

Letter

SARS-COV-2 pandemic: establishing three risk levels for 19 Italian regions and two autonomous provinces

In Italy, there are 19 regions and two autonomous provinces, and each of these 21 jurisdictions has local responsibility for health care. As regards the COVID-19 pandemic, these 21 jurisdictions have been classified into three classes of risk (mild, moderate, and high) associated with three colours (green/yellow, orange, and red).

More than 20 indicators are routinely collected in these jurisdictions, and this information determines, every 2 weeks, the colour assigned and the consequent restrictions in everyday life. The replicability index (Rt according to the Italian notation) is the main parameter influencing this decision.

In November 2020, a number of health care professionals began a collaboration (based on a Facebook group named PIFO including 446 people) specifically aimed at discussing topics and controversies in the field of COVID-19.¹ A total of 34 professionals participated in the experience described herein: 14 of these were invited to share their views through an ad hoc questionnaire.

Our purpose was to build a consensus on the following question: how can the 21 monitoring parameters established by national institutions be translated into the three risk classes? Reference 1 (Italian) reports in detail on the questions of our survey.

The criterion for agreeing the final consensus from individual responses was to select the most voted response


for categorical variables, the median for numerical ones. The consensus statement was designed to, first, select a limited number of parameters (restricted to three) and to, consequently, determine the risk levels with the respective colours.

Three main parameters were identified in our survey: (1) replicability index; (2) incidence of new cases over 14 days (normalised to 100 000 people); and (3) percentage of intensive care unit (ICU) beds occupied by COVID-19 patients. These three parameters were prioritised in the above order.

In the decision model adopted by the group, the first parameter provisionally determines the colour assignment. Thereafter, the initial colour assignment can remain unchanged or, alternatively, can be worsened by one level if parameters (2) and/or (3) rise above a predetermined alarm threshold (table 1). This approach resembles the one currently adopted by the frameworks of ASCO and ESMO in evaluating innovative anti-cancer treatments.²⁻⁵ For each of the three parameters, our survey identified the cut-off values that separate individual risk levels. Rt was confirmed as the leading parameter to guide colour assignment, but the two co-primary parameters mentioned above were evaluated as well (table 1).

In summary, our experience has shown that, in managing the COVID-19 epidemic, adopting a set of ranked risk levels according to a fully transparent approach is feasible. In our view, the decision process can better rely on three parameters rather than on one single parameter (Rt) (or, alternatively, 21 which are too many). In the perspective of further developments, one hypothesis could be to embed in the decision an outlook at 14 days (namely, the incidence projected at 14 days based on Rt)

so that prospective projections rather than retrospective data determine the decision which is made every 2 weeks.

Andrea Messori ¹, Manuela Angileri,² Marco Chiumente,³ Laura Agnoletto,⁴ Paolo Baldo,⁵ Laura Bartoli,¹ Mario Cirino,⁶ Vera Damuzzo,⁷ Elisa Ferracane,¹ M Cecilia Giron,⁸ Carolina Laudisio,⁹ Daniele Mengato,¹⁰ Angelo Claudio Palozzo,¹¹ Sabrina Trippoli¹²

¹HTA Unit, Regione Toscana, Firenze, Toscana, Italy

²Hospital Pharmacy, Azienda Sanitaria di Firenze, Firenze, Toscana, Italy

³Scientific Direction, SIFaCT, Milan, Italy

⁴Hospital Pharmacy, Azienda ULSS 5 Polesana, Rovigo, Veneto, Italy

⁵Hospital Pharmacy, Centro di Riferimento Oncologico, Aviano, Italy

⁶Hospital Pharmacy, Azienda Sanitaria Universitaria Giuliano Isontina, Presidio Ospedale Maggiore, Trieste, Italy

⁷Pharmaceutical Sciences, Università degli Studi di Padova, Padova, Veneto, Italy

⁸Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Università degli Studi di Padova, Padova, Veneto, Italy

⁹Pharmacy, Azienda Sanitaria Locale Salerno, Salerno, Campania, Italy

¹⁰Hospital Pharmacy, Bolzano Hospital, Bolzano, Italy

¹¹Presidency, SIFaCT President, Italian Society for Clinical Pharmacy and Therapy, Milano, Milano, Italy

¹²HTA Unit, Regional Health Service, Firenze, Italy

Correspondence to Dr Andrea Messori, HTA Unit, Regione Toscana, 50129 Firenze, Toscana, Italy; andrea.messori.it@gmail.com

Twitter M Cecilia Giron @mceciliagiron

Acknowledgements Part of this paper has been previously published as a preprint (see reference 1).

Contributors All authors contributed equally to this paper.

Funding The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient consent for publication Not required.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; internally peer reviewed.

Table 1 Description of the algorithm that converts three parameters included in the national COVID monitoring framework into the risk levels associated with the three pre-determined colours (green/yellow, orange, and red)

Replicability index* (or Rt according to the Italian notation)	Initial colour assignment†	Additional parameters*			Process of colour assignment revision	Final colour assignment†
		Number of new cases over 14 days normalised to 100 000 subjects		Percentage of ICU beds occupied by COVID-19 patients		
>1.20	red	inifluent	–	inifluent	n.a.	red
between 1.00 and 1.20	orange	>400	and/or	>30%	yes	red
		≤400	and	≤30%	no	orange
<1.00	green/yellow	>400	and/or	>30%	yes	orange
		≤400	and	≤30%	no	green/yellow

*The official information on these indexes recorded on a daily basis is available at the following internet addresses: <https://github.com/pcm-dpc/COVID-19/tree/master/dati-andamento-nazionale> (nationwide information) <https://github.com/pcm-dpc/COVID-19/tree/master/dati-regioni> (region-specific data) <https://github.com/pcm-dpc/COVID-19/tree/master/dati-province> (data for individual provinces).

†According to the present algorithm.

ICU, intensive care unit; n.a., not applicable.

This article is made freely available for use in accordance with BMJ's website terms and conditions for the duration of the covid-19 pandemic or until otherwise determined by BMJ. You may use, download and print the article for any lawful, non-commercial purpose (including text and data mining) provided that all copyright notices and trade marks are retained.

© European Association of Hospital Pharmacists 2021. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.



To cite Messori A, Angileri M, Chiumente M, *et al*. *Eur J Hosp Pharm* 2022;**29**:e3.

Published Online First 8 February 2021

Eur J Hosp Pharm 2022;**29**:e3.
doi:10.1136/ejhpharm-2021-002692

ORCID iD

Andrea Messori <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5829-107X>

REFERENCES

- 1 Messori A, Agnoletto L, Angileri M. SARS-COV-2 pandemic: establishing 3 risk levels for 19 Italian regions and two autonomous provinces. *OSF* 2020.
- 2 Cherny NI, Sullivan R, Dafni U, *et al*. A standardised, generic, validated approach to stratify the magnitude of clinical benefit that can be anticipated from anti-cancer

therapies: the European Society for Medical Oncology Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale (ESMO-MCBS). *Ann Oncol* 2015;26:1547–73.

- 3 Cherny NI, Dafni U, Bogaerts J, *et al*. ESMO-magnitude of clinical benefit scale version 1.1. *Ann Oncol* 2017;28:2340–66.
- 4 Schnipper LE, Davidson NE, Wollins DS, *et al*. American Society of Clinical Oncology statement: a conceptual framework to assess the value of cancer treatment options. *J Clin Oncol* 2015;33:2563–77.
- 5 Schnipper LE, Davidson NE, Wollins DS, *et al*. Updating the American Society of Clinical Oncology value framework: revisions and reflections in response to comments received. *J Clin Oncol* 2016;34:2925–34.