameters/algorithms to facilitate healthcare triage (**I**). Settings included were hospital wards, emergency departments, and ICUs. To be eligible for inclusion, studies had to report either the accuracy of a prognostic tool (area under the receiver operating characteristics curve [AUROC], or sensitivity/specificity), the validity of a prognostic tool, or significant correlation between a prognostic tool and clinical outcomes (mortality or complication rates) using odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals (CI). Target populations (**P**) were adults or children presenting to hospital during pandemic or non-crisis periods. We included cohort studies, retrospective analyses with large sample sizes (>100 patients), case-control studies, position statements of clinical colleges or professional societies, and consensus documents or guidelines. Selected articles were classified as applicable during an epidemic or applicable to routine care (i.e non-crisis situations).

Exclusion criteria

We excluded pre-prints; recommendations based on i) subjective clinical judgments only; ii) test result cut-off points that were not validated or at least statistically significantly associated with clinical outcomes; iii) disease-specific scores (e.g. for blood cancers or traumatic brain injury); that were irrelevant to COVID-19; recommendations related to injury in mass casualties; modelling studies; studies with a small sample size (<100); conference abstracts with insufficient data on association/prediction performance; poor performing algorithms; publications in non-Western health systems; and reports with a focus on logistics, ethics of surge capacity.

Outcomes

Our outcomes of interest (**O**) were performance of algorithms or individual clinical or laboratory factors in predicting patient outcomes, such as in-hospital, 30-day, 90-day, or 1-year mortality. Comparators (**C**) for the validation studies were any other algorithm or

laboratory test used by authors, or confirmation of outcomes at discharge or follow-up as specified.

Data extraction and synthesis

Dyads of reviewers (MC, EK, RN, JS), independently extracted the following study information using a standardized data extraction sheet: author, year of publication, study country, publication type, characteristics of target population disease-specific information), whether pandemic or routine care, type of triage decision (for admission to ICU, discharge from ICU), decision algorithms, and characteristics of risk prediction tools. All discrepancies were discussed within the dyads until consensus was achieved. Algorithm components and variables were presented in tabular form according to source from crisis or non-crisis situation, and whether they were used in intensive care, emergency departments or hospital wards. No meta-analysis was attempted, as this was a scoping review.

Results

Sixty-two publications relating to 20 countries (eight studies covered multiple countries) met the eligibility criteria: Seven pandemic guidelines/consensus papers/frameworks,[11,15-20] Nine pandemic triage factors/decision algorithms, [8,21-28] and 46 algorithms, prognostic tools or guidelines for non-crisis care met our inclusion criteria: 19 for routine ICU care [29-47], 21 for routine emergency department care [48-68], and six for general ward care [47,69-73]. The screening process is illustrated in [Figure 1](#), and reasons for exclusion of studies are presented in [Supplement 1, Table S1.2](#).

<Figure 1. PRISMA diagram illustrating inclusions and exclusions> [about here](#)

The target age groups for the pandemic publications were predominantly adults of all ages admitted to ICU, whereas the routine care algorithms included patients in emergency departments or ICU, and three were exclusively for babies and children [32,34,72]. [Supplement 1, Table S1.3](#) summarises the target populations, study types, and context for pandemic situations, and [Table S1.4](#) shows the corresponding information for routine care.

Fourteen of the pandemic-related articles and 8 of the routine care papers included factors that applied to patients with pneumonia. Other conditions to which risk prediction tools/factors were applied included influenza, sepsis, acute injuries due to natural disasters in adults and children, exacerbation of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, chronic kidney disease and heart failure. Most of the pandemic-related publications suggested criteria for ICU admission, ICU discharge or ventilator allocation, although not all addressed all three questions.

Domains used for decision-making

A summary of references for recommendations to consider in the decision to escalate care, admit individuals to ICU, and allocate ventilators is presented in [Table 1](#). One domain for decision making included variables and scores to determine patients' need for higher-level care (column A) to patients who may not yet be in ICU, ventilated or receiving other organ support but may do so later (Table 1, column A). Another domain for decision-making included predictors for patients who stand to benefit from ICU care or mechanical ventilation the most and should be prioritised (Table 1, column B).

The Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score and its variants was the most widely used (or reported) for both ICU admission and discharge criteria, as well as to recommend ventilator allocation or removal.

Patients who stand to benefit the most from ICU admission typically suffer from a critically severe, treatable and potentially reversible deterioration of health. ICU treatment should also be consistent with the values and preferences of the patient [13,74]. When patients' are deteriorating despite ongoing ICU care, withdrawal of life-sustaining therapies, and transfer to ward and palliative care has to be considered. This process is known as 'reverse triage' [75] and variables to facilitate these decisions are listed in Table 1, column C. Withholding or withdrawing treatments must include discussions with the patient (if possible) and their family. Ideally during pandemic triage the possibility of future deterioration and need to discharge from ICU later should already be discussed on admission to ICU.

Multiple studies investigated predictors for mortality in the ensuing weeks and months after ED or ICU admission to inform decision-making, mostly in non-pandemic situations (Table 1, columns D and E). These prediction models can assist clinicians and patients in the decision-making about the appropriateness of ICU care by providing information about the expected recovery (or likely downward trajectory) following ICU admission and/or ventilator treatment [39,76,77].

Variables and prognostic factors used for decision-making in pandemic situations

Amongst the sixteen pandemic-related publications, several expert consensus documents outlined factors that inform the allocation of ICU care and ventilator treatment (Table 2). The usual criteria for requiring critical care interventions applied such as refractory hypoxaemia, respiratory acidosis, evidence of impending respiratory failure, shock, requiring, vasopressor or inotropic support, decreased urinary output, evidence of organ failure, and altered level of consciousness.

The SOFA, qSOFA, and mSOFA score cut-offs were used to either determine priority for ICU or ventilator access or removal from a ventilator and/or discharge from ICU in futile situations. Likewise, the AGILITIES score and Simple Triage Scoring (STSS) for adults, the Pediatric Logistic Organ Dysfunction 2 (PELOD) triage score, the COVID-19 clinical risk score, and the Community Assessment Tools (CATs) criteria for adults and children were used to prioritise ICU admission or recommend ICU discharge due to a lack of benefit.

Age was a variable in six of the 15 predictive approaches for pandemic situations [8,18,19,25,27,78]. Two studies outlined criteria for patients who do not require organ support or ICU because they are below the critical illness threshold [11,23].

Table 1. Evidence-based variables and scores for decision-making about allocation of ICU care and ventilators based on predicted outcomes (during pandemics and routine care)

Factors and scores for decision-making	A) Predicts need for increased care resources/ ICU care	B) High or intermediate priority for ICU and ventilator allocation based on potential benefit	C) Recommends Not for ICU or discharge from ICU or exclude from ventilator	D) Predicts in-hospital death	E) Predicts ICU discharge death or poor function 30, 90, 365 d
OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS					
Guidelines, Consensus		[16,18,20,23,79,80]	[11,15-19,79,80]		
Triage scores, reviews	[21]	[3,20,23,27-29,81]	[10,22,28,39,47,81]	[8,27]	[73,77]
SCORES / INDICES					
SOFA/qSOFA/mSOFA	[21,49]	[3,11,15,17,18,23]	[11,15,17,21-24]	[17,22,24,51]	[29]
ICU scoring: APACHE II, PIM2, PELOD, ProVent14, SAPS II, SMART-COP, SI, STSS, SMS-ICU	[21,37,40,47,56,58]	[10,36,45,46]	[39,45,46]	[30,33-36,38,41-45,47,56,58,62,82]	[31,40,41,58]
Other routine scores: ALT, EWS, CURB65, CriSTAL, HOTEL, IDSA/ATS, mBTS, MPM, NIVO, REMS, SCAP, SCS, TIMM, WPS	[37,47,54,56,58,59,62]		[47]	[53,55,57,71,72]	[37,50,53,54,58,60,61,65,69,71]
CLINICAL & LABORATORY VARIABLES					
Sepsis	[49]			[49,51]	[70]
Shock Index	[21,56]			[21,27,55,56]	
Hypotension or requires vasopressors	[37,49,54]		[39]	[38,51]	[69]
Abnormal respiratory rate, respiratory failure, Low SpO ₂ , or pneumonia	[21,37,54]	[19]	[10,47]	[27,47]	[37,58,69]
Arterial Lactate				[64,83,84]	[48,63]
High creatinine or end-stage renal disease			[39,67]	[38,67]	[48]
CLINICAL CONDITIONS, DEMOGRAPHICS					
GCS/altered mental state	[27,37,49,54]			[27,38,47]	[38,60,69]
Cardiac arrest or resuscitation		[16,17]		[38,67]	
End-stage organ failure		[19]			
Advanced malignancy		[17]		[33,38]	[65]
Frailty/aged care residency/prior admission/obesity		[19]		[47,52,68]	[60,65]
Physical functioning, quality of life					[32,77]
Age (life cycle)	[27,54]	[17-19]	[39]	[36,39,56,65]	[60,65,69]

ALT = Admission Laboratory Tests; APACHEII= Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation; ATS = Australasian Triage Scale; CriSTAL= Criteria for Screening and Triaging to Appropriate aLternative care; CURB65=Confusion, Urea, Respiration, Blood pressure age >65; EWS = Early Warning Score; GS = Goodacre Score; H1N1=Swine flu; HOTEL= Hypotension,

Oxygen saturation, low Temperature, ECG changes and Loss of independence Score; IDSA/ATS 2007 = Infectious Diseases Society of America/American Thoracic Society 2007 Pneumonia Guidelines; mBTS= modified British Thoracic Society rule; MPM=Mortality Probability Models; NIVO=Non-Invasive Ventilation Outcomes; N/R=Not reported; PELOD-2 = Pediatric Logistic Organ Dysfunction 2; ProVent14=Platelets, Requirement for vasopressor or dialysis after 14days of ventilation; REMS = Rapid Emergency Medicine Score; SAPS= Simplified Acute Physiology Score; SAPSII = Simplified Acute Physiology Score; SCS= Simple Clinical Score; SI= Shock Index; SMART-COP= Systolic BP, Multilobar involvement, Albumin, Respiration, Tachycardia, O₂ saturation, pH; SOFA= Sepsis-related Organ Failure Assessment; SMS-ICU= Simplified Mortality Score for ICU; STSS= Simple Triage Scoring System; TIMM = Triage Information Mortality Model; TTS = Track and Trigger System; WPS = Worthing Physiological Scoring System

Table2. Summary of consensus/taskforce/algorithm recommendations for rationing ICU care and ventilators during pandemics according to patient status and response to treatment

Highest priority for ventilator and ICU access

- Patients with initial SOFA \leq 11 who showed improvement (SOFA decreases) at 48 and 120-hour, and those with initial SOFA <8 with little (<3 points decrease) or no improvement in the previous 72 hours [20]
- SOFA score \leq 7 or single organ failure [23,28]
- Other more stringent criteria were SOFA <6, age 12-40 years, and absence of life limiting conditions.[18]
- Hypoxaemia (SpO₂ <90%) or impending respiratory failure [11,20] or SpO₂ <92% with increased respiratory rate/exhaustion[26]
- Clinical evidence of shock (Systolic Blood Pressure < 90mmHg) [11,20]

Intermediate priority for ICU or ventilator

- Patients with SOFA score 6-9, age 41-60 and minor comorbidities with small impact on long-term survival. [18]
- Patients with SOFA <8 with no improvement from initial assessment.[20]
- Patient with SOFA 8-11 if no patient in the high priority category requires bed [23]

Exclusion/removal from ventilator treatment in the face of resource scarcity

- Patients who had experienced an unwitnessed cardiac arrest, have terminal cancer, or irreversible organ failure [17]
- SOFA >12 in patients with severe comorbidities and high risk of death within 1 year including age \geq 75 years. [18]
- AGILITIES score >100 integrating current clinical parameters, medical and surgical history, treatments and tests administered in the previous 6 hours, and using threats to healthcare providers as criterion to deny access [19]
- Patients near immediate death despite aggressive therapy, and those with unwitnessed cardiac arrest or cardiac arrest unresponsive to standard interventions [16]

Exclusion from/discharge from ICU (too ill to benefit from ICU support)

- SOFA score of >11 combined with comorbidities and not likely to benefit [11,17,22]
- A clear indication of \geq 6 organ failures with a SOFA of 15, or severe chronic disease with short life expectancy (85+ years) [15]
- Unwitnessed cardiac arrest, metastatic cancer, end-stage organ failure [28]
- SOFA scores not improving after 48 hours in mechanically ventilated patients [24]

Table S2.1 in Supplement 2 lists specific details of some tools used for decision-making about ICU admission and ventilator allocation during pandemics along with their reported accuracy (AUROC, OR or sensitivity/specificity). Recommendations in patients who

warrant high priority access to ICU care but have a poor prognosis were ambiguous. The COVID-19 clinical risk score predicted either need for critical care, need for ventilator or the risk of in-hospital death for patients with COVID-19, based on age, abnormal chest radiography, haemoptysis, dyspnoea, unconsciousness and history of cancer [25]. Another triage tool also had composite outcomes for patients with a score of ≥ 3 (including age, respiratory rate, oxygen saturation, shock index and altered mental status) [27]. The CATs tool was based on 5 respiratory criteria and evidence of shock and altered level of consciousness to predict the need for mechanical ventilation or ICU admission or the risk of death but did not indicate when to set a threshold for choosing a care pathway [26].

Prognostic tools used in non-crisis situations

Our study also explored whether triage algorithms/factors used for ICU, emergency departments or in hospital wards in non-crisis situations ([Supplement 2, Table S2.2](#)), could add value to the above pandemic recommendations. The majority of these prognostic indicators were derived from large patient population studies and predicted in-hospital or post-discharge mortality. Only four indicators were based on expert consensus, of which three [29,49,51] used SOFA or qSOFA for predicting outcomes, while a ward-based rule to predict mortality used the CURB65 score [69]. The tools applied predominantly to adult patients in routine ICU care (18 studies) or patients being assessed in emergency departments (21 studies), with only a few (5 studies) used in routine ward care.

Unlike pandemic tools, which focus on acute organ failure, many routine care decision-making algorithms rely more on patient history of chronic illness [34,38,41,46,52,60,61,65,66,68], admission type (emergency, medical, elective surgery, non-trauma) [30,31,35,38,39,41,65], and age [38,39,46,54,57,59,60,62,65,68,70,71].

Triage algorithms, scores and tools used in non-crisis ICU care

Instruments for decision-making about ICU triage this category also included SOFA, and qSOFA, but a diverse collection was a: Simplified Mortality Score for the ICU (SMS-ICU), ProVent 14 score, Simplified Acute Physiology Score (SAPSS II, SAPS III), SMART –COP

score, Mortality Probability Models (MPM), and Acute Physiology and Chronic Evaluation (APACHE II, III) and for children the Revised Paediatric Index of Mortality and PELOD-2.

ICU-based algorithms relied predominantly on laboratory variables or acute treatments such as those for sepsis or respiratory failure [35,37,39,41-43,46] and two relied solely on a single biomarker cut-off: Secretoneurin [44] and Procalcitonin respectively [45]. Five of the 18 articles on routine care included algorithms to predict clinical deterioration with a need for ICU admission [36,37,40,46,49]. Only one article included a tool to predict the need for vasopressor treatment and respiratory support [37]. Two articles provided information on patients who are unlikely to benefit from (ongoing) ICU treatment [39,46].

Emergency Department algorithms used in non-crisis situations

Emergency department decision-making algorithms combined laboratory tests and clinical history or examination: Severe community acquired pneumonia score (SCAP), Infectious Diseases Society of America/American Thoracic Society IDSA/ATS), the Shock Index (SI), Mortality in Emergency Department Sepsis (MEDS) score, Simple Clinical Score (SCS), Emergency Severity Index (ESI), Triage Information Mortality model (TIMM), and Criteria for screening and triaging to appropriate alternative care (CriSTAL). Two studies predicted in-patient mortality based only on frailty syndrome [52,68], and six studies based mortality predictions purely on laboratory test results [48,50,63,64,66,67].

Six of the 21 studies among patients in the emergency department predicted the need for potential transfer to ICU based on clinical and laboratory variables [54,56,58,61,62,66]. The other studies predicted mortality at different time points. One study focused on decision-making about ICU admission in patients on chronic dialysis [67]. Two studies provided recommended a score cut-off for referral to palliative care [61,65].

Ward-based triage used in non-crisis situations

Five scoring systems predicted in-hospital and 30-day mortality among ward-based patients (Simple Clinical Score, HOTEL, CURB65, NIVO, and Mortality Predictive Model for Children (MPMC) based on a combination of clinical criteria and laboratory test results

[47,69-72]. One scoring system predicted the need for non-invasive ventilation in ward-based patients with COPD and was recommended for setting a ceiling of treatment [47].

Summary of variables and prognostic factors used for decision-making in non-pandemic situations

Table S2.2 in Supplement 2 gives an overview of variables predicting poor patient outcome for decision-making about ICU admission (IDSA/ATS, ESI) or discharge in non-pandemic situations presented for ICU, ED and ward care. Several tools including SAPS II, APACHE II/III, SOFA) predicted in-hospital mortality risk. Results from the validation of Simple Clinical Score, CriSTAL tool, and Shock index, indicated a good predictive value to identify people who will require ICU admission, palliative care or will die in the short term post-discharge.

Using combined variables and prognostic factors for decision-making in pandemic situations

A simplified example of triage recommendations for pandemic times based on predicted prognosis is illustrated in Figure 2. The parameters and accompanying cut-off points are extracted from the comprehensive factors used in both pandemic and routine care shown in Supplement 2. Elements from this catalogue of triage criteria could be used to design locally relevant triage tools.

In this priority setting scenario for pandemics, two types of patients are unambiguously outside eligibility thresholds and therefore excluded from access to critical care resources: patients in group 1 who are ‘too healthy’ and patients in group 5 who are ‘too sick’ (Figure 2). For other severity profiles (patients in groups 2 to 5 with increasingly poorer prognosis) some parameters may be unknown at triage; a suite of alternatives are listed to assist with decision-making. Periodic reassessment at 48, 96 and 120 hours is recommended [11,20,24,28,38] to determine the need to discharge to ward due to improvement, escalate treatment to ICU, or withdraw ICU treatment and refer for palliative care as indicated by the arrows between all groups.

<Figure 2. Sample prioritisation criteria to determine access or exclusion from critical care services during pandemics using combinations of crisis and non-crisis algorithms> about here

The concept of a waiting list may not apply under normal circumstances, but in overwhelmed health systems, people with characteristics in group 4 may have to be managed on the ward until an ICU bed becomes available and no patient with a higher priority profile is competing for an ICU bed.

Patients who are deemed to be beyond salvageable –group 5 with the poorest prognosis– usually have already experienced a catastrophic event like a cardiac arrest and/or are unconscious and/or are refractory to vasopressors and/or need or have been on mechanical ventilation for 14+ days and/or have documented advanced chronic illness/frailty/age. The general recommendation is not to use scarce resources on these patients during a public health crisis. Importantly, no decision should be based on single parameters or undesirable individual characteristics.

Ethical and resource considerations in crisis decision-making

A number of publications identified in this scoping review explored social, ethical, and political considerations when making decisions about patients’ access to ICU and ventilator treatment (Table 3). Key principles included institutional and public transparency about the decision-making process, consultation with interdisciplinary groups, and establishing local partnerships for implementation of decision-making processes in a local context. Studies varied in their approach to including patients’ illness severity scores in the decision-making process, with some supporting their inclusion due to objectivity and validity for patient groups [11,18], and others recommending against their use in isolation to predict individual patient outcomes [80].

Guidelines warned against making judgments about the worth of individuals, and unintentionally discriminating population subgroups such as the elderly or obese, or people with certain conditions as well as specific ethnic groups or people in non-health occupations. However, some publications outlined that older age is associated with a higher risk of death

[19,21,25] or flagged a natural shorter life expectancy as an additional reason for excluding patients from critical care [15], and indicated that among young people most years of life could potentially be saved [18]. Giving preferential treatment to population subgroups such as those with dependent children [81], caregivers of elderly [81] or frontline pandemic health workers [17] were discouraged by some and promoted by others [80,85]. Likewise, discrepancies were found about the recommendation to (not) involve treating clinicians in the decision-making process, with some studies supporting the exclusion of the treating clinicians [15,86] while others recommended that the senior treating clinician should lead the decision-making process [80].

Table 3. Ethical, legal, practical and clinical considerations when allocating ICU care ventilator treatment

What to consider in ensuring fair rationing of resources
<p><i>Ethical, legal and practical considerations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make triage policy and rationing criteria transparent to staff and the public to ensure understanding of the reasons for access restrictions [2,15,79,80] • Establish local/regional partnerships to effectively manage resource shortages and triage pathways [2,15,75,80] • When resources cannot be maintained, unequal treatment may be justified and choice determined on the basis of medical need and likely benefit[12] by using a proportionately lower amount of resources [81] • People making decisions about resource allocation should not be the treating clinicians but preferably a central triage committee of senior clinicians and legal officers [15,79,86] • First come first served or lottery/ random assignment if two patients with same level of risk present at the same time [81] • Decision-makers should not be aware of patients' identity [19] • Revise existing laws and develop liability protection for clinicians using scoring systems for decision-making about allocation of scarce resources [15,29] • Priority to be given to those who have had less opportunity to live their lives [2,29] • Align patients values and preferences with decisions to admit or remain in ICU [87] • Build capacity for alternatives to ICU care before life-sustaining resources become limited and provide alternative options such as high quality palliative care [15] • Ongoing update of the triage process as new evidence of disaster experiences, research, planning, and modelling becomes available [15] <p><i>Clinical decisions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educate lay people to better understand goals of care so they can be partners in a shared decision-making process [74,88] • Use best available objective parameters to determine patients' risk profile [15], and allocate patients to waiting lists or immediate resource access [15] • Triage patients to higher level of care if they have the greatest medical need and higher chances of survival [20,81] • Re-assess response to ventilator treatment and other therapies periodically, to see if patients are recovering or if they are deteriorating to confirm that the eligibility criteria are still met (i.e. risk of death, lack of improvement of SOFA after 48 hours) [19,24,81] • If the patient does not deteriorate, commit the ventilator for 10-12 days[3]. For patients on mechanical ventilation for 14+ days, clinicians should have a discussion with the family about the poor prognosis and goals of care [39] • Refer to palliative care from ED if risk of death is very high (i.e. prior CPR or cardiac arrest)[16,17,29] • Discharge patients from ICU who have an increased mortality risk or are unlikely to benefit from ICU treatment [15,17,22,24] • Apply objective criteria, set ceilings of treatment, discuss with families a referral to palliative care, and remove those from ventilator treatment who no longer meet objective criteria for benefit [10,18,19]
What to avoid when deciding on ICU/ventilator allocation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considering older age as single criterion for exclusion from higher level of care [17,29,36,65] • Basing decisions on gender, race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability, social status, personal connections, wealth, citizenship, insurance status [19,80] • Using obesity to inform prognosis in isolation from other risk factors [18] • Prioritising healthcare workers [17], people with dependent parents or children [81] • Allocating a ventilator to a pregnant woman to save a non-viable foetus (<24 weeks gestation) although appropriate to save the woman [19] • Triaging people with a single condition to ICU ahead of those with comorbidities [17] • Using the number of medical conditions rather than their severity to make decisions [38] • Using Shock Index in isolation to rule out triage to ICU [56] • Offering short trials of ICU to patients who are not eligible (low illness severity, minor comorbidities, young age) [18,80] • Offering ICU beds to patients whose authentic values or informed treatment preferences are not consistent with ICU treatment/admission [13,74]

Discussion

This scoping review identified key principles of decision-making about allocation of intensive care beds and ventilator treatment during pandemics including the need for a local expert committee of decision-makers, use of best available objective clinical criteria, careful steering from unintentional discrimination of vulnerable groups, consistent application of rules, transparency, and ethical justification of service limitations. Our review identified a range of tools to support the decision-making process and outlined their characteristics (62 publications on guidelines, frameworks, algorithms, laboratory parameters and predictive tools).

In addition, we systematically collated scores and algorithms that can be used for triage decision-making in routine care (in non-pandemic situations) in the emergency department, on the wards, or in the ICU. Some of the identified tools were derived from influenza pandemics and non-respiratory disease public health emergencies, yet they can be extrapolated to other public health emergencies including COVID-19.

How do the results fit in with previous research and policies?

It is generally accepted that triage protocols should only be activated when resource scarcity is imminent [21,46]; be locally relevant through a committee of expert decision-makers; make best use of relevant objective criteria; be carefully steered from unintentionally discriminating vulnerable groups; consistently apply agreed rules; and be publicly transparent and ethically justifiable. ICU admission criteria vary from country to country [89] and can change overtime as technology advances, but generally rely on expert assessment of the patient's illness severity, the health system culture, resources, patient preference, and ethical considerations. Admission is considered appropriate from the medical perspective, for those who are likely to require mechanical ventilation, or support for single or multiple organ failure [89]. However, when resources are overwhelmed by a surge in number of cases requiring escalation of care, these criteria need to vary towards "crisis standards of care"[90].

It has been suggested that vital signs in critically ill patients can inform triage decisions during pandemics [27]. Quick and simplified scores e.g. qSOFA vs. SOFA) have been developed to predict sepsis mortality. However, there might be trade-offs between the simplicity of a score and its sensitivity and specificity. Using such scoring systems to deny access to care is controversial. [91]Complex algorithms with multiple variables increase the burden of data collection without necessarily increasing the predictive ability (e.g. APACHE), but some scores with multiple variables have been shown to increase predictive ability (SIRS and NEWS). The appeal of some relatively simple predictive tools (mSOFA, qSOFA, SCS, CriSTAL, AGILITIES) is that they do not require additional testing, although some clinicians warn against the use of population-based algorithms in isolation to guide decisions for individuals [80].

No consensus on ethical and social considerations

We found mixed support for some of the subjective criteria in the expert consensus and triage publications. Fears of discrimination of elderly, functionally impaired, cognitively impaired, obese or immunosuppressed patients when allocating resources have been publicly expressed [18]. Under the “life cycle principle” younger patients receive priority because they have had the least opportunity to live through stages of life [18]. A different ethical principle to make allocation decisions is the “maximizing life-years” which takes into account a patient’s life expectancy based on age, co-morbidities and other factors (hence prioritising the young) [29]. The principle behind giving healthcare workers priority [85] is a ‘multiplier effect’. When healthcare workers recover they can contribute to saving the lives of many others. Although this principle may have some ethical validity, it did not receive much support in the consensus statements.

Implementation strategies to manage clinician burden and public dissatisfaction

In overwhelmed health systems, many people with poorer prognosis may be diverted to palliative care, thus increasing demand for accelerated staff training in the communication with patients and families about end-of-life care [92]. Some publications suggested involvement of an external expert committee of senior clinicians to make decisions about ceilings of care in order to reduce the burden on the treating clinicians [15,19,86]. A legal

framework needs to be in place to protect healthcare workers from litigation if they allocate limited resources in accordance with ethical guidelines [15,93,94].

Triage aims to maximise positive health outcomes for the largest possible number of patients. Triage protocols can have negative consequences for patients who are already hospitalised or treated in ICU for conditions not related to a pandemic (e.g. stroke or myocardial infarction) who would not have been denied access under normal conditions [23]. Those admitted to ICU, should be reassessed at 48 and up to 120 hours to determine ongoing eligibility for ICU resources [21,24] or to discharge them to palliative care. While an early, gradual and personalised approach to prognostic disclosure in routine practice is recommended in terminal illness [95], this may not be possible in mass emergencies. Early prognostic disclosure may be necessary during pandemics and other public health emergencies, and “advance care planning” will have to be expedited at the time of admission. Patient and family involvement in treatment decisions may be limited by hospital policies concerned with service capacity and healthcare worker safety. However, when possible, recognising triggers for early palliative care referral and/or treatment withdrawal [96] and adhering to patient preferences [97] should be integral to management policies.

It has been recommended to invite input from members of at-risk groups or their caregivers into algorithms to determine access to ICU and ventilators during pandemics [18,93,98]. However, this may not work in all cultures, and time pressure will likely be prohibitive of consultation with all stake holders. Unfortunately, efficient allocation of ventilators may unintentionally further increase social inequalities [99]. Supplementary strategies to build trust during a pandemic include public transparency on the objective decision-making framework [18,98] and disseminating information about decision-making frameworks to the public.

Strengths and limitations of this review

We believe that this scoping review provides a useful resource for decision-making about ICU and ventilator allocation during pandemics. This is a discussion starter and can inform objective guidelines beyond the guiding principles of preparedness, organisational management for resource allocation, expanded scope of practice, equity and social justice currently published [3,79,100-103]. Prognostic indicators and other decision tools presented have been based on a multitude on criteria, which can be combined to create locally-relevant

triage algorithms. This is a discussion starter and can inform objective guidelines beyond the guiding principles of equity and social justice currently published.

We did not conduct risk of bias assessment of included studies as the purpose of this scoping review was to collate a wide range of risk prediction and decision tools, which will have to be adapted to local settings. We excluded some validation studies from low-income countries [104] which showed good predictive ability of the combined variables as there was the chance of lesser generalisability of their patient population to health systems in industrialised nations –the focus of our study.

Conclusions

The catalogue of resources we assembled provides guidance on variables used to prioritise patients for critical care in the face of scarce life-sustaining resources. Patients' clinical or demographic characteristics alone and rigid triage systems are not the preferred way of allocating resources in a constrained healthcare system. The patient perspective needs to be taken into account. Discrimination against certain population groups must be avoided at every level of disease severity. A combination of variables used in prognostic scores (based on chronic and acute risk factors) and other decision tools presented here can be combined to create locally-relevant triage algorithms to assist decisions about ICU admission and discharge and/or access to ventilator treatments during a pandemic. This unique resource will help service managers and clinicians with the emotional and ethical burden of having to select some patients over others for life-sustaining treatments. More importantly objective guidelines will provide transparency about rationing resources to the patients and communities they serve.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

Funding

No funding was available for this work.

References

1. Tanne JH; Hayasaki E; Zastrow M; Pulla P; Smith P; Garcia RA. Covid-19: how doctors and healthcare systems are tackling coronavirus worldwide. *BMJ* **2020**, *368*, m1090.
2. Maves, R.C.; Downar, J.; Dichter, J.R.; Hick, J.L.; Devereaux, A.; Geiling, J.A.; Kissoon, N.; Hupert, N.; Niven, A.S.; King, M.A., et al. Triage of Scarce Critical Care Resources in COVID-19 An Implementation Guide for Regional Allocation: An Expert Panel Report of the Task Force for Mass Critical Care and the American College of Chest Physicians. *Chest* **2020**, *158*, 212-225, doi:10.1016/j.chest.2020.03.063.
3. Aziz, S.; Arabi, Y.M.; Alhazzani, W.; Evans, L.; Citerio, G.; Fischkoff, K.; Salluh, J.; Meyfroidt, G.; Alshamsi, F.; Oczkowski, S., et al. Managing ICU surge during the COVID-19 crisis: rapid guidelines. *Intensive Care Med* **2020**, doi:10.1007/s00134-020-06092-5, 1-23, doi:10.1007/s00134-020-06092-5.
4. Immovilli, P.; Morelli, N.; Antonucci, E.; Radaelli, G.; Barbera, M.; Guidetti, D. COVID-19 mortality and ICU admission: the Italian experience. *Crit Care* **2020**, *24*, 228-228, doi:10.1186/s13054-020-02957-9.
5. Mahase, E. Covid-19: most patients require mechanical ventilation in first 24 hours of critical care. *BMJ* **2020**, *368*, m1201, doi:10.1136/bmj.m1201.
6. Auld, S.; Caridi-Scheible, M.; Blum, J.M.; Robichaux, C.J.; Kraft, C.S.; Jacob, J.T.; Jabaley, C.S.; Carpenter, D.; Kaplow, R.; Hernandez, A.C., et al. ICU and ventilator mortality among critically ill adults with COVID-19. *Crit Care Med* **2020**, *Online First*, doi:10.1097/CCM.0000000000004457.
7. Grasselli, G.; Zangrillo, A.; Zanella, A.; Antonelli, M.; Cabrini, L.; Castelli, A.; Cereda, D.; Coluccello, A.; Foti, G.; Fumagalli, R., et al. Baseline Characteristics and Outcomes of 1591 Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 Admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy. *Jama* **2020**, *323*, 1574-1581, doi:10.1001/jama.2020.5394.
8. Cummings, M.J.; Baldwin, M.R.; Abrams, D.; Jacobson, S.D.; Meyer, B.J.; Balough, E.M.; Aaron, J.G.; Claassen, J.; Rabbani, L.E.; Hastie, J., et al. Epidemiology, clinical course, and outcomes of critically ill adults with COVID-19 in New York City: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet (London, England)* **2020**, *395*, 1763-1770, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31189-2.
9. Ioannidis, J.P.A.; Axfors, C.; Contopoulos-Ioannidis, D.G. Population-level COVID-19 mortality risk for non-elderly individuals overall and for non-elderly individuals without underlying diseases in pandemic epicenters. *medRxiv* **2020**, doi:10.1101/2020.04.05.20054361, 2020.2004.2005.20054361, doi:10.1101/2020.04.05.20054361.
10. Toltzis, P.; Soto-Campos, G.; Shelton, C.; Kuhn, E.M.; Hahn, R.; Kanter, R.K.; Wetzel, R.C. Evidence-Based Pediatric Outcome Predictors to Guide the Allocation of Critical Care Resources in a Mass Casualty Event. *Pediatric critical care medicine : a journal of the Society of Critical Care Medicine and the World Federation of Pediatric Intensive and Critical Care Societies* **2015**, *16*, e207-216, doi:10.1097/pcc.0000000000000481.
11. Christian, M.D.; Hawryluck, L.; Wax, R.S.; Cook, T.; Lazar, N.M.; Herridge, M.S.; Muller, M.P.; Gowans, D.R.; Fortier, W.; Burkle, F.M. Development of a triage protocol for critical care during an influenza pandemic. *Cmaj* **2006**, *175*, 1377-1381.
12. Antommaria, A.H.; Sweney, J.; Poss, W.B. Critical appraisal of: triaging pediatric critical care resources during a pandemic: ethical and medical considerations. *Pediatric critical care medicine : a journal of the Society of Critical Care Medicine and the World Federation of Pediatric Intensive and Critical Care Societies* **2010**, *11*, 396-400, doi:10.1097/PCC.0b013e3181dac698.
13. Cardona M; Anstey M; Lewis ET; Shanmugam S; Hillman K. Appropriateness of intensive care treatments near the end of life during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Breathe* **2020**, *Sept*, In Press, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1183/20734735.0062-2020>.

14. LeDuc, J.W.; Barry, M.A. SARS, the First Pandemic of the 21st Century. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2004**, *10*, e26-e26, doi:10.3201/eid1011.040797_02.
15. Devereaux, A.V.; Dichter, J.R.; Christian, M.D.; Dubler, N.N.; Sandrock, C.E.; Hick, J.L.; Powell, T.; Geiling, J.A.; Amundson, D.E.; Baudendistel, T.E., et al. Definitive care for the critically ill during a disaster: a framework for allocation of scarce resources in mass critical care: from a Task Force for Mass Critical Care summit meeting, January 26-27, 2007, Chicago, IL. *Chest* **2008**, *133*, 51s-66s, doi:10.1378/chest.07-2693.
16. New York State Task Force in Life and The Law. *Ventilator allocation guidelines*; 2015.
17. Powell, T.; Christ, K.C.; Birkhead, G.S. Allocation of ventilators in a public health disaster. *Disaster med* **2008**, *2*, 20-26, doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/DMP.0b013e3181620794>.
18. White, D.B.; Katz, M.H.; Luce, J.M.; Lo, B. Who should receive life support during a public health emergency? Using ethical principles to improve allocation decisions. *Ann Intern Med* **2009**, *150*, 132-138, doi:10.7326/0003-4819-150-2-200901200-00011.
19. Wilkens, E.P.; Klein, G.M. Mechanical ventilation in disaster situations: a new paradigm using the AGILITIES Score System. *Am J Disaster Med* **2010**, *5*, 369-384.
20. Chuang, E.; Cuartas, P.A.; Powell, T.; Gong, M.N. "We're Not Ready, But I Don't Think You're Ever Ready." Clinician Perspectives on Implementation of Crisis Standards of Care. *AJOB Empirical Bioethics* **2020**, *11*, 148-159, doi:10.1080/23294515.2020.1759731.
21. Adeniji, K.A.; Cusack, R. The Simple Triage Scoring System (STSS) successfully predicts mortality and critical care resource utilization in H1N1 pandemic flu: a retrospective analysis. *Crit Care* **2011**, *15*, R39, doi:10.1186/cc10001.
22. Grissom, C.K.; Brown, S.M.; Kuttler, K.G.; Boltax, J.P.; Jones, J.; Jephson, A.R.; Orme, J.F., Jr. A modified sequential organ failure assessment score for critical care triage. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep* **2010**, *4*, 277-284, doi:10.1001/dmp.2010.40.
23. Guest, T.; Tantam, G.; Donlin, N.; Tantam, K.; McMillan, H.; Tillyard, A. An observational cohort study of triage for critical care provision during pandemic influenza: 'clipboard physicians' or 'evidenced based medicine'? *Anaesthesia* **2009**, *64*, 1199-1206, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2044.2009.06084.x.
24. Khan, Z.; Hulme, J.; Sherwood, N. An assessment of the validity of SOFA score based triage in H1N1 critically ill patients during an influenza pandemic. *Anaesthesia* **2009**, *64*, 1283-1288, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2044.2009.06135.x.
25. Liang, W.; Liang, H.; Ou, L.; Chen, B.; Chen, A.; Li, C.; Li, Y.; Guan, W.; Sang, L.; Lu, J., et al. Development and Validation of a Clinical Risk Score to Predict the Occurrence of Critical Illness in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19. *JAMA Intern Med* **2020**, *180*, 1-9, doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2033.
26. Semple, M.G.; Myles, P.R.; Nicholson, K.G.; Lim, W.S.; Read, R.C.; Taylor, B.L.; Brett, S.J.; Openshaw, P.J.; Enstone, J.E.; McMenemy, J., et al. An evaluation of community assessment tools (CATs) in predicting use of clinical interventions and severe outcomes during the A(H1N1)pdm09 pandemic. *PLoS one* **2013**, *8*, e75384, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0075384.
27. Talmor, D.; Jones, A.E.; Rubinson, L.; Howell, M.D.; Shapiro, N.I. Simple triage scoring system predicting death and the need for critical care resources for use during epidemics. *Crit Care Med* **2007**, *35*, 1251-1256, doi:10.1097/01.Ccm.0000262385.95721.Cc.
28. Kim, K.M.; Cinti, S.; Gay, S.; Goold, S.; Barnosky, A.; Lozon, M. Triage of mechanical ventilation for pediatric patients during a pandemic. *Disaster med* **2012**, *6*, 131-137, doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1001/dmp.2012.19>.
29. Daugherty-Biddison, E.L.; Faden, R.; Gwon, H.S.; Mareiniss, D.P.; Regenber, A.C.; Schoch-Spana, M.; Schwartz, J.; Toner, E.S. Too Many Patients...A Framework to Guide Statewide Allocation of Scarce Mechanical Ventilation During Disasters. *Chest* **2019**, *155*, 848-854, doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2018.09.025>.
30. Dólera-Moreno, C.; Palazón-Bru, A.; Colomina-Climent, F.; Gil-Guillén, V.F. Construction and internal validation of a new mortality risk score for patients admitted to the intensive care unit. *Int J Clin Pract* **2016**, *70*, 916-922, doi:10.1111/ijcp.12851.

31. Granholm, A.; Perner, A.; Krag, M.; Hjortrup, P.B.; Haase, N.; Holst, L.B.; Marker, S.; Collet, M.O.; Jensen, A.K.G.; Møller, M.H. Development and internal validation of the Simplified Mortality Score for the Intensive Care Unit (SMS-ICU). *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* **2018**, *62*, 336-346, doi:10.1111/aas.13048.
32. Gupta, P.; Rettiganti, M.; Gossett, J.M.; Daufeldt, J.; Rice, T.B.; Wetzel, R.C. Development and Validation of an Empiric Tool to Predict Favorable Neurologic Outcomes Among PICU Patients. *Crit Care Med* **2018**, *46*, 108-115, doi:10.1097/ccm.0000000000002753.
33. Hajjar, L.A.; Nakamura, R.E.; de Almeida, J.P.; Fukushima, J.T.; Hoff, P.M.; Vincent, J.L.; Auler, J.O., Jr.; Galas, F.R. Lactate and base deficit are predictors of mortality in critically ill patients with cancer. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)* **2011**, *66*, 2037-2042, doi:10.1590/s1807-59322011001200007.
34. Slater, A.; Shann, F.; Pearson, G. PIM2: a revised version of the Paediatric Index of Mortality. *Intensive Care Med* **2003**, *29*, 278-285, doi:10.1007/s00134-002-1601-2.
35. Aegerter, P.; Boumendil, A.; Retbi, A.; Minvielle, E.; Dervaux, B.; Guidet, B. SAPS II revisited. *Intensive Care Med* **2005**, *31*, 416-423, doi:10.1007/s00134-005-2557-9.
36. Brunner-Ziegler, S.; Heinze, G.; Ryffel, M.; Kompatscher, M.; Slany, J.; Valentin, A. "Oldest old" patients in intensive care: prognosis and therapeutic activity. *Wien Klin Wochenschr* **2007**, *119*, 14-19, doi:10.1007/s00508-007-0771-x.
37. Charles, P.G.; Wolfe, R.; Whitby, M.; Fine, M.J.; Fuller, A.J.; Stirling, R.; Wright, A.A.; Ramirez, J.A.; Christiansen, K.J.; Waterer, G.W., et al. SMART-COP: a tool for predicting the need for intensive respiratory or vasopressor support in community-acquired pneumonia. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* **2008**, *47*, 375-384, doi:10.1086/589754.
38. Higgins, T.L.; Teres, D.; Nathanson, B. Outcome prediction in critical care: the Mortality Probability Models. *Curr Opin Crit Care* **2008**, *14*, 498-505, doi:10.1097/MCC.0b013e3283101643.
39. Hough, C.L.; Caldwell, E.S.; Cox, C.E.; Douglas, I.S.; Kahn, J.M.; White, D.B.; Seeley, E.J.; Bangdiwala, S.I.; Rubinfeld, G.D.; Angus, D.C., et al. Development and Validation of a Mortality Prediction Model for Patients Receiving 14 Days of Mechanical Ventilation. *Crit Care Med* **2015**, *43*, 2339-2345, doi:10.1097/ccm.0000000000001205.
40. Na, H.J.; Jeong, E.S.; Kim, I.; Kim, W.Y.; Lee, K. Clinical Application of the Quick Sepsis-Related Organ Failure Assessment Score at Intensive Care Unit Admission in Patients with Bacteremia: A Single-Center Experience of Korea. *Korean J Crit Care Med* **2017**, *32*, 247-255, doi:10.4266/kjccm.2017.00241.
41. Nielsen, A.B.; Thorsen-Meyer, H.C.; Belling, K.; Nielsen, A.P.; Thomas, C.E.; Chmura, P.J.; Lademann, M.; Moseley, P.L.; Heimann, M.; Dybdahl, L., et al. Survival prediction in intensive-care units based on aggregation of long-term disease history and acute physiology: a retrospective study of the Danish National Patient Registry and electronic patient records. *The Lancet Digital Health* **2019**, *1*, e78-e89, doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(19)30024-X.
42. Pannu, S.R.; Moreno Franco, P.; Li, G.; Malinchoc, M.; Wilson, G.; Gajic, O. Development and validation of severe hypoxemia associated risk prediction model in 1,000 mechanically ventilated patients*. *Crit Care Med* **2015**, *43*, 308-317, doi:10.1097/ccm.0000000000000671.
43. Godfrey, G.; Pilcher, D.; Hilton, A.; Bailey, M.; Hodgson, C.L.; Bellomo, R. Treatment limitations at admission to intensive care units in Australia and New Zealand: prevalence, outcomes, and resource use*. *Crit Care Med* **2012**, *40*, 2082-2089, doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e31824ea045.
44. Rosjo, H.; Stridsberg, M.; Ottesen, A.H.; Christensen, G.; Petilla, V.; Linko, R.; Karlsson, S.; Varpula, T.; Ruokonen, E.; Omland, T. The novel cardiovascular biomarker secretoneurin predicts mortality and shock in critical ill patients with infections. *European Heart Journal* **2015**, *36*, 1053, doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehv401.

45. Schuetz, P.; Maurer, P.; Punjabi, V.; Desai, A.; Amin, D.N.; Gluck, E. Procalcitonin decrease over 72 hours in US critical care units predicts fatal outcome in sepsis patients. *Crit Care* **2013**, *17*, R115, doi:10.1186/cc12787.
46. Sprung, C.L.; Baras, M.; Iapichino, G.; Kesecioglu, J.; Lippert, A.; Hargreaves, C.; Pezzi, A.; Pirracchio, R.; Edbrooke, D.L.; Pesenti, A., et al. The Eldicus prospective, observational study of triage decision making in European intensive care units: part I--European Intensive Care Admission Triage Scores. *Crit Care Med* **2012**, *40*, 125-131, doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e31822e5692.
47. Hartley, T.M.; Lane, N.D.; Steer, J.; Elliott, M.W.; Sovani, M.; Curtis, H.J.; Fuller, E.R.; Murphy, P.B.; Hart, N.; Shrikrishna, D., et al. Predicting outcome from exacerbations of COPD requiring assisted ventilation: Results from the NIV outcome (NIVO) study. *Thorax* **2019**, *74*, A38-A39, doi:10.1136/thorax-2019-BTSabstracts2019.63.
48. Kristensen, M.; Iversen, A.K.S.; Gerds, T.A.; Østervig, R.; Linnet, J.D.; Barfod, C.; Lange, K.H.W.; Sölétormos, G.; Forberg, J.L.; Eugen-Olsen, J., et al. Routine blood tests are associated with short term mortality and can improve emergency department triage: a cohort study of >12,000 patients. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med* **2017**, *25*, 115, doi:10.1186/s13049-017-0458-x.
49. Mark, K.; George, N.; Rasheed, H.; Meurer, D.; Allen, B.; Elie-Turenne, M.C.; Hou, P.; Seethala, R. QSOFA criteria predicts clinical outcomes of hospitalized emergency department pneumonia patients. *Crit Care Med* **2016**, *44*, 407, doi:10.1097/01.ccm.0000510001.55136.6c.
50. O'Sullivan, E.; Calley, E.; O'Riordan, D.; Bennett, K.; Silke, B. Predicting outcomes in emergency medical admissions - role of laboratory data and co-morbidity. *Acute Med* **2012**, *11*, 59-65.
51. Singer, M.; Deutschman, C.S.; Seymour, C.W.; Shankar-Hari, M.; Annane, D.; Bauer, M.; Bellomo, R.; Bernard, G.R.; Chiche, J.D.; Coopersmith, C.M., et al. The Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3). *Jama* **2016**, *315*, 801-810, doi:10.1001/jama.2016.0287.
52. Soong, J.T.Y.; Poots, A.; Rolph, G.; Bell, D. Frailty syndromes coded within secondary user service(SUS) data predict inpatient mortality and long length of stay. *Acute Medicine* **2017**, *16*, 131-132.
53. Brabrand, M.; Folkestad, L.; Clausen, N.G.; Knudsen, T.; Hallas, J. Risk scoring systems for adults admitted to the emergency department: a systematic review. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med* **2010**, *18*, 8, doi:10.1186/1757-7241-18-8.
54. España, P.P.; Capelastegui, A.; Gorordo, I.; Esteban, C.; Oribe, M.; Ortega, M.; Bilbao, A.; Quintana, J.M. Development and validation of a clinical prediction rule for severe community-acquired pneumonia. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine* **2006**, *174*, 1249-1256, doi:10.1164/rccm.200602-1770C.
55. Jalbout, N.A.; Hamade, B.; Balhara, K.S.; Hsieh, Y.H.; Bayram, J.D. Shock index as a predictor of hospital admission and inpatient mortality in a united states national database of emergency departments. *Journal of Emergency Medicine* **2017**, *53*, 433, doi:10.1016/j.jemermed.2017.08.040.
56. Koch, E.; Lovett, S.; Nghiem, T.; Riggs, R.A.; Rech, M.A. Shock index in the emergency department: utility and limitations. *Open access emergency medicine : OAEM* **2019**, *11*, 179-199, doi:10.2147/oaem.S178358.
57. Teubner, D.J.; Considine, J.; Hakendorf, P.; Kim, S.; Bersten, A.D. Model to predict inpatient mortality from information gathered at presentation to an emergency department: The Triage Information Mortality Model (TIMM). *Emerg Med Australas* **2015**, *27*, 300-306, doi:10.1111/1742-6723.12425.
58. Brown, S.M.; Jones, J.P.; Aronsky, D.; Jones, B.E.; Lanspa, M.J.; Dean, N.C. Relationships among initial hospital triage, disease progression and mortality in community-acquired pneumonia. *Respirology* **2012**, *17*, 1207-1213, doi:10.1111/j.1440-1843.2012.02225.x.

59. Grossmann, F.F.; Zumbunn, T.; Frauchiger, A.; Delpont, K.; Bingisser, R.; Nickel, C.H. At risk of undertriage? Testing the performance and accuracy of the emergency severity index in older emergency department patients. *Ann Emerg Med* **2012**, *60*, 317-325.e313, doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2011.12.013.
60. Kellett, J.; Deane, B. The Simple Clinical Score predicts mortality for 30 days after admission to an acute medical unit. *Qjm* **2006**, *99*, 771-781, doi:10.1093/qjmed/hcl112.
61. Subbe, C.P.; Jishi, F.; Hibbs, R.A. The simple clinical score: a tool for benchmarking of emergency admissions in acute internal medicine. *Clinical medicine (London, England)* **2010**, *10*, 352-357, doi:10.7861/clinmedicine.10-4-352.
62. Yu, S.; Leung, S.; Heo, M.; Soto, G.J.; Shah, R.T.; Gunda, S.; Gong, M.N. Comparison of risk prediction scoring systems for ward patients: a retrospective nested case-control study. *Crit Care* **2014**, *18*, R132, doi:10.1186/cc13947.
63. Allegretti, A.S.; Steele, D.J.; David-Kasdan, J.A.; Bajwa, E.; Niles, J.L.; Bhan, I. Continuous renal replacement therapy outcomes in acute kidney injury and end-stage renal disease: a cohort study. *Crit Care* **2013**, *17*, R109, doi:10.1186/cc12780.
64. Bethea, A.; Seidler, D.; Coleman, C.; Johnson, K.; Davis, E.; Thompson, S. Prehospital identification of elevated lactic acid levels and sepsis-related outcomes (lasr study). *Crit Care Med* **2018**, *46*, 687, doi:10.1097/01.ccm.0000529407.05908.9b.
65. Cardona, M.; Lewis, E.T.; Kristensen, M.R.; Skjøt-Arkil, H.; Ekmann, A.A.; Nygaard, H.H.; Jensen, J.J.; Jensen, R.O.; Pedersen, J.L.; Turner, R.M., et al. Predictive validity of the CriSTAL tool for short-term mortality in older people presenting at Emergency Departments: a prospective study. *Eur Geriatr Med* **2018**, *9*, 891-901, doi:10.1007/s41999-018-0123-6.
66. Haas, L.; Eckart, A.; Haubitz, S.; Mueller, B.; Schuetz, P.; Segerer, S. Estimated glomerular filtration rate predicts 30-day mortality in medical emergency departments: Results of a prospective multi-national observational study. *PloS one* **2020**, *15*, e0230998-e0230998, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0230998.
67. Hutchison, C.A.; Crowe, A.V.; Stevens, P.E.; Harrison, D.A.; Lipkin, G.W. Case mix, outcome and activity for patients admitted to intensive care units requiring chronic renal dialysis: a secondary analysis of the ICNARC Case Mix Programme Database. *Crit Care* **2007**, *11*, R50, doi:10.1186/cc5785.
68. Wallis, S.J.; Wall, J.; Biram, R.W.; Romero-Ortuno, R. Association of the clinical frailty scale with hospital outcomes. *Qjm* **2015**, *108*, 943-949, doi:10.1093/qjmed/hcv066.
69. Lim, W.S.; van der Eerden, M.M.; Laing, R.; Boersma, W.G.; Karalus, N.; Town, G.I.; Lewis, S.A.; Macfarlane, J.T. Defining community acquired pneumonia severity on presentation to hospital: an international derivation and validation study. *Thorax* **2003**, *58*, 377, doi:10.1136/thorax.58.5.377.
70. Marwick, C.A.; Guthrie, B.; Pringle, J.E.; McLeod, S.R.; Evans, J.M.; Davey, P.G. Identifying which septic patients have increased mortality risk using severity scores: a cohort study. *BMC Anesthesiol* **2014**, *14*, 1, doi:10.1186/1471-2253-14-1.
71. Stræde, M.; Brabrand, M. External validation of the simple clinical score and the HOTEL score, two scores for predicting short-term mortality after admission to an acute medical unit. *PloS one* **2014**, *9*, e105695, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0105695.
72. Tabak, Y.P.; Sun, X.; Hyde, L.; Yaitanes, A.; Derby, K.; Johannes, R.S. Using enriched observational data to develop and validate age-specific mortality risk adjustment models for hospitalized pediatric patients. *Med Care* **2013**, *51*, 437-445, doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e318287d57d.
73. van Walraven C; McAlister FA; Bakal JA; Hawken S; Donzé J. External validation of the Hospital-patient One-year Mortality Risk (HOMR) model for predicting death within 1 year after hospital admission. *Cmaj* **2015**, *187*, 725-733.
74. Heyland, D.K.; Davidson, J.; Skrobik, Y.; des Ordons, A.R.; Van Scoy, L.J.; Day, A.G.; Vandall-Walker, V.; Marshall, A.P. Improving partnerships with family members of ICU patients:

- study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* **2018**, *19*, 3, doi:10.1186/s13063-017-2379-4.
75. Einav, S.; Hick, J.L.; Hanfling, D.; Erstad, B.L.; Toner, E.S.; Branson, R.D.; Kanter, R.K.; Kissoon, N.; Dichter, J.R.; Devereaux, A.V., et al. Surge capacity logistics: care of the critically ill and injured during pandemics and disasters: CHEST consensus statement. *Chest* **2014**, *146*, e17S-43S, doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1378/chest.14-0734>.
 76. Murray, S.A.; Kendall, M.; Boyd, K.; Sheikh, A. Illness trajectories and palliative care. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)* **2005**, *330*, 1007-1011, doi:10.1136/bmj.330.7498.1007.
 77. Heyland, D.K.; Stelfox, H.T.; Garland, A.; Cook, D.; Dodek, P.; Kutsogiannis, J.; Jiang, X.; Turgeon, A.F.; Day, A.G.; on behalf of the Canadian Critical Care Trials, G., et al. Predicting Performance Status 1 Year After Critical Illness in Patients 80 Years or Older: Development of a Multivariable Clinical Prediction Model. *Crit Care Med* **2016**, *44*.
 78. Adeniji, K.; Cusack, R.; Golder, K. The simple triage scoring system (STSS) successfully predicts mortality and critical care resource utilisation in H1N1 pandemic flu. *Intensive Care Medicine* **2010**, *36*, S286, doi:10.1007/s00134-010-2000-8.
 79. World Health Organization. *Clinical management of COVID-19. Interim guidance*; WHO/2019-nCoV/clinical/2020.5; 2020; p 62.
 80. Australia and New Zealand Intensive Care Society. [web report] Guiding principles for complex decision making during Pandemic COVID-19. Version 2.0. Available online: https://www.anzics.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/ANZI_3367_Guidelines_V2.pdf (accessed on June).
 81. Winsor, S.; Bensimon, C.M.; Sibbald, R.; Anstey, K.; Chidwick, P.; Coughlin, K.; Cox, P.; Fowler, R.; Godkin, D.; Greenberg, R.A., et al. Identifying prioritization criteria to supplement critical care triage protocols for the allocation of ventilators during a pandemic influenza. *Healthc Q* **2014**, *17*, 44-51.
 82. Minne, L.; Abu-Hanna, A.; de Jonge, E. Evaluation of SOFA-based models for predicting mortality in the ICU: A systematic review. *Crit Care* **2008**, *12*, R161, doi:10.1186/cc7160.
 83. Alam, A.; Gupta, S. Lactate Measurements and Their Association With Mortality in Pediatric Severe Sepsis in India: Evidence That 6-Hour Level Performs Best. *J Intensive Care Med* **2020**, 10.1177/0885066620903231, 885066620903231, doi:10.1177/0885066620903231.
 84. Bozcuk, H.; Koyuncu, E.; Yildiz, M.; Samur, M.; Ozdogan, M.; Artaç, M.; Coban, E.; Savas, B. A simple and accurate prediction model to estimate the intrahospital mortality risk of hospitalised cancer patients. *Int J Clin Pract* **2004**, *58*, 1014-1019, doi:10.1111/j.1742-1241.2004.00169.x.
 85. Rothstein, M.A. Currents in contemporary ethics. Should health care providers get treatment priority in an influenza pandemic? *J Law Med Ethics* **2010**, *38*, 412-419, doi:10.1111/j.1748-720X.2010.00499.x.
 86. Daugherty, E.L.; Rubinson, L. Preparing your intensive care unit to respond in crisis: considerations for critical care clinicians. *Crit Care Med* **2011**, *39*, 2534-2539, doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0b013e3182326440>.
 87. Patel JJ; Heyland DK. Unmasking the triumphs, tragedies and opportunities of the COVID-19 pandemic. *ICU Management and Practice* **2020**, *3*.
 88. Van Scoy, L.J.; Chiarolanzio, P.J.; Kim, C.; Heyland, D.K. Development and initial evaluation of an online decision support tool for families of patients with critical illness: A multicenter pilot study. *J Crit Care* **2017**, *39*, 18-24, doi:10.1016/j.jcrc.2016.12.022.
 89. Bion J; Dennis A. ICU admission and discharge criteria. In *Oxford Textbook of critical care*, 2nd ed.; Oxford University Press: 2016; 10.1093/med/9780199600830.003.0020.
 90. Mareiniss, D.P.; Levy, F.; Regan, L. ICU triage: the potential legal liability of withdrawing ICU care during a catastrophic event. *Am J Disaster Med* **2011**, *6*, 329-338.
 91. Hick JL; Hanfling D; Wynia MK; Pavia AT. Duty to Plan: Health Care, Crisis Standards of Care, and Novel Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2. NAM Perspectives. Discussion paper. . *National*

- Academy of Medicine* **2020**, <https://doi.org/10.31478/202003b>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.31478/202003b>.
92. Fadul, N.; Elsayem, A.F.; Bruera, E. Integration of palliative care into COVID-19 pandemic planning. *BMJ Supportive & Palliative Care* **2020**, 10.1136/bmjspcare-2020-002364, doi:10.1136/bmjspcare-2020-002364.
 93. New York State Task Force on Life & the Law. Ventilator allocation guidelines. New York State Department of Health: New York, USA, 2015; p 266 pp.
 94. Biddison, L.D.; Berkowitz, K.A.; Courtney, B.; De Jong, C.M.; Devereaux, A.V.; Kissoon, N.; Roxland, B.E.; Sprung, C.L.; Dichter, J.R.; Christian, M.D., et al. Ethical considerations: care of the critically ill and injured during pandemics and disasters: CHEST consensus statement. *Chest* **2014**, *146*, e145S-155S, doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1378/chest.14-0742>.
 95. Clayton, J.M.; Hancock, K.M.; Butow, P.N.; Tattersall, M.H.; Currow, D.C.; Adler, J.; Aranda, S.; Auret, K.; Boyle, F.; Britton, A., et al. Clinical practice guidelines for communicating prognosis and end-of-life issues with adults in the advanced stages of a life-limiting illness, and their caregivers. *The Medical journal of Australia* **2007**, *186*, S77-s105.
 96. Mercadante, S.; Gregoretti, C.; Cortegiani, A. Palliative care in intensive care units: why, where, what, who, when, how. *BMC Anesthesiology* **2018**, *18*, 106, doi:10.1186/s12871-018-0574-9.
 97. Braganza MA; Glossop A; Vora VA. Treatment withdrawal and end-of-life care in the intensive care unit. *BJA Education* **2017**, *17*, 396-400.
 98. Silva, D.S.; Gibson, J.L.; Robertson, A.; Bensimon, C.M.; Sahni, S.; Maunula, L.; Smith, M.J. Priority setting of ICU resources in an influenza pandemic: a qualitative study of the Canadian public's perspectives. *BMC public health* **2012**, *12*, 241, doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-241.
 99. Silva, D.S.; Nie, J.X.; Rossiter, K.; Sahni, S.; Upshur, R.E. Contextualizing ethics: ventilators, H1N1 and marginalized populations. *Healthcare quarterly (Toronto, Ont.)* **2010**, *13*, 32-36, doi:10.12927/hcq.2013.21613.
 100. Australasian College of Emergency Medicine. Clinical Guidelines for the management of COVID-19 in AUstralasian Emergency Depratments. Availabe online: <https://acem.org.au/getmedia/78105c4b-5195-43f6-9c91-25dda5604eaf/Clinical-Guidelines> (accessed on v3.0).
 101. Australia and New Zealand Intensive Care Society. COVID-19 Guidelines version 2. Availabe online: https://www.anzics.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/ANZI_3367_Guidelines_V2.pdf (accessed on
 102. Sprung, C.L.; Zimmerman, J.L.; Christian, M.D.; Joynt, G.M.; Hick, J.L.; Taylor, B.; Richards, G.A.; Sandrock, C.; Cohen, R.; Adini, B., et al. Recommendations for intensive care unit and hospital preparations for an influenza epidemic or mass disaster: summary report of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine's Task Force for intensive care unit triage during an influenza epidemic or mass disaster. *Intensive Care Med* **2010**, *36*, 428-443, doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00134-010-1759-y>.
 103. Challen, K.; Bentley, A.; Bright, J.; Walter, D. Clinical review: mass casualty triage--pandemic influenza and critical care. *Crit Care* **2007**, *11*, 212.
 104. Haniffa, R.; Mukaka, M.; Munasinghe, S.B.; De Silva, A.P.; Jayasinghe, K.S.A.; Beane, A.; de Keizer, N.; Dondorp, A.M. Simplified prognostic model for critically ill patients in resource limited settings in South Asia. *Crit Care* **2017**, *21*, 250, doi:10.1186/s13054-017-1843-6.

ONLINE SUPPLEMENTS 1 and 2

Title: **Supporting decision-making on allocation of ICU beds and ventilators in pandemics**

Authors: *Magnolia Cardona, PhD, MBBS,^{1,2*} Claudia C. Dobler MD, PhD,^{1,3,6} Eyza Koreshe MPH, BSc,⁴ Daren K Heyland, MD, FRCPC⁵ Rebecca Nguyen,⁶ Joan P.Y. Sim,⁶ Justin Clark, BA,¹ Alex Psirides MBBS, FCICM.⁷*

Affiliations

¹ Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare, Bond University Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia

² Gold Coast University Hospital, Southport, Queensland, Australia

³ Evidence-Based Practice Center, Robert D. and Patricia E. Kern Center for the Science of Health Care Delivery, Mayo Clinic, Minnesota, USA

⁴ Boden Institute, University of Sydney, NSW, Australia

⁵ Department of Critical Care Medicine, Queens University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada

⁶ The University of New South Wales, South Western Sydney Clinical School, NSW Australia

⁷ Intensive Care Unit, Wellington Regional Hospital, Wellington, New Zealand

Supplement 1. Table S1.1 Detailed Search strategy	pages 2-3
Supplement 1, Table S1.2. Reasons for exclusion after full text screening	pages 4-6
Supplement 1, Table S1.3 Characteristics of publications informing ICU Triage <u>in pandemic</u> situations. N= 16	pages 7-8
Supplement 1, Table S1.4 Characteristics of publications on prognostic tools for risk of death in routine clinical care potentially applicable to ICU triage in pandemics (N= 46)	pages 9-12
Supplement 2. Table S2.1 Validation status, study types and clinical parameters predicting poor outcome for potentially guidance on ICU admission or discharge <u>during pandemics</u> (N=16)	pages 13-19
Supplement 2. Table S2.2 Validation status, and clinical parameters predicting poor outcome for potentially guidance on ICU admission or discharge derived from <u>routine care</u> studies in ICU, ED or wards(N= 46 studies)	20-36

Supplement 1. Table S1.1 Detailed Search strategy Searches run 14/05/2020:

PubMed

("Resource Allocation"[Mesh] OR Resource[tiab] OR Resources[tiab] OR Allocation[tiab] OR Demand[tiab] OR "Prognostic certainty"[tiab] OR "External validation"[tiab] OR Prognosticative[tiab] OR Prognosticating[tiab] OR "Validation cohort"[tiab])

AND

("Decision rule"[tiab] OR "Decision Support"[tiab] OR Prediction[tiab] OR Predictions[tiab] OR Predictor[tiab] OR Predicting[tiab] OR Predictive[tiab] OR "Scoring systems"[tiab] OR "Scoring system"[tiab] OR "Decision making"[tiab] OR "Preparedness strategies"[tiab] OR "Preparedness strategy"[tiab] OR "Prioritization Criteria"[tiab] OR "Prioritizing access"[tiab] OR "Consensus Statement"[tiab] OR "Categorization decisions"[tiab] OR "Allocation decisions"[tiab] OR "Clinical guidelines"[tiab])

AND

("Triage"[Mesh] OR "Patient Selection"[Mesh] OR Triage[tiab] OR Triaging[tiab] OR Admission[tiab] OR Discharge[tiab] OR "Incident management"[tiab] OR "Treatment priority"[tiab] OR "Patient volumes"[tiab] OR ((Managing[tiab]) AND (Cohort[tiab]))) OR (Calculators[tiab] AND Patients[tiab]))

AND

("Emergency Medical Services"[Mesh] OR "Critical Care"[Mesh] OR "Intensive Care Units"[Mesh] OR "Intensive care"[tiab] OR "Critical care"[tiab] OR ICU[tiab] OR PICU[tiab] OR "Critically ill"[tiab] OR "Life saving"[tiab] OR Life-saving[tiab] OR Life-sustaining[tiab] OR "Life sustaining"[tiab] OR "Life support"[tiab] OR "Short-term death"[tiab] OR "Short term death"[tiab] OR "Death prediction"[tiab] OR Hospital[tiab] OR Hospitals[tiab] OR "Emergency department"[tiab] OR "Emergency departments"[tiab])

AND

("Pandemics"[Mesh] OR Disasters[Mesh] OR "Hospital Mortality"[Mesh] OR "COVID-19"[nm] OR Pandemic[tiab] OR Pandemics[tiab] OR Disaster[tiab] OR Disasters[tiab] OR "SARS CoV 2"[tiab] OR "COVID 19"[tiab] OR "COVID-19"[tiab] OR "Mass casualty"[tiab] OR "Severe sepsis"[tiab] OR "Septic shock"[tiab] OR "Short-term mortality"[tiab])

Embase

('Resource Allocation'/exp OR Resource:ti,ab OR Resources:ti,ab OR Allocation:ti,ab OR Demand:ti,ab OR "Prognostic certainty":ti,ab OR "External validation":ti,ab OR Prognosticative:ti,ab OR Prognosticating:ti,ab OR "Validation cohort":ti,ab)

AND

("Decision rule":ti,ab OR "Decision Support":ti,ab OR Prediction:ti,ab OR Predictions:ti,ab OR Predictor:ti,ab OR Predicting:ti,ab OR Predictive:ti,ab OR "Scoring systems":ti,ab OR "Scoring system":ti,ab OR "Decision making":ti,ab OR "Preparedness strategies":ti,ab OR "Preparedness strategy":ti,ab OR "Prioritization Criteria":ti,ab OR "Prioritizing access":ti,ab OR "Consensus Statement":ti,ab OR "Categorization decisions":ti,ab OR "Allocation decisions":ti,ab OR "Clinical guidelines":ti,ab)

AND

('Patient Selection'/exp/mj OR Triage:ti,ab OR Triaging:ti,ab OR Admission:ti,ab OR Discharge:ti,ab OR "Incident management":ti,ab OR "Treatment priority":ti,ab OR "Patient volumes":ti,ab OR ((Managing:ti,ab) AND (Cohort:ti,ab)) OR (Calculators:ti,ab AND Patients:ti,ab))

AND

('Emergency Medical Service'/exp OR 'intensive care'/exp OR 'Intensive Care Unit'/exp OR "Intensive care":ti,ab OR "Critical care":ti,ab OR ICU:ti,ab OR PICU:ti,ab OR "Critically ill":ti,ab OR "Life saving":ti,ab OR Life-saving:ti,ab OR Life-sustaining:ti,ab OR "Life sustaining":ti,ab OR "Life support":ti,ab OR "Short-term death":ti,ab OR "Short term death":ti,ab OR "Death prediction":ti,ab OR Hospital:ti,ab OR Hospitals:ti,ab OR "Emergency department":ti,ab OR "Emergency departments":ti,ab)

AND

('Pandemic'/exp OR 'Disaster'/exp OR 'Hospital Mortality'/exp OR Pandemic:ti,ab OR Pandemics:ti,ab OR Disaster:ti,ab OR Disasters:ti,ab OR "SARS CoV 2":ti,ab OR "COVID 19":ti,ab OR COVID-19:ti,ab OR "Mass casualty":ti,ab OR "Severe sepsis":ti,ab OR "Septic shock":ti,ab OR "Short-term mortality":ti,ab)

Supplement 1, Table S1.2. Reasons for exclusion after full text screening N= 70

No objective parameters	N=9
Barrera, R., et al. (2001). "Accuracy of predictions of survival at admission to the intensive care unit." <i>J Crit Care</i> 16(1): 32-35.	
Burkle, F. M., Jr. (2006). "Population-based triage management in response to surge-capacity requirements during a large-scale bioevent disaster." <i>Acad Emerg Med</i> 13(11): 1118-1129.	
Christian, M. D., et al. (2014). "Triage: care of the critically ill and injured during pandemics and disasters: CHEST consensus statement." <i>Chest</i> 146(4 Suppl): e61S-74S.	
Dadoun, A., et al. (2017). "Invoking the "expectant" triage category: Can we make the paradigm shift?" <i>Am J Disaster Med</i> 12(3): 167-172.	
Einav, S., et al. (2014). "Surge capacity logistics: care of the critically ill and injured during pandemics and disasters: CHEST consensus statement." <i>Chest</i> 146(4 Suppl): e17S-43S.	
Fink, S. L. (2010). "Worst case: rethinking tertiary triage protocols in pandemics and other health emergencies." <i>Crit Care</i> 14(1): 103.	
Godfrey, G., et al. (2012). "Treatment limitations at admission to intensive care units in Australia and New Zealand: prevalence, outcomes, and resource use*." <i>Crit Care Med</i> 40(7): 2082-2089.	
Prekker ME, et al., (2020) Regional planning for extracorporeal membrane oxygenation allocation during Coronavirus disease 2019. <i>Chest</i> 158(2):603-607.	
Ravikumar N, et al (2020) Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Infection: Part I – Preparedness and Management in the pediatric intensive care unit in resource-limited settings. <i>Indian Pediatrics</i> April 15, p324-334	
No validation or regression	N=8
Antommaria, A. H., et al. (2020). "Ventilator Triage Policies During the COVID-19 Pandemic at U.S. Hospitals Associated With Members of the Association of Bioethics Program Directors." <i>Ann Intern Med</i> .	
Baysan, M., et al. (2020). "The Added Value of Lactate and Lactate Clearance in Prediction of In-Hospital Mortality in Critically Ill Patients With Sepsis." <i>Crit Care Explor</i> 2(3): e0087.	
Cowen, M. E., et al. (2014). "Implementation of a mortality prediction rule for real-time decision making: feasibility and validity." <i>J Hosp Med</i> 9(11): 720-726	
Dziadzko, M. A., et al. (2018). "Multicenter derivation and validation of an early warning score for acute respiratory failure or death in the hospital." <i>Crit Care</i> 22(1): 286.	
Hahn, R., et al. (2009). "Use of pediatric risk of mortality (PRISM) II score as a tool for critical care triage during a pandemic." <i>Critical Care Medicine</i> 37(12): A327.	
Hick J. L., et al. (2007) Clinical review: Allocating ventilators during large-scale disasters - problems, planning, and process	
Thomas, D. R., et al. (2005). "The relationship of functional status, nutritional assessment, and severity of illness to in-hospital mortality." <i>J Nutr Health Aging</i> 9(3): 169-175	
Thakur, M., et al. (2016). "Intensive Care Admissions in Pregnancy: Analysis of a Level of Support Scoring System." <i>Matern Child Health J</i> 20(1): 106-113.	
Abstract/Poster Presentation-insufficient information	N=9
Acton, C., et al. (2016). "Ten patients, one ventilator: How to best allocate critical care resources during mass disaster." <i>Canadian Journal of Emergency Medicine</i> 18: S79.	
Adeniji, K., et al. (2010). "The simple triage scoring system (STSS) successfully predicts mortality and critical care resource utilisation in H1N1 pandemic flu." <i>Intensive Care Medicine</i> 36: S286.	
Allareddy, V., et al. (2018). "Use of ecmo and associated outcomes in children hospitalized for sepsis in the United States." <i>Critical Care Medicine</i> 46: 744.	
Aluvaala, M. J., et al. (2018). "Predicting in-hospital mortality using routine data to guide decision making for essential neonatal care." <i>American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene</i> 99(4): 450.	
Flaatten, H. (2009). "ICU triage: An overview." <i>Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica</i> 53: 17-18.	
Marriott, D., et al. (2012) "To admit or not to admit? The suitability of critical care admission criteria." <i>Crit Care</i> 16, P511	
Nobre de Jesus et al (2019) "Clinical outcome prediction after admission in intermediate level critical care unit:role of severity scores." <i>Critical Care</i> 23(Suppl 2):72, poster 466	
Soliman, I. W., et al. (2017). "Long-term prognostication in the ICU: A systematic review into available prediction models." <i>Intensive Care Medicine Experimental</i> 5(2).	
Soong, J. T. Y., et al. (2017). "Frailty syndromes coded within secondary user service(SUS) data predict inpatient mortality and long length of stay." <i>Acute Medicine</i> 16(3): 131-132.	
Ethical/resource/preparedness focus	N=11
Australasian College of Emergency Medicine. "Clinical Guidelines for the management of COVID-19 in Australasian Emergency Departments". Melbourne VIC: ACEM, 2020, p. 112.	
Antommaria, A. H., et al. (2010). "Critical appraisal of: triaging pediatric critical care resources during a pandemic: ethical and medical considerations." <i>Pediatr Crit Care Med</i> 11(3): 396-400.	

Antommaria, A. H., et al. (2011). "Ethical issues in pediatric emergency mass critical care." <i>Pediatr Crit Care Med</i> 12(6 Suppl): S163-168.	
Barnett, D. J., et al. (2009). Resource allocation on the frontlines of public health preparedness and response: report of a summit on legal and ethical issues. <i>Public Health Rep</i> 124(2): 295-303.	
Biddison, L. D., et al. (2014). "Ethical considerations: care of the critically ill and injured during pandemics and disasters: CHEST consensus statement." <i>Chest</i> 146(4 Suppl): e145S-155S.	
Challen K, et al., (2007) "Clinical review: mass casualty triage – pandemic influenza and critical care". <i>Critical Care</i> 11:212 , 6pp	
Farrell, T. W., et al. (2020). "AGS Position Statement: Resource Allocation Strategies and Age-Related Considerations in the COVID-19 Era and Beyond." <i>J Am Geriatr Soc</i> .	
Flaatten, H., et al. (2017). "The status of intensive care medicine research and a future agenda for very old patients in the ICU." <i>Intensive Care Med</i> 43(9): 1319-1328.	
Ghanbari, V., et al. (2019). "Ethical prioritization of patients during disaster triage: A systematic review of current evidence." <i>Int Emerg Nurs</i> 43: 126-132.	
Kanter, R. K., & Cooper, A. (2009). Mass critical care: pediatric considerations in extending and rationing care in public health emergencies. <i>Disaster medicine and public health preparedness</i> , 3(S2), S166-S171.	
Maves RC, et al., (2020) "Triage of scarce critical resources in COVID-19. An implementation guide for regional allocation". <i>Chest</i> 158(1):212-225	
Modelling study/no primary data	N=11
Abir, M., et al. (2013). "Design of a model to predict surge capacity bottlenecks for burn mass casualties at a large academic medical center." <i>Prehosp Disaster Med</i> 28(1): 23-32.	
Amram, O., et al. (2012). "A web-based model to support patient-to-hospital allocation in mass casualty incidents." <i>J Trauma Acute Care Surg</i> 72(5): 1323-1328.	
Bolt, S. and R. Sparks (2013). "Detecting and diagnosing hotspots for the enhanced management of hospital Emergency Departments in Queensland, Australia." <i>BMC Med Inform Decis Mak</i> 13: 132.	
Enfield, K., et al. (2011). "Limited utility of SOFA and APACHE II prediction models for ICU triage in pandemic influenza." <i>Chest</i> 140(4).	
Ercole, A., et al. (2009). "Modelling the impact of an influenza A/H1N1 pandemic on critical care demand from early pathogenicity data: the case for sentinel reporting." <i>Anaesthesia</i> 64(9): 937-941.	
Gall, C., et al. (2016). "Pediatric Triage in a Severe Pandemic: Maximizing Survival by Establishing Triage Thresholds." <i>Crit Care Med</i> 44(9): 1762-1768.	
Kanter, R. K. (2015). "Would triage predictors perform better than first-come, first-served in pandemic ventilator allocation?" <i>Chest</i> 147(1): 102-108.	
Nap, R. E., et al. (2007). "Pandemic influenza and hospital resources." <i>Emerg Infect Dis</i> 13(11): 1714-1719.	
Toltzis P, Soto-Campos G, Kuhn E, Wetzel R. A pediatric triage scheme to guide resource allocation in a mass casualty. <i>Critical Care Medicine</i> . 2013;41(12):A148.	
Steinberg DO, et al. (2020) Critical review: COVID-19 calculators during extreme resource –limited situations. <i>Emerg Medicine Pract</i> 22(5):5pp	
Toltzis P, Soto-Campos G, Shelton C, Kuhn EM, Hahn R, Kanter RK, et al. Evidence-Based Pediatric Outcome Predictors to Guide the Allocation of Critical Care Resources in a Mass Casualty Event. <i>Pediatr Crit Care Med</i> . 2015 Sep;16(7):e207-16.	
Non-Western health system	N=6
Alam A, Gupta S. Lactate Measurements and Their Association With Mortality in Pediatric Severe Sepsis in India: Evidence That 6-Hour Level Performs Best. <i>J Intensive Care Med</i> . 2020	
Arshad A, Ayaz A, Haroon MA, Jamil B, Hussain E. Frequency and Cause of Readmissions in Sepsis Patients Presenting to a Tertiary Care Hospital in a Low Middle Income Country. <i>Crit Care Explor</i> . 2020 Feb;2(2):e0080.	
Santana AR, Amorim FF, Menezes BM, Soares FB, Araújo FVB, De Souza JL, et al. Serum arterial lactate at the time of admission as a predictor of mortality in patients admitted with severe sepsis and septic shock to an ICU. <i>Critical Care</i> . 2013;17:P47.	
Ytzhak A, Sagi R, Bader T, Assa A, Farfel A, Merin O, et al. Pediatric ventilation in a disaster: clinical and ethical decision making. <i>Crit Care Med</i> . 2012 Feb;40(2):603-7.	
Dumas, G., et al. (2019). "Mottling score is a strong predictor of 14-day mortality in septic patients whatever vasopressor doses and other tissue perfusion parameters." <i>Crit Care</i> 23(1): 211.	
Yusoff SJ, Zakaria MI, Mohamed FL, Bujang MA, Lakshmanan S, Asaari AH. Value of Shock Index in prognosticating the short-term outcome of death for patients presenting with severe sepsis and septic shock in the emergency department. <i>Med J Malaysia</i> . 2012 Aug;67(4):406-11.	
Other disease/treatment specific	N=4
Barbaro, R. P., et al. (2016). "Development and validation of the pediatric risk estimate score for children using extracorporeal respiratory support (Ped-RESCUERS)." <i>Intensive Care Med</i> 42(5): 879-888	
Bozcuk H, Koyuncu E, Yildiz M, Samur M, Ozdogan M, Artaç M, et al. A simple and accurate prediction model to estimate the intrahospital mortality risk of hospitalised cancer patients. <i>Int J Clin Pract</i> . 2004 Nov;58(11):1014-9.	

Cheng, L., et al. (2015). "An evaluation of laboratory data at admission for predicting mortality among critically ill patients with cancer." <i>Cancer Research</i> 75(15).	
Agulnik, A., et al. (2017). "Validation of a pediatric early warning system for hospitalized pediatric oncology patients in a resource-limited setting." <i>Cancer</i> 123(24): 4903-4913	
Injury/surgical triage	N=3
Chang, C. J., et al. (2013). "Predicting hospital mortality in adult patients with prolonged stay (>14 days) in surgical intensive care unit." <i>Minerva Anestesiol</i> 79(8): 843-852.	
Kim, J., et al. (2009). "Development and validation of the Excess Mortality Ratio-adjusted Injury Severity Score Using the International Classification of Diseases 10th Edition." <i>Acad Emerg Med</i> 16(5): 454-464.	
Muessig, J. M., et al. (2018). "Clinical Frailty Scale (CFS) reliably stratifies octogenarians in German ICUs: a multicentre prospective cohort study." <i>BMC Geriatr</i> 18(1): 162.	
Poor performing tool/score	N=5
El Maraghi, S., et al. (2016). "Kallistatin level as a novel prognostic marker for community acquired pneumonia (CAP) in critically ill patients." <i>Intensive Care Medicine Experimental</i> 4.	
Hsin, C. H., et al. (2016). "Venovenous extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in adult respiratory failure: Scores for mortality prediction." <i>Medicine (Baltimore)</i> 95(25): e3989.	
Suberviola, B., et al. (2011). "Prognostic value of proadrenomedullin in severe sepsis and septic shock patients with community-acquired pneumonia." <i>Critical Care</i> 15: S98	
Suberviola, B., et al. (2013). "Hospital mortality prognostication in sepsis using the new biomarkers suPAR and proADM in a single determination on ICU admission." <i>Intensive Care Med</i> 39(11): 1945-1952.	
Wong, H. R., et al. (2014). "A multibiomarker-based outcome risk stratification model for adult septic shock*." <i>Crit Care Med</i> 42(4): 781-789.	
Too small sample size	N=2
Morton B, Nweze K, O'Connor J, Turton P, Joeke E, Blakey JD, et al. Oxygen exchange and C-reactive protein predict safe discharge in patients with H1N1 influenza. <i>Qjm.</i> 2017 Apr 1;110(4):227-32.	
Tan L, et al. (2020) "Lymphopaenia predicts disease severity of COVID-19: a descriptive predictive study." <i>Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy</i> 5:33	
Reviews – Reference list checked	N=1
Wynants L, et al., (2020) "Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19: systematic review and critical appraisal". <i>BMJ</i> 369: m1328.	
Not in English	N=1
Piccini, M., et al. (2010) Ethical, deontologic and legal considerations about SIAARTI Document "Clinical ethics recommendations for the allocation of intensive care treatments, in exceptional, resource-limited circumstances"	

Supplement 1, Table S1.3 Characteristics of publications informing ICU Triage in pandemic situations. N= 16

Author and publication year	Country of study subjects or where guideline applied	Publication type			Target population			Pathological Process		Proposed Benefit criteria		
		Guideline/ consensus	Retro/prospective	Literature Review	Age range (years) ^a	Admitted to ICU	ED/other hospital	Pneumonia/Lung	Multi-organ/sepsis	ICU Admission/ not	Discharge (ICU)	Ventilator access
CONSENSUS												
Christian et al., 2006	Canada	✓			0-paediatric	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Devereaux et al, 2007	USA	✓			All ages	✓				✓	✓	
Powell et al., 2008	USA	✓			0 - older adult	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
White et al., 2009	USA	✓			12- older adult		✓	✓	✓			✓
Wilkens et al., 2010	USA	✓			0- older adult		✓	✓	✓			✓
NewYork Taskforce, 2015	USA	✓			0- older adult	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Chuang et al., 2020	USA	✓			Adults	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
ALGORITHMS/FACTORS												
Guest et al, 2009	UK		P		60 (IQR 41-69)	✓		✓		✓		
Khan et al., 2009	UK		R		26-52	✓			✓	✓	✓	
Grissom et al., 2010	USA		R		50 ±20	✓			✓		✓	✓
			P		53 ±20							
Chuang et al, 2020	USA		P		All ages	✓		✓		✓		✓
Adenjil et al., 2011	UK		R		18-71	✓		✓		✓		
Cummings et al., 2020	USA		P		62 (51–72)	✓		✓	✓			

Author and publication year	Country of study subjects or where guideline applied	Publication type			Target population			Pathological Process		Proposed Benefit criteria		
		Guideline/ consensus	Retro/prospective	Literature Review	Age range (years) ^α	Admitted to ICU	ED/other hospital	Pneumonia/Lung	Multi-organ/sepsis	ICU Admission/ not	Discharge (ICU)	Ventilator access
Talmor et al., 2007	USA		R		Mean 59 (≥ 18)		✓		✓	✓		✓
Liang et al., 2020	China		R		48.2±15.2 (4-88)		✓	✓		✓		
Semple et.al., 2013	UK		R		0-older adult		✓	✓	✓			✓
Kim et.al., 2012	USA			LR	0-paediatric	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

^α range or mean ±SD or median and IQR as reported in eligibility or findings sections of eligible articles

(D): Derivation cohort; DK=Denmark; LR=Literature review; N/R= Not reported ; SOFA= Sepsis-related Organ Failure Assessment P= Prospective; R=Retrospective;

Supplement 1, Table S1.4 Characteristics of publications on prognostic tools for risk of death in routine clinical care potentially applicable to ICU triage in pandemics (N= 46)

Author and publication year	Country of study subjects or where guideline applied	Publication type			Target population			Pathological Process		Proposed Benefit criteria		
		Guideline /consensus	Retro/prospective	Literature review	Age range (years) ^a	Admitted to ICU	ED/other hospital	Pneumonia/Lung	Multi-organ/sepsis	ICU Admission/ not	Discharge (ICU)	Ventilator access
CONSENSUS												
Singer et al., 2016	Multiple	✓			NR	✓			✓	✓		
Daugherty-Biddison et al, 2019	USA	✓			All ages	✓			✓	✓		✓
Mark et al., 2016	USA		R		N/R		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
ALGORITHMS												
Lim et al., 2003	UK, NZ, NL		P		64.1 (17-100)			✓		✓		
Kellett et al, 2006	Ireland		P		62 _± 20		✓		✓	✓	✓	
Charles et al., 2008	Australia, USA, Canada		P		≥18		✓	✓		✓		
Higgins et al., 2008	Multiple		P	LR	>18	✓			✓		✓	
Hajjar et al., 2011	Belgium		P		61 _± 2	✓			✓	✓	✓	
Allegretti et al., 2013	USA		P		older adults	✓			✓	✓	✓	
Marwick et al., 2014	UK		P		≥18		✓		✓	✓		
Sprung et al., 2012	Multi-centre 7 Europe		P		59 _± 18 (>18)	✓			✓	✓		

Author and publication year	Country of study subjects or where guideline applied	Publication type			Target population			Pathological Process		Proposed Benefit criteria		
		Guideline /consensus	Retro/prospective	Literature review	Age range (years) ^a	Admitted to ICU	ED/other hospital	Pneumonia/Lung	Multi-organ/sepsis	ICU Admission/ not	Discharge (ICU)	Ventilator access
Straede et.al., 2014	Denmark		P		62.4 ±19.2 (≥15)		✓		✓			
Dólera-Moreno et al, 2016	Spain		P		(D): 64.4 ± 16.2 (V): 64.6 ± 16.2	✓			✓			
Kristensen et.al., 2017	Denmark		P		63.8 (>16)		✓		✓	✓		
Bethea et al., 2018	USA		P		NR	✓	✓		✓	✓		
Haas et al., 2020	Switzerland, France, USA		P		62 (IQR 46-76)		✓		✓	✓		
Heyland 2016	Canada & USA		P		≥ 80 years	✓			✓			
Aegerter et al, 2005	France		R		56.2±19 ≥15	✓			✓	✓		
España et al., 2006	Spain		P		64.7±17		✓	✓		✓		
Hutchison et al., 2007	UK		R		(>18) Adults	✓			✓	✓	✓	
Subbe et al., 2010	UK		R		65+19		✓		✓	✓		
O'Sullivan et.al. 2012	Ireland		R		56.5 (37.2-75.8)		✓		✓			
Schuetz et.al., 2013	USA		R		65.8±16.2	✓			✓		✓	
Yu et al, 2014	USA		R		Controls: 64 (IQR 49-78) Cases: 67 (IQR 55-79)		✓		✓	✓		

Author and publication year	Country of study subjects or where guideline applied	Publication type			Target population			Pathological Process		Proposed Benefit criteria		
		Guideline /consensus	Retro/prospective	Literature review	Age range (years) ^a	Admitted to ICU	ED/other hospital	Pneumonia/Lung	Multi-organ/sepsis	ICU Admission/ not	Discharge (ICU)	Ventilator access
Hough et al., 2015	USA		R		54 ± 17	✓		✓			✓	
Rosjo et.al., 2015	Finland		N/R		≥18 N/R	✓			✓			
Teubner et.al., 2015	Australia		R		62 (16-104)		✓		✓			
Pannu et al, 2015	USA		R		(D): 61(IQR 48-72) (V): 60 (IQR 49-71)	✓		✓				✓
Wallis et al., 2015	UK		R		84.3 ± 5.9		✓		✓	✓		
Soong et.al., 2017	UK		N/R		>65		✓		✓			
Na et.al., 2017	Korea		R		69 (≥18)	✓			✓			✓
Jalbout et al., 2017	USA		R		≥18		✓		✓	✓		
Granholm et al, 2018	Scandinavia, Germany, NL France, AUS, Switzerland, Spain, Italy, Brazil, UK, Canada		R		66 (IQR 55-75)	✓			✓			
Nielsen et.al., 2019	Denmark		R		64 (≥18)	✓			✓			
Hartley et al., 2019	UK		R		NR	✓				✓	✓	✓
Cardona et al, 2018, 2019	Australia, Denmark		P		65+	✓	✓		✓	✓		

Author and publication year	Country of study subjects or where guideline applied	Publication type			Target population			Pathological Process		Proposed Benefit criteria		
		Guideline /consensus	Retro/prospective	Literature review	Age range (years) ^a	Admitted to ICU	ED/other hospital	Pneumonia/Lung	Multi-organ/sepsis	ICU Admission/ not	Discharge (ICU)	Ventilator access
Van Walraven 2015	Canada & USA		R		≥18 years		✓		✓			
Brown et al, 2012	USA		R		Adults	✓	✓			✓		
Grossmann et al., 2012	Switzerland		P		≥65		✓		✓			
Godfrey et al., 2012	Australia, New Zealand		R		42-88	✓			✓	✓		
Brunner-Ziegler et al, 2007	Austria		P		<65 to ≥85	✓			✓			
Braband et al, 2010	Multiple			LR	Adults		✓		✓	✓		
Koch et al., 2019	Multiple			LR	All ages		✓		✓	✓		
CHILDREN ALGORITHMS												
Slater et al, 2003	AUS, NZ, UK		P		Median 19 months	✓		✓				
Tabak et.al., 2013	US		R		<17 yrs		✓	✓	✓			
Gupta et al, 2018	USA		R		4.0 (IQR 0.8-11.6)	✓			✓			

^a range or mean \pm SD or median and IQR as reported in eligibility or findings sections of eligible articles

(D): Derivation cohort DK=Denmark LR=Literature review NL=The Netherlands N/R= Not reported
Assessment P= Prospective R=Retrospective S=Simulation STSS= Simple Triage Scoring System

SOFA= Sepsis-related Organ Failure
(V)= Validation cohort

Supplement 2. Table S2.1 Validation status, study types and clinical parameters predicting poor outcome for potentially guidance on ICU admission or discharge during pandemics (N=16)

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
EXPERT CONSENSUS						
SOFA score	I	P	Taskforce advice	N	PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ ratio ≤ 100 Bilirubin >12 mg/dL Hypotension with vasopressors (dopamine>15 epinephrine>0.1 norepinephrine>0.1) Glasgow Coma score <6 Creatinine (mg/dL ($\mu\text{mol/L}$) > 5.0 or urine<200 mL/d	Exclusion from critical care: 1.If risk of hospital mortality $\geq 80\%$ SOFA > 15 SOFA > 5 for ≥ 5 d, and with flat or rising trend ≥ 6 organ failures 2. Severe, chronic disease with short life expectancy (age >85yr) [Devereaux 2007] Exclusion from ICU SOFA > 11 Blue code=High probability of mortality; should be discharged from critical care; medical management palliate and discharge [Powell 2008] Exclusion from ventilator access: -Cardiac arrest: unwitnessed, non-responsive, recurrent -Metastatic malignancy with poor prognosis -End-stage organ failure (cardiac, pulmonary, hepatic, renal or neurological) [Powell 2008]
	I	P	Consensus	N		
SOFA score	I	P	Collaborative process using best evidence, expert panels, stakeholder consultations and ethical principles	N	Inclusion criteria: The patient must have 1 of the following: A. Requirement for invasive ventilatory support • Refractory hypoxemia (SpO ₂ < 90% on non-rebreather mask or FIO ₂ > 0.85) • Respiratory acidosis (pH < 7.2) • Clinical evidence of impending respiratory failure • Inability to protect or maintain airway B. Hypotension (systolic blood pressure < 90 mm Hg or relative hypotension) with clinical evidence of shock • altered level of consciousness, • decreased urine output or other evidence of end-organ failure refractory to volume resuscitation requiring vasopressor or inotrope support that cannot be managed in ward setting	The minimum criteria for survival dictate reassessment at 48 and 120 hours, as well as an ongoing cut-off ceiling if a patient ever has a SOFA score of 11 or higher or any other exclusion criteria. Highest priority for ICU: SOFA score ≤ 7 or single-organ failure Exclusion criteria- Manage on ward May not require ICU if too healthy and no evidence of organ failure or can be managed on the ward [Christian 2006]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Triage protocol	I	P	Qualitative consultation		<p>Demand > resources & Public health emergency declared</p> <p>Criteria for ventilator support/critical care interventions (1 or more of the following met):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Need to invasive ventilator support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refractory hypoxemia (SpO₂ < 90%) Respiratory acidosis Clinical evidence of impending respiratory failure Inability to protect or maintain airway Shock – systolic hypotension < 90mmHg with evidence of any of the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Altered level of consciousness Decreased urine output or other evidence of organ failure Refractory to volume resuscitation requiring vasopressor or inotrope support <p>Phase I: SOFA ≤ 7 or single organ failure SOFA < 8</p> <p>Phase II: (intubated patients re-evaluated at 48hours, 120hours and each 48-hour interval to continue MV) SOFA ≤ 11 and decreasing (48hr & 120hr assessment) SOFA < 8 with no improvement from initial assessment (48hr assessment) and/or SOFA < 8 with < 3 points decrease in past 72hrs</p>	<p>Highest priority for ventilator or critical care bed Immediate priority for ventilator or critical care bed</p> <p>Highest priority to continue with ventilator or critical care bed Immediate priority to continue with ventilator or critical care bed [Chuang 2020]</p>
Ventilator allocation during public SOFA score	E	P	Expert opinion	N	<p>SOFA score Comorbidities Life cycle principle (Age, or prioritise the young; i.e. save the most years)</p>	<p>Decline offer of ventilator and other scarce ICU technologies: SOFA score >12, severe comorbidities, death likely within 1 year, age ≥ 75 years Highest priority for ICU and ventilator: SOFA score < 6, no conditions that limit long-term survival, age 12-40 Next priority: SOFA score 6-9, minor comorbid conditions with small impact on long-term survival, age 41-60 [White 2009]</p>

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
AGILITIES score Triage system for ventilators	I	P	Consensus by authors after Retrospective analysis and	N	Medical /surgical history: 1 pt for each of stroke, coronary disease, immune disease, diabetes, COPD, asthma, drug/alcohol use, smoking; 2 pts each for heart surgery, >10 medicines, home oxygen, CPAP/BiPAP; 4 pts for dialysis. Age in years x0.5 (or 24 minus months of life for toddlers) Glasgow score 15 minus GCS Infusions: # IV drugs x 2 Lungs: 2pts for use of suction; 3 pts each for SpO2 <88% on 50% O2, PAP >30cm of water, respiratory rate >30. Interventions: 1 pt for every IV drug started Tests: 1 pt for every test in the past 6 hours Incidental: 3 pt for every Lt/fluid in past 6 hours; 10 pts for threat or violence to any provider Excessive weight: 3 pts for BMI >30; 6 pts for BMI >40 Subtract 2 pts if gestation >34 weeks	AGILITIES score used to remove ambiguity of ventilator allocation: score >100 is an indication for removal from ventilator and seek other means of ventilation (i.e. bag mask) but may preserve airway devices such as endotracheal tube. [Wilkens 2010]
NY Dept of Health 2015 Guidelines	E	P	Consensus guidelines		Worst-Moderate and Best parameters specified for adults, children and neonates with (blue or black, red, yellow, green) colour scheme adopted from military disaster protocols for admission eligibility & exclusion criteria for ventilator allocation	Exclusion from ventilator Medical Conditions that Result in Immediate or Near-Immediate Mortality Even with Aggressive Therapy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cardiac arrest: unwitnessed arrest, recurrent arrest without hemodynamic stability, arrest unresponsive to standard interventions and measures; trauma-related arrest • Irreversible age-specific hypotension [NY Taskforce 2015]
ALGORITHM/TRIAGE PROTOCOLS						
COVID-19 clinical risk score	E	P	Retrospective	Y	Increased age, per year in patients with COVID-19 Any chest x-ray abnormality in patients with COVID-19 Presence of hemoptysis in patients with COVID-19 Presence of dyspnea in patients with COVID-19 Unconsciousness in patients with COVID-19 Positive cancer history in patients with COVID-19	Predicts critical illness event, i.e. composite outcome of wither requiring ventilation, ICU admission, or death in patients with COVID-19 OR 1.03 (95% CI 1.01– 1.05), p = 0.002 OR 3.39 (95% CI 2.14 – 5.38), p < 0.001 OR 4.53 (95% CI 1.36 – 15.15), p = 0.01 OR 1.88 (95% CI 1.18 – 3.01), p = 0.01 OR 4.71 (95% CI 1.39 – 15.98), p = 0.01 OR 4.07 (95% CI 1.23 – 13.43), p = 0.02 [Liang 2020]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Algorithm for COVID-19 in-hospital mortality	I	P	Prospective	N	Age (per 10-year increase) Chronic cardiac disease (CHF, CAD) COPD or interstitial lung disease Interleukin 6 (per decile increase) D-dimer per decile increase	Predictors of in-hospital mortality: HR 1.31 (1.09-1.57) HR 1.76 (1.08-2.86) HR 2.94 (1.48-5.84) HR 1.11 (1.02-1.20) HR 1.10 (1.01-1.19) [Cummings 2020]
SOFA score	I	P	Observational cohort study	Y	Criteria for assessing patients before ICU admission: Triage for critical care 1) Patient has any of the predefined exclusion criteria, or has a SOFA score > 11 (Considered too ill for ICU support; manage medically & palliative care as needed) 2) SOFA 8-11 (Intermediate priority ; admit to ICU if no patient in red category requires bed) 3) SOFA score <= 7 or single-organ failure (Highest priority ; admit to ICU if bed available) 4) No significant organ failure (i.e. does not require any ICU specific treatment and care can be managed adequately on general ward) (Defer or discharge Reassess as needed)	Performance of priority for ICU admission: Sensitivity 61.0% and specificity 87.0% But AUROC for SOFA score>11 at admission predicting mortality in all patients AUROC =0.740 indicating only a fair level of test accuracy. [Guest 2009]
SOFA score	I I	P P	Retrospective validation Retrospective chart review	Y N	PaO2/FiO2 ratio ≤100 Bilirubin >12 mg/dL Hypotension with vasopressors (dopamine>15 epinephrine>0.1 norepinephrine>0.1) Glasgow Coma score <6 Creatinine (mg/dL (μmol/L) > 5.0 or urine<200 mL/d	Ongoing assessment of SOFA scores not improving at 48 hours in mechanically ventilated patients led to changes in decision to remain in ICU [Khan 2009] For discharge from ICU as not likely to benefit: SOFA >11 [Grissom 2010]
Modified SOFA score	I	P	Retrospective validation	Y	PaO2/FiO2 ratio ≤150 Bilirubin - Scleral icterus or jaundice Hypotension with vasopressors (dopamine>15 epinephrine>0.1 norepinephrine>0.1) Glasgow Coma score <6 Creatinine (mg/dL (μmol/L) > 5.0	For discharge from ICU as not likely to benefit: high risk SOFA score combined with comorbid conditions that increase mortality risk [Grissom 2010]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
STSS Score (Simple Triage Scoring)	I	P	Retrospective analysis	Y	The STSS uses vital signs and patient characteristics that are available at initial presentation. Its components are: Respiratory rate >30 breaths per minute (OR 3.9, CI 2.5-6.3) Shock index >1 (HR > BP) (OR 2.8, CI 1.8-4.2) Low oxygen saturation (OR 2.8, CI 1.8-4.2) Altered mental status (OR 1.9, CI 1.3-2.8) Age of 65 to 74 years (OR 3.0, CI 1.7-5.5) Age of at least 75 years (OR 4.4, CI 2.7-7.2) *simplified final rule points = 1 for each variable	A higher STSS score equates with higher mortality in comparison with a high SOFA score. The performance of the STSS score was better at predicting need for ICU admission (AUROC 0.88; 0.78 to 0.98) and need for MV (AUROC 0.91; 0.83 to 0.99), compared to the SOFA score in predicting the need for admission to the ICU (AUROC 0.77; 0.65 to 0.89) and the requirement for MV (AUROC 0.87; 0.72 to 1.00). [Adeniji 2011]
Epidemic Triage rule	E	P	Retrospective validation	Y	(1 point each for) age of 65 yrs-74 or age ≥75 Altered mental status Respiratory rate of 30 breaths/min Low oxygen saturation Shock index of >1.0 (heart rate > blood pressure)	Score ≥ 3 Predicts need for critical care, mechanical ventilators and in-hospital death AUROC (derivation) 0.80 for mortality, 0.70 for ICU admission, 0.69 for MV requirement AUROC (validation) 0.73 for mortality, 0.70 for ICU admission, 0.68 for MV requirement [Talmor 2007]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions																																																																																																																																																				
PELOD score for ventilator triage protocol	E	P	Literature review	Y	<p>Exclusion criteria for ICU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cardiac arrest: unwitnessed cardiac arrest, witnessed cardiac arrest not responsive to electrical therapy, recurrent cardiac arrest - Metastatic malignant disease with poor prognosis - Advanced and irreversible immunocompromise - Severe and irreversible neurologic event or condition with highly expected mortality - End stage organ failure of any: NYHA Class III or IV heart failure; Child-Pugh score 7 or MELD score >20; severe chronic lung disease with FEV1 <25 predicted, baseline PaO2 <55mmHg or secondary pulmonary hypertension; previously diagnosed primary pulmonary hypertension with NYHA class III or IV heart failure, or mean pulmonary arterial pressure >50mmHg <table border="1" data-bbox="757 798 1346 1332"> <caption>PELOD Scoring System¹¹</caption> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Organ System</th> <th rowspan="2">Variable</th> <th colspan="4">Score</th> <th rowspan="2">Maximum System Score</th> </tr> <tr> <th>0</th> <th>1</th> <th>10</th> <th>20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Neurologic</td> <td>Glasgow coma score</td> <td>12-15 AND</td> <td>7-11</td> <td>4-6 OR</td> <td>3</td> <td rowspan="2">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pupillary reaction</td> <td>Both reactive</td> <td></td> <td>Both fixed</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="4">Cardiovascular</td> <td>Heart rate</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td rowspan="4">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td><12 y</td> <td>≤195 bpm</td> <td></td> <td>>195 bpm</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>>12 y</td> <td>≤150 bpm</td> <td></td> <td>>150 bpm</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>AND</td> <td></td> <td>OR</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="4">Systolic blood pressure</td> <td><1 mo</td> <td>>65 mm Hg</td> <td></td> <td>35-65 mm Hg</td> <td><35 mm Hg</td> <td rowspan="4">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>≥1 mo & <1 y</td> <td>>75 mm Hg</td> <td></td> <td>35-75 mm Hg</td> <td><35 mm Hg</td> </tr> <tr> <td>≥1 y & <12 y</td> <td>>85 mm Hg</td> <td></td> <td>45-85 mm Hg</td> <td><45 mm Hg</td> </tr> <tr> <td>≥12 y</td> <td>>95 mm Hg</td> <td></td> <td>55-95 mm Hg</td> <td><55 mm Hg</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="4">Renal</td> <td>Creatinine</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td rowspan="4">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td><7d</td> <td><1.59 mg/dL</td> <td></td> <td>≥1.59 mg/dL</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>≥7 d & <1 y</td> <td><0.62 mg/dL</td> <td></td> <td>≥0.62 mg/dL</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>≥1 y & <12 y</td> <td><1.13 mg/dL</td> <td></td> <td>≥1.13 mg/dL</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Pulmonary</td> <td>Pa o₂/F iO₂ ratio</td> <td>>70 mm Hg</td> <td></td> <td>≤70 mm Hg</td> <td></td> <td rowspan="2">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>AND</td> <td></td> <td>OR</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Hematologic</td> <td>Pa co₂</td> <td>≤90 mm Hg</td> <td></td> <td>>90 mm Hg</td> <td></td> <td rowspan="2">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>AND</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Hepatic</td> <td>Mechanical vent</td> <td>No</td> <td>Yes</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td rowspan="2">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WBC</td> <td>≥4.5K</td> <td>1.5-4.4 K</td> <td><1.5</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Hepatic</td> <td>Platelets</td> <td>≥35 K</td> <td><35</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td rowspan="3">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AST</td> <td><950 IU/L</td> <td>≥950 IU/L</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prothrombin time</td> <td>AND</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>>60%</td> <td>≤60%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Abbreviations: PELOD, Pediatric Logistic Organ Dysfunction; bpm, blood pressure monitor; Pa o₂/F iO₂, partial pressure of oxygen, arterial/fraction of inspired oxygen; Pa co₂, partial pressure of carbon dioxide, arterial; WBC, white blood cells; AST, aspartate aminotransferase.</p>	Organ System	Variable	Score				Maximum System Score	0	1	10	20	Neurologic	Glasgow coma score	12-15 AND	7-11	4-6 OR	3	20	Pupillary reaction	Both reactive		Both fixed		Cardiovascular	Heart rate					20	<12 y	≤195 bpm		>195 bpm		>12 y	≤150 bpm		>150 bpm			AND		OR		Systolic blood pressure	<1 mo	>65 mm Hg		35-65 mm Hg	<35 mm Hg	10	≥1 mo & <1 y	>75 mm Hg		35-75 mm Hg	<35 mm Hg	≥1 y & <12 y	>85 mm Hg		45-85 mm Hg	<45 mm Hg	≥12 y	>95 mm Hg		55-95 mm Hg	<55 mm Hg	Renal	Creatinine					10	<7d	<1.59 mg/dL		≥1.59 mg/dL		≥7 d & <1 y	<0.62 mg/dL		≥0.62 mg/dL		≥1 y & <12 y	<1.13 mg/dL		≥1.13 mg/dL		Pulmonary	Pa o ₂ /F iO ₂ ratio	>70 mm Hg		≤70 mm Hg		10		AND		OR		Hematologic	Pa co ₂	≤90 mm Hg		>90 mm Hg		10		AND				Hepatic	Mechanical vent	No	Yes			1	WBC	≥4.5K	1.5-4.4 K	<1.5		Hepatic	Platelets	≥35 K	<35			1	AST	<950 IU/L	≥950 IU/L			Prothrombin time	AND						>60%	≤60%			<p>Highest priority for ICU: Initial assessment PELOD <21 or single organ failure; 48h assessment PELOD <33 and decreasing; 120h assessment PELOD <33 and decreasing progressively Mortality of PELOD <21 20%</p> <p>Intermediate priority for ICU: Initial assessment PELOD 21-33; 48h assessment PELOD <21 no change; 120h assessment PELOD <21 minimal decrease (<3 point decrease in past 72h) Mortality of PELOD 33 90.6%</p> <p>Exclusion from ICU: Any exclusion criteria or PELOD >33</p> <p>PELOD score system proposed for use as a ventilator triage tool for pediatric patients during a respiratory pandemic.</p> <p>[Kim et.al., 2012]</p>
Organ System	Variable	Score						Maximum System Score																																																																																																																																																		
		0	1	10	20																																																																																																																																																					
Neurologic	Glasgow coma score	12-15 AND	7-11	4-6 OR	3	20																																																																																																																																																				
	Pupillary reaction	Both reactive		Both fixed																																																																																																																																																						
Cardiovascular	Heart rate					20																																																																																																																																																				
	<12 y	≤195 bpm		>195 bpm																																																																																																																																																						
	>12 y	≤150 bpm		>150 bpm																																																																																																																																																						
		AND		OR																																																																																																																																																						
Systolic blood pressure	<1 mo	>65 mm Hg		35-65 mm Hg	<35 mm Hg	10																																																																																																																																																				
	≥1 mo & <1 y	>75 mm Hg		35-75 mm Hg	<35 mm Hg																																																																																																																																																					
	≥1 y & <12 y	>85 mm Hg		45-85 mm Hg	<45 mm Hg																																																																																																																																																					
	≥12 y	>95 mm Hg		55-95 mm Hg	<55 mm Hg																																																																																																																																																					
Renal	Creatinine					10																																																																																																																																																				
	<7d	<1.59 mg/dL		≥1.59 mg/dL																																																																																																																																																						
	≥7 d & <1 y	<0.62 mg/dL		≥0.62 mg/dL																																																																																																																																																						
	≥1 y & <12 y	<1.13 mg/dL		≥1.13 mg/dL																																																																																																																																																						
Pulmonary	Pa o ₂ /F iO ₂ ratio	>70 mm Hg		≤70 mm Hg		10																																																																																																																																																				
		AND		OR																																																																																																																																																						
Hematologic	Pa co ₂	≤90 mm Hg		>90 mm Hg		10																																																																																																																																																				
		AND																																																																																																																																																								
Hepatic	Mechanical vent	No	Yes			1																																																																																																																																																				
	WBC	≥4.5K	1.5-4.4 K	<1.5																																																																																																																																																						
Hepatic	Platelets	≥35 K	<35			1																																																																																																																																																				
	AST	<950 IU/L	≥950 IU/L																																																																																																																																																							
	Prothrombin time	AND																																																																																																																																																								
		>60%	≤60%																																																																																																																																																							

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Community Assessment Tools (CATs) criteria	W	P	Retrospective	N	CATS parameters Severe respiratory distress Increased respiratory rate Oxygen saturation $\leq 92\%$ on pulse oximetry breathing air, or 'on oxygen' Respiratory exhaustion Evidence of severe clinical dehydration or clinical shock Altered consciousness level Causing other clinical concern to patient's GP or clinical team	<p>Predicts use of mechanical ventilation: Increased respiratory rate: Adults OR=2.74 (95%CI 1.78-4.23) Oxygen saturation $<92\%$ breathing air, or on oxygen: Children OR=4.27 (95% CI 2.22-8.22); Adults OR=7.18 (95%CI 4.33-11.9) Respiratory exhaustion: Adults OR=6.13 (95%CI 2.08-18.1) Severe clinical dehydration or shock: Children OR=16.5 (95%CI 2.10-130); Adults OR=1.89 (95%CI 1.17-3.05) Altered consciousness: Children OR=5.42 (95%CI 2.57-11.4); Adults OR=4.02 (95%CI 1.97-8.21) Other clinical concern: Adults OR=2.76 (95%CI 1.53-4.99)</p> <p>Predicts ICU admission or death: Severe respiratory distress: Children OR=2.14 (95%CI 1.17-3.91) Increased respiratory rate: Adults OR=2.28 (95%CI 1.55-3.34) Oxygen saturation $<92\%$ breathing air, or on oxygen: Children OR=3.72 (95%CI 2.07-6.67); Adults OR=5.68 (95%CI 3.81-8.48) Respiratory exhaustion: Adults OR=3.53 (95%CI 1.23-10.1) Severe clinical dehydration or shock: Children OR=13.3 (95%CI 1.71-104); Adults OR=2.51 (95%CI 1.66-3.79) Altered consciousness: Children OR=6.79 (95%CI 3.34-13.8); Adults OR=4.31 (95%CI 2.21-8.41) Other clinical concern: Adults OR=2.49 (95%CI 1.47-4.23)</p> <p>CATs may have value in scenarios where a high triage threshold is required for both adults and children such as other severe acute respiratory pandemic events, and possibly in some sudden impact health emergencies producing mass casualties.</p> <p>[Semple et.al., 2013]</p>

Supplement 2. Table S2.2 Validation status, and clinical parameters predicting poor outcome for potentially guidance on ICU admission or discharge derived from routine care studies in ICU, ED or wards(N= 46 studies)

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
EXPERT CONSENSUS						
Triaging scoring system	I	R	Consensus Framework		<p>**Scoring system Primary considerations: Prognosis for short-term survival – based on Adults (SOFA) or paediatrics (PELOD-2)</p> <p>PELOD-2 Glasgow coma score ≥ 11 Pupillary reaction – both reactive Lactatemia (mmol/L) < 5.0 Mean arterial pressure (mmHg) Creatinine (umol/L) PaO₂ (mmHg)/FiO₂ ≥ 61 PaCO₂ (mmHg) ≥ 58 Invasive ventilation - no WBC count ($\times 10^9/L$) > 2 Platelet ($\times 10^9/L$) ≥ 142</p> <p>Prognosis for long-term survival – based on assessment of comorbid conditions: 1. NYHA class IV heart failure. 2. Advanced lung disease with FEV₁ $< 25\%$ predicted, total lung capacity $< 60\%$ predicted, or baseline PAO₂ < 55 mm Hg. 3. Primary pulmonary hypertension with NYHA class III or IV heart failure. 4. Chronic liver disease with Child-Pugh score > 7. 5. Severe trauma. 6. Advanced untreatable neuromuscular disease. 7. Metastatic malignant disease or high-grade primary brain tumors Secondary considerations (tiebreaker): Age (life cycle considerations)</p>	<p>Score 1: SOFA score ≤ 8, PELOD-2 ≤ 12 Score 2: SOFA score 9-11, 12 PELOD-2 12-13 Score 3: SOFA score 12-14, PELOD-2 14-16 Score 4: SOFA score > 14, PELOD-2 ≥ 17</p> <p>Score ≥ 3: severe comorbid conditions; death likely within 1year</p> <p>Score 1: Age 0-49years Score 2: Age 50-69years Score 3: Age 70-84years Score 4: Age ≥ 85years</p> <p>[Daugherty- Biddison 2019]</p>

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
qSOFA	E	R	3rd International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis & Retrospective	N	Quick sepsis-related multiorgan failure assessment for pneumonia patients one point each for low blood pressure (SBP≤100 mmHg), high respiratory rate (≥22 breaths per min), or altered mental state (Glasgow coma scale <15) Sepsis-3 (suspected infection + qSOFA ≥ 2) vasopressors required to maintain MAP ≥65 mm Hg AND serum lactate level >2 mmol/L →septic shock	Predictor of: ICU admission (OR 4.69 95% CI 3.21 – 6.84, p<0.0001) need for invasive ventilation (OR 3.62 (95% CI 2.33 -5.62, p <0.0001) in-hospital mortality (OR 3.62 (95% CI 1.83 – 7.19, p 0.001) [Mark 2016] qSOFA in sepsis predicts in-hospital mortality of 10% qSOFA in septic shock predicts mortality of 40% [Singer &Cliff 2016]
modified British Thoracic Society (mBTS) rule	W	R	Consensus	Y	One point for each of Confusion, Urea >7 mmol/l, Respiratory rate >30/min, low systolic(<90 mm Hg) or diastolic (<60 mm Hg) Blood pressure) when blood urea results not available. (2+ points=severe pneumonia)	CURB score ≥2 has OR=5.2 95%CI 2.7-10.3 30-day mortality Sensitivity 75% (95% CI 72 -78) and specificity 69% (95% CI 66 - 72) [Lim WS 2003] Albumin <30 g/dl OR 4.7 95%CI 2.5-8.7 [Lim WS 2003]
ALGORITHM/SCORES						
INTENSIVE CARE						
Prediction tool for favourable neurologic outcome among paediatric ICU patients	I	R	Retrospective	Y	Cardiac arrest – no versus yes Days of mechanical ventilation (for every 3 day decrease)	Predicts favourable neurological outcome (defined as improvement, no change, or decline by only 1 in Pediatric Cerebral Performance Category scale, from ICU admission to ICU discharge) OR 0.50 (95% CI 0.41-0.61), p < 0.001 OR 0.91 (95% CI 0.89-0.93), p < 0.001 [Gupta 2018]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Simplified Mortality Score for the Intensive Care Unit (SMS-ICU)	I	R	Retrospective	Y	Age - 60-79 years – 10 points - ≥80 years – 13 points Lowest systolic blood pressure - ≤49mmHg – 6 points - 50-69mmHg – 5 points Acute surgical admission – 3 points Haematologic malignancy or metastatic cancer – 7 points Use of vasopressors/inotropes – 4 points Use of respiratory support – 5 points Use of renal replacement therapy – 4 points	Predicts 90-day mortality in patients admitted to ICU AUROC 0.72 (95% CI 0.71-0.74) Haematologic malignancy or metastatic cancer – OR 2.68 (95% CI 2.19 – 3.28), p < 0.001 Use of vasopressors or inotropes – OR 1.76 (95% CI 1.48-2.09), p < 0.001 Use of respiratory support – OR 1.99 (95% CI 1.69 – 2.34), p < 0.001 [Granholtm 2018]
Predictive model of ICU mortality	I	R	Prospective	Y	Sepsis Mechanical ventilation Inotropic support Cardiology admission (including surgical cardiology admissions)	Predicts all-cause mortality during ICU admission OR = 4.41 (95% CI 2.01-9.68), p < 0.001 OR = 9.99 (95% CI 4.54-22.02), p < 0.001 OR = 5.01 (95% CI 2.35-10.70), p < 0.001 OR = 2.84 (95% CI 1.19-6.81), p = 0.019 AUROC 0.95 (95% CI 0.91-0.99) in validation sample [Dólera-Moreno 2016]
Revised Paediatric Index of Mortality (PIM2)	I	R	Retrospective	Y	Paediatric Revised index Mechanical ventilation predicts mortality: High risk diagnosis (cardiac arrest preceding ICU admission, severe combined immune deficiency, leukaemia or lymphoma after first induction, spontaneous cerebral haemorrhage, cardiomyopathy or myocarditis, hypoplastic left heart syndrome, HIV infection, liver failure as main reason for ICU admission, or, neurodegenerative disorder)	OR 3.801 (95% CI 3.061-4.719), p < 0.001 predicts ICU mortality OR 5.381 (95% CI 4.566-6.343), p < 0.001 predicts ICU mortality AUROC 0.85 (95% CI 0.82–0.87) in patients admitted with cardiac illness AUROC 0.85 (95% CI 0.82–0.89) in patients admitted with neurological illness AUROC 0.87 (95% CI 0.84–0.89) in patients admitted with respiratory illness [Slater 2003]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Severe Hypoxaemia Associated Risk Prediction Model for mechanically ventilated patients in ICU	I	R	Retrospective	Y	Serum pH 7.2 – 7.35 Serum pH < 7.2 Vasopressor use (dopamine, epinephrine, vasopressin, and phenylephrine)	Predicts in hospital mortality for patients with severe hypoxaemic respiratory failure on mechanical ventilation OR = 2.2 (95% CI 1.3-3.6), p = 0.002 OR = 17.4 (95% CI 4.7-112.7), p < 0.001 OR = 2.1 (95% CI 1.2-3.6), p = 0.006 Derivation cohort AUC 0.85 (95% CI 0.81-0.89) Validation cohort AUC 0.80 (95% CI 0.76-0.83) [Pannu 2015]
ProVent 14 score	I	R	Cohort	Y	Increasing age (continuous) Platelet count < 100,000/mL Requirement for vasopressors/inotropes still on day 14 Requirement for hemodialysis (renal replacement therapy provided on or within 48 hours before or after day 14 of mechanical ventilation) Non-trauma admission.	For patients already received 14 days of mechanical ventilation: AUROC for 1-year mortality model using continuous variables was 0.80 (95% CI 0.76–0.83) development cohort and 0.78 (95% CI 0.72–0.83) validation cohort vs. APACHE III for 1-yr mortality in this cohort 0.60 (95% CI, 0.55–0.64) ProVent 14 model can support clinical judgment of prognosis and can inform clinical decision aids to facilitate discussions of goals of care in the setting of prolonged mechanical ventilation (Potential to use for discharge from ICU) [Hough 2015]
SAPSII & source of ICU admission	I	R	Observational study		Age-excluded SAPS-II score has a greater impact on ICU mortality ICU admission from within hospital vs. from a public place	OR = 1.03 95%CI 1.02-1.03 p<0.001 OR = 1.5, p = 0.04 [Brunner-Ziegler 2007]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
SAPS II (Simplified Acute Physiology Score II)	I	R	Retrospective analysis	Y	SAPS II Age >50; heart rate <69 or >120; Systolic BP <100 or >200; Temperature > 39C ; PaO2 if on MV: <100, 100-199 or >200; urinary output <1.0 L/day; Blood urea Nitrogen > 10 mmol/L; WBC <1 or >20 /mm3; Potassium <3 or >5 mmol/L; Sodium <125 or >145; Bicarbonate <20 mmol/L; Bilirubin >68.4 umol/L; Glasgow Comma Scale <14; metastatic cancer; scheduled medical admission; unscheduled surgical admission	SAPS II score range from 0 to 163 points; The higher the score the higher the mortality risk. 64 points 75% in-hospital mortality; 77 points 90% mortality; ≥142 = 100% mortality AUROC 0.87 for in-hospital mortality among ICU patients [Aegerter 2005]
SMART-COP score	I	R	Cohort	Y	Systolic blood pressure < 90 mm Hg Multilobar involvement on radiography Albumin <3.5 mg/dL Respiratory rate > 30 breaths/min (age > 50 years) or RR>25 breaths/min if <50 years Tachycardia ≥125 bpm Confusion (new onset) Oxygen saturation PaO2 ≤93% (<50 years), ≤90% (≥ 50 years) P Arterial pH < 7.35 (decreased)	92.3% (84.8–96.9) sensitive in identifying which patients need ICU-level care (Intensive vasopressor and respiratory support= IVRS) and 30-day mortality. Specificity 62.3 (58.8–65.7) Score 5-6 points :High risk (1 in 3) of needing IRVS Score ≥ 7 points: Very high risk (2 in 3) of needing IRVS Score ≥3 AUROC 0.87 (95%CI 0.83-0.91); Score ≥2 AUROC 0.80 (95%CI 0.76-0.84) [Charles 2008]
MPM Mortality Probability Models	I	R	Cohort	Y	Age 70+; heart rate ≥ 150bpm; systolic BP ≤ 90mmHg; on mechanical ventilation; Coma/stupor or GCS 3-4; Chronic renal failure; acute renal failure; Cirrhosis; metastatic neoplasm; unscheduled admission; CPR prior to admission; GI bleeding; cerebrovascular incident; cardiac dysrhythmia; full code status; or no other risk factor.	AUROC 0.837 on admission and 0.844 at 24 hours in predicting hospital mortality. Reasonable to support clinical judgment. Robust to predict ICU outcome in groups of patients meeting risk factor profiles. [Higgins 2008]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Algorithm at ICU Admission	I	R	Retrospective analysis	Y	APACHE III-j scoring system to predict risk of death. Treatment limitations at admission to ICU vs risk of death Sepsis with shock Unspecified respiratory diseases Chronic comorbidities	OR = 5.68, 95%CI 5.32%-6.07% (p < 0.001) OR = 0.53, 95% CI 0.37-0.76 (p<0.001) OR = 0.57, 95%CI 0.38-0.85 (p =.005) OR = 0.89, 95%CI 0.81-0.98 (p = 0.019) AUROC = 0.80 Development model (2007 and 2008) AUROC = 0.79 Validation model (2009) [Godfrey 2012]
Intensive Care Admission Triage scores	I	R	Prospective observational	N	Final triage score parameters: Age: 60-70 (32 pts); 70-80 (53pts); >80 (56pts) Diagnosis: cerebrovascular accident (83pts); intracerebral haemorrhage/haematoma (19pts); status post-cardiopulmonary resuscitation (27pts); cardiogenic shock (94pts) Creatinine: 140-200 (8pts); >200 (13pts) WCC: ≤5 (17pts); >21 (12pts) Platelets: ≤70 (53pts); 70-120 (24pts) Albumin: ≤24 (15pts) Vasopressors: any (24pts) Glasgow Coma scale: ≤4 (117pts); 5-6 (78pts); 7-14 (7pts) Karnofsky performance status: ≤40%(42pts);50-60%(16pts) Operative status: no operation (12pts) Chronic disorders: chronic renal failure, dialysis, cirrhosis (29pts); haematologic neoplasm, metastatic cancer, AIDS, immunosuppression (25pts)	Admission criteria: Initial refusal score <173.5 (predicted to survive) and subsequent assessment with final triage score >0. Final triage score AUROC 0.83 (95%CI 0.80-0.86) Non-admission criteria: Initial refusal score >173.5 (predicted to not survive), or initial refusal score <173.5 with final triage score=0 (survive even without ICU care) This objective triage score can improve patient survival, decrease admissions of patients who will not benefit from ICU care. [Sprung et.al., 2012]
qSOFA	I	R	Retrospective	N	Sepsis-3: suspected infection + qSOFA ≥2	qSOFA ≥2 predicts: 28-day mortality: OR=2.722 (95% CI 1.582-4.683), p<0.001 Worse clinical severity (septic shock) and medical resource use (ventilators+ haemodialysis) within 72h of ICU admission. [Na et.al., 2017]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Aggregation of long-term disease history and acute physiology (SAPS II, APACHE II)	I	R	Retrospective	Y	<p>Aggregated history parameters: Age, sex, 10-year disease history prior to ICU, length of hospital stay, transfer category, hospital code, acute (first 24h ICU admission) SAPS II & APACHE II score</p> <p>SAPS II parameters: Age, bilirubin, FiO₂, Glasgow coma scale, heart frequency, PaO₂, serum bicarbonate, serum potassium, sodium, urea, systolic blood pressure, temperature, urine output, white cell count, chronic disease (metastatic cancers, haematological malignancy, AIDs), mechanical ventilation, type of admission</p> <p>APACHE II parameters: Age, arterial pH, Glasgow coma scale, heart rate, haematocrit, mean arterial pressure, PaO₂, respiratory rate, serum creatinine, potassium, sodium, temperature, white cell count, acute renal failure, history of severe organ failure of immunocompromise (cardiac failure, cirrhosis, chronic lung disease, dialysis-dependent renal failure)</p>	<p>Aggregated history predicts: In-hospital mortality: AUROC 0.792, PPV 0.575 30-day mortality: AUROC 0.787, PPV 0.481 90-day mortality: AUROC 0.787, PPV 0.589</p> <p>[Nielsen et.al., 2019]</p>
Secretoneurin levels	I	R	N/R	Y	Secretoneurin levels >175pmol/L associated with mortality in critically ill patients with severe sepsis	<p>Predict in-hospital mortality for patients with severe sepsis: OR=3.17 (95% CI 1.12-9.00), p=0.030</p> <p>Predict shock during hospitalisation for patients with severe sepsis: OR=2.17 (95% CI 1.06-4.46), p=0.034</p> <p>[Rosjo et.al., 2015]</p>
Palliative Performance Scale	I	R	Prospective	Y	<p>Primary diagnosis of emergency CABG or valve replacement</p> <p>Male APACHE II (per 9 points) Charlson Comorbidity Index (per 2 points) Primary diagnosis of stroke Clinical frailty scale (per 2 points)</p>	<p>Predict poor performance at 12 months OR 8.48 (95%CI 1.91-37.8)</p> <p>Predict good performance at 12 months OR 0.51 (95%CI 0.29-0.89) OR 0.52 (95%CI 0.37-0.74) OR 0.59 (95%CI 0.43-0.80) OR 0.30 (95%CI 0.09-0.96) OR 0.42 (95%CI 0.25-0.71)</p> <p>Cut-off @10% probability of PPS >=60: Sensitivity 97%, specificity 32% Cut-off @50% probability of PPS >=60: Sensitivity 47%, specificity 92% AUROC 0.81 fir 8-parameter model</p> <p>[Heyland et al., 2016]</p>

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Procalcitonin	I	R	Retrospective	Y	Plasma procalcitonin 72h change 4 category cut-offs: 0% decrease or PCT increase 40% decrease 60% decrease ≥80% decrease	<p>72h PCT kinetics predict ICU mortality & in-hospital mortality: Derivation cohort: AUROC 0.70 (95% CI 0.61-0.79) & AUROC 0.70 (95% CI 0.61-0.79) Validation cohort: AUROC 0.71 (95% CI 0.57-0.84) & AUROC 0.67 (95% CI 0.54-0.79)</p> <p>>80% PCT decrease predicts ICU mortality Derivation cohort ICU mortality: sensitivity 0.91 (95% CI 0.79-0.98), specificity 0.35 (95% CI 0.26-0.45), PPV 0.37 (95% CI 0.28-0.46), NPV 0.90 (95% CI 0.77-0.97) Validation cohort: sensitivity 0.83 (95% CI 0.59-0.96), specificity 0.37 (95% CI 0.27-0.48), PPV 0.22 (95% CI 0.13-0.34), NPV 0.91 (95% CI 0.76-0.98) &</p> <p>>80% PCT decrease predicts in-hospital mortality: Derivation cohort: Sensitivity 0.92 (95% CI 0.80-0.98), specificity 0.36 (95% CI 0.27-0.46), PPV 0.40 (95% CI 0.31-0.50), NPV 0.90 (95% CI 0.77-0.97) Validation cohort: sensitivity 0.77 (95% CI 0.58-0.90), specificity 0.38 (95% CI 0.26-0.50), PPV 0.34 (95% CI 0.23-0.46), NPV 0.79 (95% CI 0.62-0.91)</p> <p>>80% PCT decrease within 72h predicts individuals with lower ICU and in-hospital mortality risk and hence good candidates for early ICU discharge. Conversely, a non-decrease or increase of PCT may help to flag patients who are at high mortality risk and, therefore likely to require treatment escalation. [Schuetz et.al., 2013]</p>
EMERGENCY						
qSOFA	E	R	Retrospective	N	Quick sepsis-related organ failure assessment parameters: 1pt each for systolic blood pressure ≤100 mmHg, respiratory rate ≥22 breaths/min, Glasgow coma scale ≤13	<p>Sepsis-3 predicts: ICU admission: OR=4.69 (95% CI 3.21-6.84), p<0.0001 Need for invasive ventilation: OR=3.62 (95% CI 2.3-5.62), p <0.0001 In-hospital mortality: OR=3.62 (95% CI 1.83-7.19), p<0.001 [Mark et.al., 2016]</p>

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Triage Information Mortality model (TIMM)	E	R	Retrospective	Y	TIMM parameters: Age Gender Arrival by ambulance Triage complaint (cardiac arrest, syncope/collapse, other cardiac, sepsis, other neurological, stroke/transient ischaemic attack, other respiratory, malignancy, malaise) ATS score (1-5)	<p>Predicts in-hospital mortality: Age OR=1.05 (95%CI 1.05-1.06) Male gender OR=1.34 (95%CI 1.26-1.42) Arrival by ambulance OR=1.94 (95%CI 1.78-2.12) Cardiac arrest OR=14.28 (95%CI 11-18.9) Syncope/collapse OR=1.57 (95%CI 1.41-1.75) Other cardiac OR=1.23 (95%CI 1.08-1.40) Sepsis OR=2.77 (95%CI 2.10-3.66) Other neurological OR=1.75 (95%CI 1.50-2.04) Stroke/transient ischaemic attack OR=3.01 (95%CI 2.69-3.37) Other respiratory OR=2.13 (95%CI 1.95-2.35) Malignancy OR=10.63 (95%CI 9.06-12.46) Malaise OR=3.27 (95%CI 2.62-4.09) ATS 2 OR=0.23 (95%CI 0.21-0.26) ATS 3 OR=0.13 (95%CI 0.12-0.15) ATS 4 OR=0.09 (95%CI 0.08-0.11) ATS 5 OR=0.09 (95%CI 0.04-0.19) Derivation cohort: AUROC 0.834 (95%CI 0.829-0.839) External validation cohort: AUROC 0.837 (95%CI 0.823-0.851)</p> <p>[Teubner et.al., 2015]</p>
SCAP score Severe community acquired pneumonia	E	R	Cohort	Y	age > 80 years, multilobar involvement on radiography, respiratory rate > 30 breaths/min, altered mental status/confusion (new onset) PaO ₂ <54 mmHg or PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ < 250 mm Hg, decreased arterial pH, < 7.30), and systolic blood pressure < 90 mm Hg.	<p>Measured in ED, predictors of adverse patient-oriented outcomes potentially necessitating a higher level of care Major criteria for adverse outcome: pH<7.30 OR=10.8 (95%CI3.5-34.0) and Systolic BP <90 mmHg OR=8.9 (95%CI 3.2-25.2) Minor criteria: respiratory rate OR=12.7 (95%CI 7.7-21.0); altered mental state OR=</p> <p>Sensitivity 92.1% and 84.3% (derivation and validation); Specificity 73.8% and 60.3% (derivation and validation) and AUROC 0.38 and 0.72 (derivation and validation) [España 2006]</p>

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Shock Index (SI)	E	R	Retrospective	N Y N	(SI) is defined as the heart rate (HR) divided by systolic blood pressure (SBP) in patients at risk of shock from: pulmonary embolism, sepsis, etc Score >1.3 increase likelihood of hospital admission Score >1.3 increase likelihood of inpatient mortality Score > 1.0 at 2 hours post-resuscitation best death predictor Score >0.9 Predicts increased risk of mortality, need for massive transfusion protocol activation, and admission to ICU SI >0.8 predicts requirement for vasopressors within 72 hrs of admission	Likelihood Ratio (+LR 6.76) Likelihood Ratio (+LR 5.67) [Jalbout 2017] AUROC 0.889 [95% CI 0.805, 0.974] for at least 80% of those identified in ED ; SI useful to anticipate need for ICU and likelihood of mortality but not in isolation [Koch 2019]
Scoring systems as triage tools on admission to ED	E	R	Systematic Review	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-hospital mortality Some systems used vital signs others blood tests for patients admitted to a MAU or non-surgical ED or transferred to hospital wards. 30-day mortality Mortality while admitted to ED Death within 15mins to 24hours after arrival 	REMS: AUROC = 0.852 (+/- 0.014) p < 0.0001 external validation TTS: AUROC (0.657-0.782) external validation GS: AUROC = 0.81 (95% CI: 0.78-0.84) WPS: AUROC = 0.74 (0.74-0.77) EWS: AUROC = 0.68 (0.65-0.71) SCS: AUROC = 0.858 (SE 0.009) derivation AUROC = 0.856 (SE 0.013) validation: ALT: AUROC = 0.904: no 95%CI provided HOTEL: AUROC = 0.865 (0.793-0.937) derivation AUROC = 0.854 (0.746-0.962) validation: [Braband 2010]
Mortality in Emergency Department Sepsis (MEDS) score	E	R	Retrospective case control	Y	Terminal illness (<30 days) – 6 points Tachypnoea (respiratory rate >20) or hypoxia (oxygen saturation <90% or need for oxygen saturation of 40% FiO2 or higher to maintain adequate saturation) – 3 points Septic shock – 3 points Platelets <150,000/mm ³ – 3 points Bands >5% - 3 points Age >65 – 3 points Lower respiratory tract infection – 2 points Nursing home resident – 2 points Altered mental status – 2 points	MEDS score predicts clinical deterioration (i.e. requiring a critical care consult, ICU admission, or death) at: 48-72 hours before clinical deterioration event - AUROC 0.71 (95%CI 0.64- 0.78) 0-12 hours before clinical deterioration event – AUROC 0.74 (95%CI 0.70-0.78) [Yu 2014]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
IDSA/ATS criteria on admission	E	R	Retrospective study	Y	Community acquired pneumonia: IDSA/ATS 2007 criteria for severe pneumonia: Minor criteria Respiratory rateb \geq 30 breaths/min PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ ratio \leq 250 Multilobar infiltrates Confusion/disorientation Uremia (BUN level, \geq 20 mg/dL) Leukopeniac (WBC count, $<$ 4000 cells/mm ³) Thrombocytopenia (platelet count, $<$ 100,000 cells/mm ³) Hypothermia (core temperature, $<$ 36C) Hypotension requiring aggressive fluid resuscitation Major criteria Invasive mechanical ventilation Septic shock with the need for vasopressors Ward triage to ICU within 72 hours IDSA/ATS score \geq 3 at admission in the ED triaged to the ward Initial Ward Triage vs. Initial ICU Triage on 30-day mortality	OR = 2.6, p=0.056 30-day mortality OR = 4.0, p=0.08 mortality OR = 2.4 95% CI 0.95–5.9, p = 0.06 [Brown 2012]
Simple Clinical Score (SCS)	E	R	Prospective	Y N	Age 75+, Coma, oxygen saturation $<$ 90%, respiratory rate $>$ 30/min or breathlessness, systolic blood pressure \leq 70, Pulse $>$ systolic BP, new stroke, Altered mental status (agitated, confused, fluctuating level of consciousness), nursing home residency, unable to stand unaided, prior illness keeping patient some part of day in bed, diabetes type 1 or 2, abnormal ECG, Temperature $<$ 35 C or \geq 39 C SCS can be used to stratify patients into 5 groups with very low to very high risk profiles	Weighted SCS score \geq 12 points indicates very high risk patients; 8-11 high risk of death from the first to the 30th day after admission. Most significant adjusted predictors of 30-day mortality: Coma, new stroke, temperature $<$ 35C or \geq 39C, inability to stand unaided, & abnormal ECG AUROC 0.858 derivation (SE 0.009) and 0.856 (SE 0.013) validation [Kellert 2006] Applicability for early identification of patients with a high risk of death, who will require care in critical care areas (or specialist palliative care) [Subbe 2010]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Emergency Severity Index (ESI) for triaging older patients	E	R	Prospective cohort study	Y	<p>Age \geq 65years</p> <p>Association of ESI with mortality (ESI level 2 vs 1) (ESI level 3 vs 2)</p> <p>Admission to an ICU</p> <p>ESI (level 1) diagnostic accuracy to predict life-saving interventions</p> <p>ESI 5-level triage tool (Level 1): Stability of vital functions (ABCs): Unstable Life threat or organ threat: Obvious Requires resuscitation: Immediately Severe pain or severe distress: Yes Expected resource intensity: max – staff at bedside continuously; mobilisation of outside resources Physician/staff response: immediate team effort Expected time disposition: 1.5hr</p>	<p>HR = 0.128 (95% CI 0.03 to 0.52) HR = 0.309 (95% CI 0.09 to 1.01)</p> <p>Age \geq 65years AUROC = 0.7490 (95% CI 0.727 to 0.770)</p> <p>Sensitivity = 0.462 (95% CI 0.232 to 0.709) Specificity = 0.998 (95% CI 0.989 to 1.000)</p> <p>[Grossmann 2012]</p>
Criteria for screening and triaging to appropriate alternative care	E	R	Prospective	Y	<p>Age 65+ years; frailty as CFS $>$5 ; meets \geq2 calling criteria for rapid response (oxygen saturation $<$90%, respiratory rate $<$5/min or $>$30/min, loss of consciousness, prolonged or repeat seizures, hypoglycaemia 1.0 - 4.0 mmol/L, low urinary output ($<$15 ml/hour or $<$0.5 ml/kg/hour); nursing home resident; previous emergency hospitalisation in past year; previous ICU admission in past year; either of 7 conditions: advanced cancer, HCF, CKD, COPD, stroke, history of myocardial infarction; chronic liver disease, cognitive impairment; chronic ECG abnormality; proteinuria (++ or $>$30 mg albumin/g creatinine); polypharmacy \geq 6 prescribed medications; history of fall in the past 3 months</p>	<p>CriSTAL score \geq6 should consider goals of care discussion and palliative care pathway</p> <p>Severe cognitive impairment in the absence of a contactable surrogate decision-maker on admission</p> <p>Rule of 1 point for each of 19 risk factors. Scores of 6+ indicate high risk of death within 3-6 months.</p> <p>Most statistically significant death predictors on full model: frailty, advanced malignancy, nursing home residency, oxygen saturation, advanced age, any mental impairment AUROC 0.809 (0.761–0.857) for Australia AUROC 0.794 (0.755–0.837) For Denmark</p> <p>[Cardona 2018]</p>

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Advanced malignancy	E E I	R	Cohort Cohort Cohort	Y Y N	Advanced malignancy increased risk of 3-month mortality Advanced malignancy increased risk of 3-month mortality Cancer+sepsis+Lactate 24hs post-admission	OR=4.9 95%CI 2.2 –10.8 Australia [Cardona 2018] OR=3.2 95%CI 1.9 – 5.4 Denmark [Cardona 2018] OR=4.0 95%CI 2.7 – 5.9 ICU mortality [Hajjar 2011]
Clinical Frailty Scale	E	R	Retrospective	Y	Patients aged ≥75 years: Clinical frailty score Age Charlson comorbidity index Known history of dementia and/or current cognitive concern	OR 1.60 (95% CI 1.48 - 1.74), p < 0.001, AUROC 0.72 (95% CI 0.69 - 0.75) for inpatient mortality OR 1.03 (95% CI 1.01 - 1.05), p = 0.001 for inpatient mortality OR 1.16 (95% CI 1.12 - 1.20), p < 0.001 for inpatient mortality OR 0.66 (95% CI 0.51 - 0.86), p = 0.002 for inpatient mortality [Wallis 2015]
Frailty syndromes	E	R	N/R	N	Frailty syndromes: Delirium, dementia, mobility problems, pressure ulcers	Predictors of in-patient mortality: Delirium OR=1.562 (95% CI 1.229-1.985) Dementia OR=1.595 (95% CI 1.323-1.924) Mobility problems OR=1.495 (95% CI 1.231-1.817) Pressure ulcers OR=2.996 (95% CI 2.403-3.735) AUROC 0.728 (95% CI 0.708-0.748), p<0.001 [Soong et.al., 2017]
Routine blood tests	E	R	Prospective cohort study	Y	Blood test parameters: Albumin, creatinine, c-reactive protein, haemoglobin, lactate dehydrogenase, leukocyte, potassium, sodium Demographic parameters: age (>16) and gender	Routine blood tests + demographics predictor of 30-day mortality: Derivation cohort AUROC 0.886 (95% CI 0.861-0.911) Validation cohort AUROC 0.908 (95% CI 0.892-0.923) Routine blood test should be included in early risk stratification for ED physicians to prioritise patients when necessary. [Kristensen et.al., 2017]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Laboratory only model	E	R	Retrospective	Y	Standard laboratory data parameters: Serum sodium, potassium, urea, albumin, red cell distribution, white blood cell count 30-day mortality risk-estimates subsets based on laboratory data + troponin: Group I: $\leq 1\%$ Group II: $>1 \leq 2\%$ Group III: $>2 \leq 4\%$ Group IV: $>4 \leq 8\%$ Group V: $>8\%$	Predicts 30-day mortality using only laboratory data + troponin Group I: OR=1.0 (reference group); Group II: OR=5.1 (95%CI 3.4-7.7); Group III: OR=14.5 (95%CI 10.1-20.8); Group IV: OR=50.8 (95%CI 36.2-71.5); Group V: OR=85.5 (95%CI 61.0-119.9) Derivation cohort: AUROC 0.90 (95%CI 0.89-0.90) Validation cohort: AUROC 0.88 (95%CI 0.86-0.90) [O'Sullivan et.al., 2012]
Serum Creatinine or End-stage Renal disease	E	R	Retrospective data analysis	Y	Serum creatinine $>3\text{mg/dL}$ at time of continuous renal replacement therapy. Chronic or acute kidney disease (KD) CPR before admission + KD requiring renal dialysis CPR before admission+ KD not requiring renal dialysis	OR=1.24 (95%CI 1.13-1.37) for in-hospital mortality among patients on chronic renal dialysis Adjusted AUROC 0.853 (95% CI 0.851–0.854) OR= 1.9 95% CI 1.44-2.52 in-hospital mortality [Hutchison 2007] OR= 2.1 95% CI 2.05-2.22 in-hospital mortality [Hutchison 2007] This may inform the clinical decision process surrounding ICU admission for patients receiving chronic dialysis therapy [Hutchison 2007]
Arterial Lactate	E	R	Cohort Cohort	N N	Serum arterial lactate ≥ 3.3 mmol/L in-hospital mortality Serum arterial lactate >4 mmol/L	OR= 2.2 95% CI 1.5-3.1 post-discharge mortality [Allegretti 2013] OR= 4.2 95% CI 1.9-9.4 in-hospital mortality [Bethea 2018]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR)	E	R	Prospective cohort	Y	eGFR at time of emergency presentation, per decrease of 10ml/min/1.73m ² as calculated using the Chronic Kidney Disease-Epidemiology Collaboration equation (CKD-EPI).	OR 1.15 (95% CI 1.09 - 1.22), p < 0.001, AUROC 0.71 (95% CI 0.68 - 0.73) for 30 day mortality OR 1.16 (95% CI 1.08 - 1.24), p < 0.001, AUROC 0.71 (95% CI 0.68 - 0.75) for in hospital mortality OR 1.15 (95% CI 1.10 - 1.20), p < 0.001, AUROC 0.63 (95% CI 0.60 - 0.65) for ICU admission [Haas 2020]
WARD CARE						
Simple clinical score (SCS) & HOTEL score	W	R	Prospective cohort study	Y	SCS parameters: Age (0 pts for <50 men or <55 women; 2 pts for ≥50 men and ≥55 women but ≤75 for either; >75 for both men and women), systolic blood pressure (0pts for >100; 2 pts for >80 and <100; 3 pts for >70 and <80; 4pts for <70), pulse rate > systolic blood pressure (2 pts), temperature (2 pts for <35°C or ≥39°C), respiratory rate (0pts for <20; 1 pt for >20 and <30; 2 pts for >30), oxygen saturation (0 pts for ≥95%, 1 pt for ≥90 and <95%; 2 pts for <90%), breathlessness on presentation (1pt), abnormal ECG (2 pts), diabetes (1pt for type1/2), coma without intoxication or overdose (4 pts), altered mental status without coma, intoxication or overdose and >50 years (3 pts), new stroke on presentation (3 pts), unable to stand unaided, or a nursing home resident (2 pts), prior to current illness spent some part of daytime in bed (2pts) HOTEL parameters: 1 point each for Systolic blood pressure <100mmHg Oxygen saturation <90% Temperature <35°C Abnormal ECG Unable to stand unaided	SCS: Predicts 24h mortality: AUROC 0.960 (95% CI 0.932-0.988), p=0.998 Predicts 30-day mortality: AUROC 0.826 (95% CI 0.774-0.879), p=0.947 [Straede et.al., 2014] HOTEL: Predicts 24h mortality: AUROC 0.931 (95% CI 0.901-0.962), p=0.234 [Straede et.al., 2014]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
NIVO score Non-invasive ventilation outcomes	W	R	Retrospective	Y	Atrial fibrillation, chest X-ray consolidation, pH <7.25, Glasgow coma scale ≤14 (all 1 point), timing of acidaemia >12 hours from admission time (2 points) and eMRCD (1–4=0, 5a=2, 5b=3).	For exacerbations of COPD and respiratory acidaemia requiring assisted ventilation : Maximum score of 9 using 6 indices. Higher score=increased in-hospital mortality AUROC in derivation cohort: 0.83; in validation cohort=0.79 Useful for guiding level of care, setting treatment limitations and objectifying both clinician decision making and discussion with patients/family members. [Hartley 2019]
HOMR Hospital patient 1-year mortality risk	W	R	Retrospective	Y	age, sex and living status); health burden (measured using the Charlson Comorbidity Index score, home oxygen status and the number of visits to emergency departments and admissions to hospital by ambulance in the previous year); and acuity of illness (admission urgency and hospital service, direct admission to an intensive care unit and whether the admission was an urgent readmission to hospital).	Risk of 1-year mortality: 8.7% (95%CI 8.7-8.8) AUROC range 0.89 (95%CI 0.87-0.91) to AUROC 0.92 (95%CI 0.91-0.93) in 3 validation cohorts [van Walraven 2015]
CURB 65 score	W I E W	R	Cohort Cohort Cohort Cohort	Y Y Y Y	Six point score, one point for each of C onfusion, U rea >7 mmol/l, R espiratory rate >30/min, low systolic(<90 mm Hg) or diastolic (<60 mm Hg) B lood pressure), age >65 years	30-day mortality : score 4= 41.5% mortality and score 5= 57% CURB-65 ≥3 specificity 74.9% derivation and 74.7% validation [Lim WS 2003] CURB-65 ≥3 Sensitivity 38.5 (95%CI 28.4–49.2) Specificity 74.2 (95%CI 71.0–77.2) and AUROC 0.62 (95%CI 0.56–0.67) [Charles 2008] CURB-65 ≥3 Sensitivity 68.4% and 60.3% (derivation and validation); Specificity 86.8% and 78.4% (derivation and validation) and AUROC 0.78 and 0.69 (derivation and validation) [España 2006] CURB65 ≥3 predicts 30-day mortality from sepsis onset: OR=30.3 (95% CI 6.17-66.87) AUROC 0.72 (95% CI 0.67-0.77) Sensitivity 81%, specificity 52%, PPV 29%, NPV 92% [Marwick et.al., 2014]

Objective parameter (clinical or laboratory)	ICU/ED/ward	Pandemic/ Routine	Study design	Validated	Specific parameters / recommended cut-off points predicting poor outcome	Prognostic performance findings/ thresholds/ recommendations/ conclusions
Mortality Predictive Model for Children	W	R	Retrospective	Y	Laboratory parameters for children (2-17y) Albumin ≤ 2.8 g/dL Aspartate aminotransferase > 5 U/L Creatinine > 0.8 mg/dL Glucose > 300 mg/dL Sodium ≤ 130 or ≥ 142 mEq/L Arterial pH ≤ 7.35 or > 7.45 pH units PaCO ₂ > 60 mmHg Haemoglobin ≤ 10 g/dL Platelets $\leq 150 \times 10^9$ /L Vital signs & altered mental status: Oral temperature $\leq 95^\circ$ F Pulse > 120 bpm SBP ≤ 80 or > 150 mmHg Mild or moderate altered mental status Severe altered mental status	Laboratory results, vital signs and principal diagnosis predicts mortality for children (2-17y): Albumin OR=1.9 (95%CI 1.3-2.8) Aspartate aminotransferase OR=1.9 (95%CI 1.4-2.5) Creatinine OR=1.8 (95%CI 1.4-2.3) Glucose OR=2.4 (95%CI 1.7-3.5) Sodium OR=2.0 (95%CI 1.5-2.6) Arterial pH OR=1.8 (95%CI 1.4-2.5) PaCO ₂ OR=2.3 (95%CI 1.4-3.7) Haemoglobin OR=1.5 (95%CI 1.1-2.0) Platelets OR=1.7 (95%CI 1.2-2.3) Oral temperature OR=2.4 (95%CI 1.8-3.2) Pulse OR=1.9 (95%CI 1.5-2.4) SBP OR=1.8 (95%CI 1.4-2.2) Mild or moderate altered mental status OR=2.1 (95%CI 1.4-3.0) Severe altered mental status OR=15.0 (95%CI 11.0-20.7) Respiratory failure OR=3.5 (95%CI 2.0-6.1) [Tabak et.al., 2013]
Age as Included in several algorithms	I E E W E I	R	Cohort Retrospective Retrospective Prospective Cohort	N Y Y Y Y	≥ 85 years predicts ICU mortality ≥ 80 years predicts high severity requiring higher resources ≥ 75 years & ≥ 65 years predict need for IVU and MV ≥ 65 years predicts 30-day mortality ≥ 65 years in-hospital or post-discharge mortality	OR= 1.8, p <0.001 [Brunner Ziegler 2007] OR= 2.4 95% CI 1.3 to 4.4 [España 2006] OR=4.4 (2.7-7.2) & OR=3.0 (1.7-5.5) respectively [Talmor 2007] OR= 3.5 95% CI 1.6 to 8.0 [Lim WS 2003] OR=1.05 95% CI 1.02 – 1.08 Denmark [Cardona 2018]
	I E	P	Guidelines and Consensus	Y	≥ 65 years overall mortality	Age not per se, but in conjunction with chronic conditions to maximise life-years saved rather than lives. [Powell NY 2008, Brunner Ziegler 2007, Daugherty-Biddison 2019] OR=6.5 95% CI 3.8 to 11.2 [Hough 2015]
	I E	R	Cohort	Y	≥ 65 years in-hospital mortality	Age and Shock Index better predictors of in-hospital death than SBP [Koch 2019]

ALT = Admission Laboratory Tests; APACHE= Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation; ATS = Australasian Triage Scale; BP= Blood pressure; CriSTAL= Criteria for Screening and Triaging to Appropriate aLternative care; EWS = Early Warning Score; GS = Goodacre Score; H1N1=Swine flu; HOTEL = Hypotension, Oxygen saturation, low Temperature, ECG changes and Loss of independence Score; IDSA/ATS 2007 = Infectious Diseases Society of America/American Thoracic Society 2007 Pneumonia Guidelines; MV= mechanical ventilation in ICU; MV= mechanical ventilation; N/R=Not reported; NPV=negative predictive value; PCT = procalcitonin; PELOD-2 = Pediatric Logistic Organ Dysfunction 2; PPV=positive predictive value; REMS = Rapid Emergency Medicine Score; SAPS= Simplified Acute Physiology Score; SAPS-2 = Simplified Acute Physiology Score; SBP= Systolic blood pressure; SCS= Simple Clinical Score; SOFA= Sepsis-related Organ Failure Assessment; STSS= Simple Triage Scoring System; TIMM = Triage Information Mortality Model TTS = Track and Trigger System; WBC= white blood cells;; WPS = Worthing Physiological Scoring System

**Individual scores (1-4 for short-term; 0 or 3 for long-term) are assigned for each consideration and then added together to produce a total triage score. Priority is given to those with the lowest total triage scores