

Human Stampedes: an updated review of current literature

Maria R.L. Moitinho de Almeida, MD MPH

Affiliation: Health Systems and Policy, Department of Public Health Sciences,
Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

Johan von Schreeb, MD PhD

Affiliation: Health Systems and Policy, Department of Public Health Sciences,
Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

All correspondence should be directed to Maria Moitinho de Almeida, 30 clos
Chappelle-aux-Champs, Bte 30.15.1 1200 Brussels, Belgium. E-mail address
mariamoitinho@gmail.com

Abstract

Introduction: Human stampede is a major cause of mortality in mass gatherings, but has received limited scientific attention. While the number of publications has increased, there is no recent review of new study results. This study compiles and reviews available literature on stampedes, their prevention, preparedness, and response.

Review: A search for peer-reviewed and grey literature in PubMed, Google Scholar, Web of Science, the World Health Organization Library Database, and ReliefWeb was conducted, and papers were selected according to predefined eligibility criteria.

Included items were read and results were compiled and summarized. A total of 64 publications were included, of which 34 were published between 2013-2016. The most studied events were Germany's Love Parade stampede in 2010 ($n = 6$) and the United Kingdom Hillsborough stadium stampede in 1989 ($n = 4$). Conflicting definitions of human stampedes were found. The common belief that they result from an irrational and panicking crowd has progressively been replaced by studies suggesting that successive systemic failures are main underlying causes. There is a lack of systematic reporting, making news reports often the only source available. Prevention measures are mainly related to crowd management and venue design, but their effectiveness has not been studied. Drills are recommended in the preparedness phase to improve coordination and communication. Delay in decisions, poor triage, or loss of medical records, are common problems in the response which may worsen the outcome.

Discussion: Stampedes are complex phenomena that remain incompletely understood, hampering formulation of evidence-based strategies for their prevention and management. Documentation comes mostly from high-profile events and findings are difficult to extrapolate to other settings. More research from different disciplines is warranted to address these gaps, in order to prevent and mitigate future events. A start

would be to decide on a common definition of stampedes.

List of Abbreviations

CPR – Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation

GPS – Global Positioning System

HSE – Health and Safety Executive

IR - Infrared

MCI – Mass Casualty Incident

PTSD – Post Traumatic Stress Disorder

RFID – Radio frequency Identification

UK – United Kingdom

USA – United States of America

WHO – World Health Organization

WHOLIS – World Health Organization Library

WLAN – Wireless Local Area Network

Introduction

Mass gatherings are a “concentration of people at a specific location for a specific purpose over a set period of time, and which has the potential to strain the planning and response resources of the country or the community” (1). With population growth and a constant increase of human travels, mass gatherings are becoming more frequent and attract more and more participants (2). Mass gatherings are either spontaneous such as at train stations during rush hour (2), or at planned sport, cultural, religious or political events (1). The Hajj pilgrimage in Saudi Arabia, and the Kumbh Mela in India, are the biggest regular mass gatherings worldwide, bringing millions of pilgrims together (3, 4).

Mass gatherings may affect health in different ways (2). Communicable diseases, in particular gastrointestinal and respiratory, are of major concern due to the potential for transmission in large concentrations of people (1, 2, 5). Environmental threats include extreme temperatures and weather events (1). Finally, “crowd disasters” may occur, including the collapse of infrastructures, fire incidents, terrorist attacks, violence riots, and human stampedes (1, 6, 7). Stampedes are often described as the “disruption of the orderly movement of crowds...leading to injuries and fatalities” (4), often “in response to a perceived danger, loss of physical space”, or “a will to attain something seen as gratifying” (4, 8, 9). They carry high mortality rates and are, besides heat-related illnesses, the most common cause of mortality in mass gatherings (5, 7).

A review of peer-reviewed journals in 2008 only identified 20 relevant articles about human stampedes since 1970, with only eight events described (8). A later study, which incorporated non-traditional sources like news reports to document the epidemiological characteristics of stampedes, found that a majority of events occurred after 2000, and mainly in low-income countries, where they had a 7.75 times higher fatality rate compared to stampedes in other settings. Stampede fatalities were up to 40 times higher in mass gatherings that were unplanned (10).

In the last years, more research has been published regarding human stampedes in a wide range of scientific fields (11-13). However, human stampedes still receive scarce scientific attention, and they keep recurring although being presumably preventable, which suggests that their current understanding is limited (14-16). An updated review of what is currently known about stampedes was found to be needed. The aim of this study is to synthesize current knowledge on stampedes, their prevention, preparedness and response.

I. Methodology

A search for English peer-reviewed publications, organization reports, and academic works was undertaken in PubMed, Google Scholar, Web of Science, the World Health Organization Library Database (WHOLIS), and ReliefWeb, with the search terms “Stampede*” OR “trampling*” OR “Crowd Disaster” OR “mass gathering”. Papers available until June 2016 and specifically referring to human stampedes, considered a “disruption of the orderly movement of crowds” that could “lead to injuries and fatalities” (4), were included. Papers regarding crowd evacuation models or crowd behavior not related to stampedes, and events related to fire disasters and terrorist attacks were excluded. Abstracts and newspaper reports were also excluded from this review. Titles were at first screened for relevance and duplicates were removed. In a second round, abstracts and summaries were read and their inclusion was decided based on the eligibility criteria. Full texts were read if there were any uncertainties. Distribution of the literature by type, chronology, and geography was described. Key findings were organized and synthesized according to predefined and emerging themes.

II. Results

The initial search of all databases resulted in a total of 20,787 citations. After removing duplicates and screening titles, the abstracts of 729 items were screened for eligibility and full texts were read in case of uncertainty. Finally, 64 documents were included in this review, 22 from Google Scholar, 14 from Pubmed, 10 from ReliefWeb, 18 from Web of Science, and none from the WHOLIS. Peer-reviewed scientific papers accounted for 75% (n=48) of all papers included. The oldest paper retrieved was from 1987 (17), and more than half (n=34) were published between 2013 and 2016. All papers were in English, mostly from India (n=13), the United States of America (USA) (n=13), China (n=8), the United Kingdom (UK) (n=5), Germany (n=5), and Australia

(n=4). The most frequent event reported was Germany's Love Parade stampede from 2010, in six different papers. The 1989 Hillsborough stadium stampede, in the UK, was reported in four different papers.

Definition and Classification of Stampedes

We found several definitions for stampede, some of them conflicting (table 1). Several expressions such as “crowd disasters”, “trampling” and “crushing”, as well as “mass crowded stampede-trampling accident” and “crowd quakes”, were often used with the same meaning (18, 19). Helbing et al. in 2012 suggest that stampede precedes crowd disaster, and that the term “crushing” relates to a crowd pushing towards a bottleneck, whereas “trampling” means people walking carelessly over others (16).

Ngai et al. proposed a stampede magnitude classification based on reported deaths (table 2). Other authors argue that a classification should consider number of injuries, or fatality and injury rates (8, 10, 20).

Causes of Stampedes

Stampedes are often described as a complex chain of events (16, 21). Frequent triggers include rumors of a threat, sudden loud sounds, or the sudden notice of something desirable or urgent, such as the distribution of free tickets, or the change of platforms at a train station (4, 22-24).

Overcrowding is a major factor for the occurrence of a stampede. Crowd density reportedly influences the outcome more than the absolute number of attendees (25).

Even if the global density of a mass gathering is low, the local density in specific locations can be very high, as the crowd is not distributed evenly throughout the venue (18, 26, 27). The capacity of the venue and the density of the crowd depend on the body sizes and culture, and is therefore specific to each event (26).

Closing entrances or exits, congestion at bottlenecks, and deficiencies in safety barriers, potentiated by a lack of coordination with local authorities, are often described as underlying causes (9, 15, 28). When the event takes place in isolated, rural, or low resource settings, there is an increased risk due to narrow lanes, ambulant sellers, steep and muddy floors, or dead ends (4, 22).

Initially, stampedes were described as the result of an irrational crowd behavior caused by panic (16, 17, 28, 29). An attempt to describe this “escape panic” was made in 2000. First, people try to move faster than normal and start pushing, with physical interactions. Moving and passing bottlenecks becomes uncoordinated, with arching and clogging observed at exits. Physical interactions cause pressures up to 4450 N/m^2 . Because people start falling, they become obstacles, and the movement is further slowed (30-35). However, more recent research counter-argues the description of this behavior as “irrational” and “dangerous”. Qualitative studies on victims from different stampedes suggest that, in critical times, the crowd was actually cooperative and behaving rationally (17, 28, 29). Even with the perception of a risk, a crowd may feel safe and reduce the risk of a stampede through self-organization and psychological unity (36). Specific types of crowds, like football fans, are often linked to violence, alcohol and drugs intake, and these behaviors are instinctively blamed when stampedes occur (29). This has, however, been counter-argued by the fact that post-mortem blood tests on the Hillsborough stadium stampede victims did not show elevated levels of drugs and alcohol (28).

Mechanism

The literature showed different reports on what happens in different crowd densities. Video analyses from the 2006 Mina crowd disaster showed that even at crowd densities of 10 people/m^2 , individual speed never reached zero (26). Different

crowd density thresholds are mentioned in the literature. Sindhu Kolli, for example, defines a stampede as an event occurring at a density above 5.26 persons/m² (37).

Another author, Ibrahim, suggests metrics to characterize the crowd: Loose crowd 1 person/m²; dense crowd 2 persons/m², very dense crowd 4 persons/m²(38). Experts argue that crowd pressure, a product between the density and the variance of the densities, gives better information about critical areas and timings (26, 39).

A pattern of the mechanism leading to stampedes is described in the literature (26, 40): in normal situations, the crowd moves in a free or laminar flow. When density increases, the flow changes to “stop-and-go waves”. This can lead to loss of movement control by the crowd and individuals are pushed randomly – “crowd turbulence”. When a person loses balance and stumbles, or is pushed down, the people around fall due to sudden forces imbalance. To avoid falling, trampling, which is the act of standing or walking on someone else, may occur. People at the bottom of the crowd eventually die of traumatic asphyxia (16).

Stampedes reportedly occur in unidirectional or turbulent flow (random movements in different directions). Unidirectional flows are usually caused by the sudden increase or decrease in force, such as a congested bottleneck or exit, or the collapse of a security barrier, respectively (8).

A study on an escalator group trample showed that the severity of the situation is influenced by the initial location of the trample, the time at which counter- measures are taken, the pedestrian velocity, and the standing up duration. The recovery rate (the time a person needs to stand up again) and the propagation rate (the velocity at which people start falling after the first one) were other parameters that influenced the outcome (18).

Epidemiology

Systematic data collection on human stampedes is mostly based on news reports, as formal reporting is lacking. Two search methods are described in the literature. The Ngai method consists of a LexisNexis©® search with a secondary hand-search of important news agencies. The Roy method searches data from major Indian newspapers, and is only applicable to India (11). Although more widely used, the Ngai method is believed to underestimate stampede events by approximately 18% (11).

Between 1980 and 2007 the Ngai method identified 215 stampede events worldwide; and 350 events between 1980 and 2012 (11). Between 1980 and 2007, 7,069 deaths and 14,078 injuries were caused by stampedes (10); increasing to 10,243 deaths and 22,445 injuries between 1980 and 2012 (11). Most stampedes occur indoors, during daytime, and in sports events (10). Unidirectional mechanism increased fatality rate by 3.46 times, believed to be due to the confluence of forces in one same direction (10).

Women, children and older people are reportedly more affected because they are less capable to defend themselves from external weight pressure (15, 23). One study showed that the ratio of fatalities between women and men after a stampede in Shanghai was 3:2(41).

According to the Ngai method, India is the country with the highest number of stampedes (10). A combination of Roy and Ngai method identified a total of 40 human stampedes in India between 2001 and 2010 (11). Another study using data from the National Crime Records Bureau identified 34 human stampedes in the country between 1954 and 2012, with a total of 1823 reported dead(4). Between 58.8% and 79% of the events were religiously related, and most occurred in the northern half of the country (4, 10).

Clinical Aspects

Extreme overcrowding causes external compression that limits thorax expansion, leading to traumatic asphyxia, the major cause of mortality. A smaller proportion of deaths is caused by trampling and consequent internal organ injuries (8, 42). Classic clinical signs of traumatic asphyxia are cervico-facial congestion and cyanosis, and conjunctival and facial petechiae (8). Resuscitation efforts such as chest compression cause injuries similar to signs of traumatic asphyxia, complicating legal medicine diagnoses (43). Crush injuries may lead to rhabdomyolysis and precipitate the need for kidney replacement therapy (44). Other possible physical consequences of stampedes are traumatic brain injuries, haemothoraces, and femur fractures (23, 42). Psychological and psychiatric sequels include depressive and anxiety disorders, phobic disorders, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (8, 12). A study on school stampede victims showed PTSD was not the most common psychiatric disorder, suggesting that other disturbances merit attention (12).

Prevention

The most consensual prevention measure is to reduce the size of a crowd. Nevertheless, this remains difficult to implement, as big crowds are usually preferred in mass gatherings by organizers and visitors themselves (25, 45). Crowd management is a preventive approach that starts before the event, whereas crowd control reacts to the behavior of a crowd (45, 46).

Avoiding overcrowding is a consensual strategy. A proposed maximum capacity calculation is that the number of visitors should be inferior to seven times the area in m² (22, 26). Strategies to manage visitor inflow include dispersing arrivals, pre-registration and ticket systems, regulating the timing and routing of groups, or limiting group sizes (22, 47). Festival seating, the lack of reserved seats in the venue, is widely appreciated

among visitors and organizers, but its banning is described as an effective measure to decrease risk for stampedes (46).

A challenge commonly reported is the conception of venue designs that are optimal in case of emergencies, but practical in normal situations (48-50). Avoiding bottlenecks and intersection or merging flows is widely recommended, as well as removing obstacles and protecting emergency lanes (26). Several architectural solutions are proposed in the literature. Segmentation divides a crowd in smaller groups that are easier to manage, and prevents propagation of an incident between them. The “nested doll” inserts a structure in the venue, like an emergency exit beneath a building.

Expanding the surface can be achieved by adding another dimension, such as higher floors (26). Zig-zag shapes prevent congestion during panic, but are unpractical in normal situations (25, 48). Increasing a bottleneck space is only a temporary solution, whereas minimizing pedestrian speeds at specific locations may reduce the risk of a crowd disaster (49).

Crowd monitoring examines the condition, movement and behavior of a crowd (38), and it is recommended to monitor critical areas during highly congested time periods (26). Some crowd monitoring systems include video recording, Global Positioning System (GPS), Bluetooth, Infrared (IR), Radio frequency Identification (RFID), broadband satellite network, and Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) (38, 51). Recent research suggests that the use of mobile phones could improve accuracy of stampede detection, prediction, and crowd force estimation (52).

Preparedness

Planning a mass gathering event should start as early as possible and ensure a good coordination between organizers, police forces, community leaders, and health care services (4, 16). Detailed contingency plans are strongly recommended, and they should

be worked out and exercised (16, 26, 53, 54) . Emergency ingress and egress should always be planned for and free access ensured during the whole event (15). During mass gatherings, referral hospitals should be prepared for various types of mass casualty incidents (MCI). A drill in South Africa highlighted that important flaws in preparedness were related to risk communication and public relations, staff and patient safety, supplies, and security (55).

Response

Experts believe crowd control and response should start as early as stop-and-go waves set in, to reduce the time of exposure to high crowd density or dangerous movements (18, 26). Late evacuation of the Love Parade venue, about 6 minutes after crowd turbulence started, is considered one of the reasons for the outcome of 21 deaths (16). It remains unclear how real-time crowd control should be undertaken, and how it changes the immediate behavior of the crowd, but water cannons and tear gas can worsen the situation (15, 20, 56) . Vertical communication between the event organizer, the crowd tracking personnel and the crowd control force is presumably more effective than horizontal communication between members of a crowd control force, such as the police (37).

Reports from stadium stampedes reveal that on-site triage and referral is often poorly done. Frequently, injured arrive at the nearest hospital by their own means. Lack of prompt communication to emergency departments, poor use of media to inform people effectively, and lack of psychosocial support to the victims were commonly reported (20, 42).

On-site medical teams are useful for discharging patients who do not need medical attention, referring those in need of higher level of care, and giving immediate life-saving support like cardio pulmonary resuscitation (CPR) (28, 43). Poor on- site

medical triage and care may miss persons with traumatic asphyxia likely to be saved should they have received appropriate medical attention (28). Access for emergency medical teams is vital, but often a problem in the dense crowd (21). Immediate referral for critical patients is of extreme importance, but problematic in rural and low resource settings (4). Loss of medical records during transportation is a common flaw that delays hospital treatment and hinders legal medicine reports (20, 42, 43).

A report by the British Health and Safety Executive (HSE) on the Hillsborough Stadium stampede showed that emergency services failed to activate the major incident plan, and the Emergency Medical Services were delayed in recognizing the situation as a crisis (28). Response can be highly influenced by misperceptions of panic and danger, which has consequences in the receptivity of the crowd to information given (57).

The health system and community context where the stampede takes place also determine the level and quality of the response. In more deprived or unstable settings, health facilities often need external provision of basic supplies and additional assistance to the victims and their families (68-70).

Discussion

Publications and reports on human stampedes have increased in recent years, as more than half of the material included in this study dates from 2013 and 2016. This study showed that the definition used by researchers and operational organizations varied significantly. Moreover, some of the definitions used were conflicting and based on the now outdated belief that stampedes result from an irrational or even “animal” behavior of the crowd. This lack of systematic wording and definition has not been highlighted elsewhere in the literature.

While stampedes mainly occur in low-income countries, this search retrieved publications mostly from high-income countries, and most frequently including high-

profile events, such as the Love Parade or the Hillsborough stadium. The imbalance between occurrence or risk of stampedes and number of publications does not come as a surprise. Events in low resource settings do not mobilize the same level of organization, infrastructure, and reliable data are scarce (16, 18, 26, 32, 35). Current knowledge thus seems to base itself on a minority of all stampede events, and as a consequence it is biased and does not picture nor explain this global and increasing phenomenon.

This study highlights the complex and multifactorial causes of stampedes. Indeed, most studies have shown that they are in fact a complex chain of events, coming from flaws in the organization of mass gatherings, crowd mismanagement, miscommunication, and effective planning and preparedness. The multidimensional causality of stampedes has recently been described in scientific studies (16, 28). Attributing the responsibility of stampedes to an irrational crowd may represent a communication strategy for the event organizers but is seldom true. Indeed, this has been demonstrated in the longest trial to reach a verdict in the UK, related to the Hillsborough stadium stampede, as the event organizers were found guilty due to planning and management deficiencies, despite their long accusing of the victims for their violent behaviour (58).

Despite multiple and successive calls for improvement, no progress has been made in systematic reporting of human stampedes. A lack of definition can be an explanation for this know- do gap. Without such detailed data, it will be difficult to gain better insight on mortality and injury rates, differences between sex and age groups, and factors associated with the occurrence and severity of a stampede.

The recent 2015 Hajj stampede that killed over 2,000 pilgrims was the deadliest ever recorded, a striking surprise in a country known for its crowd management strategies that include the specifically constructed, stampede preventing, Jamarat bridge (21, 59). This event served as a reminder that human stampedes are not fully understood.

This review had several limitations. Despite a thorough and comprehensive search of the literature, it is possible that important reports were missed. The definition of stampede used in this search may have influenced the selection process. Because this review aimed to be broad and comprehensive, some specificity may have been lost. It must also be noted that 16 (25%) of the papers included were not peer-reviewed. These were mainly organization reports on stampede events and management plans. This does not allow to generalize findings, or be extremely accurate in the results. However, this exercise has allowed us to understand current practices, used definitions, and highlight important research gaps.

Conclusions

Despite an increasing awareness to human stampedes, this event still occurs frequently and causes a considerable number of fatalities. Current knowledge remains mostly based on a small sample of high-profile events in high income countries. We suggest to commence systematic reporting, and include low-profile stampedes from lower resource settings, in order to provide evidence to tackle this complex and multifactorial event. A first step is to decide on a standard and operational definition of human stampedes.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the staff from the Karolinska Institutet Library who provided guidance to undertake this review.

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Maria Moitinho de Almeida received a scholarship through the European Union funded Erasmus Mundus Master Program in Public Health in Disasters.

Johan von Schreeb's work was funded by the Swedish National Board of Health and Welfare.

Tables

Table 1: Stampede definitions in identified literature

Author	Definition
Illiya et al 2013 (4)	“(…) the surge of individuals in a crowd, in response to a perceived danger or loss of physical space. It often disrupts the orderly movement of crowds resulting in irrational and dangerous movement for self-protection leading to injuries and fatalities”
Ngai et al 2009 (8)	“(…) an impulsive mass movement of a crowd that often results in injuries and deaths. Another commonly associated term is trampling that leads to infliction of crushing casualties”
Hsieh et al 2009 (10)	“(…) either trampling or asphyxiating crushes with mass casualties”
Burkle 2011 (9)	“Stampedes can take two forms: one occurs from panic attempts to escape a detected threat, whereas the second happens when the rush is toward something seen as gratifying”
Helbing et al 2000 (30)	“(…) induced by panic, often leading to fatalities as people are crushed or trampled. Sometimes this behaviour is triggered in life-threatening situations such as fires in crowded buildings; at other times, stampedes can arise during the rush for seats or seemingly without cause”
Wieringa 2015 (60)	“(…) an occasion when many people suddenly all move quickly and in uncontrolled way in the same direction at the same time, especially because of fear” (adapted from Cambridge Dictionary 2014) “A crush can result from a stampede that is caused by mass panic.”
Sindhu Kolli 2014 (61)	“a person might lose his balance and stumble, which when followed by trampling leads to a stampede.” Stampede is defined when the crowd density is above 5.26person/m ² ; or when the inflow of people is much higher than the outflow.
Prasun 2015 (62)	“(…) the humans when in crowd, they start behaving by animal instinct. Thus for a crowd, stampede is a situation when individuality is lost and individuals behave according to the crowd to get into a safer

	place. Stampede is a self-destructing human wave i.e. a panic situation, like fire or rumours, which starts at highly dense crowded area (10 people in an square metre area) and like a wave humans run to escape in a disorderly way.”
Salamati & Rahimi-Movaghar 2016 (59)	“There are two types of stampede. The first type is a panic behavior of people who afraid of a detected threat, while the second type takes place when a great number of people attack to get a pleasuring object”
Bolia 2015 (63)	“Stampede is particular instance of crowd disaster. ‘Stampede’ is derived from a Mexican-Spanish word ‘estampida’ which means ‘uproar’. Stampede is defined as “an act of mass impulse, which occurs in times of massive flight or massive craze response” (Chukwuma and Kingsley 2014).”
Khana et al. 2014 (53)	“A stampede is an act of mass impulse among herd animals or a crowd of people in which the herd or crowd collectively with no clear direction or purpose”; “This is also referred to as crowd crush.”

Table 2: Stampede classification by Ngai et al. (8)

Class I	Mild	Injuries, 0 deaths
Class II	Moderate	1 to 10 deaths
Class III	Severe	11 to 100 deaths
Class IV	Devastating	101 to 1000 deaths
Class V	Catastrophic	More than 1000 deaths

1. World Health Organization. Public health for mass gatherings: Key considerations. 2015.
2. Johansson A, Batty M, Hayashi K, Al Bar O, Marcozzi D, Memish ZA. Crowd and environmental management during mass gatherings. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2012;12(2):150-6.

3. Ahmed QA, Arabi YM, Memish ZA. Health risks at the Hajj. *Lancet*. 2006;367(9515):1008-15.
4. Illiyas F, Mani S, Pradeepkumar A, Mohan K. Human stampedes during religious festivals: A comparative review of mass gathering emergencies in India. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 2013;5:10-8.
5. Steffen R, Bouchama A, Johansson A, Dvorak J, Isla N, Smallwood C, et al. Non-communicable health risks during mass gatherings. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2012;12(2):142-9.
6. Soomaroo L, Murray V. Disasters at mass gatherings: lessons from history. *PLoS Curr*. 2012;4:RRN1301.
7. Still GK. Crowd Safety and Risk Analysis [10/12/2017]. Available from: <http://www.gkstill.com/ExpertWitness/CrowdDisasters.html>.
8. Ngai KM, Burkle FM, Jr., Hsu A, Hsu EB. Human stampedes: a systematic review of historical and peer-reviewed sources. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*. 2009;3(4):191-5.
9. Burkle FM, Hsu EB. Ram Janki Temple: understanding human stampedes. *Lancet*. 2011;377(9760):106-7.
10. Hsieh YH, Ngai KM, Burkle FM, Hsu EB. Epidemiological characteristics of human stampedes. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*. 2009;3(4):217-23.
11. Ngai KM, Lee WY, Madan A, Sanyal S, Roy N, Burkle FM, Jr., et al. Comparing two epidemiologic surveillance methods to assess underestimation of human stampedes in India. *PLoS Curr*. 2013;5.
12. Bhatia MS, Srivastava S, Jhanjee A. Psychiatric morbidity in school children who suffered a stampede. *Ind Psychiatry J*. 2012;21(1):61-3.
13. Huang Y, Xu T, Sun W. Public Health Lesson from Shanghai New Year's Eve Stampede. *Iran J Public Health*. 2015;44(7):1021-2.
14. Tam JS, Barbeschi M, Shapovalova N, Briand S, Memish ZA, Kieny MP. Research agenda for mass gatherings: a call to action. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2012;12(3):231-9.
15. Hsu EB, Burkle FM. Cambodian Bon Om Touk stampede highlights preventable tragedy. *Prehosp Disaster Med*. 2012;27(5):481-2.
16. Helbing D, Mukerji P. Crowd disasters as systemic failures: analysis of the Love Parade disaster. *EPJ Data Science*. 2012;1(1):7.
17. Johnson NR. Panic at "The Who Concert Stampede": An Empirical Assessment*. *Social Problems*. 1987;34(4):362-73.
18. Li W, Gong J, Yu P, Shen S. Modeling, simulation and analysis of group trampling risks during escalator transfers. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*. 2016;444:970-84.
19. Ma J, Song WG, Lo SM, Fang ZM. New insights into turbulent pedestrian movement pattern in crowd-quakes. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*. 2013;2013(02):P02028.
20. Madzimbamuto FD. A hospital response to a soccer stadium stampede in Zimbabwe. *Emerg Med J*. 2003;20(6):556-9.
21. Kasthala S, Lakra HS, editors. Disaster Preparedness for Mass Religious Gatherings in India-Learning from Case Studies. Second World Congress on Disaster Management; 2015.
22. Prasun A, Dixit P, editors. Stampede Management For Religious Events In India. International Conference on Disaster Management in Civil Engineering; 2015.

23. Greenough PG. The Kumbh Mela stampede: disaster preparedness must bridge jurisdictions. *BMJ*. 2013;346:f3254.
24. Ngo MQ, Haghighi PD, Burstein F. A Crowd Monitoring Framework using Emotion Analysis of Social Media for Emergency Management in Mass Gatherings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:160600751*. 2016.
25. Pin SC, Haron F, Sarmady S, Talib AZ, Khader AT. Applying TRIZ principles in crowd management. *Safety Science*. 2011;49(2):286-91.
26. Johansson A, Helbing D, Al-Abideen HZ, Al-Bosta S. From crowd dynamics to crowd safety: a video-based analysis. *Adv Complex Syst*. 2008;11.
27. Pearl TH. Crowd crush: How the law leaves american crowds unprotected. *Ky LJ*. 2015;104:1.
28. Phil S. The legacy of Hillsborough: liberating truth, challenging power. *Race & Class*. 2013;55(2):1-27.
29. Nielsen NH. Social control of the media: A comparative analysis of British media coverage of 1989 Hillsborough Disaster (1989 to 1990 and 2012 to 2013): California State University, Northridge; 2015.
30. Helbing D, Farkas I, Vicsek T. Simulating dynamical features of escape panic. *Nature*. 2000;407.
31. Moussaïd M, Helbing D, Theraulaz G. How simple rules determine pedestrian behavior and crowd disasters. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2011;108.
32. Helbing D, Johansson A, Al-Abideen HZ. The dynamics of crowd disasters: an empirical study. *Phys Rev E, Stat Nonlinear Soft Matter Phys* 2007.
33. Hartman N, Williamson A, Sojka B, Alibertis K, Sidebottom M, Berry T, et al. Predicting resource use at mass gatherings using a simplified stratification scoring model. *Am J Emerg Med*. 2009;27(3):337-43.
34. Dias C, Sarvi M, Shiwakoti N, Ejtemai O, Burd M. Investigating collective escape behaviours in complex situations. *Safety science*. 2013;60:87-94.
35. Krausz B, Bauckhage C. Loveparade 2010: Automatic video analysis of a crowd disaster. *Comput Vis Image Underst*. 2012;116(3):307-19.
36. Drury J, Novelli D, Stott C. Managing to avert disaster: Explaining collective resilience at an outdoor music event. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 2015;45(4):533-47.
37. Kolli S. Multi-Agent Management of Crowds to Avoid Stampedes in Long Queues. Hyderabad, India: International Institute of Information Technology Hyderabad. 2014.
38. Ibrahim AM, Venkat I, Subramanian KG, Khader AT, Wilde PD. Intelligent Evacuation Management Systems: A Review. *ACM Trans Intell Syst Technol*. 2016;7(3):1-27.
39. Lee RSC, Hughes RL. Prediction of human crowd pressures. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*. 2006;38(4):712-22.
40. Wang JY, Weng WG, Zhang XL. New insights into the crowd characteristics in Mina. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*. 2014;2014(11):P11003.
41. Zhen W, Mao L, Yuan Z. Analysis of Trample Disaster and a Case Study - Mihong Bridge Fatality in China in 2004. *Safety science*. 2008;46(8):1255-70.
42. Bowley DM, Rein P, Scholtz HJ, Boffard KD. The Ellis Park Stadium Tragedy. *European Journal of Trauma*. 2004;30(1):51-5.

43. Colville-Ebeling B, Freeman M, Banner J, Lynnerup N. Autopsy practice in forensic pathology - evidence-based or experience-based? a review of autopsies performed on victims of traumatic asphyxia in a mass disaster. *J Forensic Leg Med*. 2014;22:33-6.
44. Sheikh IA, Shaheen FA, El-Aqeil NA, Al-Khader A, Karsuwa S. Acute Renal Failure due to Rhabdomyolysis Following Human Stampede. *Saudi J Kidney Dis Transpl*. 1994;5(1):17-22.
45. Garcia L-M. Pathological Crowds: Affect and Danger in Responses to the Love Parade Disaster at Duisburg. 2011. 2011.
46. Pearl TH. Far from the Madding Crowd: A Statutory Solution to Crowd Crush. *Hastings LJ*. 2016;68:159.
47. Jain A. Crowd Management at Heritage Sites. We Can Not Leave Everything to God Children and Crowd Management in Schools. 2014(107):10-1.
48. Shukla PK, editor Genetically optimized architectural designs for control of pedestrian crowds. Australian Conference on Artificial Life; 2009: Springer.
49. Lee RSC, Hughes RL. Minimisation of the risk of trampling in a crowd. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation (MATCOM)*. 2007;74(1):29-37.
50. Deshpande N, Gupta R. Crowd management using fuzzy logic and GIS. *WIT Transactions on Information and Communication Technologies*. 2010;43:325-34.
51. Soomaroo L. UNISDR Scientific and Technical Advisory Group Case Studies—2014.
52. Ramesh MV, Shanmughan A, Prabha R. Context aware ad hoc network for mitigation of crowd disasters. *Ad Hoc Networks*. 2014;18:55-70.
53. Khanna B, Qwatara A, Khanna N. Need for Stampede Management at School Level. We Can Not Leave Everything to God Children and Crowd Management in Schools. 2014(107):5-7.
54. Bhatt MR. We Can Not Leave Everything to God. We Can Not Leave Everything to God Children and Crowd Management in Schools. 2014(107):2-3.
55. Valesky W, Silverberg M, Gillett B, Roblin P, Adelaine J, Wallis LA, et al. Assessment of hospital disaster preparedness for the 2010 FIFA World Cup using an internet-based, long-distance tabletop drill. *Prehosp Disaster Med*. 2011;26(3):192-5.
56. Huang L, Chen T, Wang Y, Yuan H. Congestion detection of pedestrians using the velocity entropy: A case study of Love Parade 2010 disaster. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*. 2015;440:200-9.
57. Cocking C, Drury J. Talking about Hillsborough: 'Panic' as Discourse in Survivors' Accounts of the 1989 Football Stadium Disaster. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*. 2014;24(2):86-99.
58. Conn D. Hillsborough inquests jury rules 96 victims were unlawfully killed. *The Guardian*. 2016;26.
59. Salamati P, Rahimi-Movaghar V. Need for Revision of Strategies for Prevention of Hajj Stampedes. *Archives of Trauma Research*. 2016(In Press):e36308.
60. Wieringa SH. Planning Safe Pedestrian Mass Events: Proposing a Framework for Mitigating Risks of Crowd Disasters at Mass Events in the Public Urban Space. 2015.
61. Kolli S. Multi-Agent Management of Crowds to Avoid Stampedes in Long Queues. Hyderabad, India: International Institute of Information Technology Hyderabad; 2014.

62. Prasun A, Dixit P, editors. Stampede Management For Religious Events In India. International Conference on Disaster Management in Civil Engineering; 2015; Phuket, Thailand.
63. Bolia NB. Risk management strategies to avoid stampede at Mass gatherings. 2nd World Conference on Disaster Management; Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India 2015.