

1 **Full title** Preparations of Dutch emergency departments for the COVID-19 pandemic: a
2 questionnaire-based study.

3 **Short title** Preparations for the COVID-19 pandemic in Dutch EDs.
4

5 **Authors**

6 Rory D O'Connor^{a*}

7 Dennis G Barten^b

8 Gideon HP Latten^c
9

10 * Corresponding author

11 E-mail: r.o.connor@jbz.nl
12

13 **Affiliations**

14 a Department of Emergency Medicine, Jeroen Bosch Hospital, Henri Dunantstraat 1, 5223 GZ 's-
15 Hertogenbosch, The Netherlands

16 b Department of Emergency Medicine, VieCuri Medical Center, Tegelseweg 210, 5912 BL Venlo, The
17 Netherlands

18 c Department of Emergency Medicine, Zuyderland Medical Center, Henri Dunantstraat 5, 6419 PC
19 Heerlen, The Netherlands

20 **Abstract**

21 Background: The onset of the COVID-19 pandemic was characterized by rapidly increasing patient
22 volumes, which necessitated a swift emergency department (ED) overhaul. Challenges mainly
23 concerned surge capacity, frontline staff protection and the segregation of patients with suspected
24 COVID-19. To date, only few studies have assessed nation-wide ED preparedness for the COVID-19
25 pandemic. This study aimed to form an overview of preparations that were taken in Dutch EDs during
26 the initial phase of this public health crisis.

27 Methods: This study was designed as a nation-wide, cross-sectional, questionnaire-based study
28 among Dutch hospital organizations with ≥ 1 ED. The questionnaire was conducted between the first
29 and the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in the Netherlands and contained close-ended and
30 open-ended questions on changes in ED infrastructure, ED workforce adaptations and the role of
31 emergency physicians (EPs) in the hospital's crisis organization.

32 Results: Overall response rate was 79.5%. All EDs had made preparations in anticipation of a possible
33 COVID-19 surge. Treatment capacity was expanded in 69.7% of EDs, with a median increase of 49%
34 (IQR 32.5–72.7%). COVID-19 suspected patients were segregated from non-COVID-19 patients in
35 86.4% of EDs. Non-COVID-19 patients were more often assessed at alternative locations than
36 patients with suspected COVID-19 infection. In 81.8% of EDs the workforce was expanded, which
37 mainly concerned expansion of nursing staff. A formal role of EPs in the hospital's crisis organization
38 was reported by 93.9% of EP staffed hospital organizations.

39 Conclusion: All Dutch EDs made preparations for COVID-19 in a short time span and with many
40 uncertainties. Preparations predominantly concerned expansion of treatment capacity and
41 segregation of COVID-19 ED care. EPs had a prominent role, both in direct patient COVID-19 ED care
42 and in the hospitals' crisis organizations. Although it is vital for EDs to be able to dynamically adapt to
43 community needs, variability of pandemic ED preparedness was high.

44 **Key words**

45 Preparedness, pandemic, surge capacity, emergency department, COVID-19

46 **Abbreviations**

47 EP Emergency physician

48 ED Emergency department

49 ICU Intensive care unit

50 IQR Interquartile Range

51 **Introduction**

52 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) first emerged in Southeast China in December 2019 and was
53 declared a pandemic by the World Health Organization on March 11, 2020.¹ As COVID-19 spread
54 rapidly around the globe, emergency departments (EDs) within hospitals braced for impact. In the
55 Netherlands, the first case of COVID-19 was identified on February 27, 2020.² As of February 27,
56 2021, there have been 1,084,021 confirmed cases of infection (of which 24,165 were hospitalized)
57 and 15,543 confirmed COVID-19-deaths.³

58 Emergency medical services and the EDs within hospitals are viewed as the community-based
59 resources responsible for the initial medical response towards any type of disaster, both in the short
60 and long term.⁴ In contrast with sudden-onset events, large-scale infectious outbreaks typically
61 require a prolonged, sustainable response.^{4,5} Since its commencement, the current COVID-19
62 pandemic was characterized by rapidly increasing patient volumes, which necessitated a swift
63 overhaul of several aspects of ED preparations in Dutch hospitals.^{6,7} Challenges mainly concerned
64 surge capacity, frontline staff protection and the segregation of patients with suspected COVID-19.⁸⁻

65 ¹¹

66 To date, only few studies have assessed nation-wide ED preparedness for the COVID-19 pandemic. A
67 French questionnaire-based study, conducted during an early stage of the pandemic (March 7 to
68 March 11, 2020), revealed that EDs were poorly prepared.¹²

69 A similar study from India, limited to academic EDs, showed that 90% of hospitals had developed
70 specific COVID-19 triage systems and that almost 80% established dedicated areas for COVID-19
71 suspected patients. However, it also revealed that the level of preparedness amongst EDs was highly
72 variable. The authors stated that an individualized strategy for ED preparedness that considers
73 baseline needs and available resources is superior to a blanket strategy for all EDs.¹³
74 Whilst clinical and intensive care unit (ICU) capacity for COVID-19 in Dutch hospitals were closely
75 monitored and controlled through a national body, there was no guidance on the surge capacity
76 management of EDs.⁶ Consequently, hospitals largely restructured the organization of their EDs on a
77 solitary basis. This study aimed to form an overview of preparations that were taken in Dutch EDs
78 during the initial phase of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, it aimed to explore the role of Dutch
79 emergency physicians (EPs) in the hospitals' crisis organizations.

80 **Methods**

81 **Setting**

82 The Netherlands is provided with a modern healthcare system with effective primary care and a
83 finely meshed network of specialized acute and critical care facilities, including 83 EDs (Fig 1). The
84 EDs are located within 71 hospital organizations (11 hospital organizations have multiple ED
85 locations). These EDs serve a population of 17.4 million people and have a mean annual attendance
86 rate of 22,500 patients, of which on average 17.4% are self-referred.¹⁴

87 Fig 1 – Emergency departments in the Netherlands (June 2020)¹⁵

- 88 - Pink circle: Opened 24 hours, 7 days a week
- 89 - Yellow square: Opened day and evening, 7 days a week

90 **Study design**

91 This was designed as a nation-wide, cross-sectional, questionnaire-based study among Dutch hospital
92 organizations with ≥ 1 ED. For each hospital organization one respondent, consisting of either an EP
93 or an ED manager, received an invitation by email on July 29, 2020. If a respondent did not complete

94 the questionnaire, a reminder was sent every fortnight. The questionnaire could be completed until
95 September 30, 2020. English and Dutch versions of the questionnaire are provided as supplemental
96 file 1 and 2.

97 Respondents were requested to complete the questionnaire on behalf of the hospital organization
98 where the respondent practiced. When the hospital organization contained multiple EDs, the
99 questionnaire adapted to facilitate information on all EDs. The questionnaire contained 14 close-
100 ended multiple-choice questions and 2 open-ended questions on general ED details and on
101 preparations for a possible surge in COVID-19 patients. Broadly, these questions covered 3 topics:
102 changes in ED infrastructure, ED workforce adaptations and the role of EPs in the hospital's crisis
103 organization.

104 **Statistical analysis**

105 All analyses were performed with SPSS version 26 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA). Continuous data were
106 reported as means with standard deviation (SD) or as medians with interquartile ranges (IQR).

107 Categorical data were reported as absolute numbers and as valid percentages (to correct for missing
108 data).

109 All data were collected anonymously. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in
110 Epidemiology guidelines was used for reporting this observational study.¹⁶ The Medical Ethics
111 Committee Zuyderland & Zuyd concluded that the rules of the Medical Research Involving Human
112 Subjects Act (WMO in Dutch) do not apply to this study (METCZ20200130). The study was registered
113 in the Netherlands Trial Register (Trial number NL8818).

114 **Results**

115 The questionnaire was completed on behalf of 66 (79.5%) out of 83 EDs (Table 1). These EDs served
116 58 (81.7%) out of 71 hospital organizations, as eight hospital organizations had multiple ED locations.

117 Pre-COVID, the majority of the EDs had an annual attendance rate of fewer than 30,000 patients per
118 year and 86.4% of EDs were staffed by EPs.
119 All participating EDs had made preparations in anticipation of a possible surge of COVID-19 patients.
120 The date when these preparations were finalized varied between February 24 and May 5, 2020.

Table 1 – Baseline ED characteristics	EDs (n=66)*
Annual attendance	
- <20,000 patients	19 (28.8%)
- 20,000-25,000 patients	17 (25.8%)
- 25,000-30,000 patients	13 (19.7%)
- 30,000-35,000 patients	8 (12.1%)
- 35,000-40,000 patients	3 (4.5%)
- >40,000 patients	6 (9.1%)
Staffed by EPs	57 (86.4%)
Preparations made for COVID-19 pandemic	66 (100%)

121 * Data are presented as n (%).

122 Abbreviations: ED – emergency department, EPs – emergency physicians

123 **Changes in ED infrastructure**

124 Before the COVID-19 pandemic, the median number of ED treatment spaces was 17 (IQR 12–21)
125 (Table 2). Treatment capacity was expanded in 46 (69.7%) EDs. The median number of additional
126 treatment spaces was 8 (IQR 4-10), which equals to a median increase of 49% (IQR 32.5–72.7%).
127 Explanations for not increasing the ED capacity included previous reduction of ED utilization by
128 several logistic alterations (15.2%), being designated as a non-COVID-19 ED (6.1%), and the inability
129 to expand ED treatment spaces due to isolation measures demanding more space per patient (4.5%).
130 Logistic alterations to usual practice included the redirection of low-acuity ED visits, such as minor
131 traumatic injuries, to outpatient departments in 41 (62.1%) EDs. Furthermore, 12 (18.1%) EDs
132 effectuated a faster admission process to hospital wards and intensive care units, therewith
133 shortening ED length of stay.
134 COVID-19 suspected patients were segregated from non-COVID-19 patients in 57 (86.4%) EDs. In the
135 majority (68.4%) of EDs, this was organized within the original ED space. The alternative locations
136 used by the remaining EDs can be found in supplemental file 3. In most (75.4%) EDs, the suspicion of
137 COVID-19 was established using a symptom-based checklist only.

138 In 53 (80.3%) hospital organizations, one or more of the implemented measures for the pandemic
 139 were intended to be maintained (Supplemental file 4). These included improved infection prevention
 140 in 13 (22.4%), improved interdisciplinary collaboration in 13 (22.4%), permanent adjustments to
 141 segregate possibly contagious patient categories in 10 (17.2%) and permanent redirection of low-
 142 urgent patient categories 8 (13.8%) hospital organizations.

Table 2 – Changes in ED infrastructure	EDs*
Pre-pandemic treatment spaces	17 (12-21)
Treatment spaces increased during pandemic	46 (70.0%)
– Additional treatment spaces	8 (4-10)
No increase in treatment spaces	20 (30.3%)
– Logistic alterations to usual ED practice	10 (15.2%)
– non-COVID-19 hospital	4 (6.1%)
– Expansion not feasible	3 (4.5%)
– Other	3 (4.5%)
Segregation of COVID-19 ED care	57 (86.4)
Location of COVID-19 ED care	
– Original ED only	39 (68.4%)
– Original ED and other location	14 (24.6%)
– Other location only	4 (7.0%)
Location of non-COVID-19 ED care	
– Original ED only	27 (47.4%)
– Original ED and other location	23 (40.4%)
– Other location only	7 (12.3%)
Screening for COVID-19 before ED entry performed with	
– Symptom-based screening list only	43 (75.4%)
– Symptom-based screening list and radiological imaging (Chest X-ray or CT)	13 (22.8%)
– Chest CT only	1 (1.8%)

143 * Data are presented as median (IQR), or n (%).

144 Abbreviations: ED – emergency department

145 ED workforce adaptations

146 In 54 (81.8%) EDs the workforce was expanded (Table 3). In all of these EDs nursing staff was
 147 expanded by deploying both additional specialized ED nurses (53.0%) as well as nurses from other
 148 departments (60.6%). A large variety of physicians were directly involved in COVID-19 ED care, of
 149 which emergency medicine (86.4%), internal medicine (84.8%) and pulmonology (81.8%) were

150 involved most frequently. In 21 (31.8%) EDs, the additional workforce consisted of nurses and
 151 physicians only, whereas other disciplines were also deployed in the remaining 45 (68.2%) EDs.

Table 3 – ED workforce adaptations	EDs*
Expansion of nursing staff	54 (81.8%)
- Additional ED nurses	35 (53.0%)
- Additional non-ED nurses	40 (60.6%)
- Specialties involved in ED COVID-19 care	
Emergency medicine	57 (86.4%)
- Internal medicine	56 (84.8%)
- Pulmonology	54 (81.8%)
- Anesthesiology	26 (39.4%)
- Geriatrics	24 (36.4%)
- Surgery	23 (34.8%)
- Neurology	22 (33.3%)
- Cardiology	20 (30.3%)
- Pediatrics	20 (30.3%)
- Otolaryngology/ENT	18 (27.3%)
- Gastro-enterology	16 (24.2%)
- Orthopedics	14 (21.2%)
- Urology	12 (18.2%)
- Dermatology	6 (9.1%)
- Primary care	6 (9.1%)
- Plastic surgery	6 (9.1%)
- Rheumatology	5 (7.6%)
- Gynecology	4 (6.1%)
- Other	16 (24.2%)
- Other disciplines	44 (66.7%)
- Physician assistants	17 (25.8%)
- Medical interns	17 (25.8%)
- Doctor's assistants	15 (22.7%)
- Surgery assistants	14 (21.2%)
- Anesthetic nurses	9 (13.6%)
- Plaster technicians	9 (13.6%)
- Other**	7 (10.6%)

152 * Data are presented as n (%). ** Volunteers, medical students

153 Abbreviations: ED – emergency department, ENT – ear nose throat

154 **Role of EPs in the crisis organization**

155 EPs were staffed in 49 (84.5%) hospital organizations. In all of these hospital organizations, EPs were
 156 directly involved in the assessment and treatment of COVID-19 patients. In addition, in hospital
 157 organizations staffed by EPs, EPs had a coordinating role in the ED in 44 (89.8%) and were involved in
 158 triage or segregation of COVID-19 suspected patients in 40 (81.6%) hospital organizations. A formal

159 role of EPs in the hospital's crisis organization was reported in 46 (93.9%) hospital organizations. An
160 EP was member of the strategic crisis team in 19 (38.8%) hospital organizations and of the
161 operational crisis team in 34 (69.4%) hospital organizations.

162 **Crowding**

163 The majority (52%) of hospital organizations did not experience crowding during the first COVID-19
164 surge. Occasional crowding was reported by 24 (41%) and no crowding by 30 (52%) hospital
165 organizations.

166 **Discussion**

167 This questionnaire-based study aimed to provide an overview of preparations of Dutch EDs for the
168 initial phase of the COVID-19 pandemic. With a response rate of 79.5% of EDs, the results are
169 representative for all Dutch EDs.

170 All participating EDs made preparations for a surge in COVID-19 patients. Treatment capacity was
171 expanded in almost 70% of the participating EDs, with a median increase in treatment spaces of 50%.
172 COVID-19 patients were segregated from non-COVID-19 patients in 86.4% of EDs, and ED workforce
173 was expanded in 81.8% of EDs. EPs were directly involved in the care for COVID-19 patients in all EDs
174 and had a prominent role in the crisis organization in 93.9%.

175 The COVID-19 pandemic forced EDs to make drastic organizational changes in a very short time span.
176 At the time, it was unclear for EDs if they would be either sufficient or even necessary.⁸ In the
177 Netherlands, there was national guidance on clinical and ICU capacity.⁶ Remarkably, there was no
178 alignment or general advice on the expansion of ED capacity. This is reflected by the heterogeneity of
179 the results of this study. Although more alignment between EDs may be desirable, the solitary surge
180 capacity plans worked for most EDs as the majority reported no or occasional crowding. In this
181 perspective, it is important to acknowledge that ED surge capacity planning should be
182 accommodated to specific hospital characteristics and leave room for improvisation, even when

183 there is national guidance. During the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, regions within the
184 Netherlands differed considerably with regards to COVID-19 infection rates. This may have
185 influenced the burden on EDs and could in part explain the heterogeneity between pandemic ED
186 approaches as well.

187 The COVID-19 pandemic may have changed ED care forever, as some adaptations will remain. E-health
188 applications have flourished and there is more focus on getting the right care in the right place.¹⁷

189 Some patient categories do not necessarily need ED care, but may receive safe and efficient care at
190 another location. Furthermore, this public health crisis has shown the importance of a strong
191 emergency and critical care system, where a certain degree of overcapacity may be pivotal for an
192 effective response. As this pandemic is ongoing, surge capacity models that allow flexibility to some
193 extent may be most useful.^{7,9,18} Hospital capacity is dynamic and highly dependent on the occupancy
194 of available resources.¹⁹ At times when the pressure on ED care is temporarily lower, capacity could
195 be used for non-urgent care and vice versa. This way, hospitals could timely anticipate to community
196 demands.

197 Close collaboration within hospitals has always been of vital importance. As shown by our results,
198 virtually all medical disciplines were deployed in the EDs during the pandemic. Although this survey
199 did not examine the quality of inter-disciplinary collaboration, multiple respondents greatly valued
200 the unique situation where all kinds of disciplines worked closely together. It may not come as a
201 surprise that EPs, internists and pulmonologists were involved in COVID-19 ED care. However, EPs
202 also played an important role in ED coordination and triage. Furthermore, EPs took vital positions in
203 the hospitals' crisis organizations, underlining the necessity of experienced staff members working
204 specifically in the ED.

205 The present study is not without limitations. First, this was a retrospective questionnaire-based study
206 filled in by one respondent per ED, who may also have been the most involved professionals in crisis
207 management in these EDs. Second, hospitals all around the world experienced reduced utilization of
208 emergency services during the pandemic.²⁰ This phenomenon, which is not yet completely

209 understood, may have salvaged EDs which could have suffered from overcrowding without the
210 reduction of non-COVID-19 ED care. In other words, the pandemic approaches of these EDs may not
211 be as successful in other crisis situations. Finally, the results of this study may not apply to EDs in
212 other healthcare systems, specifically systems without a strong primary care system functioning as
213 gatekeepers for the hospitals.

214 **Conclusion**

215 This study showed that all Dutch EDs made preparations for COVID-19 in a short time span and with
216 many uncertainties. Preparations primarily included the expansion of treatment capacity and the
217 segregation of COVID-19 care. EPs had a prominent role, both in direct patient COVID-19 ED care and
218 in the crisis organizations of hospitals. Although it is vital for EDs to be able to dynamically adapt to
219 community needs, variability of pandemic ED preparedness was high.

220 **Acknowledgements**

221 We would like to thank all participating EDs for their participation in this study. We also want to
222 thank the Dutch Society of Emergency Physicians for its support in distributing the questionnaire
223 among the EDs.

224 **Collaborators**

225 L.M. Esteve Cuevas, M.L. Ridderikhof, dr W.A.M.H. Thijssen, R.R. Pigge, N.E. Mullaart-Jansen, R.J.C.G.
226 Verdonschot, V. Brown, G. van Woerden, E.L. Janssens, B.Y.M. van der Kolk, B. de Groot, F. Derkx-
227 Verhagen, W.P. Poortvliet, H. Lameijer, Y. Schoon, J. Holkenborg, L.E. Kerkvliet, M.S.A. de la Fosse, E.
228 ter Avest, MD, PhD., K. Azijli, S. Postma, J.M. van Lieshout, B. Vlaming, C. Kok, M. Maltha, R. Lulf,
229 R.J.L. Boden, A.E. Boendermaker, J.L.P. Kuijten, J.L. van der Meer, K. van den Broek, L. Jansen, M.J.
230 Meijer, T.B. Nanlohi, D.J.R. Keereweer, A.G. Pol, T.J. Oosterveld-Bonsma, J.M. Huttenhuis, G.B.
231 Spijkers

232 **Conflicts of interest**

233 There are no conflicts of interest.

234 **References**

235

236 1. WHO director-general's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19. *World Health*

237 *Organization*. 2020.

238 2. Alderweireld CEA, Buiting AGM, Murk JAN, Verweij JJ, Berrevoets MAH, van Kasteren, Marjo E. E.

239 [COVID-19: Patient zero in the netherlands]. *Ned Tijdschr Geneeskd*. 2020;164. Accessed Mar 22,

240 2021.

241 3. COVID-19 dataset. *Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (Rijksinstituut*

242 *voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu)*. 2021.

243 4. Lewis CP, Aghababian RV. Disaster planning, part I. overview of hospital and emergency

244 department planning for internal and external disasters. *Emerg Med Clin North Am*. 1996;14(2):439-

245 452. Accessed Mar 22, 2021. doi: 10.1016/s0733-8627(05)70261-3.

246 5. Schreyer KE, Del Portal DA, King LJJ, et al. Emergency department management of the covid-19

247 pandemic. *J Emerg Med*. 2020;59(6):946-951. Accessed Mar 22, 2021. doi:

248 10.1016/j.jemermed.2020.07.022.

249 6. Berkeveld E, Mikdad S, Zandbergen HR, et al. Experience of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19)

250 patient care in the amsterdam region: Optimization of acute care organization. *Disaster Med Public*

251 *Health Prep*. 2020:1-5. Accessed Mar 22, 2021. doi: 10.1017/dmp.2020.446.

- 252 7. Barten DG, Kusters RWJ, Peters, Nathalie A. L. R. A swift and dynamic strategy to expand
253 emergency department capacity for COVID-19. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep.* 2020:1-4. Accessed
254 Mar 22, 2021. doi: 10.1017/dmp.2020.430.
- 255 8. Paganini M, Conti A, Weinstein E, Della Corte F, Ragazzoni L. Translating COVID-19 pandemic surge
256 theory to practice in the emergency department: How to expand structure. *Disaster Med Public*
257 *Health Prep.* 2020;14(4):541-550. Accessed Mar 22, 2021. doi: 10.1017/dmp.2020.57.
- 258 9. Nadarajan GD, Omar E, Abella BS, et al. A conceptual framework for emergency department design
259 in a pandemic. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med.* 2020;28(1):118. Accessed Mar 22, 2021. doi:
260 10.1186/s13049-020-00809-7.
- 261 10. Schmitz D, Vos M, Stolmeijer R, et al. Association between personal protective equipment and
262 SARS-CoV-2 infection risk in emergency department healthcare workers. *Eur J Emerg Med.* 2020.
263 Accessed Mar 22, 2021. doi: 10.1097/MEJ.0000000000000766.
- 264 11. Fistera D, Pabst D, Härtl A, et al. Separating the wheat from the chaff-COVID-19 in a german
265 emergency department: A case-control study. *Int J Emerg Med.* 2020;13(1):44. Accessed Mar 25,
266 2021. doi: 10.1186/s12245-020-00302-z.
- 267 12. Casalino E, Bouzid D, Ben Hammouda A, et al. COVID-19 preparedness among emergency
268 departments: A cross-sectional study in france. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep.* 2020:1-9. Accessed
269 Mar 22, 2021. doi: 10.1017/dmp.2020.331.
- 270 13. Gopinathan V, Asanar S, Krishnan S V, Sirur FM, Balakrishnan JM. Assessment of the
271 preparedness and planning of academic emergency departments in india during the COVID-19
272 pandemic - A multicentric survey. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep.* 2021:1-13. Accessed Mar 27,
273 2021. doi: 10.1017/dmp.2021.73.

- 274 14. Gaakeer MI, van den Brand, C. L., Gips E, et al. [National developments in emergency
275 departments in the netherlands: Numbers and origins of patients in the period from 2012 to 2015].
276 *Ned Tijdschr Geneeskd.* 2016;160:D970. Accessed Mar 22, 2021.
- 277 15. G.J. Kommer, C. Deuning. Locaties ziekenhuizen met SEH 2020.
278 [https://www.volksgezondheinzorg.info/kaart/locaties-ziekenhuizen-met-seh-2020#!node-locaties-](https://www.volksgezondheinzorg.info/kaart/locaties-ziekenhuizen-met-seh-2020#!node-locaties-ziekenhuizen-met-seh)
279 [ziekenhuizen-met-seh](https://www.volksgezondheinzorg.info/kaart/locaties-ziekenhuizen-met-seh). Updated 2020. Accessed Mar 22, 2021.
- 280 16. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The strengthening
281 the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (STROBE) statement: Guidelines for reporting
282 observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2008;61(4):344-349. Accessed Mar 25, 2021. doi:
283 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008.
- 284 17. Joshi AU, Lewiss RE. Telehealth in the time of COVID-19. *Emerg Med J.* 2020;37(10):637-638.
285 Accessed Mar 22, 2021. doi: 10.1136/emered-2020-209846.
- 286 18. Tan RMR, Ong GY, Chong S, Ganapathy S, Tyebally A, Lee KP. Dynamic adaptation to COVID-19 in
287 a singapore paediatric emergency department. *Emerg Med J.* 2020;37(5):252-254. Accessed Mar 22,
288 2021. doi: 10.1136/emered-2020-209634.
- 289 19. Faccincani R, Della Corte F, Sesana G, et al. Hospital surge capacity during expo 2015 in milano,
290 italy. *Prehosp Disaster Med.* 2018;33(5):459-465. Accessed Mar 22, 2021. doi:
291 10.1017/S1049023X18000742.
- 292 20. Barten DG, Latten GHP, van Osch, Frits H. M. Reduced emergency department utilization during
293 the early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic: Viral fear or lockdown effect? *Disaster Med Public Health*
294 *Prep.* 2020:1-4. Accessed Mar 22, 2021. doi: 10.1017/dmp.2020.303.
- 295

296	Supporting information
297	S1 Questionnaire English
298	S2 Questionnaire Dutch
299	S3 Alternative locations of emergency care
300	S4 Measures intended to be maintained

