

1 A comparison of self-triage tools to nurse driven triage in the emergency department

2

3 Sachin V Trivedi<sup>1</sup>, Rachit Batta<sup>2</sup>, Nicolas Henao – Romero<sup>3</sup>, Prosanta Mondal<sup>4</sup>, Tracy Wilson<sup>1</sup>,

4 James Stempien<sup>1</sup>

5

6 1. Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon,

7 Saskatchewan, Canada

8 2. Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

9 3. College of Medicine, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

10 4. Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, University of Saskatchewan,

11 Saskatoon, Saskatchewan Canada

12

13 Corresponding Author: [Sachin.trivedi@usask.ca](mailto:Sachin.trivedi@usask.ca) (ST)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

## 25 **ABSTRACT**

## 26 **INTRODUCTION**

27 Canadian patients presenting to the emergency department (ED) typically undergo a triage  
28 process where they are assessed by a specially trained nurse and assigned a Canadian Triage and  
29 Acuity Scale (CTAS) score, indicating their level of acuity and urgency of assessment. We  
30 sought to assess the ability of patients to self-triage themselves through use of one of two of our  
31 proprietary self-triage tools, and how this would compare with the standard nurse-driven triage  
32 process.

## 33 **METHODS**

34 We enrolled a convenience sample of ambulatory ED patients aged 17 years or older who  
35 presented with chief complaints of chest pain, abdominal pain, breathing problems, or  
36 musculoskeletal pain. Participants completed one, or both, of an algorithm generated self-triage  
37 (AGST) survey, or visual acuity scale (VAS) based self-triage tool which subsequently generated  
38 a CTAS score. Our primary outcome was to assess the accuracy of these tools to the CTAS score  
39 generated through the nurse-driven triage process.

## 40 **RESULTS**

41 A total of 223 patients were included in our analysis. Of these, 32 (14.3%) presented with chest  
42 pain, 25 (11.2%) with shortness of breath, 75 (33.6%) with abdominal pain, and 91 (40.8%) with  
43 musculoskeletal pain. Of the total number of patients, 142 (47.2%) completed the AGST tool,  
44 159 (52.8%) completed the VAS tool and 78 (25.9%) completed both tools. When compared to

45 the nurse-driven triage standard, both the AGST and VAS tools had poor levels of agreement for  
46 each of the four presenting complaints.

47

## 48 **CONCLUSIONS**

49 Self-triage through use of an AGST or VAS tool is inaccurate and does not appear to be a viable  
50 option to enhance the current triage process. Further study is required to show if self-triage can  
51 be used in the ED to optimize the triage process.

## 52 **INTRODUCTION**

53 When patients present to the emergency department (ED), triage serves as their gateway  
54 to receiving care. Triage involves the patient being assessed by a specially trained registered  
55 nurse, and the process results in a score which assigns a level of acuity and urgency to a given  
56 patient's presenting complaint. The Canadian Triage and Acuity Scale (CTAS) is the reference  
57 standard for this output in Canada. The current landscape of emergency medicine is mired by  
58 prolonged wait times, which are known to have negative patient outcomes. [1 - 2] Incorporating  
59 the patient into the triage process may serve to enhance its efficiency.

60 This notion of self-triage has been studied previously with success in specific  
61 populations. [3 – 5] However, this approach may be fraught with challenges owing to individual  
62 health literacy. Previous literature would suggest that laypersons may be overcautious in  
63 deciding their need to seek medical care, or miss identifying potential emergencies. [6] Indeed,  
64 laypersons have also been previously demonstrated to not follow prescribed advice when  
65 directed to either present, or not present, to an ED to seek care. [6 – 8] We previously sought to

66 compare a computer-assisted self-triage tool to the traditional method of triage and found low  
67 rates of agreement and high rates of over triage, a result consistent with other literature. [4, 6, 9]

68 In this study, we aimed to build on the existing knowledge base and further our previous  
69 work by assessing the ability for patients to self-triage. We based this on four specific presenting  
70 complaints: chest pain, shortness of breath, abdominal pain and musculoskeletal pain. We tested  
71 this through two different methods – an algorithm-generated self-triage (AGST) score, and a  
72 visual analogue scale (VAS) based score. In an attempt to see if this is a viable option for the  
73 evolution of triage, we aimed to compare the accuracy of these tools against the gold standard of  
74 nurse driven triage with respect to their resulting CTAS score.

## 75 **METHODS**

### 76 **Setting**

77  
78 This was a prospective, observational pilot study conducted within the tertiary care EDs  
79 at Royal University Hospital and St. Paul’s Hospital in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada. We  
80 enrolled a convenience sample of ambulatory patients who presented either independently or  
81 with a caregiver that were aged 17 and older. We selected for those who presented with chest  
82 pain, abdominal pain, shortness of breath, and musculoskeletal chief complaints. Those excluded  
83 were the patients who presented by ambulance and who had different presenting complaints as  
84 listed above. We further excluded those patients who identified discrepant presenting complaints  
85 between our self-triage tools and the nurse driven triage, as well as those who left the ED prior to  
86 completing the formal triage process.

87 Eligible participants were identified by a research assistant who was present in the ED  
88 every afternoon, or early evening, for five hours at a time from Monday through Friday  
89 beginning on November 4, 2019. Enrollment of participants was stopped due to the beginning of  
90 the Covid-19 pandemic in March 11, 2020. Once identified, the research assistant explained the  
91 purpose of our project. Participants subsequently had the option to opt in or out of the project.  
92 This project was funded by the Royal University Hospital Foundation. The University of  
93 Saskatchewan's Research Ethics Board granted approval for this project (BEH #16-239).  
94 Operational approval for this study was obtained from the Saskatchewan Health Authority.

95

## 96 **Intervention and Outcome**

97 We designed two tools which were used to generate self-triage CTAS scores. An  
98 emergency physician and two emergency medicine residents drafted the initial tools, which were  
99 then vetted by a heterogenous group of individuals in an iterative process. This group included a  
100 departmental research facilitator, senior ED nurses, and representatives of the Saskatchewan  
101 Health Authority's Patient and Family Advisory Council. Ultimately, the two tools took the form  
102 of an AGST survey, and a VAS based tool. Both tools provided a CTAS score output, as  
103 described below. For the purposes of this project, we combined the higher acuity CTAS 1 and  
104 CTAS 2 patients in the same grouping. Similarly, we grouped CTAS 4 and 5 patients together.

105 The AGST survey (seen in Table 1) consisted of five to six symptoms based yes or no  
106 questions depending on presenting complaint. If patients answered "yes" to one or two  
107 questions, patients were assigned as being either a CTAS 4 or 5 presentation. Similarly, if  
108 patients answered "yes" to three or four categories, they were assigned as being a CTAS 3

109 presentation. Finally, if all questions were responded to as “yes,” patients were assigned as being  
 110 a CTAS 2.

111

112 **Table 1. AGST Survey Questions.**

Study Category	Questions
Chest Concerns	Does your chest [pain/discomfort/heaviness] affect your daily activities?
	Have you been admitted into hospital (stayed overnight in hospital) for a similar problem in the past?
	Does this problem cause you [shortness of breath/difficulty breathing]?
	Was there any trauma/injury to the area?
	Do you have any of these risk factors? (high cholesterol high blood pressure diabetes cigarette smoking family members with heart problems)
Breathing Problems	Do you have any cough/congestion?
	Have you had any fever or cold sweats in the last 24 hours?
	Does the breathing problem affect your daily activities?
	Does the breathing problem cause you any [chest pain/discomfort/heaviness]?
	Any previous medical diagnoses that have caused you breathing difficulties? (heart failure, asthma, COPD, cancer etc.)
	Has anything happened recently to make these symptoms worse (falls, colds, run out of medication)?
Abdominal Concerns	Does this problem cause you nausea/vomiting?
	Does your pain affect the activities you normally perform each day?
	Have you stayed overnight in hospital for this problem previously?
	Has this pain ever happened to you previously?
	Have you noticed any abnormal bleeding or bleeding that would otherwise not be normally present?
Bone and Joint Concerns	Are you still able to move your affected joint as you were able to a week ago?
	Have you stayed overnight in hospital for a similar problem?
	Can you move the area with minimal pain?
	Was there any injury that came before the pain?
	Are you able to walk?

113

114 The VAS based tool consisted of a sliding scale from 0 to 10. It asked four questions  
 115 which were consistent across all presenting complaints. These were: 1) how much pain are you  
 116 in right now; 2) how worried are you about your condition right now; 3) how urgently for you  
 117 think you need to see the doctor; and 4) how much is your condition interfering with your daily  
 118 activities. The scores for all of these were subsequently averaged. If the average VAS score was  
 119 between 1 and 3.3, the patient was listed as a CTAS 4 or 5 presentation. If the average score was

120 between 3.4 and 6.6, the patient was assigned as a CTAS 3. Finally, if the score was between 6.7  
121 and 10, the patient was noted as a CTAS 2.

122 Both tools were built on the Ethica app software in order to maintain the necessary level  
123 of security and privacy required by our local research ethics board. They were loaded on four  
124 Samsung Galaxy 6 smartphones. Depending on individual comfort level, participants were given  
125 the option to handle the smartphones themselves in filling out the app, or having the research  
126 assistant input their answers for them. Three different versions of the survey were administered  
127 at random: 1) one version was a visual analog/ Likert scale; 2) the second version a series of  
128 dichotomous closed-ended questions wherein the answers were simply yes or no; and 3) the third  
129 version a combination of both scale and questions.

130 Participants enrolling in our study indicated their informed consent through completion  
131 of a form which was presented to them on the smartphone they were using prior to using any of  
132 our self-triage tools. Following this, they provided demographic details as well as their name and  
133 birthdate. At the conclusion of the data collection period, we used the latter information to  
134 retrospectively review their chart to acquire the CTAS scores which were generated through  
135 nurse-driven triage. This retrospective review was completed on March 2, 2021.

136 Our primary outcome of this study was to assess the level of concordance between both  
137 sets of self-triage scores and the reference standard of the triage score assigned by the usual  
138 process of nurse driven triage.

139

## 140 **Sample Size Calculation and Statistical Analysis**

141 As a pilot correlational study, we intended to have a minimum of 16 participants per each  
142 individual variable, defined here as the unique presenting complaints. [10] We sought to meet

143 this minimum for each triage tool. Once all data was collected, it was analyzed quantitatively,  
144 using Kappa statistics calculated through the SPSS program. Kappa statistics were used to  
145 determine level of correlation between the self-triage tools and the nurse driven triage standard.  
146

## 147 **RESULTS**

148 A total of 279 participants were enrolled in the study and completed the self-triage  
149 questionnaire. Of this group, 39 participants were excluded as their self-reported chief complaint  
150 did not match their actual chief complaint. An additional 17 participants were excluded as they  
151 had left prior to the formal triage process, and so no actual CTAS score could be determined.  
152 Ultimately, 223 participants were included for analysis. The emergency department of Royal  
153 University Hospital provided the majority of the data, as the emergency department of Saint  
154 Paul's Hospital was often empty during the months in which it was attended or devoid of patients  
155 whose conditions were appropriate for the study.

156 With respect to the different forms of our self-triage tools, a total of 159 participants  
157 completed the VAS based tool, and 142 participants completed the AGST survey. Of these  
158 participants, 78 completed both self-triage tools. Of the four study categories, chest concerns  
159 comprised 14.3% (n = 32) of the responses, breathing concerns comprised 11.2% (n = 25) of the  
160 responses, abdominal concerns comprised 33.4% (n = 75) of the responses and musculoskeletal  
161 concerns comprised 40.8% (n = 91) of the responses.

162 Table 2 outlines the descriptive statistics of our study. Table 3 displays the concordance  
163 of the AGST tool with the nurse-driven triage result, and Table 4 displays the same but with the



164 VAS tool. Table 5 presents the data of the subgroup which completed both the AGST and VAS  
 165 tools.

166

167

168 **Table 2. Demographics**

		N (%)
<b>Sex</b>	<b>Male</b>	103 (46.2)
	<b>Female</b>	120 (53.8)
<b>Age (Years)</b>	<b>&lt;20</b>	15 (6.7)
	<b>20-39</b>	120 (53.8)
	<b>40-60</b>	57 (25.6)
	<b>&gt;60</b>	31 (13.9)
<b>Presenting Complaint</b>	<b>Chest Concerns</b>	32 (14.3)
	<b>Breathing Concerns</b>	25 (11.2)
	<b>Abdominal Concerns</b>	75 (33.6)
	<b>Bone and Joint Concerns</b>	91 (40.8)
<b>Completed Self-Triage Tool</b>	<b>Algorithm-generated self-triage (AGST)</b>	142 (47.2)
	<b>Visual Acuity Scale (VAS)</b>	159 (52.8)
	<b>Both AGST and VAS</b>	78 (25.9)

169

170 **Table 3. AGST tool vs. Nurse-driven Triage**

<b>Presenting Complaint</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Agreement (%)</b>	<b>Over-triage (%)</b>	<b>Under-triage (%)</b>	<b>Kappa Value</b>
<b>Chest Concerns</b>	23(16.2)	11(47.8)	10(43.5)	2(8.7)	0.156
<b>Breathing Problems</b>	16(11.3)	10(62.5)	2(12.5)	4(25)	0.273
<b>Abdominal Concerns</b>	43(30.3)	21(48.8)	13(30.2)	9(20.9)	-0.019
<b>Bone and Joint Concerns</b>	60(42.3)	41(68.3)	6(10.0)	13(21.7)	0.116

171

172 **Table 4. VAS triage tool vs. Nurse-driven triage**

<b>Presenting Complaint</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Agreement (%)</b>	<b>Over-triage (%)</b>	<b>Under-triage (%)</b>	<b>Kappa Value</b>
-----------------------------	------------------	----------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------

<b>Chest Concerns</b>	22(13.8)	7(31.8)	8(36.4)	7(31.8)	-0.111
<b>Breathing Problems</b>	20(12.6)	9(45)	2(10)	9(45)	0.083
<b>Abdominal Concerns</b>	56(35.2)	19(33.9)	5(8.9)	32(57.1)	0.015
<b>Bone and Joint Concerns</b>	61(38.4)	9(14.8)	1(1.6)	51(83.6)	-0.028

173

174

175 **Table 5. Subgroup analysis of participants who completed both AGST and VAS tools vs.**  
 176 **Nurse-driven triage**

<b>Presenting complaint (n, %)</b>	<b>Self – Triage tool used</b>	<b>Agreement (%)</b>	<b>Over-triage (%)</b>	<b>Under-triage (%)</b>	<b>Kappa Statistic (95% CI)</b>
<b>Chest Concerns (n=13, 16.7)</b>	<b>AGST</b>	7(53.8)	5(38.5)	1(7.7)	0.264
	<b>VAS</b>	7(53.8)	4(30.8)	2(15.4)	0.235
<b>Breathing Problems (n=11, 14.1)</b>	<b>AGST</b>	7(63.6)	2(18.2)	2(18.2)	0.302
	<b>VAS</b>	6(54.5)	0(0)	5(45.5)	0.295
<b>Abdominal Concerns (n=24, 30.8)</b>	<b>AGST</b>	14(58.3)	6(25)	4(16.7)	0.172
	<b>VAS</b>	9(37.5)	0(0)	15(62.5)	0.100
<b>Bone and Joint Concerns (n=30, 38.5)</b>	<b>AGST</b>	20(66.7)	4(13.3)	6(20)	0.091
	<b>VAS</b>	4 (13.3)	0 (0)	26 (86.7)	-0.04

## 177 **DISCUSSION**

178 In this study, we endeavored to see if ambulatory patients who presented to the ED could  
 179 use our proprietary self-triage tools to similar acuity levels in comparison to the reference  
 180 standard of nurse-driven triage. Our intent with this study was to see if the triage process could  
 181 evolve in a patient-centered format. Our results demonstrate that, in their current form, both the  
 182 AGST survey and VAS tools are not appropriate for this purpose. In the case of participants who

183 individually completed either tool, agreement was non-existent, minimal, or weak at best.  
184 Though the existing literature has demonstrated a high degree of over-triage, in our study  
185 patients both over- and under-triaged themselves. [4, 6, 9] The AGST survey tool appeared to  
186 slightly outperform the VAS scale, including in the group of participants who completed both  
187 self-triage tools. Though it is important to understand the subjective experience of the patient  
188 with respect to treating their symptoms and managing their expectations in a given ED visit, it is  
189 likely that the subjectivity of the responses from the VAS score influenced the VAS tool's  
190 relative underperformance.

191 We had hoped that by this degree of patient involvement in triage, the triage component  
192 in ED-experience for patients could be optimized. Self-assessments have previously  
193 demonstrated some success with triage when they are honed down to specific complaints.  
194 [3,5,11] One particular ED based study looked at patients presenting with chest pain used a  
195 similar “yes” or “no” based approach like our AGST tool and had high levels of agreement with  
196 low risk to patient safety. [11] The success of these studies raises the question of how focused,  
197 complaint – specific tools may be utilized to optimize triage overall. Kiosk based triage, though  
198 largely focused on early registration of patients, has been studied in terms of optimizing  
199 efficiency in triage. [12- 13] In considering this, it follows that combining kiosk based triage  
200 with the development of individual, complaint-focused tools may represent an area for how  
201 triage can evolve.

202 Innovation in triage is not limited to this, however, as other technologies have potential  
203 for use. Previously, online-symptom checkers have been studied with respect to their overall  
204 diagnostic and triage accuracy, but these have similarly been faced with challenges surrounding  
205 accuracy, and rates of over or under triage. [14 – 16] Artificial intelligence may also have uses in

206 triage, with machine learning models having been demonstrated as having some success with  
207 specific presenting complaints. [17 – 19] The possibilities of how triage can evolve can take a  
208 variety of different forms, and these merit further investigation.

209         Although our study had a negative result, we are confident that it provides additional  
210 context to studying the future of ED triage. Our study design was strengthened by the fact that  
211 we tested two different self-triage tools and included a group where patients completed both  
212 tools, comparing their accuracy against each other with a controlled userbase. Further, we had  
213 involved patient and family advisors in the development process so as to capture their insights.  
214 We did, however, have some limitations. Bias was likely introduced through our recruitment as it  
215 was a convenience sample during daytime and weekday hours. Given how the majority of our  
216 patients came from the Royal University Hospital, bias was also inherently introduced as we did  
217 not capture a significant population from our inner-city hospital. As well, although we had stated  
218 that participation in our study would not result in any expedited assessments in the ED, patients  
219 may have still intentionally over-triaged themselves in order to avoid waiting for a prolonged  
220 period. Finally, though nurse-driven triage was our reference standard, this is an imperfect  
221 system with established variability. [20 – 21]

222         Ultimately, our study showed that self-triage through use of an AGST or VAS tool does  
223 not appear to be a viable option for use in the ED. Further studies, including those using focused  
224 questionnaires around specific presenting complaints, or those leveraging existing technology,  
225 are required to optimize the triage process for ED patients.

## 226 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

227 The authors would like to thank Thomas Graham, Marissa Evans, Jenna Mee and  
228 Nathaniel Osgood for their contributions to this study.

229

230

231

## 232 REFERENCES

233 Guttman A, Schull MJ, Vermeulen MJ, Stukel TA. Association between waiting times and  
234 short term mortality and hospital admission after departure from emergency department:  
235 Population based cohort study from Ontario, Canada. *BMJ*. 2011 Jun 4;342: d2983

236 Nyce A, Gandhi S, Freeze B, Bosire J, Ricca T, Kupersmith E, et al. Association of Emergency  
237 Department Waiting Times With Patient Experience in Admitted and Discharged Patients. *J*  
238 *Patient Exp*. 2021;8: 1-7.

239 Eijk ESV, Wefers Bettink-Remeijer M, Timman R, Heres MHB, Busschbach JJV. Criterion  
240 validity of a computer-assisted instrument of self-triage (ca-ISET) compared to the validity of  
241 regular triage in an ophthalmic emergency department. *Int J Med Inform*. 2014 Sep 9;85(1):61–  
242 7.

243 Dickson SJ, Dewar C, Richardson A, Hunter A, Searle S, Hodgson LE. Agreement and validity  
244 of electronic patient self-triage (eTriage) with nurse triage in two UK emergency departments: a  
245 retrospective study. *European Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2022 Feb 1;29(1):49–55.

- 246 Huchon C, Dumont A, Chantry A, Falissard B, Fauconnier A. Triage using a self-assessment  
247 questionnaire to detect potentially life-threatening emergencies in gynecology. *World Journal of*  
248 *Emergency Surgery*. 2014 Aug; 9: 46.
- 249 Kopka M, Feufel MA, Balzer F, Schmieding ML. The Triage Capability of Laypersons:  
250 Retrospective Exploratory Analysis. *JMIR Form Res*. 2022 Oct 1;6(10): e38977.
- 251 North F, Jensen TB, Stroebel RJ, Nelson EM, Johnson BJ, Thompson MC, et al. Self-Triage  
252 Use, Subsequent Healthcare Utilization, and Diagnoses: A Retrospective Study of Process and  
253 Clinical Outcomes Following Self-Triage and Self-Scheduling for Ear or Hearing Symptoms.  
254 *Health Serv Res Manag Epidemiol*. 2023 Jan 1;10: 1-11.
- 255 Hong AS, Hughes A, Courtney DM, Fullington H, Lee SJC, Sweetenham JW, et al.  
256 Characteristics of Self-Triaged Emergency Department Visits by Adults With Cancer. *American*  
257 *Journal of Managed Care*. 2023 Sep 1;29(9):e267–73.
- 258 Trivedi S, Littmann J, Stempien J, Kapur P, Bryce R, Betz M. A Comparison Between  
259 Computer-Assisted Self-Triage by Patients and Triage Performed by Nurses in the Emergency  
260 Department. *Cureus*. 2021 Mar 19; e14002
- 261 Tabachnick BG and Fidell L. *Using multivariate statistics*. 1983. New York: Harper and Row  
262 Publishers
- 263 Ng M, Liu Z, Tan JSL, Ponampalam R. Comparison of self-reported EDACS versus physician-  
264 reported EDACS for the triage of chest pain patients in the emergency department. *JACEP*  
265 *Open*. 2021 Apr 1;2: e12393
- 266 Joseph MJ, Summerscales M, Yogesan S, Bell A, Genevieve M, Kanagasingam Y. The use of  
267 kiosks to improve triage efficiency in the emergency department. Vol. 6, *npj Digital Medicine*.  
268 *Nature Research*; 2023: 6: 19.

- ~~263~~ Coyle N, Kennedy A, Schull MJ, Kiss A, Hefferon D, Sinclair P, et al. The use of a self-check-  
270 in kiosk for early patient identification and queuing in the emergency department. *Canadian*  
271 *Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2019 Nov 1;21(6):789–92.
- ~~274~~ Chan F, Lai S, Pieterman M, Richardson L, Singh A, Peters J, et al. Performance of a new  
273 symptom checker in patient triage: Canadian cohort study. *PLoS One*. 2021 Dec 1;16 (12):  
274 e0260696.
- ~~275~~ Riboli-Sasco E, El-Osta A, Alaa A, Webber I, Karki M, El Asmar ML, et al. Triage and  
276 Diagnostic Accuracy of Online Symptom Checkers: Systematic Review. Vol. 25, *Journal of*  
277 *Medical Internet Research*. JMIR Publications Inc.; 2023; 25: e43803.
- ~~278~~ Cotte F, Mueller T, Gilbert S, Blümke B, Multmeier J, Hirsch MC, et al. Safety of Triage Self-  
279 assessment Using a Symptom Assessment App for Walk-in Patients in the Emergency Care  
280 Setting: Observational Prospective Cross-sectional Study. *JMIR*. 2022 Mar 1;10(3): e32340.
- ~~281~~ Sung SF, Hung LC, Hu YH. Developing a stroke alert trigger for clinical decision support at  
282 emergency triage using machine learning. *Int J Med Inform*. 2021 Aug 1;152: 104505.
- ~~283~~ Patel SJ, Chamberlain DB, Chamberlain JM. A Machine Learning Approach to Predicting Need  
284 for Hospitalization for Pediatric Asthma Exacerbation at the Time of Emergency Department  
285 Triage. *Academic Emergency Medicine*. 2018 Dec 1;25(12):1463–70.
- ~~286~~ Ellertsson S, Hlynsson HD, Loftsson H, Sigurðsson EL. Triage patients with artificial  
287 intelligence for respiratory symptoms in primary care to improve patient outcomes: A  
288 retrospective diagnostic accuracy study. *Ann Fam Med*. 2023 May 1;21(3):240–8.
- ~~289~~ Mistry B, Stewart De Ramirez S, Kelen G, Schmitz PSK, Balhara KS, Levin S, et al. Accuracy  
290 and Reliability of Emergency Department Triage Using the Emergency Severity Index: An  
291 International Multicenter Assessment. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2018 May 1;71(5):581-7.

292 Farrohknia N, Castrén M, Ehrenberg A, Lind L, Oredsson S, Jonsson H, et al. Emergency  
293 Department Triage Scales and Their Components: A Systematic Review of the Scientific  
294 Evidence. Vol. 19, Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine.  
295 2011; 19: 42.

296