

## Medical Journal of Australia Manuscript submission template

<b>Type of article</b> See <a href="#">Types of articles published by the MJA</a>	<b>Ethics and law</b>
<b>Title</b>	Transparent triage policies during the COVID-19 pandemic: a critical part of medico-legal risk management for clinicians

<b>Abstract</b>	
<b>Articles requiring a descriptive 15-word introductory line are: Perspectives, Ethics and law, Reflection and History articles, and Editorials.</b>	
<i>Making triage policies transparent is not only important for ethical reasons; there are good legal reasons to do so too.</i>	
Abstract (max 100 words):	
For these article types, please also supply a 100-word (maximum) abstract. Note this is not for publication but may be used in correspondence with reviewers for the a selection of articles see MJA Instructions for authors to identify these types of articles	
<b>Abstract word count</b>	<b>76</b>

This article addresses the legal status of policy documents relied on by clinicians making resource allocation decisions in the context of public health emergencies such as the COVID-19 pandemic. A lack of clear state-supported guidelines elevates risks for clinicians for the consequences of decisions that they have a professional duty to make in the interests of their community. The article argues that transparent triage policies are critical from a legal, as well as an ethical perspective.

<b>Text</b>	
<b>Research reports</b> should be written in IMRAD format (Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion).	
<b>Lessons from practice</b> should be written using headings “Clinical record” and “Discussion”.	
<b>Text word count</b>	<b>1510</b>

## Introduction

Clinicians, ethicists, and lawyers have long debated the parameters of triage in response to the inevitable disasters that sporadically overwhelm the healthcare system. Almost universally, they have advocated for open, transparent, and consultative triage protocols, guidelines, and legislation to combat biases and to support clinicians making unavoidable decisions in the interests of the community as a whole.

The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has highlighted the importance of transparent triage. While there is considerable debate about ethical aspects of triage, including concerns that the traditional focus on utilitarianism is discriminatory, largely missing from this discussion in Australia is that triage protocols are also important from a *legal* perspective – as a mechanism to promote lawful decision-making processes and as a justification or defence to support clinicians’ decisions if a matter is litigated.

The purpose of this article is twofold. First, after providing an overview of current COVID-19 triage policies in Australia, it assesses their legal status. Second, the article argues that beyond ethics, transparent policies are needed so their compliance with law can be tested, and to enable practitioners to better understand their obligations before making these sometimes “impossible” decisions.

## Australian COVID-19 triage policies

Australian clinicians have seen numerous ethical and professional guidance documents addressing COVID-19 triage.[1][2][3] These documents anticipate that if Australia’s healthcare system is overwhelmed as in other countries, clinicians will need guidelines to allocate limited resources, including ventilators, beds, and highly trained personnel.

The umbrella term “triage policy” can denote: 1) broad **ethical** or **operational guidelines** with suggested decision-making principles;[1][2][3] and, 2) more specific **triage protocols**,[4] with set inclusion/exclusion criteria, and a process to prioritise individual patients when the system is overwhelmed. Many Australian COVID-19 triage policies are ethical guidelines, but some Australian hospitals have also developed triage protocols.[5] Internationally, the availability and content of such protocols varies widely. In a study from the United States, over half of responding institutions lacked a COVID-19 triage protocol.[6] Mitchell, Tumilty and Fuscaldò recently exposed insufficient transparency and significant variation in Victorian protocols.[5]

In Australia, primary responsibility for the administration of hospital services lies with the states, which have the power to promote a statewide approach to triage. While every Australian state and territory has disaster management plans,[7] publicly available COVID-19 triage protocols are lacking. From March 2020 to 27 November 2020, the lead author regularly searched health department websites for COVID-19 triage policies, examining both the websites' content dedicated to COVID-19 and searching keywords alone and in various combinations (COVID; intensive care; critical care; ICU; triage; framework; guidelines; policy; ethical). These searches revealed few relevant documents (Table 1). New South Wales is the only state to mention a triage guideline, but its COVID-19 framework does not link to it.[8] Queensland Health released an extensive ethical framework for COVID-19 in April 2020,[5] which has since been removed.[9] Western Australia has a 4-page ethical framework, but no publicly-accessible protocol.[10]

The Commonwealth Government's COVID-19 strategy indicates the Commonwealth will work with state and territory governments to 'agree on novel coronavirus triage criteria (if required),'[11] but there are no such criteria to date. Given constitutional arrangements, there is no expectation that the Commonwealth government would provide these. The National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) has conducted consultation on *An Ethics Framework for Pandemics* but this is limited to ethical guidance.

### **Legal status of COVID-19 triage policies**

The prospect of deciding between patients who would benefit from life-sustaining treatment is distressing. Compounding this is the potential for legal liability. Many of the legal issues that arise in pandemic triage are untested and various areas of law may be engaged and applied in complex, fact-specific ways. As other work has detailed, health authorities have wide discretion in making resource allocation decisions, which are generally respected by the courts.[12] However, in some circumstances clinicians (and institutions) may be found liable, and decisions may also be challenged on public law grounds (Box 1).[13][14] These concerns are not merely academic; after Hurricane Katrina one doctor faced possible murder charges and civil lawsuits after several patients died during a hospital evacuation.[15]

Overseas, some governments have enacted immunity or indemnity laws to protect clinicians making COVID-19 triage decisions.[13][14] No such laws exist in Australia, and they do not appear to have been considered. Absent such laws, triage protocols may provide the next strongest legal defence. Under civil liability legislation, a clinician will generally not be negligent if acting in a manner widely accepted in Australia by peer professional opinion as competent medical practice ("professional practice defence").[12]

Concrete advice on the legal significance of triage policies is difficult because the relationship between law and professional guidance is complex and each case is evaluated according to its unique facts. Whether the professional practice defence applies generally depends on the guideline's nature, author and purported authority.[16][17] A policy may create additional obligations beyond those imposed by law (e.g. a specific hospital COVID-19 triage protocol that must be followed by its clinicians), which may inform the legal standard of care.[17] However, policy is not necessarily determinative of the standard of care, especially when couched as broad guidance (e.g. COVID-19 ethical guidelines from a professional college).[17] Rigid adherence to policy can also be problematic; to meet the standard of care (and broader public decision-making standards), clinicians must use judgment appropriate to the circumstances.[16]

Moreover, while policy can establish obligations in addition to the law, law may also impose more onerous obligations than a policy.[17] When this occurs the legal standard will prevail. In other words, COVID-19 triage policies can shape a regulatory response but only within the boundaries of the law. COVID-19 triage policies may infringe laws in various nuanced ways.[13] Liddell et al note that the utilitarian ‘save the most lives possible’ principle underlying most triage policies can infringe patients’ legal rights, many of which are unchanged in a disaster.[13] In the United Kingdom a legal challenge to the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) COVID-19 critical care protocol was initiated on the basis that its heavy reliance on the Clinical Frailty Scale (CFS) constituted unlawful discrimination.[18] In response, NICE revised the protocol to reduce reliance on the CFS for some patients.

These issues have significant implications for clinicians:

1. Absent a COVID-19 triage policy, not providing beneficial life-sustaining treatment beneficial is potentially risky because it may be harder to establish the professional practice defence in a negligence action. An institution’s failure to promulgate a policy could also result in claims. Additionally, a triage protocol (with its greater degree of specificity) would generally provide more legal protection than ethical guidelines.
2. While it is lawful for governments and professional bodies to issue COVID-19 triage policies, these policies should rely on appropriate evidence and must comply with specific jurisdictional laws, such as guardianship and human rights legislation (Box 1).
3. Triage policies promote quality and consistency in decision-making and guide clinicians to consider appropriate factors. However, clinicians must still exercise judgment which is reasonable and responsive to individual circumstances.
4. Policies should provide guidance for when an individual is denied life-sustaining treatment, since the duty to exercise reasonable care remains. Where reasonably possible this may include communicating to the patient (or family) the reasons for the decision, providing appropriate palliative care, and information about complaints or dispute resolution processes.

### **Transparency – not just about ethics**

From an ethical perspective, legitimate triage decisions require what Daniels and Sabin’s prioritisation framework calls “accountability for reasonableness” – a fair process based on relevant criteria, a publicly-accessible rationale, and (to the extent possible given the urgency of decisions) mechanisms for appeal, review and enforcement.[19]

Transparency is also important from a legal perspective because it subjects triage policies to public scrutiny before public health emergencies reach crisis levels. While internal legal advice on triage policies may have been sought, the NICE example illustrates that public scrutiny, consultation, and litigation play an important role in testing legal boundaries. In addition to protecting individual patients, this promotes rigorous policy development and evaluation, and also benefits clinicians who are then not relying on policy later found to be deficient.[16] It may also alleviate stress caused by uncertainty about protocols. Disclosure of

triage policies also provides a measure of natural justice by providing notice to patients and their families of decision-making criteria and processes.

## **Conclusion**

So far, Australia has avoided the scale of pandemic that has overwhelmed health systems elsewhere. While in this context governments' reluctance to develop and/or release triage protocols until a crisis has arrived is politically understandable, such a course of action carries significant risks.

Public confidence is enhanced when governments have the political courage to embark on these difficult public debates in advance of need. Prioritising some individuals over others when the demand for resources exceeds supply is confronting for clinicians and the community alike and challenges us to reflect on our deeply-held values as a society. When clinicians are allocating scarce resources, they need standards to support their decisions which have been subject to public consultation and rigorous legal review.

Australia's successful management of the COVID-19 pandemic is offering us the luxury of time to consult and reflect.

## References

**References** should be in and should **not** appear as endnotes.

References to material on the Internet should include the organisation, the page title, the article title and the author (if there is one) as well as the URL and the month the page was visited ([see examples here](#)).

1. Dawson A, Isaacs D, Jansen M, et al. An ethics framework for making resource allocation decisions within clinical care: responding to COVID-19. *J Bioeth Inq* 2020; 17: 749-755.
2. Warrillow S, Austin D, Cheung W, et al. ANZICS Guiding principles for complex decision making during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Crit Care Resusc* 2020; 22: 98-102.
3. Australasian College for Emergency Medicine. COVID-19 clinical guidelines, triage and reception of patients. ACEM, 2020. <https://acem.org.au/Content-Sources/Advancing-Emergency-Medicine/COVID-19/Resources/Clinical-Guidelines/Triage-and-Reception-of-Patients> (accessed 27 Nov 2020).
4. Iserson KV, Moskop JC. Triage in medicine, part I: concept, history, and types. *Ann Emerg Med* 2007; 49: 275-281.
5. Mitchell L, Tumilty E, Fuscaldo G. COVID-19: resource allocation transparency and variation. *MJA Insight*, Sept 2020. <https://insightplus.mja.com.au/2020/38/covid-19-resource-allocation-transparency-and-variation/> (accessed 27 Nov 2020).
6. Antommaria AHM, Gibb TS, McGuire AL, et al. Ventilator triage policies during the COVID-19 pandemic at U.S. hospitals associated with members of the association of bioethics program directors. *Ann Intern Med* 2020; 173: 188-194.
7. Parliament of Australia. Australian COVID-19 response management arrangements: a quick guide. Canberra: Parliamentary Library, 2020. [https://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/download/library/prspub/7312939/upload\\_binary/7312939.pdf](https://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/download/library/prspub/7312939/upload_binary/7312939.pdf) (accessed 27 Nov 2020).
8. NSW Agency for Clinical Innovation. NSW adult intensive care services pandemic response planning. New South Wales Health, Department of Health, Sept 2020. <https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/Infectious/covid-19/communities-of-practice/Documents/covid-19-adult-intensive-care-pandemic-response-planning.pdf> (accessed 27 Nov 2020).
9. Queensland Government, Department of Health. Resources and information for clinicians. COVID-19 information for Queensland clinicians, Nov 2020. <https://www.health.qld.gov.au/clinical-practice/guidelines-procedures/novel-coronavirus-qld-clinicians/resources-for-clinicians> (accessed 27 Nov 2020).
10. Government of Western Australia, Department of Health. Framework to guide decision making on the appropriateness of intensive care management during the COVID-19 pandemic. 2020. <https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/-/media/Corp/Documents/Health-for/Infectious-disease/COVID19/COVID19-Framework-to-guide-intensive-care-management-during-the-pandemic.pdf> (accessed 27 Nov 2020).

11. Australian Government Department of Health. Australian health sector emergency response plan for novel coronavirus (COVID-19). Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, Apr 2020. [https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2020/02/australian-health-sector-emergency-response-plan-for-novel-coronavirus-covid-19\\_2.pdf](https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2020/02/australian-health-sector-emergency-response-plan-for-novel-coronavirus-covid-19_2.pdf) (accessed 27 Nov 2020).
12. Gunn MA, McDonald FJ. COVID-19, rationing and the right to health: Can patients bring legal actions if they are denied access to care? *Med J Aust* 2020; <https://www.mja.com.au/journal/2020/covid-19-rationing-and-right-health-can-patients-bring-legal-actions-if-they-are> [Preprint, 28 July 2020] .
13. Liddell K, Skopek JM, Palmer S, et al. Who gets the ventilator? Important legal rights in a pandemic. *J Med Ethics* 2020; 46: 421-426.
14. Cohen IG, Crespo AM, White DB. Potential legal liability for withdrawing or withholding ventilators during COVID-19: Assessing the risks and identifying needed reform. *JAMA* 2020; 323: 1901-1902.
15. Okie S. Dr. Pou and the hurricane — Implications for patient care during disasters. *N Eng J Med* 2008; 358: 1-5.
16. *Queensland v Masson* [2020] HCA 28. <http://eresources.hcourt.gov.au/showCase/2020/HCA/28> (accessed 11 Mar 2021).
17. Jackson E. The relationship between medical law and good medical ethics. *J Med Ethics*. 2015; 41: 95-98.
18. Hodge, Jones and Allen Solicitors. NICE amends COVID-19 critical care guideline after judicial review challenge. Mar 2020. <https://www.hja.net/press-releases/nice-amends-covid-19-critical-care-guideline-after-judicial-review-challenge/> (accessed 27 Nov 2020).
19. Daniels N, Sabin J. Setting limits fairly: can we learn to share medical resources? New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

## Tables and Boxes

Tables and boxes should be provided as editable tables constructed using the tables function in your word processor, not as images or as PDFs. Table cells should not contain multiple items of data separated by hard returns.

Provide meaningful titles for each **table/box**.

Information in **tables** should be simplified as much as possible, keeping the number of columns to a minimum and the headings short.

Information in **tables/boxes** should not be duplicated in the text.

Tables should be designed to fit comfortably onto a Journal page.

Table 1. Australian triage protocols and ethical guidelines for resource allocation during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic

Jurisdiction	Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) triage protocol or ethical guidelines	Type of guidance	Publicly available?
Commonwealth	Australian Health Ethics Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) <i>An Ethics Framework for Pandemics</i> (anticipated release in early 2021).	Ethical guidelines	Anticipated
Australian Capital Territory (ACT)	None located on ACT Health website: <a href="https://health.act.gov.au/">https://health.act.gov.au/</a> .	-	-
New South Wales (NSW)	<p>The New South Wales Health website provides a COVID-19 framework entitled ‘NSW adult intensive care services pandemic response planning.’[8]</p> <p>The framework indicates when the ‘demand for critical care services significantly exceeds organisation-wide capacity’ it will ‘[a]ctivate NSW Pandemic Resource-based decision making’ with a reference (but no link to) a document entitled the ‘NSW Health COVID-19 intensive care guidance drawn from principles in the NSW Health Influenza Pandemic Plan (PD2016_016). Sydney: NSW Health; 2020’.</p> <p>This 2020 document is based on the New South Wales Health Influenza Pandemic Plan (PD2016_016), which references the New South Wales Health policy ‘Influenza</p>	Triage protocol and ethical and operational guidelines	COVID-19 intensive care guidance is not publicly available

	<p>Pandemic – Providing Critical Care (PD2010_028). PD2010_028. PD2010_028 contains a triage tool (see NSW Health, Policy documents by A-Z: <a href="https://www1.health.nsw.gov.au/pds/Pages/a-z.aspx">https://www1.health.nsw.gov.au/pds/Pages/a-z.aspx</a>).</p> <p>However, as the updated COVID-19 intensive care guidance is not publicly available, we cannot confirm that it contains the same guidance as PD2016_016 or the PD2010_028 triage tool.</p>		
Northern Territory	<p>None located on the Northern Territory Health Department website: <a href="https://health.nt.gov.au/">https://health.nt.gov.au/</a>.</p>	-	-
Queensland	<p>On 20 April 2020 Queensland Health released a comprehensive ethical framework (developed in consultation with a numerous stakeholders) but this has since been removed from its website.[9]</p>	Ethical guidelines	No (initially available but since recalled)
South Australia	<p>None located on South Australia Health Department website: <a href="https://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/">https://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/</a>.</p>	-	-
Victoria	<p>None located on the Victoria Health website: <a href="https://www.dhhs.vic.gov.au/clinical-guidance-and-resources-covid-19">https://www.dhhs.vic.gov.au/clinical-guidance-and-resources-covid-19</a>.</p>	-	-
Western Australia	<p>The Western Australia Health Department website includes a Framework to guide decision making on the appropriateness of intensive care management during the COVID-19 pandemic (last updated 26 June 2020) in its section on COVID-19 guidance for health professionals.[10]</p>	Ethical guidelines	Yes

## Box 1. Examples of potential areas of legal risk in response to pandemic triage decisions

### **Civil law**

- Withholding or withdrawing beneficial life-sustaining treatment from one patient to provide it to a patient with a better prognosis could amount to a breach of the duty of care and liability in negligence (subject to the ‘peer professional practice’ defence for clinicians and the resource allocation defence in the case of hospitals).

### **Criminal law**

- Withdrawing a ventilator from one patient who is stable to provide it to another patient with a greater chance of survival could lead to charges of murder or manslaughter if the first patient died as a result (charges would be subject to prosecutorial discretion and jurisdiction-specific defences such as necessity).

### **Commonwealth and State anti-discrimination laws**

- A triage protocol could violate State and Territory anti-discrimination legislation if the decision was made on the basis of a ‘protected attribute’ such as age, disability or race (although specific protections may apply under the legislation for decision makers).

### **Guardianship legislation**

*Applies to patients who lack decision-making capacity, e.g. because they are unconscious, sedated, or have cognitive impairment*

- At common law, medical practitioners have no legal duty to provide treatment that is non-beneficial. However, the *Guardianship and Administration Act 2000* (Qld) makes it an offence to withhold or withdraw life-sustaining treatment from patients who lack capacity without the consent of an appropriate decision maker, even if providing that treatment would be ‘inconsistent with good medical practice’ (i.e. even if that treatment is non-beneficial). This may preclude some triage decisions in Queensland.
- A decision to withhold or withdraw beneficial life-sustaining treatment from a patient who lacks capacity to provide it to someone with a better prognosis may violate State or territory guardianship legislation, which requires health care decisions to be made in a person’s best interests. (This could also result in an emergency application to the Supreme Court to intervene in its *parens patriae* jurisdiction to protect the patient’s best interests.)

*This is a non-exhaustive list of examples. For an expanded discussion of the particular legal challenges in Australia see Close E, Young S, Cockburn T, et al. Legal challenges to ICU triage decisions in the COVID-19 pandemic: How effectively does the law regulate bedside rationing decisions in Australia? (unpublished study). See further Liddell et al (2020)[13] for the UK context, which has some similarities with Australia.*