

Community first response for cardiac arrest: comparing phased dispatch policies through Monte Carlo simulation

Pieter L. van den Berg^{a,f}, Shane G. Henderson^b,
Hemeng Li^b, Bridget Dicker^{c,d}, Caroline J. Jagtenberg^e

^a*Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Burgemeester Oudlaan 50, 3062 PA, Rotterdam, the Netherlands, vandenberg@rsm.nl, corresponding author*

^b*School of Operations Research and Information Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA*

^c*Clinical Audit and Research, Hato Hone St John New Zealand, Auckland, New Zealand*

^d*Paramedicine Research Unit, Paramedicine Department, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand*

^e*School of Business and Economics, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, the Netherlands*

^f*Corresponding author*

Abstract

Background Advanced Community First Responder (CFR) systems send so-called phased alerts: notifications with built-in time delays. The policy that defines these delays affects response times, CFR workload and the number of redundant CFR arrivals.

Methods We compare policies by Monte Carlo Simulation, estimating the three metrics above. We bootstrap acceptance probabilities and response delays from 29,307 rows of historical data covering all GoodSAM alerts in New Zealand between 1-12-2017 and 30-11-2020. We simulate distances between the patient and CFRs by assuming that CFRs are located uniformly at random in a 1 km circle around the patient, for different CFR densities. Our simulated CFRs travel with a distance-dependent speed that was estimated by linear regression on observed speeds among those responders in the above-mentioned data set that eventually reached the patient.

Results The alerting policy has a large impact on the expected number of alerts sent, the redundant arrivals and the probability of patient survival. CFR app managers can use our results to identify a policy that displays a desirable trade-off between these performance measures.

Keywords: community first responders, volunteer alert, out-of-hospital cardiac arrest, Monte Carlo simulation

1. Introduction

Survival for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest (OHCA) can be significantly improved through bystander efforts.¹ To shorten the time to good-quality cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), some emergency call centers use mobile phone technology to rapidly locate and alert nearby trained volunteers. A number of such community first responder (CFR) systems are active in, for example, the United States,² the United Kingdom³ and Europe.⁴

While details may differ between CFR systems, most systems alert multiple volunteers for each patient, and volunteers take some random amount of time to notice their alert and determine whether they will go. Volunteers subsequently indicate on the smartphone app whether they accept or reject the alert, and in case of acceptance, proceed to the patient's location. Upon arrival, volunteers provide CPR until an ambulance takes over.

Since The International Liaison Committee on Resuscitation (ILCOR) identified a lack of literature on the effect of CFR systems in 2015,⁵ several papers have been published that investigate systems through surveys^{6,2} or retrospective data analysis⁷ (see Table 2 in that paper). Many reported a positive impact, e.g., statistically significant improved survival to hospital discharge⁸ or a lower degree of disability or dependence after survival.⁹ One study applied Monte Carlo simulation to compare four hypothetical CFR systems by estimating response times and patient survival.¹⁰

Challenges for an effective CFR system include the activation radius and volunteer density.² One article studies densities of activated responders within a 1km circle and concludes that 10 volunteers /km² are needed.¹¹ A positive correlation between the fraction of inhabitants registered as volunteers and patient survival has been observed.¹² It is reasonable to assume that managerial decisions for activation radii are dependent on volunteer density.

Despite the recent growth in literature on CFR systems, there is no study systematically evaluating different *alerting policies*. An alerting policy prescribes which volunteer to alert when. Simple alerting policies alert up to a fixed number of volunteers, and/or up to a fixed radius around the patient, and send all alerts at once. More complex alerting policies may use *phased* alerts, sending alerts in batches with time lags in between, to see if previous ones have been accepted. Such a policy is used by St John New Zealand, an ambulance provider that deploys the CFR system GoodSAM. St John New Zealand configured the system to dispatch CFRs in batches of 3 with time lags of 30 seconds.

For a single patient, it is best to send many alerts at once, but this leads to a higher volunteer workload as well as an increased likelihood of multiple volunteers arriving on scene, which may diminish their perceived contribution. Both aspects can lead to a long-term negative impact on volunteers' willingness to respond. The question arises how the choice of alerting policy affects patient survival as well as volunteer fatigue.

We used Monte Carlo simulation to shed light on the question above, ultimately seeking to assist CFR system managers in understanding the consequences of their chosen alerting policy. We use historical data from GoodSAM responses in New Zealand between 2017 and 2020 to estimate travel times, as well as the probability of, and delay until, volunteer acceptance.

1.1. Preliminaries

The process of both CFR and EMS response is depicted in Figure 1. There, the name 'EMS response time' reflects the duration that is common for EMS providers to measure, and for which they often face targets and reporting obligations. For clarity, we have also added a 'GoodSAM response time', which starts at the moment the CFR system is activated.




Figure 1: CFR response process.

44 EMS response times are measured from the moment of call arrival, so they are not ideal for
 45 estimating OHCA survival: the time that has passed since patient collapse is more relevant. To
 46 that end, we define another duration, T_{EMS} : the duration between patient collapse and EMS arrival.
 47 Similarly, we define T_{CFR} : the duration between patient collapse and the arrival of the first responder,
 48 regardless of whether this is a volunteer or EMS. This is summarized in Figure 1.

49 2. Material and methods

50 We applied Monte Carlo simulation to estimate the GoodSAM response time (see Figure 1) for
 51 selected dispatch policies. This involved bootstrapping delay and acceptance probabilities from histor-
 52 ical records of GoodSAM responses in New Zealand, see Section 2.1. We report the estimated expected
 53 values of four key performance indicators (KPIs) described in Section 2.4.

54 2.1. Data

55 We used data obtained from the St John Ambulance Service, which operates the GoodSAM app
 56 in New Zealand. The data covers all OHCA in the country between 1-12-2017 and 30-11-2020,
 57 along with their location and 911 call arrival time. The data also contains which CFRs were alerted
 58 through GoodSAM, at what time, and what their location was at the time of notification (*alert time*
 59 in Figure 1). Moreover, the data contains the time at which the volunteer reacted (*decision time*) by
 60 either accepting or rejecting the alert. Finally, the time volunteers arrived on scene (*CFR arrival*)
 61 is determined by the system, based on GPS signal. The data contains a total of 29,307 CFR alerts,
 62 which were either accepted (4009), accepted and dropped later (1199), rejected (7925), or not seen
 63 (16,174). From the 4009 accepting volunteers, 1776 eventually reached the patient.

64 For the view delay, we measured the duration between the alert time and the decision time. We
 65 ignored entries for which the alert time was equal to ‘nan’ (thereby excluding 1 entry). If the decision
 66 time was not listed, which is the case for not-seen alerts, we set the view delay to infinity. We treated
 67 both accepted and accepted-but-dropped-later entries as accepts, and we treated rejected and not-seen
 68 as rejects. This led to an empirical acceptance rate of $\frac{4009+1199}{29,307} \approx 17.77\%$. Figure 2 shows the empirical
 69 view delay distribution, as well as the probability of an accept, given a certain view delay. Not-seen
 70 alerts are not visible in this plot as these have an infinite view delay.

71 Acceptance rates in Australia and New Zealand were found to be similar to those reported for other
 72 CFR smartphone apps.⁶

73 The CFR’s travel duration depends on their distance from the patient. Locations and travel times
 74 were only recorded for *alerted* CFRs, so we cannot observe information on non-alerted individuals.
 75 However, in our counterfactual simulations those CFRs *may* be alerted, so we estimate their distances
 76 using Monte Carlo simulation. For each CFR that is within 1km of the patient, we simulate their
 77 location uniformly at random in this circle.

78 To translate distance into travel time, we used empirical data on volunteer’s travel speed, condi-
 79 tioning on the distance between volunteer and patient. We excluded observations with a travel time of




Figure 2: Historical view delays and acceptance probabilities as observed on GoodSAM in New Zealand.

80 0 seconds. We discretized the distances in 100-meter blocks and for each block, took the median speed of all volunteer responses in the data. We excluded the data for responses between 0 and 100 meters
81 as we considered these less reliable. We then performed linear regression on the remaining medians to
82 estimate the relationship between distance and speed.
83

84 2.2. Policies

85 We consider so-called alerting policies, which may base the decision to send an alert on the amount
86 of time that has passed, and/or the responses that are received from previously alerted volunteers.
87 Our policies only alert a more distant volunteer when all closer volunteers are already alerted. This
88 helps to narrow down the set of all policies to realistic and promising ones. We further assume that
89 no alerts are sent out after a volunteer accepts an alert, or 10 minutes have passed after GoodSAM
90 activation, whichever comes first.

91 We evaluate the following policies:

- 92 1. *Send all at time 0*: alert all available volunteers within the dispatch radius immediately upon
93 GoodSAM activation, which we call time 0.
- 94 2. *Send n at time 0*: Alert n volunteers immediately at time 0, and send no alerts after.
- 95 3. *Keep- n -active*: Alert n volunteers at time 0 and replace every incoming reject with an additional
96 alert.
- 97 4. *NZ current policy*: Alert 3 volunteers at time 0 and 3 additional volunteers every 30 seconds
98 until one volunteer accepts the alert, or 10 minutes have passed.

99 For *send n at time 0*, we consider the values of n between 1 and 15. For *keep- n -active* we consider
100 values of n between 1 and 10. This gives a total of 27 policies.

101 2.3. Simulation

102 To estimate performance for the different policies, we applied Monte Carlo simulation, considering
103 two sources of uncertainty: 1) the distance between the volunteers and the patient, and 2) the view
104 delay and reply of alerted volunteers. The simulation evaluates 1,000 different OHCA. For each
105 OHCA, their CFR view delays and corresponding replies were bootstrapped 10,000 times from the
106 empirical data. Each view delay and reply were jointly sampled to maintain the statistical dependence
107 between the time a volunteer takes to respond and the likelihood that the reply is ‘accept’ (see Figure
108 2). This calculation estimates all KPIs with very narrow confidence intervals.

109 2.4. Performance metrics

110 We consider two KPIs related to the quality of care and two KPIs related to the inconvenience
111 caused to volunteers.

112 **Coverage**: fraction of incidents that receive a CFR response within a given time threshold. We
113 define this on the ‘GoodSAM response time’ (see Figure 1) and use a threshold of 5 minutes.

114 **Lives saved:** the number of OHCA patients that are expected to survive until hospital discharge,
 115 in New Zealand, annually. This number is estimated using the relationship between time to CPR, time
 116 to EMS (T_{CPR} and T_{EMS} in Figure 1) and the probability of survival as modeled by Waalewijn et
 117 al.¹³ We assumed a T_{EMS} of 13 minutes as this is St John New Zealand’s target for urgent requests.¹⁴
 118 To estimate T_{CPR} , we further need to estimate the ‘Witness delay’, which we assumed to be 1 minute,
 119 and the ‘Triage delay’, for which we used 124 sec (the median of the data).

120 The resulting survival percentage was converted to lives saved, by multiplying it by 5,141, which
 121 is the nationally observed number of OHCA’s per year.¹⁵

122 **Number of alerts:** the average number of alerts sent per incident.

123 **Redundant arrivals:** the average number of volunteers arriving on scene after the first responder,
 124 per incident.

125

126 The relative performance of the different policies depends on the number of volunteers. This
 127 number depends on the density of volunteers in an area. We evaluated the different policies under a
 128 low (10 volunteers within 1km), medium (30 volunteers within 1km) and high (100 volunteers within
 129 1km) density of volunteers. These densities roughly correspond to what would be found in Auckland,
 130 New Zealand if 0.2% of the inhabitants signed up (low), what is recommended in¹¹ (medium) and our
 131 estimate for central Amsterdam (high).

132 3. Results


133 3.1. Parameter estimation

134 Figure 3a shows the observed median travel speeds for different distances, which increase with
 135 distance. Linear regression of travel speeds in km/h, y , on distances in meters, x , based only on the
 136 distances above 100 meters has an R^2 of 0.96 and yields the relationship

$$y = 1.83 + 0.0108x. \quad (1)$$

137 The resulting relationship between the distance in meters and travel time in minutes, plotted in
 138 Figure 3b, is

$$travelTime(x) = \frac{60x}{1830 + 10.8x}. \quad (2)$$



(a) Median travel speed depending on distance to patient.

(b) Estimated travel time depending on distance to patient.

Figure 3: Distance-dependent travel times estimated based on historical data.

139 3.2. Performance of policies

140 Tables 1-3 show the results for the different policies for a low, medium and high number of vol-
141 unteers. For reference, alerting 0 volunteers would lead to 98 survivors, 0 redundant arrivals, 0 alerts
142 and 0 coverage.

143 By only alerting the closest volunteer, the number of survivors can be increased to 120, 124, or
144 129, for 10, 30 or 100 volunteers within 1km, respectively. For coverage, the contribution of the closest
145 volunteer is 11.9%, 13.4%, or 14.5%, respectively.

146 Comparing policies *Send n alerts at time 0*, with *Keep n alerts active* indicates that a similar level
147 of survival can be obtained with 1 alert less at time 0, by replacing rejects with additional alerts. This
148 would reduce the impact of the alerts on the volunteers (both in terms of redundant arrivals as well
149 as the number of alerts) without sacrificing survival.

150 The current policy used by GoodSAM in New Zealand on average leads to sending out 11.4 alerts
151 per incident, if sufficiently many volunteers are within 1km from the patient. The corresponding
152 number of expected survivors per year is 181, 205, or 229 for a low, medium and high number of
153 volunteers. Coverage as a result of this policy is estimated at 28.1%, 43.6%, or 61.5%, respectively.

154 The policy that sends an alert to all volunteers at time 0 by definition yields the highest estimated
155 survival (191, 231 and 259 survivors per year) and coverage (42.3%, 80.7% and 99.6%), but also gives
156 the highest estimated number of redundant arrivals (0.919, 4.333 and 16.77) and alerts.

157 4. Discussion

158 The trade-offs between the KPIs in Tables 1-3 help a CFR system manager to identify a desirable
159 dispatch policy. This choice will likely depend on the volunteer density in the region. Our reported
160 number of volunteers within 1 km of the patient has a direct relationship with the volunteer density.
161 The three cases we considered correspond to a density of 3.18 vol/km², 9.55 vol/km², and 31.83
162 vol/km², respectively. For reference, the literature recommends a volunteer density of at least 10
163 vol/km².¹¹

164 The insight that a different density might lead to a different preferred policy might be somewhat new
165 in the academic literature; however, it was already known to GoodSAM. For this reason, their system
166 offers the ability to configure different rules for urban and rural areas, which is done by uploading
167 KML files that represent parts of the map. This feature implies that potential insights from this paper
168 can readily be implemented in practice.

169 Alerting the same number of volunteers leads to higher expected survival and better coverage as
170 volunteer density increases. This effect is visible throughout Tables 1-3, and also holds in generality,
171 assuming all other system parameters remain equal. The reason is that the n -th closest volunteer is
172 expected to be nearer to the patient when volunteer density is higher.

173 Comparing policies *Send 6 alerts at time 0* and *Send 10 alerts at time 0* shows different survival
174 numbers for different volunteer densities. In Table 1 the difference is 13 lives, while in Table 3 it is 24
175 lives. The reason is that in Table 1, the 6th-10th volunteers are farther from the patient than they are
176 in Table 3.

177 Perhaps more surprising is that the policy *Send 6 alerts at time 0* gives approximately the same
178 survival probability as *Keep 5 alerts active*, and that this is the case in each of the three tables. We
179 have no intuition for this, but conjecture that this result would be found for any volunteer density
180 within the entire range of 3.18 – 31.83 vol/km².

181 The current strategy in New Zealand of alerting volunteers in batches of three with 30-second
182 intervals leads to few redundant arrivals, but at a low volunteer density, this comes at a high cost in
183 terms of coverage. This insight might be a reason to fine-tune the number of alerts per batch and the
184 interval between batches to better align with the view delay and acceptance probability, especially in
185 sparsely populated parts of the country.

186 A limitation of this study is that the time on-scene is based on the geolocation of the phone which
187 may have some error in it due to gaps in cell tower coverage and the resulting inability to ping the
188 phone when it is in the vicinity of the patient. It is unknown how often this situation occurs. The
189 stop-gap to this is that responders can also manually generate a time on scene by pressing a button
190 on the app, but responders do not always do this.

191 Another limitation is that we focused on volunteers who directly go to the patient to provide
192 CPR. However, in practice, certain CFR systems differentiate alerts, directing some volunteers to

193 immediately attend to the patient and others to retrieve an Automated External Defibrillator (AED).
194 Such a system raises new questions; answering those questions would require an extension of our
195 methods.

196 We limited attention to policies that alert far-away volunteers only if all nearer ones have already
197 been alerted. While this choice may seem restrictive, these policies are optimal when we do not have
198 volunteer-specific knowledge. While some CFR systems collect volunteer-specific parameters such as
199 acceptance rates, to the best of our knowledge, no system currently uses this information in their
200 real-time dispatch decisions.

201 We explored results for three different volunteer densities, but a CFR system will have varying
202 volunteer densities throughout the day and the region. It might then be worthwhile to differentiate
203 the dispatch policy within one system through times of the day and parts of the region. Accurately
204 evaluating such a CFR system would require running simulations with the correct mix of densities and
205 policies, thereby introducing complexity and likely diminishing insight. Therefore we decided not to
206 pursue that approach here.

207 Although it is plausible that a high number of alerts and/or redundant arrivals reduce future CFR
208 engagement, there is, to the best of our knowledge, no study that quantifies the magnitude of this effect.
209 We welcome such studies, as they might aid in designing even better dispatch policies. The current
210 knowledge gap led us to refrain from recommending a specific dispatch policy, instead presenting a list
211 of options from which a CFR system manager can choose.

212 Future research might address more sophisticated policies. For example, we conjecture that it would
213 be a good idea to consider a CFR as inactive when they have not responded for some prescribed time.
214 Moreover, it could be useful to let the chosen policy depend on the real-time locations of volunteers
215 and the time of day. If, for example, the third volunteer is far from the patient, it might be better to
216 alert only two, and more alerts might be sent at times when volunteers are less likely to respond.

217 **5. Conclusions**

218 A CFR system's dispatch policy affects the trade-off between the number of alerts, redundant
219 arrivals, and patient survival. In comparison to sending all alerts immediately, it is beneficial to send a
220 reduced number of alerts immediately plus additional alerts upon receiving rejections. This reduces the
221 number of redundant arrivals as well as the number of alerts, without losing much in terms of patient
222 survival. The benefit of such a policy increases with an increasing number of volunteers around the
223 patient.

224 This paper quantified KPI trade-offs for several reasonable dispatch policies and varying volunteer
225 densities, and hence can guide CFR system managers in choosing a policy that suits their region. The
226 choice likely depends on the volunteer density in the region and might even be differentiated within
227 one system if volunteer densities vary over the day and between different parts of the region.

228 We hope that this article will stimulate discussion on phased dispatching of CFRs and pave the
229 way for incorporating methods from the field of operations research in designing improved dispatch
230 policies.

231 **Conflicts of Interest**

232 None.

233 **Acknowledgements**

234 We thank GoodSAM and St John Ambulance Service New Zealand for access to data.

235 Funding: This work was supported by the Dutch Institute for Advanced Logistics (TKI Dinalog)
236 [grant number 2023-1-307TKI], the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) [grant
237 number VI.Veni.191E.005] and the (USA) National Science Foundation [grant number CMMI-2035086].

238 References

- 239 ¹ Kristian Kragholm, Mads Wissenberg, Rikke N Mortensen, Steen M Hansen, Carolina Malta Hansen,
240 Kristinn Thorsteinsson, Shahzleen Rajan, Freddy Lippert, Fredrik Folke, Gunnar Gislason, et al.
241 Bystander efforts and 1-year outcomes in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *New Engl. J. Med.*,
242 376(18):1737–1747, 2017.
- 243 ² Steven C Brooks, Graydon Simmons, Heather Worthington, Bentley J Bobrow, and Laurie J Morri-
244 son. The PulsePoint Respond mobile device application to crowdsource basic life support for patients
245 with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: challenges for optimal implementation. *Resuscitation*, 98:20–26,
246 2016.
- 247 ³ Christopher M Smith, Mark H Wilson, Ali Ghorbangholi, Christopher Hartley-Sharpe, Carl Gwin-
248 nutt, Bridget Dicker, and Gavin D Perkins. The use of trained volunteers in the response to out-of-
249 hospital cardiac arrest—the GoodSAM experience. *Resuscitation*, 121:123–126, 2017.
- 250 ⁴ Iris Oving, Siobhan Masterson, Ingvild BM Tjelmeland, Martin Jonsson, Federico Semeraro, Mattias
251 Ringh, Anatolij Truhlar, Diana Cimpoesu, Fredrik Folke, Stefanie G Beesems, et al. First-response
252 treatment after out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: a survey of current practices across 29 countries in
253 Europe. *Scand. J. Trauma, Resusc. Emerg. Med.*, 27(1):112, 2019.
- 254 ⁵ Gavin D Perkins, Andrew H Travers, Robert A Berg, Maaret Castren, Julie Considine, Raffo Es-
255 calante, Raul J Gazmuri, Rudolph W Koster, Swee Han Lim, Kevin J Nation, et al. Part 3: adult
256 basic life support and automated external defibrillation: 2015 international consensus on cardiopul-
257 monary resuscitation and emergency cardiovascular care science with treatment recommendations.
258 *Resuscitation*, 95:e43–e69, 2015.
- 259 ⁶ Brian Haskins, Ziad Nehme, Bridget Dicker, Mark H Wilson, Michael Ray, Stephen Bernard, Peter
260 Cameron, and Karen Smith. A binational survey of smartphone activated volunteer responders for
261 out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: availability, interventions, and post-traumatic stress. *Resuscitation*,
262 169:67–75, 2021.
- 263 ⁷ Ailish Valeriano, Shyan Van Heer, François de Champlain, and Steven C. Brooks. Crowdsourcing
264 to save lives: A scoping review of bystander alert technologies for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest.
265 *Resuscitation*, 158:94–121, 2021.
- 266 ⁸ Christopher M Smith, Ranjit Lall, Rachael T Fothergill, Robert Spaight, and Gavin D Perkins.
267 The effect of the GoodSAM volunteer first-responder app on survival to hospital discharge following
268 out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Eur. Heart J. Acute Cardiovasc. Care*, 11(1):20–31, 2022.
- 269 ⁹ Ruud WM Pijls, Patty J Nelemans, Braim M Rahel, and Anton PM Gorgels. A text message
270 alert system for trained volunteers improves out-of-hospital cardiac arrest survival. *Resuscitation*,
271 105:182–187, 2016.
- 272 ¹⁰ Greg Lancaster and Jeffrey W Herrmann. Computer simulation of the effectiveness of novel cardiac
273 arrest response systems. *Resusc. Plus*, 7:100153, 2021.
- 274 ¹¹ Remy Stieglis, Jolande A Zijlstra, Frank Riedijk, Martin Smeekes, Wim E van der Worp, and
275 Rudolph W Koster. AED and text message responders density in residential areas for rapid response
276 in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation*, 150:170–177, 2020.
- 277 ¹² Ruud WM Pijls, Patty J Nelemans, Braim M Rahel, and Anton PM Gorgels. Characteristics of
278 a novel citizen rescue system for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest in the Dutch province of Limburg:
279 relation to incidence and survival. *Neth. Heart J.*, 27(2):100–107, 2019.
- 280 ¹³ Reinier A Waalewijn, Rien de Vos, Jan GP Tijssen, and Rudolph W Koster. Survival models
281 for out-of-hospital cardiopulmonary resuscitation from the perspectives of the bystander, the first
282 responder, and the paramedic. *Resuscitation*, 51(2):113–122, 2001.
- 283 ¹⁴ Ministry of Health. Emergency ambulance service national performance report. https://www.tewhatuora.govt.nz/assets/Our-health-system/Who-were-working-with/NASO/Naso-monthly-reports/NASO-monthly-report-2021_2022-without-page3-April-2022.pdf,
284 2022.
285
286

287 ¹⁵ Janet Bray, Stuart Howell, Stephen Ball, Tan Doan, Emma Bosley, Karen Smith, Bridget Dicker,
288 Steven Faddy, Melanie Thorrowgood, Andy Swain, et al. The epidemiology of out-of-hospital cardiac
289 arrest in Australia and New Zealand: A binational report from the Australasian Resuscitation
290 Outcomes Consortium (Aus-ROC). *Resuscitation*, 172:74–83, 2022.

Policy	Coverage	Survivors per year	Nr of alerts	Redundant arrivals
Send all at time 0.	0.428	191	10.0	0.918
Keep 1 alerts active.	0.125	123	1.3	0.000
Keep 2 alerts active.	0.210	140	2.6	0.041
Keep 3 alerts active.	0.273	153	3.8	0.114
Keep 4 alerts active.	0.320	163	4.9	0.211
Keep 5 alerts active.	0.355	172	6.0	0.326
Keep 6 alerts active.	0.381	178	7.0	0.453
Keep 7 alerts active.	0.399	184	8.0	0.587
Keep 8 alerts active.	0.413	188	8.8	0.718
Keep 9 alerts active.	0.422	190	9.5	0.834
Keep 10 alerts active.	0.428	191	10.0	0.918
Send 1 alerts at time 0.	0.119	120	1.0	0.000
Send 2 alerts at time 0.	0.205	135	2.0	0.032
Send 3 alerts at time 0.	0.270	148	3.0	0.089
Send 4 alerts at time 0.	0.318	158	4.0	0.168
Send 5 alerts at time 0.	0.354	166	5.0	0.264
Send 6 alerts at time 0.	0.380	173	6.0	0.375
Send 7 alerts at time 0.	0.399	179	7.0	0.498
Send 8 alerts at time 0.	0.413	184	8.0	0.630
Send 9 alerts at time 0.	0.422	188	9.0	0.771
Send 10 alerts at time 0.	0.428	191	10.0	0.918
NZ current strategy.	0.283	181	8.1	0.574

Table 1: Results for $n = 10$ volunteers within 1 km, based on 1000 simulated volunteer locations, with 10000 view delay and acceptance simulations each. The maximum confidence interval halfwidth as a fraction of the mean among all these numbers was 0.013 (ignoring those cases where the mean was zero). Policies that send more than 10 alerts at time 0 are omitted, as there are only 10 eligible volunteers in this situation.

Policy	Coverage	Survivors per year	Nr of alerts	Redundant arrivals
Send all at time 0.	0.806	231	30.0	4.333
Keep 1 alerts active.	0.149	128	1.3	0.000
Keep 2 alerts active.	0.258	148	2.6	0.041
Keep 3 alerts active.	0.343	164	3.8	0.114
Keep 4 alerts active.	0.411	176	4.9	0.211
Keep 5 alerts active.	0.468	185	6.0	0.326
Keep 6 alerts active.	0.516	193	7.1	0.455
Keep 7 alerts active.	0.556	199	8.1	0.595
Keep 8 alerts active.	0.591	205	9.2	0.743
Keep 9 alerts active.	0.620	209	10.2	0.897
Keep 10 alerts active.	0.646	213	11.2	1.056
Send 1 alerts at time 0.	0.134	124	1.0	0.000
Send 2 alerts at time 0.	0.240	142	2.0	0.032
Send 3 alerts at time 0.	0.326	157	3.0	0.089
Send 4 alerts at time 0.	0.398	169	4.0	0.168
Send 5 alerts at time 0.	0.457	178	5.0	0.264
Send 6 alerts at time 0.	0.507	186	6.0	0.375
Send 7 alerts at time 0.	0.550	193	7.0	0.498
Send 8 alerts at time 0.	0.586	199	8.0	0.631
Send 9 alerts at time 0.	0.617	203	9.0	0.771
Send 10 alerts at time 0.	0.643	207	10.0	0.918
Send 11 alerts at time 0.	0.666	211	11.0	1.071
Send 12 alerts at time 0.	0.686	214	12.0	1.228
Send 13 alerts at time 0.	0.703	216	13.0	1.389
Send 14 alerts at time 0.	0.718	218	14.0	1.552
Send 15 alerts at time 0.	0.731	220	15.0	1.719
NZ current strategy.	0.434	205	11.3	1.002

Table 2: Results for $n = 30$ volunteers within 1 km, based on 1000 simulated volunteer locations, with 10000 view delay and acceptance simulations each. The maximum confidence interval halfwidth as a fraction of the mean among all these numbers was 0.009 (ignoring those cases where the mean was zero.)

Policy	Coverage	Survivors per year	Nr of alerts	Redundant arrivals
Send all at time 0.	0.996	259	100.0	16.768
Keep 1 alerts active.	0.168	134	1.3	0.000
Keep 2 alerts active.	0.297	159	2.6	0.042
Keep 3 alerts active.	0.400	178	3.8	0.114
Keep 4 alerts active.	0.484	193	4.9	0.211
Keep 5 alerts active.	0.552	205	6.0	0.326
Keep 6 alerts active.	0.609	214	7.1	0.456
Keep 7 alerts active.	0.657	222	8.1	0.595
Keep 8 alerts active.	0.698	228	9.2	0.743
Keep 9 alerts active.	0.733	233	10.2	0.897
Keep 10 alerts active.	0.763	237	11.2	1.056
Send 1 alerts at time 0.	0.145	129	1.0	0.000
Send 2 alerts at time 0.	0.263	152	2.0	0.032
Send 3 alerts at time 0.	0.362	170	3.0	0.089
Send 4 alerts at time 0.	0.445	184	4.0	0.168
Send 5 alerts at time 0.	0.515	196	5.0	0.265
Send 6 alerts at time 0.	0.575	205	6.0	0.375
Send 7 alerts at time 0.	0.626	214	7.0	0.498
Send 8 alerts at time 0.	0.670	220	8.0	0.631
Send 9 alerts at time 0.	0.708	226	9.0	0.771
Send 10 alerts at time 0.	0.740	231	10.0	0.918
Send 11 alerts at time 0.	0.769	235	11.0	1.071
Send 12 alerts at time 0.	0.794	238	12.0	1.228
Send 13 alerts at time 0.	0.815	241	13.0	1.388
Send 14 alerts at time 0.	0.834	244	14.0	1.552
Send 15 alerts at time 0.	0.851	246	15.0	1.718
NZ current strategy.	0.615	229	11.4	1.021

Table 3: Results for $n = 100$ volunteers within 1 km, based on 1000 simulated volunteer locations, with 10000 view delay and acceptance simulations each. The maximum confidence interval halfwidth as a fraction of the mean among all these numbers was 0.005 (ignoring those cases where the mean was zero.)