**Table 2 Inter-rater reliability of triage methods and TEM v2**

 **Group 1** **Group 2** **Group 3** **Group 4** **Group 5** **Group 6**

 Met 1 TEM Met 2 TEM Met 3 TEM Met 4 TEM Met 5 TEM Met 6 TEM

**Weighted K inter** 0,71 0,75 0,80 1 0,69 0,61 0,76 1 0,98 0,84 0,25 0,79

**Complete agreement %** 64 73 68 100 68 35 74 100 94 83 41 82

**Complete disagreement %** 2 0 4 0 0 3 0 0 0 0 2 2

Note

|  |
| --- |
| K inter range = 0-1 (o= scarse agreement, 1= maximum agreement)Complete agreement : when all 12 nurses enrolled assigned the same triage code  |
|  Complete disagreement : when nurses of the same group assigned to the same scenario triage codes that differed in more than two priority levels, e.g., one nurse assigned level 4 and one other level 1Met = Triage Method used in 12 Emergency Departments ; TEM = Triage emergency Method version 2 |

**Table 3 Validity of TEM v2 for prediction of the Reference Standard’s rating**

 **Group 1** **Group 2** **Group 3** **Group 4** **Group 5** **Group 6**

**Accuracy (95% CI)** 0,78 (0,51-1,05) 0,79(0,57-1,00) 0,90(0,71-1,09) 0,79(0,57-1,00) 0,83(0,62-1,04) 0,86(0,67-1,04)

**Sensitivity (95% CI)** 1 ,00(1,00-1,00) 1 ,00(1,00-1,00) 1 ,00(1,00-1,00) 0,98(0,94-1,02) 1 ,00(1,00-1,00) 1 ,00(1,00-1,00)

**Specificity (95% CI**) 0,97(0,92-1,01) 0,95(0,90-1,00) 0,98(0,94-1,02) 0,94 (0,88-1,00) 0,97(0,92-1,01) 0,97(0,92-1,01)

**PPV (95% CI)** 1 ,00(1,00-1,00) 1 ,00(1,00-1,00) 1 ,00(1,00-1,00) 0,92(0,76-1,07) 1 ,00(1,00-1,00) 1 ,00(1,00-1,00)

**NPV (95% CI)** 0,96(0,91-1,01) 0,94(0,88-1,01) 0,97(0,92-1,02) 0,94(0,88-1,01) 0,96(0,91-1,01) 0,96(0,91-1,01)

**Note**

We tested the Accuracy, Sensitivity, Specificity, PPV (positive predictive value)), NPV (negative predictive value) among groups of nurses in each Emergency Department (who used TEM v2) in predict the Reference standard’s rating