EDITOR'S CHOICE

Predictive scoring in non-trauma emergency patients: a scoping review

Kirsty Challen, Steve W Goodacre

Health Services Research, ScHARR, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

Correspondence to
Dr Challen, 84 Whitbarrow Road, Lymm, WA13 9BA; kirstychallen@hotmail.com

Data sharing Dataset available from KC at kirstychallen@hotmail.com.

Accepted 6 November 2010
Published Online First 6 January 2011

ABSTRACT

This study is an inclusive scoping review of the literature relating to outcome prediction in adult non-trauma emergency patients, in order to identify the number and range of risk scores developed for acutely ill adults and to identify the outcomes these scores predict. The data source used was Medline 1950—2009. To be eligible for inclusion, papers had to detail an assessment tool, wholly or predominantly clinical, applied at the point of patient presentation to unscheduled healthcare services with outcome measures up to 30 days after presentation. Papers detailing trauma, paediatrics, purely obstetric or psychiatric presentations, tools wholly applied in a critical care setting, tools requiring an algorithm not freely available, biomarkers or tests not routinely available in an Emergency Department (ED) setting were excluded. 192 papers were reviewed. Within 17 broad disease categories, 80 inclusion criteria were used, 119 tools were assessed (25 of which were non-disease specific), and 51 outcome measures were used (30 of which were disease-specific). The areas under the receiver-operator characteristic curve (AUROCs) varied from 0.44 to 0.984. The multiplicity of tools available presents a challenge in itself to the acute clinician. Many tools require a specific diagnosis, which is not immediately available, and the authors advocate ED development of tools for case-mix adjustment and clinical risk stratification.

INTRODUCTION

Risk scores may be used to predict which non-trauma patients presenting to an Emergency Department (ED) are likely to suffer adverse outcomes. They have two broad purposes within clinical medicine: 1. to guide individual patient management by risk stratification, to determine best site-of-care, to place a ceiling on intensity of intervention, to decide if palliation is appropriate and to support information provided to patients and relatives; and 2. to provide case-mix adjustment for research and audit.

The use of standardised tools to affect site-of-care decisions is most advanced in the prehospital management of trauma; a number of rules have been proposed to identify major trauma patients in need of direct transfer to a specialised trauma centre or of the presence of a full trauma team.[1–5] The use of standardised alert systems in hospital has recently been advocated by the UK National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence to identify the acutely ill patient and ensure the appropriate level of care.[6]

The science of risk prediction and case-mix adjustment is advanced in trauma and critical care. A multiplicity of predictive tools exists in the critical care literature (APACHE I–IV,[7–10] Mortality Probability Model I–III,[11–13] Simplified Acute Physiology Score I[14] and II[15]), together with refinements based on changes of those scores over time.[16–19] In the UK,[20 21] Australasia,[22] Europe[23–25] and the USA,[26] various audit groups provide analysis to aid comparison between different units. In the USA and the UK, multi-site data collection (the American College of Surgeons Trauma Quality Improvement Programme[27] and the Trauma Audit Research Network[28]) is ongoing to provide risk-adjusted mortality ratios to assist in quality assurance at individual care providers.

The absence of similar tools in non-trauma patients causes problems in risk prediction and case-mix adjustment. Patients with delayed admission to critical care areas have higher rates of mortality than those admitted directly from the ED.[29 30] Not all patients require admission to hospital or critical care, but the lack of existence of a good indicator of future deterioration may engender defensive practice and unnecessary admissions. The lack of a valid tool for case-mix adjustment also causes problems in our era of league tables. Crude mortality estimates may reflect case mix rather than quality of care, and risk-adjustment may be subject to the 'constant risk fallacy'.[31] Failure to take these factors into account

Table 1 Previously identified severity scores for non-trauma patients searched for by name and/or common abbreviation

Altona	Alvarado
APACHE	Balthazar
Blatchford	CTAS/Canadian Triage
ESI/Emergency Severity	Essen
EWS/Early Warning Score	GCS/Glasgow Coma Scale
Geneva	Glasgow pancreas
Goldman	GRACE
Hardman	Manchester Triage/MTG/MTS
Mannheim	MEDS/Mortality in Emergency Department
MEEDS/Mainz Emergency	MELD
MPM/Mortality Probability Model	Norris
Peritonitis Severity Score	POSSUM
PURSUIT	Ranson
RAPS/Rapid Acute Physiology Score	REMS/Rapid Emergency Medicine Score
RISC	Rockall
ROSE	San Francisco (limited to syncope)
SAPS/Simplified Acute Physiology Score	Scorten
SOFA	TIMI
TISS/Therapeutic Intervention Severity Score	Wells

Table 2 Search strategy for prognostic indicators

Prognosis/OR 'Severity of Illness Index'/OR severity.mp OR risk/plus:

Acute coronary syndrome/
Aneurysm, dissecting/
Aneurysm, infected/
Aortic aneurysm/
Arsenic Poisoning/
Exp asthma/
Brain abscess/
Bronchitis, chronic/
Cadmium Poisoning/
Carbon Tetrachloride Poisoning/
Cardiomyopathy, dilated/
Central nervous system bacterial infections/
Central nervous system parasitic infections/
Chagas cardiomyopathy/
Cirrhosis.mp
Coronary aneurysm/
Dermatitis, exfoliative/
Dermatomyositis/
Exp Diabetic Ketoacidosis/
Encephalitis/
Endocarditis/
Endocarditis, subacute bacterial/
Fasciitis, Necrotizing/
Food Poisoning/
Gas Poisoning/
Heart aneurysm/
Exp Heat Exhaustion/
Heavy Metal Poisoning, Nervous System/
Hepatic encephalopathy/
Hepatitis/
Exp Hypothermia/
Intracranial aneurysm/
'Intracranial embolism and thrombosis'/
Ischemic Attack, Transient/
Liver failure/
Manganese Poisoning/
Meningitis/
Meningitis, bacterial/
Meningitis, viral/
Mercury Poisoning/
Mesenteric vascular occlusion/
Mushroom Poisoning/
Myocarditis/
Pancreatitis, acute necrotizing/
Exp peptic ulcer hemorrhage/
Peritonitis, tuberculous/
Pleuropneumonia/
Pneumonia, aspiration/
Pneumonia, pneumocystis/
Poisoning/
Pulmonary embolism/
Renal artery obstruction/
Sepsis/
Skin diseases/
Skin diseases, infectious/
Soft tissue infections/
Exp status asthmaticus/
Subarachnoid Hemorrhage/
Suppuration/
syncope, vasovagal/
Toxemia/
Ventricular dysfunction/
Ventricular dysfunction, right/
aneurysm/
aneurysm, false/
aneurysm, ruptured/
arachnoiditis/
arterial occlusive diseases/
bacteremia/
brain infarction/
bronchopneumonia/
Carbon Monoxide Poisoning/
cardiomyopathy, alcoholic/
cardiomyopathy, hypertrophic/
central nervous system fungal infections/
central nervous system viral diseases/
Ciguatera Poisoning/
confusion/
Delirium/
dermatitis herpetiformis/
Diabetic coma/
empyema, subdural/
encephalomyelitis/
endocarditis, bacterial/
epidural abscess/
Fluoride Poisoning/
fungemia/
exp gastrointestinal hemorrhage/
Heart Failure/
exp Heat Stroke/
exp hematemesis/
hepatic insufficiency/
hyperglycaemic hyperosmolar nonketotic coma/
iliac aneurysm/
intracranial embolism/
intracranial thrombosis/
Lead Poisoning/
liver failure, acute/
exp melena/
meningitis, aseptic/
meningitis, fungal/
meningoencephalitis/
Mercury Poisoning, Nervous System/
MPTP Poisoning/
myocardial infarction/
pancreatitis/
pancreatitis, alcoholic/
peritonitis/
Plant Poisoning/
pneumonia/
pneumonia, bacterial/
pneumonia, viral/
pulmonary disease, chronic obstructive/
pulmonary infarction/
Salmonella Food Poisoning/
shock, septic/
skin diseases, eczematous/
skin diseases, metabolic/
Staphylococcal Food Poisoning/
stroke/
subphrenic abscess/
Syncope/
takotsubo cardiomyopathy/
urinary tract infections/
ventricular dysfunction, left/

Table 3 Inclusion criteria

Condition	Inclusion criteria
AAA	Patients undergoing endovascular repair of ruptured AAA[33 34] Patients undergoing repair of ruptured AAA[35–42] Patients undergoing repair of ruptured infrarenal AAA[43]
ACS or potential ACS	Patients with potential ACS[44–49] Patients with ACS[50–68] Patients with AMI[59–65] Patients with NSTEMI[69 70] Patients with STEMI[57 71–74] Patients aged >65 with STEMI[75] Patients thrombolysed for STEMI[76] Patients undergoing PCI for STEMI[77] Patients admitted to inpatient telemetry[75 76] Patients admitted to CCU with NSTEMI[78] Patients admitted to ICU with AMI[79] Patients with chest pain after cocaine use[80] Patients being transported by helicopter with potential ACS[81]
Asthma/COPD	Patients with asthma[82–84] Patients admitted with COPD[85] Patients admitted to critical care with COPD/asthma[86]
GI bleeding	ED patients with GI bleed[87] Inpatients with upper GI bleed[88–91] Inpatients undergoing OGD[91–93] Inpatients undergoing OGD for non-variceal bleed[92] Inpatients undergoing OGD for peptic ulcer[93] Inpatients undergoing OGD for peptic ulcer with age>60, shock, comorbidities or Hb<10[94] Inpatients with lower GI bleed[95]
Heart failure	Patients with acute pulmonary oedema[96] Inpatients with heart failure[97–99]
Hypothermia	Patients admitted with core temperature <35[100]
Meningitis	Patients with bacterial meningitis[101 102]
Myxoedema	Patients with myxoedema coma[103]
Pancreatitis	Inpatients[104–117] Inpatients with 'severe' pancreatitis[118] HIV +ve inpatients[119]
Pneumonia (non-hospital-acquired)	Patients in primary care with CAP >65 years[120] Nursing home patients with pneumonia[121] Patients in primary care and ED[122 123] ED patients[124–134] Inpatients[124–141] Inpatients including those with TB[142] Inpatients aged >60 years[143] Inpatients excluding those from nursing homes[144] Inpatients with pneumococcal pneumonia[145] Inpatients with MRSA pneumonia[146] Inpatients with PSI category V pneumonia[147] Immunosuppressed inpatients[148]
Poisoning	Inpatients with organophosphate poisoning[149 150]
Pulmonary embolism	Patients with a discharge diagnosis of PE[151] ED patients with non-massive PE[152] Patients with PE diagnosed by CT[153] Patients undergoing CT for?PE[151]
Sepsis/infection	ED patients having a blood culture taken[154] ED patients with infection[155] ED patients meeting SIRS criteria[156–159] ED patients with severe sepsis/septic shock[160] Inpatients with first episode infective endocarditis[161] Inpatients with necrotising soft tissue infection[162] Patients with pyogenic liver abscess[163 164] Inpatients meeting criteria for early goal-directed therapy[165] Patients admitted to ICU via ED with sepsis[166]
Surgical	Patients undergoing damage control surgery[167] Patients undergoing emergency or urgent surgery[168] Patients undergoing emergency surgery for peptic ulcer[169] Patients undergoing emergency surgery for colorectal cancer[170 171] Patients undergoing surgery for colonic perforation[172 173] Patients undergoing surgery for complications of diverticulosis[174 175] Patients undergoing surgery for peritonitis[176] Inpatients with peritonitis secondary to hollow viscus perforation[177 178]
Syncope	ED patients with syncope[179–181] ED patients with syncope or near syncope[182 183]
TIA	Primary care[184] ED patients[184–187] Inpatients[188]
Unselected	ED patients[189 190] ED patients aged >65 years[191] ED patients with a non-surgical condition[192 193] ED patients seen in resuscitation area[194 195] Patients on MAU[196–199] Patients on MAU/SAU[200] Patients admitted to critical care from the ED[201 202] Patients admitted to critical care from the ED with shock[203]

AAA: abdominal aortic aneurysm; ACS: acute coronary syndrome; AMI: acute myocardial infarction; CAP: community-acquired pneumonia; CCU: coronary care unit; COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; ED: emergency department; GI: gastrointestinal; ICU: intensive care unit; MAU: medical assessment unit; MRSA: methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus; NSTEMI: non-ST elevation myocardial infarction; OGD: oesophagogastroduodenoscopy; PCI: primary coronary intervention; PE: pulmonary embolism; PSI: pulmonary severity index; SAU: surgical assessment unit; SIRS: systemic inflammatory response syndrome; STEMI: ST elevation myocardial infarction; TB: tuberculosis.

can lead to inappropriate conclusions being drawn about the association between quality of care and mortality.[32]

Attempts to implement risk-prediction methods in clinical decision-making, audit and research are hampered by the substantial range and number of risk scores available. There are so many potential scores for non-trauma patients that deciding which score should be used and which variable measured presents a challenge in itself. Therefore, this study aimed to carry out a scoping review of the literature relating to outcome prediction in adult non-trauma emergency patients, in order to identify the number and range of risk scores developed for acutely ill adults and to identify the outcomes these scores predict.

METHODS

The aim was to identify papers describing assessment tools applied at the point of patient presentation to unscheduled healthcare services (excluding trauma, paediatrics and purely obstetric or psychiatric presentations) and describing short-term outcomes. A search of Medline 1950 to October week 3 2009 was carried out using a deliberately inclusive two-pronged strategy (tables 1 and 2). The search was deliberately designed to achieve breadth rather than depth. It was intended to determine the scope of risk scores available, rather than obtain accurate estimates of the performance of each score.

All searches were limited to English language, humans and adults. Search output was limited by title, abstract or full paper review to those papers fitting three criteria: 1. a wholly or predominantly clinical assessment (ie, not biomarkers or specialist tests not available in the majority of EDs such as myocardial scintigraphy); 2. an adult population and 3. an outcome measure up to 30 days after presentation. Also assessment tools requiring a specialist algorithm not freely available, or those that were applied only to patients in a critical care setting were excluded.

The following data were extracted from each article selected for inclusion: the name and/or acronym of the score, the target condition or conditions, the patient groups included in the target condition(s), the main outcomes measured and the discriminant value of the score, expressed as the area under the receiver-operator characteristic curve (AUROC) or sensitivity and specificity. The AUROC is also known as the c-statistic. It is the probability that a randomly selected patient from those with the outcome of interest will have a higher score than a randomly

Table 4 Tools assessed

Condition	Tools
AAA	APACHE II[43] Edinburgh aneurysm score[38 39] Glasgow aneurysm score[38–40] Hardman[33–36 38–40 42] Modified Hardman[35] POSSUM[43] RAAA-POSSUM[42] V-POSSUM[41]
ACS or potential ACS	APACHE II[79 204] Acute Physiology Score[79] Bazzino[65] Chang[72] Coronary prognostic index[79] EMMACE[205] Freedom-from-event score[55] Goldman[49 52 53 206 207] GRACE[51 54 59 61 67–69 77 205] Hasdai[76] IHDI[204] Mayo[208] MINAP[73] Normand[209] Norris[210] PAMI[77] PREDICT[69] PURSUIT[59 64 67–69 78 205] Rapid Acute Physiology Score[81] Sanchis[49] Simplified Acute Physiology Score[79] Selker[48] Simple risk index[75 205 211] TIMI[45 47 50 56–62 66 68–70 74 77 80] Modified TIMI[45 47 58] TIMI risk index[44 46 71 212] Troponin Prediction Score[63]
Asthma/COPD	Acute asthma index[84] APACHE II Acute physiology[86] BAP-65[85] CAPS[86] National asthma guidelines[82] Rodrigo[83]
GI bleed	Blatchford[91 92 194 213] Modified Blatchford[195] BLEED[87] Bordley[88] Rockall[89 94] Rockall (clinical component)[90–93 213] Strate[95]
Heart failure	ADHERE decision rule[97] ADHERE logistic regression[97] Brigham[97] EFFECT[97 99] Le Conte[96] Pulmonary edema prognostic score[98]
Hypothermia	Elbaz[100]
Meningitis	Aronin[101] Weisfelt[102]
Myxoedema	SOFA[103]
Pancreatitis	APACHE II[104 107–109 111 112 114–119] APACHE III[104] APACHE-O[111 114] BALI[112] BISAP[105] EWS[115] Glasgow[112 117 119] Glasgow at admission[116] Modified Glasgow[106 109] Imrie[110 115 118] MODS[115] Ranson[104 110 112 116–119] Ranson (Biliary)[109] SAPS[113]
Pneumonia	APACHE II[146] American Thoracic Society 2001[139 140 214] Modified ATS[147 215] American Thoracic Society 2007[124 139 215] British Thoracic Society[140] Modified BTS[142] CORB[216] CRB[122 216] CRB-65[120 122 123 129 130 134 137 144–146 215–217] CURB[122 132 139 147 214 216 218] CURB-65[124 125 127–131 133 134 137 138 141 144 146 147 214–222] Pitt Bacteremia score[215] PMEWS[141] PSI[121 124–127 130–132 134–140 143 148 214–223] REA-ICU[138] SCAP[127 138 219] SEWS[129 130] SIRS[129 145] SMART-COP[131] SMRT-CO[131]
Poisoning	GCS[149] Modified APACHE[150] Poison severity score[149]
Pulmonary embolism	Aujesky[151 152] PESI[153]
Sepsis/infection	APACHE II[162 163 165] APS[161] CURB-65[155] MEDS[154–156 158–160 165 166] MEWS[158] MPM0[165] REMS[155] SAPS II[157 164 165] SOFA[157]
Surgical	Altona[172] APACHE II[170 172 177] APACHE III[170] CR POSSUM[170 173] Mannheim[172 175 176 178] MPM II[170] Peritonitis severity score[178] POSSUM[174] POSSUM physiology[169] P-POSSUM[167 168 171] SAPS II[170]
Syncope	EGSYS[180] OESIL[181] San Francisco[179 182 183]
TIA	ABCD[185 186 188] ABCD2[184 187]
Unselected	APACHE II[224 225] ESI[190 191] HOTEL[199] Kellett[198] LODS[203] Manchester Triage[190 201] MEWS[198 225] MPM0[202 203] PEDS[225] RAPS[189 192 193 224] REMS[189 192 193 224 225] RTS[225] SAPS II[196 203] SEWS[200] Worthing[197]

AAA, abdominal aortic aneurysm; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; GI, gastrointestinal; TIA, transient ischaemic attack.

selected patient without the outcome of interest. A score with a c-statistic of 0.5 or less has no value for discriminating which patients will suffer the outcome of interest. Similarly, a dichotomised score for which the sensitivity and specificity add up to 100% or less has no discriminatory value.

It was not planned to synthesise data, but to present descriptive data outlining the breadth of scores available for

Table 5 Outcome measures

Condition	Outcome measures
AAA	'Immediate' postoperative death[40] 30/7 death[33] Inpatient death [34–36 38 42 43] Inpatient or 30/7 death [39 41]
ACS or potential ACS	12 h troponin rise[63] 14/7 death [50] 14/7 AMI[50] 14/7 revascularisation[50] 14/7 death, AMI or recurrent ischaemia[57] 30/7 death[46 57 64 72 74 75 77 78 205 208 209 211 212] 30/7 death or AMI[59 64] 30/7 death, AMI or revascularisation[44 45 47 53 58 60–62 66 70 77 80] Inpatient death[48 51 67–69 71 73 79 81 204 210] Inpatient death preventable by monitoring or VF or VT[207] Inpatient ACS[49] Inpatient malignant arrhythmia[69] Inpatient death or AMI[65] Inpatient death, AMI or revascularisation[56 66] Inpatient heart failure, shock, AF, VF, cardiac arrest, VT, MI, stroke, major bleed, death[52 54 55 206] Cardiogenic shock[76]
Asthma/COPD	Poor treatment response[84] Hospitalisation[82 83] Requirement for mechanical ventilation[85] Inpatient death[85 86]
GI bleed	30/7 rebleed[92 94 213] 30/7 death [94] Inpatient death[89 92 93] Inpatient rebleed[89] Inpatient intervention or death[91] Inpatient rebleed or death[195] Inpatient rebleed, surgery or death[87 88] Requiring transfusion, surgery or endoscopic intervention[194] Requiring >2 unit transfusion, >20% fall in haematocrit, rebleed >24 h[95] Requiring endoscopic intervention[90] High risk stigmata at OGD[195]
Heart failure	30/7 death[99] Inpatient death[96–98] Inpatient death or life-threatening condition[97]
Hypothermia	Inpatient death[100]
Meningitis	Inpatient death[101] Glasgow Outcome Score 1–4[102]
Myxoedema	Inpatient death[103]
Pancreatitis	Inpatient death[105 106 112 113 115 117 118] Atlanta severity criteria[104 108 114 115] Admission to critical care[107 117] Admission to critical care >1/7[109] Admission to critical care >5/7[116] Admission to critical care, necrosis or death[111] Admission to critical care, local complications, surgery or death[119] Severe complications[110] Infection (bacteraemia/infected necrosis)[117]
Pneumonia	2/7 death[136] 14/7 death[215] 28/7 death[123] 30/7 death[120–122 126 128 129 133 134 137 140 141 143 144 146 217 218 220–223] Inpatient death[124 135 139 142 145 148 214] Hospitalisation[121 141] Complicated effusion or empyema[130] Severe sepsis[127] Critical care admission[124 127 131 132 134 136 139–141 147 214 220] Critical care admission or death[125 216 219] Critical care admission in 1-3/7[138]
Poisoning	Inpatient death[149] Requirement for endotracheal intubation[150]
Pulmonary embolism	30/7 death[151 153] Inpatient death[152] Haemodynamic instability[152]
Sepsis/infection	5/7 death[159] 28/7 death[155 156 158 166] 30/7 death[157 159] Inpatient death[154 160–165]
Surgical	30/7 death[168 173] Inpatient death[167 170–172 174–178] Complication[169]
Syncope	7/7 serious outcome[179 182 183] Adverse cardiac outcome[181] Final diagnosis cardiac syncope[180]
TIA	2/7 CVA[184] 7/7 CVA[184–188] 30/7 CVA[186 188]
Unselected	Hospital admission[190 191] Admission to critical care[201] 24 h death[199] 7/7 death or ICU admission[225] 14/7 death[224] 30/7 death[198 225] Inpatient death[189 192 193 196 197 200 202 203]

AAA, abdominal aortic aneurysm; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CVA, cerebrovascular accident; ICU, intensive care unit; MI, myocardial infarction; OGD, oesophagogastroduodenoscopy; TIA, transient ischaemic attack; VF, ventricular fibrillation; VT, ventricular tachycardia.

different conditions, the outcomes measured and the range of AUROC values reported.

RESULTS

The initial searches identified 14 659 (method 1) and 46 605 (method 2) titles. A significant number of titles were identified by more than one search. Six hundred and eighty-two (method 1) and 1661 (method 2) abstracts were screened and 192 papers deemed to fit the inclusion criteria.

Scoring systems were available for 17 broad conditions. Within these 17 conditions, 80 different inclusion criteria were used (table 3).

One-hundred and nineteen tools were assessed (table 4). Of these, 25 were generic (non-disease-specific). A number of tools were assessed in multiple disease categories.

Fifty-one different outcome measures were used (table 5). Of these, 30 were disease-specific.

A variety of different measures were used to report score performance. Of 247 analyses using death as an outcome, 190 reported an AUROC, of which 69 reported an AUROC greater than 0.8. Of 215 analyses not including death as an outcome, 151 reported an AUROC, of which 30 reported an AUROC greater than 0.8. A number of studies (22) used the same dataset to compare the predictive value of a single tool for different outcomes (table 6). For comparison, the lowest AUROC in the study was 0.44 (PIMI for predicting hospital death in patients with acute myocardial infarction[204]) and the highest was 0.984 (APACHE II for predicting hospital death in patients with peritonitis[177]). It is generally accepted that an AUROC of over 0.8 represents good discriminatory capacity.[226]

Studies were variously purely derivation, mixed derivation and validation, external validation and secondary analysis of other datasets (including disease registries) (table 7).

DISCUSSION

A wide variation in the patient groups to which scoring systems are applied has been demonstrated, and an equally wide variation in patient outcomes considered relevant. The sheer number of available tools makes it impossible for the working clinician to use more than a few in daily practice. The discriminant value of the scores, expressed as an AUROC or sensitivity and specificity, often varies between studies and is poor in many cases, suggesting the score will have limited value in practice. Furthermore, most scores

Table 6 Studies with comparison of different outcome measures

Condition		
ACS	GRACE	30/7 death AUROC 0.471 vs major cardiac event AUROC 0.544[77]
		Death AUROC 0.578 (0.457–0.699) vs malignant arrhythmia AUROC 0.573 (0.444–0.701)[69]
	PAMI	30/7 death AUROC 0.742 vs major cardiac event AUROC 0.65[77]
	PREDICT	Death AUROC 0.829 (0.744–0.914) vs malignant arrhythmia AUROC 0.531 (0.366–0.697)[69]
	PURSUIT	30/7 death AUROC 0.814 vs death or reinfarct AUROC 0.669[64]
		Death AUROC 0.86 (0.778–0.942) vs malignant arrhythmia AUROC 0.523 (0.358–0.688)[69]
	TIMI	Death AUROC 0.74 vs death/MI AUROC 0.63 vs MI AUROC 0.66 vs revascularisation AUROC 0.68[50]
		30/7 death AUROC 0.724 vs major cardiac event AUROC 0.635[77]
		Death AUROC 0.638 (0.515–0.76) vs malignant arrhythmia AUROC 0.486 (0.328–0.645)[69]
Asthma/COPD	BAP-65	Death AUROC 0.72 (0.7–0.74) vs IPPV AUROC 0.77 (0.75–0.79) Death AUROC 0.71 (0.7–0.73) vs IPPV AUROC 0.77 (0.75–0.79)[85]
GI bleed	Blatchford	Death sens 1, spec 0.08, PPV 0.01, NPV 1 vs rebleed sens 1, spec 0.09, PPV 0.07, NPV 1[92]
	Clinical Rockall	Death sens 1, spec 0.19, PPV 0.01, NPV 1 vs rebleed sens 0.69, spec 0.18, PPV 0.06, NPV 0.89[92]
	Rockall	Death AUROC 0.834 vs rebleed AUROC 0.798[89]
Heart failure	ADHERE decision rule	Inpatient death AUROC 0.68 (0.67–0.7) vs death/life-threatening event AUROC 0.58 (0.57–0.59)[97]
	ADHERE logistic regression	Inpatient death AUROC 0.73 (0.72–0.75) vs death/life-threatening event AUROC 0.61 (0.6–0.62)[97]
	Brigham	Inpatient death AUROC 0.61 (0.59–0.62) vs inpatient death/life-threatening event AUROC 0.61 (0.6–0.62)[97]
	EFFECT	Inpatient death AUROC 0.74 (0.72–0.75) vs inpatient DEATH/life-threatening event AUROC 0.62 (0.61–0.63)[97]
Pancreatitis	APACHE II	Death AUROC 0.875 vs Atlanta severity AUROC 0.861[115]
		Death AUROC 0.81 vs organ dysfunction AUROC 0.88 vs infection AUROC 0.73[117]
	EWS	Death AUROC 0.827 vs Atlanta severity AUROC 0.853[115]
	Glasgow	Death AUROC 0.73 vs organ dysfunction AUROC 0.74 vs infection AUROC 0.73[117]
	Imrie	Death AUROC 0.794 vs Atlanta severity AUROC 0.747[115]
	MODS	Death AUROC 0.783 vs Atlanta severity AUROC 0.793[115]
	Ranson	Death AUROC 0.83 vs organ dysfunction AUROC 0.84 vs infection AUROC 0.82[117]
Pneumonia	ATS 2001	30/7 death AUROC 0.6 (0.54–0.65) vs ICU admission AUROC 0.61 (0.57–0.65)[140]
		Inpatient death AUROC 0.63 vs ICU admission AUROC 0.9[214]
		Death sens 0.65, spec 0.71, PPV 0.25, NPV 0.93 vs ICU admission sens 0.9, spec 0.8, PPV 0.53, NPV 0.97[139]
	Modified ATS 2001	Death sens 0.75 spec 0.8 PPV 0.53 NPV 0.91 vs ICU admission sens 0.72 spec 0.77 PPV 0.44 NPV 0.91[147]
	ATS 2007	Death sens 0.75, spec 0.65, PPV 0.24, NPV 0.95 vs ICU admission sens 0.9, spec 0.72, PPV 0.44, NPV 0.97[139]
	ATS 2007 minor criteria	Death AUROC 0.88 (0.86–0.91) vs ICU admission AUROC 0.85 (0.81–0.88)[124]
	BTS	30/7 death AUROC 0.62 (0.57–0.69) vs ICU admission AUROC 0.58 (0.53–0.63)[140]
	CURB	Inpatient death AUROC 0.74 vs ICU admission AUROC 0.7[214]
		Death (score >1) sens 0.5, spec 0.75, PPV 0.22, NPV 0.91 vs ICU admission (score >1) sens 0.58, spec 0.79, PPV 0.4, NPV 0.89[139]
		Death sens 0.78 spec 0.45 PPV 0.3 NPV 0.87 ICU admission sens 0.72 spec 0.42 PPV 0.24 NPV 0.86[147]
	CURB-65	Inpatient death AUROC 0.74 vs ICU admission AUROC 0.61[214]
		30/7 death AUROC 0.79 (0.74–0.85) vs need for IPPV/vasopressor AUROC 0.77 (0.72–0.83)[130]
		Death AUROC 0.82 (0.78–0.85) vs ICU admission AUROC 0.68 (0.63–0.72)[124]
		Death sens 0.73 spec 0.8 PPV 0.53 NPV 0.85 vs ICU admission sens 0.6 spec 0.44 PPV 0.21 NPV 0.81[147]
	PSI	30/7 death AUROC 0.75 (0.71–0.78) vs ICU admission AUROC 0.6 (0.56–0.65)[140]
		Inpatient death AUROC 0.73 vs ICU admission AUROC 0.65[214]
		30/7 death AUROC 0.79 (0.73–0.84) vs need for IPPV/vasopressor AUROC 0.73 (0.67–0.78)[130]
		2/7 death class I 0, class II 0.2%, class III 0.3%, class IV 1.3%, class V 7.5% versus ICU admission class I 2.5%, class II 3.7%, class III 3.9%, class IV 5%, class V 10.2%[136]
		Death (class IV/V) sens 0.95, spec 0.49, PPV 0.21, NPV 0.99 vs ICU admission (class IV/V) sens 0.81, spec 0.5, PPV 0.28, NPV 0.91[139]
		Death AUROC 0.86 (0.83–0.88) vs ICU admission AUROC 0.75 (0.71–0.79)[124]
Pulmonary embolism	Aujesky	Death score <65 0, 65–85 0, 86–105 11%, 106–25 23%, >125 22% vs haemodynamic instability score <65 0, 65–85 20%, 86–105 56%, 106–125 39%, >125 56%[152]
Sepsis	MEDS	5/7 death AUROC 0.89 vs 5–30/7 death AUROC 0.78[159]
TIA	ABCD	CVA 7/7 AUROC 0.75 (0.63–0.88) vs 30/7 AUROC 0.76 (0.66–0.86)[186]
	ABCD2	CVA 2/7 AUROC 0.72 (0.6–0.84) vs 7/7 AUROC 0.63 (0.57–0.69) CVA 2/7 AUROC 0.79 (0.68–0.9) vs 7/7 AUROC 0.83 (0.75–0.91) CVA 2/7 AUROC 0.72 (0.61–0.82) vs 7/7 AUROC 0.75 (0.68–0.83) CVA 2/7 AUROC 0.73 (0.57–0.89) vs 7/7 AUROC 0.74 (0.64–0.84)[184]
Unselected	APACHE II	30/7 death AUROC 0.838 (0.793–0.876) vs 1/52 death or ICU AUROC 0.733 (0.681–0.78)[225]
	MEWS	30/7 death AUROC 0.754 (0.703–0.799) vs 1/52 death or ICU AUROC 0.761 (0.711–0.806)[225]
	PEDS	30/7 death AUROC 0.898 (0.86–0.928) vs 1/52 death or ICU AUROC 0.909 (0.872–0.938)[225]
	REMS	30/7 death AUROC 0.771 (0.722–0.816) vs 1/52 death or ICU AUROC 0.696 (0.643–0.745)[225]
	RTS	30/7 death AUROC 0.766 (0.717–0.811) vs 1/52 death or ICU AUROC 0.748 (0.698–0.794)[225]

ACS, acute coronary syndrome; AUROC, area under ROC curve; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; GI, gastrointestinal; ICU, intensive care unit; IPPV, intermittent positive pressure ventilation; MI, myocardial infarction; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value; sens, sensitivity; spec, specificity; TIA, transient ischaemic attack.

Table 7 Source of datasets

Studies reporting purely derivation sets	AAA[35 38] ACS[65 73] Heart failure[96 98] Hypothermia[100] Unselected[193 225]
Studies reporting derivation and validation sets	ACS[38 42 61 208] Asthma/COPD[83 85 86] GI bleed[88 95] Heart failure[99] Meningitis[101 102] Pneumonia[127 131 146 148 151] Pulmonary embolism[151] Sepsis[154] Syncope[180] Unselected[215–217]
Studies providing external validation	AAA[33 37 177 189 193 204 226–229] ACS[34–36 43 44 46 47 49–51 56 59 66 72 74–80] Asthma/COPD[82 84 86] GI bleed[86 88–91 93–97] Myxoedema[103] Pancreatitis[107–114 117 118 121 122] Pneumonia[123–129 131–134 136 138 139 141 144–147 149–152 154 155 157 158 160] Poisoning[150] Pulmonary embolism[163–165] Sepsis[158 162 168 171 173 175 176 179] Surgical[180–188 191 196 197] Syncope[198 200–202] TIA[188 203 205–207] Unselected[190 194 195 211–214 216 219 220]
Studies with secondary analysis of data collected for another purpose as derivation set	ACS[40 45 53 54 69 71 73] Pancreatitis[112]
Studies with secondary analysis of data collected for another purpose as validation set	ACS[37 39 41 48 52 53 63–65 67 68 71 73] GI bleed[195] Heart failure[97] Pancreatitis[112] Pneumonia[130 135 137 140 143 144 153] Poisoning[149] Sepsis[167 169 172 178] Unselected[209 218 221]

AAA, abdominal aortic aneurysm; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; GI, gastrointestinal; TIA, transient ischaemic attack.

have only been tested in the population in which they were developed. This will tend to overestimate the discriminatory value and further reduce the value of the scores in practice.

The authors are not aware of any previous systematic reviews that have attempted to characterise the full scope of risk scores available for non-trauma patients. Although there is obviously a huge amount of primary data relating to risk scores, there have been few attempts to systematically evaluate these data and draw broader conclusions for clinical practice. Indeed, one of the characteristics of the literature relating to risk scores is that each risk score seems to be developed de novo with very little reference to previous studies or other scores. This may reflect the tendency for studies developing risk scores to be secondary analyses of existing datasets rather than studies undertaken for the primary purpose of developing a risk score. The present review suggests that further unfocussed primary research is unlikely to clarify the situation. Instead, future studies of risk scores should aim to build on existing data and be designed specifically to develop an optimal risk score.

The study is limited by the structure and the lack of information in many included papers. Few were precise about the timing of the assessment, leaving potential for lead-time bias. The majority focused on hospital-specific outcomes, and it is often unclear to what extent patient-relevant out-of-hospital outcomes have been investigated. The often restricted nature of patient sets (eg, requiring consultant radiologist confirmation for the diagnosis of pneumonia) limits the generalisability of many of the results to the day-to-day ED population where formal diagnosis is often not known initially; only four papers could be identified assessing a truly unselected group of ED patients.[189 190 192 193]

Although a number of reviews have analysed the performance of systems identifying high-risk inpatients,[227–229] the authors are unaware of any previous review of similar tools available to the ED clinician.

It is apparent that one outcome measure does not fit all; in the limited literature assessing the performance of the same tool for two different outcomes, the results rarely matched. Clinicians must therefore examine their practice and decide which outcomes are relevant to their patients and situation. It is highly unlikely that a tool developed for case-mix adjustment will perform equally well at clinical risk stratification; currently the ED community lacks a tool for either and both should be developed. It is likely, given the heterogeneity of ED patients, that it will be challenging to develop a single overall predictive tool; it may be that a variable of presenting complaint (along the lines of APACHE) will be required in such a tool for it to be of benefit in simplifying risk prediction for the practising Emergency Physician.

Funding SG is an employee of the University of Sheffield. KC is funded by a Medical Research Council PhD studentship. Neither body had any role in study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the article for publication.

Competing interests All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare that (1) no authors have support from any commercial company for the submitted work; (2) no authors have relationships with any commercial company that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; (3) their spouses, partners, or children have no financial relationships that may be relevant to the submitted work; and (4) no authors have non-financial interests that may be relevant to the submitted work.

Contributors KC and SG jointly conceived the study, analysed the data and drafted the manuscript. KC carried out the literature search and is the guarantor. Both authors had full access to all of the data in the study and can take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

REFERENCES

1. **Gray A,** Goyder E, Goodacre S, *et al*. Trauma triage: a comparison of CRAMS and TRTS in a UK population. *Injury* 1997;**28**:97–101.
2. **Baxt WG,** Jones G, Fortlaget D. The trauma triage rule: a new, resource-based approach to the prehospital identification of major trauma victims. *Ann Emerg Med* 1990;**19**:1401–6.
3. **Bond R,** Kortbeek J, Preshaw R. Field trauma triage: combining mechanism of injury with the prehospital index for an improved trauma triage tool. *J Trauma* 1997;**443**:283–7.
4. **Emerman CL,** Shade B, Kubincanek J. Comparative performance of the Baxt Trauma triage rule. *Am J Emerg Med* 1992;**10**:294–7.
5. **Gilpin D,** Nelson P. Revised trauma score: a triage tool in the accident and emergency department. *Injury* 1991;**22**:35–7.
6. **NICE Short Clinical Guidelines Technical Team.** *Acutely ill patients in hospital: recognition of and response to acute illness in adults in hospital*. London: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, 2006.
7. **Knaus W,** Zimmerman J, Wagner D, *et al*. Apache: acute physiology and chronic health evaluation; a physiologically based classification system. *Crit Care Med* 1981;**9**:591.
8. **Knaus WA,** Draper EA, Wagner D, *et al*. APACHE II: a severity of disease classification system. *Crit Care Med* 1985;**13**:818–29.
9. **Knaus W,** Wagner D, Draper E, *et al*. The APACHE III prognostic system. Risk prediction of hospital mortality for critically ill hospitalized adults. *Chest* 1991;**100**:1619–36.
10. **Zimmerman JE,** Kramer AA, McNair DS, *et al*. Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) IV: Hospital mortality assessment for today's critically ill patients. *Crit Care Med* 2006;**34**:1297–310.
11. **Lemeshow S,** Teres D, Pastides H, *et al*. A method for predicting survival and mortality of ICU patients using objectively derived weights. *Crit Care Med* 1985;**13**:519–25.
12. **Lemeshow S,** Teres D, Klar J, *et al*. Mortality probability models (MPM II) based on an international cohort of intensive care unit patients. *JAMA* 1993;**270**:2478–86.

13. **Higgins TL,** Teres D, Copes WS, *et al*. Assessing contemporary intensive care unit outcome: an updated Mortality Probability Admission Model (MPM0-III). *Crit Care Med* 2007;**35**:827—35.
14. **Le Gall J-R,** Loirat P, Alperovitch A, *et al*. A simplified acute physiology score for ICU patients. *Crit Care Med* 1984;**12**:975—7.
15. **Le Gall J,** Lemeshow S, Saulnier F. A new simplified acute physiologic score (SAPS II) based on a European/North American multicenter study. *JAMA* 1993;**270**:2957—63.
16. **Chang R,** Jacobs S, Lee B. Predicting outcome among intensive care unit patients using computerised trend analysis of daily Apache II scores corrected for organ system failure. *Intens Care Med* 1988;**14**:558—66.
17. **Ferreira FL,** Peres Bota D, Bross A, *et al*. Serial evaluation of the SOFA score to predict outcome in critically ill patients. *JAMA* 2001;**286**:1754—8.
18. **Ho KM,** Dobb GJ, Knuiman M, *et al*. A comparison of admission and worst 24-hour Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II scores in predicting hospital mortality: a retrospective cohort study. *Critical Care* 2006;**10**:R4.
19. **Rogers J,** Fuller HD. Use of daily Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) II scores to predict individual patient survival rate. *Crit Care Med* 1994;**22**:1402—5.
20. **Rowan K,** Kerr J, Major E, *et al*. Intensive Care Society's APACHE II study in Britain and Ireland-II: outcome comparisons of intensive care units after adjustment for case mix by the American APACHE II method. *BMJ* 1993;**307**:977—81.
21. **Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group.** *Audit of critical care in Scotland 2009*. Edinburgh: NHS National Services Scotland, 2009.
22. **Stow P,** Hart G, Higlett T, *et al*. Development and implementation of a high-quality clinical database: the Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Society Adult Patient Database. *J Crit Care* 2006;**21**:133—41.
23. **Brazzi L,** Apolone G, Liberati A. Risultati preliminari di uno studio multicentrico sui profili di cura e sull'outcome di pazienti ricoverati in reparti di terapia intensiva. *Minerva Anestesiol* 1992;**58**:927—9.
24. **Peelen L,** de Keizer NF, Peek N, *et al*. The influence of volume and intensive care unit organization on hospital mortality in patients admitted with severe sepsis: a retrospective multicentre cohort study. *Crit Care* 2007;**11**:R40.
25. **Vázquez Mata G,** Jiménez Quintana M, Rivera Fernández R, *et al*. Objetivación de la gravedad mediante el sistema APACHE-III aplicado en España. *Med Clin* 2001;**117**:446—51.
26. **Cook SF,** Visscher WA, Hobbs CL, *et al*. Results from a pilot validity study of a new observational database. *Crit Care Med* 2002;**30**:2765—70.
27. **Demetriades D,** Martin M, Salim A, *et al*. The effect of trauma center designation and trauma volume on outcome in specific severe injuries. *Ann Surg* 2005;**242**:512—19.
28. **Lecky F,** Woodford M, Bouamra O, *et al*. Lack of change in trauma care in England and Wales since 1994. *Emerg Med J* 2002;**19**:520—3.
29. **Parkhe M,** Myles PS, Leach DS, *et al*. Outcome of emergency department patients with delayed admission to an intensive care unit. *Emerg Med Australas* 2002;**14**:50—7.
30. **McQuillan P,** Pilkington S, Allan A, *et al*. Confidential inquiry into quality of care before admission to intensive care. *BMJ* 1998;**316**:1853—8.
31. **Nicholl J.** Case-mix adjustment in non-randomised observational evaluations: the constant risk fallacy. *J Epidemiol Commun Health* 2007;**61**:1010—13.
32. **Mohammed MA,** Deeks JJ, Girling A, *et al*. Evidence of methodological bias in hospital standardised mortality ratios: retrospective database study of English hospitals. *BMJ* 2009;**338**:b780.
33. **Karkos CD,** Karamanos D, Papazoglou KO, *et al*. Usefulness of the Hardman index in predicting outcome after endovascular repair of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysms. *J Vasc Surg* 2008;**48**:788—94.
34. **Sharif MA,** Lee B, Makar RR, *et al*. Role of the Hardman Index in predicting mortality for open and endovascular repair of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm. *J Endovasc Ther* 2007;**14**:528—35.
35. **Calderwood R,** Halka T, Haji-Michael P, *et al*. Ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm: is it possible to predict outcome? *Int Angiol* 2004;**23**:47—53.
36. **Prance S,** Wilson Y, Cosgrove C, *et al*. Ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysms: selecting patients for surgery. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg* 1999;**17**:129—32.
37. **Tambyraja A,** Fraser S, Murie J, *et al*. Validity of the Glasgow Aneurysm Score and the Hardman Index in predicting outcome after ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm repair. *Br J Surg* 2005;**92**:573—3.
38. **Tambyraja A,** Murie J, Chalmers R. Predictors of outcome after abdominal aortic aneurysm rupture: Edinburgh ruptured aneurysm score. *World J Surg* 2007;**31**:2243—7.
39. **Tambyraja AL,** Lee AJ, Murie JA, *et al*. Prognostic scoring in ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm: a prospective evaluation. *J Vasc Surg* 2008;**47**:282—6.
40. **Leo E,** Biancari F, Nesi F, *et al*. Risk-scoring methods in predicting the immediate outcome after emergency open repair of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm. *Am J Surg* 2006;**192**:19—23.
41. **Harris JR,** Forbes TL, Steiner SH, *et al*. Risk-adjusted analysis of early mortality after ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm repair. *J Vasc Surg* 2007;**42**:387—91.
42. **Neary W,** Crow P, Foy C, *et al*. Comparison of POSSUM scoring and the Hardman Index in selection of patients for repair of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm. *Br J Surg* 2003;**90**:421—5.
43. **Lazarides MK,** Arvanitis DP, Drista H, *et al*. Scores do not predict the outcome of ruptured infrarenal aortic aneurysms. *Ann Vasc Surg* 1997;**11**:155—8.
44. **García-Almagro FJ,** Gimeno JR, Villegas M, *et al*. Prognostic value of the Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction risk score in a unselected population with chest pain. Construction of a new predictive model. *Am J Emerg Med* 2008;**26**:439—45.
45. **Conway Morris A,** Caesar D, Gray S, *et al*. TIMI risk score accurately risk stratifies patients with undifferentiated chest pain presenting to an emergency department. *Heart* 2006;**92**:1333—4.
46. **Ilkhanoff L,** O'Donnell CJ, Camargo CA, *et al*. Usefulness of the TIMI Risk Index in predicting short- and long-term mortality in patients with acute coronary syndromes. *Am J Cardiol* 2005;**96**:773—7.
47. **Jaffery Z,** Hudson MP, Jacobsen G, *et al*. Modified Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction (TIMI) risk score to risk stratify patients in the emergency department with possible acute coronary syndrome. *J Thromb Thrombolysis* 2007;**24**:137—44.
48. **Selker HP,** Griffith JL, D'Agostino RB. A time-insensitive predictive instrument for acute myocardial infarction mortality: a multicenter study. *Med Care* 1991;**29**:1196—211.
49. **Manini AF,** Dannemann N, Brown DF, *et al*. Limitations of risk score models in patients with acute chest pain. *Am J Emerg Med* 2009;**27**:43—8.
50. **Antman E,** Cohen M, Bernink P. The TIMI risk score for unstable angina/non—ST elevation MI. a method for prognostication and therapeutic decision making. *JAMA* 2000;**284**:835—42.
51. **Elbarouni B,** Goodman SG, Yan RT, *et al*. Validation of the Global Registry of Acute Coronary Event (GRACE) risk score for in-hospital mortality in patients with acute coronary syndrome in Canada. *Am Heart J* 2009;**158**:392—9.
52. **Goldman L,** Cook EF, Johnson PA, *et al*. Prediction of the need for intensive care in patients who come to emergency departments with acute chest pain. *N Engl J Med* 1996;**334**:1498—504.
53. **Limkakeng A,** Gilbler WB, Pollack C, *et al*. Combination of Goldman risk and initial cardiac troponin I for emergency department chest pain patient risk stratification. *Acad Emerg Med* 2001;**8**:696—702.
54. **Sinclair H,** Paterson M, Walker S, *et al*. predicting outcome in patients with acute coronary syndrome: evaluation of b-type natriuretic peptide and the global registry of acute coronary events (GRACE) Risk score. *Scott Med J* 2007;**52**:8—13.
55. **Brieger D,** Fox K, FitzGerald G, *et al*. Predicting freedom from clinical events in non-ST elevation acute coronary syndromes: the Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events. *Heart* 2009;**95**:888—94.
56. **Soiza R,** Leslie S, Williamson P. Risk stratification in acute coronary syndromes—does the TIMI risk score work in unselected cases? *Q J Med* 2006;**99**:81—7.
57. **Foussas SG,** Zairis MN, Lyras AG, *et al*. Early prognostic usefulness of c-reactive protein added to the thrombolysis in myocardial infarction risk score in acute coronary syndromes. *Am J Cardiol* 2005;**96**:533—7.
58. **Body R,** Carley S, McDowell G, *et al*. Can a modified thrombolysis in myocardial infarction risk score outperform the original for risk stratifying emergency department patients with chest pain? *Emerg Med J* 2009;**26**:95—9.
59. **de Araujo Goncalves P,** Ferreira J, Aguiar C, *et al*. TIMI, PURSUIT, and GRACE risk scores: sustained prognostic value and interaction with revascularization in NSTE-ACS. *Eur Heart J* 2005;**26**:865—72.
60. **Karounos M,** Chang AM, Robey JL, *et al*. TIMI risk score: does it work equally well in both males and females? *Emerg Med J* 2007;**24**:471—4.
61. **Lyon R,** Morris AC, Caesar D, *et al*. Chest pain presenting to the Emergency Department—to stratify risk with GRACE or TIMI? *Resuscitation* 2007;**74**:90—3.
62. **Pollack CV,** Sites FD, Shofer FS, *et al*. Application of the TIMI risk score for unstable angina and non-ST elevation acute coronary syndrome to an unselected emergency department chest pain population. *Acad Emerg Med* 2006;**13**:13—18.
63. **Januzzi JL,** Newby LK, Murphy SA, *et al*. Predicting a late positive serum troponin in initially troponin-negative patients with non—ST-elevation acute coronary syndrome: Clinical predictors and validated risk score results from the TIMI IIIB and GUSTO IIA studies. *Am Heart J* 2006;**151**:360—6.
64. **Boersma E,** Peiper KS, Steyerberg E, *et al*. Predictors of outcome in patients with acute coronary syndromes without persistent ST-segment elevation: result from an international trial of 9461 patients. *Circulation* 2000;**101**:2557—67.
65. **Bazzino O,** Díaz R, Tajer C, *et al*. Clinical predictors of in-hospital prognosis in unstable angina: ECLA 3. *Am Heart J* 1999;**137**:322—31.
66. **Campbell CF,** Chang AM, Sease KL, *et al*. Combining thrombolysis in myocardial infarction risk score and clear-cut alternative diagnosis for chest pain risk stratification. *Am J Emerg Med* 2009;**27**:37—42.
67. **Yan AT,** Jong P, Yan RT, *et al*. Clinical trial—derived risk model may not generalize to real-world patients with acute coronary syndrome. *Am Heart J* 2004;**148**:1020—7.
68. **Yan AT,** Yan RT, Tan M, *et al*. Risk scores for risk stratification in acute coronary syndromes: useful but simpler is not necessarily better. *Eur Heart J* 2007;**28**:1072—8.
69. **Rahimi K,** Watzlawek S, Thiele H, *et al*. Incidence, time course, and predictors of early malignant ventricular arrhythmias after non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction in patients with early invasive treatment. *Eur Heart J* 2006;**27**:1706—11.
70. **Samaha FF,** Kimmel SE, Kizer JR, *et al*. Usefulness of the TIMI risk score in predicting both short- and long-term outcomes in the Veterans Affairs Non—QWave Myocardial Infarction Strategies In-Hospital (VANQWISH) Trial. *Am J Cardiol* 2002;**90**:922—6.
71. **Wiviott SD,** Morrow DA, Frederick PD, *et al*. performance of the thrombolysis in myocardial infarction risk index in the national registry of myocardial infarction-3

and -4: a simple index that predicts mortality in ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2004;**44**:783—9.
72. **Chang W-C,** Kaul P, Fu Y, *et al*. Forecasting mortality: dynamic assessment of risk in ST-segment elevation acute myocardial infarction. *Eur Heart J* 2006;**27**:419—26.
73. **Gale C,** Manda S, Batin P, *et al*. Predictors of in-hospital mortality for patients admitted with ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a real-world study using the Myocardial Infarction National Audit Project (MINAP) database. *Heart* 2008;**94**:1407—12.
74. **Morrow DA,** Antman EM, Charlesworth A, *et al*. TIMI risk score for ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a convenient, bedside, clinical score for risk assessment at presentation. *Circulation* 2000;**102**:2031—7.
75. **Rathore SS,** Weinfurt KP, Gross CP, *et al*. Validity of a simple ST-elevation acute myocardial infarction risk index: are randomized trial prognostic estimates generalizable to elderly patients? *Circulation* 2003;**107**:811—16.
76. **Hasdai D,** Califf RM, Thompson TD, *et al*. Predictors of cardiogenic shock after thrombolytic therapy for acute myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2000;**35**:136—43.
77. **Lev EI,** Kornowski R, Vaknin-Assa H, *et al*. Comparison of the predictive value of four different risk scores for outcomes of patients with ST-elevation acute myocardial infarction undergoing primary percutaneous coronary intervention. *Am J Cardiol* 2008;**102**:6—11.
78. **Brilakis ES,** Wright RS, Kopecky SL, *et al*. Association of the PURSUIT risk score with predischarge ejection fraction, angiographic severity of coronary artery disease, and mortality in a nonselected, community-based population with non-ST—elevation acute myocardial infarction. *Am Heart J* 2003;**146**:811—18.
79. **Moreau R,** Soupison T, Vauquelin P, *et al*. Comparison of two simplified severity scores (SAPS and APACHE II) for patients with acute myocardial infarction. *Crit Care Med* 1989;**17**:409—13.
80. **Chase M,** Brown AM, Robey JL, *et al*. Application of the TIMI risk score in ED patients with cocaine-associated chest pain. *Am J Emerg Med* 2007;**25**:1015—18.
81. **Rhee KJ,** MacKenzie JR, Burney RE, *et al*. Rapid acute physiology scoring in transport systems. *Crit Care Med* 1990;**18**:1119—23.
82. **Kelly A-M,** Kerr D, Powell C. Is severity assessment after one hour of treatment better for predicting the need for admission in acute asthma? *Respir Med* 2004;**98**:777—81.
83. **Rodrigo G,** Rodrigo C. A new index for early prediction of hospitalization in patients with acute asthma. *Am J Emerg Med* 1997;**15**:8—13.
84. **Rodrigo G,** Rodrigo C. Early prediction of poor response in acute asthma patients in the emergency department. *Chest* 1998;**114**:1016—21.
85. **Tabak YP,** Sun X, Johannes RS, *et al*. Mortality and need for mechanical ventilation in acute exacerbations of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: development and validation of a simple risk score. *Arch Intern Med* 2009;**169**:1595—602.
86. **Wildman MJ,** Harrison DA, Welch CA, *et al*. A new measure of acute physiological derangement for patients with exacerbations of obstructive airways disease: the COPD and asthma physiology score. *Respir Med* 2007;**101**:1994—2002.
87. **Kollef MH,** O'Brien JD, Zuckerman GR, *et al*. BLEED: A classification tool to predict outcomes in patients with acute upper and lower gastrointestinal hemorrhage. *Crit Care Med* 1997;**25**:1125—32.
88. **Bordley DR,** Mushlin AI, Dolan JG, *et al*. Early clinical signs identify low-risk patients with acute upper gastrointestinal hemorrhage. *JAMA* 1985;**253**:3282—5.
89. **Sarwar S,** Dilshad A, Khan AA, *et al*. Predictive value of Rockall score for rebleeding and mortality in patients with variceal bleeding. *J Coll Physicians Surg Pakistan* 2007;**17**:253—6.
90. **Das A,** Ben-Menachem T, Farooq FT, *et al*. Artificial neural network as a predictive instrument in patients with acute nonvariceal upper gastrointestinal hemorrhage. *Gastroenterology* 2008;**134**:65—74.
91. **Stanley A,** Ashley D, Dalton H, *et al*. Outpatient management of patients with low-risk upper-gastrointestinal haemorrhage: multicentre validation and prospective evaluation. *Lancet* 2009;**373**:42—7.
92. **Chen I-C,** Hung M-S, Chiu T-F, *et al*. Risk scoring systems to predict need for clinical intervention for patients with nonvariceal upper gastrointestinal tract bleeding. *Am J Emerg Med* 2007;**25**:774—9.
93. **Sanders D,** Carter M, Goodchap R, *et al*. Prospective Validation of the Rockall Risk Scoring System for Upper GI Hemorrhage in Subgroups of Patients With Varices and Peptic Ulcers. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2002;**97**:630—5.
94. **Church NI,** Dallal HJ, Masson J, *et al*. Validity of the Rockall scoring system after endoscopic therapy for bleeding peptic ulcer: a prospective cohort study. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2006;**63**:606—12.
95. **Strate LL,** Saltzman JR, Ookubo R, *et al*. Validation of a Clinical Prediction Rule for Severe Acute Lower Intestinal Bleeding. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2005;**100**:1821—7.
96. **Le Conte P,** Coutant V, N'Guyen JM, *et al*. Prognostic factors in acute cardiogenic pulmonary edema. *Am J Emerg Med* 1999;**17**:329—32.
97. **Auble TE,** Hsieh M, McCausland JB, *et al*. Comparison of four clinical prediction rules for estimating risk in heart failure. *Ann Emerg Med* 2007;**50**:127—35.
98. **Fiutowski M,** Waszyrowski T, Krzeminska-Pakula M, *et al*. Pulmonary edema prognostic score predicts in-hospital mortality risk in patients with acute cardiogenic pulmonary edema. *Heart Lung* 2008;**37**:46—53.
99. **Lee DS,** Austin PC, Rouleau JL, *et al*. Predicting mortality among patients hospitalized for heart failure. *JAMA* 2003;**290**:2581—7.
100. **Elbaz G,** Etzion O, Delgado J, *et al*. Hypothermia in a desert climate: severity score and mortality prediction. *Am J Emerg Med* 2008;**26**:683—8.
101. **Aronin SI,** Peduzzi P, Quagliarello VJ. Community-acquired bacterial meningitis: risk stratification for adverse clinical outcome and effect of antibiotic timing. *Ann Intern Med* 1998;**129**:862—9.
102. **Weisfelt M,** van de Beek D, Spanjaard L, *et al*. A risk score for unfavorable outcome in adults with bacterial meningitis. *Ann Neurol* 2008;**63**:90—7.
103. **Dutta P,** Bhansali A, Masoodi SR, *et al*. Predictors of outcome in myxoedema coma: a study from a tertiary care centre. *Crit Care* 2008;**12**:R1.
104. **Chatzicostas C,** Roussomoustakaki M, Vlachonikolis IG, *et al*. Comparison of Ranson, APACHE II and APACHE III scoring systems in acute pancreatitis. *Pancreas* 2002;**25**:331—5.
105. **Singh VK,** Wu BU, Bollen TL, *et al*. A prospective evaluation of the bedside index for severity in acute pancreatitis score in assessing mortality and intermediate markers of severity in acute pancreatitis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2009;**104**:966—71.
106. **de Beaux A,** Palmer K, Carter D. Factors influencing morbidity and mortality in acute pancreatitis; an analysis of 279 cases. *Gut* 1995;**37**:121—6.
107. **De Sanctis J,** Lee M, Gazelle G, *et al*. Prognostic indicators in acute pancreatitis: CT vs APACHE II. *Clin Radiol* 1997;**52**:842—8.
108. **Gürleyik G,** Emir S, Kiliçoglu G, *et al*. Computed Tomography Severity Index, APACHE II Score, and Serum CRP Concentration for Predicting the Severity of Acute Pancreatitis. *J Pancreas* 2005;**6**:562—7.
109. **Meek K,** Toosie K, Stabile BE, *et al*. Simplified admission criterion for predicting severe complications of gallstone pancreatitis. *Arch Surg* 2000;**135**:1048—54.
110. **Meek K,** Virgilio C, Murrell Z, *et al*. Correlation between Admission Laboratory Values, Early Abdominal Computed Tomography, and Severe Complications of Gallstone Pancreatitis. *Am J Surg* 2000;**180**:556—60.
111. **Papachristou GI,** Papachristou DJ, Avula H, *et al*. Obesity increases the severity of acute pancreatitis: performance of APACHE-O score and correlation with the inflammatory response. *Pancreatology* 2006;**6**:279—85.
112. **Spitzer AL,** Barcia AM, Schell MT, *et al*. Applying Ockham's razor to pancreatitis prognostication: a four-variable predictive model. *Ann Surg* 2006;**243**:380—8.
113. **van den Biezenbos A,** Kruyt P, Bosscha K, *et al*. Added value of CT criteria compared to the clinical SAP score in patients with acute pancreatitis. *Abdom Imag* 1998;**23**:622—6.
114. **Yeung YP,** Lam BYK, Yip AWC. APACHE system is better than Ranson system in the prediction of severity of acute pancreatitis. *HBPD Int* 2006;**5**:294—9.
115. **Garcea G,** Gouda M, Hebbes C, *et al*. Predictors of severity and survival in acute pancreatitis: validation of the efficacy of early warning scores. *Pancreas* 2008;**37**:e54—61.
116. **Taylor SL,** Morgan DL, Denson KD, *et al*. A comparison of the Ranson, Glasgow, and APACHE II scoring systems to a multiple organ system score in predicting patient outcome in pancreatitis. *Am J Surg* 2005;**189**:219—22.
117. **Ueda T,** Takeyama Y, Yasuda T, *et al*. Simple scoring system for the prediction of the prognosis of severe acute pancreatitis. *Surgery* 2007;**141**:51—8.
118. **Halonen KI,** Leppäniemi AK, Lundin JE, *et al*. Predicting fatal outcome in the early phase of severe acute pancreatitis by using novel prognostic methods. *Pancreatology* 2003;**3**:309—15.
119. **Gan I,** May G, Raboud J, *et al*. Pancreatitis in HIV infection: predictors of severity. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2003;**98**:1278—83.
120. **Bont J,** Hak E, Hoes AW, *et al*. Predicting death in elderly patients with community-acquired pneumonia: a prospective validation study reevaluating the CRB-65 severity assessment tool. *Arch Intern Med* 2008;**168**:1465—8.
121. **Carusone SBC,** Walter SD, Brazil K, *et al*. Infections in nursing home residents: predictors of hospitalization and mortality. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007;**55**:414—19.
122. **Bauer T,** Ewig S, Marre R, *et al*. CRB-65 predicts death from community-acquired pneumonia. *J Intern Med* 2006;**260**:93—101.
123. **Kruger S,** Papassotiriou J, Marre R, *et al*. Pro-atrial natriuretic peptide and pro-vasopressin to predict severity and prognosis in community-acquired pneumonia: results from the German competence network CAPNETZ. *Intens Care Med* 2007;**33**:2069—78.
124. **Phua J,** See K, Chan Y, *et al*. Validation and clinical implications of the IDSA/ATS minor criteria for severe community-acquired pneumonia. *Thorax* 2009;**64**:598—603.
125. **Schuetz P,** Stolz D, Mueller B, *et al*. Endothelin-1 precursor peptides correlate with severity of disease and outcome in patients with community acquired pneumonia. *BMC Infect Dis* 2008;**8**:22.
126. **Pilotto A,** Addante F, Ferrucci L, *et al*. The multidimensional prognostic index predicts short- and long-term mortality in hospitalized geriatric patients with pneumonia. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2009;**64A**:880—7.
127. **Yandiola PPE,** Capelastegui A, Quintana J, *et al*. Prospective comparison of severity scores for predicting clinically relevant outcomes for patients hospitalized with community-acquired pneumonia. *Chest* 2009;**135**:1572—9.
128. **Parsonage M,** Nathwani D, Davey P, *et al*. Evaluation of the performance of CURB-65 with increasing age. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2009;**15**:858—64.
129. **Barlow G,** Nathwani D, Davey P. The CURB65 pneumonia severity score outperforms generic sepsis and early warning scores in predicting mortality in community-acquired pneumonia. *Thorax* 2007;**62**:253—9.
130. **Chalmers J,** Singanayagam A, Murray M, *et al*. Risk factors for complicated parapneumonic effusion and empyema on presentation to hospital with community-acquired pneumonia. *Thorax* 2009;**64**:592—7.

131. **Charles PG,** Wolfe R, Whitby M, *et al*. SMART-COP: a tool for predicting the need for intensive respiratory or vasopressor support in community-acquired pneumonia. *Clin Infect Dis* 2008;**47**:375—84.
132. **Ewig S,** de Roux A, Bauer T, *et al*. Validation of predictive rules and indices of severity for community acquired pneumonia. *Thorax* 2004;**59**:421—7.
133. **Lim W,** van der Eerden M, Laing R, *et al*. Defining community acquired pneumonia severity on presentation to hospital: an international derivation and validation study. *Thorax* 2003;**58**:377—82.
134. **Man SY,** Lee N, Ip M, *et al*. Prospective comparison of three predictive rules for assessing severity of community-acquired pneumonia in Hong Kong. *Thorax* 2007;**62**:348—53.
135. **Flanders WD,** Tucker G, Krishnadasan A, *et al*. Validation of the pneumonia severity index: importance of study-specific recalibration. *J Gen Intern Med* 1999;**14**:333—40.
136. **Garau J,** Baquero F, Perez-Trallero E, *et al*. Factors impacting on length of stay and mortality of community-acquired pneumonia. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2008;**14**:322—9.
137. **Menendez R,** Martinez R, Reyes S, *et al*. Biomarkers improve mortality prediction by prognostic scales in community-acquired pneumonia. *Thorax* 2009;**64**:587—91.
138. **Renaud B,** Labarère J, Coma E, *et al*. Risk stratification of early admission to the intensive care unit of patients with no major criteria of severe community-acquired pneumonia: development of an international prediction rule. *Critical Care* 2009;**13**:R54.
139. **Kontou P,** Kuti JL, Nicolau DP. Validation of the infectious diseases society of America/American Thoracic Society criteria to predict severe community-acquired pneumonia caused by Streptococcus pneumoniae. *Am J Emerg Med* 2009;**27**:968—74.
140. **Angus DC,** Marrie TJ, Obrosky DS, *et al*. Severe community-acquired pneumonia use of intensive care services and evaluation of American and British Thoracic Society diagnostic criteria. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2002;**166**:717—23.
141. **Challen K,** Bright J, Bentley A, *et al*. Physiological-social score (PMEWS) vs. CURB-65 to triage pandemic influenza: a comparative validation study using community-acquired pneumonia as a proxy. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2007;**7**:33.
142. **Loh L-C,** Khoo S-K, Quah S-Y, *et al*. Adult community-acquired pneumonia in Malaysia: prediction of mortality from severity assessment on admission. *Respirology* 2004;**9**:379—86.
143. **Mody L,** Sun R, Bradley S. Community-acquired pneumonia in older veterans: does the pneumonia prognosis index help? *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2002;**50**:434—8.
144. **Zuberi F,** Khan J. Prospective comparison of prediction rules of mortality risk for CAP in a developing country. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis* 2008;**12**:447—52.
145. **Schaaf B,** Kruse J, Rupp J, *et al*. Sepsis severity predicts outcome in community-acquired pneumococcal pneumonia. *Eur Respir J* 2007;**30**:517—24.
146. **Kollef KE,** Reichley RM, Micek ST, *et al*. The Modified APACHE II score outperforms Curb65 pneumonia severity score as a predictor of 30-day mortality in patients with methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus pneumonia. *Chest* 2008;**133**:363—9.
147. **Valencia M,** Badia JR, Cavalcanti M, *et al*. Pneumonia severity index class v patients with community-acquired pneumonia: characteristics, outcomes, and value of severity scores. *Chest* 2007;**132**:515—22.
148. **Sanders KM,** Marras TK, Chan CK. Pneumonia severity index in the immunocompromised. *Can Respir J* 2006;**13**:89—93.
149. **Davies J,** Eddleston M, Buckley N. Predicting outcome in acute organophosphorus poisoning with a poison severity score or the Glasgow coma scale. *Q J Med* 2008;**101**:371—9.
150. **Eizadi-Mood N,** Saghaei M, Jabalameli M. Predicting outcomes in organophosphate poisoning based on APACHE II and modified APACHE II scores. *Hum Exp Toxicol* 2007;**26**:573—8.
151. **Aujesky D,** Obrosky DS, Stone RA, *et al*. A prediction rule to identify low-risk patients with pulmonary embolism. *Arch Intern Med* 2006;**166**:169—75.
152. **Palmieri V,** Gallotta G, Rendina D, *et al*. Troponin I and right ventricular dysfunction for risk assessment in patients with nonmassive pulmonary embolism in the Emergency Department in combination with clinically based risk score. *Intern Emerg Med* 2008;**3**:131—8.
153. **Choi W-H,** Kwon SU, Jwa YJ, *et al*. The Pulmonary Embolism Severity Index in Predicting the Prognosis of Patients With Pulmonary Embolism. *Kor J Intern Med* 2009;**24**:123—7.
154. **Shapiro NI,** Wolfe RE, Moore RB, *et al*. Mortality in emergency department sepsis (MEDS) score: a prospectively derived and validated clinical prediction rule. *Crit Care Med* 2003;**31**:670—5.
155. **Howell MD,** Donnino M, Talmor D, *et al*. Performance of severity of illness scoring systems in Emergency Department patients with infection. *Acad Emerg Med* 2007;**14**:709—14.
156. **Sankoff JD,** Goyal M, Gaieski DF, *et al*. Validation of the mortality in emergency department sepsis (MEDS) score in patients with the systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS). *Crit Care Med* 2008;**36**:421—6.
157. **Kofoed K,** Eugen-Olsen J, Petersen J, *et al*. Predicting mortality in patients with systemic inflammatory response syndrome: an evaluation of two prognostic models, two soluble receptors, and a macrophage migration inhibitory factor. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2008;**27**:375—83.
158. **Vorwerk C,** Loryman B, Coats T, *et al*. Prediction of mortality in adult emergency department patients with sepsis. *Emerg Med J* 2009;**26**:254—8.
159. **Lee C-C,** Chen S-Y, Tsai C-L, *et al*. Prognostic value of mortality in emergency department sepsis score, procalcitonin, and C-reactive protein in patients with sepsis at the emergency department. *Shock* 2008;**29**:322—7.
160. **Jones AE,** Saak K, Kline JA. Performance of the Mortality in emergency department sepsis score for predicting hospital mortality among patients with severe sepsis and septic shock. *Am J Emerg Med* 2008;**26**:689—92.
161. **Chu VH,** Cabell CH, Benjamin DK, *et al*. Early Predictors of in-hospital death in infective endocarditis. *Circulation* 2004;**109**:1745—9.
162. **Yilmazlar T,** Ozturk E, Alsoy A, *et al*. Necrotizing soft tissue infections: Apache II score, dissemination, and survival. *World J Surg* 2007;**31**:1858—62.
163. **Hsieh C-B,** Tzao C, Yu C-Y, *et al*. APACHE II score and primary liver cancer history had risk of hospital mortality in patients with pyogenic liver abscess. *Digest Liver Dis* 2006;**38**:498—502.
164. **Chen S-C,** Huang C-C, Tsai S-J, *et al*. Severity of disease as main predictor for mortality in patients with pyogenic liver abscess. *Am J Surg* 2009;**198**:164—72.
165. **Nguyen HB,** Banta JE, Cho TW, *et al*. Mortality predictions using current physiological scoring systems in patients meeting criteria for early goal-directed therapy and the severe sepsis resuscitation bundle. *Shock* 2008;**30**:23—8.
166. **Chen C-C,** Chong C-F, Liu Y-L, *et al*. Risk stratification of severe sepsis patients in the emergency department. *Emerg Med J* 2006;**23**:281—5.
167. **Stawicki SP,** Brooks A, Bilski T, *et al*. The concept of damage control: extending the paradigm to emergency general surgery. *Injury* 2008;**39**:93—101.
168. **Neary W,** Prytherch D, Foy C, *et al*. Comparison of different methods of risk stratification in urgent and emergency surgery. *Br J Surg* 2007;**94**:1300—5.
169. **Egberts J-H,** Summa B, Schulz U, *et al*. Impact of preoperative physiological risk profile on postoperative morbidity and mortality after emergency operation of complicated peptic ulcer disease. *World J Surg* 2007;**31**:1449—57.
170. **Ertan T,** Yoldas O, Kýlýç YA, *et al*. External validation of prognostic models among cancer patients undergoing emergency colorectal surgery. *Am J Surg* 2008;**195**:439—41.
171. **Poon JT,** Chan B, Law WL. Evaluation of P-POSSUM in Surgery for Obstructing Colorectal Cancer and Correlation of the Predicted Mortality With Different Surgical Options. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2005;**48**:493—8.
172. **Horiuchi A,** Watanabe Y, Doi T, *et al*. Evaluation of prognostic factors and scoring system in colonic perforation. *World J Gastroenterol* 2007;**13**:3228—31.
173. **Anwar MA,** D'Souza F, Coulter R, *et al*. Outcome of acutely perforated colorectal cancers: experience of a single district general hospital. *Surg Oncol* 2006;**15**:91—6.
174. **Oomen J,** Engel A, Cuesta M. Mortality after acute surgery for complications of diverticular disease of the sigmoid colon is almost exclusively due to patient related factors. *Colorectal Dis* 2006;**8**:112—19.
175. **Mäkelä JT,** Kiviniemi H, Laitinen S. Prognostic factors of perforated sigmoid diverticulitis in the elderly. *Digest Surg* 2005;**22**:100—6.
176. **Notash AY,** Salimi J, Rahimian H, *et al*. Evaluation of Mannheim peritonitis index and multiple organ failure score in patients with peritonitis. *Indian J Gastroenterol* 2005;**24**:197—200.
177. **Kulkarni SV,** Naik AS, Subramanian N. APACHE-II scoring system in perforative peritonitis. *Am J Surg* 2007;**194**:549—52.
178. **Biondo S,** Ramos E, Fraccalvieri D, *et al*. Comparative study of left colonic Peritonitis Severity Score and Mannheim Peritonitis Index. *Br J Surg* 2006;**93**:616—22.
179. **Cosgriff TM,** Kelly A-M, Kerr D. External validation of the San Francisco Syncope Rule in the Australian context. *Can J Emerg Med* 2007;**9**:157—61.
180. **Del Rosso A,** Ungar A, Maggi R, *et al*. Clinical predictors of cardiac syncope at initial evaluation in patients referred urgently to a general hospital: the EGSYS score. *Heart* 2008;**94**:1620—6.
181. **Hing R,** Harris R. Relative utility of serum troponin and the OESIL score in syncope. *Emerg Med Australas* 2005;**17**:31—8.
182. **Birnbaum A,** Esses D, Bijur P, *et al*. Failure to validate the San Francisco syncope rule in an independent emergency department population. *Ann Emerg Med* 2008;**52**:151—9.
183. **Sun BC,** Mangione CM, Merchant G, *et al*. External validation of the San Francisco syncope rule. *Ann Emerg Med* 2007;**49**:420—7.
184. **Johnston SC,** Rothwell PM, Nguyen-Huynh MN, *et al*. Validation and refinement of scores to predict very early stroke risk after transient ischaemic attack. *Lancet* 2007;**369**:283—92.
185. **Bray JE,** Coughlan K, Bladin C. Can the ABCD Score be dichotomised to identify high-risk patients with transient ischaemic attack in the emergency department? *Emerg Med J* 2007;**24**:92—5.
186. **Sciolla R,** Melis F. Rapid Identification of High-Risk Transient Ischemic Attacks Prospective Validation of the ABCD Score. *Stroke* 2008;**39**:297—302.
187. **Ay H,** Arsava EM, Johnston SC, *et al*. Clinical- and imaging-based prediction of stroke risk after transient ischemic attack: the CIP model. *Stroke* 2009;**40**:181—6.
188. **Tsivgoulis G,** Spengos K, Manta P, *et al*. Validation of the ABCD score in identifying individuals at high early risk of stroke after a transient ischemic attack. *Stroke* 2007;**37**:2892—7.
189. **Goodacre S,** Turner J, Nicholl J. Prediction of mortality among emergency medical admissions. *Emerg Med J* 2006;**23**:372—5.
190. **van der Wulp I,** Schrijvers A, van Stel H. Predicting admission and mortality with the Emergency Severity Index and the Manchester Triage System: a retrospective observational study. *Emerg Med J* 2009;**26**:506—9.

191. **Baumann MR,** Strout TD. Triage of geriatric patients in the emergency department: validity and survival with the emergency severity index. *Ann Emerg Med* 2007;**49**:234—40.
192. **Olsson T,** Lind L. Comparison of the rapid emergency medicine score and APACHE II in nonsurgical Emergency Department patients. *Acad Emerg Med* 2003;**10**:1040—8.
193. **Olsson T,** Terent A, Lind L. Rapid Emergency Medicine score: a new prognostic tool for in-hospital mortality in nonsurgical emergency department patients. *J Intern Med* 2004;**255**:579—87.
194. **Masaoka T,** Suzuki H, Hori S, *et al*. Blatchford scoring system is a useful scoring system for detecting patients with upper gastrointestinal bleeding who do not need endoscopic intervention. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2007;**22**:1404—8.
195. **Romagnuolo J,** Barkun AN, Enns R, *et al*. simple clinical predictors may obviate urgent endoscopy in selected patients with nonvariceal upper gastrointestinal tract bleeding. *Arch Intern Med* 2007;**167**:265—70.
196. **Cosentini R,** Folli C, Cazzaniga M, *et al*. Usefulness of simplified acute physiology score II in predicting mortality in patients admitted to an emergency medicine ward. *Intern Emerg Med* 2009;**4**:241—7.
197. **Duckitt R,** Buxton-Thomas R, Walker J, *et al*. Worthing physiological scoring system: derivation and validation of a physiological early-warning system for medical admissions. An observational, population-based single-centre study. *Br J Anaesth* 2007;**98**:769—74.
198. **Kellett J,** Deane B. The Simple Clinical Score predicts mortality for 30 days after admission to an acute medical unit. *Q J Med* 2006;**99**:771—81.
199. **Kellett J,** Deane B, Gleeson M. Derivation and validation of a score based on Hypotension, Oxygen saturation, low Temperature, ECG changes and Loss of independence (HOTEL) that predicts early mortality between 15 min and 24 h after admission to an acute medical unit. *Resuscitation* 2008;**78**:52—8.
200. **Paterson R,** MacLeod D, Thetford D, *et al*. Prediction of in-hospital mortality and length of stay using an early warning scoring system: clinical audit. *Clin Med* 2006;**6**:281—4.
201. **Cooke MW,** Jinks S. Does the Manchester triage system detect the critically ill? *J Accid Emerg Med* 1999;**16**:179—81.
202. **Rodriguez RM,** Wang NE, Pearl RG. Prediction of poor outcome of intensive care unit patients admitted from the emergency department. *Crit Care Med* 1997;**25**:1801—6.
203. **Jones AE,** Fitch MT, Kline JA. Operational performance of validated physiologic scoring systems for predicting in-hospital mortality among critically ill emergency department patients. *Crit Care Med* 2005;**33**:974—8.
204. **Alemi F,** Rice J, Hankins R. Predicting in-hospital survival of myocardial infarction: a comparative study of various severity measures. *Med Care* 1990;**28**:762—75.
205. **Gale C,** Manda S, Weston C, *et al*. Evaluation of risk scores for risk stratification of acute coronary syndromes in the Myocardial Infarction National Audit Project (MINAP) database. *Heart* 2009;**95**:221—7.
206. **Durairaj L,** Reilly B, Das K, *et al*. Emergency department admissions to inpatient cardiac telemetry beds: a prospective cohort study of risk stratification and outcomes. *Am J Med* 2001;**110**:7—11.
207. **Hollander JE,** Sites FD, Pollack CV, *et al*. Lack of utility of telemetry monitoring for identification of cardiac death and life-threatening ventricular dysrhythmias in low-risk patients with chest pain. *Ann Emerg Med* 2004;**43**:71—6.
208. **Williams B,** Wright R, Murphy J, *et al*. A new simplified immediate prognostic risk score for patients with acute myocardial infarction. *Emerg Med J* 2006;**23**:186—92.
209. **Normand S-LT,** Glickman ME, Sharma R, *et al*. Using admission characteristics to predict short-term mortality from myocardial infarction in elderly patients: results from the cooperative cardiovascular project. *JAMA* 1996;**275**:1322—8.
210. **Christiansen JP,** Liang C-s. Reappraisal of the Norris Score and the prognostic value of left ventricular ejection fraction measurement for in-hospital mortality after acute myocardial infarction. *Am J Cardiol* 1999;**83**:589—91.
211. **Das R,** Dorsch M, Lawrance R, *et al*. External validation, extension and recalibration of Braunwald's simple risk index in a community-based cohort of patients with both STEMI and NSTEMI. *Int J Cardiol* 2006;**107**:327—32.
212. **Bradshaw PJ,** Ko DT, Newman AM, *et al*. Validation of the Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction (TIMI) risk index for predicting early mortality in a population-based cohort of STEMI and non-STEMI patients. *Can J Cardiol* 2007;**23**:51—6.
213. **Gralnek IM,** Dulai GS. Incremental value of upper endoscopy for triage of patients with acute non-variceal upper-GI hemorrhage. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2004;**60**:9—14.
214. **Buising KL,** Thursky KA, Black JF, *et al*. Reconsidering what is meant by severe pneumonia: a prospective comparison of severity scores for community acquired pneumonia. *Thorax* 2006;**61**:419—24.
215. **Feldman C,** Alanee S, Yu V, *et al*. Severity of illness scoring systems in patients with bacteraemic pneumococcal pneumonia: implications for the intensive care unit care. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2009;**15**:850—7.
216. **Buising KL,** Thursky KA, Black JF, *et al*. Identifying severe community-acquired pneumonia in the emergency department: a simple clinical prediction tool. *Emerg Med Australas* 2007;**19**:418—26.
217. **Capelastegui A,** Espana P, Quintana J, *et al*. Validation of a predictive rule for the management of community-acquired pneumonia. *Eur Respir J* 2006;**27**:151—7.
218. **Aujesky D,** Auble TE, Yealy DM, *et al*. Prospective comparison of three validated prediction rules for prognosis in community-acquired pneumonia. *Am J Med* 2005;**118**:384—92.
219. **España PP,** Capelastegui A, Gorordo I, *et al*. Development and Validation of a Clinical Prediction Rule for Severe Community-acquired Pneumonia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2006;**174**:1249—56.
220. **Chalmers JD,** Singanayagam A, Scally C, *et al*. Admission D-dimer can identify low-risk patients with community-acquired pneumonia. *Ann Emerg Med* 2009;**53**:633—8.
221. **Huang DT,** Weissfeld LA, Kellum JA, *et al*. Risk prediction with procalcitonin and clinical rules in community-acquired pneumonia. *Ann Emerg Med* 2008;**52**:48—58.
222. **Huang DT,** Angus DC, Kellum JA, *et al*. Midregional proadrenomedullin as a prognostic tool in community-acquired pneumonia. *Chest* 2009;**136**:823—31.
223. **Querol-Ribelles JM,** Tenias JM, Grau E, *et al*. Plasma d-Dimer levels correlate with outcomes in patients with community-acquired pneumonia. *Chest* 2004;**126**:1087—92.
224. **Man SY,** Chan KM, Wong FY, *et al*. Evaluation of the performance of a modified Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE II) scoring system for critically ill patients in emergency departments in Hong Kong. *Resuscitation* 2007;**74**:259—65.
225. **Cattermole GN,** Mak SP, Liow CE, *et al*. Derivation of a prognostic score for identifying critically ill patients in an emergency department resuscitation room. *Resuscitation* 2009;**80**:1000—5.
226. **Ohman EM,** Granger CB, Harrington RA, *et al*. Risk stratification and therapeutic decision making in acute coronary syndromes. *JAMA* 2000;**284**:876—8.
227. **Gao H,** McDonnell A, Harrison DA, *et al*. Systematic review and evaluation of physiological track and trigger warning systems for identifying at-risk patients on the ward. *Intens Care Med* 2007;**33**:667—9.
228. **Smith GB,** Prytherch DR, Schmidt PE, *et al*. A review, and performance evaluation, of single-parameter "track and trigger" systems. *Resuscitation* 2008;**79**:11—21.
229. **Smith GB,** Prytherch DR, Schmidt PE, *et al*. Review and performance evaluation of aggregate weighted 'track and trigger' systems. *Resuscitation* 2008;**77**:170—9.