Power System Technology
ISSN:1000-3673
Received: 16-10-2025 Revised: 05-11-2025 Accepted: 02-12-2025

Medical Decision Strategies for Mass Casualty Management in Defense and Paramilitary Operations

Alawaji, Omar Ibrahim Almarwani, Ziyad Ghazi W Murayr, Faisal Tayeb Alzahrani, Abdulrahman saleh ahmed Alshurayyan, Mana Mohammed Alsalem, Fahad Hamad bin Nasser Almunajjim, Mohammed mana Sharif, Ghannam Hussain

Abstract:

Background: Medical management of Mass Casualty Incidents (MCIs) in defense and paramilitary operations presents severe ethical and logistical challenges distinct from civilian disaster response. Decisions must prioritize force preservation and are made under extreme duress, resource scarcity, and high uncertainty. This paper descriptively analyzes the strategic frameworks that govern medical decision-making in these high-threat environments.

Methodology: A Descriptive Analytical Methodology was employed, synthesizing academic literature, military medical doctrine (e.g., TCCC), and ethical guidelines. The analysis focused on thematic frameworks across three operational phases: Point of Injury, Field Care (Resource Allocation), and Strategic Evacuation.

Analysis: The strategic shift from individualistic patient care to utilitarian triage is the core decision driver. Analysis revealed that decisions are highly protocols-driven (M.A.R.C.H.) due to cognitive load, often sacrificing care for the most severely injured to maximize the survival of those with treatable injuries. Furthermore, effective medical leadership relies on clear intent communication and predictive resource allocation based on anticipated future casualties. The ethical burden on providers facing "Expectant" classifications necessitates integrated moral resilience training.

Conclusion: Effective decision strategies in combat MCIs require highly trained personnel who can rapidly execute utilitarian triage protocols under stress. Optimization mandates increased high-fidelity simulation training, utilization of decision support technology, and mandatory ethical preparation to sustain the moral integrity of the medical force.

Keywords: Medical Decision Strategies, Mass Casualty Management, Defense Operations, Paramilitary Operations, Tactical Triage, TCCC, Resource Allocation, Moral Injury, Emergency Preparedness.

1. Introduction

1.1 Context and Severity of the Problem

Medical management during **Mass Casualty Incidents (MCIs)** in defense and paramilitary settings represents the most challenging interface between tactical necessity and ethical obligation. Unlike civilian disasters, these operational environments are often characterized by

Power System Technology
ISSN:1000-3673
Received: 16-10-2025 Revised: 05-11-2025 Accepted: 02-12-2025

high threat levels, resource scarcity, prolonged evacuation times, and the potential for recurrent hostile action [1]. Effective medical decision-making under such extreme duress directly impacts troop survivability, operational integrity, and force preservation [2]. The shift from providing optimal, definitive care to executing **utilitarian, resource-constrained triage** demands robust, clearly articulated decision strategies, The practical imperative for refining MCI decision strategies in high-threat environments is continually demonstrated by recent global conflicts and asymmetric warfare patterns, where the distinction between conventional combat zones and humanitarian crises often blurs. The failure to rapidly and ethically execute sound medical decisions can transition a tactical loss into a strategic failure by eroding unit cohesion, straining logistical networks, and undermining public trust in the operational force. Current literature acknowledges the difficulty of tactical triage (Section 2.1) but often lacks rigorous analysis of the **feedback loop** between frontline medical execution (the medic) and **strategic resource commands** (the medical director) [19].

Crucially, there remains a research void concerning the effective integration of **Non-Medical Factors (NMFs)**—such as current intelligence reports, projected threat timelines, and political objectives—into purely medical decision algorithms [27]. Most existing models focus solely on clinical patient physiology. This paper directly addresses this deficit by establishing an analytical framework to evaluate how medical leaders assimilate these NMFs, particularly in decisions related to **Prolonged Field Care (PFC)** and the prioritization of scarce aerial evacuation assets. Therefore, the outcome of this analysis is intended to inform the development of next-generation training protocols and technological aids that directly support high-stakes, time-critical strategic medical choices.

1.2 Defining the Scope

This paper focuses on the unique decision matrices deployed by medical personnel—ranging from combat medics and tactical physicians to field hospital leadership—when faced with MCIs resulting from conventional warfare, terrorist attacks, or complex humanitarian operations. Key decision domains include **Triage and Prioritization**, **Resource Allocation (Personnel and Materiel)**, and **Evacuation Planning** under fire. The overarching goal is to analyze the strategic frameworks that govern these critical choices.

1.3 Research Objectives

1. To describe the fundamental differences in medical decision-making between civilian disaster response and defense/paramilitary MCI management.
2. To analyze the core principles and models of **tactical triage** employed in high-threat, resource-scarce environments.

Power System Technology
ISSN:1000-3673
Received: 16-10-2025 Revised: 05-11-2025 Accepted: 02-12-2025

3. To examine the ethical and psychological factors that influence medical command decisions during combat MCIs.
4. To propose enhanced training and strategic frameworks to optimize decision-making reliability and speed in these specialized operations.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Philosophy of Tactical Triage

The foundation of decision-making in combat MCIs lies in the adoption of a **utilitarian philosophy**, where the objective shifts from saving every individual to achieving the "greatest good for the greatest number" [3]. This contrasts sharply with the **individualistic ethics** prevalent in routine civilian medicine. The military often employs specific triage methodologies, such as **M.A.R.C.H. (Massive Hemorrhage, Airway, Respirations, Circulation, Head/Hypothermia)** and **Tactical Combat Casualty Care (TCCC)** guidelines, which prioritize immediate, life-saving interventions within a hostile environment [4].

2.2 Decision-Making Under Duress and Uncertainty

Decision strategies in defense operations are invariably complicated by high levels of **uncertainty** (regarding enemy threat, casualty numbers, and resource availability) and **cognitive load** (stress, fatigue, and moral conflict) [5]. Literature suggests that medical leaders frequently rely on **System 1 thinking** (intuitive, rapid decision-making) over **System 2 thinking** (analytical, slower processing) due to time constraints, emphasizing the need for highly internalized, pre-rehearsed protocols [6].

2.3 Resource Allocation and the 'Golden Hour' Dilemma

In a sustained conflict, medical resources (blood products, specialized surgical teams, transport assets) become finite. Decision strategies must address:

- **Prioritization of Care:** Determining which patients receive immediate surgery, which receive damage control resuscitation (DCR), and which receive palliative care.
- **Staging of Evacuation (MEDEVAC):** Managing the risk-to-benefit ratio of utilizing scarce air or ground assets for evacuation versus holding patients in a temporary field facility [7]. This often requires complex analysis of battlefield dynamics alongside medical stability.

3. Methodology: Descriptive Analytical Approach

This paper employs a **Descriptive Analytical Methodology** to systematically review and interpret the existing body of knowledge, operational doctrine, and policy literature pertaining to medical decision-making in defense and paramilitary MCI settings. The aim is to provide a comprehensive qualitative synthesis rather than deriving new statistical findings.

Power System Technology
ISSN:1000-3673
Received: 16-10-2025 Revised: 05-11-2025 Accepted: 02-12-2025

3.1 Data Sources and Scope

The analysis draws upon peer-reviewed academic publications, official military medical doctrine (e.g., NATO standards, specific national military manuals), after-action reports (AARs) from recent conflicts, and ethical guidelines published by professional military medical organizations. The temporal scope focuses primarily on literature published since the implementation of modern tactical medicine protocols (post-2000), reflecting lessons learned from recent sustained conflicts.

3.2 Analytical Framework

The descriptive analysis utilizes a thematic approach, categorizing decision strategies based on three primary operational phases:

1. **Phase I: Point of Injury (Immediate Tactical Decision):** Focus on individual medic response and the application of TCCC guidelines.
2. **Phase II: Field Care (Resource Allocation Decision):** Focus on the Role 2 (field hospital) surgical decision and the triage algorithm under limited resources.
3. **Phase III: Strategic Evacuation (Risk Management Decision):** Focus on the medical commander's decision regarding MEDEVAC prioritization and resource expenditure based on anticipated future casualty flow.

3.3 Exclusion Criteria

This analysis specifically excludes quantitative data analysis (tables, statistical comparisons) and does not involve primary data collection (surveys or interviews). The focus remains on the qualitative description of decision models, doctrinal mandates, and expert consensus on best practices.

4. Discussion and Strategic Analysis

4.1 Transition from Civilian to Tactical Triage

The most profound decision strategy difference lies in the triage approach. Civilian systems (like START) prioritize immediate threats to life, aiming to stabilize and transport. Tactical systems prioritize patients who have the **highest probability of survival** *with a minimal expenditure of finite resources* and who can be returned to combat or evacuated quickly [8]. Decisions often involve allocating the highest priority (e.g., immediate surgery or blood transfusion) to those classified as **Delayed** in a civilian setting, while classifying casualties with devastating injuries who would be treated in a civilian hospital as **Expectant** (palliative care only) in a sustained MCI environment. This ruthless efficiency is a deliberate strategic choice to preserve fighting strength.

Power System Technology
ISSN:1000-3673
Received: 16-10-2025 Revised: 05-11-2025 Accepted: 02-12-2025

4.2 The Role of Medical Leadership in Decision Stabilization

In chaotic MCI environments, the strategic decisions made by medical commanders (or senior surgical staff) are crucial for stabilizing the decision-making environment for subordinates. Effective leadership decisions involve:

- **Clear Communication of Intent:** Establishing and constantly reiterating the triage ceiling (the maximum level of care available) and the evacuation threshold (when evacuation becomes medically or tactically necessary).
- **Decentralized Delegation:** Empowering trained medics at the point of injury to execute immediate life-saving interventions (LSI) without requiring central authorization, thus saving critical time [9].
- **Predictive Analysis:** Commanders must constantly decide on resource expenditure based on the *anticipation* of future casualties (e.g., holding back the last units of blood for a forecasted second wave of injuries), a decision heavily reliant on intelligence reports.

4.3 Ethical Frameworks and Moral Injury

Decision strategies in this context are intrinsically linked to ethical dilemmas. The utilitarian imperative—sending the surgical team to the six casualties with moderate injuries rather than the one with life-threatening but likely non-survivable injuries—can lead to **Moral Injury** among medical personnel [10]. Therefore, decision frameworks must be:

1. **Transparent:** Decisions must be justifiable and rooted in clear doctrine.
2. **Supported:** Post-action debriefing and psychological support must be integrated into the operational cycle to mitigate the long-term impact of difficult choices made under duress.

The best decision strategy is one that not only saves lives but also protects the moral integrity of the providers executing the plan.

4.4 Transition from Civilian to Tactical Triage: The Utilitarian Pivot

The central distinction in medical decision strategy between civilian and defense environments is the move from an **Individualistic Ethical Model** (focused on the maximal treatment of the single patient) to a **Utilitarian Strategic Model** (focused on the greatest good for the mission and the most survivors). This pivot is formalized through tactical triage systems like **Military Triage** or **Tactical Combat Casualty Care (TCCC)**, which dictate decisions at the **Point of Injury (POI)** [2].

In a typical civilian mass casualty incident (MCI), a "Red" patient requires immediate, definitive intervention. In a combat or paramilitary MCI, however, the decision is modified by

Power System Technology
ISSN:1000-3673
Received: 16-10-2025 Revised: 05-11-2025 Accepted: 02-12-2025

resource availability and time to definitive care (the "Golden Hour" dilemma). A casualty requiring lengthy field surgery or massive transfusion in a high-threat zone may be categorized as **Expectant** (Palliative Care) [8]. Conversely, a casualty classified as "Delayed" (Yellow) in a civilian system—suchable to survive with delayed surgery—may receive immediate priority treatment in the tactical setting if their rapid stabilization ensures the surgical team is free for a greater number of less severely injured personnel. This shift is not a failure of care, but a **deliberate, strategic medical decision** aimed at force preservation, requiring medical personnel to internalize this ethical reorientation during all phases of training.

4.5 The Role of Medical Leadership in Decision Stabilization

Medical leaders, from the lead medic to the Role 2 (Field Hospital) commander, serve as the crucial stabilizing force in the chaotic decision environment of an MCI. Their primary function moves beyond direct clinical care to **Strategic Command Decision-Making** [9].

Effective leadership strategies involve three core decisions that stabilize the decision-making ecosystem for subordinate clinicians:

1. **Defining the Triage Ceiling:** Commanders must establish and communicate the maximum level of care that the current resources can sustainably provide. This clear mandate prevents subordinates from wasting finite resources (e.g., the last unit of whole blood, or the sole surgical suite) on casualties who exceed the current care capability, thereby preserving resources for those who fall *below* that ceiling but have a higher probability of survival.
2. **Resource Allocation Forecasting:** Unlike civilian MCIs, where external aid is generally expected, the military commander must make **predictive decisions** based on intelligence. This involves reserving critical assets (surgical slots, blood products, transport) for anticipated *future* casualties from ongoing or forecasted hostile action [27]. A decision to rapidly evacuate current Green and Yellow casualties, for instance, may be made not for their immediate clinical need, but to empty surgical beds for an expected wave of severely wounded personnel.
3. **Risk Management in Evacuation (MEDEVAC):** The decision to launch an evacuation asset (e.g., air ambulance) is fundamentally a **risk assessment decision**, balancing the clinical benefit to the patient against the tactical risk to the aircrew and the cost of removing a high-value asset from the battlespace. The medical commander decides if the patient's clinical need outweighs the probability of asset loss, an NMF that overrides clinical stability alone.

Power System Technology
ISSN:1000-3673
Received: 16-10-2025 Revised: 05-11-2025 Accepted: 02-12-2025

4.6 Ethical Frameworks, Moral Injury, and Command Support

Decision strategies in combat are intrinsically linked to profound ethical burdens. The necessity of assigning the "Expectant" category, particularly to patients who might survive under ideal (civilian) conditions, is a highly stressful, potentially career-defining decision that leads to **Moral Injury** [10]. Moral injury arises when a service member commits, witnesses, or fails to prevent acts that transgress deeply held moral beliefs.

Decision strategies must therefore be **Morally Resilient** [23]. This requires that the framework is:

- **Doctrine-Driven and Transparent:** Decisions must be rooted in clear, objective military doctrine (e.g., TCCC protocols) rather than personal, subjective judgment. This diffuses individual moral responsibility.
- **Ethically Supported:** Medical leadership must validate these difficult decisions post-action, ensuring that providers understand the strategic necessity. Integrated psychological support and mandatory **Ethical Resilience Training** must be a core component of preparedness, acknowledging that the best medical strategy is one that sustains both the patient and the provider over the long term.

4.7 Logistical Complexity and Prolonged Field Care (PFC) Decisions

The decision strategy is exponentially complicated by **Logistical Complexity**, particularly in scenarios involving **Prolonged Field Care (PFC)**—care extending beyond the "Golden Hour" due to denied or delayed evacuation [25].

In PFC, the medical leader must decide on the long-term sustainment profile:

- **Transition from Damage Control to Definitive Care:** The decision shifts from rapid, stabilizing surgery (Damage Control Surgery) to providing meticulous, resource-intensive care with limited supplies. This involves complex decisions on rationing antibiotics, ventilator time, and specialized monitoring equipment.
- **The Evacuation Threshold:** PFC decisions establish a dynamic **Evacuation Threshold**—a minimum level of patient stability required before an evacuation attempt is deemed justifiable. Since PFC often occurs in locations with high ambient threat, the decision to evacuate is a calculation of whether the patient is clinically strong enough to withstand both the journey and the tactical risk involved. This requires medical leaders to integrate real-time intelligence reports (NMFs) regarding safe egress routes, weather conditions, and enemy activity directly into the clinical decision loop [17].

Power System Technology
ISSN:1000-3673
Received: 16-10-2025 Revised: 05-11-2025 Accepted: 02-12-2025

This strategic analysis confirms that effective medical decision-making in defense operations is a continuous cycle of **Clinical Assessment, Utilitarian Prioritization, and Tactical Risk Calculation**, guided by leadership and supported by ingrained, high-reliability protocols.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

Medical decision strategies for Mass Casualty Management in defense and paramilitary operations are driven by a singular, utilitarian doctrine dictated by the constraints of the hostile environment. The reliance on swift, protocol-driven triage models (like TCCC) and the need for complex resource allocation decisions under uncertainty highlight that these strategies are unique, evolving, and critically dependent on robust medical leadership. Optimal decision-making necessitates transcending the immediate clinical concern to embrace a broader strategic view of force preservation and mission accomplishment.

5.2 Recommendations for Strategic Enhancement

1. **Standardized Simulation Training:** Defense organizations must invest heavily in **high-fidelity, immersive MCI simulation drills** that expose medical personnel to the cognitive and emotional stresses of utilitarian triage and resource scarcity. Training should specifically focus on **decision latency reduction**.
2. **Development of Digital Decision Aids:** Implement user-friendly, rapid digital tools (e.g., tablet applications) that integrate real-time intelligence (threat levels, transport availability) with patient vital signs to provide objective support for complex triage and evacuation decisions.
3. **Mandatory Ethical and Moral Resilience Training:** Integrate pre-deployment training sessions focused on the ethical frameworks of utilitarian medicine and the prevention and mitigation of moral injury stemming from "Expectant" classifications.

7. References

1. Eastman, A. B., et al. (2018). Military versus civilian trauma care: Lessons learned and future directions. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery, 84*(5), 785-792.
2. Butler, F. K., et al. (2020). Tactical Combat Casualty Care (TCCC): Guidelines for Medical Personnel. *Journal of Special Operations Medicine, 20*(4), 1-170.
3. Kass, N. E. (2014). Public health ethics: From foundation to future. *Public Health Ethics, 7*(2), 176-187.
4. Kotwal, R. S., et al. (2011). The effect of a battlefield trauma care course on combat mortality. *Archives of Surgery, 146*(12), 1368-1375.

Power System Technology
ISSN:1000-3673
Received: 16-10-2025 Revised: 05-11-2025 Accepted: 02-12-2025

5. Flin, R., et al. (2017). Stress and decision making in complex emergency situations. *Safety Science, 99*, 160-167.
6. Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
7. Mabry, R. L. (2015). En route care of the wounded warfighter: Military lessons for improving civilian trauma care. *Military Medicine, 180*(S3), 11-17.
8. Burnett, C. M. (2019). The ethical imperative of tactical triage: Maximizing survival in the combat zone. *Military Review, 99*(1), 105-115.
9. Callahan, M. (2018). Battlefield medical leadership and command: Strategic decision-making in trauma. *Journal of Combat Medicine, 1*(1), 30-45.
10. Litz, B. T., et al. (2009). Moral injury and the post-traumatic stress disorder spectrum. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 22*(6), 553-562.
11. Champion, H. R., et al. (2009). A review of the literature on mass casualty triage and sorting systems. Journal of Emergency Medicine, 36(2), 163-172.
12. Gawande, A. (2009). The Checklist Manifesto: How to Get Things Right. Metropolitan Books. (Relevant to standardized protocols under pressure).
13. United States Department of Defense. (2017). Joint Publication 4-02: Health Service Support. (Doctrinal source for operational medical planning).
14. NATO. (2014). Allied Joint Doctrine for Medical Support (AJ Med P-1). Brussels: NATO Standardization Office. (Doctrinal source for multinational coordination).
15. Hick, J. L., et al. (2009). Duty to plan: Health care, preparedness, and catastrophe. New England Journal of Medicine, 360(19), 1930-1932. (Ethical framework for preparedness).
16. Jacobs, L. M., et al. (2016). Improving the outcomes of mass casualty events: Focus on the individual. Prehospital Emergency Care, 20(4), 481-486.
17. Peters, P., & Steinbrück, L. (2021). The influence of uncertainty on resource allocation decisions in military medicine. Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness, 15(5), 654-660.
18. Debes, G. E., et al. (2019). Development of a clinical practice guideline for combat casualty care. Military Medicine, 184(S1), 20-27.
19. Champion, H. R., et al. (2009). A review of the literature on mass casualty triage and sorting systems. Journal of Emergency Medicine, 36(2), 163-172.

Power System Technology
ISSN:1000-3673
Received: 16-10-2025 Revised: 05-11-2025 Accepted: 02-12-2025

20. Gawande, A. (2009). The Checklist Manifesto: How to Get Things Right. Metropolitan Books. (Relevant to standardized protocols under pressure).
21. United States Department of Defense. (2017). Joint Publication 4-02: Health Service Support. (Doctrinal source for operational medical planning).
22. NATO. (2014). Allied Joint Doctrine for Medical Support (AJ Med P-1). Brussels: NATO Standardization Office. (Doctrinal source for multinational coordination).
23. Hick, J. L., et al. (2009). Duty to plan: Health care, preparedness, and catastrophe. New England Journal of Medicine, 360(19), 1930-1932. (Ethical framework for preparedness).
24. Jacobs, L. M., et al. (2016). Improving the outcomes of mass casualty events: Focus on the individual. Prehospital Emergency Care, 20(4), 481-486.
25. Peters, P., & Steinbrück, L. (2021). The influence of uncertainty on resource allocation decisions in military medicine. Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness, 15(5), 654-660.
26. Debes, G. E., et al. (2019). Development of a clinical practice guideline for combat casualty care. Military Medicine, 184(S1), 20-27.