

**PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY FOR A LARGE SCALE OF REMOTE  
PATIENTS: A CASE STUDY OF CHRONIC HEART DISEASE**

**ABDULNISER KHALD HAMZAH**

**THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE  
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)**

**FACULTY OF ART, COMPUTING & CREATIVE INDUSTRY  
SULTAN IDRIS EDUCATION UNIVERSITY**

**2018**



## ABSTRACT

This research aims to present a methodology based on Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) to aid decision-makers in prioritizing a large scale of patients in a telemedicine environment. In this study, the data from 500 patients with chronic heart disease are examined and evaluated their emergency levels based on four main sources: electrocardiogram (ECG), oxygen saturation (SPO2), blood pressure (BP), and non-sensory measurement (text frame). The researcher of this study constructed a decision matrix based on a crossover of multiple sources and patients list according to the features of the sources. Subsequently, patients were prioritized using MCDM techniques, namely, integrated Multi-layer Analytic Hierarchy Process (MLAHP) and Technique for Order Performance by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS). For validation, subjectively, cardiologists are consulted to confirm the ranking results; objectively, mean  $\pm$  standard deviation and T-test are used to check the accuracy of the systematic ranking. For evaluation, this study provided scenarios and checklist benchmarking to evaluate the proposed and existing prioritization methods. The following results were obtained. (1) Integrating MLAHP and Group-TOPSIS is effective for solving patient prioritization problems. (2) In subjective validation, the first five patients assigned to the doctors are the most critical cases needing the highest priority levels, whereas the last five are the least critical cases and thus given the lowest priority levels. In objective validation, significant differences were observed between the groups' scores, indicating that the ranking results were identical. (3) In evaluation, regarding the first, second, and third scenarios, the proposed method had an advantage over the benchmark method with rates of 40%, 60%, and 100%, respectively. The implications of this study, will gain the benefits to medical organizations in provide a way to improve the priority settings processes for the healthcare manages constantly making difficult resource decisions. As well as benefits to doctors by assist medical teams through providing a decision making support for prioritizing and perform a timely and accurate treatment of their patients. Moreover, the benefits to patients are provided as the prioritization improves fairness, decreases urgent waiting times for patients with heart chronic disease.





## KAEDAH PENGUTAMAAN BAGI PESAKIT PENDUDUK PEDALAMAN BERSKALA BESAR: KAJIAN KES BAGI PENYAKIT JANTUNG KRONIK

### ABSTRAK

Kajian ini bertujuan untuk membentangkan rangka kerja berdasarkan *Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM)* bagi membantu pembuat keputusan mengutamakan pesakit berskala besar persekitaran tele-perubatan. Melalui kajian ini, data dari 500 pesakit jantung kronik yang telah diperiksa dan dinilai tahap kecemasan mereka berdasarkan empat ukuran utama iaitu *Electrokardiogram (ECG)*, oksigen tepu (*SPO2*), tekanan darah dan pengukuran bukan deria (bingkai teks). Penyelidik kajian ini membina matriks keputusan berdasarkan pelbagai sumber bersilang dan senarai pesakit mengikut ciri-ciri sumber. Seterusnya, pesakit dinilai berdasarkan Teknik MCDM, iaitu *Integrated Multi-layer for Analytic Hierarchy Process (MLAHP)* dan *Technique for Order Performance by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS)*. Bagi tujuan pengesahan pakar kardiologi telah dirujuk untuk mengesahkan keputusan kedudukan secara subjektif, sedangkan secara objektifnya, perhitungan  $\min \pm$  sisihan piawai dan ujian-T dalam memastikan kedudukan yang sistematik. Manakala bagi penilaian pula, pelbagai senario dan senarai tanda aras telah disediakan untuk menilai dan membandingkan kaedah sedia ada yang telah dicadangkan. Hasil kajian telah menghasilkan penemuan berikut: (1) Intergrasi TOPSIS dan MLAHP secara sistematik adalah berkesan untuk menyelesaikan penetapan pesakit terhadap permasalahan pengutamaan kritikal. (2) Dalam kesahan, secara subjektifnya lima pesakit pertama yang diberikan kepada Doktor menjadi kes yang paling terkini yang memerlukan tahap keutamaan yang paling tinggi, manakala pesakit yang lima terakhir pula menjadi tahap keutamaan yang paling rendah berbanding yang lain. Sedangkan secara objektifnya terdapat perbezaan yang ketara yang telah dikenal pasti di antara skor-skor kumpulan yang menunjukkan bahawa keputusan kedudukan adalah sama. (3) Mengikut penilaian senario pertama, kedua dan ketiga, kaedah yang telah dicadangkan mempunyai kelebihan terhadap kaedah penanda aras iaitu dengan peratusan masing-masing sebanyak 40%, 60% dan 100%. Kesan kajian ini, akan mendatangkan kebaikan kepada organisasi perubatan dalam menyediakan jalan penyelesaian bagi membaiki proses tetapan keutamaan untuk mengurus penjagaan kesihatan secara tetap terhadap sumber keputusan yang sukar. Di samping itu, kebaikan kepada Doktor daripada pasukan pembantu perubatan melalui penyediaan sokongan keputusan untuk keutamaan dan menjalankan rawatan pada waktunya dan tepat kepada pesakit-pesakit mereka. Tambahan pula, kebaikan kepada pesakit dengan menyediakan keutamaan membantu keadilan, mengurangkan masa menunggu kepada pesakit yang mengidap penyakit jantung kronik





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DECLARATION OF ORIGINAL WORK</b>	<b>Page</b> <b>ii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENT</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>APPENDICES LIST</b>	<b>xx</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Research Background	2
1.3 Research Problem	5
1.4 Research Objectives	7
1.5 Research Scope	8
1.6 Research Organization	9
1.7 Chapter Summary	10
<b>CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 Introduction	12
2.2 Systematic Review Protocol	15
2.2.1 Method	15



2.2.2	Information Sources	15
2.2.3	Study Selection	16
2.2.4	Search	16
2.2.5	Eligibility Criteria	17
2.2.6	Taxonomy Analysis	19
2.3	Patient Prioritization: An overview	20
2.4	Patient Prioritization Processes	21
2.5	Patient Prioritization in Emergency Services	23
2.6	Patient Prioritization outside ED	26
2.6.1	Patient Prioritization in Healthcare Services Scalability Challenges	26
2.6.1.1	Population Aging	27
2.6.1.2	Disasters and MCIs	30
2.6.2	Patient Prioritization Environment	33
2.6.2.1	Patient Prioritization on Scene	33
2.6.2.2	Remotely Patient Prioritization	34
2.6.3	Patient Prioritization Methods and Related Studies	36
2.6.3.1	Qualitative, Fixed-Priority Methods	36
2.6.3.2	Quantitative Methods that Formulate a Mathematical Program .....	37
2.6.3.3	Triage Rules Based on Quantitative Methods	40
2.6.4	Critical Review and Analysis	52
2.7	Remote Healthcare Monitoring over Telemedicine	53
2.8	Chronic Diseases in Remote Healthcare Monitoring	55
2.8.1	Heart Disease	58
2.9	Sources Used to Measure Patients' Medical Vital Signs	59
2.9.1	ECG Sensor	61
2.9.2	Blood Oxygen Saturation (SpO2) Sensor	63
2.9.3	Blood Pressure (BP) Sensor	65
2.9.4	Text Source	66
2.9.5	Critical Review and Analysis	67

2.10	Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM): An Overview	69
2.10.1	Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM): Definition and Importance	69
2.10.2	Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) Applications	71
2.10.3	Overview of Using Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) in Healthcare Domain	72
2.10.4	Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) Methods	73
2.10.4.1	Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)	78
2.10.4.2	Technique for Order Performance by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS)	79
2.10.5	Summary for Multi Criteria Decision Making	80
2.11	Chapter Summary	82

### CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 84

3.1	Introduction	84
3.2	Preliminary Study Phase	85
3.3	Identification Phase	87
3.3.1	Identify the Targeted Tier within the Telemedicine Architecture	87
3.3.1.1	Description of Tier 1 and Tier 2	88
3.3.1.2	Tier 3 (Remote Server)	89
3.3.2	Identification of Chronic Heart Disease Patients and Data Set	90
3.3.3	Evaluation of the Number and Type of the Existing Features Used	91
3.3.4	Propose a Decision Matrix within Telemedicine Environment	92
3.3.4.1	Data Presentation	95
3.3.4.1.1	ECG Sensor	97
3.3.4.1.2	Blood Pressure (BP) Sensor	99
3.3.4.1.3	SpO <sub>2</sub> Sensor	100
3.3.4.1.4	Text source	101
3.3.4.2	Data Alignment	103
3.4	Development Phase	106

3.4.1	Develop a decision-making solution for Prioritizing a Large Scale of Patients with Chronic Heart Disease based on the Integrated MLAHP-TOPSIS Method	108
3.4.1.1	Multi – layer Analytic Hierarchy Process MLAHP	109
3.4.1.1.1	Decompose a Decision Problem into a Decision Hierarchy	110
3.4.1.1.2	Construct the Pairwise Comparisons	111
3.4.1.1.3	Obtain Priority Judgment Ranking Scores	112
3.4.1.1.4	Building the Normalized Decision Matrix (DM)	114
3.4.1.1.5	Calculate all Priority Values (Eigenvector)	115
3.4.1.1.6	Calculate a Consistency Ratio (CR)	117
3.4.1.2	Adaptive TOPSIS Method for Patient Prioritization	118
3.4.1.2.1	Decision Making Contexts	122
3.5	Validation and Evaluation Phase	123
3.5.1	Validation Process	123
3.5.1.1	Objective Validation	124
3.5.1.2	Subjective Validation	125
3.5.2	Evaluation Process	126
3.6	Chapter Summary	126
<b>CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>		<b>128</b>
4.1	Introduction	128
4.2	Data Presentation Results	129
4.3	Data Alignment Results	132
4.4	Weight Measurement Using MLAHP	135
4.5	Results of TOPSIS Decision Making Contexts.....	142
4.5.1	TOPSIS Results of Individual Context for Different Experts' Weights	143
4.5.2	Group TOPSIS with Internal and External Aggregation	160
4.6	Chapter Summary	163
<b>CHAPTER 5 VALIDATION AND EVALUATION</b>		<b>165</b>
5.1	Introduction	165
5.2	Validation Process	166



5.2.1	Objective Validation	167
5.2.2	Subjective Validation	173
5.3	Evaluation Process	176
5.4	Chapter Summary	187
<b>CHAPTER 6</b>	<b>CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK</b>	189
6.1	Introduction	189
6.2	Research Goals Attained	190
6.3	Research Contributions	191
6.4	Research Scheme	192
6.5	Research Limitations	194
6.6	Recommendations for Future Work	195
6.7	Research Conclusion	196
<b>REFERENCES</b>		197
<b>LIST OF PUBLICATION</b>		231
<b>APPENDICES</b>		232







## LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Page
2.1 Environment for patients' prioritization	35
2.2 The patient prioritization methodologies	46
2.3 State of the art of patient prioritization studies from emergency service perspective	48
2.4 Description of Relevant Medical Sources Used in Monitoring Patients	60
2.5 Spo2 Severity Levels (Schenker, 2004)	64
2.6 Classification of emergency blood pressure ranges	65
3.1 Medical assessment for the sources and features used in this research	92
3.2 Decision Matrix	94
3.3 Decision Matrix for a Sample of Patient	102
3.4 The Overall Measurements for Sources and Features	104
3.5 The nine scales of pairwise comparisons	112
4.1 Sample of the data presentation results	130
4.2 Sample of the results of data alignment process	133
4.3 The MLAHP measurement for weight preferences of the first expert	136
4.4 MLAHP Local and Global Weights for Six Expert	138
4.5 Results of Weight Calculated for Six Experts	140
4.6 TOPSIS sample of the first and last forty patients for the first expert	145
4.7 TOPSIS sample of the first and last forty patients for the second expert	147
4.8 TOPSIS sample of the first and last forty patients for the third expert	149



4.9 TOPSIS sample of the first and last forty patients for the fourth expert	151
4.10 TOPSIS sample of the first and last forty patients for the fifth expert	153
4.11 TOPSIS sample of the first and last forty patients for the sixth expert	155
4.12 Group decision making of TOPSIS with internal and external aggregation (for the first and last forty patients)	161
5.1 The results of the first and second group (TOPSIS scores)	168
5.2 The results of the third and fourth group (TOPSIS scores)	169
5.3 Statistical analysis results for the four groups	171
5.4 P value results among the four groups	172
5.5 Checklist benchmarking	182
5.6 The differences in methods coverage for checklist points and scenarios	187
6.1 The connections among research objectives, research methodology and research goals	191
A.1 List of experts involved in the pairwise questionnaire	237
A.2 <i>List of experts involved in the validation process</i>	237
B.1 <i>Data presentation results</i>	238
C.1 <i>Data alignment results</i>	246
D.1 <i>The AHP measurement for weight preferences of the second expert</i>	255
D.2 <i>The AHP measurement for weight preferences of the third expert</i>	255
D.3 <i>The AHP measurement for weight preferences of the fourth expert</i>	256
D.4 <i>The AHP measurement for weight preferences of the fifth expert</i>	257
D.5 <i>The AHP measurement for weight preferences of the sixth expert</i>	258
E.1 <i>TOPSIS results for the first expert (patients from 1-150)</i>	260



E.2 TOPSIS results for the first expert (patients from 150-300)	261
E.3 TOPSIS results for the first expert (patients from 300-450)	261
E.4 TOPSIS results for the first expert (patients from 450-500)	262
E.5 TOPSIS results for the second expert (patients from 1-150)	263
E.6 TOPSIS results for the second expert (patients from 150-300)	264
E.7 TOPSIS results for the second expert (patients from 300-450)	265
E.8 TOPSIS results for the second expert (patients from 450-500)	266
E.9 TOPSIS results for the third expert (patients from 1-150)	267
E.10 TOPSIS results for the third expert (patients from 150-300)	268
E.11 TOPSIS results for the third expert (patients from 300-450)	269
E.12 TOPSIS results for the third expert (patients from 450-500)	270
E.13 TOPSIS results for the fourth expert (patients from 1-150)	271
E.14 TOPSIS results for the fourth expert (patients from 150-300)	272
E.15 TOPSIS results for the fourth expert (patients from 300-450)	273
E.16 TOPSIS results for the fourth expert (patients from 450-500)	274
E.17 TOPSIS results for the fifth expert (patients from 1-150)	274
E.18 TOPSIS results for the fifth expert (patients from 150-300)	275
E.19 TOPSIS results for the fifth expert (patients from 300-450)	276
E.20 TOPSIS results for the fifth expert (patients from 450-500)	277
E.21 TOPSIS results for the sixth expert (patients from 1-150)	278
E.22 TOPSIS results for the sixth expert (patients from 150-300)	279
E.23 TOPSIS results for the sixth expert (patients from 300-450)	280
E.24 TOPSIS results for the sixth expert (patients from 450-500)	281





F.1 <i>Internal and external aggregation results (patients from 1-90)</i>	283
F.2 <i>Internal and external aggregation results (patients from 91-190)</i>	284
F.3 <i>Internal and external aggregation results (patients from 191-290)</i>	284
F.4 <i>Internal and external aggregation results (patients from 291-390)</i>	285
F.5 <i>Internal and external aggregation results (patients from 391-490)</i>	286
F.6 <i>Internal and external aggregation results (patients from 490-500)</i>	287





## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Page
1.1. Problem statement configuration	7
2.1. Literature Review Structure	14
2.2. Flowchart of study selection, including the query and inclusion criteria	18
2.3. A taxonomy of research literature on patient prioritization	19
2.4. Problems that cause the increase in users' request in remote healthcare monitoring systems	27
2.5. United States (U.S.) national healthcare expenditures per Capita (Foundation, 2009)	29
2.6. Three-tiered architecture of telemedicine system for healthcare monitoring (Acampora et al., 2013)	54
2.2.7 Features of the ECG signal	62
2.8. Features of the ECG signal	62
3.1. Research methodology phases	86
3.2. The high-level abstract of the telemedicine architecture	88
3.3. Overall architecture and design of the server side within the telemedicine environment	93
3.4. Feature extraction algorithm	96
3.5. Processes of ECG feature extraction	98
3.6. Integrated MLAHP–TOPSIS method for patient prioritization	109



3.7. The hierarchy of MLAHP	110
3.8. Sample evaluation form	113
3.9. The design of MLAHP measurement steps for the weight preferences	116
4.1. Final AHP weights for (A) 1 <sup>st</sup> Expert (B) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Expert (C) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Expert (D) 4 <sup>th</sup> Expert (E) 5 <sup>th</sup> Expert (F) 6 <sup>th</sup> Expert	141
4.2. Overall TOPSIS final ranking for six experts (A) First expert ranking (B) Second expert ranking (C) Third expert ranking (D) Fourth expert ranking (E) Fifth expert ranking (F) Sixth expert ranking	157
4.3. The results of external aggregation	162
4.4. The results of internal aggregation	162
5.1. The structure of the validation processes	166
5.2. Results of the four groups of patients (A) 1 <sup>st</sup> group (B) 2 <sup>nd</sup> group (C) 3 <sup>rd</sup> group (D) 4 <sup>th</sup> group (E) Four patients' groups	170
5.3. Bar chart for mean and standard deviation results of the four groups	171
5.4. The relations between the comparison issues and scenarios	178
5.5. The differences in methods coverage for the scenarios	186
6.1. General scheme and scope of the study	194



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AHP	Analytic Hierarchy Process
ANP	Analytic Network Process
BFAWC	Back-Forward Adjustment for Weight Computing
BP	Blood Pressure
CESIRA	Coscienza, Emorragie, Shock, Insufficienza respiratoria, Rotture, Altro
DEEDS	Data Elements for Emergency Departments
DES	Discrete Event Simulation
DGP	Dynamic Grouping and Prioritization
DM	Decision Making
DSS	Decision Support System
ECG	Electrocardiogram
ED	Emergency Department
E-health	Electronic Health
EM	Evaluation Matrix
ESI	Emergency Severity Index
FCFS	First Come First Serve
FFMEA	Fuzzy Failure Modes and Effects Analysis





GDM	Group Decision Making
GSM	Global System for Mobile Communication
HAW	Hierarchical Adaptive Weighting
HOCA	Healthcare Aware Optimized Congestion
IMDs	Interoperable Medical Devices
IS	Information System
MAC	Media Access Control
MAUT	Multi Attribute Utility Theory
MCDM	Multi Criteria Decision Making
MCI	Mass Causalities Incidence
MEW	Multiplicative Exponential Weighting
MLs	Medical Institutes
MLAHP	Multi-layer Analytic Hierarchy Process
mmHg	Millimetres of Mercury
MTS	Manchester Triage System
NIS	Negative Ideal Solution
PC	Priority Code
PGS	Patient's Guidance System
PIS	Positive Ideal Solution
QOS	Quality of Service
RHMSs	Remote Health Monitoring Systems
SAW	Simple Additive Weighting
SpO2	Blood Oxygen Saturation Level







STM	Sacco Triage Method
TOPSIS	Technique for Order Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution
WBAN	Wireless Body Area Network
WHO	World Health Organization
WPM	Weighted Product Method
WSM	Weighted Sum Model



## APPENDICES LIST

- A PAIRWISE COMPARISON
- B DATA PRESENTATION RESULTS
- C DATA ALIGNMENT RESULTS
- D AHP RESULTS
- E TOPSIS RESULTS
- F INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AGGREGATION RESULTS



## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION



#### 1.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the research topic, problem statement, and research objectives. It also presents and explains the experimental and technical scopes of this research. Section 1.2 presents a brief background of the research components. Section 1.3 identifies and introduces the problem statement, on which the direction of the research is based. Section 1.4 follows with a description of the research objectives. Section 1.5 discusses the scope of the study. Section 1.6 briefly outlines the main structure of the thesis. Finally, Section 1.7 summarizes this chapter.





## 1.2 Research Background

The combined effect of increasing life expectancy and population aging will undoubtedly increase the societal burden of chronic illnesses among future populations of older people (Parekh, Goodman, Gordon, & Koh, 2011). The aging population and increasing number of chronic diseases have encouraged society to foster health consciousness among patients, encouraging them to become “health consumers” looking for improved health management (Touati & Tabish, 2013). Increase in the number of patients is expected to be driven by various causes, such as population aging, disasters, and mass casualty incidents (MCIs). One possible solution to these problems is for patients to be prioritized for services and treatments by triage nurses (Salman, Rasid, Saripan, & Subramaniam, 2014; Tebé et al., 2015). However, challenges to prioritization increase when patients are far from hospitals and use remote healthcare services (Salman et al., 2014).

A prioritization process is often conducted to ensure that care is given in an appropriate and timely manner (Seising & Tabacchi, 2013). Early identification of critically ill patients and stratification into priority levels upon admission to the emergency department (ED) is important for the quality and safety of emergency medicine (Acampora, Cook, Rashidi, & Vasilakos, 2013; Rocha et al., 2013). Therefore, the primary aim of patient prioritization is to identify patients who can safely wait and those who cannot (Brown & Clarke, 2014). Patient prioritization improves fairness and decreases the waiting times of urgent patients. The patients’ condition should be the primary tool in assessing their priority according to medical guidelines (Polk, Walker, & Bhatia, 2007). In the






hospital domain, prioritization has traditionally relied on the ability of nurses to assess cases (Christensen et al., 2011; Sakanushi et al., 2013; Zarabzadeh et al., 2013). Vital signs are very important in the prioritization setting because these provide an objective complement to the professional judgment of nurses and optimize inter-rater consistency (Westergren, Ferm, & Häggström, 2014).

For remote patients, who live far from hospitals and use tele-monitoring tools, continuous monitoring from a distant hospital is highly desirable to ensure adequate care and provide suitable guidelines for proper medication (Mirkovic, Bryhni, & Ruland, 2012). Remote patient care is now becoming a subject of major concern in healthcare services (Sarkar & Sinha, 2014). Remote prioritization, meanwhile, means triaging patients for treatment and transportation to hospitals after evaluating their vital signs (Sakanushi et al., 2013). Furthermore, prioritization is required to improve the processing of telemedicine patients (Salman et al., 2014) and the emergency operations in remote healthcare services and disaster systems. Remote home patients, especially the elderly, are at critical risk of harm during a disaster (Wyte-Lake, Claver, & Dobalian, 2016). Thus, prioritization processes are important to support the continuous care of remote patients in a pervasive environment. The overwhelming heterogeneous data can cause difficulty in deciding which patient out of many should be first provided with care (Sarkar & Sinha, 2014). Thus, decision-based methods for prioritizing patients in this environment are urgently needed (Sarkar & Sinha, 2014).



In view of the above discussion, emerging technology offers the potential for sensor networks and information combination to help health services with patient prioritization. For example, a patient with cardiovascular disease may use wearable or implanted biological sensors that monitor vital signs such as pulse rate and blood pressure (BP); when these vital signs are detected as unstable, the smart healthcare service notifies the user (Jentsch, Ramirez, Wood, & Elmasllari, 2013; Touati & Tabish, 2013).

Prioritization based on medical condition and chance of survival is complex (O. M. Ashour & Okudan, 2010b; Claudio & Okudan, 2010; Göransson, Ehnfors, Fonteyn, & Ehrenberg, 2008) because the decision is made based on a set of attributes (Faulin, Juan, Grasman, & Fry, 2012). Thus, several prioritization methods have been designed to achieve

 05 triaging goals and help triage nurses make accurate triage judgments for patients who are physically inside the ED (Christensen et al., 2011; Claudio, Kremer, Bravo-Llerena, & Freivalds, 2014; Pinto Júnior, Salgado, & Chianca, 2012; Sakanushi et al., 2013; Seising & Tabacchi, 2013). In addition, even though most triage systems categorize patients into a priority group, the order of patients is typically determined using the first come, first served (FCFS) principle. However, in the case of remote patients, neither triage doctors nor triage nurses are physically available to help them. Therefore, prioritizing is a complex, multi-attribute decision-making process, especially in a remote monitoring environment. This process raises questions such as how remote patients can be prioritized. These concerns, which are directly related to patients' lives, are our research problems. This study aims to improve the efficiency of large-scale remote patient prioritizing processes.



### 1.3 Research Problem

Patient prioritization employing medical conditions and chance of survival is considered a complex decision-making problem (O. M. Ashour & Okudan, 2010b; Claudio & Okudan, 2010; Göransson et al., 2008; Seising & Tabacchi, 2013). For large numbers of critically ill or injured patients, prioritizing of the patients is required (Alemdar & Ersoy, 2010; Azeredo, Guedes, de Almeida, Chianca, & Martins, 2015).



05 2014). In existing systems, patients who are physically present at the ED of a hospital are prioritized by triage nurses and rely on the prioritizing skills of nurses (Azeredo et al., 2015). In an ideal world, patients in an ED would be provided with care on an FCFS basis (Claudio & Okudan, 2010). However, in reality, FCFS cannot be applied. Hence, a quick, well-informed, and timely decision on prioritizing patients is needed (Claudio & Okudan, 2010; K. W. Tan, 2013). If made appropriately, such decisions can save lives, among other advantages. Prioritization also becomes complicated when patients are far from the hospital (remote patients) and rely on telemedicine. In this case, triage nurses and doctors are not physically available to help the patient. Situations that utilize telemedicine are more complex than those in actual ED situations (Rasid, Fadlee, Saripan, K Subramaniam, & Salman, 2013; Salman et al., 2014) as a remote healthcare systems.





Remote healthcare systems in telemedicine have gained considerable attention because of their significant role in the lives of people (Salman et al., 2014; Sanders, Devergnas, Wichmann, & Clements, 2013). In telemedicine, patients are prioritized for treatment and transportation to hospitals on the basis of their vital signs (Sakanushi et al., 2013; Salman et al., 2014). Thus, prioritizing remote patients involves simultaneous consideration of multiple attributes (vital signs and complaints) with respect to assigning the proper weight for each attribute to determine the patients requiring the most urgent care (Faulin et al., 2012; Sakanushi et al., 2013). In more details; for patients who have the most emergency cases should receive the highest priority level, while the patients who have the less emergency cases should be given the lowest priority levels compared to other patients' scores over telemedicine environment. However, setting this prioritization is a very difficult and challenging task as it involves simultaneous consideration of heterogeneous data from multiple attributes for evaluation vital signs and text and generates data conflict. For example, ECG and SpO<sub>2</sub> have been proven to be very important in prioritization setting because they provide an objective complement to optimize inter-rater consistency. Furthermore, each decision maker gives different weights for these attributes (vital signs). On one hand, a server who aims to give a score for a patient might give more weight to the vital feature rather than to others features that gain less interest. Thus, the prioritization processes as large scales of remote patients with chronic heart diseases in particular is a multi-complex attributes problem, where each patient is considered as an available alternative for the decision maker. Figure 1.1 illustrates the problem statement configuration.