Saudi Journal of Medicine and Public Health

https://saudijmph.com/index.php/pub

https://doi.org/10.64483/202522356

Emergency Preparedness in Healthcare Systems: A Health Security Framework for Risk Assessment, Resilience, and Continuity of Operations

Turki Muqbil Marzouq Alotaibi [(1)] , Rawan Mohammed Ali Al-Qahtani [(1)] , Bashayr Thear Mesfer Alqahtani [(1)] , Tahani Hadi Yahya Aati [(1)] , Naif Abdulaziz Hathal Aldawsari [(1)] , Muneerah Saleh Sulman Alshunaifi [(1)] , Thamer Mohsen Mohammed Aldajani [(1)] , Sarah Mohammed Nasser Alshuhail [(1)] , Mashail Ibrahim Jaza AlQahtani [(1)] , Mohammed Ayad Nasir Alqahtani [(1)] , Khawlah Mohammed Judayba [(2)] , Taghred Ayad Alshalwi [(3)] , Reem Sunaytan Alotaibi [(2)] , Manal Saud Alharbi [(4)]

(1) Durma Hospital,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(2) Al Sahafah Primary Health Care, Riyadh,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(3) King Fahad Medical City,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(4) Al Manar Primary Health Care, Riyadh,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Background: Healthcare systems face increasing threats from natural and man-made disasters, requiring robust emergency preparedness frameworks to ensure continuity of operations and protect public health.

Aim: This study aims to develop a comprehensive health security framework for risk assessment, resilience, and continuity of operations, with a focus on pediatric emergency readiness and interprofessional interventions.

Methods: A narrative review approach was employed, synthesizing disaster management literature, international guidelines, and evidence-based frameworks such as SMAUG for risk prioritization. The analysis included disaster typologies, operational classifications, and preparedness strategies across healthcare systems.

Results: Findings highlight that preparedness is a dynamic, systems-based process requiring clear terminology, hazard classification, and adaptive planning. Pediatric emergency readiness emerged as a critical determinant of clinical outcomes, with significant gaps identified in general emergency departments. Interprofessional collaboration, technology integration, and continuous training were found essential for operational resilience. Frameworks like SMAUG support transparent prioritization, while drills and exercises ensure practical capability.

Conclusion: Emergency preparedness in healthcare must integrate risk assessment, pediatric readiness, and interprofessional coordination into continuous planning cycles. Leadership commitment, interoperability, and sustained training are vital for resilience. Benchmarking against international standards can transform preparedness from aspirational to operational, reducing morbidity and mortality during crises.

Keywords: Emergency preparedness, health security, disaster management, pediatric readiness, interprofessional collaboration, SMAUG model, resilience.

Introduction

Emergency preparedness refers to an organized and continuous process through which institutions and communities anticipate hazardous events, evaluate their potential consequences, and develop the capabilities needed to reduce harm, sustain essential functions, and restore operations after disruption. In the context of health security, preparedness is not limited to having emergency supplies or written protocols; it is a systems-based approach that integrates risk assessment, strategic resource allocation, workforce readiness, and interprofessional coordination to protect human life and preserve critical services during crises. A central premise of modern preparedness is that disasters are not defined solely by the presence of a hazard, but by the interaction between hazardous events and the conditions that shape exposure, vulnerability, and response capacity. In this respect, the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction characterizes a disaster as a serious disruption of community functioning at any scale, produced when hazardous events intersect with exposure, vulnerability, and capacity, leading to human, material, economic, or environmental losses and impacts (Source: United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, 2017). This framing is especially relevant for healthcare systems because the same hazard may produce markedly different outcomes depending on infrastructure resilience, staffing levels, coordination mechanisms, and the availability of surge resources. Although the terms “disaster” and “emergency” are frequently used interchangeably, they are not always identical in meaning, and the distinction can

*Corresponding author e-mail: Xturkiz77@hotmail.com (Turki Muqbil Marzouq Alotaibi).
Receive Date: 25 November 2025, Revise Date: 20 December 2025, Accept Date: 22 December 2025

influence planning assumptions. The term "disaster" commonly denotes an event that is sudden, severe, and capable of generating immediate threats to population health and safety.[1] This concept emphasizes both the unexpected nature of the event and its capacity to overwhelm routine coping mechanisms, thereby requiring extraordinary measures and external support. By contrast, "emergency" is sometimes used more broadly to describe hazardous events that may be urgent and high-risk but do not necessarily produce the level of disruption that impairs community or societal functioning. This distinction becomes particularly important in biological, technological, and health hazard contexts, where an event may begin as an emergency within a limited scope yet evolve into a disaster as burdens accumulate and systemic strain intensifies. In practical terms, emergency preparedness must accommodate both rapid-onset, high-severity disasters and smaller-scale emergencies, recognizing that both can threaten continuity of care when preparedness is inadequate.

A comprehensive preparedness framework also relies on clear terminology related to the consequences of hazardous events. "Disaster damage" typically refers to the measurable losses that occur during or immediately after a disaster, often expressed in physical or infrastructural terms, such as the area of housing destroyed, the length of road damaged, or the loss of functional capacity in utilities and public systems. Damage may include structural destruction, interruption of essential services, and impairment of livelihoods, which can directly translate into health risks through displacement, compromised sanitation, disrupted access to medications, and delayed emergency response. "Disaster impact," however, is broader and encompasses the overall consequences of a hazardous event across human, economic, and environmental domains. Impact includes direct and indirect effects such as injury and death, psychological trauma, economic losses, and long-term degradation of social well-being, and it may also incorporate potential positive outcomes in limited circumstances, such as localized economic activity associated with reconstruction. Importantly for health security, disaster impact is not limited to physical morbidity and mortality; it extends to mental health outcomes, social cohesion, and the functioning of healthcare delivery systems, including the ability to maintain routine services while simultaneously responding to crisis needs. Classifying disasters into types serves a critical function in preparedness because it enables risk to be assessed with greater precision and allows preparedness measures to be tailored to the hazard profile and operational demands anticipated. Without a clear understanding of disaster categories, emergency planning can become overly generic, leading to response strategies that are not operationally feasible in the conditions that emerge. Disaster typologies provide a structure for aligning training, communication systems, supply management, and incident command procedures with the kinds of events most likely to occur and most likely to overwhelm local capacity. An accurate categorization framework also supports coordination across agencies by establishing shared language, improving interoperability, and reducing confusion during multi-jurisdictional responses [2].

Natural disasters are often understood as ecological disturbances or environmental hazards that exceed the adaptive capacity of affected communities.[2] These events can include wildfires, major floods, hurricanes, and earthquakes, among others.[2] Their health consequences are shaped not only by the immediate physical forces involved but also by secondary effects such as displacement, water contamination, disruption of chronic disease care, interruption of supply chains, and damage to hospitals and transportation infrastructure. In contrast, man-made disasters are attributable directly to human action and may involve armed conflict, severe environmental pollution, large-scale technological failure, and intentional acts such as terrorism or bioterrorism, including events like anthrax release. This category also includes high-impact attacks such as the September 11, 2001 events, which demonstrated how a single incident can create widespread mortality, psychological harm, and prolonged systems disruption (Source: Guha-Sapir; Landesman ed., 2000). From a preparedness standpoint, man-made disasters frequently require additional emphasis on security coordination, law enforcement integration, forensic considerations, and management of public fear and misinformation, which can compound health system strain. Disaster classification can also be approached through the scale of disruption and the level of assistance required. Small-scale disasters may primarily affect a local community, yet still exceed local resources, thereby necessitating external assistance. These events may not be "small" in consequence for the individuals impacted; rather, the designation reflects the geographic scope and the relative capacity needed for stabilization. Large-scale disasters involve broader populations and produce demands that require coordinated regional, national, or international response efforts. This distinction matters for healthcare because surge staffing, field hospitals, supply logistics, and interfacility transfer networks become increasingly necessary as scale expands. Planning for large-scale disasters therefore often incorporates mutual aid agreements, cross-sector coordination, and regional command structures that can reallocate resources rapidly.

Another operationally important classification distinguishes between internal and external disasters as they relate to healthcare facilities. Internal disasters originate within the hospital environment and may include active shooter

incidents, prolonged power outages, cyberattacks that compromise electronic health records, or radiation exposure events.[3] Such incidents threaten clinical operations directly by degrading the facility's ability to deliver care, maintain communications, or protect patients and staff. They also carry the potential to trigger cascading failures, such as medication dispensing disruptions, loss of diagnostic capacity, or compromise of life-sustaining systems. External disasters occur outside the hospital, such as transportation accidents or industrial incidents, and often generate a surge of casualties presenting for care. However, internal and external categories are not mutually exclusive, and they can occur simultaneously. For example, a natural disaster may create mass casualties while also damaging hospital infrastructure and disrupting supply chains, effectively generating both external demand and internal operational degradation. This convergence represents one of the most challenging preparedness scenarios because the facility must respond to increased patient volume while operating under constrained capacity. Preparedness frameworks further differentiate disasters by their temporal pattern and demand curve. Acute disasters are characterized by sudden onset and an immediate surge of patients, often beginning with a wave of low-acuity presentations that rapidly consumes triage capacity and emergency department throughput. These patients may arrive quickly and unpredictably, sometimes by personal transport rather than organized emergency medical services. As the event unfolds, additional patients continue to present, and more critically ill individuals may arrive later via emergency medical services or other prehospital systems, reflecting the time required for extraction, stabilization, and transport. Peak patient volumes frequently occur within a few hours of the precipitating event, often around the 2-to-3-hour mark, creating a time-compressed operational challenge in which staffing, space, supplies, and command coordination must scale quickly. In such scenarios, the effectiveness of surge plans, triage systems, and rapid role assignment can strongly influence morbidity and mortality [1][2].

Evolving disasters, by contrast, progress gradually and impose prolonged demands on healthcare resources and workforce resilience. Infectious disease pandemics such as COVID-19 and Ebola illustrate this pattern: patient volume may rise over weeks, supply shortages may become chronic, staff fatigue and burnout may accumulate, and the healthcare system may be required to sustain altered standards of operation for months. These events stress not only clinical capacity but also logistics, staffing continuity, infection prevention infrastructure, and public communication systems. The operational burden is often amplified by uncertainty, as evolving events may require repeated revision of guidelines, shifting resource allocation priorities, and ongoing coordination with public health authorities. In such contexts, preparedness must include mechanisms for adaptive planning, sustained supply management, workforce protection, and strategies that preserve essential non-disaster healthcare services while responding to the evolving threat. Within these diverse hazard types and temporal patterns, preparedness can be conceptualized as a structured state of readiness developed through comprehensive emergency planning processes.[4] This readiness is achieved through deliberate planning, training, drills, and continuous quality improvement rather than through reactive improvisation. Effective preparedness involves developing clear incident command structures, establishing communication protocols that function under stress, pre-positioning essential supplies, ensuring redundancy for critical systems such as power and information technology, and building relationships with external partners including emergency medical services, public health agencies, and law enforcement. It also requires cultivating an organizational culture in which risk reporting is encouraged, lessons learned from exercises are translated into measurable improvements, and leadership maintains sustained commitment to preparedness rather than episodic attention following high-profile events. Ultimately, emergency preparedness in health security is best understood as the capacity to anticipate hazards, reduce vulnerabilities, manage acute and evolving disruptions, and recover in a manner that restores and strengthens system function. By grounding preparedness in rigorous definitions, distinguishing among disaster types and operational contexts, and embedding readiness into continuous planning processes, healthcare systems can improve their ability to protect patients, staff, and communities under conditions where time, information, and resources are severely constrained.[1][2][3][4]

Issues of Concern

Emergency planning in health security and disaster management is most effective when it is grounded in a disciplined understanding of hazards, an honest appraisal of vulnerabilities, and a realistic anticipation of human behavior under stress. The first and most persistent challenge is that hazards are rarely static: threats evolve, communities change, infrastructure ages, and new technologies introduce novel failure modes. Consequently, accurate characterization of hazards cannot be reduced to a single risk register completed at the beginning of the year. Instead, it requires an iterative process that combines threat intelligence, vulnerability analysis, and appraisal of the likely behavioral responses of staff, patients, and the public. In practical terms, this means that continuous threat assessment should remain active even during a disaster's impact phase,

because unfolding information can rapidly change the operating picture and the most appropriate actions. A plan that is accurate on paper but outdated in practice can be more dangerous than an incomplete plan because it may create a false sense of readiness and push decision-makers toward rigid actions that no longer fit the situation. Within this context, structured prioritization tools help translate complex risk information into operationally meaningful decisions. The SMAUG model is one such framework used to rank and manage disaster-related risks using five criteria: seriousness, manageability, acceptability, urgency, and growth.[5] The utility of SMAUG lies in its capacity to force explicit judgments about what matters most and why, rather than allowing planning teams to treat all hazards as equally pressing. Seriousness addresses the magnitude of consequences, including risk to life, degree of disruption, and potential financial loss. Manageability focuses on whether the organization or community can realistically mitigate or control the hazard through available capabilities, policies, and resources. Acceptability considers how tolerable the consequences are to stakeholders—an especially important dimension in healthcare, where some operational compromises may be clinically unacceptable even if they reduce other risks. Urgency reflects how rapidly decisions and actions must be taken to prevent escalation. Growth estimates whether the likelihood or magnitude of the hazard is expected to increase over time, which is critical for distinguishing between risks that are stable and those that are accelerating. By rating hazards across these dimensions and aggregating results into high, medium, or low categories, the SMAUG approach supports transparent prioritization while preserving the flexibility to revisit decisions as conditions change.[5]

A recurring planning error is to equate speed with effectiveness. Emergency management often rewards rapid action, particularly during the response phase, yet the appropriateness of action frequently has greater consequence than its immediacy. A fast but poorly matched response can amplify harm, consume scarce resources, or create secondary crises that persist beyond the initial event. This is why planning guidance in disaster scholarship has historically emphasized that timeliness alone is insufficient; the central question is whether the response is suitable for the hazard, aligned with operational priorities, and feasible given existing constraints. In this sense, emergency plans should privilege core principles over exhaustive procedural detail. When plans become overly specific, they can inadvertently imply that every function is equally important, diluting attention from truly life-saving priorities. Excessive detail may also create rigidity, encouraging responders to follow steps that no longer fit the evolving situation. Planning guidance therefore cautions that plans must be structured to accommodate the realities of disaster operations, with priorities clearly defined and operational detail deliberately limited to preserve decision space, adaptability, and clarity under pressure. The tension between comprehensiveness and flexibility is particularly pronounced in healthcare environments, where the temptation to create department-by-department micro-procedures is strong. Hospitals are complex systems that require coordinated movement of personnel, supplies, and information across units that may face distinct hazards simultaneously. Yet an overly granular plan can become unworkable in real time, especially when communications are disrupted, staffing is reduced, and leaders must make rapid trade-offs between competing clinical demands. A robust planning process therefore establishes a small number of dominant priorities—protect life, sustain critical functions, preserve continuity of essential services, and enable recovery—then outlines adaptable operational strategies for how those priorities will be pursued. In doing so, the plan becomes a guide for decision-making rather than a script that responders must follow irrespective of context [5].

Another major issue of concern is that no single organization can manage complex disasters alone. Emergency planning must incorporate interorganizational coordination across emergency managers, law enforcement, healthcare systems, public health agencies, military resources where applicable, and other stakeholders whose capabilities are essential for diverse threat environments. Coordination is not an abstract ideal; it is the practical mechanism through which scarce resources are mobilized, information is shared, and conflicting operational objectives are reconciled. The rationale for this coordination is that, although disaster agents differ, many hazards generate similar response demands. For example, both natural disasters and certain man-made incidents can require mass casualty triage, security management, evacuation logistics, shelter operations, and supply chain stabilization. Because response functions are often common across hazards, personnel, procedures, facilities, and equipment can be shared or re-purposed across different disaster types, improving efficiency and reducing duplication. Effective planning therefore emphasizes interoperability: the ability of organizations to work together using compatible communications, shared terminology, aligned command structures, and pre-negotiated agreements on mutual aid and resource sharing. Training is inseparable from planning because preparedness is not achieved through documentation but through practiced capability. Plans that have not been trained and exercised function largely as administrative artifacts rather than operational tools. Training also extends beyond direct responders; it includes the government agencies and institutional leaders responsible for funding, evaluating, and overseeing

emergency management programs. This broader inclusion matters because financial decisions, procurement rules, staffing approvals, and policy constraints can determine whether the operational plan can actually be executed. When planning is disconnected from governance and resource allocation, the result is often an aspirational framework that cannot be implemented under real conditions. Conversely, when leaders understand the operational logic of the plan through participation in exercises and reviews, they are more likely to fund the critical capabilities that make readiness real [5].

Testing is therefore a defining requirement of an effective planning process. Drills and exercises provide integrated assessments of preparedness because they simultaneously evaluate the plan itself, staffing adequacy, training effectiveness, procedures, facility readiness, equipment functionality, and material availability. A drill can reveal whether communication systems fail when overloaded, whether unit leaders understand their roles, whether evacuation routes are realistic, and whether critical supplies are located where they can be accessed rapidly. It can also surface the behavioral realities of crisis response—hesitation, confusion, role overlap, and the tendency for people to seek confirmation rather than act—allowing those vulnerabilities to be addressed before an actual incident. Importantly, emergency planning is dynamic and continuous; the purpose of exercising is not merely to "pass" a test, but to incorporate change across all components of the emergency management system. New threats, staff turnover, facility renovations, evolving regulations, and lessons learned from real incidents should continuously reshape the plan. In this view, preparedness is not a static achievement but an evolving organizational competency. Planning rarely occurs in a neutral environment. It often unfolds amid institutional resistance, competing priorities, and conflict about costs, workload, and perceived probability of hazards. Regulatory or legislative mandates may encourage planning but are frequently insufficient to overcome barriers such as budget constraints, cultural complacency, or disagreement among stakeholders. For this reason, successful initiation and sustainability of planning efforts depend on sustained advocacy and strong leadership.[6] Leadership is required not only to approve policies but also to legitimize the time required for training, to reinforce reporting cultures, and to address the political friction that can arise when preparedness initiatives challenge existing routines. Without leadership support, planning may remain fragmented, underfunded, or performative, leaving the organization vulnerable despite nominal compliance.

A related issue of concern is the frequent conflation of planning with management. Planning and management are distinct functions: planning establishes frameworks, roles, priorities, and operational options, while management executes decisions under real constraints and adapts to unfolding conditions. The ultimate validity of a plan is demonstrated not by how well it reads, but by how it performs during a real emergency. This is why disaster scholarship has emphasized that the true test of a plan is its operational performance, including its ability to support coordination, prioritize actions, and remain flexible under stress. In practical terms, planning as a core element of preparedness requires systematic identification of hazards, evaluation of potential impacts, and delineation of geographic or functional areas at risk. These steps ensure that the plan is anchored in the actual environment the facility serves, rather than generic assumptions borrowed from other contexts. The response phase presents its own set of concerns because it is the point at which plans are activated to address immediate needs. Response activities occur at multiple levels—facility, regional, and national—and they must prioritize basic humanitarian requirements and the minimization of loss of life. The nature of the disaster largely determines the medical care delivered, including the balance between trauma care, infectious disease control, mental health stabilization, and continuity of chronic disease management. The critical point is that local resources may quickly become overwhelmed, at which stage coordination between individual facilities and regional systems becomes essential.[7] In healthcare, this coordination may involve patient redistribution, activation of surge beds, resource sharing agreements, and standardized triage protocols to ensure that scarce critical care capacity is used where it will have the greatest benefit. Without regional coordination, facilities may operate in isolation, leading to preventable bottlenecks and inequitable distribution of burdens [6][7].

In the United States, the National Response Framework provides an organizing structure for multi-level disaster response, clarifying roles and responsibilities at local, state, and federal levels to facilitate coordinated action. Within this kind of structured response environment, two primary strategies frequently guide facility-level decisions: shelter-in-place and evacuation. Shelter-in-place involves establishing a secure location within the facility and remaining there until conditions are judged safe. This strategy is not passive; it typically requires active internal organization, including protection of vulnerable populations, continuity of essential clinical functions, and provision of care to injured individuals using resources immediately available. Evacuation, in contrast, involves relocating individuals from the affected facility or region, a process that may require transferring equipment and supplies depending on the circumstances, the duration of displacement, and the feasibility of maintaining care standards elsewhere. The

appropriate strategy is hazard-dependent: some incidents make evacuation life-saving, while others make evacuation more dangerous than remaining sheltered due to external threats, infrastructure collapse, or hazardous exposures. The transition from response to salvage and recovery introduces further concerns because it begins only after the immediate threat to human life has been controlled and the initial response has stabilized. Recovery is often mistakenly treated as a simple "return to normal," yet in complex disasters it is a prolonged process requiring sustained governance, financing, workforce support, infrastructure repair, and attention to psychological and community impacts. The recovery phase focuses on restoring the affected facility or area to normal operations as rapidly as possible, but "rapidly" is not always feasible, especially when infrastructure systems such as power grids, water supply, transportation routes, or digital networks have been damaged. In healthcare, recovery also includes restoring elective services, rebuilding supply chains, reconstituting staffing, and addressing deferred care burdens that accumulated during the response phase. These operational recovery tasks intersect with the human recovery needs of staff and patients, including grief, trauma, burnout, and moral injury. In extreme circumstances—such as prolonged armed conflict or widespread epidemics—salvage and recovery may be severely hindered, resulting in delays that can extend for years. This possibility has direct implications for emergency planning because preparedness must account not only for immediate response tactics but also for resilience strategies that sustain essential operations over long durations. During prolonged crises, the concept of recovery can shift from "restoration" to "adaptation," where organizations establish new modes of functioning that are sustainable under chronic constraints. This may include reconfiguring service lines, adjusting staffing models, decentralizing care delivery, and building redundancy into critical systems to prevent repeated collapse when new shocks occur. Recovery planning therefore must be integrated into the emergency management lifecycle rather than treated as an afterthought, because the ability to recover determines the long-term health outcomes of affected populations and the stability of the healthcare system itself [5][6][7].

Taken together, the issues of concern in emergency planning reflect a core truth: preparedness is a continuous, interorganizational, and evidence-informed process that depends on prioritization, leadership, training, and adaptability. Frameworks like SMAUG support transparent risk ranking and help organizations avoid treating all threats as equal.[5] Effective planning prioritizes appropriate action over merely fast action, builds flexibility into operational guidance, and integrates the full ecosystem of stakeholders needed for response. The system must be tested through drills that reveal real-world weaknesses and drive continuous improvement. Planning must also be sustained despite institutional resistance, requiring strong leadership and ongoing advocacy to ensure that preparedness remains resourced and operational.[6] Finally, response and recovery must be understood as connected phases: response activates the plan to meet immediate needs, while recovery restores—and ideally strengthens—system function, recognizing that some crises can delay full recovery for extended periods.[7]

Clinical Significance

Pediatric Emergency Readiness

Pediatric emergency readiness is a defining determinant of clinical outcomes for children who present with acute illness, injury, or disaster-related needs, yet it remains unevenly distributed across healthcare systems. Unlike adults, children require care that is tailored not only to their smaller size but also to their developmental physiology, disease patterns, and psychosocial needs. This reality becomes particularly consequential in general emergency departments, which constitute the most common point of entry for urgent care in many regions but may not consistently possess pediatric-specific expertise, equipment, and operational policies. In health security terms, pediatric readiness is not a niche competency; it is an essential element of system resilience because disasters, epidemics, and mass casualty incidents routinely involve children, and poor pediatric preparedness can translate directly into preventable morbidity and mortality. Optimal pediatric emergency care requires an integrated readiness model that includes appropriately trained staff, pediatric-sized and pediatric-calibrated equipment, and standardized policies and protocols that reflect current best practices. These requirements encompass clinical domains such as airway management, vascular access, medication dosing, resuscitation algorithms, sedation safety, trauma stabilization, and recognition of time-sensitive conditions unique to pediatrics. In addition, pediatric readiness includes operational features such as triage pathways, rapid consultation access, transfer protocols to higher levels of pediatric care, and a quality improvement infrastructure capable of identifying and correcting gaps over time. However, many general emergency departments lack sufficient pediatric capability and experience, particularly in environments where pediatric critical illness is relatively infrequent and where staff primarily maintain competence through adult-focused caseloads. In such circumstances, even well-intentioned teams may struggle to execute pediatric resuscitation, deliver accurate weight-based medication dosing, or recognize subtle decompensation patterns that are characteristic of pediatric physiology. These vulnerabilities can contribute to substandard care and adverse outcomes, particularly for critically ill and injured children

whose survival depends on accurate early stabilization and timely escalation [7].

Large-scale national assessments have substantiated these concerns. Findings from the National Pediatric Readiness Project revealed substantial variability and significant readiness gaps across general emergency departments, including the absence of designated pediatric emergency care coordinators in many facilities and limited pediatric-focused policies and quality improvement initiatives.[8][9] The presence of pediatric emergency care coordinators—typically a physician and a nurse with designated responsibility—has been emphasized because pediatric readiness requires continuous oversight: ensuring that equipment is available and functional, maintaining pediatric competency through training, updating protocols, and integrating pediatric metrics into quality improvement systems. When such roles are absent, pediatric preparedness becomes diffuse and episodic, often dependent on individual champions rather than institutional commitment. Importantly, these deficiencies are not merely structural concerns; they have been associated with clinically meaningful outcomes, including increased mortality among critically ill and injured children treated in less-prepared emergency departments.[8][9] This association highlights that pediatric readiness is a measurable patient safety issue rather than a theoretical standard. Variation in preparedness across facilities also has equity implications. Children who live closer to well-resourced hospitals or specialized pediatric centers may benefit from higher readiness, while those in rural or underserved areas may present to facilities with fewer pediatric resources and lower pediatric volume. In disasters or large-scale incidents, this readiness gradient can become even more pronounced, as surge conditions strain staffing, supplies, and interfacility transfer capacity. Consequently, pediatric emergency readiness should be evaluated and strengthened not only at the level of individual hospitals but also within regional systems of care, where protocols for redistribution, transfer, and teleconsultation can mitigate disparities [8][9].

To address this variability, established guidelines and audit frameworks have been developed to support pediatric emergency preparedness. The present study—consistent with the approach described—aims to assess the preparedness level of emergency departments within a healthcare cluster using the guidelines of the Royal College of Pediatrics and Child Health and the International Federation for Emergency Medicine as audit benchmarks.[10] The use of recognized benchmarks is clinically significant because it enables facilities to measure readiness systematically rather than relying on subjective impressions. Benchmarking can identify gaps in staffing competencies, equipment availability, medication safety systems, triage processes, and pediatric-specific governance structures. It also supports comparative assessment across sites, allowing leadership to allocate resources strategically and track improvement over time. In health system terms, this approach transforms pediatric preparedness from a conceptual ideal into an operational quality domain with measurable indicators and accountable leadership. Pediatric disaster preparedness requires an all-hazards approach that acknowledges the distinctive physical, psychological, and developmental needs of children. Children are not simply “small adults.” Anatomically, they have smaller airways, proportionally larger heads, and different injury patterns; physiologically, they maintain blood pressure until late stages of shock, making decompensation potentially sudden; and pharmacologically, they require precise weight-based dosing with narrow margins for error. These characteristics demand pediatric-adapted triage and care pathways, particularly in mass casualty scenarios where rapid decisions must be made under resource constraints. Furthermore, children’s developmental stage affects communication, cooperation, and psychological response. A frightened toddler, a school-aged child separated from caregivers, and an adolescent exposed to trauma may present with different behavioral responses and different support needs, requiring clinicians to integrate psychological first aid alongside physical stabilization [9][10].

Pediatric care providers—including pediatricians, pediatric emergency physicians, nurses, and allied health professionals—hold a central role in planning, response, and recovery across both healthcare and community settings. Their expertise is critical in designing pediatric-inclusive disaster plans, ensuring that pediatric supplies and medications are incorporated into caches, and training non-pediatric clinicians who may be called upon to care for children during surge events. Pediatric providers also contribute to public-facing preparedness, helping families develop emergency plans, maintain medication supplies for chronic conditions, and understand how to access care during disruptions. In the immediate response phase, pediatric clinicians are essential for triage support, resuscitation leadership, and guidance on the appropriate thresholds for transfer to pediatric-capable centers. In the recovery phase, they help address longer-term physical rehabilitation needs and manage the psychological sequelae of trauma exposure. Mental health support is an indispensable component of pediatric readiness. Children may manifest disaster-related stress through sleep disturbance, regression, irritability, somatic complaints, or academic decline, and caregivers may experience guilt, anxiety, or post-traumatic symptoms that affect family functioning. Clinicians must be able to recognize these patterns and provide early supportive interventions, including reassurance, routine restoration strategies, and referral pathways

for specialized care when needed. Pediatric readiness also intersects with emerging infectious diseases, which highlight the importance of vigilance, recognition, isolation, and safe management when children present with potentially hazardous infections. Children may serve as key transmission nodes in certain outbreaks, and pediatric settings require rigorous infection prevention controls, appropriate personal protective equipment, and protocols that balance isolation needs with the developmental necessity of caregiver presence and psychological safety. Preparedness is strengthened through pediatric-specific drills that simulate both routine pediatric emergencies and disaster-scale scenarios. Drills expose gaps that may not be evident in daily operations, such as missing equipment sizes, confusion over pediatric medication concentrations, unclear roles during pediatric resuscitation, or inadequate processes for family reunification. Pediatric-inclusive exercises also clarify how adult-focused systems—such as general triage protocols or disaster command structures—must be adapted when pediatric surges occur. This is particularly relevant in incidents involving large numbers of children, such as school bus crashes, mass casualty events in public venues, or community outbreaks that disproportionately affect pediatric populations [0].

Specialized knowledge is also required for nuclear and radiological incidents. In these scenarios, accurate diagnosis, effective treatment, and public reassurance are essential, and children may be more vulnerable to radiation-related harm due to higher tissue sensitivity and longer life expectancy. Providers must be prepared to interpret exposure risk, implement contamination control, and counsel families in ways that reduce panic and support adherence to protective measures. Biological threats, including potential bioterrorism events, may similarly place pediatricians at the forefront of community response, given their role in recognizing unusual clusters of illness and guiding vaccination or prophylaxis strategies. Chemical emergencies require coordinated action among multiple agencies and demand awareness of pediatric-focused decontamination strategies, because children's skin surface area, breathing patterns, and developmental behaviors (such as hand-to-mouth activity) may increase exposure risk. Appropriate protective equipment and decontamination processes must therefore be designed to accommodate children safely and efficiently, rather than relying solely on adult-oriented systems. Finally, pediatric readiness is inseparable from trauma system integration, particularly for penetrating injuries associated with explosives and firearms. Pediatric trauma care requires specialized surgical, anesthetic, and critical care capabilities, and outcomes depend on rapid prehospital identification, appropriate triage, and coordinated transport to pediatric-capable trauma centers. Close integration of emergency medical services and trauma systems is essential to optimize survival and reduce long-term disability in affected children. As emphasized in contemporary disaster medicine perspectives, pediatric clinicians must be prepared not only to treat injuries but also to contribute to system-wide coordination, family-centered communication, and the ethical decision-making required when resources are scarce. In sum, pediatric emergency readiness is clinically significant because it directly influences survival, complications, and long-term recovery for children facing acute illness, injury, or disaster-related harm. Evidence indicates that many general emergency departments have meaningful gaps in pediatric infrastructure, policies, and leadership roles, and that lower readiness is associated with worse outcomes in critically ill and injured children.[8][9] By auditing preparedness against established guidelines, healthcare clusters can identify deficiencies systematically, implement targeted improvement initiatives, and build a resilient all-hazards pediatric readiness program that protects children across both routine emergencies and complex disasters.[10]

Nursing, Health Security Workers, and Interprofessional Team Interventions

Strengthening public health emergency preparedness and crisis response is increasingly recognized as a systems-level responsibility that depends on coordinated action across disciplines, institutions, and sectors. Nursing and allied health professionals occupy an especially consequential position within this landscape because they are embedded in the daily operational fabric of healthcare delivery, maintain close contact with patients and communities, and often serve as the primary workforce sustaining continuity of care during emergencies. However, their impact is maximized only when interventions are designed through an explicitly interprofessional approach that integrates policy development, technological advancement, and community-based initiatives. As emphasized in contemporary public health preparedness scholarship, collaboration among governments, international organizations, healthcare institutions, and communities is essential for establishing crisis response frameworks that are both comprehensive and adaptable. Effective coordination is not an abstract aspiration; it enables timely mobilization of resources, reliable information exchange, and rapid operational intervention under conditions of uncertainty and time pressure. Public–private partnerships further strengthen crisis response by leveraging private sector expertise and resources, particularly in areas such as medical supply distribution, vaccine development, and digital health solutions. In practical terms, nursing and allied health interventions begin long before a crisis occurs. Preparedness is built through standardized policies and protocols that clarify roles, ensure consistent triage pathways, define escalation triggers, and

establish communication practices that function during system stress. Nurses contribute to policy implementation by translating institutional frameworks into unit-level practice, ensuring that staff understand workflows for surge capacity, isolation procedures, evacuation or shelter-in-place operations, and the management of high-risk populations such as children, older adults, and critically ill patients. Allied health professionals—such as respiratory therapists, radiology technologists, laboratory personnel, pharmacists, physiotherapists, paramedics, and health informatics specialists—provide essential technical and operational capability. During crises, respiratory therapists and critical care nurses may be central to ventilator allocation and respiratory surge management; radiology and laboratory teams ensure diagnostic continuity; pharmacists safeguard medication access and dosing integrity; and informatics personnel sustain health information systems, cybersecurity response, and data-driven situational awareness. When these roles are integrated into preparedness planning rather than consulted after the fact, response capacity becomes more coordinated and resilient [10].

Technology is a key enabler of interprofessional response, but only when paired with governance and training. Digital tools—such as electronic health record–based alerts, surge dashboards, telehealth platforms, and logistics tracking systems—can improve real-time awareness and accelerate decision-making. Nursing and allied health staff play a practical role in ensuring these systems are usable under stress, including validating workflows, participating in drills that test communication channels, and identifying failure points before an actual emergency occurs. In the community, nurses and allied health professionals often function as trusted sources of risk communication, translating public health guidance into culturally appropriate messaging and supporting adherence to protective measures. Community-based initiatives may include education on preparedness kits, vaccination campaigns, chronic disease continuity plans, and outreach programs for vulnerable populations. These interventions reduce demand surges by enabling prevention and early management outside the hospital, thereby preserving critical care capacity for those most in need. Interprofessional preparedness also requires coordination across jurisdictional levels and sectors, particularly in countries where emergency response operates through tiered governance. In the United States, national emergency management coordination is overseen by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), which sits within the Department of Homeland Security. Importantly, disaster response is typically initiated locally—by police, fire services, emergency medical services, and facility-based response groups—because local responders arrive first and have immediate situational knowledge. When local capacity is exceeded, responsibility escalates to the state level, and FEMA functions primarily as a support agency rather than a commanding authority. This distinction has operational consequences for healthcare teams: hospitals must be prepared to act autonomously in the early phase of a crisis and to integrate with state and federal support mechanisms as the event expands. For coordination, FEMA organizes the nation and its territories into ten regions, facilitating logistical support, resource allocation, and interagency alignment across a standardized geographic structure [10].

Within this governance environment, nurses and allied health professionals contribute to the operationalization of crisis response through incident command participation, unit-level leadership, and execution of surge strategies. Their interventions can include rapid triage and patient flow redesign, staffing reallocation, implementation of crisis standards of care when authorized, and coordination of transfers to balance regional capacity. In many events—particularly infectious disease outbreaks—nursing teams lead infection prevention measures at the bedside, maintain isolation discipline, and ensure correct use of personal protective equipment. Allied health personnel, such as environmental services and biomedical engineering teams, may be essential for decontamination workflows and equipment readiness, while logistics and supply chain staff ensure that consumables remain available. A key strength of an interprofessional model is that it integrates clinical care with operational support functions, recognizing that a response fails if either component collapses. Volunteerism and community engagement represent an additional layer of preparedness that can extend the reach of formal health systems. Citizen Corps, a volunteer initiative under the Department of Homeland Security, is designed to enhance community-level emergency preparedness through education and training. Although not a substitute for professional response, such volunteer programs can support community resilience by improving public knowledge of basic preparedness principles, strengthening neighborhood networks, and facilitating community-based response activities that reduce pressure on emergency services. For nursing and allied health professionals, these community initiatives can create partnerships that improve risk communication, support outreach to high-risk groups, and enhance continuity of care during disruptions when transportation, clinic access, or routine services are compromised [10].

In terrorist-related incidents or major national emergencies, the activation of structured national frameworks further shapes response coordination. In the United States, the Secretary of

Homeland Security may activate the National Response Framework, aligning federal, state, and local resources and reinforcing a principle of managing incidents at the lowest effective level. For healthcare teams, this framework supports coordination across agencies, clarifies roles in resource requests, and facilitates deployment of specialized federal assets when local and state capacity is overwhelmed. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention also contributes essential guidance and educational resources relevant to public health emergencies, including infectious disease outbreaks, chemical exposures, radiation incidents, and natural or weather-related disasters. This guidance informs clinical protocols, public messaging, surveillance, and infection prevention measures, and it often shapes the training content used by nursing and allied health teams to maintain readiness. A critical issue for interprofessional interventions is sustainability. Preparedness cannot depend on episodic training after high-profile events; it requires continuous quality improvement, routine drills, and repeated role-based education. Simulation-based exercises that include nursing and allied health roles can reveal bottlenecks in triage, patient transport, communication pathways, and supply distribution. They also clarify the ethical and practical trade-offs that emerge during crisis standards of care, including prioritization decisions, staff safety obligations, and family communication under resource constraints. By embedding interprofessional drills into routine operations, healthcare systems create a shared mental model of crisis response and reduce the likelihood of confusion when real events occur. In summary, nursing, allied health, and interprofessional interventions strengthen emergency preparedness by integrating clinical competence with operational readiness and community resilience. Effective crisis response depends on coordinated policies, interoperable technology, trained workforce capacity, and strong partnerships across government, healthcare institutions, and the private sector (Source: Afrihyia et al, 2025). Within the U.S. model, local response initiates action, states coordinate escalation, and FEMA supports through regional structures, while national frameworks and CDC guidance provide alignment and specialized resources for public health emergencies. When nursing and allied health professionals are empowered as core contributors—rather than peripheral participants—preparedness becomes more actionable, adaptable, and capable of protecting populations during both acute disasters and prolonged crises [9][10].

Conclusion:

Emergency preparedness in healthcare systems is not a static achievement but an evolving competency that demands continuous planning, training, and interorganizational coordination. Disasters—whether natural, technological, or man-made—pose complex challenges that cannot be mitigated through isolated or episodic measures. A resilient health security framework must prioritize hazard identification, vulnerability reduction, and adaptive response strategies that sustain essential services under severe constraints. Pediatric emergency readiness is particularly significant, as children represent a vulnerable population with unique physiological and psychosocial needs. Evidence demonstrates that gaps in pediatric preparedness correlate with preventable morbidity and mortality, underscoring the need for systematic audits and integration of pediatric-specific protocols. Interprofessional collaboration further strengthens preparedness by aligning clinical expertise with operational support, technology, and community engagement. Leadership commitment and governance structures are indispensable for overcoming institutional resistance and ensuring resource allocation. Ultimately, preparedness must extend beyond immediate response to encompass recovery and adaptation, recognizing that prolonged crises may require new modes of functioning. By embedding flexibility, prioritization, and continuous improvement into emergency planning, healthcare systems can protect lives, preserve critical functions, and enhance resilience in the face of unpredictable hazards.

References:

[1] Gebbie KM, Qureshi K. Emergency and disaster preparedness: core competencies for nurses. The American journal of nursing. 2002 Jan:102(1):46-51

[2] Yagub AI, Mtshali K. The role of non-governmental organizations in providing curative health services in North Darfur State, Sudan. African health sciences. 2015 Sep:15(3):1049-55. doi: 10.4314/ahs.v15i3.48.

[3] Metzler EC, Kodali BS, Urman RD, Flanagan HL, Rego MS, Vacanti JC. Strategies to maintain operating room functionality following the complete loss of the recovery room due to an internal disaster. American journal of disaster medicine. 2015 Winter:10(1):5-12. doi: 10.5055/ajdm.2015.0183.

[4] Perry RW, Lindell MK. Preparedness for emergency response: guidelines for the emergency planning process. Disasters. 2003 Dec:27(4):336

[5] Arnold JL. Risk and risk assessment in health emergency management. Prehospital and disaster medicine. 2005 May-Jun:20(3):143

[6] Quarantelli EL. Social and organisational problems in a major community emergency. The Australasian nurses journal. 1982 Oct:11(9):18-20

[7] Holloway R, Rasmussen SA, Zaza S, Cox NJ, Jernigan DB. Updated preparedness and response framework for influenza pandemics. MMWR. Recommendations and reports :

Morbidity and mortality weekly report. Recommendations and reports. 2014 Sep 26:63(RR-06):1-18

[8] Gausche-Hill M, Ely M, Schmuhl P, Telford R, Remick KE, Edgerton EA, Olson LM. A national assessment of pediatric readiness of emergency departments. JAMA pediatrics. 2015 Jun:169(6):527-34. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.138.

[9] Ames SG, Davis BS, Marin JR, Fink EL, Olson LM, Gausche-Hill M, Kahn JM. Emergency Department Pediatric Readiness and Mortality in Critically Ill Children. Pediatrics. 2019 Sep:144(3):. doi: 10.1542/peds.2019-0568.

[10] Ang PH, Chong SL, Ong YG, Pek JH. Pediatric Preparedness of the Emergency Departments. Pediatric emergency care. 2020 Dec:36(12):602-605. doi: 10.1097/PEC.000000000000225.