The Review Of
DIABETIC
STUDIES
OPEN ACCESS

Healthcare Security In Tactical Emergency Medical Services: Medical Care And Casualty Evacuation Under Active Threat Conditions

Fahad Shuayfan Mohsen Alotaibi[1] , Abdullah Hamoud Abdulrahman Al-Nefaie[2] , Faisal Majed Saeed Alshahrani[3] , Mohammed Nasser Sulaiman Alhusaynan[4] , Abdulrahman Ali Ahmed Hadadi[5] , Turki Muqbil Marzouq Alotaibi[6] , Rawan Mohammed Ali Al-Qahtani[7] , Bashayr Thear Mesfer Alqahtani[8] , Tahani Hadi Yahya Aati[9] , Naif Abdulaziz Hathal Aldawsari[10] , Muneerah Saleh Sulman Alshunaifi[11] , Thamer Mohsen Mohammed Aldajani[12] , Sarah Mohammed Nasser Alshuhail[13] , Mashail Ibrahim Jaza Alqahtani[14]

[1-14]*Durma Hospital.*

Abstract:

Background: High-threat law enforcement operations have accelerated the integration of Tactical Emergency Medical Support (TEMS) into police missions, translating battlefield lessons to the civilian domain. TEMS emphasizes threat-calibrated care, structured operational zoning (hot/warm/cool), rapid and remote assessment, and a trauma sequence that prioritizes exsanguination control (XABCDE). It also formalizes extraction and evacuation pathways and demands disciplined interagency communication and healthcare security practices.

Aim: To synthesize a healthcare security–focused framework for medical care and casualty evacuation under active threat, delineating competencies, decision processes, and operational enablers that optimize survivability while safeguarding responders.

Methods: Narrative synthesis of doctrinal principles and practice guidance described in the article, mapping core elements—zonal care, rapid and remote assessment methodology (RRAM), XABCDE, extraction modalities, evacuation coordination (ground and air), and communication protocols—into a coherent, operational model. Simulation insights on extraction devices and commonly deployed en-route critical care capabilities are incorporated.

Results: A threat-informed continuum is defined: in the hot zone, self-care and rapid movement to cover predominate; in the warm zone, providers balance immediate life-saving intervention against residual risk; in the cool zone, bundled care and organized transport proceed. RRAM provides a stepwise risk–benefit algorithm, while XABCDE operationalizes clinical priorities (tourniquets, chest seals, decompression, permissive hypotension, selective airway strategies). Extraction emphasizes longitudinal drags, vest-assisted control, and the judicious use of rigid/soft stretchers and armored shielding; evacuation stresses preplanned EMS interfaces, capacity for blood products, vasopressors, and ventilation, and contingencies for law-enforcement or rotary-wing transport. Communication discipline underpins security, tempo, and clinical accuracy.

Conclusion: Implementing this integrated model can reduce preventable mortality and provider harm by aligning medical interventions with tactical realities, standardizing communication, and rehearsing extraction–evacuation workflows.

Keywords: Tactical emergency medical support; active threat; TECC/TCCC; XABCDE; RRAM; hot–warm–cool zones; extraction; evacuation; hemorrhage control; SWAT; CBRNE; interagency communication; healthcare security.

Introduction:

In the wake of numerous highly publicized police operations that culminated in injuries to both officers and bystanders, agencies have accelerated the institutionalization of tactical emergency medical support (TEMS) as a distinct capability embedded within law enforcement missions. This maturation reflects an intentional translation of battlefield medical practice to the civilian high-threat context, acknowledging that prehospital interventions must be planned and executed within evolving threat landscapes rather than controlled clinical settings. The conceptual roots of TEMS are unmistakably military. During World War I, commanders detailed nonmedical personnel to forward trenches to render immediate aid to the wounded, establishing a precedent for point-of-injury care under fire. By World War II, these functions had coalesced into the fully fledged combat medic, an operational role recognized across modern armed forces and characterized by rapid assessment, lifesaving intervention, and facilitation of evacuation despite tactical constraints. As domestic policing increasingly confronted situations with comparable risks and tempo, this combat medic paradigm was purposefully adapted to civilian special-operations policing, culminating in a set of practices and training pathways aligned with law enforcement objectives. The Tactical Combat Casualty Care (TCCC) guidelines—originally designed for military units—were formally recalibrated for civilian application in 2011, marking a pivotal moment in codifying threat-informed, prehospital trauma care for police-supported operations (Source: Callaway, 2017).

Within this modernized framework, TEMS teams are specifically educated to recognize and manage the dynamic hazards inherent to high-risk deployments, sustaining medical decision-making amid uncertainty, limited cover, and operational imperatives such as scene dominance and rapid extraction. Their mandate is not merely to deliver clinical care but to do so in a manner that preserves force protection, supports mission completion, and minimizes preventable mortality under hostile or degraded conditions (Source: Granholm, 2024). Consequently, TEMS providers must transcend the conventional skill set associated with urban emergency response. While foundational emergency medical services (EMS) competencies remain essential, the operational profile of TEMS demands additional breadth and depth. Providers cultivate proficiency in wilderness and austere medicine to address resource-limited or prolonged operations; they train extensively in recognizing and mitigating chemical, biologic, radiologic, nuclear, and explosives (CBRNE) threats; and they master hazardous materials protocols to protect patients, responders, and evidence integrity during contaminated or suspicious scenes. They also plan and execute casualty evacuation and medical evacuation under tactical constraints, integrating route security, staging, and interagency coordination with the medical priorities of triage, stabilization, and hypothermia prevention. These capabilities are underpinned by a suite of operational competencies—from communications and movement under fire to interface with command structures—that enable safe, timely, and ethically sound medical actions when seconds and meters determine survivability [1].

Crucially, the care pathways and evacuation logic adopted in TEMS depart in significant ways from those used in routine civilian EMS. In TEMS, triage and intervention are explicitly threat-based: providers calibrate what can be done against what must be done given the balance of tactical risk, terrain, and available resources. This means that in certain phases of an operation—especially while under direct threat—the scope of feasible care may be deliberately constrained to hemorrhage control, rapid repositioning to cover, and immediate preparations for extraction. Only as the threat diminishes do providers expand to broader airway and breathing management, circulation optimization, and other definitive prehospital measures. Evacuation, too, is conceived differently: routes, modes, and timing are chosen not only for medical expediency but also for survivability of all parties, scene security, and evidentiary considerations. Such differences—rooted in the realities of contested spaces, fluid command decisions, and the imperative to minimize additional casualties—mark a substantive divergence from the civilian EMS paradigm, where the scene is expected to be secured before clinical care proceeds and where transport timelines, packaging standards, and resuscitation protocols are shaped by comparatively stable risk profiles [2][3][4].

Collectively, these developments position TEMS as a rigorously interdisciplinary domain that fuses clinical excellence with tactical literacy. The historical progression from trench-side aid to the combat medic and, ultimately, to civilian TEMS underscores a central insight: effective prehospital care in high-threat events must reconcile medical priorities with operational realities. The 2011 civilian adaptation of TCCC guidelines (Source: Callaway, 2017) and the subsequent professionalization of TEMS training (Source: Granholm, 2024) codify this reconciliation by equipping providers to deliver context-appropriate, evidence-informed interventions while safeguarding responders and the public. In practice, TEMS thereby serves as both a medical force multiplier and a strategic asset—one that reduces preventable deaths, enhances mission success, and strengthens community trust by ensuring that lifesaving care is not deferred until the shooting stops but is intelligently delivered throughout the continuum of threat [1][2][3][4].

Issues of Concern

Tactical emergency medical support hinges on the disciplined capacity of practitioners to appraise the operational context rapidly, weigh the spectrum of environmental and situational hazards, and then sequence interventions that yield the highest survivability advantage relative to the prevailing threat. In practice, this means that clinical decision-making is inseparable from tactical judgment: providers must continuously reconcile patient needs with the realities of limited cover, uncertain or shifting lines of fire, and fluctuating command priorities. The result is a model of care that frequently accepts delayed intervention, acknowledges austere resource constraints, and anticipates protracted transport intervals—conditions that collectively demand a rigorous triage ethic, mastery of time-critical skills, and a high tolerance for ambiguity [5][6][7]. Within this paradigm, the notion of "best" care is contingent not on the completeness of a clinical algorithm but on the safety envelope within which the provider and patient exist at any given moment. To bring structure to these choices, the zoning framework distinguishes the hot, warm, and cool areas of operation, each defined by the immediacy and magnitude of risk and each prescribing a distinct ceiling for permissible medical action. The hot zone denotes the locus of immediate danger—the "red zone" or the classic Care Under Fire phase—where the influence of the threat eclipses nearly all other considerations. In this environment, the cardinal objective is survival through movement, and therefore patient contact is necessarily minimalistic and purpose-built. Only self-care by the casualty or the most time-sensitive, body-substance-isolated actions that facilitate rapid extraction are justifiable. The logic is straightforward: any procedure that anchors the provider or delays egress magnifies exposure and may compound casualties, subverting both medical and tactical goals.

As the threat attenuates to a level that remains possible but not immediate, the operational space transitions to the warm zone—often termed the "yellow zone" or Tactical Field Care. Here, providers must execute a nuanced risk calculus: whether to evacuate promptly and accept delays in intervention, or to remain in a marginally secure area to address life-threatening derangements before movement. This balance is dynamic, influenced by variables such as cover and concealment, enemy pattern of life, resource proximity, and the number and condition of casualties. The warm zone thereby becomes the fulcrum of tactical medicine—where the greatest gains in preventable death are achievable, yet where overextension still courts unacceptable risk. When the operational picture stabilizes such that imminent danger no longer persists, the area is designated the cool zone, also known as the "green zone" or Tactical Evacuation Care (Tac-Evac). In this setting, patient management can approximate conventional prehospital practice, with broader assessment, bundled interventions, and organized transport—though always tempered by the possibility of re-escalation and the imperatives of coordinated evacuation. A disciplined, reproducible approach to scene entry and early actions is articulated in the rapid and remote assessment methodology (RRAM), which systematizes how providers maximize patient benefit while minimizing provider risk. Its first principle is standoff situational analysis: practitioners should interrogate the scene from a protected vantage point and defer entry into environments where danger is possible or likely unless the anticipated medical benefit is both substantial and time-critical. Under active fire or direct threat, the scope of practice contracts to essential maneuvers only; canonical stabilization steps—however familiar in civilian contexts—must be re-evaluated through a tactical lens that penalizes duration and noise, and rewards mobility and concealment. Security validation follows any injury event; providers must seek confirmation, through command channels and personal observation, that the immediate area is sufficiently controlled to permit contact. When contact is feasible, they must also determine whether the casualty is a threat actor. The CLEAR mnemonic structures this judgment: Confirm identity to establish friend, foe, or unknown; Look deliberately for concealed or dropped weapons; Evaluate injuries with an eye to weapons access and functional capacity; Acquire intelligence if obtainable without jeopardy; and Retain proficiency with weapons to disarm or render them safe if circumstances require.

Simultaneously, providers evaluate injury severity and stratify the tempo of care accordingly. Stable patients can often be coached in self-care from a protected position—tightening a tourniquet, applying direct pressure, or repositioning for airway patency—while unstable patients necessitate a more aggressive posture. Even then, the operative question is not "what can we do?" but "what must we do, here and now, to keep this patient alive long enough to reach a safer echelon of care?" When provider risk remains high—owing to active threat, poor cover, or uncertain flank security—attempts to reach the casualty should be deferred until either the tactical team creates a corridor to safety or the situation otherwise permits low-risk access. Conversely, when risk is acceptably low, measured advancement to patient contact is warranted, with the understanding that in high-risk circumstances only critical resuscitation should be delivered prior to movement, and that comprehensive resuscitation belongs in controlled spaces where the provider's safety envelope is wide enough to accommodate more definitive care. Environmental discipline is a nonnegotiable companion to RRAM and governs how providers move, communicate, and manipulate equipment. Exposure—literal and figurative—must be minimized; silhouette and profile management are fundamental to avoiding targeting. Communication should prioritize brevity and silence, leveraging hand signals and low-volume speech to decrease detection risk. Equipment must be staged to eliminate rattle, reflective surfaces, and entanglement hazards; every pouch and strap should be purpose-positioned so that critical items—tourniquets, chest seals, hemostatics—are accessible under stress without visual confirmation. Upon reaching the casualty, doctrine dictates immediate relocation to cover, even if this imposes short delays in the initiation of care, because survivability for both provider and patient hinges on denying the adversary line of sight. In low-light conditions, illumination should be constrained to the minimum effective level, employing shielded or red-filtered sources to preserve night vision and reduce the provider's visual signature.

Within this tactical scaffold, the primary survey in TEMS adheres to the XABCDE prioritization, reflecting the primacy of hemorrhage control in preventable mortality. The "X" denotes exsanguinating hemorrhage, which must be identified and controlled before all else. When injuries are anatomically amenable, a tourniquet should be applied promptly and secured; for non-tourniquet sites—junctional or cavitary wounds—combat gauze with firm pressure provides a viable alternative. The evidence base supports these practices, demonstrating that rapid tourniquet application improves hemodynamic stability and favorable shock indices at receiving facilities, thereby translating early tactical interventions into measurable downstream physiological benefit [8]. The success of this phase is predicated on repetition and muscle memory: providers should be able to apply a tourniquet one-handed, in darkness, under fire, and verify effectiveness by cessation of distal bleeding and loss of distal pulse. Airway management in tactical environments is inherently challenging. Low-light conditions, positional constraints, limited adjuncts, and sparse manpower conspire against the smooth execution of advanced maneuvers. Consequently, the preferred approach is to privilege simple, rapidly deployable techniques that confer the greatest marginal benefit with the least exposure time. Manual maneuvers and upright or lateral positioning may suffice to restore patency in many cases. When an advanced adjunct is necessary, a supraglottic airway often represents the most pragmatic choice: it can be inserted quickly, requires minimal fine motor control, and can stabilize oxygenation until a safer location permits more definitive management. There are occasions, however, when a surgical airway is the only viable option—particularly with trismus, persistent obstruction, high cervical injury, or devastating maxillofacial trauma in which noninvasive techniques fail to sustain patency. Even then, the decision to perform a cricothyrotomy in a marginal environment must account for provider exposure, illumination needs, and the availability of a second set of hands.

Breathing assessment targets conditions that undermine oxygenation and ventilation. Large, open chest wounds demand swift coverage with a purpose-designed chest seal or an occlusive dressing, coupled with continuous observation for evolving respiratory distress or signs of tension physiology. The index of suspicion for tension pneumothorax must remain high in the setting of thoracic trauma, and when indicated, providers should execute needle decompression without delay, conscious that this intervention—though invasive—can be performed expeditiously and is strongly life-saving in the field. Circulation encompasses both hemorrhage control beyond the “X” and intravascular resuscitation strategies calibrated to injury patterns. For penetrating torso trauma, permissive hypotension is advisable to avoid dislodging nascent clots and exacerbating hemorrhage; the target is perfusion adequate for mentation and distal pulses rather than normotension. Peripheral vascular access with 18-gauge intravenous catheters is usually sufficient for fluid administration in this context; where IV placement is not feasible, an intraosseous route offers reliable access under stress. Importantly, when no pulse is detected, cardiopulmonary resuscitation is contraindicated in unsecured areas due to unacceptable provider risk and—even in secured environments—generally confers little benefit in traumatic arrest, where the underlying pathology is hemorrhagic shock or catastrophic tissue disruption rather than primary cardiac dysrhythmia. The disability component of the survey emphasizes early neurologic assessment proportional to the tactical window. Pupillary reactivity and gross mental status should be documented as soon as operationally feasible to establish a baseline for subsequent reassessment. While the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) remains a standardized metric, its granularity may be impractical under fire; in many tactical contexts, the AVPU schema—Awake, responsive to Verbal stimuli, responsive to Pain, or Unresponsive—offers a faster, sufficiently discriminating alternative aligned with the tempo of the mission. Finally, exposure is undertaken judiciously to permit comprehensive injury identification while vigilantly preventing hypothermia, a silent adversary that compounds coagulopathy and shock. Insulation, vapor barriers, and heat retention blankets should be applied early, recognizing that active versus passive warming strategies have not shown meaningful divergence in core temperature trajectories in this setting, which reinforces the priority of early prevention over later correction.

Across these domains, the throughline is a disciplined willingness to do less, sooner, and safer when the threat profile is high, and to do more, deliberately when the environment allows. This ethic protects providers, conserves scarce resources, and—most importantly—focuses effort on interventions with the greatest likelihood of altering outcome trajectories within the constraints of time, space, and risk. Tactical providers are therefore scholars of context as much as technicians of care: their craft entails an unblinking appreciation of how noise discipline, light management, cover utilization, and movement techniques are as determinative of survival as tourniquets and chest seals. It also demands constant communication with command elements to synchronize medical actions with tactical maneuvers, ensuring that casualty care neither compromises operational objectives nor proceeds in isolation from the evolving battlespace. In aggregate, the issues of concern in TEMS are not discrete problems to be solved but interdependent considerations to be harmonized under pressure. The zoning model legitimizes graduated care thresholds; RRAM instills a protective bias toward provider survivability without abandoning the patient; XABCDE keeps priorities aligned with the epidemiology of preventable death; and the environmental discipline ensures that, at every step, clinical intent is translated into action with minimal tactical penalty. By internalizing these principles, TEMS practitioners can deliver high-yield, threat-appropriate interventions that bridge the perilous gap between point of injury and definitive care, even when the path out is long, the lighting poor, the supplies lean, and the clock unforgiving [5][6][7][8].

Extraction and Evacuation

Extraction, in the tactical medical context, denotes the deliberate movement of a casualty from the point of wounding to a position of relative safety where immediate lethality is mitigated and lifesaving measures can proceed with a lower risk to both patient and provider. Because the conditions precipitating extraction are characterized by uncertainty, time pressure, and hostile stimuli, the associated techniques must be overlearned through disciplined training and frequent repetition. The objective is to render these movements reflexive so that, under the sensory overload of gunfire, alarms, low light, and disorientation, rescuers can execute them accurately and without hesitation. For members of Special Weapons and Tactics teams, the first imperative—when injuries allow—is self-extraction. A wounded operator who retains mobility should immediately withdraw to the nearest area of cover or concealment that reduces exposure to direct threat. Upon reaching this safer location, the operator should initiate self-administered lifesaving measures, such as rapid tourniquet application, airway positioning, or hemorrhage control, depending on the nature of the injury. When self-care can adequately temporize physiologic deterioration and threat conditions remain unresolved, deliberate evacuation may appropriately be deferred until the scene is better secured, thus limiting avoidable risk to fellow officers and medical personnel. By contrast, injuries that degrade mobility or consciousness—such as penetrating torso trauma or devastating musculoskeletal or neurologic compromise—can preclude both self-extraction and self-care, making timely manual extraction by rescuers indispensable.

Manual extraction encompasses moving the casualty by lifting, carrying, or dragging, often under suboptimal visibility and with limited personnel. Ideal practice prioritizes a rapid but purposeful assessment to identify obvious hazards—ongoing hemorrhage, airway obstruction, or unstable fractures—before initiating movement. Nonetheless, tactical imperatives sometimes require reversing that sequence. If the environment remains kinetically dangerous, with an active line of fire or insufficient cover, the calculus must favor immediate displacement of the casualty to hard cover or a safer corridor even at the expense of a fuller initial assessment or on-scene intervention. In such circumstances, the distance moved should be the minimum required to achieve meaningful protection from the threat, thereby minimizing the time both rescuers and patient remain exposed. Throughout, rescuers must adhere to sound body mechanics and operate within their physical capabilities; a preventable musculoskeletal injury to a rescuer compromises the extraction and may create a second casualty, further straining operational and medical resources.

Dragging is often the simplest and safest technique for short, urgent movements to protective cover because it affords speed, control, and a low rescuer profile. When dragging, alignment along the casualty's longitudinal axis helps reduce torsional stress on the spine and minimizes secondary injury from uncontrolled rotation. For armored officers wearing tactical vests, grasping inside the vest at the shoulders or collar can create a stable purchase that enables the rescuer's forearms to cradle the neck, thereby protecting the airway and cervical alignment during movement. Purpose-built drag devices—featuring webbing handles, reinforced panels, and ankle loops—can further improve mechanical advantage and reduce rescuer fatigue, especially over uneven surfaces or longer distances. Particular vigilance is required on stairwells, where gravity can accelerate the descent; a two-rescuer configuration is generally safer and affords better control of the casualty's head, torso, and lower extremities. When vertical translation or prolonged movement is anticipated, rigid or semirigid stretchers provide superior spinal protection and distribute force more evenly across the body, while soft stretchers may be suitable on smooth surfaces for a single rescuer or on rough terrain when multiple rescuers can share the load and maintain stability. Additional approaches—such as a thrown-rope drag to create distance from the point of exposure, or time-honored manual carries executed by one or two rescuers—remain viable when conditions and training permit. The consistent thread across these options is procedural discipline: techniques must be executed according to a plan that prioritizes speed, concealment, and safety, while conserving rescuer stamina for subsequent tasks in the operation.

In some deployments, armored vehicles assigned to SWAT units can be brought forward to interpose ballistic protection between the casualty and the threat. The shielding afforded by such platforms may permit brief, on-scene medical actions—tourniquet confirmation, airway positioning, chest seal application—before a more extended movement to a casualty collection point. While numerous devices and methods exist for manual extraction, simulation data suggest that "firefighters worn" configurations and flexible tarp-based systems perform favorably for controlled, rapid removal of casualties under tactical constraints, offering a balance of speed, simplicity, and rescuer protection [9]. These findings support the integration of such tools into unit equipment caches and training curricula, provided they are matched to mission profiles and the operating environment. Evacuation should be understood as the subsequent echelon of movement: the transfer of a stabilized casualty from the cool zone—where imminent danger no longer dictates actions—to a location from which formal transport can be effected. Effective evacuation depends on interoperability and preplanning. In many jurisdictions, this entails seamless coordination with civilian ambulance services staged beyond the outer perimeter, positioned to expedite departure without encroaching on the operational footprint. Once the casualty reaches this interface, transport proceeds, often with a tactical medical provider accompanying the patient to ensure continuity of care, maintain situational awareness about the mechanism of injury, and facilitate handoff. The physiologic demands of the evacuation phase are distinct from those of extraction. Teams frequently employ advanced resuscitative capabilities, including whole blood or component transfusion for hemorrhagic shock, vasoactive infusions to sustain perfusion in the context of permissive hypotension strategies, and mechanical ventilation for patients with compromised airways or ventilatory failure. These skills, executed within the logistical and temporal constraints of the evacuation corridor, can stabilize critical physiology long enough to reach definitive trauma care [10].

Operational realities sometimes preclude the availability of an advanced life support ambulance at the decisive moment. In such contingencies—particularly when a severely injured officer's survival hinges on immediate movement—tactical medical programs may authorize transport in a SWAT vehicle or patrol car to the nearest appropriate facility. Such decisions must weigh the potential benefits of rapid arrival against the absence of en route ALS interventions and the challenges of performing resuscitation in confined, poorly lit, and nonmedical spaces. To mitigate risk, agencies benefit from codified protocols detailing when law enforcement transport is permissible, how it is to be executed safely, and how receiving hospitals are to be notified to prepare for immediate trauma team activation upon arrival. Geography and access also influence evacuation strategy. In remote or semi-rural operations, or when hostile activity or environmental obstacles substantially delay ground transport, air medical evacuation may be the most rational option. The success of rotary-wing utilization in tactical settings depends on anticipatory planning. Prior to operations, agencies should prearrange relationships with air medical providers, define authority for launch decisions, and establish procedures for early standby activation. During an incident, air crews should be provided with accurate Global Positioning System coordinates for a primary landing zone and at least one alternate, together with concise, standardized landing zone briefings covering hazards, wind, terrain, lighting, and security. The choice of landing zone must be coordinated with the tactical command to ensure that air operations do not compromise containment, evidence integrity, or officer safety. When the aircraft arrives, handoffs must be brisk and structured, with clear communication of injuries, interventions performed, response to therapy, and remaining threats or constraints that may affect the flight profile.

Both extraction and evacuation benefit from a systems perspective that extends beyond the kinetic event. Before operations, cross-disciplinary training should rehearse likely extraction problems, such as removing casualties from vehicles, narrow corridors, rooftops, and stairwells, and should incorporate realistic stressors including noise, low light, and time compression. Equipment should be standardized, staged for ambidextrous access, and inspected before each mission; redundancies must account for the possibility that the first rescuer to reach a casualty may be a nonmedical operator performing initial movement. Preincident planning should designate casualty collection points suited to likely threat axes and egress routes and should define primary and secondary evacuation corridors that can be adapted as the tactical picture evolves. During operations, communication between tactical and medical elements must be continuous, with medical leaders embedded in command discussions to time extractions with suppressive actions, breaching sequences, or smoke deployment that can reduce exposure during movement. After action, systematic debriefs should interrogate not only clinical outcomes but also the human factors that shaped extraction and evacuation quality: decision latency under uncertainty, clarity and discipline in radio traffic, adequacy of cover, effectiveness of hand signals, and the ergonomics of drag and carry techniques under load. Lessons identified should translate into modifications in policy, training sequences, and equipment layouts. This continuous improvement cycle is critical because the tactical, architectural, and environmental variables encountered on real calls are too diverse to script; only iterative rehearsal, critical reflection, and disciplined adaptation can yield robust performance across scenarios.

At the bedside level, the throughline connecting extraction and evacuation remains the patient's physiology and the team's risk. During extraction, the emphasis is on speed to cover and the immediate control of exsanguinating hemorrhage and airway compromise using swift, low-signature interventions. During evacuation, the focus shifts to maintaining perfusion and oxygenation with judicious, evidence-concordant therapies while preparing the patient for the next echelon of care. Throughout, decisions must be justified by a coherent risk–benefit analysis: whether to move now or treat now; whether to choose ground or air; whether to accept a longer route with better cover or a shorter one with higher exposure; whether to allocate rescuers to carry or to provide suppressive support for the movement element. These are not purely medical choices, nor are they purely tactical; they are hybrid judgments that define the discipline of tactical medicine. In sum, extraction and evacuation constitute a seamless continuum that bridges the chaos of the point of injury and the order of definitive care. Mastery of this continuum requires not only technical competence in drags, carries, and transport medicine, but also an operational mindset that values planning, interagency coordination, and disciplined adaptation. Evidence-informed selection of extraction devices and methods can enhance the safety and efficiency of early movement [9], while well-trained evacuation teams equipped for advanced resuscitation can stabilize fragile physiology en route to hospital [10]. When these elements are integrated under a unified command philosophy, the result is a resilient capability that preserves life without compromising the safety of those who respond.

Clinical Significance:

Clinical significance in tactical emergency medical operations centers on communication discipline, clarity, and continuity across all phases of care. During SWAT deployments, coordination between tactical teams and civilian emergency medical services directly affects response time, treatment accuracy, and patient survival. Failure in communication introduces delay, confusion, and risk. You reduce these risks through structured, controlled information exchange that respects operational security while supporting medical decision making. Early identification of communication channels is essential. The radio frequency used by the standby EMS unit must be confirmed before the operation begins. When available, direct mobile phone contact provides an additional layer of reliability, particularly if radio traffic becomes congested or compromised. You should limit radio transmissions to essential content only. Avoid names, identifiers, and tactical details. Brevity protects both patient privacy and mission integrity. In high-threat environments, mobile communication often provides greater discretion and clarity, especially for relaying medical updates or evacuation timing. Ongoing situational updates to the standby EMS team are critical. You improve patient outcomes when EMS personnel understand the evolving operational context before patient contact occurs. Information about mechanism of injury, environmental hazards, and anticipated extraction routes allows EMS crews to prepare equipment, allocate resources, and position vehicles effectively. This preparation reduces on-scene time and accelerates transfer to definitive care. You should treat the standby EMS unit as an integrated component of the tactical medical plan rather than a passive asset.

Communication with the receiving medical facility carries equal importance. Advance notification of injury patterns, physiologic status, and estimated time of arrival allows hospital teams to mobilize surgical, imaging, and critical care resources. This coordination shortens door-to-intervention intervals, which directly influences morbidity and mortality in penetrating trauma and blast injuries. If the injured operator carries a medical card, its contents provide immediate access to critical data such as allergies, medications, and prior conditions. This information supports rapid clinical decisions when the patient cannot communicate. Effective communication in tactical medical care supports operational security, clinical efficiency, and patient safety. You achieve this through preparation, discipline, and respect for both medical and security priorities.

Conclusion:

Tactical Emergency Medical Support succeeds when medicine is inseparable from mission. The article delineates a practical, security-minded doctrine that aligns clinical priorities with operational constraints through three mutually reinforcing pillars: zoned care, rapid and remote assessment (RRAM), and the XABCDE trauma sequence. Together, they enable providers to "do less, sooner, and safer" in the presence of immediate danger and "do more, deliberately" once the risk envelope widens. Extraction and evacuation are treated not as discrete events but as a continuous pathway—beginning with self-extraction and minimal-signature interventions under fire, progressing to controlled movement using rehearsed drags, carries, and armored shielding, and culminating in preplanned interfaces with EMS or air medical assets capable of transfusion, vasopressor support, and mechanical ventilation. Crucially, the framework embeds healthcare security into every decision: noise and light discipline, cover management, minimal radio content, and structured, need-to-know communication with EMS and receiving hospitals. Before operations, units must preposition equipment, designate casualty collection points and corridors, and rehearse extractions from complex spaces under realistic stressors. After operations, disciplined debriefs should convert lessons into updated protocols, training, and kit layout. By institutionalizing this cycle of planning, execution, and refinement, agencies can shorten time to hemorrhage control, reduce exposure during movement, and improve handoffs to definitive care—ultimately enhancing survivability for casualties while safeguarding the responders who risk themselves to save others.

References:

1. Snyder EN, Less K. EMS Federal and State Laws Affecting Tactical Medicine. StatPearls. 2025 Jan
2. McKenzie MR, Parrish EW, Miles EA, Spradling JC, Littlejohn LF, Quinlan MD, Barbee GA, King DR. A Case of Prehospital Traumatic Arrest in a US Special Operations Soldier: Care From Point of Injury to Full Recovery. Journal of special operations medicine : a peer reviewed journal for SOF medical professionals. 2016 fall:16(3):93-96. doi: 10.55460/69HW-YWF9.
3. de Schoutheete JC, Hachimi Idrissi S, Watelet JB. Pre-hospital interventions: introduction to life support systems. B-ENT. 2016:Suppl 26(1):41-54
4. Savage E, Forestier C, Withers N, Tien H, Pannell D. Tactical combat casualty care in the Canadian Forces: lessons learned from the Afghan war. Canadian journal of surgery. Journal canadien de chirurgie. 2011 Dec:54(6):S118-23. doi: 10.1503/cjs.025011.
5. Milbrath GR. Grace Under Fire: The Army Nurses of Pearl Harbor, 1941. U.S. Army Medical Department journal. 2016 Oct-Dec:(3-16):112-7
6. Pfenninger EG, Domres BD, Stahl W, Bauer A, Houser CM, Himmelseher S. Medical student disaster medicine education: the development of an educational resource. International journal of emergency medicine. 2010 Feb 16:3(1):9-20. doi: 10.1007/s12245-009-0140-9.
7. Gildea JR, Etengoff S. Vertical evacuation simulation of critically ill patients in a hospital. Prehospital and disaster medicine. 2005 Jul-Aug:20(4):243-8
8. Strauss R, Menchetti I, Perrier L, Blondal E, Peng H, Sullivan-Kwantes W, Tien H, Nathens A, Beckett A, Callum J, da Luz LT. Evaluating the Tactical Combat Casualty Care principles in civilian and military settings: systematic review, knowledge gap analysis and recommendations for future research. Trauma surgery & acute care open. 2021:6(1):e000773. doi: 10.1136/tsaco-2021-000773.
9. Service Médical du RAID. Tactical emergency medicine: lessons from Paris marauding terrorist attack. Critical care (London, England). 2016 Feb 13:20():37. doi: 10.1186/s13054-016-1202-z.
10. Boutonnet M, Raynaud L, Pasquier P, Vitiello L, Coste S, Ausset S. Critical Care Skill Triad for Tactical Evacuations. Air medical journal. 2018 Nov-Dec:37(6):362-366. doi: 10.1016/j.amj.2018.07.028.