

Triage in Medicine, Part I: Concept, History, and Types

Kenneth V. Iserson, MD, MBA

From the University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ (Iserson); and the Brody School of Medicine at East Carolina University and the University Health Systems of Eastern Carolina, Greenville, NC (Moskop).

John C. Moskop, PhD

This 2-article series offers a conceptual, historical, and moral analysis of the practice of triage. Part I distinguishes triage from related concepts, reviews the evolution of triage principles and practices, and describes the settings in which triage is commonly practiced. Part II identifies and examines the moral values and principles underlying the practice of triage. [Ann Emerg Med. 2007;49:275-281.]

0196-0644/\$-see front matter

Copyright © 2007 by the American College of Emergency Physicians.

doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2006.05.019

SEE RELATED ARTICLE, P. 282.

INTRODUCTION

When the needs or demands for medical treatment significantly outstrip the available resources, decisions must be made about how to distribute these resources, recognizing that not all needs will be satisfied immediately and some may not be satisfied at all. Decisions about distributing scarce health care resources can arise at all levels, from societal choices within a national health care system (macroallocation) to individuals allocating immediate emergency treatment and transport among the multiple severely injured survivors of a motor vehicle crash or industrial accident (microallocation). Several terms, including "triage," "rationing," and "allocation," are used to refer to the distribution of scarce resources in different health care contexts. This article will focus on "triage," the term most commonly used to mean the sorting of patients for treatment priority in emergency departments (EDs) and in multicase incidents, disasters, and battlefield settings. Most discussions about triage address practical questions, such as when the process should occur and which techniques are most effective. Commentators rarely consider the essential characteristics of triage, the historical evolution of the practice, or the ethical justification for selecting those who will receive priority treatment—or any treatment—among a large group of acutely ill and injured patients. In essence, triage discussions usually focus on when and how to cut the resource "pie," not whether providers should be using a particular tool to do the cutting—or whether they should be cutting the pie at all.

This 2-article series seeks to remedy the relative neglect of the conceptual, historical, and moral foundations of triage. In part I, we first explicate the concept of triage and distinguish it from related concepts. Next, we review the development of various triage systems and plans. We then describe the most common settings in which triage is practiced. In part II, we offer

a moral analysis of different triage systems, examining their underlying values and principles.

WHAT IS TRIAGE?

"Triage," "rationing," and "allocation" are terms commonly used to refer to the distribution of medical resources to patients. Although these terms are sometimes used interchangeably, there are clear differences among them. The broadest of the 3, allocation, describes the distribution of both medical and nonmedical resources and does not necessarily imply that the resource being distributed is scarce. For example, a host may allocate seats to the guests at a dinner party.

Rationing also refers to resource distribution but implies that the available resources are not sufficient to satisfy all needs or wants. It also implies that some system or method is being used to guide this distribution, such as the card systems used to ration gasoline and food in the United States during World War II.

The term "triage" is the narrowest in scope. Derived from the French word *trier*, to sort, it was originally used to describe the sorting of agricultural products.¹ "Triage" is now used almost exclusively in specific health care contexts. Though "triage" may be used in an extended sense to refer to any decision about allocation of a scarce medical resource, we believe that use of the term in its primary sense (which we will use in this article) requires that 3 conditions be satisfied:

1. At least a modest scarcity of health care resources exists. The degree of scarcity can vary considerably, from modest, as in a hospital ED where not every patient who presents for care can be served immediately, to dire, as after a catastrophic disaster in which hundreds or thousands of people may experience severe injuries in a short time. Thus, in circumstances in which resources are sufficient to address all patients' needs without delay, no triage is necessary. At the other extreme, if there are no health care resources available, triage is pointless (Table).

Table. Continuum of triage scenarios: most resources, most social order, to fewest resources, chaos.

Circumstances	Setting					
	ED "Daily"	ICU	Multicasualty Incident	Battlefield	Disaster, Localized	Disaster, Widespread (eg, Weapons of Mass Destruction)
Resources available	Relatively plentiful	Relatively plentiful	Good locally; usually transport patients to hospital with plentiful resources	Fair locally; usually transport to plentiful resources	Sparse initially; increases to plentiful over short to medium time period	Sparse for prolonged time
Social order	Intact	Intact	Intact; possible local confusion	Variable; military command structure often intact	Temporary, localized diminished social order	Chaos, possibly for a long period
Resource-to-patient ratio	High for sickest patients; high to moderate for others	High	Low to moderate; high at hospital	Low on battlefield; higher at treatment facility	Initially low to moderate; later high	Extremely low
Patient arrival pattern	Linear	Linear	Grouped	Linear or grouped	Grouped, then linear	Linear
Triage method(s)	Sickest treated first (and sometimes least sick if they are triaged to urgent care clinic); then patients treated on a first-come, first-served basis	Variable	Best possible outcomes first (or selected for most rapid transport method); rarely use "expectant" category	Modern armies: best possible outcomes first (or selected for most rapid transport method); expectant category used when relative limitations of resources exist; guerilla/third-world armies: those able to return to battle first; expectant category used	Best possible outcomes first; "expectant" category used at least until additional resources obtained and social order restored	None; minimal treatment, sporadically

- A health care worker (often called a "triage officer") assesses each patient's medical needs, usually based on a brief examination. This assessment distinguishes the practice of triage, in which microallocation decisions are made about specific individuals according to face-to-face encounters, from the process of macroallocation, such as decisions made by legislators or administrators when allocating health care funds or other resources to different population groups.
- The triage officer uses an established system or plan, usually based on an algorithm or a set of criteria, to determine a specific treatment or treatment priority for each patient. This condition distinguishes triage from purely ad hoc or arbitrary decisions about distribution of health care resources.

The third condition suggests an important distinction between the concepts of triage and triage planning. If a triage officer makes use of an established plan, some person or group must have developed the plan, and someone must have chosen

to use that plan for making specific triage decisions in that situation. Triage planning involves developing and adopting a system or plan to prioritize patient treatment in particular contexts.² The level of social order that exists determines, in part, the type of triage plan that can be implemented (Table).

HISTORY OF TRIAGE

The practice of triage arose from the exigencies of war, and it remains closely associated with military medicine. The earliest documented systems designed to distribute health care systematically among wounded and sick warriors date back only to the 18th century. Ancient and medieval armies made little or no formal effort to provide medical care for their soldiers, and the care provided was likely to be ineffective.³ Injured soldiers usually relied on their comrades for aid, and most died of their wounds. Beginning in the 18th century, military surgeons developed and implemented the first battlefield triage rules in the West; little is known about triage elsewhere.

Most scholars attribute the first formal battlefield triage system to the distinguished French military surgeon Baron Dominique-Jean Larrey, chief surgeon of Napoleon's Imperial Guard.⁴ Larrey recognized a need to evaluate and categorize wounded soldiers promptly during a battle. His system was to treat and evacuate those requiring the most urgent medical attention, rather than waiting hours or days for the battle to end before treating patients, as had been done in previous wars.^{1(pp 1-4),5} Acting on this recognition, Larrey performed hundreds of amputations on the battlefield while the battle was still raging; he also designed light carriages, which he called "flying ambulances," to rapidly transport the wounded.⁶ In his memoirs on the Russian campaign (1812), Larrey articulated a clear rule for sorting patients for treatment: "Those who are dangerously wounded should receive the first attention, without regard to rank or distinction. They who are injured in a less degree may wait until their brethren in arms, who are badly mutilated, have been operated on and dressed, otherwise the latter would not survive many hours; rarely, until the succeeding day."⁷

Commentators credit British naval surgeon John Wilson with the next major contribution to military triage.⁸ In 1846, Wilson argued that, to make their efforts most effective, surgeons should focus on those patients who need immediate treatment and for whom treatment is likely to be successful, deferring treatment for those whose wounds are less severe and those whose wounds are probably fatal with or without immediate intervention.⁹

The US Army was slow to implement triage systems. In the early days of the Civil War, for example, the medical services were understaffed and poorly organized, and there was no uniform method of sorting casualties. Working as a "wound dresser" for Union troops, poet Walt Whitman described the order of treatment as follows: "The men, whatever their condition, lie there, and patiently wait till their turn comes to be taken up."¹⁰ Whitman's description indicates that the guiding principle was "first come, first served." This method does establish treatment priority, but it does not take into account relative urgency, patient salvageability, or effective use of available resources. After a disastrous first year, the Union Medical Corps greatly decreased mortality by combining triage procedures with front-line medical care and ambulance services. Much of the credit for this goes to Jonathan Letterman, medical director of the Army of the Potomac from 1862 to 1864.¹¹

Military surgeons continually refined their triage protocols, widely using the term "triage" for the first time during World War I.⁴ The introduction in World War I of deadly new weapons, including machine guns and poison gases, created an unprecedented number of potentially treatable mass casualties requiring triage. This description of a triage situation from a World War I-era military surgical manual offers a slightly different approach to prioritization for treatment from that of Larrey or Wilson:

"[A] hospital with 300 or 400 beds may suddenly be overwhelmed by 1000 or more cases. It is often, therefore, physically impossible to give

speedy and thorough treatment to all. A single case, even if it urgently requires attention—if this will absorb a long time—may have to wait, for in that same time a dozen others, almost equally exigent, but requiring less time, might be cared for. The greatest good of the greatest number must be the rule."¹²

The approach proposed in this manual clearly differs from Larrey's dictum that priority goes to the most seriously injured. It also goes beyond Wilson's proposal that the hopelessly injured not be treated. It asserts that a critical and treatable patient should not be given priority for treatment if the time required to provide that treatment would prevent treatment for other patients with critical but less complicated injuries. This approach explicitly recognizes that, when resources are limited, some patients who could be saved may be allowed to die to save others.

Other World War I triage planners offered a quite different approach to battlefield triage; rather than deferring treatment of the less severely wounded, some suggested giving priority to this group because they could be treated quickly and returned to combat duty. One medical handbook cited by Winslow listed the 2 objectives of triage as "1st, conservation of manpower; 2nd, the conservation of the interest of the sick and wounded."^{1(p 6)}

World War II saw the introduction of additional weapons, including improved tanks and air support, and of new treatments, including plasma and penicillin. Military physicians developed new, more detailed protocols to assess and triage patients.^{13,14} Beecher recounts a well-known example of a controversial World War II decision about allocation of the extremely limited supply of penicillin. When the first shipment of penicillin arrived in North Africa in 1943, US military physicians decided to use it to treat and return to duty soldiers with gonorrhea rather than soldiers with infected war wounds.¹⁵ Similarly, German military physicians, in the Russian campaign of 1941, used the principle of maximizing the fighting strength by treating those who could most quickly be returned to action with the least expenditure of time and resources.¹⁶ Another example of this approach to military triage can be found in a 1958 North Atlantic Treaty Organization military handbook that describes 3 triage categories: (1) those who are slightly injured and can return to service, (2) those who are more seriously injured and in need of immediate resuscitation or surgery, and (3) the "hopelessly wounded" or dead on arrival.¹⁷

Today, primarily covert, guerilla, and developing world armed forces lack the resources to treat severely injured combatants. Scarcity of medical resources has become much less likely in modern armed forces that can quickly evacuate large numbers of critically wounded combatants from the battlefield to fully equipped, high-level medical facilities that are able to treat all casualties under most circumstances.

Rapid evacuation of the wounded began with basic aeromedical transport (without in-air medical care) in the Korean War and progressed to sophisticated multicasualty helicopter transport with airborne treatment in Vietnam. The average time from injury to definitive care decreased from 12 to 18 hours in World War II, to 2 to 4 hours in Korea, and to

less than 2 hours in Vietnam.¹⁸ In the 2 Iraq conflicts, mobile field hospitals, ideally within 10 miles of the battlefield, kept evacuation times relatively short.¹⁹ In modern military conflicts, triage often is a matter of deciding who should be evacuated to definitive care first, with the dead being evacuated last.

The use of nuclear weapons in World War II and the continuing threat of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons of mass destruction pose special challenges for triage and triage planning. In a limited attack with weapons of mass destruction, triage planning for major disasters may help providers distribute limited resources among injured survivors. After the widespread use of such weapons or a major natural disaster, however, the number of casualties and the destruction of available resources and of the social order may be so great that effective medical care, including meaningful triage, becomes impossible (Table).²⁰⁻²²

It is often mentioned that military triage systems have been adapted for triage in civilian contexts, including disasters and EDs, but there has been little discussion of the history of triage in these civilian contexts. Based on a comprehensive review of United States disasters, Auf der Heide²³ reported that, despite the existence of triage systems, most disaster casualties do not undergo out-of-hospital triage, because victims are found and transported directly to hospitals by bystanders. It was not until 1964 that Weinerman et al²⁴ published the first systematic description of civilian EDs' use of triage. Individual institutions, local and regional emergency medical systems, and federal agencies have subsequently developed and refined triage systems for most ED and disaster situations. The following section briefly describes several of these systems.

TRIAGE: TYPES AND SYSTEMS

As noted above, triage in its primary sense is the sorting of patients for treatment in situations of at least modest resource scarcity, according to an assessment of the patient's medical condition and the application of an established sorting system or plan. Defined in this way, the most common types of triage include ED triage, inpatient (ICU) triage, incident (multicasualty) triage, military (battlefield) triage, and disaster (mass casualty) triage.

Although each of these types of triage has distinctive elements, all of them satisfy the 3 basic conditions for triage described above, and some have additional features in common. One can, in fact, represent the types of triage as points on a continuum from relatively resource-rich situations in a stable social environment, as in EDs, to the almost total lack of resources and social chaos experienced during or after severe widespread disasters. This continuum is based on the ratio of resources to the number of patients who must be evaluated and treated simultaneously. EDs have the highest resource-to-patient ratio, and large-scale weapons of mass destruction incidents have the lowest, although these ratios often change as a situation progresses (Table).

ED Triage

In modern US EDs, triage officers, usually nurses, routinely assess all patients who present for treatment to sort and prioritize them. ED triage systems are typically designed to identify the most urgent (or **potentially most serious**) cases to ensure that they receive priority treatment, followed by the less urgent cases on a first-come, first-served basis. In routine ED triage, resources are available to treat every patient, although those who are less severely ill or injured must wait longer. Some patients choose to leave the ED rather than continue waiting for treatment.²⁵ Some ED triage systems are designed to identify patients with very minor problems and refer them for treatment at clinics or by their own physicians.^{26,27} Commentators have criticized this practice as both morally and medically perilous.^{28,29}

For routine on-site triage, EDs in the United States generally use a 3-level system, although 5-level systems are gaining acceptance as they prove themselves to be more reliable.^{30,31} Other countries, such as Canada, Spain, the United Kingdom, and Australia, have already adopted 5-level systems for ED use.^{30,32-34} Several methods of 5-level triage are in use. The Emergency Severity Index, developed in the United States, designates the most acutely ill patients as level 1 (highest level) or 2 and uses the number of resources a patient needs to determine levels 3 to 5 (lowest level).³⁰ The Manchester Triage Scale, used widely in Great Britain, uses 52 algorithms based on the patient's chief complaint to determine the triage level.³⁵ The Canadian Triage and Acuity Scale uses an extensive list of clinical descriptors to place patients in one of 5 triage levels. Each level has an associated time required for physician assessment, with all level 1 patients needing to be treated immediately.^{36,37} These methods have good, but not excellent, interrater reliability, making it unclear whether these are flawed systems, whether those using them are not up to the task, or whether other-than-medical criteria are influencing some decisions.³⁷⁻³⁹

Inpatient (ICU) Triage

When a patient requires hospitalization, additional decisions must be made about what level of hospital care the patient should receive. In the optimal situation with abundant hospital resources, the patient can immediately receive any and all services that reason suggests may be beneficial. In the more common situation of relative scarcity of at least some hospital-based resources, decisions must be made about who will receive priority access to those services. If these decisions are based on assessment of the patient's condition and are made according to some system or plan, they are triage decisions. The most common inpatient triage decisions in US hospitals involve access to intensive care.⁴⁰⁻⁴² In theory, these decisions allocate ICU beds to those who can most benefit from this level of treatment. In less affluent nations with limited hospital services, inpatient triage decisions are routinely made about priority access to surgery and diagnostic imaging, as well as intensive care.

Incident (Multicasualty) Triage

This type of triage is designed to respond to an incident that creates multiple casualties, as, for example, a multiple-motor-vehicle crash, a major residential fire, or a commercial airliner crash. In such events, many injured patients, including some with severe injuries, place significant stress on, but typically do not overwhelm, a local emergency medical system.⁸ Emergency caregivers at the scene and in the ED triage patients to identify the most critically injured for priority transportation and treatment. Although some on-scene confusion may occur, social stability is not an issue. Additional physicians and other medical and support personnel may be called to help treat the large number of patients with urgent needs, and those with minor injuries and illnesses (the "background noise" of the ED) must wait longer than usual for treatment, but all can eventually receive care.

Military (Battlefield) Triage

As noted, military physicians were the first to implement formal systems of triage to determine treatment priorities for wounded soldiers. Military triage has several distinctive features. The triage officers and treating professionals are typically members of a military service, and the patients are usually, but not always, also military personnel. As military personnel, these health care professionals and patients may have obligations, allegiances, and expectations that are not shared by other health care professionals or by the general public.⁴³ For example, military personnel typically give up certain rights and liberties and assume an obligation to obey their superior officers' orders. Military personnel may also be willing to accept life-threatening assignments according to, in part, the expectation that they will receive optimal medical care if they are injured in the line of duty. Furthermore, in addition to the internal medical objective to act in the patient's best interest, external objectives related to accomplishing a strategic or military mission may influence military triage systems. These systems may, for example, define which patients they may treat, such as combatants and civilians injured by their actions, and whom they may not, typically all other civilians. Finally, international laws, such as the Geneva Conventions about treatment of the wounded in war, define legitimate and illegitimate practices when different categories of wounded soldiers and civilians are treated.⁴⁴

Disaster (Mass Casualty) Triage

In its policy titled "Disaster Medical Services," the American College of Emergency Physicians offers the following description of a medical disaster: "A medical disaster occurs when the destructive effects of natural or man-made forces overwhelm the ability of a given area or community to meet the demand for health care."⁴⁵ As this description suggests, disaster triage can be roughly distinguished from incident triage by the trigger event's magnitude of destruction. Because a medical disaster creates demands that overwhelm the capacity of the local health care system, at least some demands cannot be satisfied, and triage can be used to determine who will receive treatment and who

will not. Criteria used for triage after natural or manmade disasters may vary, depending on the anticipated number of casualties and the severity of their injuries, the geographic area involved, and the expected arrival time of additional resources. Therefore, to make optimal disaster triage decisions, in addition to rapid patient assessment skills and knowledge of triage systems, triage officers also need accurate information about the cause and extent of the disaster, as well as the location, capabilities, and functional status of nearby health care facilities.⁴⁶

The World Medical Association has recommended that clinicians categorize disaster victims with a system that has been adopted worldwide in some form and which involves the following triage criteria:

- a) Those who can be saved but whose lives are in immediate danger, requiring treatment immediately or within a few hours (red triage tag: "immediate"; priority 1)
- b) Those whose lives are not in immediate danger but who need urgent but not immediate medical care (yellow triage tag: "delayed"; priority 2)
- c) Those requiring only minor treatment (green triage tag: "minimal"; priority 3)
- d) Those who are psychologically traumatized and might need reassurance or sedation if acutely disturbed (no specific triage tag)
- e) Those whose condition exceeds the available therapeutic resources, who have severe injuries such as irradiation or burns to such an extent and degree that they cannot be saved in the specific circumstances of time and place, or complex surgical cases that oblige the physician to make a choice between them and other patients (black triage tag: "expectant"; no priority)⁴⁶

This last category, "expectant," which encompasses those who are dead or who are "beyond emergency care," carries the most emotional and ethical baggage for individuals doing triage. Yet, it is a vital part of disaster triage systems. As the World Medical Association points out, "It is unethical for a physician to persist, at all costs, at maintaining the life of a patient beyond hope, thereby wasting to no avail scarce resources needed elsewhere."⁴⁷

Alternative categorization methods have been adopted for disaster triage. Among these are Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) and JumpSTART, the more prescriptive and specific methods adopted by disaster medical assistance teams in the United States. Developed at Hoag Hospital in Newport Beach, CA, START is an expedient triage system designed to assist minimally trained first responders to identify the most seriously injured patients and to triage multiple victims in 30 seconds or less, according to primary observations about respiration, perfusion, and mental status.⁴⁸ Although it has been field-proven in mass-casualty incidents and in disasters, its ease of use is offset by its high overtriage rate.⁸ JumpSTART, a modification of START for pediatric patients, emphasizes the

presence of respiratory arrest, a common problem in critically injured children.

Supervising editor: Robert K. Knopp, MD

Funding and support: The authors report this study did not receive any outside funding or support.

Publication dates: Received for publication January 5, 2006. Revisions received March 28, 2006, April 5, 2006, and May 19, 2006. Accepted for publication May 23, 2006. Available online July 10, 2006.

Presented at the Second Congress of Emergency Medicine, May 2004, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Address for reprints: Kenneth V. Iserson, MD, University of Arizona, 1501 N. Campbell Avenue, POB 245057, Tucson, AZ 85724; fax 520-626-2480; E-mail kvi@u.arizona.edu.

REFERENCES

1. Winslow GR. *Triage and Justice*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 1982:169.
2. Gatter RA, Moskop JC. From futility to triage. *J Med Philos*. 1995; 20:191-205.
3. Nuland SB. The inglorious healing arts. In: Naythons M, ed. *The Face of Mercy: A Photographic History of Medicine at War*. New York, NY: Random House; 1993:7-35.
4. Blagg CR. Triage: Napoleon to the present day. *J Nephrol*. 2004; 17:629-632.
5. Lucas GR Jr, Ogletree TW, eds. *Lifeboat Ethics: The Moral Dilemmas of World Hunger*. New York, NY: Harper and Row; 1976:32.
6. Wengert JW. Jean Dominique Larrey (1766-1842): Surgeon of the Guard. *Mil Med*. 1979;144:414-417.
7. Larrey DJ. *Memoirs of Military Surgery, and Campaigns of the French Armies: Vol 2*. Hall RW, translator. Baltimore, MD: Joseph Cushing; 1814:123. Reprinted, Classics of Medicine Library; 1987.
8. Hogan DE, Laird J. Triage. In: Hogan DE, Burstein JL, eds. *Disaster Medicine*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott; 2002:10-15.
9. Watt J. Doctors in the wars. *J Royal Soc Med*. 1984;77:265-267.
10. Whitman W. *Complete Prose Works*. New York, NY: Appleton and Company; 1910:28.
11. Bollet AJ. *Civil War Medicine: Challenges and Triumphs*. Tucson, AZ: Galen Press; 2002:98-99.
12. Keen WW. *The Treatment of War Wounds*. Philadelphia, PA: WB Saunders; 1917:13.
13. Trueta J. *Principles and Practice of War Surgery*. St. Louis, MO: C. V. Mosby Co; 1943:178.
14. Bacon DR, Albin M, Pender JW. Anesthesiology's greatest generation? *Anesthesiology*. 2001;94:725-726.
15. Beecher HK. Penicillin. In: Freund P, ed. *Experimentation with Human Subjects*. New York, NY: George Braziller; 1970:70-72.
16. Dolev E. Ethical issues in military medicine. *Israel J Med Sci*. 1996;32:785-788.
17. North Atlantic Treaty Organization. *Emergency War Surgery*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office; 1958:168.
18. Eiseman B. Combat casualty management in Vietnam. *J Trauma*. 1967;7:153-163.
19. Kaplan LF. America's near-invisible wounded: survivor: Iraq [The New Republic Online Web site]. Available at: <http://www.tnr.com/doc.mhtml?i=20031013&s=kaplan101303>. Accessed February 16, 2006.
20. Hersey J. *Hiroshima*. New York, NY: A.A. Knopf; 1985.
21. Leaning J. Burn and blast casualties: triage in nuclear war. In: *Institute of Medicine: The Medical Implications of Nuclear War*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 1986:251-283.
22. Iserson KV, Pesik N. Ethical resource distribution after biological, chemical or radiological terrorism. *Camb Q Healthc Ethics*. 2003; 12:455-465.
23. Auf der Heide E. Principles of hospital disaster planning. In: Hogan DE, Burstein JL, eds. *Disaster Medicine*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2002:57-89.
24. Weinerman ER, Ratner RS, Robbins A, et al. Yale studies in ambulatory care V: determinants of use of hospital emergency services. *Am J Public Health*. 1966;56:1037-1056.
25. Stock LM, Bradley G, Lewis R, et al. Patients who leave emergency departments without being seen by a physician: magnitude of the problem in Los Angeles County. *Ann Emerg Med*. 1994;23:294-298.
26. Derlet RW, Kinser D, Ray L, et al. Prospective identification and triage of nonemergency patients out of an emergency department: a five year study. *Ann Emerg Med*. 1995;25:215-223.
27. Washington DL, Stevens CD, Shekelle PG, et al. Next-day care for emergency department users with nonacute conditions. *Ann Intern Med*. 2002;137:707-714.
28. Schmidt TA, Iserson KV, Freas GC, et al. Ethics of emergency department triage: SAEM position statement. *Acad Emerg Med*. 1995;2:990-995.
29. Iserson KV. Assessing values: rationing emergency department care. *Am J Emerg Med*. 1992;3:263-264.
30. Tanabe P, Gimbel R, Yarnold PR, et al. Reliability and validity of scores on the emergency severity index version 3. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2004;11:59-65.
31. Travers DA, Waller AE, Bowling JM, et al. Five-level triage system more effective than three-level in tertiary emergency department. *J Emerg Nurs*. 2002;28:395-400.
32. American College of Emergency Physicians. A uniform triage scale in emergency medicine: information paper [American College of Emergency Physicians Web site]. Available at: <http://www.acep.org>. Accessed February 16, 2006.
33. Sociedad Española de Medicina de Urgencias y Emergencias. Sistema España de triaje (SET) [Sociedad Española de Medicina de Urgencias y Emergencias Web site]. Available at: <http://www.semes.org>. Accessed February 16, 2006.
34. Manchester Triage Group. *Emergency Triage*. London, England: BMJ Publishing Group; 1997.
35. Cronin J. The introduction of the Manchester Triage Scale to an emergency department in the Republic of Ireland. *Accid Emerg Nurs*. 2004;11:121-125.
36. Beveridge R, Clarke B, Janes L, et al. Canadian Emergency Department Triage Scale (CTAS) implementation guidelines. *Can J Emerg Med*. 1999;1:(suppl 3):S1-S24.
37. Fernandes CMB, Tanabe P, Golboy N, et al. Five-level triage: a report from the ACEP/ENA five-level triage task force. *J Emerg Nurs*. 2005;31:39-50.
38. Eitel DR, Travers DA, Rosenau AM, et al. The Emergency Severity Index triage algorithm version 2 is reliable and valid. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2003;10:1070-1080.
39. Beveridge R, Ducharme J, Janes L, et al. Reliability of the Canadian Emergency Department Triage and Acuity Scale: interrater agreement. *Ann Emerg Med*. 1999;34:155-159.
40. Truog RD. Triage in the ICU. *Hastings Cent Rep*. 1992;22:13-17.
41. Teres D. Civilian triage in the intensive care unit: the ritual of the last bed. *Crit Care Med*. 1993;21:598-606.
42. Society of Critical Care Medicine Ethics Committee. Consensus statement on the triage of critically ill patients. *Jama*. 1994;272: 1200-1203.

43. Moskop J: A moral analysis of military medicine. *Mil Med.* 1998; 163:76-79.
44. International Committee of the Red Cross. Geneva Convention's HV (1949) and additional protocols I and II (1977) [International Committee of the Red Cross Web site]. Available at: <http://www.icrc.org/Web/Eng/siteeng0.nsf/html/genevaconventions>. Accessed June 21, 2006.
45. American College of Emergency Physicians. Disaster medical services (ACEP policy statement, approved June 2000) [American College of Emergency Physicians Web site]. Available at: <http://www.acep.org/webportal/PracticeResources/PolicyStatements/ems/dismedsvc.htm>. Accessed June 21, 2006.
46. Kennedy K, Aghababian RV, Gans L, et al. Triage: techniques and applications in decisionmaking. *Ann Emerg Med.* 1996;28:136-144.
47. World Medical Association. Statement on Medical Ethics in the Event of Disasters. Adopted by the 46th Stockholm, Sweden: WMA General Assembly, September 1994. Available at: <http://www.wma.net/e/policy/d7.htm>. Accessed June 21, 2006.
48. Super G. *START: A Triage Training Module*. Newport Beach, CA: Hoag Memorial Hospital Presbyterian; 1984.

IMAGES IN EMERGENCY MEDICINE

(continued from p. 272)

DIAGNOSIS:

Cecal volvulus. The CT revealed a markedly dilated right colon with a thickened, irregular wall and a small amount of free fluid and free air (Figures 1 and 2). Cecal volvulus was confirmed during surgery, and ileocectomy was performed. The patient recovered well. Unlike sigmoid volvulus, which occurs more often in elderly patients, incidence of cecal volvulus peaks at age 25 to 35 years. It is associated with hypofixation of the cecum and other parts of the intestine to the posterior abdominal wall,¹ which results in hypermobility, often around the ileocecal artery's mesenteric pedicle, and can be provoked by neoplasms, inflammation, or previous surgery. Marathon runners seem to have higher rates of cecal volvulus, possibly because of a thin elastic mesentery. The characteristic "coffee bean" finding is not always seen on plain radiograph. Expeditious evaluation is essential because mortality is 10% to 15% if the bowel is viable and up to 40% if the bowel has infarcted. Although successful reduction by barium enema has been reported, there are higher rates of perforation, and the standard of care is almost always operative, with either cecopexy or right-sided colectomy.²

REFERENCES

1. Bitterman RA, Peterson MA. Volvulus. In: Marx JA, Hockberger RS, Walls RM, eds. *Rosen's Emergency Medicine: Concepts and Clinical Practice*. 5th ed. St. Louis, MO: Mosby; 2002:1335.
2. Kahi CJ, Rex DK. Bowel obstruction and pseudo-obstruction. *Gastroenterol Clin North Am.* 2003;32:1229-1247.

Triage in Medicine, Part II: Underlying Values and Principles

John C. Moskop, PhD

Kenneth V. Iserson, MD, MBA

From the Brody School of Medicine at East Carolina University and the University Health Systems of Eastern Carolina, Greenville, NC (Moskop); and the University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ (Iserson).

Part I of this 2-article series reviewed the concept and history of triage and the settings in which triage is commonly practiced. We now examine the moral foundations of the practice of triage. We begin by recognizing the moral significance of triage decisions. We then note that triage systems tend to promote the values of human life, health, efficient use of resources, and fairness, and tend to disregard the values of autonomy, fidelity, and ownership of resources. We conclude with an analysis of three principles of distributive justice that have been proposed to guide triage decisions. [Ann Emerg Med. 2007;49:282-287.]

0196-0644/\$-see front matter

Copyright © 2007 by the American College of Emergency Physicians.

doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2006.07.012

SEE RELATED ARTICLE, P. 275.

THE MORAL SIGNIFICANCE OF TRIAGE DECISIONS

In the aftermath of a massive natural or man-made disaster, triage officers face difficult decisions about who will receive scarce life-saving treatment and who will be left to die without treatment. Even in "routine" emergency department (ED) triage, decisions about who should receive treatment priority and who can wait for treatment may, at least occasionally, have life-and-death consequences. Because they can have such serious consequences, triage decisions may weigh heavily on those who must make them. It is therefore important that triage officers understand the triage system they employ and the moral values and principles upon which it is based. If triage officers do not understand the ethical basis for their decisions, they may be indecisive. Failing to act due to moral uncertainty is unacceptable, however, since inaction is often the worst of the available options.¹

In mass casualty situations, out-of-hospital health care workers may be asked to serve as triage officers in the field, despite the fact that they have less experience and training than the senior emergency physicians and trauma surgeons who usually perform this task at hospitals. To relieve these out-of-hospital providers of the fear of making grievous errors by triaging some salvageable patients to the "expectant" category, the Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) protocol suggests that a new category (Triage tag: Blue) be inserted between the patients who need immediate transport (priority) and those with significant injuries, but who can wait for treatment (delayed). This would effectively still give priority patients the most access to medical resources while making sure that no one was left to die because of a triage error.²

Evacuating hospital patients after widespread or devastating in-hospital disasters may be even more difficult than out-of-hospital triage. Triage criteria may demand that, contrary to their normal practice of devoting maximum time and resources to the sickest patients, clinicians must first evacuate ambulatory patients, then those not dependent on high-intensity care or advanced technology. Such was often the case during hospital evacuations following Hurricane Katrina. Unlike those who routinely work in the emergency care system, the physicians often given this triage task are not professionally or emotionally prepared to perform it. They may be particularly distressed by having to categorize patients as "expectant."

Especially in disaster situations, clinical experience prepares triage officers better than formal training. Similar experience can be garnered in a busy trauma center/ED and by practicing in austere medical environments. Burkle listed the 10 characteristics of good triage officers (Figure).³ Recognizing the ethical basis for difficult triage decisions underlies many of these qualities.

TRIAGE AND VALUES

Part I of this 2-article series described a spectrum of different triage systems and criteria employed in a variety of settings. Triage systems also rely, implicitly or explicitly, on a several different health care values. Other significant values in contemporary health care play little or no role in triage. To begin an ethical analysis of triage, therefore, let us first consider how triage fosters the values of human life, health, efficient use of resources, and fairness.



Values Fostered by Triage

Human life. As part of the health care enterprise, triage seeks to preserve and protect endangered human lives. As noted

Clinically experienced	Well recognized
Good judgment and leadership	Cool under stress
Decisive	Knowledge of available resources
Sense of humor	Imaginative and creative problem solving
Available	Knowledge about anticipated casualties

Figure. Traits of a good triage officer.

above, triage systems typically assign priority to patients who have an immediate need for life-sustaining treatment. Although the preservation of individual lives is highly valued in most triage systems, it is not generally an absolute value. That is, triage systems often direct that patients with life-threatening injuries not receive life-sustaining treatment, as, for example, if the chance of success is too low or if the required treatment would expend too many resources needed to treat other patients. Thus, many triage systems allow the loss of an individual patient's life to provide life-saving treatment for other patients in need.

Human health. Although triage systems typically give highest priority to patients with immediate needs for life-saving treatment, they also grant priority to patients with urgent or emergent needs for treatment to preserve or restore function or health. Unless the situation is one of extreme scarcity, therefore, triage-guided health care delivery systems will meet patient needs for both life-saving and non-life-saving treatment. Patients with less urgent or less serious conditions may, however, have to wait until those with more serious needs have been treated. That waiting period may be a time of pain and suffering, and it may also increase the risk of treatment complications or poor outcomes.

Efficient use of resources. As noted above, triage is a response to scarcities of health care resources in particular settings, during which health care providers typically seek to use available resources to achieve the best overall outcome. Thus, triage systems tend to direct resources to the care of those patients whose needs are great and for whom treatment is likely to be successful, and to withhold resources from those patients who are not likely to benefit significantly from treatment, because their injuries or illnesses are either too severe to be successfully treated or too minor to require treatment. It is important to note, however, that triage systems may differ in the outcomes they strive to produce. For example, a disaster triage system may seek to maximize the number of lives saved, while a military triage system may seek to maximize the number of injured or diseased soldiers returned to combat duty.

Fairness. Decisions or actions can be described as "fair" in 2 different senses: procedurally and substantively. Procedurally, an action is fair if it conforms to the rules governing the practice in question. Because triage decisions are made according to established rules, they allow judgments about procedural justice, that is, whether the system's rules were followed. The reliance on decision rules distinguishes triage from the unfairness of decisions made arbitrarily or on the basis of personal prejudice.

In a substantive sense, an action is fair if it conforms to an accepted standard or principle of justice. Because triage systems distribute scarce medical resources among people in need, they typically appeal to one or more principles of distributive justice. A subsequent section of this article will be devoted to an examination of several of those principles.

Values Foreign to Triage

In addition to recognizing the values promoted by triage, it is also important to note that triage systems generally disregard several other prominent health care values, including autonomy, fidelity, and ownership of resources.

Autonomy. Contemporary theories of biomedical ethics rely heavily on the value of personal autonomy.^{4, 5} These theories emphasize the patients' right to make choices about their health care; that right is enshrined in the doctrine of informed consent to treatment. Other commentators defend the physicians' right to autonomy in their practice decisions, including decisions to accept patients and to refuse requests for futile or harmful treatment.^{6, 7} Both patients and physicians have come to expect considerable autonomy in their interactions. Triage systems, however, make little or no mention of autonomy. Instead, without being consulted or asked for their consent, patients are simply assigned to treatment categories based on their conditions. Triage officers, in turn, are not free to assign patients to treatment categories at will, but must conform to established criteria in assigning patients to different triage categories.

Fidelity. The physician-patient relationship is traditionally understood as a fiduciary relationship in which the physician has a responsibility to act in the best interest of the patient, favoring the patient's interests over self-interest or the interests of others.^{8, 9} This responsibility, sometimes called "fidelity" or "loyalty," enables the patient to have confidence in the physician's firm commitment to his or her interests. In contrast to this unqualified commitment of fidelity or loyalty to "one's own" patients, triage officers are required to assess each patient's condition impartially and to assign treatment priority based on established criteria. Triage officers and physicians working within a triage system cannot, therefore, pledge unqualified commitment to any individual patient based on a new or continuing relationship with that individual patient.

Ownership of resources. Health care delivery systems in the United States typically grant the owners of the financial and material resources for health care significant control over the use of those resources. For example, health care institutions, including hospitals and physician practices, may decide whether or not to accept a patient, and such decisions often turn on whether the patient is able to pay for the treatment provided, either directly or through a health insurance plan. The most prominent exception to this linking of health care with payment in the United States is the federal requirement that health care institutions provide screening and stabilizing treatment for patients with medical emergencies, regardless of ability to pay.¹⁰ Triage systems follow the paradigm for emergency treatment,

not the more general US approach to distributing health care resources. That is, in guiding decisions about treatment priority, triage criteria do not consider who owns the health care resources or whether individual patients have the ability to pay for their care.

TRIAGE AND PRINCIPLES OF DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

Triage schemes systematically allocate the benefits of health care, and the burdens of limited, delayed, or deferred care, among a population of sick or injured persons. This makes triage a classic problem in the domain of distributive justice, that branch of ethical theory that addresses questions of how benefits and burdens should be distributed within a population. Moral philosophers have proposed and defended various principles of distributive justice to guide these allocation decisions. Triage planners, in turn, have appealed to one or more of these principles to defend a particular triage system. We will examine 3 principles of distributive justice: the principle of utility, the difference principle, and the principle of equal chances, focusing on how each might be used to defend different triage systems.

The Principle of Utility

The principle of utility, also called the greatest happiness principle, is the cornerstone of utilitarianism, a widely discussed ethical theory first clearly articulated by the British moral philosopher Jeremy Bentham in 1789¹¹ and John Stuart Mill in 1863.¹² Philosophers have proposed many different interpretations of utilitarianism and different versions of the principle of utility. Broadly speaking, however, utilitarians hold that actions should be judged by their consequences and that actions are right or good insofar as they produce the greatest net benefit among all those affected. Note that the principle of utility requires that consideration be given to the good or bad consequences of one's actions for everyone concerned; no one's interests can be ignored. It does not, however, require that one's actions have the same or similar consequences for everyone affected, but rather that the greatest overall benefit be achieved. Thus, bad consequences for some may be justified if an action produces the greatest overall benefit.

The principle of utility offers a general guide to action, and it clearly can be applied to the distribution of benefits and burdens among individuals. In fact, justifications of triage systems often appeal explicitly to the principle of utility. For example, Hartman asserts simply: "The rationale for triage is utilitarianism, or to do the greatest good for the greatest number."¹³ Similarly, Repine et al observe that "in the acute setting of combat medical care, the physician's duty is changed to 'do the most good for the most people'.¹⁴ Although commentators often do not go on to explain exactly how triage systems maximize utility, links between the 2 are fairly obvious. Triage systems seek to use the available resources to achieve the health benefits of survival, restoration or preservation of

function, relief of suffering, and so on. To maximize these benefits overall, however, triage systems may dictate that treatment for some patients be delayed or denied, often resulting in increased suffering or poorer outcomes for those patients.

The principle of utility may well offer the most compelling moral justification for the practice of triage, but a close examination reveals difficult underlying questions about the proper scope of concern or consideration, the calculation of consequences, and the production of unequal outcomes. We will briefly examine each of these areas in turn.

The scope of concern. Triage systems typically focus on the population of patients needing health care in a particular situation, asking how the available resources can be used to achieve the best overall health outcomes for them. It seems reasonable to focus on this population, since they will be most directly and significantly affected by the triage system, and the effects of the system on them will be easiest to predict and measure. An initial question, however, is whether the triage officer's focus should be on those patients needing care at a particular time, or on all of the patients projected to need care, both now and in the near future. Since one's triage decisions typically have consequences for future patients, and since the principle of utility requires that all foreseeable consequences be taken into consideration, utility directs that consequences for future patients be considered. Thus, it has been proposed that, during pandemics or weapons of mass destruction events, emergency health care and public service workers receive priority for treatment, since they will, when they have recovered sufficiently, act as "multipliers" of beneficial effects for future patients.¹⁵

Moreover, the population of present and future patients is not the only group affected by a triage system, and attention to broader consequences sometimes significantly influences triage systems. Perhaps the most prominent example of this attention to broader consequences in triage is the practice, in some military triage systems, of giving treatment priority to less severely ill or injured soldiers in order to return them quickly to combat duty. This practice subordinates the overall health benefits of the population of patient/soldiers to the broader societal benefit of achieving victory in the military campaign.

The calculation of consequences. Choosing one's actions on the basis of their expected consequences requires that one can predict with reasonable accuracy what those consequences will be. A standard criticism of utilitarianism is that it is often very difficult to predict the consequences of one's actions accurately. This criticism may have considerable force in some of the circumstances for which triage systems are designed, such as natural or man-made disasters, since these circumstances may be unfamiliar, chaotic, rapidly changing, and resistant to **information gathering**. **It may be difficult, therefore, for triage planners to determine what triage system or set of criteria will be most effective, and even more difficult for triage officers to determine when and how to apply the triage system in a**

particular situation.

Consider, for example, some of the criteria that have been proposed for the triage of battlefield casualties. Larrey's dictum that the most severely wounded be treated first concentrates efforts on those with the most urgent need for treatment, and so seems more efficient than either random treatment or the principle of "first come, first served." If many of these casualties have lethal injuries, however, and if triage officers are able to judge accurately which injuries are mortal, then deferral of treatment of these injuries will result in the most efficient use of the available resources. If, moreover, some serious injuries are treatable, but only with a great investment of resources, and if triage officers can identify these injuries accurately, then deferring treatment of these injuries will also result in the most efficient use of limited resources, since the resources saved can be used to treat multiple other severe injuries. Finally, if some patient/soldiers can be quickly treated and returned to combat, if triage officers can accurately identify these soldiers, and if their return to combat can significantly affect the outcome of the campaign, then giving priority treatment to these soldiers may contribute to the most beneficial outcome for the society at large. Which one of these criteria will, in fact, maximize utility, depends on complex empirical questions about the triage situations and the triage officers' assessment skills.

The creation of unequal outcomes. Triage systems recognize that, because resources are scarce in relation to needs, the needs of some patients will be subordinated to those of others, in an effort to achieve the greatest overall benefit. Thus, a triage system grounded in the principle of utility may direct physicians to deny care to a severely injured but salvageable patient in order to devote the resources that would have been required to save that patient to the task of saving multiple other seriously injured patients. In this situation, one patient is allowed to die in order to save at least several others. Some commentators raise moral objections to the inequality of outcomes in this situation.⁹ If this practice is justifiable on the basis of greater net benefit, one might ask, would it not also be justifiable to remove multiple organs from an otherwise healthy person, thereby causing that person's death, in order to save the lives of multiple patients in need of organ transplants?

Questions like the ones posed in this section have prompted some scholars to propose other principles of distributive justice as stronger moral foundations for the practice of triage. We turn now to consideration of these principles.

The Difference Principle

In his influential 1971 volume *A Theory of Justice*, moral philosopher John Rawls proposes and defends a set of 3 principles of justice for governing the basic structure of society.¹⁶ The principles Rawls proposes are principles of distributive justice in the sense that they are intended to guide the distribution of what he calls society's "primary goods," including basic liberties, powers, opportunities, income, and wealth. Rawls' first 2 principles assert that individuals have equal rights to basic liberties and to opportunities for offices and

positions within the society according to one's skills and abilities. The third principle, called "the difference principle," addresses the distribution of social and economic benefits within the society. It holds that societal institutions are to be arranged so as to maximally benefit society's least-advantaged persons. The difference principle permits unequal distribution of social and economic benefits as long as such inequalities provide the best outcome for the least well off.

Rawls offers a complex argument to justify his principles of justice. Briefly stated, he asserts that these principles would be the principles of justice chosen by hypothetical contractors acting under ideal conditions for the creation of a just society. The contracting parties, Rawls argues, should be rational and should seek to protect their own interests, but should not be biased by knowledge about their specific characteristics or their position in the society. Therefore, the contracting parties are presumed to know general facts about human society, but none of them knows his or her particular place in the society or his or her own natural assets and abilities.¹⁶ Following this approach, Rawls argues that the parties will adopt a "maximin strategy." That is, they will choose principles that maximize benefits to the worst off in order to protect themselves from an intolerable outcome if they should find themselves in that worst off group.

Rawls did not apply his principles of justice to the distribution of health care, but Winslow, and Baker and Strosberg, argue that Rawls' difference principle can serve as a justification for triage systems.^{17, 18} Winslow asks how Rawls' hypothetical contracting parties would view triage situations, and he responds that "the one purpose that would have the most obvious appeal to rational contracting agents would be lowering the probability of the worst possible outcome, in this case, death."¹⁷ Winslow argues that to increase their chances of survival in a triage situation, the contractors would choose triage systems that give priority to patients who can be saved without a disproportionate investment of scarce resources. Though he reaches conclusions about justifiable triage systems similar to those of utilitarians, Winslow claims that Rawls' theory offers a more persuasive defense for triage.

The application of Rawls' theory of justice to the issue of triage poses its own set of problems, however. First of all, Rawls cautions that his principles of justice, and his device of the hypothetical social contract situation, are meant to apply only to decisions about society's basic structure and the allocation of the primary social goods of liberty, opportunity, and income, not to decisions about the allocation of all social goods.¹⁶ If one does attempt to apply the difference principle to complex microallocation decisions like triage, it is not at all obvious how to do so. Winslow argues that the contractors would seek to improve their odds of avoiding the worst outcome, namely, death, and would therefore favor criteria that minimize the number of deaths. Arguably, however, the worst off group in triage situations are those severely ill or injured patients whose risk of death is highest, and for whom the likelihood of successful treatment is low. If, guided by the difference

principle, triage systems should be designed to maximize benefits for this worst-off group, they should give priority to treatment for these most severely ill or injured patients. That rule would be most likely to benefit this clearly disadvantaged group, since at least some of them might be saved, but it would also increase the overall number of patients who do not survive.

In applying Rawls' difference principle to triage situations, much depends on how one defines the worst-off group, since the difference principle directs us to choose the system that maximizes benefits to this group. Proponents of a Rawlsian justification for triage argue that this approach would focus on minimizing the number of avoidable deaths. Their interpretation would direct triage systems to focus on "salvageable" patients, but it seems to ignore the needs of an even worse off group, namely, those who are unlikely to survive or whose treatment would consume a disproportionate share of scarce resources. In fact, philosophers and theologians have argued explicitly that in situations of scarcity, maximizing the number of patients saved should not be the overriding moral consideration.^{9, 19-21} We turn now to an examination of one such argument.

The Principle of Equal Chances

In a widely discussed 1977 article entitled "Should the Numbers Count?" philosopher John Taurek considers the following simple triage situation: "I have a supply of some life-saving drug. Six people will all certainly die if they are not treated with the drug. But 1 of the 6 requires all the drug if he is to survive. Each of the other 5 requires only one-fifth of the drug. What ought I to do?"¹⁹

Taurek acknowledges that it seems obvious to many that one ought to use the drug to save the larger number, but he rejects this conclusion (in a later article addressing triage, Bell also argues that physicians have no obligation to save more lives rather than fewer).²⁰ Taurek notes that, in the situation he is considering, the magnitude of the harm to each person at risk is the same, namely, the loss of his or her life. Though some patients in this situation might altruistically choose to sacrifice their own life for someone else, Taurek argues that if we were to ask any of the 6 people at risk what should be done, it would also be natural and appropriate for them to prefer that their own life be saved. He explicitly rejects the utilitarian claim that we should sum up the expected benefits and burdens to all the affected persons in order to arrive at the best course of action. Such a calculation would be appropriate, he argues, in choosing which of one's valuable possessions to save in a disaster situation, but not in choosing among human lives. Because each person's life is equally valuable to him or her, Taurek claims that one ought to give each person in his hypothetical situation an equal chance to survive, perhaps by flipping a coin to choose between the 2 options. This approach, he concludes, best expresses an equal concern and respect for each person.

If triage planners are convinced by Taurek's arguments, what kind of triage system should they design? Their goal would be to give all patients an equal chance at survival. They would,

therefore, presumably operate on a first-come, first-served basis, giving equal priority for treatment to all salvageable patients, no matter how resource intensive their treatment will be, even though concentration of resources on the care of one or a few patients may result in a greater overall number of deaths. The reluctance of physicians to abandon any patient whom they believe they can save may give implicit support to this approach to triage.

Not surprisingly, a number of authors have challenged Taurek's conclusion that the number of lives saved in triage situations is morally irrelevant.^{22, 23} Philosopher F. M. Kamm, for example, argues that the world is a better place if more people are saved than if fewer are saved, and a worse place if more rather than fewer people suffer or die.²² Kamm acknowledges the importance of respect for the worth of each individual person. She notes, however, that in situations of dire scarcity, we cannot save the lives of all those who seek our assistance, and we know that saving some lives is unavoidably linked with allowing others to die. Kamm concludes that we should honor as many requests for life-saving care as we can, even though we regrettably cannot save everyone.

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRIAGE PLANNING

In this article, we have identified a number of values fostered by the practice of triage, and we have examined several principles of distributive justice to which triage planners might appeal. These values and principles provide the moral justification for decisions by triage officers to provide and to deny treatment to patients. Therefore it is essential that health care system leaders, including public health officials, health care system administrators, and ED directors engage in careful planning for triage in all of its settings, from the daily routine of the hospital ED to a massive earthquake or infectious disease pandemic. We have also argued that, in order to carry out their task effectively, triage officers must clearly understand the triage system they are employing and appreciate the moral basis of that system.

As components of disaster plans and of hospital policy, triage systems are a type of public policy with significant moral implications. In a recent article, Robert Veatch argues that health care professionals and the American public are likely to take different approaches to triage, with professionals favoring triage systems that maximize the overall number of lives saved, and the public supporting systems that give priority to the sickest patients.⁹ In addition to health care experts, it is important that public representatives and ethics scholars contribute to triage planning. Broad involvement in triage planning could take a variety of forms. In anticipation of a potential avian flu pandemic, for example, public or professional organizations at the national and state level could organize task forces with multidisciplinary representation to develop strategies to respond to potential outbreaks of the disease. Proposed revisions of ED triage protocols could be reviewed and evaluated by hospital ethics committees or by ethics panels of emergency medicine professional organizations.

CONCLUSION

Triage provides a method to distribute health care resources when patient needs exceed available resources. Triage operates along a continuum of decreasing resources, social order and the resource-to-patient ratio. Arrival patterns, triage methods, and the applicable ethical basis for triage vary along this continuum.

Most triage systems are designed to serve the values of human life, human health, efficient use of resources, and fairness. Nevertheless, given the variety of specific triage settings and goals, there is no single "correct" way to perform or to justify triage. Routine triage in the relatively resource-rich setting of the modern hospital ED, for example, focuses appropriately on maximizing benefits for each individual patient, giving treatment priority to patients whose needs are most urgent. In triage following a massive disaster, where not all individual needs for life-saving care can be met, the focus may shift from an individual to a group perspective, and triage officers may seek to save as many lives as possible with the limited resources at their disposal. In special circumstances such as a nation at war, military commanders may direct that triage systems devote scarce medical resources to achieving a nonmedical goal, namely, military victory. In situations of complete devastation, the lack of social order and minimal resources may make triage impossible.

This article has examined values and principles to which triage planners may appeal. Whether the choice of a triage system for a particular setting is justifiable will depend on an evaluation of the specific system itself, its underlying values and principles, and the setting in which it is applied.

Supervising editor: Robert K. Knopp, MD

Funding and support: The authors report this study did not receive any outside funding or support.

Publication dates: Received for publication April 5, 2006. Accepted for publication April 10, 2006. Available online August 14, 2006.

Presented at the Second Congress of Emergency Medicine, May 2004, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Reprints not available from the authors.

Address for correspondence: Kenneth V. Iserson, MD, University of Arizona, 1501 N. Campbell Avenue, POB 245057, Tucson, AZ 85724; 520-626-2398, fax 520-529-6459; E-mail kvi@u.arizona.edu.

REFERENCES

1. Milo RD. Physician calls re: do-not-resuscitate orders. In: Iserson KV, Sanders AB, Mathieu D (eds). *Ethics in Emergency Medicine*, 2nd edition. Tucson, AZ: Galen Press, Ltd.;1995: 371-377.
2. Super G. *START: A Triage Training Module*. Newport Beach, CA: Hoag Memorial Hospital Presbyterian; 1984.
3. Burkle FM. *Disaster Medicine: Application for the Immediate Management and Triage of Civilian and Military Disaster Victims*. New Hyde Park, NY: Medical Examination Pub; 1984.
4. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. Respect for autonomy. In *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. 5th ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 2001:57-112.
5. Engelhardt HTJr. *The Foundations of Bioethics*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 1996.
6. American Medical Association Policies: E-2.035 Futile Care, Council on Ethical and Judicial Affairs Opinion 2.03, "Allocation of Limited Medical Resources" and Opinion 2.095, "The Provision of Adequate Health Care."
7. American College of Emergency Physicians. Non-beneficial ("Futile") emergency medical interventions. Available at <http://www.ecu.acep.org/webportal/PracticeResources/PolicyStatements/ethics/NonbeneficialFutileEMinterventions.htm>. Accessed July 28, 2006.
8. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. Fidelity. In: *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. 5th ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 2001:312-319.
9. Veatch RM. Disaster preparedness and triage: justice and the common good. *Mt Sinai J Med*. 2005;72:236-241.
10. 42 USC 1395dd. *Examination and treatment for emergency medical conditions and women in labor; also known as Section 1867 of the Social Security Act; also known as Section 9121 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985*.
11. Bentham J. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Oxford: Clarendon; 1907. (Originally published 1789).
12. Mill JS. *Utilitarianism*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing, 2001. (Originally published 1863).
13. Hartman RG. Tripartite triage concerns: issues for law and ethics. *Crit Care Med*. 2003;31(suppl):S358-S361.
14. Repine TB, Lisagor P, Cohen DJ. The dynamics and ethics of triage: rationing in hard times. *Milit Med*. 2005;170: 505-509.
15. Iserson KV, Pesik N. Ethical resource distribution after biological, chemical or radiological terrorism. *Cambridge Quarterly of Health care Ethics*. 2003;12:55-65.
16. Rawls J. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press;1971.
17. Winslow GR. *Triage and Justice*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
18. Baker R, Strosberg M. Triage and equality: an historical reassessment of utilitarian analyses of triage. *Kennedy Inst Ethics J*. 1992;2:103-123.
19. Taurek JM. Should the numbers count? *Philos Publ Aff*. 1977;6: 293-316.
20. Bell N. Triage in medical practices: an unacceptable model? *Soc Sci & Med*. 1981;15F:151-156.
21. Sokol M. The allocation of scarce medical resources: a philosophical analysis of the halakhic sources. *AJS Review*. 1990;15:63-93.
22. Kamm FM. Equal treatment and equal chances. *Philos Publ Aff*. 1985;14:177-194.
23. Sanders JT. Why the numbers should sometimes count. *Philos Publ Aff*. 1988;17:3-14.