International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health
Alsaidiani AA et al. Int J Community Med Public Health. 2026 Feb;13(2):986-990
http://www.ijcmph.com
pISSN 2394-6032 | eISSN 2394-6040

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20260060

Review Article

Assessment of the San Francisco syncope rule in detecting high-risk cardiac and neurological causes of syncope

Anwar Ahmed Alsaidiani[1]*, Ibrahim Saleh Allehaimeed[2], Abdullah Fahad Almansour[3], Abdullah Emad Allehaidan[3], Faisal Abdulaziz Alkhalifah[3], Feras Saad Almukhlifi[3], Munthir Saad Alnughmush[4], Samah Saleh Alghamdi[5], Suhyeb Khalid Korban[6], Fatima Jouma Akil[7]

[1]Department of Emergency Medicine, Al Thager Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[2]Department of General Practice, Ministry of Health, Buraydah, Saudi Arabia
[3]Collage of Medicine, King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences (KSAU-HS), Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
[4]Home Health Care Department, King Fahad Hospital Hofuf, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia
[5]Department of Emergency Medicine, Ajyad Hospital, Makkah, Saudi Arabia
[6]Department of Emergency Medicine, Ministry of Health, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[7]College of Medicine, Alfaisal University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Received: 01 January 2026
Accepted: 16 January 2026

***Correspondence:**
Dr. Anwar Ahmed Alsaidiani,
E-mail: aalsaidalni@moh.gov.sa

ABSTRACT

Syncope is a common clinical presentation in emergency departments (ED), often posing significant diagnostic challenges due to its broad differential and the potential for life-threatening underlying causes. Accurate risk stratification is essential to differentiate patients requiring urgent intervention from those who can be safely discharged. The San Francisco syncope rule (SFSR) was developed to aid clinicians in identifying patients at risk of short-term serious outcomes. Despite its widespread adoption, evidence regarding its reliability and predictive accuracy remains mixed. External validation studies have reported variable sensitivity and specificity, with some highlighting its failure to detect neurologic or subtle cardiac causes of syncope. Comparative analysis with other stratification tools such as the OESIL score, ROSE rule, and EGSYS score reveals key differences in design and clinical utility. Each model offers unique strengths but also exhibits important limitations when applied across heterogeneous patient populations. Inconsistent definitions of serious outcomes and variable study methodologies have contributed to difficulty in standardizing syncope assessment across settings. Additionally, neurologic causes are frequently underrepresented in many tools, reducing their diagnostic reach. Biomarkers and imaging have been proposed as adjuncts but are limited by access, cost, and timing. Recent interest has turned to machine learning models capable of integrating broader clinical variables to generate personalized risk profiles. Although early results are encouraging, such approaches require rigorous external validation before widespread clinical use. Overall, existing models offer useful guidance but are not definitive. Risk stratification in syncope should remain a dynamic process informed by evidence-based tools, clinician experience, and ongoing research into more adaptable, data-rich strategies capable of addressing the complexity of syncope presentations in modern emergency care.

Keywords: Syncope, Risk stratification, San Francisco syncope rule, Emergency medicine, Clinical prediction tools

INTRODUCTION

Syncope is a transient loss of consciousness due to global cerebral hypoperfusion, characterized by rapid onset, short duration, and spontaneous complete recovery. It is a common clinical problem, accounting for approximately 1 to 3 percent of ED visits and up to 6 percent of hospital admissions annually.[1] Although many cases of syncope are benign and self-limiting, a subset of patients may experience episodes secondary to serious underlying cardiac or neurological conditions. These high-risk causes are associated with increased short-term morbidity and mortality, particularly when not identified early.[2] Rapid and accurate risk stratification in the ED is therefore essential to guide appropriate management and prevent adverse outcomes.

The diagnostic evaluation of syncope remains a significant challenge for clinicians, as initial clinical assessments often yield limited information. Traditional tools such as history-taking, physical examination, and basic investigations may not sufficiently differentiate between benign and life-threatening etiologies. In response to this diagnostic uncertainty, several clinical decision rules have been developed to aid in risk stratification. Among these, the SFSR has gained widespread recognition since its introduction in 2004 as one of the first tools designed to predict serious outcomes within seven days of a syncopal event.[3]

The SFSR consists of five clinical criteria: abnormal electrocardiogram, hematocrit less than 30 percent, shortness of breath, systolic blood pressure less than 90 mmHg at triage, and a history of congestive heart failure. The presence of any one of these predictors classifies the patient as high risk. Early studies reported promising sensitivity and specificity, prompting interest in the adoption of the rule as a standard component of syncope evaluation in emergency settings.[3,4] However, subsequent validation studies have produced conflicting results, with sensitivity values varying widely across different patient populations and clinical contexts.[4]

One major concern with the SFSR has been its inconsistent performance in detecting high-risk cardiac and neurological causes of syncope, which are the primary contributors to early adverse outcomes. While the rule includes elements suggestive of cardiac dysfunction, its ability to identify conditions such as arrhythmias, structural heart disease, or transient ischemic events has been questioned. Several studies have suggested that serious neurologic causes, such as seizures or cerebrovascular incidents, may not be adequately captured by the criteria included in the SFSR.[2,4] This raises important questions regarding the generalizability and safety of relying on the rule as a sole triage tool.

The SFSR has been extensively evaluated since its inception, yet its utility in consistently identifying high-risk cardiac and neurological causes of syncope remains debated. While initial validation studies reported high sensitivity, later analyses have demonstrated considerable variability in performance, particularly across diverse patient populations and healthcare settings. This inconsistency raises concerns about its reliance as a standalone decision-making tool in EDs. Some studies have reported false-negative results, where patients with serious cardiac arrhythmias or neurological events were classified as low risk, potentially leading to premature discharge and missed diagnoses.[5]

One limitation of the SFSR is its limited inclusion of neurologic features, which may contribute to under-recognition of serious central nervous system events such as transient ischemic attacks or seizures. Additionally, the rule does not consider dynamic ECG monitoring findings or advanced imaging, which are sometimes necessary to detect intermittent or subtle abnormalities. These limitations have led some clinicians to advocate for more comprehensive assessment strategies that combine clinical judgment with additional diagnostic tools rather than relying solely on the rule itself.[6] Therefore, while the SFSR remains a useful starting point, its role should be contextualized within a broader framework of risk assessment to enhance diagnostic accuracy and patient safety.

CLINICAL UTILITY AND PREDICTIVE ACCURACY OF THE SFSR

SFSR was developed to support emergency physicians in identifying patients at risk of serious outcomes following a syncopal episode. Designed to improve early detection while minimizing unnecessary hospital admissions, it quickly became a focal point of clinical decision-making protocols. In practice, however, the utility of the rule has revealed a nuanced landscape shaped by variations in sensitivity, specificity, and application across healthcare systems.

Studies have documented fluctuating sensitivity rates when the SFSR is applied outside the original derivation setting. In some external validations, its performance was significantly reduced, prompting clinicians to re-evaluate its reliability. For instance, in a large prospective cohort study conducted in multiple Canadian EDs, the rule failed to achieve the level of sensitivity reported in the original work, capturing only a portion of patients who experienced serious outcomes within seven days.[7] This discrepancy raised concerns about contextual influences such as clinician interpretation of variables, patient demographics, and differences in how serious outcomes are defined.

Of the five original components of the rule, electrocardiogram abnormalities and systolic blood pressure have generally retained predictive value across studies. Nonetheless, criteria such as hematocrit measurement and shortness of breath present more variability. The predictive weight assigned to each

criterion may shift depending on population characteristics. In elderly patients, for example, the clinical expression of cardiac syncope can be atypical, making sole reliance on rigid criteria problematic. Moreover, many of the underlying high-risk conditions can elude initial testing, which inherently limits any rule based exclusively on first-encounter data.

Misclassification, particularly false negatives, poses a significant challenge. Patients who were categorized as low risk by the SFSR have, in several investigations, subsequently experienced life-threatening events or required urgent interventions. Evidence from a multi-center study in Italy showed that while the rule helped reduce unnecessary admissions, nearly 4 percent of patients flagged as low risk developed serious outcomes within a week, including ventricular arrhythmias and strokes.[8] These findings emphasize the tension between the rule's intent to streamline triage and the unpredictable nature of syncopal pathologies.

The clinical environment also plays a role in modulating the rule's impact. In settings with high patient throughput, the SFSR can function as a preliminary filter to prioritize care. However, in more resource-rich or specialized centers, where extended observation and advanced diagnostics are feasible, the rule tends to serve as a supplementary tool rather than a determining one. Importantly, the physician's gestalt remains a parallel force in decision-making. Studies comparing structured tools with clinician judgment have sometimes found no significant advantage in predictive accuracy, suggesting that intuition, when informed, can rival algorithmic approaches.[9]

Further examination of long-term outcomes reveals additional complexity. While the rule focuses on short-term serious events, it does not account for recurrence or delayed complications. This shortcoming limits its ability to guide comprehensive follow-up plans. A retrospective analysis examining 30-day outcomes post-syncope found that the SFSR overlooked certain neurologic cases that emerged days after discharge, particularly in patients with non-specific symptoms at presentation.[10] These insights continue to shape the ongoing refinement of risk stratification models in syncope care.

COMPARATIVE EVALUATION WITH OTHER RISK STRATIFICATION TOOLS

Since the introduction of the SFSR, several other risk stratification models have emerged, each designed to address perceived limitations in earlier tools or to offer broader applicability across diverse clinical settings. These models include the OESIL (Osservatorio Epidemiologico sulla Sincope nel Lazio) score, the ROSE (Risk stratification of syncope in the ED) rule, and the EGSYS (Evaluation of Guidelines in Syncope Study) score. Though each shares a common purpose they differ in terms of predictive criteria, clinical orientation, and validation results across populations.

The OESIL score assigns a point for each of the following: age over 65, history of cardiovascular disease, abnormal electrocardiogram, and syncope without prodrome. A total score of 2 or more is associated with a higher risk of mortality in one year. While its long-term predictive capacity adds value in outpatient management planning, it lacks focus on short-term outcomes, which limits its use in high-acuity emergency settings.[11] By comparison, the SFSR targets immediate post-episode risk, offering a more acute lens on clinical deterioration, though sometimes at the expense of long-range risk recognition.

The ROSE rule, developed in the United Kingdom, includes markers such as BNP levels, hemoglobin, and oxygen saturation, expanding the clinical input to laboratory values and hypoxia indicators. Initial studies demonstrated impressive sensitivity in detecting serious outcomes at one month, yet external validations have not consistently replicated those findings. A multicenter study assessing the ROSE rule found that while its inclusion of biochemical markers offered diagnostic depth, practical limitations posed challenges to its routine adoption in EDs with time-sensitive workflows.[4] This contrasts with the simplicity and speed of the SFSR, which relies primarily on bedside clinical data.

In terms of cardiac-specific prediction, the EGSYS score is distinguished by its emphasis on features suggestive of arrhythmic syncope, such as palpitations before fainting and abnormal ECG findings. Its orientation toward distinguishing arrhythmic from non-arrhythmic causes gives it utility in cardiology-focused triage. However, the model may be less informative for identifying neurologic or non-cardiac emergencies. A comparative review found that while the EGSYS score demonstrated better performance in patients with known cardiac conditions, it was less effective in heterogeneous patient populations where multiple etiologies coexisted.[12] This limitation reduces its scope in general emergency medicine.

Efforts to benchmark these tools often reveal trade-offs. While some models display higher sensitivity, they may do so at the cost of specificity, leading to unnecessary admissions. Others are more selective but risk overlooking patients with subtle presentations. A prospective trial comparing the SFSR, ROSE, and OESIL scores in an academic ED noted moderate agreement between the tools, with substantial divergence in patient classification when applied simultaneously.[13]

These findings highlight the underlying complexity in risk prediction and support the notion that no single tool, regardless of origin or design, can fully capture the multifactorial nature of syncope presentation in acute care.

LIMITATIONS, CONTROVERSIES, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN SYNCOPE RISK ASSESSMENT

Despite decades of research, syncope continues to resist simple classification. Risk prediction tools such as the SFSR were built to address clinical uncertainty, yet their development has not eliminated the layers of ambiguity that often surround the evaluation process. One problem lies in the way these rules are derived and validated. Many were developed in specific institutions under narrow conditions, using outcomes and definitions that may not translate cleanly into broader clinical contexts. As a result, external validation studies have frequently reported disappointing or inconsistent findings when the tools are applied outside of their original environment.[14] This undermines confidence and often leads emergency clinicians to rely more heavily on personal judgment than algorithmic output.

Diagnostic bias plays a large role in this variability. The criteria included in the SFSR and similar rules often reflect assumptions about which factors correlate most strongly with adverse events. Yet when those factors are examined in different patient cohorts their predictive value may diminish or vanish altogether. What counts as a "serious outcome" also varies between studies, creating further difficulty in comparing performance across settings. A cardiac arrhythmia caught on telemetry may be counted in one study, while in another it is not unless it requires a procedure or admission. These definitional gaps complicate efforts to establish a unified approach to syncope triage.[15]

The question of neurologic causes introduces further complexity. Many existing tools, including the SFSR, emphasize cardiac markers. Neurologic conditions, particularly those without overt focal deficits, may go unrecognized. Syncope that precedes a seizure or transient ischemic event can easily be mistaken for a benign faint unless the clinical context is scrutinized closely. Yet few rules incorporate imaging data or advanced neurologic testing, which are often necessary to make these distinctions. A multicenter analysis of adverse neurologic outcomes found that rules focusing primarily on cardiovascular variables often missed non-cardiac high-risk patients, especially when initial presentations were subtle or mixed with non-specific symptoms such as nausea or brief confusion.[16]

Controversies also surround the use of troponin and brain natriuretic peptide (BNP) levels in syncope assessment. Some studies have found associations between elevated biomarkers and adverse outcomes, but others have questioned their specificity and cost-effectiveness in routine use. Variability in laboratory standards and timing of sample collection contributes to these discrepancies. For clinicians working in time-constrained environments, delays in lab results may render these data points moot, reducing their real-time clinical value.

Looking ahead, risk prediction in syncope is likely to evolve beyond static rule sets. Interest is growing in machine learning models that can incorporate a wider array of variables to generate individualized risk estimates. Pilot studies using such approaches have shown promising early results, although most remain in experimental phases and lack external validation. The challenge remains in balancing clinical utility with interpretability, so that physicians can apply these tools without becoming dependent on opaque or overly complex algorithms.[17]

CONCLUSION

Risk assessment in syncope remains a complex clinical task that no single tool can fully address. The SFSR offers valuable guidance but shows limitations in sensitivity and generalizability. Comparative models and evolving technologies provide alternative pathways but require further validation. Future strategies should integrate clinical judgment with adaptive, data-driven tools for safer triage decisions.

Funding: No funding sources
Conflict of interest: None declared
Ethical approval: Not required

REFERENCES

1. Win-Kuang S, Sheldon Robert S, Benditt David G, et al. ACC/AHA/HRS Guideline for the evaluation and management of patients with syncope: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. Circulation. 2017;136(5):e60-122.
2. Saccilotto RT, Nickel CH, Bucher HC, Steyerberg EW, Bingisser R, Koller MT. San Francisco Syncope Rule to predict short-term serious outcomes: a systematic review. CMAJ. 2011;183(15):E1116-26.
3. Quinn JV, Stiell IG, McDermott DA, Sellers KL, Kohn MA, Wells GA. Derivation of the San Francisco Syncope Rule to predict patients with short-term serious outcomes. Ann Emergency Med. 2004;43(2):224-32.
4. Reed MJ, Newby DE, Coull AJ, Prescott RJ, Jacques KG, Gray AJ. The ROSE (risk stratification of syncope in the emergency department) study. J Am College Cardiol. 2010;55(8):713-21.
5. Costantino G, Casazza G, Reed M. Syncope risk stratification tools vs clinical judgment: an individual patient data meta-analysis. Am J Med. 2014;127(11):1126.
6. Grossman SA, Fischer C, Lipsitz LA, Lawrence M, Kenneth S, Scott T, et al. Predicting adverse outcomes in syncope. J Emergency Med. 2007;33(3):233-9.
7. Birnbaum A, Esses D, Bijur P, Wollowitz A, Gallagher EJ. Failure to validate the San Francisco Syncope Rule in an independent emergency

department population. Ann Emergency Med. 2008;52(2):151-9.
8. Ungar A, Del Rosso A, Giada F, Angelo B, Raffaello F, Fabio Q, et al. Early and late outcome of treated patients referred for syncope to emergency department: the EGSYS 2 follow-up study. Europ Heart J. 2010;31(16):2021-26.
9. Sun BC, Thiruganasambandamoorthy V, Cruz JD, Reporting CtSESRS. Standardized reporting guidelines for emergency department syncope risk-stratification research. Academic Emergency Med. 2012;19(6):694-702.
10. Gibson TA, Weiss RE, Sun BC. Predictors of short-term outcomes after syncope: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Western J Emergency Med. 2018;19(3):517.
11. Colivicchi F, Ammirati F, Melina D, Guido V, Imperoli G, Santini M. Development and prospective validation of a risk stratification system for patients with syncope in the emergency department: the OESIL risk score. European Heart J. 2003;24(9):811-9.
12. Del Rosso A, Ungar A, Maggi R, Giada F, Petix NR, De Santo T, et al. Clinical predictors of cardiac syncope at initial evaluation in patients referred urgently to a general hospital: the EGSYS score. Heart. 2008;94(12):1620-6.
13. Serrano LA, Hess EP, Bellolio MF, Mohammed HM, Victor MM, Patricia JE, et al. Accuracy and quality of clinical decision rules for syncope in the emergency department: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Emergency Med. 2010;56(4):362-73.
14. Probst MA, Gibson T, Weiss RE, Annick NY, Susan EM, David HA, et al. Risk stratification of older adults who present to the emergency department with syncope: the FAINT score. Ann Emergency Med. 2020;75(2):147-58.
15. Ricci F, Sutton R, Palermi S, Claudio T, Giulia R, Sabina G, et al. Prognostic significance of noncardiac syncope in the general population: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Cardiov Electrophysiol. 2018;29(12):1641-7.
16. Brignole M, Alboni P, Benditt D, Bergfeldt L, Blanc JJ, Thomsen PEB, et al. Guidelines on management (diagnosis and treatment) of syncope. Europ Heart J. 2001;22(15):1256-306.
17. Müller S, Diekmann S, Wenzel M, Horst KH, Johannes T, Ulrike E, et al. Combining machine learning with real-world data to identify gaps in clinical practice guidelines: feasibility study using the prospective German stroke registry and the national acute ischemic stroke guidelines. JMIR Med Informat. 2025;13:e69282.

Cite this article as: Alsaidiani AA, Allehaimeed IS, Almansour AF, Allehaidan AE, Alkhalifah FA, Almukhlifi FS, et al. Assessment of the San Francisco syncope rule in detecting high-risk cardiac and neurological causes of syncope. Int J Community Med Public Health 2026;13:986-90.