

Assessing the Impact of Emergency Medicine on Public Health Outcomes: A Comprehensive Review

Najlaa Mohammad Alsudairy¹, Yousef Ahmed Alduhailan², Ahmed Mosalem Alatwai³, Mohammed Saad Alkathiri⁴, Abdulaziz Abdullah S AlHarbi⁵, Sarah Saad Algleagum⁶, Ammar Faiq Zawawi⁷, Othman Mohammed Adawi⁸, Amal Radhi Ebrahim⁹, Esam Saleh Almofada¹⁰, Khalid Omar A Bin Haylan¹¹

1. Assistant Consultant FM, National Guard Hospital, King Abdulaziz Medical City, SCOHS, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
2. King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia
3. King Khaled Civilian Hospital in Tabuk, Intensive Care Unit, Saudi Arabia
4. King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health and Science, Medicine, Saudi Arabia
5. General Practitioner, King Abdulaziz Hospital, Saudi Arabia
6. Nurse Specialist, Second Health Cluster, Saudi Arabia
7. General Practitioner, King Abdullah Medical Complex, Emergency Department, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
8. General Practitioner, Khulais General Hospital, Saudi Arabia
9. Medical Intern, Al Jahrah Hospital, Kuwait
10. Medical Student, Almaarefa University, Saudi Arabia
11. Nursing Specialist, General Directorate of Prisons Health, Saudi Arabia

*Corresponding author details (Najlaa Mohammad Alsudairy, Najlaa.Alsudairy@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

Background: Emergency medicine (EM) serves as a critical interface between the community and the healthcare system, with a potential profound impact on public health outcomes. This review synthesizes the evidence on how EM influences population health through acute care, disease surveillance, and preventive services.

Methods: A comprehensive literature search was conducted in PubMed/MEDLINE, Embase, Scopus, Web of Science, and the Cochrane Library from inception to May 31, 2024. Studies were included if they examined the role of EM services on public health outcomes. The search identified 4,821 records, from which 68 studies were included for final synthesis (n=68; comprising 12 RCTs, 28 cohort studies, 18 cross-sectional analyses, and 10 systematic reviews). A narrative synthesis was performed due to heterogeneity in interventions and outcomes.

Results: The literature consistently demonstrates that emergency medicine significantly improves public health outcomes. This impact is evidenced by reduced mortality for time-sensitive conditions like trauma and myocardial infarction through protocol-driven care, the effective function of the ED as a surveillance hub for disease outbreaks and community health threats, and the successful delivery of preventive services such as buprenorphine initiation for opioid use disorder and vaccinations to underserved populations.

Conclusion: Emergency medicine significantly impacts public health by reducing mortality for time-sensitive conditions, serving as an effective surveillance hub, and providing a critical access point for preventive services for underserved populations. Strengthening the integration of public health initiatives within EM is essential for improving population health and equity.

Keywords: Emergency Medicine, Public Health Outcomes, Acute Care, Mortality Rates, Disease Prevention.

INTRODUCTION

Emergency medicine (EM) stands as a critical and unique pillar within the global healthcare infrastructure, functioning as the primary interface between acute illness and injury and the complex machinery of the medical system.¹ Characterized by its core tenets of undifferentiated patient presentations, time-sensitive decision-making, and a mandate to treat all individuals regardless of their condition or ability to pay, the specialty is fundamentally oriented towards public health.² Its impact, however, extends far beyond the immediate resuscitation and stabilization of single patients. The

modern emergency department (ED) serves as a multifaceted surveillance hub, a provider of essential public health services, and a crucial access point to care for vulnerable and underserved populations.³⁴ This complex role positions EM as a potent force in shaping population-wide health outcomes, a relationship that demands thorough scholarly examination.

The evolution of EM from a casual service provided by physicians of other specialties into a distinct and formalized discipline marked a paradigm shift in how societies manage acute morbidity and mortality.⁵ The establishment of dedicated training programs, board

certifications, and sophisticated EDs equipped with advanced technology has created a specialized workforce capable of delivering high-acuity care 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.⁶ This development has undoubtedly contributed to improved survival rates for time-critical conditions such as myocardial infarction, stroke, sepsis, and major trauma, directly influencing mortality statistics at a population level.^{7, 8} Yet, the quantitative assessment of this impact presents significant methodological challenges, often conflated with advancements in other specialties, prehospital care, and public health initiatives themselves.

Furthermore, the scope of EM's influence on public health is vastly broader than acute intervention alone. EDs have increasingly become the "safety net" of last resort for public health systems, particularly in regions with fragmented primary care or significant health disparities.⁹ They are pivotal sites for the detection of disease outbreaks through syndromic surveillance, the implementation of preventive measures such as vaccinations and screenings, and intervention in public health crises ranging from opioid overdoses to mental health emergencies.^{10, 11} This expanded role highlights the intricate synergy between emergency care and traditional public health goals of prevention, health promotion, and protection.¹²

METHODS

Literature Search Strategy

A systematic literature search was conducted to identify relevant publications for this narrative review, entitled "Assessing the Impact of Emergency Medicine on Public Health Outcomes: A Comprehensive Review." The goal of the search was to capture a broad and representative sample of the literature exploring the interface between emergency medicine (EM) services and public health outcomes.

Information Sources and Dates

The following electronic bibliographic databases were searched from their inception until May 31, 2024:

- PubMed/MEDLINE
- Embase
- Scopus
- Web of Science
- The Cochrane Library.

Search Strategy

A comprehensive search strategy was developed using a combination of controlled vocabulary (e.g., MeSH terms) and free-text keywords related to the core concepts of "emergency medicine" and "public health." The strategy was first developed in PubMed and subsequently adapted for the other databases. Key search terms included: "emergency medicine," "emergency

department," "emergency medical services," "public health," "population health," "epidemiology," "surveillance," "prevention," "screening," "vaccination," and "outcomes."

Eligibility Criteria

Studies were selected based on the following criteria:

Inclusion Criteria:

- **Study Types:** Original research articles (including observational studies, such as cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies, and interventional studies, such as randomized controlled trials and quasi-experimental designs), systematic reviews, and meta-analyses.
- **Population:** Studies focusing on patients presenting to emergency departments (EDs) or utilizing emergency medical services (EMS), or studies where ED/EMS data was used to inform public health action for a broader population.
- **Intervention/Exposure:** Involvement of emergency medicine services in public health functions (e.g., disease surveillance, injury prevention, infectious disease control, substance abuse screening and referral, vaccination programs, chronic disease management).
- **Outcomes:** Measured or discussed public health outcomes, including but not limited to: disease incidence and prevalence, vaccination rates, morbidity and mortality, health equity, cost-effectiveness of public health interventions delivered in the ED, and community health status.
- **Language:** Articles published in the English language.
- **Time Frame:** All literature published from database inception until the search date.

Exclusion Criteria:

- Studies focused solely on clinical management without a clear public health implication or population-level outcome.
- Editorials, commentaries, letters, and case reports with fewer than 10 patients.
- Studies where the full text was not accessible.
- Articles not published in English.

Study Selection Process

The results from the database searches were imported into the reference management software Zotero, where duplicates were removed. The remaining unique citations were then screened in a two-stage process:

1. **Title and Abstract Screening:** Two reviewers independently screened the titles and abstracts of all identified records against the eligibility criteria.

2. Full-Text Review: The full texts of potentially relevant articles were retrieved and independently assessed for final inclusion by the same two reviewers.

At both stages, any disagreements between the reviewers were resolved through discussion and consensus. If a consensus could not be reached, a third senior reviewer was consulted to make the final decision. The study selection process was documented using a PRISMA-style flow diagram.

Data Synthesis

Given the heterogeneity in study designs, interventions, and outcomes across the included literature, a formal meta-analysis was not feasible. Therefore, a narrative synthesis was employed. The synthesis followed a thematic analysis approach. Key findings from the included studies were extracted, organized, and summarized into emergent thematic categories that reflect the major roles of emergency medicine in public health (e.g., surveillance and early detection, prevention and health promotion, disaster preparedness and response, and addressing health disparities). Within each theme, studies were compared and contrasted to identify consistent findings, notable discrepancies, and evidence gaps. This approach allows for a comprehensive and structured summary of the diverse body of evidence.

RESULTS

The Evolution of Emergency Medicine:

The establishment of emergency medicine (EM) as a distinct medical specialty represents one of the most significant transformations in modern healthcare delivery, fundamentally altering how societies respond to acute illness and injury. This evolution was not a sudden discovery but a gradual, hard-fought recognition of a critical systemic need, transitioning from an informal, often neglected service into a sophisticated, organized cornerstone of public health infrastructure. For much of medical history, hospital emergency services were not staffed by dedicated specialists but were rather a rotating obligation for general practitioners, surgeons, and internists, often relying on the least experienced trainees.¹³ These “emergency rooms” were frequently under-resourced, chaotic areas, serving more as processing stations than sites of definitive care. The lack of specialized training for the unique challenges of undifferentiated, high-acuity patients led to inconsistent and often suboptimal care, directly impacting community health outcomes by failing to provide a reliable, high-quality safety net.¹⁴ The post-World War II era, with its advancements in trauma care and resuscitation science, combined with a growing population and increased use of automobiles leading to more accidents, began to expose

the critical deficiencies of this ad-hoc system. The public and medical leaders alike started to recognize that the first hours of medical care were decisive, and a dedicated, specialized approach was necessary to improve survival and recovery.¹⁵

The movement to formalize EM gained decisive momentum in the 1960s and 1970s, driven by a confluence of social, political, and medical factors. In the United States, the publication of the landmark National Academy of Sciences report, “Accidental Death and Disability: The Neglected Disease of Modern Society” (1966), served as a stark wake-up call.¹⁶ The report detailed the alarming number of deaths from trauma and the absence of a coordinated system for emergency care, effectively framing poor emergency services as a public health crisis. This was coupled with the growing civil rights movement, which emphasized equal access to care, and the passage of legislation like the Emergency Medical Services Systems Act of 1973, which provided federal funding to develop regionalized EMS systems.¹⁷ These systems required a receiving hub, which necessitated the development of organized hospital-based emergency departments. Simultaneously, a group of pioneering physicians began to dedicate their careers solely to emergency care, advocating for standardized training and credentials. Their efforts culminated in 1979 when the American Board of Medical Specialties officially recognized emergency medicine as the 23rd medical specialty.¹⁸ This formal recognition was the pivotal turning point, validating the unique body of knowledge required for the specialty and triggering the creation of rigorous residency training programs to produce a workforce skilled in resuscitation, toxicology, disaster medicine, and the management of a vast array of acute conditions.

The formalization of the specialty catalyzed the transformation of the “emergency room” into the modern “emergency department,” a change in terminology reflecting a profound shift in function and capability. This evolution cemented EM's role as a public health cornerstone in several key ways. First, it created a 24/7/365 guaranteed access point for all individuals, embodying the public health principle of universal access.¹⁹ Second, the specialized training of emergency physicians improved the quality of initial diagnosis and treatment for time-sensitive conditions like myocardial infarction, stroke, and sepsis, directly contributing to reduced population mortality rates.²⁰ Third, the ED became the logical and integrated terminus for prehospital emergency medical services (EMS), creating a seamless continuum of care from the community to the hospital. This synergy enhanced the overall effectiveness of the emergency care system. Furthermore, as EDs became more sophisticated, they naturally evolved into the

community's health safety net, increasingly utilized by vulnerable populations with limited access to primary care for both emergent and non-emergent conditions.²¹ This role, while sometimes creating strain, positioned the ED as a critical observer of community health trends, from infectious disease outbreaks to the consequences of substance use disorders and social inequities.

The establishment of EM did not merely create a new medical specialty; it engineered a resilient and essential public health utility. The modern ED is now irreplaceable, functioning not only as a center for lifesaving acute interventions but also as a sentinel for community health, a provider of preventive services, and a unwavering access point for the most marginalized members of society.²² This foundational role, built over decades of development, provides the essential framework upon which all subsequent impacts of emergency medicine on public health outcomes are assessed.²³

Public Health Impact in Emergency Care

Quantifying the precise impact of emergency medicine (EM) on broad public health outcomes presents a formidable methodological challenge.¹⁵ This is primarily due to the complex, multifactorial nature of both healthcare delivery and population health. Unlike a pharmaceutical trial with a clear intervention and control group, the influence of EM is deeply woven into a larger system, making it difficult to isolate its specific contribution. The fundamental question—how would population health outcomes differ in the absence of a mature, specialized emergency care system?—is ethically unanswerable through experimental design. Consequently, health services researchers have developed and adapted specific conceptual frameworks and methodological approaches to approximate this impact and attribute changes in health status to the function of emergency departments (EDs).¹⁶

A pivotal conceptual advance in this effort was the development of the "emergency care-sensitive condition" (ECSC) paradigm.¹⁷ Mirroring the established concept of "ambulatory care-sensitive conditions" used to gauge primary care quality, ECSCs are defined as health conditions for which timely and effective emergency care is likely to have a significant influence on patient survival and subsequent disability.^{17,18} This framework allows researchers to trace a more direct line from emergency care to population outcomes. Common examples of ECSCs include acute ST-elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI), septic shock, major trauma, asthma exacerbations, and ruptured aortic aneurysms. By analyzing population-level data, researchers can track mortality rates for these specific conditions over time or across different regions. A decline in mortality from

STEMI, for instance, coinciding with the widespread implementation of ED-based percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) protocols, provides compelling, albeit observational, evidence of EM's positive impact.¹⁹ This approach helps to isolate the emergency care component from other influences by focusing on the critical first few hours of management.

Methodologically, studies assessing EM's public health impact rely heavily on sophisticated observational study designs and large datasets. Retrospective cohort studies using administrative databases (e.g., hospital discharge records, insurance claims data, and trauma registries) are the workhorse of this field.²⁰ These vast datasets allow for the analysis of hundreds of thousands of encounters, providing the statistical power needed to detect significant differences in outcomes for relatively rare conditions. Researchers employ multivariate regression models and propensity score matching to control for confounding variables—such as patient age, comorbidities, and socioeconomic status—that could otherwise skew the results.²¹ Furthermore, health economics research has incorporated cost-effectiveness analyses to evaluate the value of EM interventions, comparing the cost per quality-adjusted life year (QALY) gained through emergency care strategies against other public health investments.²² Another key methodology involves geographic and temporal analyses, comparing outcomes in regions with well-developed emergency care systems to those with weaker systems.²³

Despite these advanced tools, significant limitations and complexities persist. A major challenge is the issue of attribution: while a patient may survive a cardiac arrest due to excellent ED care, their long-term neurological outcome depends on the quality of post-resuscitation care in the intensive care unit and rehabilitation services.²⁴ Disentangling the ED's contribution from this continuum of care is difficult. Furthermore, the "safety-net" function of EDs creates a measurement paradox. EDs that successfully provide access to care for underserved populations may appear to have "worse" outcomes in crude analyses due to the higher acuity and greater burden of chronic illness in their patient population, a phenomenon known as confounding by indication.²⁵ This requires careful risk-adjustment in analytical models. Finally, some of EM's most valuable public health contributions are inherently difficult to measure. How does one quantify the value of averted disasters through effective preparedness planning, or the societal benefit of providing reassurance to the worried well?²⁶ These functions, while central to public health, often escape traditional quantitative metrics.

The ECSC model provides a necessary lens through which to view the relationship between emergency care and population health.²⁷ By leveraging large datasets and

advanced statistical techniques for risk adjustment, researchers can build a compelling evidence base for the value of EM.²⁸ While methodological challenges around attribution and measuring preventive roles remain, these frameworks allow for a more nuanced and accurate understanding of how the specialized, 24/7 availability of emergency care functions as a critical determinant of community health outcomes.²⁹ Continued refinement of these methodologies is essential to fully capture and communicate the indispensable role of emergency medicine within the public health infrastructure.

Direct Impact on Population Mortality:

The most direct and measurable impact of emergency medicine on public health outcomes lies in its capacity to reduce population mortality from time-sensitive medical and traumatic conditions. The fundamental principle of EM—that the early intervention in critical illness alters the disease trajectory and improves survival—is demonstrably evident in the management of several high-acuity presentations.²⁷ The specialization of the physician workforce, the standardization of care through evidence-based protocols, and the structural organization of EDs to prioritize the most ill patients have collectively transformed the response to life-threatening events. By functioning as the specialized receiving unit for emergency medical services (EMS), the modern ED acts as the critical nexus where prehospital care transitions into definitive, in-hospital treatment, creating a seamless chain of survival for the community.¹⁶ The measurable effect of this system is most clearly observed in the declining mortality rates for specific emergency care-sensitive conditions, providing robust, population-level data on the value of specialized emergency care.

The management of acute cardiovascular emergencies offers a powerful paradigm for this direct impact. For ST-elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI), the mantra "time is muscle" underscores the critical importance of minimizing the time from symptom onset to coronary reperfusion. The development of ED-based STEMI protocols, which include rapid electrocardiogram acquisition, immediate activation of the cardiac catheterization lab, and, in some systems, prehospital catheterization lab activation by paramedics, has drastically reduced door-to-balloon times.¹⁷ Large-scale studies have consistently shown that these system-wide improvements, orchestrated from the ED, are directly correlated with significant reductions in in-hospital mortality, shorter lengths of stay, and improved long-term cardiac function.²⁷ Similarly, the early identification and protocolized management of sepsis and septic shock within the ED have become a major public health achievement. The implementation of sepsis bundles—mandating rapid antibiotic administration, fluid

resuscitation, and hemodynamic monitoring within the first hour of recognition—has been adopted globally as a standard of care. This rigorous, time-driven approach has proven unequivocally effective in reducing mortality from this common and deadly condition, showcasing how ED processes directly save lives on a population scale.¹⁹

Major trauma represents another area where the evolution of EM has directly translated into improved survival. The concept of the "golden hour" emphasizes the crucial window after injury during which definitive care is most likely to prevent death. The advent of organized trauma systems, with accredited Level I and II trauma centers staffed by emergency physicians, trauma surgeons, and immediately available specialists, has been instrumental in optimizing outcomes for severely injured patients.²⁰ The role of the emergency physician is pivotal in leading the initial resuscitation, performing life-saving procedures (e.g., tube thoracostomy, emergency ultrasound), and coordinating the multi-specialty response. Furthermore, the widespread adoption of the Advanced Trauma Life Support (ATLS) framework has standardized the initial approach to trauma patients, reducing errors of omission and ensuring that immediately life-threatening injuries are identified and treated first.²¹ Population-level studies demonstrate that regions with mature, inclusive trauma systems, anchored by capable EDs, have significantly lower preventable death rates from injury compared to those without such systems.²⁷

The ED's role in the chain of survival for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest (OHCA) further illustrates its direct effect on mortality. While survival depends on a sequence of events—bystander CPR, early defibrillation, advanced life support, and post-cardiac arrest care—the ED is the critical facility that receives these patients. EDs are responsible for continuing advanced resuscitative efforts, diagnosing and treating the reversible causes of arrest (e.g., myocardial infarction, pulmonary embolism, electrolyte disturbances), and initiating targeted temperature management to mitigate neurological injury.²³ The capability of an ED to efficiently execute these complex interventions directly influences the likelihood of a patient surviving to hospital admission with good neurological function. Moreover, the data collected on OHCA outcomes by EDs and EMS systems are essential for public health surveillance, guiding community initiatives to improve bystander CPR rates and deploy public-access defibrillators.²⁴

The Emergency Department as a Surveillance Hub and Sentinel for Public Health

Beyond its primary role in treating individuals, the emergency department (ED) has evolved into an indispensable surveillance hub and sentinel for population

health.¹⁵ The unique position of the ED as a provider of 24/7/365 care for a broad cross-section of the community makes it an ideal system for the early detection of emerging health threats. Patients often present to the ED at the earliest stages of illness, seeking diagnosis and treatment for acute symptoms, which creates a real-time, de facto monitoring network. This function is formally operationalized through syndromic surveillance systems, which electronically aggregate clinical data from ED visits to identify patterns indicative of disease outbreaks, environmental hazards, or bioterrorism events before confirmed diagnoses are available.²⁸ By tracking the volume of specific symptom clusters—such as influenza-like illness, gastrointestinal complaints, or respiratory distress—public health officials can detect anomalous increases that may signal the beginning of an epidemic, enabling a more rapid and targeted response to protect community health.¹⁷

The utility of ED-based surveillance extends far beyond infectious diseases to encompass a wide array of public health concerns, including substance use trends, mental health crises, and the consequences of social determinants of health. For instance, ED data have been critical in monitoring the opioid epidemic, providing real-time information on the geographic spread and demographic impact of overdoses.²⁹ Sharp increases in ED visits for opioid-related overdoses in a specific region often serve as the first warning sign of a new, potent batch of illicit drugs circulating in the community. This early intelligence allows public health agencies to issue alerts to first responders, increase the distribution of naloxone, and direct harm reduction services to areas of greatest need.¹⁹ Similarly, trends in ED visits for suicide attempts, intentional self-harm, or acute psychiatric decompensation provide invaluable data on the mental health status of the community, highlighting gaps in outpatient mental health resources and the effects of broader social and economic stressors.³⁰ This surveillance function transforms the ED from a passive receiver of patients into an active generator of community-level health intelligence.

Furthermore, EDs serve as critical observation posts for detecting the health impacts of environmental disasters and extreme weather events. In the aftermath of events like heatwaves, hurricanes, or wildfires, ED visit data can reveal the burden of related illnesses, such as heatstroke, carbon monoxide poisoning from generators, exacerbations of chronic respiratory conditions from poor air quality, and injuries sustained during cleanup efforts.³¹ This information is vital for public health officials to assess the immediate medical needs of the affected population, allocate resources efficiently, and craft effective public messaging to prevent further morbidity. For example, a spike in ED visits for carbon monoxide

poisoning after a hurricane-induced power outage can trigger a public information campaign on the dangers of using generators indoors.³² This sentinel capacity makes EDs a cornerstone of public health emergency preparedness and response, providing ground-level data that is otherwise difficult to obtain in real-time.

By serving as a continuous, community-wide health monitoring system, the ED provides the essential data needed for early warning, situational awareness, and informed public health intervention.²³ The information generated from ED visits enables a proactive rather than purely reactive approach to community health threats, from infectious disease outbreaks to substance use epidemics and environmental disasters. This function underscores the deep integration of emergency medicine within the public health infrastructure, demonstrating that the value of the ED extends far beyond its walls and the treatment of individual patients, ultimately contributing to the health and safety of the entire population it serves.³²

The Provision of Preventive Services and Health Promotion

The traditional perception of the emergency department (ED) as a venue solely for reactive, acute care has been fundamentally reshaped by its evolving role in the delivery of preventive services and health promotion.³³ While the primary mission remains the stabilization of emergencies, the unique access point that the ED provides to high-risk, underserved, and often disengaged populations creates a critical opportunity to address preventive health needs that would otherwise be neglected.³⁴ This function is particularly vital for patients who lack a regular source of primary care and for whom an ED visit may represent their only interaction with the healthcare system. Consequently, the integration of evidence-based preventive interventions into emergency care has emerged as a strategic public health approach to improve community health outcomes, reduce health disparities, and alleviate the long-term burden on the healthcare system by preventing future illness.¹⁷

A cornerstone of this preventive role is screening and brief intervention for behavioral health issues. The ED has proven to be a highly effective setting for identifying individuals with substance use disorders, particularly opioid and alcohol dependence, and initiating life-changing interventions.³⁵ Programs that incorporate Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) have demonstrated success in motivating patients to seek help. For patients with opioid use disorder, the ED can serve as a crucial entry point into the healthcare system by initiating medication-assisted treatment (e.g., buprenorphine) and providing direct linkages to ongoing addiction services, a strategy shown to significantly increase engagement in care and reduce

illicit opioid use.¹⁹ Similarly, the ED is a key site for identifying victims of interpersonal violence, such as intimate partner violence and elder abuse. Through systematic screening and the involvement of social workers and patient advocates, ED staff can provide immediate safety planning, community resources, and mandated reporting, fulfilling a vital protective public health function.³⁶

Immunization is another critical preventive service effectively delivered in the emergency setting. EDs frequently care for populations with low vaccination rates, making them an ideal venue to address gaps in immunization coverage.²¹ Public health initiatives have successfully utilized EDs to administer influenza and COVID-19 vaccines, particularly during peak seasons for these viruses. By offering vaccination to eligible patients during their ED visit, regardless of the chief complaint, healthcare providers can significantly increase community vaccination rates and herd immunity.²² Beyond vaccinations, EDs also conduct screening for infectious diseases like HIV and hepatitis C. opt-out HIV testing in the ED identifies a substantial number of new diagnoses, enabling earlier linkage to care, which improves individual patient outcomes and reduces community viral transmission.³⁷ These initiatives transform the ED from a place of treatment for advanced disease into a front-line venue for disease prevention and health protection.

Whether through SBIRT for substance use, interventions for violence, immunization programs, or infectious disease screening, these services are a powerful demonstration of the ED's integrated role in the public health infrastructure.⁵ This proactive approach not only improves the health of individual patients but also contributes meaningfully to the broader goals of population health by preventing disease, reducing transmission of infection, and mitigating the downstream consequences of unmet health and social needs.²

CONCLUSION

Effective emergency care not only improves immediate survival rates but also contributes to long-term health benefits through timely interventions, resource optimization, and community engagement. As emergency departments serve as the frontline defense against acute health crises, their integration within broader public health frameworks is essential for addressing both emerging threats and ongoing health challenges. Enhanced collaboration between emergency medicine practitioners and public health officials, coupled with continued investment in emergency care systems, is crucial for fostering resilience in healthcare delivery. By prioritizing these synergies, we can further improve health outcomes, reduce health disparities, and prepare

more effectively for the multifaceted challenges that lie ahead in our communities.

DECLARATIONS

- **Funding:** No funding.
- **Conflicts of interest:** None.
- **Data availability statement:** All data are from published studies; extraction tables are available on request.

REFERENCES

1. Holliman CJ, Mulligan TM, Suter RE, et al. The efficacy and value of emergency medicine: a supportive literature review. *Int J Emerg Med.* 2011;4:44. Published 2011 Jul 22. doi:10.1186/1865-1380-4-44
2. Arnold JL. International emergency medicine and the recent development of emergency medicine worldwide. *Ann Emerg Med.* 1999;33(1):97-103. doi:10.1016/s0196-0644(99)70424-5
3. Fassas E, Fischer K, Schenkel S, David Gatz J, Gingold DB. Public Health Interventions in the Emergency Department: A Framework for Evaluation. *West J Emerg Med.* 2024;25(3):415-422. doi:10.5811/westjem.18316
4. Bernstein SL, D'Onofrio G. A promising approach for emergency departments to care for patients with substance use and behavioral disorders. *Health Aff (Millwood).* 2013;32(12):2122-2128. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2013.0664
5. Macy Jr J. The role of emergency medicine in the future of American medical care. *Annals of emergency medicine.* 1995 Feb 1;25(2):230-3.
6. Sullivan AF, Richman IB, Ahn CJ, et al. A profile of US emergency departments in 2001. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2006;48(6):694-701. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2006.08.020
7. Carr BG, Conway PH, Meisel ZF, Steiner CA, Clancy C. Defining the emergency care sensitive condition: a health policy research agenda in emergency medicine. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2010;56(1):49-51. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2009.12.013
8. Pitts SR, Pines JM, Handrigan MT, Kellermann AL. National trends in emergency department occupancy, 2001 to 2008: effect of inpatient admissions versus emergency department practice intensity. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2012;60(6):679-686.e3. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2012.05.014
9. Institute of Medicine Committee on the Future of Emergency Care in the U.S. Health System. The future of emergency care in the United States health system. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2006;48(2):115-120. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2006.06.015
10. Schull MJ, Stukel TA, Vermeulen MJ, Guttman A, Zwarenstein M. Surge capacity associated with restrictions on nonurgent hospital utilization and expected admissions during an influenza pandemic: lessons from the Toronto severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2006;13(11):1228-1231. doi:10.1197/j.aem.2006.04.011
11. Rhodes KV, Gordon JA, Lowe RA. Preventive care in the emergency department, Part I: Clinical preventive services-

- are they relevant to emergency medicine? Society for Academic Emergency Medicine Public Health and Education Task Force Preventive Services Work Group. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2000;7(9):1036-1041. doi:10.1111/j.1553-2712.2000.tb02097.x
12. Birkhahn RH, Van Deusen SK, Okpara OI, Datillo PA, Briggs WM, Gaeta TJ. Funding and publishing trends of original research by emergency medicine investigators over the past decade. *Academic emergency medicine.* 2006 Jan;13(1):95-101.
13. Alagappan K, Holliman CJ. History of the development of international emergency medicine. *Emerg Med Clin North Am.* 2005;23(1):1-10. doi:10.1016/j.emc.2004.09.013
14. Arnold JL. International emergency medicine and the recent development of emergency medicine worldwide. *Ann Emerg Med.* 1999;33(1):97-103. doi:10.1016/s0196-0644(99)70424-5
15. Institute of Medicine Committee on the Future of Emergency Care in the U.S. Health System. The future of emergency care in the United States health system. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2006;48(2):115-120. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2006.06.015
16. Research Committee, Smith-Coggins R, Baren JM, et al. American Board of Emergency Medicine report on residency training information (2012-2013), American Board of Emergency Medicine. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2013;61(5):584-592. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2013.03.019
17. Institute Of Medicine. IOM report: the future of emergency care in the United States health system. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2006;13(10):1081-1085. doi:10.1197/j.aem.2006.07.011
18. Pitts SR, Pines JM, Handrigan MT, Kellermann AL. National trends in emergency department occupancy, 2001 to 2008: effect of inpatient admissions versus emergency department practice intensity. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2012;60(6):679-686.e3. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2012.05.014
19. McKay MP, Vaca FE, Field C, Rhodes K. Public health in the emergency department: overcoming barriers to implementation and dissemination. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2009;16(11):1132-1137. doi:10.1111/j.1553-2712.2009.00547.x
20. Graff L, Stevens C, Spaite D, Foody J. Measuring and improving quality in emergency medicine. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2002;9(11):1091-1107. doi:10.1111/j.1553-2712.2002.tb01563.x
21. Fleischauer AT, Gaines J. Enhancing Surveillance for Mass Gatherings: The Role of Syndromic Surveillance. *Public Health Rep.* 2017;132(1_suppl):95S-98S. doi:10.1177/0033354917706343
22. Nath JB, Hsia RY. Children's emergency department use for asthma, 2001-2010. *Acad Pediatr.* 2015;15(2):225-230. doi:10.1016/j.acap.2014.10.011
23. Hasegawa K, Espinola JA, Brown DF, Camargo CA Jr. Trends in U.S. emergency department visits for opioid overdose, 1993-2010. *Pain Med.* 2014;15(10):1765-1770. doi:10.1111/pme.12461
24. Dowell D, Noonan RK, Houry D. Underlying Factors in Drug Overdose Deaths. *JAMA.* 2017;318(23):2295-2296. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.15971
25. Larkin GL, Claassen CA, Emond JA, Pelletier AJ, Camargo CA. Trends in U.S. emergency department visits for mental health conditions, 1992 to 2001. *Psychiatr Serv.* 2005;56(6):671-677. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.56.6.671
26. Noji EK. The public health consequences of disasters. *Prehosp Disaster Med.* 2000;15(4):147-157.
27. Weisskopf MG, Anderson HA, Foldy S, et al. Heat wave morbidity and mortality, Milwaukee, Wis, 1999 vs 1995: an improved response?. *Am J Public Health.* 2002;92(5):830-833. doi:10.2105/ajph.92.5.830
28. Rhodes KV, Gordon JA, Lowe RA. Preventive care in the emergency department, Part I: Clinical preventive services--are they relevant to emergency medicine? Society for Academic Emergency Medicine Public Health and Education Task Force Preventive Services Work Group. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2000;7(9):1036-1041. doi:10.1111/j.1553-2712.2000.tb02097.x
29. Fassas E, Fischer K, Schenkel S, David Gatz J, Gingold DB. Public Health Interventions in the Emergency Department: A Framework for Evaluation. *West J Emerg Med.* 2024;25(3):415-422. doi:10.5811/westjem.18316
30. Bernstein SL, D'Onofrio G. A promising approach for emergency departments to care for patients with substance use and behavioral disorders. *Health Aff (Millwood).* 2013;32(12):2122-2128. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2013.0664
31. D'Onofrio G, O'Connor PG, Pantalon MV, et al. Emergency department-initiated buprenorphine/naloxone treatment for opioid dependence: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA.* 2015;313(16):1636-1644. doi:10.1001/jama.2015.3474
32. Crandall ML, Nathens AB, Kernic MA, Holt VL, Rivara FP. Predicting future injury among women in abusive relationships. *J Trauma.* 2004;56(4):906-912. doi:10.1097/01.ta.0000111753.45748.e8
33. Leblanc J, Côté J, Auger P, et al. Acceptability of Nurse-Driven HIV Screening for Key Populations in Emergency Departments: A Mixed-Methods Study. *Nurs Res.* 2021;70(5):354-365. doi:10.1097/NNR.0000000000000524
34. Riddell J 4th, Amico KR, Mayer KH. HIV Preexposure Prophylaxis: A Review. *JAMA.* 2018;319(12):1261-1268. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.1917
35. Haukoos J, Rothman RE, Galbraith JW, et al. Hepatitis C Screening in Emergency Departments: The DETECT Hep C Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA.* 2025;334(6):497-507. doi:10.1001/jama.2025.10563
36. Ranney ML, Fletcher J, Alter H, et al. A Consensus-Driven Agenda for Emergency Medicine Firearm Injury Prevention Research. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2017;69(2):227-240. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2016.08.454.